**Humanising research relationships: Democratising education-based enquiry with student researchers**

**Abstract**

This paper critically reflects upon the experiences of three student researchers during a participatory research project conducted in an English sixth-form academy. Discussion is centred upon a research conversation involving three student researchers (aged 17 years) and two postgraduate researchers, from York St John University, UK. Collectively, critical insights are offered into the process of conducting education-based participatory re- search; leading to the identification of situations in which ethical challenges, tensions and power imbalances arose. Through reflection, attention is paid to how researchers can disrupt neoliberal educational agendas and create opportunities for democratic research. The narratives presented in this paper offer recommendations for facilitating more democratic research relationships, that centralise the valuing of all voices and promote collaborative approaches to research. Envisioning this ‘space’ for future research through adaptation of Freire’s ‘culture circles’, the article concludes with suggestions of how researchers may work to humanise research relationships.
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**Introduction**

The past decade has witnessed augmentation in the advocation and implementation of democratically grounded participatory methodologies within educational institutions (Edwards and Brannelly, 2017; Flewitt et al., 2018). This paper explores how young people experience participatory research within educational institutions by presenting the narratives of three student researchers who engaged in a school-based project during 2022. Discussion centres upon a research conversation between three student researchers and two postgraduate researchers, who explore how researchers may democratise re- search relationships. This serves to highlight some of the complexities, ethical challenges, and tensions in facilitating education-based research with young people.

*Youth participatory action research*

Viewed as a twenty-first century paradigm for research (Kellett, 2005), participatory research, in its originally intended form, recognises the expertise of participants and seeks to engage these individuals throughout the research process (Brown, 2021). Initially inspired by Marxist, Feminist, and anti-colonial thinking, participatory and YPAR methodologies are becoming increasingly favoured when researching issues affecting the lives of children and young people (Edwards and Brannelly, 2017; Flewitt et al., 2018). Authors have suggested that the early development of participatory action research lies with Paulo Freire’s pedagogies (Freire, 1970), where collaboration and co-creation enabled research to adapt and develop ideas of an inclusive and truly participatory research context (Wallace and Giles, 2019). The project described in this paper intended to build a YPAR methodology where the research questions and design were crafted to suit those most affected by the issue under scrutiny (Fine and Torre, 2019), in this case, school toilets. Although the project proved successful in supporting young people to contribute to various stages of the research process, due to a variety of limitations and complexities the project was unable to implement a purposeful ‘action’ stage of the research. The definition of participatory research which underpinned the school toilets project was taken from Wallace and Giles, who outline the methodology as:

An approach that values the involvement of participants, is concerned with addressing the power dynamics of research and uses methodology flexibly to best suit the research needs (Wallace and Giles, 2019: 2).

Despite the growing advocation and implementation of PAR methodologies in education-based settings, scholars warn against the constraining aspects of such approaches which are entangled within broader discourses, practices and power relations between adults and young people (Kirby, 2020; Spyrou, 2011). Gallagher (2008) states that underlying tensions within participatory methodologies with young people are often centred upon the positionality of power within research relationships. It has been argued that facilitating and supporting young people to contribute to research processes can take extensive time commitments and resources from the adult researcher, which may not be the case for widely implemented qualitative and quantitative approaches (Corney et al., 2021). The authors put forward that time is not only required to conduct and disseminate the research but also for mindful reflection and appreciation of how young people experience such projects (Corney et al., 2021). Brown (2021) further encourages researchers embarking on this important, yet challenging, journey of participatory research with young people to reflect upon their conscious positioning alongside the youth co- researchers. Moreover, as with the case in all child-based research, researchers pursuing participatory research with young people have a significant responsibility to ensure that student co-researchers experience no harm or disadvantage through their participation (Brown, 2021; Corney et al., 2021). This paper discusses the co-researchers’ perceptions of their involvement in the school toilets project, the research relationships which developed, and ideas for future participatory research with young people.

*Student voice*

The concept of student voice has been described as ‘the involvement of young people in school and community leadership to ensure that youth can inform, participate in, and/or lead the decisions that impact them on a daily basis’ (Brasoft and Levitan, 2022: 1). As of the field of student voice research has grown the premise that student voice work always provides students the right of democratic participation in school processes is widely contested (Flewitt et al., 2018; Lundy, 2007; Spyrou, 2011; Taylor and Robinson, 2009). Prominent child-rights scholar, Laura Lundy (2007), argues that the use of the term ‘voice’ is often inadequate and misleading, questioning the enactment of the core principles of Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989). Aiming to address such concerns, Lundy (2007) proposes that it may be more appropriate to consider the interconnectedness of space, voice, audience, and in- fluence when working to assure the rights of the child in student voice work, see Figure 1.

Figure 1 displays Lundy’s (2007: 932) model of implementation of Article 12, which demonstrates the interrelatedness and significant overlap between (a) space and voice, and (b) audience and influence. Lundy (2007) stresses that children and young people should be assured the right to express their views as well as the right to have their views given due weight. In the ensuing discussions, we discuss the steps taken and challenges encountered in developing research relationships that enact the principles of Article 12.

**Figure 1:** Lundy model of implementation of Article 12



*Education-based research and neoliberalism*

It has been argued that the omission of students’ voices in research is a result of broader contexts that situate research in schools due to the ‘high-performance’ orientation of institutions, which reflect market-driven ideologies (Fielding, 2006). Building upon such claims, Nelson and Charteris (2021: 214) state that ‘neoliberal agendas colonise empowerment discourses traditionally associated with student voice, in practice through the co-option of terms such as choice and empowerment to a market agenda.’ A marker of neoliberal discourses, which are becoming increasingly engrained in English education systems, is that schools are now positioned in league tables and judged to be outstanding; good; requires improvement; or inadequate because of their educational performance (Ingleby, 2021). Scholars have also overviewed the consequences of neoliberal political agendas on educational contexts, stating there is an increasing standardisation and ac- countability of schools, a trend towards running schools like businesses, with increased competition between schools (Caldwell, 2010; Hadar, 2023; Perryman et al., 2011). Perryman et al., (2011:179) state that a major consequence of neoliberalism in English schools has resulted in a ‘pressure to deliver’ and argue there is a preoccupation with achievement. Caldwell (2010) argues that the high-stakes nature and examination focused curriculum within neoliberal educational contexts are inextricably linked to the relegation of innovation and creativity. The Good Childhood Report (Children’s Society, 2022) explores the impact of the market-driven agenda within United Kingdom (UK) schools and reports that 1 in 8 10–15-year-olds as ‘unhappy’ with school. Feelings of happiness were strongly related to feeling listened to, however almost 1 in 5 young people thought that they did not have a say in decisions that were important to them in school (Children’s Society, 2022: 4). Focusing on the impact of neoliberal structures on school-based research, Anderson (2017a) argues that PAR has the potential to disrupt the current neoliberal educational agendas by developing alliances among teachers, students, and communities. Anderson (2017b) declares that PAR is vulnerable to being co-opted in the increasing test-driven and audit culture of public schools. Warning of the outcome-driven educational system and the messiness of democratic research, Herr (2017) stresses that school-based research is fraught with tensions due to the structures and support mechanisms which maintain the status quo of schooling. Such concerns will be acknowledged throughout the discussion later in this article.

**Methods**

*Research context*

The discussion presented in this special issue contribution develops from a participatory research project conducted by Alice, Josh, Elliot, and Oscar in 2022. Across a 4-month period, the research group worked collaboratively exploring ‘toilet issues’ in one in- dependent sixth-form academy in the North of England, Northfields Academy [pseudonymised]. Guided by participatory methodologies and by adapting Kellett’s (2005) ‘children as researchers’ model, Alice worked alongside Josh, Elliot, and Oscar to develop a research plan to gather insights from other students at Northfields Academy to issues relating to the toilets. The project commenced with six student researchers, three male and three female, however half-way through the project three of the student re- searchers voluntarily withdrew to focus on their upcoming examinations. Throughout 12 workshop-style research sessions, the group formed research questions, identified a data collection method, analysed their data, and disseminated the findings to their peers and the Academy senior leadership team. Following the conclusion of the project, the research group were invited to present their findings at an academic conference at York St John University, where they met fellow school-based researcher, Matthew. After sharing their research experiences, Josh, Elliot, Oscar, Alice and Matthew discussed further how young people may experience education-based research and how academic researchers could improve young people’s experiences. This conversation encouraged Alice and Matthew to further reflect and discuss their involvement in education-based research projects.

*Research conversations*

This article presents the narratives of three student researchers alongside the discussions of two postgraduate researchers drawn from a research conversation. Swain and King (2022: 2) advocate the use of conversation as a qualitative research method and identify that ‘participatory conversations’ provide opportunities for greater ease and depth in communication. Similarly, Shier (2019) argues that for researchers to effectively engage with young people in rights-based research they must acknowledge their influence on the co-researcher’s participation. Such considerations are heightened in educational settings as young people often feel compelled to give ‘correct’ answers, with power differentials often influential in this process (Shier, 2019). Alice and Matthew were conscious of the student researchers potentially feeling compelled into providing answers that did not truly reflect their experiences. To mitigate such concerns, before the research conversation was conducted, the student researchers were asked via email to outline what they would like to discuss, they provided the following ‘suggestion areas’, (a) why being involved in re- search is useful to students (b) which students should be involved, and (c) why students should be involved in research. These early lines of enquiry, alongside discussions of ‘power’, ‘participation’, and ‘tension’ between the co-authors at the research conference, formed unstructured conversation prompts to be discussed during the research conversation. In keeping with the democratic approach of the original research project, Alice and Matthew considered it essential to invite Josh, Elliot and Oscar to further discuss their experiences. The research conversation from which discussion is presented was con- ducted in April 2023, lasting 90 min. The research conversation was audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by Alice and Matthew, before being reviewed and reflected upon by all authors.

The research conversation provided space in which Josh, Elliot, Oscar, Alice and Matthew could discuss, reflect and evaluate their experiences of education-based re- search. Discussions were guided by Josh, Elliot and Oscar’s reflections on their involvement in the ‘toilet issues’ project, which they had previously communicated to Alice, and later to Matthew during their conversation at the academic conference. Once transcribed, Josh, Elliot, and Oscar were sent the research conversation and were asked by Alice and Matthew to identify any extracts or discussion points that they considered to be particularly important. Early drafts of this article were sent on two occasions by Alice and Matthew to the student researchers to offer critique and suggest areas for development.

*Ethical considerations*

Whilst the ‘toilet issues’ PAR project, upon which this article is underpinned, raised several ethical considerations and challenges, for the purpose of this paper discussion is centred upon matters related to the research conversation and presentation of student voice. Porter et al., (2010) pose several queries about the acknowledgement and inclusion of young people in research outputs, including academic papers, and question whether young people should be named authors. Likewise, Groundwater-Smith et al., (2014) advise careful consideration of which voices are presented, displayed, and acknowledged with student voice research. Notwithstanding such warnings, Cook-Sather (2020) con- tends that student-authored or co-authorised publications promote student agency and may provide more accurate representations of young people’s perceptions and experiences. Reflecting on Hamilton et al.’s (2019) discussion, the authors discussed at length the authorship of this paper and how to most appropriately present extracts drawn from the research conversation. Collectively, we decided that the three student researchers should be included as authors, due to their involvement in the data analysis process, their re- visions to drafts of the paper and preference to have their contributions recognised. Therefore, the authorship of this paper is shared by Josh, Elliot, Oscar, Alice, and Matthew. Upholding the ethical principles which underpinned the ‘toilet issues’ project, all other identifiable information related to the sixth-form academy, other individuals and institutions has been anonymised using pseudonyms. The research was approved by the York St John research ethics committee.

**Discussion**

The discussion is organised into four sub-sections encompassed within the broader theme of how researchers can facilitate democratic research with young people in educational settings. Each theme will be presented sequentially in the order in which they were discussed by Josh, Elliot and Oscar, Matthew and Alice; however, it is important to note that the themes are not presented in isolation from one another. Instead, the student researcher’s narrative accounts are presented to critically reflect upon the wider discourses and educational processes which influence research with young people.

***Facilitating democratic research in educational institutions***

The first point of discussion relates to researchers’ ability to facilitate a democratic research ‘space’ in which young people are provided with the opportunity to investigate the issues which impact their own lives. Kellett et al., (2004: 30) explain that schools are locations in which children are least able to exercise participation rights due to adults controlling their occupation of space, timetables and times of eating. Through earlier discussions, Alice and Matthew had questioned whether researchers could challenge such participation rights due to the nature of the UK education system, in which both re- searchers had been ill-afforded suitable time and spaces to facilitate research with young people. These challenges can be considered symptomatic of the neoliberal agenda upon which UK state schools are governed, with time and resources often dedicated to aca- demic performance and position within school rankings (Ingleby, 2021).

Before the commencement of the ‘toilet issues’ project, Alice had considered the challenges and pragmatic considerations of conducting research within educational institutions, however, through personal reflection she acknowledges that in future projects further thought will be paid to the physical space in which research is conducted. Alice’s reflection was aided by Elliot and Josh during the research conversation, with the student researchers alluding to the significance of the physical space in which they disseminated their findings to their Head of Year:

Elliot: ‘We’d [Elliot, Josh and Oscar] had gone into her [gatekeeper] office. I feel like a lot of that is her kind of space. Whereas if you bring her to us, sort of thing, it’d be more like, I don’t know how to describe it...’

Josh: ‘Yeah. You have to give her permission to come into our [emphasis added] area... If you are in that kind of executive meeting room with a big table with everyone sat around it in smart clothing, they would listen to you more’

As previously outlined by Morrison (2008), Elliot and Josh draw attention to the importance of physical spaces, and the social significance of such spaces, on the social relations of those who are situated within them. Morrison (2008: 58) claims that educational structures and institutional constraints contribute to students internalising that classroom success is dependent on them ‘checking their democratic rights at the door’. Josh and Elliot allude to such conclusions by explaining that they felt their teacher had ownership of the space in which they disseminated their research and further question the extent to which their voices were listened to within such a space (Lundy, 2007). This reflection, which had not been considered before the research conversation, provides valuable learning for Alice, Matthew, and other researchers who may wish to facilitate participatory research in education-based settings. Subsequently, we suggest that all researchers carefully consider and continue to reflect on the space in which research is undertaken and to assure that all voices are listened to.

***Opportunities to engage***

The social structures of UK educational institutions, and more specifically schools, have been found to be further problematic due to the culture of conformity (Kirby, 2020) in which young people are expected to conform to certain roles and patterns of behaviour. During the research conversation, Josh illustrated an example of such a culture of conformity, relating to the initial recruitment process for the ‘toilet issues’ project:

Josh: ‘What I mean by involvement is that she [gatekeeper] came to my form room and said “come on Josh, you’re in this room” ... like ushered me in. Rather than for example, you walk down the stairs, you see a poster... it was like come into this room and see what opportunity we have. No other way to get out of it really, so I just walked in. Obviously, you could say no after you heard what the opportunity was’.

Josh’s reflection highlights the expectation that young people should conform with the social orders of educational institutions which are determined and enforced by adults (Kirby, 2020). Specifically, Josh’s stipulation that there was ‘no other way to get out of it really’ exemplifies the expectation of conformity. Arguments indicate that the act of saying ‘no’ to an adult, particularly one in a position of increased authority such as a teacher, is a difficult and brave decision for a young person to make (Heath et al., 2007; Kirby, 2020). While Josh acknowledges the gatekeeper’s involvement in the recruitment process was with his best interest at heart, referring to the project as an ‘opportunity’, this still exemplifies the influence of the teacher during the recruitment process and the unintended consequences of a pressure to participate.

Later in the research conversation, Elliot discussed his thoughts on how to alter this dynamic between adults and young people within school-based research settings:

Elliot: ‘I think a lot of boils down to power dynamics between students and teachers and the head of school and I think in a classroom setting, if teachers can humanise themselves a lot more, if they sit and talk about their time at school then it kind of gives students a recognition that these people [teachers] went through exactly the same stuff they’re going through... it will push students to talk about that, I think a lot more’.

Elliot’s reflection points towards a research approach recently outlined by Barak and Lefstein (2022), who advocate the creation of a classroom climate in which young people can express opinions, make recommendations, and mutually reflect upon their participation. Similarly, Flewitt et al., (2018: 384) encourage researchers to pursue opportunities to ‘work alongside educators to create school cultures that foster belonging and genuinely support all student’s expertise’. Elliot’s reference to humanising relationships between teachers and students via dialogue demonstrates similarities to the work of Paulo Freire (1990), and more specifically his introduction of ‘culture circles’. Culture circles have been used to create a social space in which each member can engage with and contribute on an equal footing. Cook-Sather (2007) uses culture circles to promote student engagement, Guitiérrez (2008) uses the approach to develop the idea of a ‘third space’ for research relationships to develop, and Chaib (2010) adapts Freire’s work to explore the impact of music listening circles. Elliot’s insight into opening dialogical spaces to develop a spirit of collaboration amongst teachers, young people, and researchers draws us to Couldry’s words, ‘in learning of the complexities of others’ voices, we may learn something about the complexities of our own’ (Couldry, 2010: 131). Providing opportunities for students to work alongside adults through devoting time to developing ‘reciprocal trust’ (Magill and Rodriguez (2019: 60) can diminish the struggle for recognition that often silences some voices (Couldry, 2010).

***The value of participation***

By reflecting upon the suggestions offered by Josh, Elliot, and Oscar, the research conversation has enabled further discussion around the potential value of devoting time and thought to creating a space in which democratic relationships can develop. Expressing his views of the benefits of approaching research democratically, Elliot explains how such an approach could enable young people to express their opinions and begin to understand how to influence matters of importance:

Elliot: ‘I think it does a lot in terms of future students as well. Like from a young age you kind of get students used to criticising stuff, then you get to later life things with like government and things like where people will be like “oh well, not my problem”. You kind of start to get people coming through who are comfortable with disagreeing with stuff that’s happening and saying that they don’t think a particular thing that has been put through is right, or has happened, is right.

Elliot’s outlook also promotes the disruption of the culture of conformity (Kirby, 2020) in educational institutions, but also in broader societal discourses that young people should conform to adult-centred social structures (Magill and Rodriguez, 2019). Barak and Lefstein (2022: 196) reported similar advantages of participatory research they conducted, stating that by helping young people develop critical thinking, deliberative values, and argumentative skills such processes prepare young people for their active roles as critical citizens in broader society. Neoliberal discourses have contributed to a position where certain types of narrative are often blocked, particularly in institutions such as UK schools (Couldry, 2010), and as Elliot, and Barak and Lefstein (2022) advocate, providing young people with a platform from which they can express their views and criticise phenomena can provide meaningful learning.

***Insights into democratising research relationships***

The discussion presented in this article thus far has focused on why researchers should attempt to create democratic research relationships within educational institutions. The following section presents the student researcher’s perceptions of how researchers can democratise research relationships. A theme which developed throughout the research conversation was the significance of a teacher’s time and presence, or absence, during research workshops. Oscar and Elliot reflected on the relationships between student researchers and teachers during the toilet issues project:

Oscar: ‘It was kind of difficult for us to get a message across to, sort of teachers, and people who are in charge because they have so much on. We have so much on. It has been difficult to get any consistency with it.’

Elliot: ‘I’d say the main thing is detaching students from teachers, ask them individually. I’d ask everyone involved in the school what their opinion is on a particular matter. But, when you ask students don’t have a teacher sit in, in the back [of the room], because they will be very aware of the fact that they are there. Even if the teacher fully agrees with them, they will, they’ll limit what they’ll say. Still kind of have a big filter... they might get backlash for it. And I think a lot of it is kind of openness to say whatever you, however you feel about the topic to be able to say it knowing the students know what they say doesn’t get relayed, won’t necessarily be related back to like the head of year in a malicious sense’.

Oscar raises the issue of the neoliberal nature of UK educational institutions in which time is an increasingly valuable commodity and how priorities may be weighted in favour of academic achievement (Hadar, 2023; Ingleby, 2021). Elliot then raised the potential issue of young people ‘checking their democratic rights’ (Morrison, 2008: 58) when asked to discuss their thoughts and opinions regarding a particular issue in the presence of a teacher. Pace and Hemmings (2006) state that schools are structured so that teachers have increased authority over young people in which it is often deemed inappropriate for students to scrutinise. Subsequently this may limit the potential to foster a two-way dialogue (Lundy, 2007). As Elliot highlights, young people recognise the importance of how their voice is communicated and viewed within the wider networks around the research project, as fear of ‘backlash’ or inaccurate portrayal can have consequences far beyond the research (Moore et al. 2017). The conversation continued and provided an opportunity for Josh to reflect upon Elliot’s initial idea:

Josh: ‘Like hearing you guy’s perspectives changes like my perspectives, then we all have like different forms of discussion. Your perspectives kind of merge, become like one coherent kind of viewpoint across everybody. So, I think that type of thing needs prioritising im- mediately. It is trying to make a comfortable environment with students. So, like having an actual nice, a friendly environment where you can feel comfortable saying whatever about a topic... so feels less kind of afraid to open-up about your viewpoints’.

As Josh was articulating his perspective, it was evident that the discussion resonated with Oscar and Elliot, with both student researchers nodding in agreement with the points raised. Shortly after, Elliot offered his perspective of how researchers could work to create a transformative space within educational institutions:

Elliot: ‘About the friendly environment you [Josh] were talking about, I’ve just thought, I don’t think isolating each individual group is the best way to go about it. I think give everyone, each individual group a chance between themselves, a chance to talk about what they think. Around their tables they can write down on pieces of paper their opinions, put down their thoughts. But then to bring in the teacher and have the students and teacher sit around and talk about it, because I think what that would do is actually humanise everyone in the situation a lot more’.

Elliot’s inclusion of the term ‘humanise’ is one that as a group of researchers, we began discussing further. Elfert (2023) uses the term ‘humanism’ to refer to the idea that education should contribute to individual potential, empowerment and, therefore, the betterment of human lives, which was a fundamental aim of the toilet issues project. Elfret (2023) develops his understanding by arguing that humanism and democracy are strongly related. Almost in accord with Elfret (2023), Elliot further reflects upon the benefits of ‘humanising’ research relationships and offered an indication of how this can be achieved through a democratic approach:

Elliot: ‘I think giving students and teachers a chance to talk about how they view particular stuff, gives everyone in it the chance to just be people and kind of take a step back from “I’m in charge, I stand at the front, I tell you what’s happening, you’re going to get in trouble if you speak when I am”. Like a lot of that kind of power dynamic stops both the teacher and student saying something’.

Elliot’s recommendations show similarities to those offered by Mannion (2007), who advocates communication between adults and young people during PAR to enable a shared understanding of their experiences and the importance of their relationships as a prerequisite for change. Whilst the creation of such a dialogic space is not without its challenges, bravery on the part of the researchers, teachers and students is required to respect the ‘not knowing’ nature of such pedagogical spaces (Chaib, 2010). In the latter stages of the research conversation, Elliot’s promotion of providing everyone with an opportunity to ‘just be people’ shows notable similarities to Freire’s (1970) discussion of culture circles as an approach emphasising common interest and collaboration amongst students and teachers. The layering of alternative perspectives that Elliot refers to ac- knowledges that tensions may arise during participatory research projects yet provides a particularly useful tool to encourage researchers to respectfully facilitate discussion with opposing positions. This idea of a framework that enables new ways of ‘narrative ex- change’ (Couldry, 2010: 147) follows Couldry’s description of democratic processes that could begin to shape post-neoliberal society.

**Conclusion**

This special issue contribution has provided the reflections of three student researchers as the catalyst for discussion of how researchers may democratise research relationships in educational research settings. Our discussion has attempted to attune researchers to how young people experience PAR and to facilitate wider discussions of how researchers can promote humanism (Elfret, 2023) amongst teachers, young people, and researchers. Inspired by Freire’s (1970) seminal work on ‘culture circles’, the authors have critically reflected upon the importance of space, how researchers can disrupt the culture of conformity (Kirby, 2020) and demonstrated the potential value of developing a two-way dialogue and reciprocal trust (Lundy, 2007; Magill and Rodriguez, 2019). Whilst striving for more democratic and equitable research relationships, we acknowledge the wider economic and political landscape in which English state schools and sixth forms operate.

Although the discussion has considered how researchers may elevate the most im- portant voices impacted by education systems (Levitan and Brasof, 2022), a limitation of this paper is the omission of teachers’ voice both in reflecting upon the toilet issues project and during the research conversation which followed. In future, scholars may wish to include all individuals involved in participatory and PAR projects in culture circles to gain a more democratic understanding of the dynamics, tensions, and power relations in- volved. Whilst consideration of student voice work in this paper has provided us with an appreciation of how young people experience education-based research, it feels crucial to reflect again upon Couldry’s (2010: 131) assertion that ‘in learning of the complexities of others’ voices, we may learn something about the complexities of our own’.
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