Cultures of education in action: research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international setting

1. Introduction: context, data, method and objectives of the work

1.1 The context: new representations of education involving ideals and practices. Research on the case of Children's International Summer Villages

Since the determination in educational psychology (James, 1983) and philosophy (Dewey, 1916) that children, rather than being empty vessels to be filled with knowledge, play an active role in educational outcomes, the role of children in education has never ceased to be a concern for researchers and practitioners. The unpredictability of children's constructions of meaning and the opacity of their minds are considered a serious risk to educational outcomes.

Pedagogy has designed curricular and behavioral rules and structures by incorporating cultural presuppositions about standardized roles and cognitive expectations; yet the "crisis of education" and unsatisfactory reforms have continued during the 20th century. The idea of a "failure of education" has emerged and has become popular among education researchers, sociologists and politicians (Luhmann and Schorr, 1979). For Arendt (1993), crisis is a permanent condition of education, connected to a double paradox embedded in the idea of education as a linear evolutionary process from immaturity to maturity: the concept of a children's cognitive autonomy introduces the problem of trying to know a mind that resists being known, whereas teachers have a responsibility to children who are inescapably free to construct their own meanings.

Vis-à-vis a general lack of trust in education, since the 1980s, the culture of childhood has placed particular emphasis on children's self-realization and agency (Vanderbroeck and Bouverne-De Bie, 2006), which involves considering the autonomy of children as social agents and considering children as being an educational resource. This encourages the promotion of children's sense of responsibility and their skills in planning, designing, monitoring and managing social contexts; in other words, children's "understanding of their own competencies" (Matthews, 2003: 274). The success of this vision of children as social agents has created a new role for the educator as an "organiser of learning" (Holdsworth, 2005: 149) who is inventive and eschews pre-planned activities and who is able to understand that children can and must tackle important issues.

Children's International Summer Villages (CISV, http://www.cisv.org) is an international organization that offers opportunities for children to learn that, despite national or cultural differences, they are members of the human community in an increasingly interdependent world. The CISV educational project is based on the idea of *experiential knowledge* (Kolb, 1984), which uses the autonomy of children as an educational resource and is developed through specific activities based on theories of prejudice and group dynamics. People from different countries and cultures are invited to develop intercultural abilities that should help them establish effective relationships, communicate with minimal loss or distortion and work together towards common goals; participants should "learn by doing" and share the responsibility for this kind of learning.

The most important CISV program of activities is the *village*. Villages are four-week meetings between the third week of June and the first week of August, generally taking place in schools during the summer break. Villages include between 9 and 12 national delegations of four 11-year-old children each -- two males and two females -- who are led by an adult *delegation leader*; there is also an organizational staff with a director. English is the official language in CISV villages; however, translations are provided for those who are not sufficiently skilled in English, and non-verbal communication is strongly encouraged.

Since 1951, several villages (50 in 2010) have been organized on five continents and have involved thousands of children and adults (see http://www.cisv.org/programmes). In CISV villages, four progressively complex activities aim to gradually transform superficial mutual understanding into interpersonal trust: 1) name/ice-breaking games (introducing the participants); 2) running games; 3)

contact games and 4) simulation, cooperation and trust games. Following the simulation, cooperation and trust games, which are scheduled during the second half of the village activities, when interpersonal relationships are expected to evolve towards cooperation and reciprocal trust, *debriefing sessions* are intended to promote reflection in the children.

In this article, we analyze actual, naturally occurring adult-child interactions recorded during debriefing sessions at eight CISV villages in Italy during the summers of 2006 and 2007. Debriefing sessions were recorded in the context of research exploring and evaluating the concrete application of pedagogical concepts such as experiential learning, the promotion of active participation among children and the consideration of children's creativity. While many publications in the field of pedagogy offer prescriptive resources for empowering children's voices through educational practices, such as through active listening and facilitating children's creativity (Gordon, 1974; Rogers, 1951), none of the publications include empirical applications of the theories. This research was carried out by a team of sociologists at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, who videotaped 412 hours of activities (for a more extensive account of the research project, see Baraldi, 2009). The advantages of videotaped data are evident: identifying the speakers was much easier, and we had the opportunity to consider how the motions, gazes, and postures of the participants were relevant to the development of the interaction.

1.2 An integrated methodology: the analysis of sequence organization and its cultural presuppositions

Our analysis of the relationship between a specific culture of childhood education and actual communication practices has required the integration of two approaches. The first approach concerns the organization of specific interactive sequences, adjacency pairs and projections of actions and reactions. The second approach concerns the linguistic forms signaling the main cultural presuppositions of interaction and the re-contextualization of these cultural presuppositions through specific actions.

For the first approach, we used conversation analysis (CA) to study the organization of interactive sequences. The object of CA is to discover how participants understand and respond to one another, with a central focus on how sequences of actions-in-interaction are generated (ten Have, 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). People's understanding of each other's actions can actually unfold as sequences unfold and can be analyzed using the *next turn proof procedure*: any next turn in a sequence displays its producer's understanding of the prior turn of talk (Clift, Drew and Hutchby, 2006; Schegloff, 2006). The second turn in the sequence makes the interlocutors' understanding evident, showing that the meaning of action and information has been achieved (Heritage, 2006; Mazeland, 2006). CA (Heritage, 1995; 2005; 2008) provides "a perspective within which language, culture and social organization can be analyzed not as separate subfields but as integrated elements of coherent courses of action" (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990: 301).

We integrated this approach with the analysis of the general social processes producing and reproducing culture beyond any single interaction. Participants in interactions act according to what has been said in previous turns *and* to what they "perceive as other participants' intentions as well as assumptions about the world" (Baker, 2006: 325). Participants' intentions are visible in their actions and, particularly, in their role performances, which are fundamental in interaction: "we perform our gender, we step in and out of professional and other roles numerous times during the course of a single conversation, and therefore whether a participant behaves and responds as a woman, as a doctor, or as a professional interpreter at any moment depends on a variety of factors and can change during the course of a single interaction" (Baker, 2006: 326).

Role performances and expectations can be observed in interaction through *contextualization cues*, which are verbal and non-verbal (lexical, syntactic, structural) signs used by interlocutors "to relate what is said at any one time and in any one place to knowledge acquired through past experience" (Gumperz, 1992: 230). Contextualization cues work at various levels of discourse, including through prosody (intonation, pitch shift), paralinguistic signs (tempo, pausing and hesitation,

latching or overlapping of speaking turns), code choice (style, language) and one's choice of lexical forms or formulaic expressions.

Contextualization cues "highlight, foreground or make salient" (Gumperz, 1992: 232) the *cultural presuppositions* of the interaction. Cultural presuppositions are the fundamental guide for communication processes and, therefore, structure the social organization of interaction. In turn, interaction may produce a re-interpretation of these cultural presuppositions and so may have significant effects on the meaning of role performances, forms of expectations, and values. On the one hand, cultural presuppositions shape interactions; on the other hand, interaction may renew cultural presuppositions precisely by re-interpreting them within the local context.

This article discerns how reflections on the experience of simulation, cooperation and trust games are managed in debriefing sessions in CISV villages. Focusing on the communication processes that involved leaders and children gave us the ability to recognize how the organization of interaction and cultural presuppositions of education intertwined and shaped the outcomes of the debriefing sessions. The cases shown here are representative of the cases in our collection. They were selected as clear examples of the phenomena that we wish to discuss, although they are not qualitatively different from other instances in our collection. Data were transcribed using Gail Jefferson's transcription system (see figure 1). All details in individuals' speech have been altered in the transcription to protect participants' anonymity.

2. Results, the interactional achievement of education

2.1 The distribution of opportunities for active participation. The turn-taking system of the debriefing sessions

As in all types of talk-in-interaction (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974), turn-taking is the basic mechanism for organizing social participation in debriefing sessions. The asymmetry between the leaders and the children in debriefing sessions is clearly visible in the organization of turn-taking: the leaders maintain control over the trajectory and the "agenda" of the debriefing session such that there is little opportunity for the children to take the initiative.

The leaders distribute opportunities to talk and actively participate in the interaction by means of standardized practices. We observed two practices in particular: 1) calling the name of a child either before or after asking a question (see S1 and S2) establishing a "first-hand-raised talks first" rule (see S2). Both of these practices are shaped by the specific cultural presupposition that the leaders, because of their role as educators, must impose constraints on which contributions are allowed in the interaction.

[S1]   Sending colors activity. Children are instructed to select a color that matches the other choices. Debriefing session: 2 leaders, 5 children.

1 Mark (USA leader):   what kind of colors did you send? and why did you send that?
2 Children ((in unison)): blue
3 Lisa (UK leader):   you guys were sending blue every single time, why? (.) Luis?
4 Luis (Portugal child): ((looking down)) (to score) more points
5 Mark: ((turning away from Luis)) Liam, why?
6 Liam (USA child):   because we decided it=it was a group decision

In line 3, Lisa selects Luis as the next speaker, asking him to account for the group's behavior during the activity. After Luis' response (line 4), the co-coordinator, Mark, selects another child, Liam, by calling on him by name. According to Mehan's research on Initiation-Response-Evaluation sequences in educational interaction (Mehan, 1979), the absence of educator evaluations during the third turn is usually understood as a negative assessment of the previous response. In S1, Mark's selection of another candidate responder without commentary on Luis's answer makes it necessary for Liam to offer an alternative answer (line 6).

[S2] Rich and poor activity. Children are divided in two groups: one group plays the role of rich people, while the other group plays the role of poor people. Debriefing session: 2 leaders, 40 children.

```
1  Ina (Denmark leader):  we're ready (.) anyone has: (.) anything to answer about, raise your  ha:nd
2                         ANYTHING HAS TO SAY ABOUT IT?  (..) TAKE TURN! (04)
3                         ((selects Lin as the next speaker by pointing to her))
4  Lin (Thailand child):  I feel (.) this: I think it's not fair, because: (.) If you want to teach us, you
5                         should (.) do everybody poor and rich
6  Ina:                   ((selects Paula as the next speaker by pointing to her))
7  Paula (Brazil child):  (I think), I think erm it was (so much) fair, and: another thing I didn't like
8                         it the: then erm we were poor in the evening, I just discovered that erm:
9                         when you're poor, you're (.) not, erm: how do you say, not selfish, you
10                        share with   the other persons, and: erm: you share a lot more than the
11                        rich, then the riches
12 Ina:                   someone (else) raised the hand? (.) raising your hand so
12 Robbie (UK child):     °yeah°
13 LMDen:                 Robbie? ((selects Robbie as the next speaker by looking at her and
                          nodding))
```

Ina enacts a "first-hand-raised talks first" rule in line 1, applying the method systematically during the interaction to select the next speaker after each child's response (lines 3, 6 and 12). Once a child has completed his/her turn, the leader takes a turn and selects the next speaker. Only Ina may legitimately select the next speaker. Robbie's hesitant self-selection in line 12 is not genuine self-selection because Robbie reacts to Ina's invitation in line 11, therefore confirming Ina's control over the distribution of opportunities for active participation.

2.2 The organization of interaction in the debriefing sessions. Question-Answer adjacency pairs and Question-Answer-Alignment triplets

In debriefing sessions, children's participation is mostly restricted within the frame of "*leader question/child answer*" adjacency pairs where leaders' questions inspire the production of children's answers. This form of interaction reflects the main form of role performance and cognitive expectations, which are the cultural presupposition of the sequential order of interaction.
In our data, children systematically align with and provide relevant answers to the first part of the question-answer adjacency pair, thus confirming the leaders' expectations.

[S3]   Debriefing session after a cooperation game. Group discussion of the relative importance of cooperation versus competition: 1 leader, 4 children.

```
1  Karel (Poland leader):  you mean that: after all: cooperation is not important?
2  Tomas (Brazil child):   °it's (1.2) [that        he:]°
3  Karel:                              [you said you] like competition to be: like: first (.) the
4                          number one, m:?
5  Tomas:                  m::: (1) no:   (..) m:: well: it's: it's: (.) ok: I like competition but it's
6                          not that  I don't like cooperation
```

The act of questioning invokes a claim that the questioner lacks certain information. However, different question designs can adjust, or even reverse, the depth of the gap in knowledge between questioner and respondent (Heritage and Raymond, 2010). In S3, Karel's questions are designed to

claim a knowledgeable position for the questioner and are used to seek confirmation for information that is already "in play" as a piece of shared knowledge. The preferred replies are conveyed by meta-references to shared knowledge (Boyle, 2000; Koshik 2002). Rather than asking for information he does not have, Karel asks Tomas to express agreement with CISV values and objectives (in this case, cooperation) that are reproduced in everyday interactions involving expert adults and learning children in villages.

[S4]   Debriefing session after a cooperation game. Aaron has just said that his rival team won because they did not respect the rules: 1 leader, 4 children.

1 Mark (USA leader):	m:? someone didn't respect the rule? Aaron, why did you say
2	someone didn't respect the rule?
3 Aaron (USA child):	((moving closer to a Spanish child standing by his side)) hh (°no:
4	no: before°) (.) ((turning his face to Mark)) shall we have JC shop
5	before lunchtime, tomorrow?
6 Mark:	<u>hey hey</u> that's: (odd) I asked you something, m:
7 Aaron:	°bu:[t°
8 Mark:	[no:o <u>listen</u> usually people asked are supposed to answer, isn't it
9	such a bad thing do not answer to a question
10 Aaron:	°o:h sorry° (.) well (.) [I -] [°o:h°]
11 Mark:	((pointing at another child) [Nat] (.) [did so:]meone cheat?

After some questions, we observed unexpected second parts that violate the principle of conditional relevance. In S4, Mark first expresses a negative evaluation of Aaron's behavior in lines 8-9 and then excludes the child from the interaction by selecting another speaker (line 11), even though Aaron has already started to answer the question. This sanction repairs Aaron's breach, normatively imposing Mark's expectations for the organization of the interaction and the form of the children's participation.

Whereas "leader question/child answer" adjacency pairs represent the basic form of sequence organization in CISV debriefing sessions, in most cases the sequences are expanded into three-turn "Question-Answer-Alignment" (QAA) sequences. In these triplets, turn 1 consists of the leader's question addressed to a specific child or the group of children, turn 2 consists of a child's (or children's) answer to the question, and turn 3 indicates the leader's alignment or misalignment with the children's answer.

Most of the leader-children interactions in debriefing sessions may be described as recursive chains of QAA sequences where there is little room for children's initiative and where the leaders exert control over the introduction and adjustment of the topics, and hence over the "agenda" of the debriefing session. The leaders' ability to control the trajectories of action in QAA sequences relies on asymmetries between social roles: opportunities for participation depend on the social structures of education, and this orientation is evident in the sequential order of the interaction.

[S5] Debriefing session after a cooperation game: 2 leaders, 4 children.

1 Nona (Argentina leader):	((pointing at Fatima)) o:k and: and you think that in your life the
2	same situations of the game happen or it just a: fiction?
3 Fatima (Jordan child):	in the family
4 Tim (USA leader):	ok, ve:ry good (.) in the real life, in the family: m: very good
5	ind<u>ee</u>d (.) ((turning his face to Paulo)) Paulo, what do you think
6	about it?

In S5, Nona asks a question and selects Fatima as the respondent. Fatima offers an answer, and Tim closes the QAA sequence by praising Fatima. Tim's third turn in the QAA accomplishes more than praise, however; after expressing approval in lines 4-5 and after an intra-turn pause, Tim selects another speaker to answer the question (lines 5-6). By selecting Paulo as the next speaker, Tim ensures the progression of the discussion about the topic introduced by Nona in lines 1-2.

[S6] "Fill the cup" activity (teams are asked to transfer water from one large cup to another cup located ten meters away, inventing their own modes of cooperation and instruments). Debriefing session: 4 leaders, 40 children.

1 Xin (Hong Kong leader):	so: ple:ase <u>raise</u> your hands if you have something to say about it,
2	ok? we saw that group two won, m:: so: ((pointing at Fabia))? why
3	do you think group two won?
4 Fabia (Brazil child):	because there was (.) was: Paulo he was good in °pone-° put the water
5	in the cup
6 Xin:	Bjorn?
7 Bjorn (Sweden child):	m: they take only a little water so they wasted less water than us
8 Mary (USA leader):	Inga?
9 Inga (Poland child):	e: they are good
10 Xin:	Brad?
11 Brad (USA child):	they help each other so: they were so: <u>effective</u>
12 Xin:	good (.) so: cooperating is very important

The absence of an assessment by the leader is sufficient here to encourage the children to continue the search for answers. Xin (lines 6 and 10) and Mary (line 8) select the next speaker by calling his/her name. The sequential position of the leaders' selections makes it seem important to the selected speakers to offer alternative answers. Xin's selection of the next speaker in turn 3 of the first QAA sequence (line 6) initiates a second parasitic QAA sequence. In the same way, Mary's reaction to Bjorn's answer -- the selection of Inga as the next speaker (line 8) -- opens a third parasitic QAA sequence. Finally, Xin's selection of Brad (line 10) opens a fourth QAA sequence. Once Brad has offered an answer that meets the leaders' expectations, Xin's expression of appreciation works as a termination act (line 12).

[S7] Football activity. Each team follows different rules. Away teams are required to learn the home team's rule without asking. Debriefing session: 4 leaders, 40 children.

1 Mark (USA leader):	Ok, my last question is: how does this activity resemble different
2	cultures around the world?
3 Marcel (Canada leader):	CISV is (.) it's an example of the game, so if you are, we have no:
4	(.) common language, so with English, it's a big big problem to
5	decide how to live and: it's the complication of working
6 Mark:	((Ana raises her hand; Mark points at her, smiling)) Ana?
7 Ana (Brazil child)	e: each game is a co-, it 's a erm country, could be a country, erm
8	the rules erm is the rules of the country, erm because you don't –
9	when you go to a country, maybe you don't know the rules, there, so
10	you need to learn, erm erm (..) erm stay with according to the rules
11	(.) there
12 Mark:	((turning away from Ana to the whole group)) that's
13	excellent, you guys got it. Any other (.) answers? No? That's
14	it? (.) Ok, that's a good job guys, you're awesome
15	((children applaud))

As in the previous excerpt, S7 is an instance of the sequential organization of leader-children interaction in a debriefing session based on QAA triplets. After Marcel's interjection (line 3-5), which is intended to support the children in responding to Mark's question, the American delegation leader selects a specific child, Ana, by calling her name. Mark's expression of appreciation is a termination act that selects Ana's answer in lines 7-11 as the correct knowledge the children are expected to take from this part of the debriefing session. S7 is particularly interesting because Mark praises the whole group, despite the fact that Ana actually produced the answer indicated to be correct (lines 12-14). Mark's choice, emphasized by the shift in his glance from Ana to the whole group, is a contextualization cue for the cultural presuppositions of CISV educational programs, particularly for their emphasis on working together towards common goals and sharing responsibility for the "learn by doing" process. In this way, learning may be accompanied by the establishment of effective communication skills.

2.3 Teaching through asking: candidate answers inside questions

Our data offer evidence that leaders are able to impose their expectations about the outcomes of the learning process by controlling the sequential development of an interaction. Among the devices used by leaders to control interaction, one of the most common is the offering of *candidate answers inside questions*.

By offering a candidate answer inside a question, the speaker guides the interlocutor to respond in a certain way, suggesting not only what is relevant as an answer but also what the anticipated answer might be (Pomerantz, 1988). Candidate answer questions are common in many social settings (Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Arminen, 2005; Heritage and Clayman, 2010), but in educational interaction they have a special relevance because educators use them to convey educational content through interrogatively formatted turns. In these cases, providing (or not providing) a candidate answer indicates the learner's mastery of educational content and therefore may be an object of *evaluation* (Margutti, 2006). Evaluation – that is, the distinction between praise and disapproval with regard to a learner's action – is the form that *educational selection* takes in the interaction (Vanderstraeten and Biesta, 2006). Selection motivates learners to align their role performance with the educator's expectations (Luhmann and Schorr, 1979).

[S8] Debriefing session: general discussion about the value of cooperation: 2 leaders, 40 children.

```
1  Ricardo (Brazil leader):    have you ever think that maybe the: best way to  help yourself is to
2                              help the  others?
3  Children:          ((nod))
4  Ricardo:                    If I don't think "it's a problem, how can I work it out" but "how can
5                              we work it together? Maybe if I help her ((indicates a child)) then she
6                              will find    ways to help me I wouldn't think about (.)  ((turns his
7                              face to Rob)) M:h      ?
8  Rob (Netherlands child): °yes°
```

In S8, candidate answers are offered inside Ricardo's questions (lines 1-2 and lines 4-7); their function is to guide the children and align their thoughts with the educational content the leader expects them to learn. The children align (line 3) and the child Rob aligns (line 8)) with Ricardo. Their participation seems to be oriented to the leader's expectations and limited to expressions of agreement. By virtue of the polar-question format employed, Ricardo's question inspires the children's expression of either agreement or disagreement with the propositional content at play encouraging a marked preference for agreement and reducing the risk of surprising actions that would be obstacles to a successful interaction (Raymond 2003).

Ricardo's turn in lines 4-7 conveys advice-giving through an interrogatively formatted turn. Rob is not asked for a piece of information that Ricardo does not have. Rather, Rob is asked to second Ricardo's expression of appreciation for the idea of cooperation, which represents the educational content that Rob is expected to have learned. In line 8, Rob aligns with Ricardo by producing an *unmarked acknowledgment*, which is a minimal response that is limited to the acceptance of the propositional content conveyed by Ricardo's question.

Sequences of this type ("leader's advice-giving/children's unmarked acknowledgment") are very frequent in our data and resemble the sequence "doctor's diagnosis-patient's unmarked acknowledgment" discussed by Peräkylä (2006). Like doctors' diagnoses, leaders' advice-giving tends to be offered and accepted "on authority" and ordinarily does not attract significant overt acknowledgement or expressions of acceptance by children. Advice is produced and recognized as an action performed by an expert who is licensed to educate children and render authoritative judgments about the content that children are expected to learn.

.

2.4 The control of interaction: interrogative-negative questions

Educators' legitimacy in distinguishing what is right from what is wrong, and in distinguishing what is relevant from what is irrelevant for the discussion, depends on a hierarchical distribution of *epistemic rights*, or rights and responsibilities related to knowledge (Heritage and Raymond, 2005). In CISV debriefing sessions, specific turn formats are designed by the leaders to preserve their status as superior epistemic authorities. Among these turn formats is one in which questions with interrogative-negative components are the first component (Heritage, 2002).

The functioning of interrogative-negative questions relies on the sequential properties of questions as a range of social actions. Asking a question places significant constraints on what the recipient can do next and, in this way, places the questioner in a powerful position in the interaction (Stivers and Makoto, 2010). Some question formats place constraints not only on the action that the recipient should produce next but also on the specific form that this action should take (Robinson and Heritage, 2005). For instance, a polar question constrains the response to *yes* or *no,* whereas an alternative question constrains the answer to one of the alternatives provided (Raymond, 2003).

Interrogative-negative questions are polar questions designed to claim a knowledgeable position for the questioner, seeking the confirmation of information that is already "in play" as a part of the shared knowledge among the interlocutors. With a polar-question format, interrogative-negative questions project the terms that might be used by the respondent. Moreover, interrogative-negative questions clearly encourage agreement because they convey assertions related to shared knowledge that is offered as already established. Expressing disagreement with the propositional content conveyed by interrogative-negative questions may be understood as a way to disagree with the epistemic status claimed and the epistemic hierarchy proposed by the questioners (Heritage and Raymond, 2006).

In educational interaction, this action would call into question a cultural presupposition of education, that is, the epistemic rights of the educators. Therefore, disagreements are infrequent in these contexts. In our data, we found no instances of children's dispreferred responses to leaders' interrogative-negative questions.

[S9] Activity: Peace-War-Peace, simulation of a war's escalation and its consequences. Debriefing session: 2 leaders, 40 children.

```
1 Jan (Norway leader):   what do you think of the activity? Did you enjoyed it? Paulo?
2 Nelson (Brazil child): it was funny
3 Jan:                   didn't you feel bad when your countries: (..) were destroyed?
4 Nelson:                o:h °yes°
5 Jan:                   wasn't it sad that your worked a lot and in a minute everything was
6                        destroyed?
```

7 Nelson: °yes° (.) I: I didn't want to say it was funny to destroy

In S9, after a first answer (line 2) that is not accepted because it conveys that Nelson found the activity "funny," Nelson aligns his answer (line 4 and line 7) with Jan's attempt to impose the normative expectations of noticing the terrible consequences of conflict. Jan claims primacy in his knowledge about correct (and therefore acceptable) feelings. The Norwegian leader controls the outcomes of the learning process by controlling the interactional exchange and using two interrogative-negative questions (line 3 and lines 5-6).

2.5 The interactional management of knowledge and rights to be knowledgeable

First position assessments do not respond to a previous question or a previous assessment. Therefore, they convey that their producer has independent knowledge regarding the object of his/her assessment. In debriefing sessions, children's first position assessments question leaders' epistemic status, particularly if leaders cannot avoid agreeing with them. In our data, leaders systematically operate to preserve their epistemic primacy in second position assessments by producing "*confirmation and agreement token*" commentary that disengages their opinions from agreement with children's first position assessments.

Leaders' "confirmation and agreement token" turns contain a confirmation of children's first position assessments, which is crucial for the definition of the social action performed by the turn; only the second turn component contains the agreement with children's assessment.

[S10] Debriefing session (S9 continued)

1 Ana (Brazil leader):   how do you (.) feel (.) when you saw the leaders asking you to
2   destroy?
3 Pablo (Mexico child):   I feel like: let's destroy (.) their city (.) I mean I knew (.)   it was
4   an activity: was it?
5 Ana: it was an activity (.) yes it was: (.) ya, good ((Ana turns her face to a
6   group of children on the opposite side of the room and points her
7   finger at a Spanish child)) Miguel, was it sad   when you saw
8   your city   destroyed?

Ana's "confirmation and agreement token" in lines 5-8 follows Pablo's assertion in lines 3-4. Pablo downgrades the epistemic status of his assertion with a polar tag question, *was it?*, which submits the assertion to Ana's evaluation. In our data, leaders systematically react to children's epistemically downgraded assertions with "confirmation and agreement token" turns. By placing the agreement token *yes it was* after the partial repetition of the children's assertion and a pause(*it was an activity (.)*), Ana disengages her approval of Pablo's previous assessment from the action of agreeing by virtue of her authoritative knowledge status.

Interestingly, Pablo produces a division between different frames (Goffman, 1974): real life and the activity. Whereas Ana accepts this distinction, it is not transformed into a topic for discussion. Because it represents the only instance in our data of a distinction between frames produced by a child, we cannot analyze other leaders' reactions. However, we hypothesize that Ana sees that distinction as a threat to the "learn by doing" process because it seems to devalue the relevance of the village's activities with respect to real-life issues.

2.6 The cues for dialogic interaction

In a few cases, the leaders addressed the children as competent interlocutors by taking their perspectives into account and supporting their self-expression. In these interactions, knowledge was considered a result of communication processes where children played an active role, whereas leaders promoted their participation by explicitly showing interest in their self-expression. These

interactions, where educators accepted that children can tackle important issues, are examples of empowering dialogue.

[S11]   Debriefing session: general discussion about the value of cooperation: 4 leaders, 40 children.

```
1  Tim (USA leader):      ((pointing at Hristo)) you have something to add, I see, maybe I'm
2                         wrong hh  °as usual° you ((don't agree with me)), isn't it?
3  Hristo (Bulgaria child):  NO: YES ((nodding)) I  agree ((looking down))  but I think that we
4                         have to cooperate in life, anyway and:   and:
5  Tim:                   yes
6  Hristo:                you can't cooperate and:
7  Tim:                   you say you can't cooperate because it is hard to cooperate, don't you?
8  Hristo:                NO NO I mean it is not you can or can't it is that you always
9                         cooperate
10 Tim:                   m:
11 Hristo:                if you: you are walking on the streets, someone's fighting, in the front
12                        of the school, someone starts fighting (.) you see they are cooperating
13 Tim:                   m:
14 Hristo:                like here! we can also disagree, but we cooperate anyway because we
15                        communicate
16 Tim:                   ok, friends uhm: cooperating with friends is very important, yeah (..)
17                        ok, good job  (.) it's getting late  now we have lunch but: that's it
18                        we have to work together so:   it's better to cooperate
```

Hristo responds more than minimally to Tim's question in lines 3-4. Through his extended response, Hristo displays a claim of independent knowledge about the value of cooperation. Hristo's extended response is an interactional achievement: the response occurs after a promotional question in which Tim abdicates (*maybe I'm wrong hh °as usual°*), at least temporarily, the role of epistemic authority. Hristo is very cautious in expressing his opinion and produces a comment with cues indicating a dispreferred turn format (Pomerantz, 1984): his answer is preceded by delays, he stresses particular words, and he glances away from the questioner. However, Tim's question succeeds in encouraging Hristo's participation, giving him the opportunity to introduce his own ideas about cooperation.

In dialogical sequences, leaders promote children's participation by employing *continuers*, which are small tokens used to support the current speaker in his/her talking. In S11, Tim employs continuers to express his attentiveness to Hristo's actions (line 5 "Yes", line 10 and line 13 "m:"). By using continuers, Tim supports Hristo's active participation and allows him to take an active part in the joint production of reflection.

In lines 17-18, after a positive evaluation of Hristo's previous comment, Tim produces a *formulation* of Hristo's idea that communication itself is a form of cooperation. A formulation consists of "summarising, glossing, or developing the gist of an informant's earlier statement" (Heritage, 1985: 100). The formulation of the interlocutors' previous turns entails reacting to the interlocutors' comments with the explicit intention of clarifying their meanings and effects.

Formulations are contextualization cues for active listening and reveal a personal effort at understanding; therefore, formulations are cues for a dialogical attitude. Nevertheless, formulations also have an educational function. Tim's formulation finds a point in a sequence of five turns by Hristo and reformulates the gist of Hristo's commentary by "making something explicit that was previously implicit (...) making inference about its presuppositions or implications" (Heritage, 1985: 104). Tim transforms Hristo's autonomous contribution into educational content. Thus, Tim's formulation is consistent with both CISV narratives' emphasis on working together and the pedagogical concept of children's active participation in the learning process.

3. Conclusions

Our analysis shows that in most cases, reflection on activities is the outcome of a monologue that relies on asymmetries between leaders and children, where leaders control the sequential order of the interaction. Questions projecting pre-determined answers through the inclusion of candidate answers and the use of interrogative-negative formats and normative assessments of these answers are the basic components of leaders' control over sequential order. In debriefing sessions, the most recurrent and important linguistic cues concern hierarchical presuppositions and consist of sequences centered on leaders' assessments. In these moments, the leader presents herself/himself as the expert or judge. Assessments are frequently expressed in the third position after a question/answer adjacency pair, thereby forming QAA triplets.

Encouraging dialogue and promoting the equal distribution of opportunities for the children's active participation and self-expression seems to be only exceptions to these role asymmetries. The analysis demonstrates that leaders' dialogic actions are infrequent during debriefing sessions. However, their occurrence is particularly meaningful to the analysis of how participation is encouraged. Thus, we will highlight the linguistic cues that empower dialogue. In the few sequences where leaders address the children as competent interlocutors, taking into account their perspectives and supporting their self-expression, the leaders employ promotional questions that enhance children's participation. Additionally, the leaders employ continuers to sustain the children's always-cautious participation. Finally, formulations of children's previous comments are contextualization cues indicating active listening and revealing the leaders' personal efforts at understanding.

Even though our analysis did not intend to explore inter-linguistic issues, the analysis indicates that the use of English as the Lingua Franca (ELF) may cause some problems in CISV activities. ELF seems to enhance the communicative power of English-speaking children during the debriefing sessions, both in terms of understanding and linguistic production. Great differences in linguistic knowledge play an important role in the interaction and create inequalities among children that influence their opportunities for active participation in the interaction.

The children's different levels of competence at speaking English seem to be the only place where "cultural differences" emerge as an important concern in interactions in CISV villages. Otherwise, cultural differences seem to be almost completely irrelevant. In the analyzed debriefing sessions, we did not find meaningful cues regarding styles that could have been related to national or cultural norms. The particular organization of the CISV creates a normative and cognitive sense of a strong "we" identity that is confirmed through daily rituals and intensive common experience. The emphasis of role performance and normative expectations about performance plays an important role in this capacity. These cultural presuppositions help children find connections with the educational life with which they are familiar, and therefore help them locate familiarity in a very unfamiliar place (Baraldi, 2009). This creates a fascinating and simultaneously differentiated and homogeneous global culture inside CISV villages, which makes them a kind of "total institution" (Goffman 1961) in spite of linguistic difficulties, unusual and tiring life styles, and compelling and challenging close relationships among people with different perspectives.

References

Arendt, Hannah, 1993. The crisis of education. In between past and future: eight exercises in political thought. Penguin Books, New York.

Arminen, Illka, 2005. Institutional Interaction: Studies of Talk at Work. Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot.

Atkinson, Maxwell, Drew, Paul, 1979. Order in court. Humanities, Atlantic Highlands.

Baker, Mona, 2006. Contextualization in translator- and interpreter-mediated events. Journal of Pragmatics 38, 321-337.

Baraldi, Claudio (Ed.), 2009. Dialogue in Intercultural Communities. From an Educational Point of View. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Boyle, Ronald, 2000. What happened to preference organization?. Journal of Pragmatics 32, 583-604.

Clift, Rebecca, Drew, Paul, Hutchby, Ian, 2006. Conversation analysis. In: Ostaman, O., Veerschueren, J. (Eds.), Handbook of Pragmatics. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Dewey, John, 1916. Introduction to essays in experimental logic. In: Boydston, J.A. (Ed.), The Middle Works (1899/1924), Volume 10. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville, pp. 320-369.

Goffman, Erving, 1961. Asylums. Essay on the Social Situation of Mental Patient and Other Inmates. Anchor Books, New York.

Goffman, Erving, 1974. Frame Analysis: an Essay on the Organization of Experience. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Goodwin, Charles, Heritage, John, 1990. Conversation Analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology 19, 283-307.

Gordon, Thomas, 1974. Teacher Effectiveness Training. Wyden Books, New York.

Gumperz, John, 1992. Contextualization and understanding. In: Duranti, A., Goodwin, C. (Eds.), Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, pp. 229-253.

Heritage, John, 1985. Analysing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience". In: Van Dijk, T. (Ed.), Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3. Discourse and Dialogue. Academic Press, London, pp. 95-117.

Heritage, John, 1995. Conversation Analysis: methodological aspects. In: Quasfthoff, U.M. (Ed.), Aspects of Oral Communication. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, pp. 391-416.

Heritage, John, 2002. The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. Journal of Pragmatics 34, 1427-1446.

Heritage, John, 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In: Fitch, K., Sanders, R. (Eds.), Handbook of Language and Social Interaction. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, pp. 103-46.

Heritage, John, 2006. Conversational organization. In: Drew, P., Heritage, J. (Eds.), Conversation Analysis.Sage, London, 1-11.

Heritage, John, 2008. Conversation Analysis as Social Theory. In: Turner, B. (Ed.), The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 300-320.

Heritage, John, Clayman, Steven, 2010. Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions. Blackwell, Boston.

Heritage, John, Raymond, Geoffrey, 2005. The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. Social Psychology Quartley, 68 (1), 15-38.

Heritage, John, Raymond, Geoffrey, 2006. The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. Language in Society 35, 677-705.

Heritage, John, Raymond, Geoffrey, 2010. Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiscence, Agency and Resistance in Responses to Polar Questions. In: de Ruiter, J.P. (ed.), Questions, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Holdsworth, Roger. 2005. Taking young people seriously means giving them serious things to do. Children Taken Seriously. In: Mason, J., Fattore, T. (Eds.), Theory, Policy and Practice. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London, pp. 139-150.

Hutchby, Ian, Wooffitt, Robin,2008. Conversation Analysis. Polity, Cambridge.

James, William, 1983. Talks to Teachers in Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals. Harward University Press, Cambridge.

Kolb, David, 1984. Experiential Learning. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Koshik, Irene, 2002. A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. Journal of Pragmatics 24: 1851-1877.

Luhmann, Niklas, Schorr, Karl E., 1979. Reflexionsprobleme im Erziehungssysteme. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt a.M.

Margutti, Piera, 2006. "Are you human beings?" Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. Linguistic and Education 17, 313-346.

Matthews, Hugh, 2003. Children and regeneration: setting an agenda for community participation and integration. Children & Society 17, 264-276.

Mazeland, Harrie, 2006. Conversation analysis. In: Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 153-162.

Mehan, Hugh, 1979. Learning lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Peräkilä, Anssi, 2006. Communicating and responding to diagnosis. In: Heritage, J., Maynard, D. (Eds.), Communication in Medical Care. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 214-247.

Pomerantz, Anita M., 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Heritage, J., Atkinson, J.M. (Eds.), Structures of Social Action. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.57-101.

Pomerantz, Anita M., 1988. Offering a candidate answer: an information seeking strategy. Communication Monographs, 55, 360-73.

Raymond, Geoff, 2003. Grammar and social organization: yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. American Sociological Review, 68, 939-967.

Robinson, Jeffrey, Heritage, John, 2005. The structure of patients' presenting concerns; the completion relevance of current symptoms. Social Science & Medicine 61: 481-493.

Rogers, Carl, 1951. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel and Gail, Jefferson, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. Language 50 (4), 696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 2006. Sequence Organization in Interaction: a Primer in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stivers, Tanya, Makoto, Hayashi, 2010. Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. Language in Society 39, 1–25.

Ten Have, Paul, 2007. Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide. Sage, London.

Vanderbroeck, Michel, Buverne-de Bie, M., 2006. Children's agency and educational norms. A tensed negotiation. Childhood 13 (1), 127-143.

Vanderstraeten, Raf and Biesta, Gert, 2006, How is education possible? Pragmatism, communication and the social organisation of education. British Journal of Education Studies, 54(2), 160–174.

Verschueren, Jef, 2008. Intercultural communication and the challenges of migration. Language and Intercultural Communication 8 (1), 21-35.

Figure 1:   The transcription system used to mark the intonation of the interactions

[ ]	Brackets mark the start and end of overlapping speech. They are aligned to mark the precise position of overlap
↑	Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement, over and above normal rhythms of speech.
<u>Text</u>	Underlining indicates emphasis; the extent of underlining within individual words locates emphasis
°text°	Degree signs enclose hearably quieter speech
(0.4)	Numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this case, 4 tenths of a second)
(.)	A micropause, hearable but too short to measure
Te:xt	Colons show degrees of elongation of the prior sound; the more colons, the more elongation
h:	Aspiration (out-breaths); proportionally as for colons
.h:	Inspiration (in-breaths); proportionally as for colons
Tex-	Hyphens mark a cut-off of the preceding sound
>text<	'Greater than' and 'lesser than' signs enclose speeded-up talk
Text= =text	Equals' signs mark the immediate 'latching' of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval
((comment))	Additional comments from the transcriber, e.g. about features of context or delivery.