7. Activities 2: coordinating reflection

Federico Farini

1. Reflection

Among the educational activities in the villages, the debriefing sessions deserve particular attention. The debriefing sessions are communication systems in which the leaders promote the children's reflection on their experience of the activities. These sessions follow cooperation and trust games, which are scheduled in the second half of the village, when the interpersonal relationships are expected to evolve towards cooperation and reciprocal trust. After the conclusion of cooperation or trust games, the debriefing sessions stimulate the children's collective reflections on their experience of these activities. The debriefing sessions are accomplished by means of interviews, set up according to CISV guidelines.

Reflection is a communication process through which a social system interrogates itself about the meaning and the consequences of its internal processes, exploring the causal relationships between structures and processes, attributing motives and scope to social action (Luhmann 1984). By means of reflection, the internal structure and processes which constitute the "reality" of the social system are distinguished as a unit, becoming in this way an object of knowledge. Reflection during the debriefing sessions is the most important component of the intentional educational process which relies on the hierarchy of role performances and cognitive expectations. The debriefing sessions display the organization of a specialized turn taking in which the hierarchies between the adults (leading the interaction) and the children (learning from the interaction) may be observed. This chapter aims to observe how reflection is managed in the debriefing sessions.

Reflection is expected to provide the children with the opportunity to recognize both common and different aspects in their perceptions. The debriefing sessions are supposed to bring about appreciation of the ways in which sociality is constructed, and acknowledgement of a deeper common ground in terms of fundamental values, on the basis of which a peaceful intercultural citizenship may be created. In the debriefing sessions, the cultural presuppositions of CISV education are visible through specific contextualization cues which enable the participants to make inferences about their interlocutors' intentions and goals. Through these linguistic cues, the cultural presuppositions of the interaction become visible.

Promotion of reflection requires that adults observe children's active participation as a resource for their upbringing. If adults observe children's active participation as a risk, they will rely on social hierarchies in order to make children's participation compatible with their educational goals and expectations. These cultural presuppositions are not compatible with children's active participation, as they enhance monologues. However, monologues are not the only form to support reflection. Promotion of reflection may also rely on empowering dialogue. Empowering dialogue requires that educators leave pre-planned activities, accepting that children tackle important issues, even if these issues are not present in their agenda, and promoting expressions of concern and support in response to interlocutors' actions. In particular, the systematic appreciation of children's actions

allows their personal emotional involvement in the interaction. Empowering dialogue implies the dissolution of the role hierarchy between expert adults and incompetent children. Adults are required to take into account that children's creativity plays a role in shaping the trajectory of the interaction, even if children's actions are not aligned with their expectations and goals.

Crucial questions for analysing the debriefing sessions are: How is reflection sustained in the interaction? Is reflection the outcome of either the children's active participation or hierarchical relationships between social roles? Do the leaders' actions promote the children's autonomy and responsibility?

2. Hierarchical structures

As for all types of interactions, turn-taking is the basic mechanism in the organization of the debriefing sessions: after each completed turn a speaker arrives at the point of a possible speaker change (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974). The hierarchical relationship between the leaders and the children in the debriefing sessions is visible in the organization of turn taking: there is little opportunity for the children to take the initiative, while the leaders maintain control over the trajectory and the "agenda" of the interaction. The leaders distribute the opportunities to talk among the children by means of two standardized practices: 1) calling the name of a child either before or after performing a question; 2) enacting a "first hand raised-talks" rule.

Both these practices are shaped by a specific cultural presupposition: as the leaders have the task to impose constraints on the children's contributions in the interaction, they control the sequence of turns. The leaders' control is an inherent feature of the debriefing sessions.

In S1, turn 3, LFeng selects a child, M1Por, as the next speaker, asking him to provide an explanation for the actions in the group during the activity. After M1por's response in turn 4, the co-coordinator of the debriefing session (LMusa) selects another speaker (Liam) to answer the question by calling his name (tun 5).

[S1]

1. LMusa: what kind of colours did you send? and why did you send that?
2. Children: blue
3. LFeng: you guys were sending blue every single time, why? (.) Luis?
4. M1por: (to score) more points
5. LMusa: Liam, why?

In S2, LMdan explicitly enact a "first hand raised-talk" rule in turn 1, applying it systematically during the interaction to select the next speaker after each child's response, in turns 3, 5 and 7. Once a child has completed his/her turn, the leader takes the turn again, at least to select the next speaker; only LMdan holds the right to select the next speaker; this confirms the leaders' control of the distribution of opportunities to talk, that is on the opportunity to act.

[S2]

1. LMdan: we're ready (.) anyone has: (..) anything to answer about, raise your
              ha:nd anything has to say about it? (..) take turn! (04) *((selects F1Tha as the next speaker))*
2. F1tha: I feel (...) this: I think it's not fair, because: (.) If you want to teach us,
              you   should (...) do everybody poor and rich
3. *LMdan:*   *((selects F1bra as the next speaker by indicating her))*
4. F1bra: I think), I think erm it was (so much) fair, and: another thing I didn't
              like it, the: then erm we were poor in the evening, I just discovered

> that erm: when you're poor, you're (.) not, erm: how do you say, not
> selfish, you share with the other persons, and: erm: you share a lot
> more than the rich, then the riches

5. LMdan: someone (else) raised the hand? (..) raising your hand so
6. F1usa: °yeah°
7. LMdan: Robbie? *((selects F1usa as the next speaker))*

Deviances from these procedures are overtly sanctioned. The children's selections of next speakers are uncommon and systematically treated as deviant cases. In S3, M1bra selects another child as the next speaker at the first point where the transition of the turn of talk is relevant (turn 3), that is after providing a sufficient amount of data to satisfy LFusa's request for information (turn 2). By doing this, M1bra substitutes the leader's right to distribute the children's opportunities to act. This kind of action is deviant, as it appears clearly by the fact that LFusa takes the turn of talk without hesitations (turn 4), after M1bra's response, overlapping with such an unexpected second part of turn 3 (through which M1bra selects the next speaker). The competition for the right to talk is easily "won" by LFusa who sanctions M1bra's action, reiterating her role of gatekeeper of the children's participation .

[S3]

1. M1hgk: I think: (.) our group (.) we didn't collaborate
2. LFusa: so: didn't you↑ (.) Lucas?
3. M1bra: <u>No</u> No we: collaborate: a l(h)ot   [m: Mi(h)ki hhh?]
4. LFusa: [Chen, do you agree with-]   hey: <u>hey</u> next is: Chen
                                                      m: (.) let's keep it ordered, ok?

In the debriefing sessions, the basic adjacency pair involves the leader's questions and the child(ren)'s answer(s). The leaders' questions project the children's answers: this reflects role performances and cognitive expectations which are the cultural presuppositions of the sequential order of interaction. Consequently, in the debriefing sessions, participation is mostly restricted within a question-answer framework.

The structure of conditional relevance is visible when an unexpected second part of the adjacency pair has particular consequences in the interaction, e.g. a question which follows a previous question (Arminen 2007). In these particular phases of the debriefing sessions, unexpected second parts of adjacency pairs (the children's answers) violate the principle of conditional relevance and project negative evaluations.

In S4, LMusa expresses a harsh negative assessment of M1usa's action in turn 7, excluding the child from the interaction, and selecting another speaker although the child is answering his question (see turn 1).

[S4]

6. LMusa: m:? someone didn't respect the rule? Aaron, why did you say someone didn't:
              respect the rule?
7. M1usa: *((addressing to M1spa))* hh (°no: no; before°) (.) *((addressing to LMusa))*
              shall we have JC shop be before lunchtime, tomorrow?
8. LMusa: hey hey that's: (odd) I asked you something, m:
9. M1usa: °bu:[t°
10. LMusa: [no:o listen usually people asked are supposed to answer, isn't it's such a
                   bad thing do not answer to a question
11. Musa1:   °o:h sorry° (.) well (.) [I -]   °o:h°
12. LMusa: [Nat] *((addressing to M2usa))* (..) did someone cheat?

LMusa's reaction to deviance from the normative expectations concerning the adjacency pair question-answer reveals the features of social structures. The adjacently positioned second turn is the *locus* where a speaker shows that she/he understands and reacts to the previous turn. The acceptance, or refusal, of aligning to the expectations which are projected by the first part, highlights the cultural presuppositions of the interaction.

In order to avoid negative assessments, the children systematically align with the first part of the question-answer pair, meeting the leaders' expectations which they are able to infer relying on the progression of the ongoing interaction. In these cases, the organization of adjacent pairs is biased towards preferred responses. Preferred responses, that is acceptances, tend to be immediately produced (see turns 2 and 4 in S5).

[S5]

1.	SM1ita:	yes (.) and what do you get about information? for example, from your life (..) does it happen often that you: have just: too information, then after sometimes you get more information and you change your mind?
2.	M1Jor:	yes
3.	SM1ita:	any: any:: episode? like, even in the camp, from the beginning to now (.) that is similar to this activity (.) eh?
4.	F1fra:	>yes, oh yes<

Dispreferred responses and refusals tend to provoke delays, i.e. with the insertion of additional speech particles and explanations/reasons for refusal (see turns 2 and 4 in S6)

[S6]

1.	LMpol:	you mean that: after all: cooperation is not important?
2.	M1bra:	°it's (1.2) [that he: -°
3.	LMusa:	[you said you like competition to be: like: first (.) the only number one, m:?
4.	M1bra:	m::: (1) no: (..) m:: well: it's: it's: (.) ok: I like competition but it's not I don't like cooperation

As we can see, the debriefing sessions are characterized by role hierarchies between the leaders and the children. These hierarchies are expressed in terms of opportunities to participate in the interaction. These hierarchies are signalled through the recursive chain of three-part "Question-Answer-Assessment" (QAA) sequences. The structural components of this kind of sequences are:

1. The leader's question, addressed to a specific child or to the group of children (turn 1*);
2. The children's answer to this question, which is normatively expected as the second part of a "question-answer" adjacency pair (turn 2**);
3. The leader's assessment (appreciation) of the answer (turn 3***)

The structure of QAA is similar to the structure of "Initiation-Response-Evaluation" (IRE) sequences described by Mehan (1979), which is recurrent in classroom interactions where the third turns assesses children's learning. Educational monologues are generally expressed by this kind of triplet. However, QAA and IRE are different, with regard both to their functions and to their sequential properties. While in IRE sequences teachers generally ask questions to which they already know the answers to test (or extend) students' competence, in the debriefing sessions children are asked to express their personal meanings, that is to provide information that the questioner (the leader) is not expected to know. While in IRE sequences, positive assessment suggests that, given the correct answer, there is nothing more to say about the current topic, making

relevant a change in the topic of the interaction, in the QAA sequences positive assessment or appreciation do not exclude that a different answer to the same question will be positively assessed or appreciated. Debriefing sessions are "competence-in-progress" processes, where the adult may be surprised by any contribution. In QAA, positive assessment produced by adults in turn 3 do not mean that the current topic has come to an end; adults may choose either to change topic or to elicit new contributions to the current topic. Explicit questions may become relevant after positive assessments, in turn 3 of the QAA sequences.

In S7, after positive assessment of F1bra's answer, which represents the first part of her turn of talk (turn 3), LFusa selects another responder to her question, in this way eliciting the prosecution of the discussion about the topic firstly introduced by LFhgk's question in turn 1.

[S7]

1. LFhgk: do you think that work together as a group helped group two to win?
2. F1bra: yes
3. LFusa: °yes° (.) *((addressing to M1hgk))* and you, Chen?

In QAA sequences the adults are distributors of rights and duties to speak among children; their selection of next speakers surrogates the repetition of the question which opened the sequence. In S8, having been selected by LFhgk's as next speaker (turn 7), M1swe provides an answer (turn 8) that is different from the one provided by F1bra in turn 6, which received no assessment. Similarly to in IRE sequences, when adults do not react to responses, children's prosecution of the search for answers is elicited.

LFhgk's selection of the next speaker in turn 7 coincides with the opening of a second sequence, connected to the previous one.

[S8]

5. LFhgk: so: ple:ase raise your hands if you have something to say about it, ok? we
               saw that group two won, m:: so: why do you think group two won?
6. F1bra: because there was (.) was: Paulo he was good in °pone-° put the water in the
               cup
7. LFhgk: Bjorn?
8. M1swe: m: they take only a little water so they wasted less water than us

3. QAA sequences and socio-epistemic claims

Significant for the analysis of reflection in the debriefing sessions are he ways in which (a) cooperation is achieved and (b) different participants' perspectives about the meanings of the activities become aligned through the leaders' actions.

As we have seen, the structure of education implies the hierarchy between competent adults and incompetent children, who need to learn, in order to become able to participate in the most significant social processes. It follows that a major concern for education is the management of rights and responsibilities related to competence. Most of the debriefing sessions are characterized by role hierarchies between the leaders and the children. These hierarchies produce differences in opportunities to participate in the interaction. These hierarchies are signalled by QAA sequences, which are by far the most common in our data.

In QAA sequences the children have scarce opportunities to take the initiative, while the leaders hold control over introduction and change of topics, and hence over the "agenda" of the interaction. The leaders' ability to control the trajectories of actions in QAA relies on differences between

social roles: the children's participation is based on the social structures of education and this presupposition is evident in the sequential order of the interaction.

S9 and S10 are two examples of leaders' control over the interaction, which is a feature of QAA sequences. In both sequences, the leader's selection of different speakers (turns 9, 11 and 13 in S9; turn 3 in S10) makes possible the provision of different answers (turns 10, 12, 14 in S9; turn 4 in S10). Once the answer which meets the expectations of the leader is offered by a child (in S9 M1usa), the leader's positive assessment works as a termination act. The leaders' selections of next speakers, most times simply calling their names, make possible different responses to the original question, which are treated as repetitions of QAA sequences. In S9, lack of LFusa's assessment of M1swe's response elicits the children's prosecution of their search for answers. After LFhgk's selection of M1swe as next speaker by calling his name in turn 11, M1swe provides an answer that is different from the previous one, provided by F1bra in turn 10, which did not receive assessments, and the same structure is repeated in the next turns. Both positive assessments in S9 (turn 17) and in S10 (turn 5) close QAA sequences, selecting M1usa's answer in turn 16 (S9) and F1bra's answer in turn 4 (S10) as the correct ones. In S9, positive assessment is coupled with a formulation which reinforces its normative meaning (turn 17: *so: cooperating is very important*).

[S9 continuation of S8]

9.	LFhgk:	so: ple:ase raise your hands if you have something to say about it, ok? we saw that group two won, m:: so: why do you think group two won?
10.	F1bra:	because there was (.) was: Paulo he was good in °pone-° put the water in the cup
11.	LFhgk:	Bjorn?
12.	M1swe:	m: they take only a little water so they wasted less water than us
13.	LFusa:	Inga?
14.	F1pol:	e: they are good
15.	LFhgk:	Brad?
16.	M1usa:	they help each other so: they were so: effective
17.	LFhgk:	good (.) so: cooperating is very important

In S10, positive assessment that closes the multiple QAA sequence (turn 5) is reinforced through a repetition of the leader's appreciations such as *excellent*, *you guys got it*, *that's a good job* etc. which asserts the meanings that the children were expected to take from reflection on the activity. In this way, this QAA sequence is cognitively, rather than normatively, supported.

[S10]

1.	JFusa:	Ok, my last question is how does this activity resemble different cultures around the world?
2.	LMcan:	CISV is the, it's an example of the game, so if you are, we have no: (.) common language, so English, it's will be a big big problem to make some (??) how to live and: the complication of working
3.	JFusa:	Ana?
4.	F1bra:	e: each game is a co-, it 's a erm country, could be a country, erm the rules erm is the rules of the country, erm because you don't - when you go to a country, maybe you don't know the rules, there, so you need to learn, erm erm (..) erm stay with erm according to the rules (.) there
5.	JFusa:	that's excellent, you guys got it. Any other (.) answers? No? That's it? (.) Ok, that's a good job guys, you're awesome
6.		*((applause))*

After the closing of a QAA sequence, the leader is expected to take the turn to start a new course of actions. The leaders usually employ markers in order to indicate that the current topic is closing, and a new one is starting. In S11, turn 5, SF1ita, after the positive assessment of M1ger's answer, marks the beginning of a new topic by means of the adverb "So". "So" is often used as marker for changing topic, because it preserves the impression of coherence among the different topics that compose the debriefing sessions.

[S11]

1. SF1ita: ok, Aaron?
2. M1usa: it was : interesting that the: the people that was most (.) committed in building
              the city were also the ones that were: were most destructive
3. SF1ita: right, Philip?
4. M1ger: we were angry (.) because some children loved destroy other countries
5. SF1ita: good (.) So: (.) the next question we already touched on, but not really
              (.) if you did destroy, why you did it?

During the debriefing sessions, the placement of sequential markers conveys that something new is going to happen in the interaction, urging children to rise their level of attention, in order to maintain their competent participation in the interaction, e.g. responding appropriately to the leader's questions related to a new topic of discussion introduced by the sequential marker.

In the debriefing sessions, leaders' right to distinguish what is right from what is wrong, what is relevant for the discussion from what is irrelevant, largely depends on the hierarchical distribution of competence and rights to be competent of the educational communication. It follows that a major concern for education should be the management of rights and responsibilities related to competence. In the debriefing sessions, the leaders assert their primacy in competence by using assessments to claim their rights and their social identity. These socio-epistemic claims are claims to hold a superior competence in ruling, giving meanings and setting goals to the activities by virtue of the rights embedded in the status of educator.

The leaders preserve their primacy in competence as they preserve their capability to make children's contributions an object of assessment (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). In the following sections, our analysis will focus on the ways in which these claims are produced during the debriefing sessions.

Use of candidate answers inside questions

Firstly, the leaders' socio-epistemic claims are achieved in the debriefing sessions through the production of candidate answers inside their questions. According to Pomerantz (1988), offering a candidate answer allows the speaker to guide the interlocutors towards giving particular information. By means of candidate answer inside questions, the speaker leads the interlocutors to respond in a certain way, suggesting not only what should be important in the following answer, but also what the following answer might be (Arminen, 2005). Therefore, the proposal of a candidate answer inside a question implies an anticipated evaluation of the next answer.

In S12, LMbra's provision of candidate answers inside his questions (turns 1 and 3) lead the children to align with the meanings that he expects they must take from reflection. Children align with LMBra's expectations (turns 2 and 4): their participation is oriented by his expectations and is limited to expression of agreement.

[S12]

1. LMbra: have you ever think that maybe the: best way to help yourself is to help the
            others?

2. Children: *((nodding))*
3. LMbra: if I don't think "it's a problem, how can I work it out" but "how can we work it together? Maybe if I help her ((*Fljor*)) then she will find ways to help me I wouldn't think about (.) M:h?
4. M1ned: °yes°

By virtue of its interrogative syntax, a question including a candidate answer projects an assessment in the next turn. In this way, this kind of questions projects the meanings which the children should use in their assessments, reducing the risk of actions which would be obstacles for the interaction (Raymond 2003). These forms of questions are the first part of a monologue, as they project the "correct" answers.

Use of interrogative negative questions

Secondly, an important interactional resource for leaders to preserve their socio-epistemic claims is the use of interrogative negative questions, exemplified by turns that begin with interrogative frames like *Isn't it..?*, *Doesn't this..?* and *Don't you..?* (Heritage 2002).
By formulating the question in a negative form, the leaders assert a more extensive competence in the topic and/or a right to assess it (Heritage & Raymond 2006). By projecting a "yes/no" answer, this action asserts the control of the terms that may be used by the interlocutor in her/his assessments (Raymond 2003). Finally, the interrogative negative questions strongly invite agreement (Heritage 2002), as contradicting such assertive questions would mean questioning the social status of their performers.
The strength of interrogative negative questions in controlling the trajectory of actions comes from their mixed format: interrogative negative questions combine the import of a declarative assessment with the sequential implicativeness of an interrogative form, using both to project the next speaker's initiative.
In S13, in turns 7 and 9, M1bra aligns with LMnor's claims of competence of the way in which M1bra should feel during the activity expressed through interrogative-negative questions (turns 6 and 8). Negative-interrogative questions project the alignment to speaker's stance, opinions or assessments as preferred action in the next turn, hiding their coerciveness behind the interrogative format.

[S13]

4. LMnor: what do you think of the activity? Did you enjoyed it? Paulo?
5. M1bra: it was funny
6. LMnor: didn't you feel bad when your countries: (..) were destroyed?
7. M1bra o:h °yes°
8. LMnor: wasn't it sad that you worked a lot and in a minute everything was destroyed?
9. M1bra: °yes° (.) I: I didn't want to say it was funny to destroy

4. Children's reactions

Children's downgrading of their own competence

The leaders' authority may be confirmed in the interaction also by that the children's downgrading of their competence. This downgrading of competence confirms the role hierarchy between the expert and the incompetent participants.

In turn 2 of S14, F1pol downgrades her claim of competence attributing it to LMpol, and in this way she marks her leaders' epistemic primacy, which involves the right to assess what the correct behaviour is.

[S14]

1. LFusa: You just say that group one won because they found like a: method to bring
                water   from one side to the other
2. F1pol: we collaborate (.) e: Karel *((LMpol))* said you have to help the others in your   life
3. LFusa: yeah that's: that's a good point you got it

A second way for children to downgrade their claims of competence is the use of tag questions. Downgrading tag questions are used in educational interaction mainly as requests for clarifications. In S15, turn 2, M1mex downgrades his competence by means of a tag question in the second part of his turn, in this way submitting the validity of his assertion to LFbra's confirmation. A significant interactive achievement in S15 is that M1mex's tag question makes his participation object for assessment, which follows the standards of the expert leader.

[S15]

1. LFBra: how do you (.) feel (.) when you saw the leaders asking you to destroy?
2. M1mex: I feel like: if they don't care (.) let's destroy (.) their city (.) I mean I
                    knew (.) it was an activity: (..) was it?

Cooperating in the management of rights and responsibilities

The positioning of assessments in the interaction may be associated to the socio-epistemic claim that they imply. The relationship between positions of assessments and socio-epistemic claims is evident when a first position assessment implies the claim of a primary right to express competence. However, in some cases, incompatibilities may arise between the rights that a speaker wishes to claim and the position of his/her assessment. In these cases, the participants work to manage the relationship between the rights to assess and the position of assessments. The leaders can claim their access to competence also in a second position assessment, through a "confirmation and agreement token" turn format. Confirmation and agreement token turns disengage the second speaker's opinion from agreement with or conformity with the first speaker's opinion.
In most cases, the leaders' responses react to the children's tag questions asserting a claim of limited or precarious competence concerning the meaning of the activities. The children's downgrading tag questions are "yes/no" questions, that project "yes/no" answers as the first component of responses (Raymond, 2003). An agreement token (*yes*) placed after the partial repeat of the children's assertion separates the action of agreeing from the action of confirming.
In this way, the leaders' confirmation and agreement tokens confirm the children's contributions, rather than simply agreeing with them. Confirming the assessment before responding to the question, the leaders give priority to their claim of competence with respect to the agreement with the children. Confirmation and agreement token turns are indications that the leaders' opinions are relatively independent from the ongoing interaction.
In S16, which is S18 including turn 3, LFbra's "confirmation and agreement token" (turn 3) is projected by M1mex's "assertion and interrogative tag" (turn 2). In most of the debriefing sessions, this practice is achieved smoothly, as the speakers align to a definition of their rights to assess. In these circumstances, the role hierarchies are preserved in the interaction in a relatively mild way.

[S16]

1. LFbra: how do you (.) feel (.) when you saw the leaders asking you to destroy?
2. M1mex: I feel like: let's destroy (.) their city (.) I mean I knew (.) it was an
               activity: was it?
3. LFbra: it was an activity (..) yes it was: (.) ya, good

In S17, LFswe's "confirmation and agreement token" format in turn 6, separates the confirmation of F1hkg's assessment from the agreement, which is postponed until the end of the first part of her turn, before a long pause that marks the separation between the two parts. This first part of her turn shows that LFswe is aware of the impossibility that someone would let a friend in the middle fall down without catching her/him, independently of F1hkg's contribution. In the second part of the turn, after the pause, LFswe may also show her competence in analysing and discovering the psychological attitudes of F1hkg. The interrogative negative question projects a second assessment, in the format of a "yes/no" answer. The interrogative negative question gives to LFswe the opportunity to project both F1Hkg's "yes/no" answer that legitimises the leader's role as primary meaning giver, and F1Hkg's alignment to the meanings of her personal experience proposed by the leader.

[S17]

1. F1hkg: when I was in the middle I was afraid becaus- (.) I was the first but (.) eh:
2. LFswe: m:
3. F1hkg: but if I was the second or the third I wouldn't be afraid
4. LFswe: ah-ah
5. F1hkg: no >because I would see that no: no one leaves you fall< it's like: impossible
6. LFswe: it's impossible that no one leaves someone else fall, yes (1.2) but (.) how can
               you be sure about it? Isn't it because you trust the ones around you?
7. F1hkg: eh: (.) ok (.) m: °yes°

Resisting to socio-epistemic claims: non-type conforming answers

In some cases, the children refuse to align with the expectations of "yes/no" questions, that is avoid providing "yes/no" answers. These episodes are signs of disagreement with the cultural presuppositions of the "yes/no" question. The children produce non–type conforming answers highlighting that the leader's question is problematic (Raymond 2003).
In S18, M1ned's actions produce meanings that are not consistent with the educational goals of the debriefing session. In turn 4, LMbra's chain of questions (turns 6 and 8) projects a step-by-step alignment of M1ned's with the meanings the child is expected to gain from his participation in the debriefing session, namely the appreciation of the value of cooperation. M1ned weakly aligns with LMbra in turn 9 but, when LMbra produces another interrogative negative question in turn 10, in order to assert the value of cooperation, M1ned refuses to affiliate with LMbra's meanings, avoiding aligning with the conditional relevance projected by the question, that is, avoiding providing a "yes/no" answer, and offering a non-type-conforming answer (turn 11).

[S18]

4. LMbra: you think that helping each other can be good but also dangerous?
5. M1ned: yes:
6. LMbra: do you think only for yourself when you are in trouble?
7. M1ned: yes
8. LMbra: wouldn't be better help each other to join: your forces (..) two is stronger than
               one, isn't it?
9. M1ned: °yeah°

10. LMbra: so: isn't it the better way to help yourself (.) I mean (.) to help the others, m:?
11. M1Ned: I was afraid, in some points, to fall off the chair

The answer in turn 8 resumes the previous turns 2 and 4, in a way contradicting M1ned's alignment in turn 6. M1ned partially withdraws from his previous alignment through a non-type conforming answer and in this way the leader's socio-epistemic claim is indirectly disclaimed.

5. Question-Answer-Appreciation sequences

The achievement of cooperation among different participants' perspectives about the meanings of the activities does not necessarily require the reproduction of the role hierarchy. In some sequences it is possible to appreciate that the leader addresses the children as competent interlocutors, taking into account their perspectives and supporting their self-expression. In these interactions, competence is considered a result of communication where the leaders and the children hold equal opportunities to participate, where the children may play an active role as meaning-producers and the leaders promote their participation showing interest in their self-expressions. These sequences are examples of empowering dialogue which may be defined Question-Answer-Appreciation (QAAp) sequences.
QAAp sequences display the same formal features of QAA sequences. The specificity of QAAp sequences consists in the systematic appreciation of children's contributions in turn 3. In QAAp, leaders always appreciate children's contributions, that is leaders' appreciations do not depend on the placement of children's contributions on the positive side of the educational distinction between correct and incorrect answers; leaders unconditionally appreciate children's contribution as expression of their autonomy and willingness to take responsibilities in acting.
In S19, LFarg and LMusa systematically appreciate the children's contributions (turns 3, 5, 7, 9) by means of explicit appreciation markers (*ah-ah*, *good*, *ok, very good*) although these contributions express different and sometime contradictory meanings (cf. turns 2 and 4). Rather than the content of the children's second turn in the QAAp sequences, the leaders appreciate the children's participation in itself.

[S19]

1. LFarg: ok, so death was who had the hardest job (.) who do you think had the easiest
                 job?
2. F1nor: the death, but no one can help it
3. LMusa: ah-ah, good, *((addressing to Mjor))* and you, Alì?
4. M2jor: the plague because there was only one death, but many hunters, foxes
                 and: rabbit to catch
5. LFarg: o:k good and   you think that in your life the same situations of the
                 game happen or it just a: fiction?
6. F1jor: in the family, the youngest brothers and sisters are the rabbits, they had to
                 do anything and they don't they don't: had anyone to boss around
7. LFarg: go:od in the family, nice one
8. M1Bra: at schools, students are like rabbits, teachers are like foxes, they can catch them
                 to take from them all they know
9. LMusa: o:k (.) I see there's some catch, in some points (among) you (..) ve:ry good

The differences between QAAp and QAA sequences emerges comparing S18 and S9. As we have seen, in S9 both LFhgk and LFusa fail in offering systematic appreciation of the children's contributions. Absence of feedback for the children's contributions makes relevant the provision of different answers, until the preferred one is provided by M1usa. In this way, educational communication reaches its goal, that is, to inform children about the "correct behavior" which they

should learn through their participation in the debriefing sessions. However, is leaders' inattentiveness to appreciate children's action an efficient means to empower children's active participation in the interactions?

In QAAp sequences, the leaders may use *continuers* (see chapter 4) to promote reflection. The use of continuers is much more common in QAAp than in QAA sequences, thus it represents a sequential feature of the former. In S20, LMusa's continuers express his attention for M2bul's actions (turn 3 "Yes", turns 7 and 9 "m:"). Through continuers, LMusa supports M2bul's active participation, allowing him to take an active part in the joint production of reflection. Uttered at a relevant transition point, where a change of speaker is a significant option, continuers are minimal turn construction units which are used to convey that their producer is willing to pass his/her turn of talk, in order to permit the further topic development by her/his interlocutor. In QAAp sequences, continuers realize a *perspective display* (Maynard, 1991), that is they elicit the interlocutor's expression of her/his own perspective, showing attention for it.

[S20]

1. LMusa: you have something to add, I see, maybe I'm wrong hh °as usual° you don't agree ((with me)), isn't it?
2. M2bul: No: Yes I agree but I think that we have to cooperate in life, anyway and: and:
3. LMusa: yes
4. M2bul: you can't cooperate and:
5. LMusa: you say you can't cooperate because it is hard to cooperate, don't you?
6. M2bul: No No I mean it is not you can or can't it is that you always cooperate
7. LMusa: m:
8. M2bul: if you: you are walking on the streets, someone's fighting, in the front of the school, someone starts fighting (.) you see they are cooperating
9. LMusa: m:
10. M2bul: like here! we can also disagree, but we cooperate anyway because we communicate

In QAAp sequences, differently than in IRE and QAA sequences, turn 3 may be used as a resource to promote children's active participation far beyond their institutional roles of passive observers of leaders' action. The interactional function of the educators' turns, after the children's answers, rather than on their sequential position (they are always placed in turn 3) seems to rely on their cultural forms, features of either educational monologues or promotion of social participation.

6. Conclusions

In this chapter we have explored how the cultural presuppositions of CISV education are visible in interactions which produce reflection in the debriefing sessions which follow some activities. These interactions present an ordered sequential organization which is structured through specific expectations about children's participation. This sequential order is mainly based on the adults' questioning and assessments, which lead to both a Question-Answer-Assessment structure and a series of structures which construct the adults socio-epistemic claim of their educational roles.

The analysis of the debriefing sessions shows that, in most cases, the reflection on the meanings of the activities is the outcome of a monologue which relies on competence-related hierarchies between the leaders and the children, where the leaders try to control the interaction. Empowering dialogue, promoting equal distribution of opportunities for the children's active participation and self-expression, seems to be infrequent with respect to the occurrence of role hierarchies and adults' socio-epistemic claims.

Promotion of the children's active participation requires that the leaders take into account that children's creativity and issues may shape the trajectory of the interaction, even if they are not aligned with their expectations and goals. Empowering dialogue represents a risk as it implies the abolition of role hierarchies between competent adults and incompetent children. In the debriefing sessions, this risk is particularly evident, as these interactions have the function of producing the most important cultural presuppositions in the villages. Consequently, the leaders systematically avoid the risk of empowering dialogue, appreciating the children's active participation only when it is consistent with their goals and expectations. This tendency matches a widely shared idea among the leaders (chapter 3): in order to make the activities significant, it is necessary to emphasise normative and cognitive expectations proper to CISV educational narrative, as the children are observed as incompetent persons, needing a support to participate in the activities.

Apparently, the forms of communication which derive from the leaders' questions and assessments reduce the possibility of surprises and dangers for the activities. However, this reduction is what makes the interaction ineffective in promoting the children's active participation. In the frame of their monologues, the leaders act as gatekeepers of the children's participation, which is subject to its adherence to their goals. In this way, it is very difficult to achieve the "creative learning" which should be based on the experience of intercultural communication, and which is at the core of CISV educational epistemology.

Therefore, the prevalent outcome of the debriefing sessions contrasts with the effectiveness in promoting creative forms of reflection, which is evident only in few interactions, where the children's active participation brings about new meanings.