



Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://rimcis.hipatiapress.com>

Trust Building in the Promotion of Peace and Intercultural Dialogue among Adolescents in International Summer Camps

Federico Farini ¹

1) University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy

Date of publication: November, 30th, 2012

To cite this article: Farini, F. (2012). Trust Building in the Promotion of Peace and Intercultural Dialogue Among Adolescents in International Summer Camps. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 163-192. doi: 10.4471/rimcis.2012.08

To link this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4471/rimcis.2012.08>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to Creative Commons Non-Commercial and Non-Derivative License.

Trust Building in the Promotion of Peace and Intercultural Dialogue among Adolescents in International Summer Camps

Federico Farini

University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

Abstract

This article aims to offer both a theoretical contribution and examples of practices of trust building in peace education. The analysis regards international summer camps established in Italy. Each camp is attended by four delegations of ten adolescents coming from different countries; aiming to promote adolescents' ability in conflict resolution, peaceful relationships and intercultural dialogue.

In analysing interactions, we follow the basic methodology of Conversation Analysis, which consists in working on naturally occurring interactions and more specifically on the contribution of single turns or actions to the ongoing sequence, with reference to the context. The analysis concerns the design of turns (actions) produced in the interaction and the organization of the sequences in which educators' and adolescents' turns are intertwined. We aim to understand if and in which ways education is effective in enabling adolescents to communicate, creating conditions of trust and trusting commitment, mutual humanization, and mutual recognition of needs.

Our data exemplifies two different ways of promoting trust and communication: 1) the educator coordinates the direct interactions between adolescents, who cooperate in constructing a joint narrative; 2) the educator acts as a mediator of contacts among adolescents, promoting their alternate participation in the interaction in triadic exchanges.

Keywords: trust building, peace education, conflict, interaction, adolescents

2012 Hipatia Press

ISSN: 2014-3680

DOI: 10.4471/rimcis.2012.08

hipatia Press

www.hipatiapress.com



Construcción de confianza en la promoción de la paz y el diálogo intercultural entre adolescentes que asisten a campos de verano internacionales

Federico Farini

Universidad de Modena y Reggio Emilia

Resumen

El objetivo de este artículo es ofrecer tanto una contribución teórica como ejemplos de prácticas de construcción de confianza en la educación para la paz. El análisis se centra en los campos de verano internacionales que hay establecidos en Italia. A cada campo asisten cuatro delegaciones de diez adolescentes provenientes de diferentes países; con la intención de promover las habilidades de los adolescentes en la resolución de conflictos, las relaciones pacíficas y el diálogo intercultural.

Al analizar las interacciones, seguimos la metodología del análisis conversacional, que consiste en trabajar sobre las interacciones naturales que se dan y, más específicamente, sobre la contribución de cambios o acciones puntuales en toda la secuencia de cambios subsiguientes, teniendo en cuenta el contexto. El análisis se centra en el diseño de cambios (acciones) que se producen en las interacciones y en la organización de secuencias en las que los actos de los educadores y los adolescentes se hallan entremezclados. Queremos entender si la educación es efectiva, y de qué manera, ayudando a los adolescentes a comunicarse, creando condiciones de confianza y compromiso, humanización mutua, y mutuo reconocimiento de necesidades.

Nuestros datos ejemplifican dos diferentes maneras de promover la confianza y la comunicación: 1) el educador coordina las interacciones directas entre adolescentes, quienes cooperan en la construcción de una narrativa conjunta; 2) el educador hace de mediador en el contacto entre adolescentes, promoviendo su participación alternativa en las interacciones que tienen lugar en intercambios diádicos.

Palabras clave: construcción de confianza, educación para la paz, conflicto, interacción, adolescentes

2012 Hipatia Press

ISSN: 2014-3680

DOI: 10.4471/rimcis.2012.08

This article aims to offer both a theoretical contribution and examples of practices of trust building in peace education; the article presents an empirical analysis of videotaped interactions in the context of peace education activities in international groups of adolescents. The analysis regards two international summer camps promoted by the School of Peace of Monte Sole, established in the Province of Bologna, Italy, in the place where in 1944 a Nazi assault killed almost 800 children, women and old people. Each camp lasted two weeks, and was attended by four delegations of ten adolescents coming from different countries; the camps aimed to promote adolescents' ability in conflict resolution, their interest in peaceful relationships and their respect for different perspectives, and reducing their prejudices and stereotypes.

Since Merton's groundbreaking article titled "The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action" (Merton, 1936), the problem of unintended and unanticipated pertained to the effectiveness of practices and the boundaries of social planning. This is particularly important for education, which is the most ambitious social system with regard to social planning, aiming to produce and preserve the presuppositions of social cohesion. Taking into account Merton's concept of unintended consequences of social action, the analysis focuses on the controversial importance of expertise and interpersonal closeness in building trust in education. Trusting commitment in specific interactions with educators is vital for the reproduction of education. For this reason, education is particularly affected by lack of trust, which may activate a vicious circle: lack of trust implies loosing opportunities of action, reducing preparation to risk trust, and activating anxiety and suspicion for interlocutors' actions. Distrust in interactions with specific adults can determine youngsters' marginalization or self-marginalization: these may be understood as unintended consequences of education.

Education has the function of bringing about changes in young people, creating cognitive abilities (Luhmann & Schorr, 1979). This function presumes that youngsters are incomplete persons, not sufficiently responsible and autonomous in their actions with respect to the societal standards: this is the reason why they should be formed.

Hence, education is expected to function as a means of correction for childhood and adolescence (Britzman, 2007). However, since James' conceptualization of education as an intersubjective relation where children, rather to be seen as empty box to fill with knowledge, play an active role in influencing the outcome of education (James, [1899]1983) the myth of development of personality that presupposes a chronology from immaturity to maturity, controlled by educators by means of educational techniques has appeared more and more controversial.

James' assumption that the development of children's minds cannot be completely controlled by educational techniques, because of the independence of psychic processes through which people attribute meanings to communication, could be integrated in a more extensive concept developed by Portes (2000): in any social relationship, a possible derailing factor to purposive designs is that participants may react to being manipulated by a higher authority and devise means of by passing the intended consequences of their actions. Thus, even if the announced goal is intended by the educators, their actions may have other significant, and often unintended, consequences which the educators cannot control, and of which they are unaware.

In fact, for decades now, pedagogical theories have been experiencing severe difficulties in avoiding the unintended consequences of educational intentions. Facing these problems, since the 1980's the culture of childhood has been placing particular emphasis on socialising children towards an "understanding of their own competencies" (Matthews, 2003, p. 274) rather than towards the achievements of curricular state-of-development, on socialising children to a sense of responsibility and skills in planning, designing, monitoring and managing social contexts rather than to a one-way adaptation to normative expectations.

New pedagogical methodologies take into account the most recent cultural presuppositions of interaction with youngsters, that concerns the quality of their participation and self-expression. Youngsters' participation is primarily observed as involvement in decision-making, through which children can feel influential (Lawy & Biesta, 2006). Many publications in the field of pedagogy offer prescriptive resources to empower youngsters' participation, for example through teachers'

active listening and consideration for their creativity, but few of them discuss the results of the empirical application of theoretical prescriptions.

The most important, and often overlooked, variable is trust between educators and young people; in education interactions are of the greatest importance: trusting commitment in specific interactions with educators is vital for the reproduction of education. Education is particularly affected by lack of trust, which creates perverse effects as alienation, prevents commitment and leaves the floor to disappointment of expectations.

Trust building is an important topic of educational research; in order to examine the design of facilitators' actions that can promote trusting commitment, this article presents an empirical analysis of videotaped interactions in the context of peace education activities in international groups of adolescents. Thus, it is of the greatest importance to give a working definition of trust.

Theoretical framework: a sociological concept of trust and its relevance for peace education theories

In a sociological perspective, trust may be observed for its function in society, which is a way of dealing with disappointment of expectations (Giddens, 1991; Luhmann, 1988) in communication (Luhmann, 1984). In the accomplishment of this function, trust is different from confidence. Both confidence and trust accomplish this function when unfamiliar experiences arise, which imply changes and therefore potential disappointment of expectations in communication (Giddens, 1990, 1991; Luhmann, 1968, 1988). In these situations, the function of confidence is to enable the unproblematic continuation of communication, taking for granted that expectations will not be disappointed; confidence means taking for granted that, for instance, today I will not be fired from my workplace or I will not be abandoned by my beloved spouse. On the contrary, the function of trust is to deal with the *risk* of disappointment of expectations.

In today's society, all social actions (political decisions, investments,

funding and efforts of scientific research, choices of schools and universities, marriages) are observed as risky (Giddens, 1991; Luhmann, 1991), and can disappoint established expectations. Trust deals with this risk of disappointment as a consequence of actions engaged in social relationships. It implies the decision of engaging in social relationships which could be disappointing; it implies the choice of risky alternatives, the choice of "one action in preference to others in spite of the possibility of being disappointed by the action of others" (Luhmann, 1988, p. 97). Confidence turns into trust when alternatives to an established social relationship become evident: for example, with the introduction of divorce in families, trust in the affective partner substitutes confidence in a durable marriage.

The structure of modern society (Luhmann, 1997) requires both confidence as a prerequisite for participation in communication and trust as a condition for specific opportunities of action. Confidence makes opportunities for participation available and trust mobilises specific engagement, "extending the range and degree of participation" (Luhmann, 1988, p. 99). Confidence is a prerequisite for the reproduction of the most important social systems in society, such as the economy, politics, law, medicine, education, while trust assures the reproduction of the specific social relationships which are included in these systems. On the one hand, those who participate in communication inside these systems must be confident in the reproduction of the economy, politics, law, science, medicine and education; the reproduction of these social systems maintains the structure of society and the hypothesis of its failure is not considered. From this perspective, social participation is an unavoidable necessity. On the other hand, participants must trust specific activities, in specific communication processes with specific partners, such as classroom interactions in education, business meetings in the economic field, negotiations between parties in politics, doctor-patient interactions in healthcare settings.

The distinction between confidence and trust is useful to understand youngsters' commitment in educational interaction, where it seems to be exclusively or primarily connected with their confidence in educators' expert guidance (Mehan, 1979; Parsons, 1959; Walsh, 2011). However, childhood studies (Hengst & Zehier, 2005; James et al., 1998; Jenks,

1996) challenge this representation of the relationship between youngsters and educators. According to these studies, youngster cannot be considered passive recipients of educators' information and command; on the contrary, they are social agents who actively participate in the construction of social systems. This approach enables meaningful connections to the concept of trust. In particular, we can state that youngsters take the same risks of action as adults, and social attention moves towards children's trusting commitment and necessity of building trust in their relationships with educators.

In fact, education involves youngsters' confidence as well as youngsters' trust. Youngsters can distrust specific educational activities which involve certain partners. Distrust in interactions with specific adults can determine youngsters' marginalization or self-marginalization in the educational activities. Lack of risks of trust activates a vicious circle: it implies losing opportunities of youngsters' action, reducing their preparation to risk trust, and activating anxiety and suspicion for educators' actions.

During the last two decades, there has been a growing perception that youngsters' distrust can involve and undermine the educational system, if not the whole society (Goleman, 1995). In this situation, reflection on education has elaborated new strategies of building trust; according to Giddens (1990, 1991), modern societies have two options for building trust.

Firstly, trust can be built through expertise, which guarantees basic presuppositions of action and relationships. This way of building trust, however, is considered weak in motivating to commitment, and can easily fail when expertise proves ineffective in facing risks (for example environmental, medical, political, and economic risks). Secondly, trust can be achieved through interpersonal affective relationships, which mobilise it through a process of mutual disclosure. In this second case, trusting commitment concerns the relationship in itself, a pure relationship, and trust results in a demand for intimacy.

Within education, trust is primarily based on educators' expertise: educators are held to be the experts who must be trusted for their knowledge and competence. The typical IRE sequence (Initiation, Reply, Evaluation) in teacher-students interactions (Mehan, 1979)

presupposes the teacher's expertise in Initiating and, above all, Evaluating students' Replies; the reproduction of the interaction is assured through students' trust in teachers' expertise as initiators and evaluators.

However, critical pedagogy and childhood studies have questioned the effectiveness of educators' expertise in promoting youngsters' trusting commitment. According to childhood studies, in education, youngsters' opportunities of participation are strongly reduced by curricular and behavioural rules and structures, and the education system is not interested in youngsters' agency, that is it shows distrust in youngsters' agency. Therefore, the educators' expertise is often ineffective in motivating youngsters to engage in the activities proposed (Wyness, 1999).

The "normal" educational relationship may be understood as an instance of *I-It relationship* (Buber, [1923] 2004) where the educator confronts and qualifies a conceptualization of the being in its presence, the child or the adolescent, and treats that being as an object, as something incomplete to be modeled. The *I-It* relationship in normal education is in fact a relationship with oneself; it is not a dialogue, but a monologue where the educator treats youngsters' mind as objects to be transformed by means of communication. In line with Buber's theory, a recent research by Harber and Sakade (2004) suggest that, because of their historical and contemporary imperatives, "normal" schooling can be a dehumanising practice that stress cognitive forms of knowledge over the affective, and that play down important inter-personal skills of the sort that peace education tries to achieve.

The success of person-centred approaches in critical pedagogy, with the development of important pedagogical movements (Goleman, 1995) and theories (Hicks, 1996; Mercer & Littleton, 2007) demonstrates a change of perspective in education which is also important for peace education: in the perspective of critical pedagogy adults' *facilitation* of communication processes substitutes teaching of knowledge and norms (Hill et al., 2004).

Facilitation means supporting children's self-expression, taking their views into account, consulting them, involving them in decision-making processes, sharing power and responsibility for decision making with

them (Matthews, 2003; Shier, 2001). The concept of facilitation maybe understood as a pedagogical translation of Buber's philosophical concept of *I-Thou relationship* (Buber, [1923] 2004) that describes encounters where these beings, the I and the Thou, the educator and the children, meet one another in their authentic existence, without any qualification or objectification of one another.

In line to Buber's view, research on facilitation shows that youngsters can only trust facilitators who show sensitivity towards their personal expressions (Holdsworth, 2004), making relevant an I-Thou relationship rather than an I-It one. Therefore, youngsters' trusting commitment requires affective conditions; against this backdrop, interpersonal affective relationships seem to guarantee youngsters' trusting commitment.

However, trusting commitment in interpersonal affective relationships can fail and leave the floor to strong disappointment and great difficulties. Affective relationships cannot eliminate risky alternatives. Youngsters' trusting commitment should not be expected to coincide with adults' expectations, even if these are affective, and "adult society must accept that there will be complexities when children express views that do not coincide with those of adults" (Holland & O'Neill, 2006, p. 96).

Trusting commitment may meet important obstacles in conditions of radical distrust, which prevent from the construction of affective relationships. Kelman (2005) analyses conditions of radical distrust and building trust in workshops involving Israeli and Palestinian representatives trying to reach peaceful agreements. In these workshops, Kelman analyses the difficulty of building trust when mutual distrust is the basis of the interaction. According to Luhmann (1984) distrust requires additional premises for social relationships, which protect interactants from a disappointment that is considered highly probable.

In this condition, a peace process "becomes possible when the parties conclude that it is in their own best interest to negotiate an end to the conflict – in effect, to enter into an exchange relationship" (Kelman, 2005, p. 641). Confidence in distrust creates an entrapping dilemma: the parties cannot enter a peace process without some degree of mutual trust, but they cannot build trust without entering a peace process.

According to Kelman, in situations of distrust, trust can be built through successive approximations of increasing degrees of commitment, starting from the building of a feeble trust which does not commit participants to anything relevant. Therefore, trust does not presuppose sympathy, friendship and interpersonal closeness. It can be built only on self-interest, enhancing mutually acceptable accommodation and joint solution of specific problems, and thus being *working trust*. Working trust and interpersonal relationships (self-interest and interest in the other) can merge, but only at a later stage of the interaction. Interpersonal closeness is not the basis of trusting commitment and may only be created after working trust has been built.

Kelman agrees that trust can be built through facilitation. Facilitation, however, regards interactive problem-solving activities. Facilitation means that a third party (the facilitator) has the task 'to create the conditions that allow ideas for resolving the conflict to emerge out of the interactions between the parties themselves' (Kelman, 2005, p. 642). Facilitators set rules for the discussion and monitor their respect, helping participants to create constructive and non-adversarial debates. They do not participate in the actual discussion, do not offer their own perspectives or solutions, nor evaluate the parties' ideas. Ultimately, facilitation establishes the preconditions for mutual trust that is mutual humanization and mutual reassurance, based on acknowledgment of participants' needs and fears and on responsiveness to them. Both parties must show trusting commitment in the interaction with the facilitator, who can be considered trustworthy because he or she shows commitment to his or her role.

Case study and methodology: promoting trusting commitment in peace education

This article aims to offer an analysis of practicing trust-building in educational interactions where confidence in distrust may be expected. In the next section, we will analyse excerpts from group interactions in which interpretation of meanings related to peace (negative behaviours, separation/connection among human beings, human rights) are

discussed, requiring the building of working trust and facilitators' trustworthiness. The analysis aims to understand if and in which ways facilitation is effective in enabling adolescents to communicate, creating conditions of working trust, mutual humanization, mutual recognition of needs, and trustworthiness of facilitators.

In particular, it focuses on the relationship between working trust and interpersonal closeness in the specific educational situations examined. These are not extremely conflictive; however they involve activities in which: 1) conditions of interaction are unfamiliar; 2) adolescents come from different cultural traditions that are not shared, and are sometimes conflicting; 3) trust building cannot be based on previous interpersonal contacts. In this situation, facilitators are assigned the task of creating working trust during the activities, and their trustworthiness is based on actions which can promote trust building in communication both *among* adolescents and *with* adolescents.

The analysis regards two international summer camps promoted by the School of Peace of Monte Sole, established in the Province of Bologna, Italy, in the place where in 1944 a Nazi assault killed almost 800 children, women and old people. Each camp lasted two weeks, and was attended by four delegations of ten adolescents coming from different countries, two of which were always Italy and Germany, to symbolize peaceful resolution of extreme conflict. The other two were Serbian and Albanian Kosovo (first camp), France and Poland (second camp). The participants are usually forty girls and boys aged between 15 and 18 years old, equally distributed by gender, coming from places that have been or are in conflict.

The camps took place in 2005 (first camp) and 2006 (second camp); at the time of the camp, Kosovo was under transitional UN administration (UNMIK). Although the Kosovo war was ended since six years when the camp took place, the situation in the region was still of concern, because of revenge attacks and occupation of Serb properties. The Serbian delegation come from North Mitrovica, while the Albanian delegation come from different centers in the region.

However, it is important to highlight that, according to the School of Peace methodology, many efforts, from the very beginning of the camps, are devoted to create the expectation, among the participants,

that they are observed as individuals, as human beings and not as representatives of their countries of origin. Meeting on a personal level should help the adolescents to overcome ethnic or national identities, redefining themselves as a more complex form, as human beings, with desires, aspirations, emotions, different and similar at the same time. For the same reason, the conflict is rarely faced directly, but rather promoting the narration of daily experiences, memories and their points of view on a personal level.

Educators leading the camps come from selected associations and organisations engaged in youngsters education projects. They are particularly committed in peace education, non violent transformation of conflict, dialogue development. Every year, three months before the beginning of the Camps, each organisation send the two educators chosen to lead the delegation to a preparatory teamers' meeting in Monte Sole, aimed to build the programme of the experience. Former teamers and experts from the Peace School are also invited in these preparation meeting, which last at least five days.

After the meetings, each association has then the duty to select its participants, who have to speak at least a basic English (vehicular language of the camp) and who have to explain the reasons that push them to make this experience. Each delegation, leaded by two adult educators, spend two weeks in Monte Sole sharing daily life and working together divided into small groups that vary on a daily base; the educational path is marked by moments of games and role-plays, readings, personal reflections, group discussions, performances and short trips.

Summer Camps in Monte Sole could be understood as instances of *non-formal learning*, involving workshops, community courses, interest based courses, short courses, or conference style seminars rather than formal classes.

On the one hand, although the Camps occur in a formal learning environment, the School of Peace of Monte Sole, they are not *formal learning* because they are not structured in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support and don't lead to certification. On the other hand, the Camps are not *informal learning*: while informal learning in most cases is not-intentional and learning results from daily

life activities related to work, family or leisure, the Camps are intentional education, and must be understood as educational experiences from both learners' and the educators' perspectives.

The camps' goal is to promote adolescents' ability in conflict resolution, their interest in peaceful relationships and their respect for different perspectives, and reducing their prejudices and stereotypes. In the more general terms, peace education curricula at School of Peace of Monte Sole aim to develop a state of mind and ways of being where the meanings and the cultural presupposition of others who are different are recognized and respected (Bar-Tal, 2002). The main thread is that "peace involves a respect for life and for the dignity of each human being without discrimination or prejudice" (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 12). Educating for peace, then, involves a recognition of life as precious or sacred and an acknowledgment that caring communities are needed in order to nourish and develop it (Shapiro, 2002).

The School of Peace of Monte Sole understands peace education as providing alternative strategies to violence in difficult situations (Harris & Morrison, 2003). Taking into account Galtung's concept of *positive peace* as a pattern of co-operation and integration among people with the absence of both physical violence and injustice, achieved through co-operative relationships (Galtung, 1975), the School of Peace of Monte Sole works on solving problems in peaceful ways and improving human relationships.

The content of peace education at School of Peace of Monte Sole curricula includes material that is values-based (grounded in open-mindedness, empathy, justice and human rights) and offers practical skills training, focuses on the nature of conflict and violence and ways of transforming them. Peace education uses experiential learning, cooperative learning and community building (Danesh, 2006; Harris, 2002). The activities during the camps aim to create dissonance in ways that engage young people's attitudes and values; that dissonance may be just the ticket for stimulating work on rethinking and perhaps even restructuring troubling convictions (Dahl, 2009). Deliberate work in the thinking space with existing attitudes and values that conflict with the young people's desires is addressed to sustain of adolescents' awareness and modification of troubling convictions (Harris, 2004).

It is commonly stated that cross-cultural contact breeds intercultural competence; however, research shows that peace education programmes peopled by international adolescents does not inevitably provide opportunities for cross-cultural interaction, because of a tendency towards segregated national friendship groups (Brown, 2009). Moreover, peace education curricula at School of Peace of Monte Sole are not part of a school programme which can satisfy adolescents' self-interest enhancing their individual careers; adolescents' voluntary participation is based on personal motivation. In the camps we analyzed, participants did not share ideas, values or principles; rather, at least some of them (i.e. Serbs and Albanians) shared the perspective of unavoidable differences and conflicts. Since self-interest was not a precondition, and peace was far from being a common practice in adolescents' social environment, the risk of distrust could not be avoided and trust had to be built in the interaction.

The Camps at School of Peace of Monte Sole represent an interesting case-study: education to peace and dialogue must be inclusive: the creation of areas of marginalization would represent complete failure of the educational project. All participants needs to participate actively in the activities, as participation is the presupposition of experience of dialogue and working trust. Under these conditions, facilitation is considered primarily important in promoting adolescents' trusting commitment, enabling their participation in communication, and assuring their mutual responsiveness. By increasing the possibilities of adolescents' active participation, and by reducing their anxiety and suspicion for interlocutors, facilitation can prepare adolescents to risk trust.

In analysing interactions, we will follow the basic methodology of Conversation Analysis (e.g. Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), which consists in working on naturally occurring interactions and more specifically on the contribution of single turns or actions to the ongoing sequence, with reference to the context. Actions are considered context-shaped as well as context-renewing; every current action contributes to the contextual framework in terms of which next action(s) it projects. The analysis concerns the design of turns (actions) produced in the interaction and the organization of the sequences in which facilitators' and adolescents'

turns are intertwined. In particular, the analysis focuses on two kinds of sequences: (1) facilitators' risky actions that open alternatives in the interaction, upgrading adolescents' authority as active participants (Heritage & Robinson, 2005); (2) adolescents' risky actions, which choose among alternatives, showing agency and authority. This analysis highlights degree of mutual trust, joint solution of problems, interpersonal closeness, responsiveness to needs. Our analysis moves from the design of facilitators' turns which proved to be effective in building trust, demonstrating their "trustworthiness", opening alternative directions in the interaction, and upgrading adolescents' authority in expressing interpretations.

We aim to understand if and in which ways facilitation is effective in enabling adolescents to communicate, creating conditions of working trust and trusting commitment, mutual humanization, and mutual recognition of needs. In particular, the analysis focuses on the relationship between facilitation, building trust and the avoidance of some unintended consequences of education related to lack of trust such as alienation, marginalization and self-marginalization. For a peace education programme, it is important to create effective conditions for trusting commitment, promoting possibility for social action and relationships, avoiding marginalization, alienation and loss of confidence in the educational relationship.

Discussion: building trust in education through facilitation

In this section, we analyse three excerpts from group interactions in which interpretation of meanings related to peace (negative behaviours, separation/connection among human beings, human rights) were discussed, requiring the building of working trust and facilitators' trustworthiness. It is important to underline that in the Camps we observed situations in which facilitation did not work successfully in building trust; the chosen excerpts reflect our interest in highlighting successful facilitation in trust building.

Excerpt 1 (first camp) is taken from a discussion following a guided tour to the location of the 1944 slaughter. The discussion is about the Nazi behaviour, which is compared to behaviours in contemporary conflicts, and involves adolescents from Kosovo.

Excerpt 1

1. Erica (Facilitator): ok, so let's continue, just to summarise, we have two things on the table, one the problem Marcin suggested, I describe you the situation in Falluja, from a military point of view, it was almost the same as in Monte Sole, but Marcin asked, it's different? Partisans here, what else over there, terrorists or civil population or army, what's there, ok let me summarise a bit and then, the other question on the table is Victor question: how was possible that Nazi troops came here killing all these people, looking for partisans and because they weren't able to catch them they came back to the villages and killed all the civil population. It's like this?

2. Victor: ehm, no it's not why they, if they want to hunt the partisans, they said it was berufung.

3. Boris (F): mission.

4. Victor: a mission and they see the partisans troops to partisan and then, they don't follow them, they went back and why is their mission to shoot them or they could killed other people.

5. Erica (F): so, why not follow partisans up to the hill but kill other people who were not their target.

6. Marcin: I can suggest, alright, the eastern part of Poland was destroyed, burnt, so it was a total war, I think that in the second world war when the Nazi commanders order to provide a total war to destroy all enemy target in order to, to frightened the civilian people.

7. Victor: do you think they attacked because frightening the civil population of a country?

8. Marcin: maybe but there is there's another thing I that I feel: maybe it was not the initiative from the high headquarter, the soldiers maybe afraid, this soldiers who were fighting in Italy at the Nazi service, they were also human, men and they could be afraid for their life and maybe it was the reaction of it, I don't know.

In turn 1, Erica initiates the interaction formulating two questions which had been raised by Marcin and Victor during the guided tour. Formulation identifies the gist of the previous turn (Heritage, 1985), and is important in building trust, as it both demonstrates responsiveness to the interlocutors' perspective and sustains its further development (Baraldi, 2009). The formulation in turn 1 opens with an acknowledgement of the previous turns ('ok') and a discourse marker ('so'), which stresses that the current turn is developing the previous one (Hutchby, 2007). These two lexical elements indicate responsiveness to the adolescents' agency; the core of Erica's formulation shows responsiveness because it takes the adolescents' agency seriously and enables its continuation. Erica concludes her turn with a promotional question, which projects possible alternative interpretations and an upgrading of the adolescents' authority, while downgrading her own.

Through his response, Victor upgrades his authority, thus contradicting Erica's formulation. In doing this, however, he proposes an explanation of the Nazi behaviour which seems to legitimise it (turns 2 and 4), although his difficulties in speaking English hamper a clear understanding of his interpretation. At this point, in an educational perspective, the facilitators could evaluate Victor's action as cognitively incorrect or normatively unacceptable. On the contrary, in this situation facilitators risk trust, supporting Victor's agency. After Boris' linguistic help has supported Victor's self-expression (turn 3), in turn 5, Erica's new so-prefaced promotional question stresses the relevance of Victor's turn in the interaction. Not surprisingly, in this environment Marcin can risk trust in her action, by self-selecting as next speaker and expressing her interpretation, without being explicitly invited by the facilitators to do so (turn 6). Victor reacts to Marcin's interpretation promoting its continuation (turn 7), without waiting for the facilitators' appreciation of its relevance to the interaction. Responding to Victor's acknowledgment of her authority, Marcin accounts for the behaviour of Nazi soldiers, leaving aside any moral judgment, although in a different and contrasting way (turn 8).

Excerpt 2 (second camp) regards an activity called *Borders and*

Bridges: adolescents are asked to take pictures of objects which represent either borders, as symbols of separation, or bridges, as symbols of contact, and to interpret these pictures in the group discussion. The excerpt concerns the phase of group discussion which is coordinated by the facilitators. The task consists in elaborating and clarifying differences between separations and connections.

Excerpt 2

1. Federica (F): bridge or border?
2. Luca: eh, yeah a border? a border between the new age and the old age, the [long pause] epoca come si dice [epoca, how do you say it].
3. Maria (F): age.
4. Luca: age.
5. Alain (F): age.
6. Marek (F): it's a bridge.
7. Alain (F): what?
8. Marek (F): it's a bridge.
9. Alain (F): for Marek is a bridge.
10. Leni (F): for me too.
11. Alain (F): for Leni too [very long long pause] and for you, boys and girls?
12. Matthias: for me is also a bridge because this picture [not understandable] two times and doesn't divide.
13. Federica (F): so, you mean that a border is always dividing two things or maybe then, it can be also?
14. Matthias: yeah, in some way, yes.
15. Federica (F): and what do you mean for the border or the bridge?
16. Matthias: mm.
17. Federica (F): because there are two differences.
18. Luca: I don't know because I think that a border is a line where two things are near, nearby.

In turn 1, Federica's question ('bridge or border?') concerns an object which was photographed. In educational settings, this kind of question is generally understood as Initiation of the IRE sequence, which continues with Reply and Evaluation (Mehan, 1979). In this case, however, Federica's question does not project expectations of a 'correct reply' which should match predetermined knowledge, but is a promotional question that projects possible alternative interpretations, demonstrating Federica's trust in the adolescents' agency and an open development of the interaction. As a consequence, in the third and following turns, after Luca's response, there are no evaluations; in turn 3 we find linguistic help ('age') and in turn 5 we find Alain's echo of Luca's take-up (turn 4), which confirms its meaningfulness. After this double echo, Marek's statement in turn 6 ('it is a bridge') could be interpreted as a correction of Luca's interpretation, with Leni cooperating in its design in turn 10. However Alain's coordination of this exchange among the facilitators downgrades their authority as experts and upgrades the adolescents' interpretation; with his lexical choices ('for him/her'), Alain introduces the facilitators' interpretation as hypothetical (turn 9: 'for Marek is a bridge'; turn 11: 'for Leni too'), thus putting forward the legitimacy of different interpretations. Furthermore, in turn 11 Alain deals with this interpretation as subject to the adolescents' authority: after a long pause, which indicates the expectation of new interpretations in the group, he involves the adolescents through a promotional question ('and for you, boys and girls?'). This promotional question indicates his trust in the adolescents' agency, and suggests that as facilitators they have the right to produce interpretations.

In turn 12, Matthias' response introduces new opportunities for interpretation. In turn 13, Federica formulates Matthias' turn, highlighting the interactional relevance of his action, while encouraging new action on his part. The formulation is followed by a new promotional question ('it can be also?'), which gives Matthias the opportunity to promote alternatives for next actions. Matthias ambiguous alignment ('in some way') projects a new question (turn 15), which is prefaced by a sequential marker ('and') that stresses continuity with the previous turn. This is a feedback question whereby Federica

explores the meanings of Matthias' interpretation, as expressed in turns 12 and 14, showing attentiveness to it and treating it as relevant to the interaction, therefore upgrading Matthias' authority in interpretation. Matthias' hesitation in turn 16 projects Federica's initiation of a suggestion (turn 17), but Luca immediately self-selects as interlocutor, expanding on Matthias' interpretation (turn 18). On the one hand, Luca's self-selection shows that the interaction has successfully opened alternatives for new actions and expansions; on the other hand, it shows he is risking trust in the facilitator's interest for the adolescents' interpretations.

Excerpt 3 (second camp) regards the interpretation of gay marriage, during a discussion on human rights.

Excerpt 3

1. Maria (F): I 'm talking with everybody because, probably, I don't know, you have different opinion from Alessandro, or the same, one thing to-, say something more about it [very long pause] eh Luca [smiling voice]?
2. Luca: eh, mm?
3. Maria (F): you wanted to say something more?
4. Luca: [very low] boh [italian interjection for "I really don't know"].
5. Maria (F): or you have different opinion, what do you think about it?
6. Luca: (very low) no, it's a difficult subject.
7. Maria (F): it's a difficult subject?
8. Luca: yes.
9. Maria (F): why [smiling voice]?
10. Luca: because if she were in Spain, she would be accepted.
11. Maria (F): mhm [Maria moves closer to Luca].
12. Luca: but in England no, she doesn't.
13. Alessandro: [overlapping with the final part of turn 12] depend on the state, on the law of a state.
14. Maria (F): it depends from the state.
15. Luca: yes.

16. Alessandro: tipo in Spagna li fanno sposare i froci, mentre in Inghilterra no [like in Spain faggots can get married, while in England they can't].

17. Maria (F): non si dice [don't use that word].

18. Alessandro: [smiling with embarrassment] eh, gli omosessuali [eh, homosexual people].

19. Maria (F): mh va beh [mh, that's fine].

20. Alessandro: se li fanno sposare non vuol dire che [if they are allowed to get married it doesn't mean].

21. Maria (F): [overlapping with the final part of turn 20] sorry, sorry, sorry, the other don't, so, Luca is saying it depends, if you live in Spain, you are accepted, if you live in England no why Spain and England, sorry? and then Alessandro was saying it depends from the state, for example in Spain it's possible for them to marry.

22. Emilio: for me, the possibility in Spain to get married it doesn't mean be accepted by the people, I think in English and Spain look homosexual in the same way other people do another way.

23. Maria (F): ok, Emilio then is saying it doesn't really depend on the laws, if I understood well eh, block me if do not, if it doesn't really depend on laws because it can be that it depends also from the people, that live in a country, probably in Spain and in England you can have both behaviour.

In turn 1, Maria refers to Alessandro's interpretation (not shown in the excerpt) without evaluating it; by suggesting that different participants can express different opinions, Maria does not select some correct knowledge to learn, and opens up alternatives for action. However, the adolescents seem to be unwilling to participate in the discussion. Maria's encouragement is followed by a four-second silence, and when she selects a specific next speaker to move the interaction forward ('eh, Luca?'), the candidate speaker first is hesitant and does not seem to understand the question (turn 2), then he shows very low enthusiasm for his involvement (turn 4: boh' an expression for 'I really don't know'), and finally he refuses to express his opinion (turn 6). Nevertheless, Maria insistently promotes Luca's participation asking

him questions, clarifying their meaning (turns 3, 5, 9), and echoing Luca's previous turn (turn 7). Echoing is a kind of action that shows attentiveness and involvement in the perspective of the interlocutor (Baraldi, 2009). After being repeatedly invited to risk trust, Luca finally expresses his interpretation (turn 10). Maria supports his action through a continuer (Gardner, 2001), that is a short turn that communicates attentiveness and invites continuation (turn 11). The insistence of the facilitator creates new opportunities for action.

In turn 13, Alessandro refers his action to Luca's previous one; his self-selection as current speaker is accepted by Maria, who ratifies the relevance of his turn by echoing it (turn 14). In turn 15, Luca aligns with this echo and with Alessandro's turn. This interactively-constructed joint authorship produces meanings with the active contributions of both the adolescents and the facilitator. In turn 16, however, Alessandro's highly depreciative lexical choice ('faggots', 'froci' in Italian) results in the inclusion of gay people in a negatively-connoted 'Them', projecting an ethnocentric form of communication (Pearce, 1989) that contradicts the cultural presuppositions of peace education. Therefore, it seems that Maria's decision to risk trust in promoting adolescents' participation is producing undesired consequences. She reacts to this risk initiating a correction (turn 17), which is completed by Alessandro (turn 18) and which she confirms in the third turn (turn 19). Maria's reaction projects a hierarchical form of communication between the facilitator and the adolescent, which parallels the ethnocentric form projected by Alessandro. Furthermore, the joint switch to the Italian language builds a side sequence that excludes most participants from the interaction.

In turn 21, Maria switches back to English with a formulation of Luca's and Alessandro's interpretation of the topic. This formulation projects the adolescents' interpretations as starting point for a new course of actions; the contingently produced hierarchical form is dissolved and substituted by a promotional one. This is demonstrated by the fact that Emilio immediately self-selects as speaker, expressing his perspective (turn 22), which refers to Luca's, Alessandro's and Maria's actions, introducing a cultural interpretation of the dichotomy acceptance/non-acceptance of gay people. Luca's and Alessandro's actions, supported by Maria's facilitation, have opened new

opportunities for action, promoting a new risk of trust, which is visible in Emilio's appreciation. Emilio's action partially contradicts the meanings cooperatively produced by Maria, Luca and Alessandro and projects Maria's formulation (turn 23), which, in its turn, proposes Emilio's action as a topic for discussion, thus supporting Emilio's agency. Rather than presenting her formulation as a synthesis produced by an expert, Maria projects an expectation of possible revision ('if I understood well eh; block me if do not'), that is the expectation of the adolescent's agency.

Conclusions

Facilitation is considered an effective means of building trust in group interaction in educational situations, and in situations of distrust; trustworthiness of facilitators is considered a crucial starting point for building trust. However, the meaning of facilitation is controversial. On the one hand, studies on children-adults relationships stress that facilitation enhances interpersonal affective relationships; facilitation is understood as active promotion of agency and support of personal expressions, and trusting commitment requires affective expectations. On the other hand, studies on situations of distrust stress that facilitation is not based on interpersonal relationships, as building trust requires mutual accommodation and joint solution of problems, based on self-interest (working trust). Both these positions seem to attach great importance to sharing and avoiding risks. On the one hand, affective expectations seem to reduce risky alternatives. On the other hand, mutual accommodation and joint solution of problems seem to reduce differences of perspectives. However, building trusting commitment means promoting risky alternatives of action. What clearly emerges in both perspectives is that facilitators and other participants *must* in fact risk trust, choosing among alternative lines of action.

The research we have discussed in this article is motivated by the fact that, according to [Portes \(2000\)](#), we believe that a sociological contribution to social intervention and, more specifically, to education, does not hinge on the elaboration of grand engineering blueprints,

but instead in careful analyses of social processes, awareness of their concealed and un-intended manifestations, and sustained efforts to understand the participants' own re-actions to their situation. The analysis cannot be generalised to any condition of facilitation that can promote building trust. However it offers two reasons of general interest. First, in the situations analysed, interactional conditions were unfamiliar, adolescents came from non-shared cultural traditions, and building trust was not based on previous interpersonal relationships. Second, the analysis revealed some kinds of facilitators' actions that systematically promoted adolescents' trusting commitment, upgrading adolescents' authority in interpretations: promotional questions that open alternatives for adolescents' actions and highlight adults' trust in their agency; feedback questions that verify and explore the meanings of adolescents' interpretations; formulations that both show responsiveness to adolescents' needs and open alternatives for their actions.

The excerpts discussed in section 4 exemplifies two different ways of promoting working trust through facilitation, which are the more important in our data. In excerpt 1, facilitation promotes trust in the direct interaction between adolescents who cooperate in constructing a joint narrative. In this case, facilitation seems to be in line with Kelman's observations and suggestions about facilitation as coordination of the parties' autonomous solutions. In excerpts 2 and 3, facilitators act as mediators of contacts among adolescents, promoting their alternate participation in the interaction in triadic exchanges. In these cases, trust is based on a specific form of facilitation in which the third party actively intervenes in its construction.

Excerpts 1-3 show that, through promotional and feedback questions, formulations, and also linguistic help, facilitators can promote adolescents' trusting commitment in the interaction, supporting their agency and avoiding evaluations of their interpretations. Facilitators are able to build trust projecting affective expectations, which are expectations of adolescents' self-expression as a result of the interaction. Therefore trust building is enhanced by facilitators' turns which project affective expectations, promoting mutual accommodation, responsiveness and production of alternatives, that is adolescents' risk of trust. In these interactions, the building of working trust does not

presuppose interpersonal relationships and closeness, but it is based on contingently produced affective expectations in the course of interaction, which are projected through the positioning of facilitators.

The discussion of data analysis offers an opportunity to reflect on a form of facilitation based on patterns of expectations regarding (1) facilitators' personal commitment, which permeates their role performances, and makes them trustworthy, and (2) affective results (affective expectations). This form of facilitation is a form of mediation if facilitators' questioning and formulating actively *coordinate* interactions *between* the parties; in these cases, peace education is able in promoting youngsters' active participation to cross-cultural interaction, breeding their intercultural competence.

These results lead to two important considerations. First, mutual accommodation is based on the opening of risky alternatives in action and interpretation. The production of risky alternatives in the interaction seems to be the most effective result of facilitation, and a genuine way of building trust. This means that a joint solution of problems is not the most probable result of facilitation, nor does this seem a particularly important feature of building trust. Second, self-interest is not so important in facilitation. We do not deny the importance of self-interest in modern society, also for institutional engagement; but we think that it is not the cultural presupposition of trusting commitment in adult-children interactions. Affective expectations, although contingently constructed, highlight that personal commitment is the basis of building trust in social relationships.

Our data show a contingent construction of affective expectations, which works from the very beginning in supporting trust. This combination of affective expectations and trust allows mutual accommodation, but this accommodation is based on the opening of risky alternatives in action and interpretation. The production of risky alternatives in the interaction seems to be the most effective result of this form of facilitation, and a genuine way of building trust.

Finally, and most important, our analysis highlights some ways in which facilitators' actions create the conditions of adolescents' trusting commitment in group activities; our study enhances a reflection on the relationship between trust building and avoidance of the unintended

consequences of education related to lack of trust. Education is a system where trusting commitment in specific interactions is vital for its reproduction; in education, creating effective conditions for trusting commitment means promoting possibility for social action and relationships, thus avoiding marginalization, alienation and loss of confidence in the educational relationship. Thus, trust building maybe intended as a strategy to avoid unintended consequences of education.

At least in the peace education camps we have analyzed, facilitation can dramatically change educational interactions, preventing marginalization, self-marginalization and the other unintended consequences of education related to lack of trust. How far it can get along with peace education in different contexts can be the object of further and much broader research.

References

- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In by G.Salomon, B.Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world*, (pp. 27-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Baraldi, C. (Ed.). (2009). *Dialogue in intercultural communities. From an educational point of view*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Britzman, D. (2007). Teacher education as uneven development: toward a psychology of uncertainty. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(1), 1-12. doi:10.1177/0022487109348344
- Brown, L. (2009). International education: a force for peace and cross cultural understanding? *Journal of Peace Education*, 6(2), 209-224. doi:10.1080/17400200903086672
- Buber, M. ([1923] 2004). *I and Thou*. New York: Continuum.
- Dahl, T. (2009). The importance of place for learning about peace: residential summer camps as transformative thinking spaces. *Journal of Peace Education*, 6(2), 225-245. doi:10.1080/17400200802655072
- Danesh, H.B. (2006). Towards an integrative theory of peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 3(1), 55–78. doi:10.1080/17400200500532151

- Galtung, J. (1975). *Peace: Research. Education. Action. Essays in peace research, Vol. 1*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: response tokens and listeners stance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity. Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for violence and peace: how does peace education differ from 'normal' schooling?. *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(2), 171-187.
[doi:10.1080/17400200903086599](https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200903086599)
- Harris, M.I. (2002). Conceptual underpinnings of peace education. In G.Salomon, B.Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 15-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harris, M.I. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education, 1*(1), 5–20. [doi:10.1080/1740020032000178276](https://doi.org/10.1080/1740020032000178276)
- Harris, M.I., & Morrison, M.L. (2003). *Peace education*. 2nd edition. London: McFarland.
- Hengst, H., & Zeiher, H. (Eds.). (2005). *Kindheit soziologisch*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analysing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue*, edited (pp. 95-117). London: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J., & Robinson, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 15-38.
[doi:10.1177/019027250506800103](https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800103)
- Hicks, D. (Ed.). (1996). *Discourse, learning, and schooling*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, M., Davis, J., Prout, A., & Tisdall, K. (2004). Moving the *Participation Agenda Forward*. *Children & Society, 18*(2), 77-96.
[doi:10.1002/chi.819](https://doi.org/10.1002/chi.819)

- Holdsworth, R. (2004). Taking Young People Seriously Means Giving Them Serious Things to Do. In J.Mason, T.Fattore (Eds.), *Children Taken Seriously. In Theory, Policy and Practice* (pp. 139-150). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Holland, S., & O'Neill, S. (2006). We Had to be there to make Sure it Was What We Wanted. Enabling Children's Participation in Family Decision-making through the Family group Conference. *Childhood, 13*(1), 91-111. doi:10.1177/0907568206059975
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I. (2007). *The discourse of child counseling*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing Childhood*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- James, W. ([1899]1983). *Talks to teachers in psychology and to students on some of life's ideals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jenks, C. (1996). *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Kelman, H. (2005). Building trust among enemies: The central challenge for international conflict resolution. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(6), 639-650. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.011
- Lawy, R., & Biesta, G. (2006). Citizenship-as-practice: the educational implications of an inclusive and relational understanding of citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54*(1), 34-50. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8527.2006.00335.x
- Luhmann, N. (1968). *Vertrauen. Ein mechanismus der reduktion sozialer komplexität*, Stuttgart: Enke.
- Luhmann, N. (1984). *Soziale Systeme*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations* (pp. 94-107). Oxford: Department of Sociology University of Oxford.
- Luhmann, N. (1991). *Soziologie des Risikos*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Luhmann, N., & Schorr, K.E. (1979). *Reflexionsprobleme im Erziehungssysteme*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

- Matthews, H. (2003). Children and Regeneration: Setting and Agenda for Community Participation and Integration. *Children & Society*, 17(4), 264-276. doi:10.1002/CHI.745
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking: a sociocultural approach*. London: Routledge.
- Merton, R.K. (1936). The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action. *American Sociological Review*, 1, 894-904. doi:10.2307/2084615
- Parsons, T. (1959). The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 29(4), 297-318.
- Pearce, W.B. (1989). *Communication and the Human Condition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Portes, A. (2000). The hidden abode: Sociology as analysis of the unexpected?. *American Sociological Review*, 65(1), 1-18. doi:10.2307/2657287
- Shapiro, S. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of peace education. In G.Salomon, B.Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 63-72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shier, H. (2001). Pathways to Participation: Openings, Opportunities and Obligations. *Children & Society*, 15(2), 107-117. doi:10.1002/chi.617
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse. Language in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Wyness, M.G. (1999). Childhood, Agency and Education Reform. *Childhood*, 6(3), 353-368. doi:10.1177/0907568299006003004

Federico Farini is Professor of Sociology, Language and Culture Sciences Department. University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy

Contact Address: Direct correspondence to the author at Language and Culture Sciences Department, Largo Sant'Eufemia, 19, Modena, 41121, Italy or at federico.farini@unimore.it