Chapter 6

Participation and hybrid integration in primary and secondary schools

Federico Farini, Sara Amadasi, Jane Murray,
Angela Scollan and Magdalena Ślusarczyk

The actions that make facilitation

Based on empirical observation of interactions involving migrant background children (CMB) and non-migrant background children across several countries, this chapter discusses excerpts from classroom interaction that illustrate successful ways to support hybrid integration in the education system (see Chapter 2). This chapter therefore addresses the facilitation of children's agency, displayed as authorship of knowledge in classroom interactions. The chapter discusses how different forms of facilitation, or different phases of the same process of facilitation, can be underpinned by the combination of several actions.

The interactions discussed in this chapter are part of the CHILD-UP project data repository which includes questionnaires, interviews with children and professionals working with them and, crucially for this chapter, 180 activities, video- or audio-recorded across 90 groups, involving 1,524 children (Table 6.1).

Across all contexts of the research, the classrooms participating in the CHILD-UP project were connotated by the presence of CMB, albeit with some relevant differences related to the location of the classrooms. The data reported in Table 6.2 does not refer to the percentage of CMB in each country across schools. Rather, it refers to the classrooms where activities were recorded. Activities in Swedish contexts were related to the teaching of Swedish as second language in lower secondary schools and were therefore attended solely by CMB.

Baraldi (2008, 2014) and Baraldi, Joslyn and Farini (2021) present a non-exhaustive list of facilitative actions: questions to invite clarifications and further discussions; acknowledgement tokens confirming and appreciating others' positioning; comments to support the ongoing interaction; formulations aiming to secure a shared understanding of the gist of previous turns of talk and their implications. Notwithstanding a varied morphology, actions are facilitative if they contribute to the aim of facilitation, that is, positioning children as agentic authors of valid knowledge, thereby creating expectations of fair distribution of participation in interaction (equity), sensitivity for others' interests and needs (empathy), and self-determination (expectations of personal expressions). Researchers have examined how facilitative actions create a favourable context for agency in a range of social situations (Baraldi, 2014; Baraldi & Gavioli, 2020;

Table 6.1 Children participating in CHILD-UP activities

	No.	%
Primary schools	786	51.6
Lower secondary schools	422	27.7
Higher secondary schools	316	20.7
Total	**1,524**	**100**

Table 6.2 Percentage of CMB in the participating classrooms

Country	*% CMB*
Belgium	6.3
Finland	46.1
Germany	21.8
Italy	40.1
Poland	17.2
Sweden	100
UK	60.7
Participating classrooms average	**49.4**

Black, 2008; Bohm, 1996; Gergen, McNamee & Barrett, 2001). Data from CHILD-UP research allows identification of the main facilitative actions that proved effective in promoting children's agency as the presupposition of hybrid integration.

Invitations to contribute

An invitation to contribute can promote both the beginning of the process of communication and its continuation, for instance by inviting details to be added or asking questions to the current speaker (Baraldi et al., 2021). There is a variety of invitations. *Inviting to talk* is the most ubiquitous facilitative action. Invitation to talk is the basic tool for facilitators to promote engagement in conversation, for instance through prefacing, interlocutory and verbal forms. *Inviting to ask* specifically favours further expansion of an ongoing contribution by inviting other participants to ask questions. *Inviting to add and expand* facilitates the engagement of bystanders as authors of knowledge by commenting on ongoing contributions or adding more content. As invitations to add and expand are pivotal for the development of interlaced narratives, they play an important role in creating conditions for the negotiation of hybrid identities.

Questions

Questions are a key facilitative action to support children's access to the role of authors of knowledge. The main types of question, with different implications for the promotion of agency, are: (1) *focused questions* that invite a short answer, such as a yes or no, or a choice between two alternatives (Farini, 2011; Margutti, 2006; Raymond, 2003); (2) *open questions* that create more favourable conditions for expanded answers. Focused questions promote a risk–free participation of children, albeit often in minimal forms. Open questions do not present their recipients with clear expectations about their answers. Risk-avoidance reactions that are averse to engagement in conversation, such as silence, can follow open questions. Nevertheless, when effective, open questions promote richer forms of participation (Farini & Scollan, 2021).

Different types of questions can be combined. Data from CHILD-UP show that open questions can be followed also by a series of focused questions, to check and clarify meanings of contributions. Focused questions can be used as ice-breakers to engage children with a low-risk form of participation and followed by open questions to enhance more complex contributions, where agency is displayed as authorship of knowledge.

Facilitative actions of minimal feedback

Continuers, repetitions, and acknowledgement tokens are actions of minimal feedback that show engagement with children's contributions. They have an important function that support children's active participation and production of narratives through "active listening", that is, sensitivity for personal expression (Voutilainen, Henttonen, Stevanovic, Kahri & Peräkylä, 2019). *Continuers* are the most minimal action of feedback that invite children to continue to talk. They include interrogative confirmations, short confirmations, and para-verbal signals (Gardner, 2001). *Repetitions* are another action of minimal feedback that reproduce the previous turn or part of it, thus showing listening and encouraging further talk (Wong, 2000). Repetitions, of words or parts of sentences, show listening more explicitly than continuers.

Acknowledgment tokens are a third action of minimal feedback that recognises the importance of specific aspect of children's contributions. Acknowledgement tokens can show positive feedback more clearly than continuers and repetitions. They have the function of showing recognition of the interlocutor's right of talk. This type of feedback is not merely effective in supporting continuation of talk, because it also displays appreciation and the consequentiality of children's agency.

Facilitative actions of complex feedback: formulations

Formulations are complex actions of feedback. Formulations summarise the gist of previous utterances and present them to the authors of those utterances.

Formulations allow mutual understanding of previous turns at talk to be confirmed (Heritage & Watson, 1979). Formulations can work in conversation as (1) *explications*, to clarify the meaning of previous turns at talk (Chernyshova, 2018); and (2) *developments* of previous turns, to prefigure or introduce possible implications of them (Peräkylä, 2019).

Formulations are a powerful type of support for children's agency as authorship of knowledge. Research suggests that formulations are used in educational interactions to check mutual understanding (Skarbø Solem & Skovholt, 2017), to manage conflicts (Baraldi, 2019) and to promote dialogue in the classroom (Baraldi, 2014). In CHILD-UP data, formulations frequently follow question-and-answer sequences: facilitators start with a question, then formulate the children's answers. Within more complex turns at talk, formulations can be introduced by acknowledgement tokens and followed by questions to check their validity. The use of questions after formulations uses the power of questions to enhance recipients' immediate reactions. Data suggest that adding questions after formulations is more effective with open questions. An empirical indicator of the success of formulation in promoting children's agency may consist in children's expansions (Baraldi et al., 2021). Expansions indicate children's willingness to use formulations as platforms for authorship of knowledge; thus, expansions signal that formulations are successful in enhancing agency.

When formulating the gist or the implications of a turn at talk, or several turns at talk, the facilitator accesses the role of author of knowledge. It is a side-effect of the use of formulations that can be mitigated reflexively through facilitation, by adopting actions that reposition children as the authors of knowledge, such as invitations to talk or to add to the formulated gist of previous utterances.

Facilitators' personal contributions

Facilitators' personal contributions are facilitative actions that can be particularly effective because they make relevant expectations of personal expression and empathy, that is, two core components of dialogue (Baraldi & Iervese, 2017; Hendry, 2009). Data suggest that facilitators' personal contributions, if successful, are most effective in securing the sustainability of facilitation over the course of the interactions, with additional implications for trust building. Nevertheless, facilitators' personal contributions need to be carefully measured to avoid the risk of shifting the focus of communication to facilitators' actions. In a more stringent way than formulations, when producing a personalised contribution the facilitator positions him/herself as an author of knowledge: this can temporarily reposition children as recipients of adults' knowledge.

Three main types of facilitators' personal contributions emerge from CHILD-UP data. *Personal comments* as a type of "upshot formulations" (Antaki, 2008) that, rather than elaborating the gist of previous utterances, introduce new topics of conversation, which are therefore authored by the facilitator. *Appreciations* provide affective support to children's agentic participation, targeting specific contributions. Appreciations can address both children's attitudes displayed by the stories

they share and children's decision to participate. *Personal stories* can be used by facilitators to show personal involvement in the interaction (rather than role-based involvement) as well as empathic closeness to children. By sharing personal stories, facilitators display they have a "story" to tell too, thus inviting children to perceive them as committed persons, rather than as interpreters of role-based routines. But, most importantly, a facilitators' choice of risking trust in children by sharing personal stories is a powerful way to invite children to trust the interaction (Farini, 2019).

Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that personal stories are the riskiest facilitative action because they entail adults' access to a higher epistemic authority and the repositioning of children as recipients of adults-owned knowledge.

Facilitation in primary schools

This section discusses examples from activities in primary schools in Italy and in the UK that illustrate practices that have been successful in the use of facilitation. As previously discussed by Baraldi, Farini and Ślusarczyk (2022), English teachers tend to be more active than Italian facilitators. Their contributions (questions, formulations, comments) are continuous, and they continuously engage with children's contributions. Italian facilitators, rather than contributing with several facilitative actions, frequently leave the floor to children who take initiatives. The types of facilitative actions observed in Italian settings are not different from those in England; rather, they are less frequently used, in favour of leaving the floor to children. As for all excerpts in this chapter, participants' identities were codified to allow recognising their position in the interaction, whilst preserving their anonymity (Table 6.3).

Excerpt 1 is based on the reading of a poem in a London primary school. Children are invited to reflect on adults' feelings. This excerpt shows a successful facilitation, based on a complex series of turns supporting and appreciating children's agency. In this excerpt, the conditions for hybrid integration are co-constructed by children and the teacher, as they share personal meanings of intergenerational relationships, via the production of narratives related to their lived experiences.

Table 6.3 Participants (Codes)

Code	Description
Tm/Tf	T(eacher), m(ale)/f(emale)
FACm/FACf	FAC(ilitator), m(ale)/f(emale)
M1	M(ale) Child, numbered as for order of appearance
F1	F(emale) Child, numbered as for order of appearance
M1m	The additional 'm' indicates migrant background (when discernible)
C/Chd	Non-identifiable C(hild)/Children

01 Tm: busy. So, what does that mean, then? We are so busy with our grown-up needs that we I say we, are completely unsuspecting of the perils and mischief that surrounds them, the children

02 M1:   unsuspecting and preoccupied

03 Tm: so, if you know what preoccupied means, don't worry about writing it down. But do you know what unsuspecting means?

04 F1:   that means you can't see it.

05 Tm: what can't they see?

06 M2:   you being silly or

07 F2:   you doing a crime. hey can't see

08 M3:   they can't see your imagination

09 Tm: fascinating. What do you mean?

10 M3:   they can't see what you're thinking

11 Tm: they are so busy with their adult lives, and why are adults busy? What are we busy with?

12 M4:   because they are busy with work

13 Tm: work

14 M4:   teaching or something

15 Tm: work. What else might we be stressed about or busy with?

16 F3:   children

17 M1:   if they don't earn the right money, they don't have enough food for their children

18 Tm: money and food, that's a worry, isn't it? So, adults are so preoccupied sometimes with their own life, that maybe they don't engage in the imagination side of things. What about children, you tell me?

19 F1:   they can't say their true emotions sometimes

20 Tm: what so you think an adult sometimes can't see a child's emotions all the time

21 F1:   sometimes

22 F3:   I think they are never happy because they never go into their imagination anymore. They are preoccupied

23 Tm: because they are preoccupied, they cannot go into the adult, not adult sorry, the child's memory. They almost forget how it is to be a child and to have fun maybe? That's interesting. Do you think that's a fair comment about adults?

24 F3:   yeah

25 Tm: how do you see adults? Do you see adults like that? Or do you see adults as these fun things that run around with their imaginations?

26 Chd: ((laugh))

27 M5:   they are preoccupied for a lot of the time.

28 Tm: right. Do you as children wish the adults sometimes had more time to, like, have that imagination?

29 M5:   yeah. Like your parents, if one of them works, you don't really get to see them as long

30 Tm: I agree. I only see my girls for half an hour when I get home, but
         I always try and like, if she wants to play a shop game, then I can
         pretend we are in a shop. Are we in a shop?
31 Chd: no
32 Tm: no, but she is imagining it. So I try and get into that imagination with
         her.
33 F5:   that's a nice thing to do
34 Tm: that's a nice thing to do, isn't it?
35 Chd: yeah

In turn 1 the teacher introduces the theme of busy adults who are not able to see children's problems. Interestingly, M1 adds to the term "unsuspecting" used by the teacher, the term "preoccupied" (turn 2). The teacher's following questions to promote expansion about the meaning of unsuspecting (turns 3 and 5) are responded to by F2, M2 and M3. M3. In turn 8, M3 says that adults cannot see children's imagination, attracting the teacher's attention (turn 9). The teacher provokes M3 to explain further. In the following turn, the teacher develops a possible implicit meaning of M3's turn, but she does not ask for M3's approval of this development; rather she provides an open question that invites expansion, enhancing M4's new initiative that focuses on adults' work (turn 12 and 14). M4's expansion is supported by the teacher with the use of minimal actions of feedback. In turn 15, 'work' is not a repetition, because M4 has already expanded his previous statement. Rather, 'work' is a formulation that summarises the gist of the previous sequence of turns. The teacher invites further expansion with an open question. In turn 17, M1's personal initiative interlaces with F3's previous turn and expands it. In the complex turn 18, the teacher provides two formulations about adults' behaviours, first formulating implicit meanings of children's comments, then summarising the gist of the whole sequence of turns 1–17 to present children with a link between preoccupation and inability to see children's imagination. Finally, she asks a question that positions children as authors of knowledge. In the following turns 20 and 23, other formulations contribute to support children's participation. In the same turn 23, two formulations are followed by appreciations and a new question to scope children's points of view. In turn 25, the teacher asks a series of focused questions, followed by a displacing comment ('Or do you see adults as these fun things that run around with their imaginations?'), provoking children's amused reactions and further comment from M5. After validating M5's comment, the teacher provides his own personal comment, positioning himself as a person rather than a role. His personal comment brings the teacher's own personal and family life into the conversation, displaying trust in children as well as expectations of equality, empathy, and personal expression. In turn 32, the teacher continues to share personal experiences, a positioning in the conversation, which is appreciated by F5, who upgrades her epistemic authority as a peer-participant in the teacher's authoring of personal stories.

Excerpt 2 is taken from an interaction recorded in a primary school in Genoa (Italy). In this excerpt, children discuss a narrative about acceptance that was

introduced by M3m. The protagonists of this conversation are two children, M3m and F1m, both with migrant background. This excerpt illustrates how facilitation supports the position of migrant children as authors of valid knowledge which is essential because only if participants' voices are valued, hybrid integration can be constructed.

01 M3m: I am (?)
02 FACf: I didn't understand you know?
03 M3m: I am a little hurt (.) I am already sure that my classmates have already accepted me as I am for how I do things, and therefore I am (I'd like to be) – more to meet new people. I like having friends, classmates, but meeting new people is nice to discover new things too. I don't want to be – that is, to be happy you have to know it's not like you have to stay with your usual friends, with your classmates, you have to be with other people, even those people they know and who don't all get along
04 F1m: then I (.) am a little bit all three more to: Luca than Filippo, because in any case Aurora says she has the anxiety to study a lot but if you follow the lessons and do what you have to do, in the end it is not hard
05 FACf: mh
06 F1m: and (second) in any case I look more like Filippo, because it is important to feel good in a group, (.) because in any case and: it is nice to be accepted by others, because if you are accepted first, now you feel like you have improved (2.0) like before I said that sadness makes you grow (.) in fact some children (.) and like before they were not accepted but just with sadness and people have managed to improve and therefore now they are accepted
07 FACf: but sorry I can think of something compared to what she says then she, if I understand correctly, you said that these children have managed to be accepted because they have improved (…) so the acceptance is from you who accept, but also from the person who (.) improves?
08 F1m: (?) [it's not
09 FACf: [no? (…) I got it wrong?
10 F1m: yes because [(?)
11 FACf: [I got it wrong yes or yes I got it right?
12 F1m: no it seems to me that you did not understand what I meant
13 FACf: then say it again
14 F1m: I mean that and: a person improves himself (.) also with the help of others but more alone (…) no because it seems to me that you said that the other person improves (.) therefore: ((gesticulates)) that is, I mean I (…) impr[ove

15 FACf:	[help me because I don't understand (.) a little bit I don't understand because of the noise from outside
16 M4:	(?)
17 FACf:	go on then
18 M4:	I don't understand a thing about what F1 said
19 FACf:	yes
20 M4:	and: earlier what she said earlier that about the sad child that if you are sad it helps you to grow
21 M2:	can I say it? I understood it
22 FACf:	go on
23 M2:	then F1 in my op- that is, from what I understand she means that if one is sad and is perhaps excluded by others, she tries to improve her behavior to be accepted by everyone
24 ?:	ah
25 F1m:	yes
26 FACf:	yes then it that was what I understood well
27 F1m:	ah

In the beginning of the excerpt, M3m introduces his own personal narrative, talking about trust in classmates' acceptance and about his interest in making friends. Instead, F1m refers to the characters of the narrative proposed by the facilitator; however, she also makes references to her personal views. She states that she feels good when in a group, and she also highlights the importance of acceptance. The facilitator upgrades children's epistemic authority by asking for confirmation twice through focused questions (turns 9, 11), after a formulation of F1m contribution in turn 7. These questions and the formulation show interest in children's opinions. In turn 12, F1m says that the facilitator misunderstood her, and the facilitator invites her to repeat her contribution. In turn 15, the facilitator invites F1m to help her understanding. This turn further upgrades F1m's epistemic authority because it makes explicit that F1m holds the knowledge whilst the facilitator struggles to understand. In turns 18 and 20, M4 asks for clarification about F1m's contribution too. In turn 21 and 23, M2 engages in the conversation by offering his personal interpretation of F1m's point of view ("if one is sad and is perhaps excluded by others, she tries to improve her behavior to be accepted by everyone"). This interpretation is finally validated by F1m in turn 25. In turn 26, the facilitator suggests she understood well but formulated badly, again preserving the position of F1as competent communicator of her own opinion.

Facilitation in lower secondary school

Lower secondary schools are characterised by a transition between childhood and adolescence, which is culturally connoted in the education system by socially-constructed expectations of pre-adolescents' problematic acceptance of teaching, where they are expected to be the recipients of adult knowledge (Rossi

& Baraldi, 2009). Therefore, it was interesting to analyse CHILD-UP data to observe preadolescents' participating in interactions which do not show a primary intention to teach, that is, when preadolescents' active participation in dialogic interactions is facilitated and they are promoted in displaying agency as authorship of knowledge.

Excerpt 3 is taken from an activity in the context of teaching Swedish as second language; thus, all children are CMB. The activity aims to combine learning of the Swedish language with support to children towards developing a conscious consumer culture related to food and the skills to share their knowledge.

01 F1m:	ok, we have made a vitamin C smoothie and it contains raspberries, blueberries, vanilla sugar, honey, and ginger and milk. ((Reading)) raspberries protect eyesight and have (?) Raspberries contain minerals and vitamins that are good for the body. Honey is good for
02 F2m:	yes, for health products
03 F1m:	ginger is good for the digestive process, and milk contains proteins, minerals and vitamins
04 Tm:	nice work
05 F2m:	((reading)) Vitamin C contributes to a better immune system, it normalises the function
06 Tm:	yes, so you get less sick
07 F2m:	exactly, it also contributes to not being so tired and exhausted
08 Tm:	hm, makes one more alert
09 F2m:	exactly
10 Tm:	great, thank you very much. Eh, this thing with ginger. You may have heard of it, that you usually use it when you have a cold, and sometimes you have it in your tea, it softens up the throat
11 F1m:	so, one can have ginger and lemon
12 Tm:	yes, exactly, and in lemon, what vitamin do we have there?
13 C(?):	C-vitamin
14 Tm:	yes, vitamin C. Turns to the whole group: Please taste (their smoothie)
15 C (?):	it tastes strange, I didn't think it would taste like that
16 Tm:	haha, and now, let's go to the next group (the spinach group)

The activity begins with an introduction of the purpose of the activity, which is to taste ingredients and discuss flavours and textures. The children are then divided into four groups and instructed to make a smoothie. Each group focuses on one of four nutritional themes: iron, protein, vitamin C, and spinach. Children are invited to seek information about the nutrients they chose for their smoothies, then to select two or three of the nutrients that they think are important and to justify why. The excerpt concerns the last phase of the activity. In turns 1, 2, 3 and 5, F1 and F2 explain collaboratively the vitamin C smoothie they have produced, reading what the group has written. In turns 4 and 10, the teacher appreciates the

work. In turns 6 and 8, the teacher confirms and formulates what F2 has said. The formulation is validated by the girl. In turn 10, the teacher comments, and F1 upgrades her own epistemic authority by adding to the teacher's comment. The teacher validates F1's display of knowledge, although adds a question that could be interpreted as a way of claiming back epistemic authority. The teacher confirms F1's reply, invites the children to taste the smoothie and moves to the next group. As in Excerpt 2, facilitative actions such as formulations, appreciations and questions converge to upgrade children's epistemic status which is condition for hybrid integration because hybrid integration is possible only if all participants are positioned as authors of knowledge.

Excerpt 4 was recorded in a lower secondary school in Genova (Italy), during an activity based on the "methodology of narration and reflection". Here, children introduce and discuss a narrative about the integration of newcomers from the perspective of relationships and friendship. Excerpt 4 illustrates how a varied range of facilitative actions (actions of minimal feedback, questions, formulations as explications, facilitator's personal initiative as appreciation) successfully promoted the status of CMB as authors of knowledge, supporting the construction and sharing of personal narratives, which is essential component of person-centred, non-essentialist hybrid integration.

01 FACf: ok are we in line with what we said earlier with your answers?
02 M?:   more or less yes
03 FACf: more or less
04 ?:   we are always on that subject
05 FACf: still on the subject eh
06 M2:   eh (.) in my opinion ours is a bit I mean (talks) both of friendships
            (which eh that of the) study method and it is that (which was said
            both) (?) and M1 is a bit- is summary let's say
07 FACf: fine
08 M2:   we did [a–
09 FACf: [a summary well
10 M3:   well, maybe a newcomer who comes I don't know from another
            city and does not know (how to settle in here) and maybe , the
            parents would like that he to be able to find new friends
11 FACf: mh (.) well, you say if there was a particular distance condition
            etcetera etcetera
12 M3:   like someone who comes from a new school a new country wants –
            maybe the parents want mh (.) to settle in I mean (?)
13 ?:   (to be comfortable)
14 M3:   yes
15 FACf: I didn't understand
16 ?:   (he feels comfortable)
17 F4m: like me at the nursery
18 FACf: (louder)

19 F4m: like me at the nursery I didn't have many friends- I mean (.)
           I wasn't happy because (.) it was a little different (let's say) but
           in primary school (.) I managed to make friends I mean they
           accepted me (?)
20 M1:   for example this year for those who start high school and maybe
           don't have middle school mates- the parents want them to settle
           in and for example this year with the distance learning and it has
           not helped a lot because in any case being distant it is not so much
           possible to (socialise)

In turns 1–5, the facilitator negotiates the conversation topic with children, using facilitative actions such as a focused question (6.1.2) in turn 1, to investigate children's points of view on the meanings developed so far in the conversation, and two repetitions (6.1.3) in turns 3 and 5 to show active listening and encouraging further talk. In turns 6 and 8, M2 intervenes to explain the difference between the work he did with his group and the work of other groups, supported by the facilitator's appreciation (6.1.5). In turn 10, M3 introduces the theme of newcomers who can find more difficulties in being included and may be pressed by parents to make new friends. This narrative is supported by the facilitator in turn 11 through a formulation (6.1.4) that elaborates the gist of M3's turn. The formulation gives the opportunity to M3 to clarify his perspective and carry on his narrative. M3 narrative is used by F4m, a child with migrant background, as an opportunity to introduce her own personal story, which she interlaces with M3's. In turn 17, F4m shares the memory of a negative experience in the nursery school, but she also adds that in primary school friendships worked better and she felt accepted. In turn 20, M1 takes the initiative to add an example of the transition to higher secondary and the implication for the stability of the existing network of friendships.

Facilitation in higher secondary schools

Data from higher secondary schools were largely collected in Italian schools, where children engaged in activities with external experts trained in the use of facilitation, rather than with teachers as in the other national contexts. Therefore, the excerpt presented in this section will not illustrate an interaction where teachers access the role of facilitators, but it presents the work of a trained facilitator. As with almost all data from this setting, Excerpt 5 relates to an activity in a vocational schools, where children with migrant backgrounds are generally more numerous than in other schools. Excerpt 5 illustrates the main characteristics of facilitation observed in higher secondary schools. The most evident characteristic is that formulations are less frequently used in this setting than in primary and lower secondary schools. Trained facilitators more frequently provide positive connotations of children's contributions, in particular personal comments as appreciations and validations. At the same time, facilitators more often take the risk of problematising children's contributions, albeit systematically accompanying problematising comments with

positive connotations. With regard to the themes of the interactions, they mainly concern interpersonal relations, classroom relations and personal aspects

01 FACf1:	F6 I would love to know the: your point of view about what was said also with also I would love to hear that of F2 (.) that are the people I see because I don't see the others (.) what do you think about what was said?
	(0.3)
02 F6m:	mh: well I aghhh I agree in part that is I agree on what F5 said [also a little bit on what F3 said
03 FACf1:	[that is? Repeat yourself, repeat yourself so we can make a summary
04 F6m:	that is, that (…) ah: there are many people who are practically made fun of
05 FACf1:	mh
06 F6m:	and: (…) well (0.2) well like me well, however: there are people that well F? said right that sometimes m: someone tries to talk to those people that are shy right?
	(…)
07 FACf1:	mh
08 F6m:	there are people that: they try to talk too
09 FACf1:	mh mh
10 F6m:	and there are people, like F3 said, who well they talk [to them] and they don't answer
11 FACf1:	ok
12 F6m:	so
13 FACf1:	I stop you for a moment because you have said something important even if you have said it a little bit a little bit quickly because it is probably difficult for you to say it, isn't it? that you have felt mocked, you are one of those who are mocked
	(…)
14 F6m:	yes
15 FACf1:	ok and so you feel teased you don't feel it as a joke it's not a joke for you
16 F6m:	no
17 FACf1:	ok [it is very important
18 F6m:	[a joke from my point of vie-
19 FACf1:	eh
20 F6m:	that is a joke from my point of view ah: – well a joke is ok, I don't say- God, well it is ok to joke but to joke in a heavy way that is no more a joke
21 FACf1:	ok so according to you who jokes should understand what the limit is, that is you play the game for a while and then after a while that's enough

22 F6m: yes
23 FACf1: do you think you are clear in making others understand when it is
           enough for you?
           (0.2)
24 F6m: well, in my opinion, if someone sees that someone else is made fun
           of, he/she notices it, right? well
25 FACf1: you think you are therefore clear, that is, your facial expression
           changes
26 F6m: yes yes
27 FACf1: ok so F6 is telling you so I don't know if F6 was among those
           people who maybe [didn't express it but
28 F3:   [yes (??)
29 FACf1: in this case she is saying it she is really saying that she feels mocked so
           there is not even the justification to say "but [I don't notice" she is telling
           you this
30 F6m: [(they had understood it)
31 F3:   no I already knew it, in fact I mean in the last days of school
32 FACf1: mh
33 F3:   anyway I tried to integrate myself with her, but she is not one of
           those people who turns around and doesn't speak to you
34 FACf1: ok right right we are talking to you ((to those we see that are
           interacting)) [no? because (??)
35 F6m: [but I tried
                                      m: I tried to talk to them I tried to
           talk to them too
           (0.2)
36 FACf2: that is, with the person?
37 F6m: go, say
38 F3:   no I don't have to say anything
39 FACf2: F6 [(??)
40 F6m: [well to make an example with a person with whom I often with a
           person with whom I often talk to is F5 well

    Excerpt 5 is taken from an activity aimed to facilitate the production of nar-
ratives on relations, conflicts, and inclusion in the classroom. The design of the
activity consists of a series of three meetings; Excerpt 5 is taken from the second
one. In turn 1, the facilitator asks F6m about her opinion on a conflict that had
been previously commented upon by F2 (not shown in the excerpt). The long,
three-seconds pause shows some hesitation of F6m, before she chooses to ignore
the request channeled by the question, expressing some measure of agreement
with F5 and F3 instead. In turn, 3 the facilitator asks F6m to clarify her point,
create the opportunity for the F6m to explain that she refers to a situation
whereby many classmates are made object of derision from others. A narrative
of issues related to inclusion and interpersonal relations is produced, supported

by facilitator's display of active listening via actions of minimal responses feedback (turns 5, 7, 9, 11). Developed across turns 4 and 10, F6m narrative includes a reference to her own experience as object of derision (turn 6), which is picked up by the facilitator returns in turn 13. The facilitator values the importance of F6m personal story, acknowledging the challenge of sharing it as it concerns negative experiences. In turn 13, the facilitator takes a personal initiative to deliver a supportive and positive comment on F6m participation, acknowledging her status as author of relevant and valuable knowledge. In turn 14, F6m confirms that she was indeed made the object of mockery; the facilitator systematically support F6m status as author of knowledge in the interaction via facilitative actions such as a question (turn 15) and actions of minimal feedback (turns 17 and 19). The series of facilitative actions succeed to promote an extended turn of talk (turn 20). Two questions are used by the facilitator to promote the expansion of the narrative (turns 21 and 23). The facilitator delivers a series of three formulations as explications in turns 25, 27 and 29 to summarise the gist of F6m extended narrative. In turn 30, F6m takes a personal initiative to highlight that the classmates were aware of her difficult situation as object of mockery. This personal initiative generates a new theme in the interaction, thus lending itself as an instance of agency. F3 takes the role of speaker to comment on F6m's previous turn, and to share her experience of failed integration with F6m. In turn 34, another person initiative is taken by the facilitator, to prevent any stigmatisation against F6m, who accesses the role of speaker to say that she tried to engage with her classmates too. Two conflicting narratives (initiated by F3 and F6m respectively) interlace in the final part of Excerpt 5, suggesting that by promoting agentic participation, facilitation also promotes the expression of several voices and different perspectives. Creating the conditions for the expression of different opinions entails more potential for conflict; nevertheless, the possibility to express divergent opinions is a condition for dialogue, therefore for hybrid integration. Research suggests that a positive management of conflict, based on the understanding of it as opportunity for mutual knowledge and understanding is within the realm of facilitative practices (Baraldi and Farini, 2011).

Mixed forms of facilitation and directive facilitation

It is important to acknowledge that children's epistemic status can also be upgraded utilising forms of facilitation where adults retain more control over the interaction, with the implication that children's agency may be somehow limited. This is the case for mixed forms of facilitation and directive facilitation.

Mixed forms of facilitation

Mixed forms of facilitation add adults' guidance to facilitation. They are based on adults' expanded turns of talk which provide comments or explanations about relevant and positive meanings produced by children.

CHILD-UP data suggest that there might be scope for using mixed forms of facilitation in situations where expectations built around the traditional forms of education are strong and a sudden change towards facilitation could harm participants' trust in the adults and the interaction. It remains true, though, that forms of facilitation where adults retain some degree of control over the development of the interaction and position themselves as superior epistemic authorities may impact negatively on children's agency. The choice of mixed forms of facilitation should be carefully considered and coherent forms of facilitation should be preferred. CHILD-UP data suggest that coherent forms of facilitation are more effective in promoting hybrid integration through the support of agency. The excerpt below, taken from an activity in an English Primary school, offers an example of mixed facilitation and its implication for children's agency.

Excerpt 6 concerns a discussion around personal experiences and family memories of war in London. The excerpt illustrates situations in the CHILD-UP data connoted by the oscillation between facilitation and more directive actions. The excerpt begins with M1's initiative. M1 criticises another child's comment in a rather articulated and competent way, thus upgrading his own epistemic authority within a discussion about war in Sierra Leone.

01 M1:   my statement is, so you know how we were doing the group
          economics thing? From M2 point of view, you know how England
          is a very first world country? Sometimes they want more than they
          have, so they take from poor countries which have good resources.
          No offence, but England is like a first world country but it isn't well
          resourced in like food and other stuff, so they take from different
          countries, so people started to think that they didn't want to do that
          so that's how war broke out
02 Tm: ok?
03 M1:   like in my country, in my family's country, Sierra Leone
04 Tm: so Sierra Leone said we shouldn't be giving all our resources to these
          rich countries, and others said we have to. And some people are
          trying to keep it to themselves, and that's how the war break loose?
05 M1:   families were torn apart. I think there was almost 2 million people
          that died in that war
06 Tm: ((to children)) Did you hear that? Because of one resource, one
          natural resource, almost 2 million people died in Sierra Leone. Even
          going back to the diamonds, the blood diamonds is probably one
          of the most famous well-known single type of resource. I mean,
          there's still people that mine the diamonds and gold, and they have
          illegal mines, and people die I would say if not weekly then certainly
          monthly. because they work in terrible conditions and they get
          stuck underground and no one saves them, and I've just watched a
          documentary on this actually, people go and attack their mines, and
          these miners are unarmed and work for like a penny a day, a penny a
          day. But are they armed, these miners?

07 F1:   no

08 Tm: they're armed with like a shovel. But is their shovel any good against a
            gun? So it's still going on today. That war was probably, I don't know,
            do you know?

09 M1:   it was 1997 because that's what my family was telling me about

10 Tm: end of 1997 ((to children)) do you know how long it spanned for?

11 M1:   my mum said it was something like 7–5 years

12 Tm: 7–5 years. To lose 2 million people in 7–5 years is an awful lot of
            people in the country, and all over a natural resource which, think
            about the apocalypse we are reading about in that book, all of us
            agreed that a diamond necklace became absolutely (.) absolutely

13 Chd: useless

14 Tm: useless, but 2 million people died just because someone with a lot of
            money in another country wanted it. Is that right?

15 F1:   no

16 Tm: nut again, during that war, if it's going on for 5–7 years, is anyone
            supporting them to finish it from the rich countries?

17 M1:   no

18 Tm: the UN might have tried to get involved. Was it the UN?

19 M3:   mister? In Afghanistan my grandad always says that they tried to get,
            I think, resources or something, they said no but then it was a war a
            long time ago before this one. I think it was for less than 20 years and
            1.5 million people died

20 Tm: but again, it's a war about natural resources by the sounds of things,
            and money. So what's driving this?

21 M3:   money. My grandad says it was for money, the Russians, and the
            American and English people before want to take all from Afghanistan

22 Tm: wanting more. Wanting more. Wanting more. What's that?

23 Chd: greedy

24 M3:   greed can lead to war.

25 Tm: this is a good chat we're having. If we all sort of shared, and found
            better systems, then would this happen? We say that, but then I give
            it all to a really nice year six class bunch, if you got it all and another
            group nothing, any of you would feel naughty? Nasty?

26 F1:   no

27 Tm: but if, what would happen in the group left with nothing?

28 M4:   anger

29 F2:   frustration

30 Tm: anger, frustration and fighting. Fighting, interestingly, in a poor
            country, [civil

31 F3:   [war

32 Tm: can you see how it plays out? Are any of you sitting there going 'Oh
            my goodness'? I had rich countries getting richer, poor countries
            getting poorer, and one poor country kept getting poorer and poorer
            and poorer to breaking point, and they couldn't agree on what to do

next and the best thing to do for their resources, they started to argue, but really upset, which is basically the same as having a [civil

33 M5:   [war

34 M1:   exactly the same as Sierra Leone

35 Tm: exactly the same as Sierra Leone

36 M1:   but they didn't have their independence taken like Afghanistan I think. My mum told me that they got their independence in like 1970 something

37 Tm: often, fledging countries, young countries, your brother taught me so much about that, by the way ((the older brother of M6, now in secondary school)), your brother, I'm an expert now. But when countries breakoff into smaller countries, they can then often be fighting over resources, land

38 M6:   Kosovo

39 F4:   it's happened all over the world, but sort of, Israel and Palestine

40 F5:   I wanted to ask M6 what happened in Kosovo?

41 M6:   yeah, they had a war, Kosovars, and Serbians

42 Tm: they have been at war for ages over who owns which bit of the country. Kosovo and Serbia, haven't they M6?

43 M6:   there was a big war there

44 Tm: we are talking millions of people dying for resources, land, and money, aren't we? When you get land you get more

45 F5:   money

46 Tm: and?

44 Chd: resources

45 Tm: exactly. Yep. Now I'm going to ask you to please put your books under your desk, desks clear please where are your notepads?

In turn 2, the teacher acknowledges M1's comment using a question, therefore combining the acknowledgment of M1's comment with an invitation to expand. The child expands his narrative, and the teacher produces a formulation that develops the meaning of his reference to the war in Sierra Leone. This formulation is based on the teacher's knowledge of the civil war; for this reason it could be interpreted as a way to infuse educational contents in the conversation. However, the question that follows the formulation as development is an invitation to M1 to maintain the role of co-author of knowledge. M1 appears to understand the function of the question, because he does not provide a direct answer, but he continues the ongoing narrative. In the long turn that follows, the teacher first acknowledges M1's epistemic authority, then he positions himself as co-expert, expanding M1's narrative to include educational contents related to aspect of the war that were not included in M1's narrative. In turn 8, the teacher again acknowledges M1's epistemic authority, and again in turn 10. Thus, M1 can continue to upgrade his own epistemic authority, systematically supported by the teacher, also via a partial repetition of the child's turn at talk (turn 12). At the end of turn 12, however, the teacher invites the children to complete his statement, and after the children's

completion, he repeats it to establish what is the valid knowledge. This is followed by a teacher's expansion to add more educational content and a new question that invites participation (turn 14). This question, as well as the following one (turn 16) do not enhance children's participation therefore, in turn 18, the teacher asks a new question. Despite the expectation of an answer projected by the question, M3 takes the initiative to introduce a personal story, based on family memories in Afghanistan, thus initiating an unpredictable development of the interaction (turn 19). The teacher accepts M3's initiative, but he works to embed it within the educational theme 'war to access resources', thus upgrading his epistemic authority and control over the interaction, typical of mixed forms of facilitation. The teacher does so by introducing the theme with a question in turn 20. M3 aligns with the expectations projected by the teacher's question (he provides an answer) whilst trying to relate the answer to his narrative based on knowledge absorbed from the family, independent of school teaching. Whilst the teacher tries to develop an educational theme, M3 continues to position himself as the author of new knowledge, independently from teaching, by adding a comment (turn 24). The teacher does not provide direct feedback on M3's display of knowledge; rather, he appreciates children's participation generically, and produces a series of interrelated questions to promote children's reflection, including an open question to promote participation (turn 25). After some contributions from children, the teacher provides a formulation as development (*fighting*), repeating it three times.

In turn 34, M1 intervenes to upgrade his epistemic authority, which is confirmed by the teacher. This confirmation enhances M1's production of new knowledge based on his family's experience (turn 36). In turn 37, the teacher introduces a new theme. The teacher prefers to introduce a new theme which is not interlaced with M1's narrative. This is a cue for the teacher's attempt to control the interaction, therefore a cue for mixed forms of facilitation. However, the teacher's attempt to control the development of the interaction is balanced by his claim that his knowledge is based on learning from the older brother of M6. In turn 38, M6 contextualises the knowledge shared by the teacher. Subsequently, F4 takes the initiative and F5 asks a question to M6, who responds, again advocating his epistemic authority. In turn 42, the teacher acknowledges M6's claim of high epistemic authority, inviting the child to confirm his turn at talk. M6 confirms, but he avoids an explicit acknowledgement of the teacher's epistemic authority. In the final phase of the excerpt, the teacher asks questions that need to be completed, driving the interaction towards a return to teaching.

Directive facilitation

Compared to mixed forms, *directive* forms of facilitation are connoted by more frequent adults' comments and explanations, combined to normative recommendations. Directive forms of facilitation further decrease the potential of communication to upgrade children's epistemic authority. For instance, within directive facilitation, the adult is the main provider of knowledge *for*, rather than *with*, children, establishing adult authority in the classroom. In some circumstances, the

position of an adult as a superior epistemic authority becomes so prominent that directive facilitation morphs into forms of *participated teaching* that resemble the methodology of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, and Ross, 1976). Scaffolding is centred around adults' actions that are devoted to support children to actively participate in the process to achieving knowledge (Sharpe, 2008). Scaffolding promotes participation of children to learning; however, it is methodologically founded upon teachers' monitoring of children's learning, which includes evaluation of children's performances against pre-determined standards. Facilitation empowers children as learners but also as authors of knowledge, whereas scaffolding only recognises the importance of participation in empowering children as learners (Pascal and Bertram, 2009), and disregards them as authors of knowledge. Facilitation is therefore more apt to upgrade children's epistemic status and their display of epistemic authority in classroom interactions, which is a condition of hybrid integration.

The excerpt below, taken from an activity in a lower secondary school in Poland, lends itself as an example of the consequence of the teacher's position as exclusive epistemic authority: the support of children's participation becomes a control of children's participation. Excerpt 7 was recorded during a Polish language lesson. It displays a typical form of scaffolding and its implications for children's participation.

01 Tf: well then, listen, my dears, I think that we can already now, slowly, move on to what we're going to talk about today. Let's do some short summary of what we said during the last lesson in relation to the sentence structure, concerning components of the sentence

02 M1: compound and non-compound ones?

03 Tf: and I'm going first to ask you about such few information as a reminder, then you'll get Xeroxed copies with such a simple exercise to do, and in the meantime, you may, of course, talks to each other, as usual. K., we can start with you. First, I (?) just to remind you, what statements we call sentences?

04 M1: these are such statements that have a predicate, that is a verb

05 Tf: mhm, all right. M2, remind us, what is the second, the so-called main part of the sentence, besides the predicate?

06 M2: can you repeat that please, Sir, because I haven't heard it?

07 Tf: and yes. Besides the predicate, we have one more part of the sentence, which we call the main part. What is it called?

08 M2: subject

09 Tf: that's right. If we're looking for a predicate in a sentence, we're looking for what, M3? You have a sentence, and you're to find a predicate, what are you looking for?

10 M3: a verb

11 Tf: you're looking for a verb, that is, you're looking for some act?

12 M3: actions=

13 Tf: =ion. (?), if we're looking for a subject, we're looking for what?

14 M3: we're looking for someone, so to speak, who does such an action

15 Tf: very well

16 M3:   or a noun

17 Tf: we're a looking for a doer of such an action. All right. F1, could you remind us what sentences we called non-compound sentences?

18 F1:   non-compound sentences are those, where there is one predicate.

19 Tf: good. And besides that predicate, can there be anything else in such a sentence, or rather not?

20 F1:   that thing like a comma, or words like: and, or.

21 Tf: but would they be in a compound or a non-compound sentence?

22 F1:   just to make it compound

23 Tf: to make it compound, then we can add new elements. All right. M4 perhaps. M4 reminds us, how we call elements that we add to a non-compound sentence to obtain the one that has clauses, or is a compound sentence. They have such a common name, how are they called, do you remember?

24 M4:   attributes (?)

25 Tf: very good. These are attributes. They are usually divided into subject attributes, object attributes and that's how, M?, what two groups appear in a sentence?

After the presentation of the topic of the lesson (turn 1), the teacher asks a question concerning previous lessons in turn 3. The question is used neither to promote agentic participation, nor to promote children's authorship of knowledge. Rather it is used to verify children's learning. The teacher acknowledges children's answers in turn 5, adding a new question to pre-defined recipient. This is the typical organisation of scaffolding, where the teacher tries to balance giving the floor to children's self-selection and securing everybody's engagement in the interactions, which is key to the success of scaffolding. In turn 9, the teacher asks a question to M3, who gives a very short answer and in turn 11 she scaffolds M3's participation suggesting to M3 the correct answer and assessing very positively M3's answer in turn 15, also inviting him to continue in turn 16. This way of supporting answers and providing final positive evaluation is repeated in the following exchanges with F1 and M4. Scaffolding means supporting children's participation but also confining it within teacher-defined boundaries.

Scaffolding may support children's participation, but it is much more doubtful that it can support children's agency, because children's choice is greatly restricted by the teacher's control of the interaction. In the example of scaffolding offered by Excerpt 7, the teacher asks questions or proceeds to explain new topics without allowing students space to participate autonomously. As a result, whilst it promotes a form of children's participation, directive facilitation replaces agentic participation with teacher-centered transfer of knowledge, particularly when it morphs into participated teaching. What is lost is children's access to the role as co-authors of knowledge, because the acknowledgement of their epistemic authority is absent.

Conclusion

The excerpts discussed in this chapter are illustrative of a general conclusion, supported by evidence from CHILD-UP data: facilitation can successfully promote children's access to the status of authors of knowledge across all age groups. Children's position as authors of knowledge, that is, their high epistemic status, is the fundamental condition for the negotiation of hybrid identities, because hybrid identities need that all participants are recognised high epistemic authority in interactions. Although the excerpts presented in the chapter concern primary and secondary schools, it is worth noting that facilitation was more common in higher secondary schools, where the level of satisfaction shown by participants in the recorded activities was the highest (80%). These schools were located in Italy, where diffuse and consistent use of facilitation was related to: (1) previous training in the use of facilitation; (2) the position of facilitators as outsiders who do not ordinarily work with the classroom, thus partially escaping the expectations of hierarchical relationships and limited agency built over time through teachers–pupils interactions. In situations where the facilitator was an outsider, a relative freedom from mutual expectations of hierarchical relationships enhanced children's agentic participation.

Whilst less common than in higher secondary schools, facilitation was nevertheless more frequent in primary schools than in lower secondary schools. However, the excerpts presented in this chapter illustrate successful facilitation with lower secondary school children, inviting reflection about the influence of adults' expectations. This setting is the context where communication between adults and children is expected to be more difficult due to limited trust of children in adults, as well as difficult socialisation during the transition towards adolescence. The recommendation from our findings is to reflect on the impact of expectations on decision-making and approaches to working with children, including possible resistance against the use of facilitation to promote their agentic participation in educational settings.

Data from seven national contexts suggest some degree of continuity in the relationship between the use of facilitation and children's ages. This is suggested by the wide range of national contexts represented in the chosen excerpts. However, as noted with regard to higher secondary schools, data also suggest that Italian settings are connoted by a more diffuse use of facilitation, probably as a consequence of the use of professional trained facilitators external to the classroom, who can position themselves outside hierarchical relationships that build up over time through daily interactions in educational settings.

Nevertheless, data also indicate that even in situations where teachers have not undertaken training in the use of facilitation and in situations where schools do not have access to external facilitators, the use of mixed forms, or sometimes forms of scaffolding, may offer some support to children's active participation. Whether, and how, active participation develops into agentic participation depends on whether children are allowed sufficient space for making autonomous choices in their responses to adults' actions that would have some potential for the promotion

of agency, such as invitations to talk, and invitations to ask or to expand questions. Facilitating migrant children, with all children, to access the role of authors of valid knowledge in classroom interaction, displaying high epistemic authority, is an essential condition for dialogue. Dialogue, on its part, is the only form of communication that can foster a negotiation of hybrid identities centred on personal meaning of personal experiences, rather than culturalist expectations of essentialist identities.

References

Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C., Vehviläinen, S., & Leudar, I. (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26–42). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baraldi, C. (2008). Promoting self-expression in classroom interactions. *Childhood*, *15*(2), 239–257.

Baraldi, C. (2014). Formulations in dialogic facilitation of classroom interactions. *Language and Dialogue*, *4*(2), 234–260.

Baraldi, C. (2019). Using formulations to manage conflicts in classroom interactions. *Language and Dialogue*, *9*(2), 193–216.

Baraldi, C., & Farini, F. (2011). Dialogic mediation in international groups of adolescents. *Language and Dialogue*, *1*(2), 207–232.

Baraldi, C., Farini, F., & Ślusarczyk, M. (2022) Facilitative practices to promote migrant children's agency and hybrid integration in schools: Discussing data from Italy, Poland and England. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1080/147084 77.2022.2096054

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2020). Managing uncertainty in healthcare interpreter-mediated interaction: On rendering question-answer sequences. *Communication and Medicine*, *15*(2), 150–164.

Baraldi, C., & Iervese, V. (2017). Narratives of memories and dialogue in multicultural classrooms. *Narrative Inquiry*, *27*(2), 398–417.

Baraldi, C., Joslyn, E., & Farini, F (Eds.) (2021). *Promoting children's rights in European schools. Intercultural dialogue and facilitative pedagogy*. London: Bloomsbury.

Black, L. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory*, *18*, 93–116.

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. Oxon: Routledge.

Chernyshova, E. (2018). Explicitation sequences in conversation: Some considerations on formulations, candidate inferences and grounding. *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, *68*, 51–58.

Farini, F. (2011). Cultures of education in action: Research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international educational setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(8), 2176–2186.

Farini, F. (2019). From the child to the pupil to the child. Trust based on categorical inequalities and the quest for alternatives towards a more inclusive education. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 246–264.

Farini, F., & Scollan, A. (2021). Meanings and methods of pedagogical innovation. In C. Baraldi, E. Joslyn, & F. Farini (Eds.), *Promoting children's rights in European schools. Intercultural dialogue and facilitative pedagogy* (pp. 67–88). London: Bloomsbury.

Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gergen, K., McNamee, S., & Barrett, F (2001). Towards transformative dialogue. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(7/8), 697–707.

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Heritage, J., & Watson, R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp.123–162). New York/London: Irvington.

Margutti, P. (2006). 'Are you human beings?' Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, *17*(4), 313–346.

Peräkylä, A. (2019). Conversation analysis and psychotherapy: Identifying transformative sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *52*(3), 257–280.

Pascal, C., & Bertram, T. (2009). Listening to young citizens: The struggle to make real a participatory paradigm in research with young children. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *17*(2), 249–262.

Raymond, G. (2003). The structure of responding: Conforming and nonconforming responses to yes/no type interrogatives. *American Sociological Review*, *68*(6), 939–967.

Rossi, E., & Baraldi, C. (2009). The promotion of children's and adolescents' social participation in Italy and Scotland. *Children & Society*, *23*, 16–28

Sharpe, T. (2008). How can teacher talk support learning? *Linguistics and Education*, *19*, 132–148.

Skarbø Solem, M., & Skovholt, K. (2017). Teacher formulations in classroom interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(1), 69–88.

Voutilainen, L., Henttonen, P., Stevanovic, M., Kahri, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2019). Nods, vocal continuers, and the perception of empathy in storytelling. *Discourse Processes*, *56*(4), 310–330.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*, 89–100.

Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at 'first and second sayings'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(4), 407–424.