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1. Interpreting in CISV villages

This report deals with interpreting during educational activities in CISV villages. In particular, it deals with interpreting in the interactions between Italian adults and Italian delegates who are not very competent speakers of English. The analysis highlights the practices of interpreting, which should promote children’s understanding and participation in the activities. These practices primarily involve leaders, and occasionally staff members and JCs. The analysis aims to discover the effects of interpreting in CISV villages.

The report presents data on 10 villages, 8 in Italy in 2006-2007 and two in Brazil and USA in 2013. The interactions were videotaped (with the exception of the US village, in which interactions were audiotaped) and subsequently transcribed following the conventions of Conversation Analysis). Videotaping and audiotaping make it possible to collect a large amount of naturally occurring interactions and to view/listen to them as many times as necessary to analyze and compare them. In CISV villages, videotaping is part and parcel of daily activities and does not therefore seem to disturb them. Videotaping (and audiotaping) was permitted by both CISV and participants in the meetings.

In a study like this, it is impossible to identify a “sample”, as accomplished interactions during the meetings cannot be counted. The research procedure aimed to videotape/audiotape all interactions with translation in Italian language taking place in the 10 villages. In the following sections, meaningful examples of transcribed interactions will be described and discussed to identify how interpreting was achieved. The extracts used in the following sections are representative of the types of discourse organization in the interactions and of the sequences of talk making the bulk of the interactions observed during data collection.

The CISV programmes consider non-verbal communication important for effective interpersonal relationships in multilingual contexts. However, the increasing value assigned to English as a lingua franca in many countries has produced two consequences for CISV activities. Firstly, the power of English-speaking children has been enhanced, both in understanding activities and, above all, in communicating during activities. Secondly, ‘translation time’ has become a very important activity. These phenomena might disappear when all children are able to speak English very well. However, at present, interpreting is an essential component of CISV activities. In villages, most children need systematic linguistic support, because their linguistic knowledge is limited, or very limited. Therefore, interpreting has a fundamental function in the interaction.

Therefore, in CISV villages, interpreting is important because children display a differentiated competence in understanding and speaking English as a lingua franca. In these contexts, interpreting is an important tool for education, as it guarantees the basic understanding of CISV activities. Therefore, adults’ translations are frequently instrumental to the achievement
of assigned educational tasks. However, interpreting is a particularly complex activity, which can strongly influence the achievement of education and which is, in its turn, influenced by educational goals.

In the last ten years, the literature on dialogue interpreting or community interpreting (e.g. Angelelli 2004; Baraldi & Gavioli 2012; Brunette et al. 2003; Carr et al. 2007; Corsellis 2008; Hale 2007; Mason 1999, 2001; Wadensjö, Englund-Dimitrova & Nilsson 2007), has been widely influenced by the idea that interpreting is achieved in the interaction (Wadensjö 1998), and that interpreters are active participants with important functions of mediation in the interaction (Baraldi & Gavioli 2012; Davidson 2000). A number of studies highlight the relevance of interpreter-mediated interactions in terms of interpreters’ coordination of the bilingual conversation. In CISV villages, interpreting is ‘ad hoc’ as it is performed by leaders, JCs and staff members without specific professional skills, who are primarily intended as educators.

According to Baraldi & Gavioli (2007), in this kind of situations, and particularly in healthcare institutions, interpreting presents two main structures: (1) after-turn translations, which are rare, and (2) combination of dyadic monolingual interactions and summarized or expanded translations, which are much more frequent. During their interpreting activity, adults tend to strategically reduce renditions of turns. Nevertheless, during the interpreting activity, dyadic interactions in the first language may be useful in promoting children’s participation.

2. After-turn translations

After-turn translations are not frequent and are followed by children’s nodding as a sign of understanding, short answers which often follow yes/no questions, and non-verbal communication in general.

In extract 1, the Italian leader (LFita) translates a British child(Meng)’s utterances in Italian, in order to promote an Italian child(Fita)’s understanding, in a turn-by-turn translation. Fita intervenes giving feedback to LFita (turns 8, 14) or implicitly inviting translation (turn 10). In turn 16, LFita abandons the role of interpreter and assumes the role of educator, inviting Fita to express her preference. LFita’s renditions allow Fita to make a choice in turn 17. Nevertheless, LFita does not translate Fita’s contribution; consequently the leader’s interpreting has an informational value only for Fita. In particular, she gives instructions to Fita about what to do and how to participate in the activity.

Extract 1

1. LFita: can you say it?
2. Meng: women’s rights
3. LFita: ermi diritti delle donne
   *erm Women’s rights*
4. Meng: free speech
5. LFita: diritto di parola
   *the right to speak*
6. Meng: democracy
7. LFita: democrazia
   *democracy*
8. Fita: sì, democrazia
   *yes, democracy*
9. Meng: health care
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10. Fita: *che cosa sono* – *what are they* -
11. LFita: servizi sanitari
*healthcare services*
12. Meng: education
13. LFita: *e l’istruzione*
*and education*
14. Fita: *mmm*
15. Meng: health care and education
16. LFita: *ok, adesso li dovete mettere in ordine di importanza (..) secondo te, qual è il più importante?*
*ok, now you have to rank them (..) which is the most important in your opinion?*
17. Fita: *questo*
*this one*

In extract 2, the children’s initiative is more evident. The French Leader (LMfra) checks children’s knowledge about the theme of the village. An Italian child (Fita) asks for translation in a low voice (turn 2). She is immediately helped by the Italian leader (LFita) who provides translation as a reduced rendition (turn 3). This support is confirmed by the leader’s suggestion of the child’s answer in English (turns 5 and 7).

Extract 2

1. LMfra  Raise your hand if you::: remember what’s the theme of the camp.
2. Fita:  °Cosa ha detto?°
3. LFita:  °Qual è il tema del campo°
4. Fita:  °E diritti umani come si dice in inglese?°
5. LFita:  °Human rights°
6. Fita:  °Eh?°
7. LFita:  °Human rights!°
8. Fita:  Human rights!

In extracts 1 and 2, the informational value of the leaders’ interpreting is evident, but their renditions are not effective in promoting the children’s participation. After-turn translation can successfully promote CISV activities, supporting their educational goals, as in extracts 1 and 2. However, it is not effective in promoting children’s personal expressions, as it does not require relevant interactional efforts. It has been shown elsewhere that after-turn translation does not allow space for negotiating clarification or investigating ambiguous meanings (Baraldi & Gavioli 2012). In CISV villages, although children can understand what they have to do, they do not participate actively in the interaction through these after-turn translations.

3. Gatekeeping as selection of information

Another, and more frequent, form of interpreting is summarized or expanded renditions of turns in English; after a sequence in English, leaders translate in a summarized or expanded way, selecting information that they provide for the interlocutors. This is a form of interpreting as gatekeeping, which “protects” the educational activity from information that is not considered useful for its function (Davidson 2000). This gatekeeping reduces the children’s opportunities of both understanding and active participation.

In extract 3, during the activity *Life boat*, seven children are acting as characters defined by
their job and social status. Only six of them will be able to remain on the boat, while the seventh will be abandoned, as the least useful to society; the aim of the game is to deal critically with the problems of prejudices and stereotypes in society. During the activity, LFita translates the Canadian Leader(LFcan)’s turns, but does not translate the children’s contributions, e.g. she does not translate turns 3 and 4. The Italian child (Fita) can only understand the rendition of LFcan’s contributions.

Extract 3

1. LFcan: the alcoholic captain of the ship  
2. LFita: il capitano alcolizzato della barca ((to Flita))  
3. Farg: (?) drive us  
4. Mspa: he’s going to kill all the people on the boat  
5. LFcan: not necessarily because (?) people are alcoholics and drink a lot, you can’t tell [(??) and we don’t know (?)  
6. LFita: [però L. (LFcan) dice che comunque non è detto che sia – ti dice che è alcolizzato, per cui solitamente beve molto, però non ti dice se effettivamente è ubriaco mentre guida la barca [however, L. says that he may not actually – she says he is alcoholic, so he normally gets drunk, but she is not saying that he is drunk while he pilots the boat]

In extract 4, turn 1, The American leader (LMusa) explains the activity “Yellow & Blue”, then he invites to translate his explanation. After a long pause (8 seconds), he adds some details to his explanation. The rules of the game are simple and the children are supposed to understand them autonomously, during the activity. The aim of the activity is reaching cooperation among the groups of children, so that all groups can gain the same score. At the end of turn 1, and again in turn 4, LMusa waits for the other leaders’ translations. In turn 6, after a long pause (9 seconds), an Italian child (Mita) asks for clarifications in a low voice, thus highlighting that translation was not produced., The Italian leader(LMita)’s rendition (turn 5) does not include some important parts of LMusa’s explanation, i.e. the rule of cooperation (“you have to work together”) and the delivery of written rules (“we will pass the rules out to you”). This reduced rendition is not sufficient to clarify the meaning of the activity, therefore Mita shows doubts about his role in the game (turn 8). In turn 9, LMita underlines that the rules must be autonomously understood by the children, and the Italian JC (JFita) confirms this statement (turn 10). Mita asks for further clarification (turn 11), but he receives the same answer in the next turns.

Extract 4

1. LMusa: Alright, is everyone with their group? Alright, we’re gonna play a game called Yellow and Blue. You have to work together to: get the most points. There are rules (.) that you have to follow (.) in order to get the most amount of points for your group. So, we will pass the rules out to you and you’ll send a representative into the middle, each round, and then we will count the points, and (..) and go from there. Any questions? Translation.  
2. ?: Yes!  
3. (8)  
4. LMusa: Each group will get a blue and yellow piece of paper, and each round you’ll have to decide whether you’re going to send a (.) yellow or a blue.  
5. (9)
6. Mita: °Marco cosa dobbiamo fare?°
7. LMita: °Questo gioco si chiama Giallo e blu, e:: ad ogni turno un bisogna mandare qualcuno nel mezzo— allora questo gioco si chiama Giallo e blu, a ogni turno un rappresentante della squadra deve andare nel mezzo, consegnare a (qualcuno) un foglietto, che è o giallo o blu, (.) e cercare di fare più punti possibili.
8. Mita: °E cosa dobbiamo fare?°
9. LMita: Però le regole del gioco:: le dovrete scoprire voi.
10. Mita: °Cosa bisogna fare??°
11. LMita: Voi in pratica dovete -
12. LMita: [Voi dovete solo decidere se consegnare un foglietto giallo o blu, e lo scopo è fare più punti possibili. Però le regole del gioco (?)
13. Mita: Come fai a sapere che quello:-
14. LMita: Eh le - le capirete pian piano.

In extract 4, LMita’s lack of clarifications is not only based on educational goals, but also on a reduced and insufficient rendition of LMusa’s explanation. The mix of the leader’s roles (educator and interpreter) affects the meaning of the interaction with the child, enhancing its ambiguity. This ambiguity is an obstacle to LMita’s facilitation of communication and to the child’s active participation.

Extract 5 highlights a more ambivalent form of gatekeeping, including a dyadic interaction. The American leader (LMusa) explains a cooperation game (Chinese Master). The difficulty of this game has been increased by including it in the Simulation Game “Handicap Day”, in which participants perform as disabled people. LMusa’ explanations is rather complex and the Spanish leader (LMspa) helps him with questions (turns 4 and 6), which aim to clarify possible doubts and to provide further details on the activity. In turn 8, the Italian leader (LMita) announces translation time and in turn 9 an Italian child (M1ita) urges this translation, showing his lack of understanding. However, LMita’s announcement is followed by a very long pause of thirty seconds. However, LMita’s turn starts after an acknowledgment and further 15 seconds of pause, highlighting hesitation. LMita underlines some limitations of his rendition (one child is “disabled” and cannot hear), then starts with it. The first and shorter part of his rendition projects the Italian children(M1ita and M2ita)’s doubts and protests, regarding their “disabled” conditions of participation (turns 11 and 12). In turn 14, M1ita asks confirmation of the type of game that was explained. LMita answers to this question, ignoring the protests, and continues his rendition (turn 16), however interrupting it, showing further hesitation. After a long pause, the rendition continues (turns 19, 21, 23 and 25). An Italian child (F1ita) first acknowledges it, then asks for repetition (turn 26). She is ignored by LMita. In turn 28, F1ita displays her understanding. In turns 30 and 31, M1ita and M2ita wail for their difficulties in moving around, but LMita ignores them and concludes his rendition in turn 32.

Extract 5

1. LMusa: Alright. °Can you hear?° We’re gonna be playing a game called Chinese Master.
2. Everybody: Yeah! Woo!
3. LMusa: Alright, so there’s going to be eight stations (.) around like kinda of our all hallway area as well as the auditorium. There will be a leader or a JC at each station who will be a Chinese Master, and you will have to perform tasks at each station. Ehm the object of the game is- where? (7). Ok, so your groups, that we have broken you
into, you’re gonna be going around and trying to collect food, water, education, peace, love, health care, shelter and (?), so we’re just trying to: collect your- same basic human- basic human (. ) needs. Uhm, and you’re gonna have to go in a certain order, (..) and so: you won’t know which Chinese Master you’re supposed to go to first, but you’ll figure it out. Uhm: so how will (?) So:: you’ll gonna have to find – Yes LMspa.

4. LMspa: Eh: if we go to a place, we do the task, a::nd- but it’s not (..) the word that we need in that moment, what do we have to do?

5. LMusa: Alright. So: if you go somewhere and you find a Chinese Master, you can ask them, like saying that you’re looking for food, you’ll go to them and you’ll ask them, do you have food? And they can be like, maybe I do! But first, you have to perform the task, and once you’ve performed this task, then you can ask them again, and they can tell you yes or no if they have food, and if they don’t, you have to go on, and find the Chinese Master that does have food.

6. LMspa: And when I need food and go the other station, I have to (do) the task again.

7. LMusa: Correct. (10) Alright, uhm, so yeah I’m gonna have the stations leader leave now, and go to their stations, if you need any translation beforehand, do that now real quick.

8. LMita: Translation time.

9. M1ita: In Italian.

(30)

10. LMita: Yes. (15) Ok, ok. Ciòè io non posso scriverlo, io adesso ve lo traduco a voi e dopo loro::- Flita io lo dico, poi non posso scriverglielo, perché lei non sente niente, dopo tu glielo scrivi. Eh. (3) Allora, è Chinese Master. Bisogna andare in varie stazioni-


12. M2ita: Camminando, io- io, non cammino. M1ita, una per me ((chiede una sedia perché per l’Handicap day aveva solo una gamba)). F2idn, one for me, one chair for me! Thank you F2idn!

13. M1ita: °E’ Chinese Master?°

14. LMita: Si bisogna andare in varie stazioni, (..) dove bisogna:: svolgere un compito che vi viene dato, qua- quando s –

15. (10)

16. M2ita: E’ bello essere siamesi? ((to Flita who has this handicap))

17. Flita: No.

18. LMita: Bisogna andare in varie stazioni e bisogna svolgere il compito che vi viene dato.

19. Flita: Ah ah.

20. LMita: Quando è terminato il compito vi viene data una parola.


22. LMita: Alla fine voi dovete riuscire (..) a collezionare tutte le parole.

23. Flita: Sì.


25. Flita: Ecco, no ripetimi, aspetta.

26. LMita: Però voi non sapete (..) se quella stazione è quella che a voi serve.

27. Flita: Ah ah.

28. LMita: Quindi magari, voi (..) [fate l’attività -

29. M1ita: [Quindi le dobbiamo girare tutte?

30. M2ita: Marco ma come facciamo io e M1ita?? ((their l’handicap consists in having only one leg))
31. LMita: Quindi voi magari fate l’attività (...) e dopo vi dicono:: che quella li non è la parola che vi serve, voi dovete andare dall’altra parte e tornare a farlo un’altra volta.

It is important to underline LMita’s hesitations that characterize his translation. This hesitation is combined with a reduced rendition; some parts of the original utterance are not translated, in particular some relevant indications about the activity (“around like kinda of our all hallway area as well as the auditorium”; “there will be a leader or a JC at each station who will be a Chinese Master”), the link to human rights and the list of these rights; moreover, LMusa’s example is summarized. In turn 23, however, LMita provides an expanded rendition regarding the future indications regarding how the collected words should be ordered. This combination of hesitation and reduced rendition creates problems for children’s understanding and participation.

Extracts 3, 4 and 5 show that interpreting does not easily promote children’s active participation in the CISV activities, as it combines “educational” gatekeeping and difficulties in rendition of complex instructions. The leaders’ renditions provide the children with tools to manage the activities; however, they are not sufficient to promote children’s active participation in the activity. Leaders select information, to convey only the turns that they think useful or necessary for the activities; consequently, Italian children participate in the communicative processes differently from children with better competences in English.

According to Davidson (2000), the selection of information is the main feature of interpreting as gatekeeping: interpreters protect institutional roles from risky situations created by their interlocutors. This consideration may well apply to CISV educators: their gatekeeping concerns both the achievement of activities and the presuppositions of CISV education. However, there are two oversimplifications in this interpretation. Firstly, gatekeeping is much more crucial for its effect in reducing children’s participation than for its protection of the institution. Secondly, the mere selection of information does no satisfactorily explain gatekeeping.

This form of interpreting is based on the coexistence with educational aims, permeating the adults’ actions while they are translating. The relevant problems created by this coexistence are clearly shown in extract 6, which concerns a debriefing session of the activity “Life Boat”, in a small group including two Italian children.

The Italian leader (LMita) coordinates the debriefing session, interacting with all the children (turns 1-2). In turn 4, an Italian child (F1ita) asks for clarification about his question in Italian, introducing ambiguity about LMita’s role in the interaction. F1ita’s contribution is legitimized by the long pause of 6 seconds following turn 2, which indicates that nobody is taking the turn; however, her initiative deviates from the official language of the debriefing. In turn 5, the American leader (LFusa) takes the floor, and this offers LMita the opportunity to ignore F1ita’s question and maintain his role of group coordinator, engaging a short dyadic sequence with an Indonesian child (F1ind) (turns 11-13). In turn 14, however, F1ita asks again for clarification in Italian. LMita answers (turn 15), translating his turn 1, with a long delay. This translation opens a short dyadic sequence in Italian, in which F1ita stresses her difficulties in understanding English (turns 16 and 18), which are ignored by LMita, who simply acknowledges her first turn, although another Italian child (F2ita) highlights these difficulties with a question (turn 19). In turn 20, LMita turns to coordination of the group.

Extract 6

1. LMita: Did you think about what was best for the group to survive, or you just chose the ones that you don’t like that much?
2. FLusa: (?) what if questioned, like, uhm (2) hh
In extract 6, the leader’s gatekeeping is clearly linked to the ambiguity of his role, as both educator and interpreter. The Italian child ignores the leader’s role of group coordinator, asking for his help as interpreter, while LMita shows his preference for maintaining the role of coordinator. The result is that the Italian children are excluded from the conversation. Italian leaders’ selection of information promotes misunderstandings and lack of orientation among Italian children. Gatekeeping as selection of information strongly influences the interaction, not only excluding utterances that deviate from the predefined institutional process, but also making this process difficult, by reducing the opportunities of children’s active participation. This is a consequence of the ambivalence of leaders’ actions, between education and interpreting.

4. Gatekeeping through formulations

Gatekeeping is based on the tendency on the part of adults to change the meanings of original utterances through renditions, influencing their interlocutors’ understanding of communicative processes. This happens for two reasons. Firstly, these changes can adapt children’s understanding to the organisation of activities and their guiding values. Secondly, they can enhance children’s performances. Formulation (Heritage 1985; Hutchby 2007) is the most relevant form in which this form of interpreting is established. Heritage (1985) defined formulation as a turn that summarizes, glosses, or develops the “gist” of previous utterances. Formulations “advance the prior report by finding a point in the prior utterance and thus shifting its focus, redeveloping its gist, making something explicit that was previously implicit in the prior utterance, or by making inferences about its presuppositions or implications” (Heritage 1985, 104). Moreover, formulations make interlocutors’ decisions in the next turn relevant, as either confirmation or disconfirmation (Heritage and Watson 1979).
It is clear that reference to preceding and following turns is a crucial point in the analysis of formulations. Against this backdrop, formulations as renditions, or renditional formulation, by interpreters provide opportunities to involve participants in the bilingual interaction, promoting concern and sensitivity for their interlocutors. In interpreter-mediated interactions: (1) formulation of prior speaker’s utterances addresses a third participant; (2) the addressee is potentially available as an interlocutor, but their actual participation requires formulation to display sensitivity; (3) addressee’s participation and display of sensitivity are dependent upon the interpreter’s rendition. Therefore, interpreter’s renditional formulations can promote prior speaker’s empowerment and addressee’s perspective-taking.

Heritage and Watson introduced the difference between formulating gist and formulating upshot. Formulating upshots means creating additional “significance” (Heritage and Watson 1980, 249) to the gist, proffering “some unexplicated version” of the previous turn (Heritage and Watson 1979, 134). In interpreter-mediated interactions, upshot formulations can be seen as forms of gatekeeping.

In extract 7 and 8, renditional formulations as gatekeeping regard children’s utterances, in extracts 9 and 10, they regard leaders’ talk. Renditional formulation can also be combined with selection of information (extract 9).

In extract 7, turn 1, the Brazilian Leader (LMbra) announces his intention to highlight the importance of respect among children; in particular, he remarks that when somebody raises her/his hand to talk, the other participants should keep silent and listen to her/him. In other words, LMbra promotes a cooperative atmosphere based on active listening and avoidance of power relationships. In turn 2, The Italian leader (LFita) translates LMbra’s turn, emphasizing the normative expectations presented. She highlights the gap between adults and children, and does so by saying that adults must be listened to by children.

Extract 7

1. LMbra: ok everybody? Just to remind you that (. . ) when (. . ) an adult or any of you participants raise your arm (we know you have) to say something (. . ) so (. . ) other people will respect you (. . ) and when you also raise an arm and remain in silence and everyone can listen to what you- [...] all right? I’ll tell you one more time. A raising hand, a high five means: “ehi people, I want to speak. Please, can you hear me? (. . ) It is not necessary for us to shout, so we can also be respectful. (. . ) For the next activities we’re gonna have some running games inside the gym (. . ) because outside (indicating outside the gym) it’s too hot (3) so we will stay here inside. (. . ) we don’t go outside (indicating again outside the gym), because outside (. . ) it’s too hot (pretending to dry off his forehead)) The most important for us now is to remain (. . ) here, inside the gym. Translations.

2. LFita: ok ((standing up and talking to her delegation)), allora, prima di tutto ricordatevi che quando un leader alza la mano dobbiamo stare in silenzio, perché significa che vuole dire qualcosa, quindi innanzitutto come segno di rispetto, ok? Adesso facciamo invece un’attività, un gioco in cui bisognerà correre, stiamo in palestra, non andiamo fuori perché è troppo caldo. Ok? ((sitting down again)) ok, so. First of all remember that we have to keep silent when a leader raises his hand, because this means that he wants to say something, so, above all in sign of respect, ok? Now we are going to do an activity, a running game. We are going to stay in the gym. We won’t go outside because it’s too hot. Ok?

This formulation can easily produce a reduction of children’s active participation, as a consequence of their lesser right to be listened to. In extract 8, during the first part of the interaction within the Italian delegation, an Italian staff member (SFita) promotes the children’s reflection about the ways in which the activity can be
performed (turns 1, 7, 15, 19). In turn 23, she translates their contributions by formulating the children’s utterances, presenting them in a more elaborated form. In this way, SFita’s rendition adds her perspective to the children’s. SFita makes her delegates aware of the meaning of her rendition (turn 25), but she presents her formulation as if it was the children’s original utterance. Moreover, she avoids translating the American leader (LMusa)’s turn (24), which underlines the importance of participation.

Extract 8

1. SFita: ehm: come siete riusciti a comunicare nella vostra squadra?
2. what are the ways you communicate in your team?
3. M2ita: [coi gesti, poi in inglese
4. with gesture, then in English
5. F1ita: [in inglese!
6. in English!
7. M2ita: gli facevi vedere così –
8. you did like this -
9. F1ita: anche un po’ in inglese!
10. a little bit in English too!
11. SFita: lui ha detto anche in inglese-
12. he says in English too-
[...]
15. SFita: ma secondo voi nel primo gioco si comunicava bene?
16. do you think that there was a good communication in the first game?
17. F2ita: ma quale, quello de:1 tren0(.) secondo me abbastanza
18. which one? The one of the train? (.) Enough, in my opinion
19. F1ita: soprattutto in quello delle sedie
20. above all in the game of the chairs.
21. M1ita: in quello della penna pure (..) quello delle sedie, se non capivi potevi cadere per terra
22. in the pen game too (..) in the chair game, if you did not understand, you could fall down.
23. SFita: ma secondo voi, in quale gioco era più facile comunicare quello dei treni, quello della penna nella bottiglia o quello della sedia
24. from your point of view, could you communicate easily in the train game, the pen game, the bottle game or the chair game?
25. F2ita: sedia
26. chair
[...]
23. SFita: and: they are saying they communicate even in English, with signs but: it was: (.) easier to communicate with signs in the last game, because: it was easier, just in the structure of the game, it was easier to communicate with signs, like: they pass the chair and it was obvious that you have to pay attention to the signs while you take it
24. LMusa: [that's very very important, the signs, talking is very important (.). if they don’t understand what you say, you have to say it in another way
25. SFita: [(to M2ita)) gli ho detto quello che avete detto voi, che praticamente era più semplice l’ultimo gioco perché ti passavano la sedia e tu sapevi che per forza la dovevi andare avanti e: quindi era più semplice questo che gli altri
[1 told him what you told me, the last game was easier because they passed the chair and you knew you had to go on and: that’s why it was easier than the other games

The establishment of normative and cognitive expectations is very frequent in interpreting during the CISV activities. These expectations guide the selection of information in order to
achieve expected results, the meanings of upshot formulations which reinforce educational values, and the management of possible interactions with the children in their first language. However, they also prevent children from expressing their perspectives.

In extract 9, gatekeeping as upshot formulation is combined with gatekeeping as selection of information, and with a dyadic sequence in Italian. The extract regards the activity “Egg game”, in which children must protect an egg by building an eggshell. The explanation of this activity is provided in turns 1, 3 and 4, by the Spanish JC (JMspa) and the leader of Fjor-öer (LFjor). They provide instructions to perform the activity, but without promoting the children’s participation. The Italian leader (LFita)’s multi-part rendition is a formulation of these turns. The first part of this rendition (turn 1) is more focused on group cooperation than the original utterance, while it ignores the request of creativity in performing the activity (turn 1: “you have to be creative”). In the second part of this rendition (turn 3), LFita translates “if it breaks, I’m sorry, and if it doesn’t break, good job” with “se l’uovo si rompe naturalmente avete perso, non avete fatto un buon lavoro, se l’uovo rimane intatto, bene”, thus excluding the empathic component of the original turn (“I’m sorry” and “good job”), and introducing an assessment of the children’s performance. In turn 5, LFita adds the detail that the egg is a real egg from hen, which was not provided in JMspa’s and LFjor’s turns. An Italian child (FIita) asks for more details about the egg, but she is ignored by her leader, who continues explaining the activity. FIita repeats her question (turn 4), projecting LFita’s answer; this initiates a dyadic side sequence between the leader and the two Italian children, concerning the egg, which is irrelevant for the activity. LFita answers the children’s questions but she does not translate their contributions.

Extract 9

1. JMspa: Basically ehm, you'll get, each team will get one egg ((he shows the egg with his hands)) and your duty is to make a kind of project a kind of gadget which ehhh protects the egg, like we'll give you some material and you have to be creative and create some stuff, some kind of design that would ehm let the egg, would stand the impact from ehm ((he shows an egg that falls down)) from from high, some height, ok? Did you get it guys?
2. M1cos: Yes!
3. LFjor: Like you have to do like a project with this egg you need, you have some material, you need to protect this egg ((she shows the egg)) because at the end, when you guys finish, every team we're gonna take their egg and we're gonna throw it from a certain point. If it breaks, I'm sorry, and if it doesn't break, good job
4. JMspa: It is really important that the egg remains safe.

[…]

1. LFita: Italiano! ((she raises her hand)) Allora e:: in questo gioco si lavora in squadre, riceverete dei materiali diversi, differenti e in gruppo dovrete decidere di costruire, di fare un progetto, una costruzione per proteggere un uovo, un uovo vero di gallina che vi sarà dato ((she shows the egg with her hands)) per proteggerlo perché e:: poi la vostra costruzione sarà portata in un punto alto, circa alto così, diciamo ((she shows the height with her hands)) e lasciato cadere e l'uovo non deve rompersi, dovete proteggerlo bene e usare i materiali che vi vengono dati. Se l'uovo si [rompe
2. FIita: [ma è vero?]
3. LFita: Naturalmente avete perso, non avete fatto un buon lavoro, se l’uomo rimane intatto, bene
4. F1ita: Ma è vero?
5. LFita: Sì si, un uovo di gallina vero.
6. Fita: E se si rompe?
7. LFita: Se si rompe, si rompe!
8. F2ita: Poi esce un pulcino?
9. LFita: No niente pulcino. ((she laughs))
10. F1ita: Ah ecco!

Extract 10 follows two unsuccessful activities which were planned by the children. The main problem was that the children were not able to explain the instructions of these activities, as they peers made great confusion.

In extract 10.1, the French leader (LMfra) promotes the children’s participation. In turn 1, he is supportive, stressing that the activities have gone well (“the girls did a great job and the boys did well also”) and that the leaders appreciated them. LMfra adds that, however, these activities can be improved and invites the children to reflect about possible improvements. The tone of his voice and his slow way of talking are reassuring. Turn 1 is closed with a question about the children’s perceptions, which projects a number of reactions; the children’s active participation originates a conflict between males and female about the responsibility of failure (turn 8). LMfra ignores this conflict, distributing participation, asking questions (turn 6: “Why girls?”) and projecting completions (turn 4: “Making the-“). In turn 9, LMfra formulates the previous turns (“Ok, making the girls shut”), however correcting the use of lexicon (“be silent, we don’t say shut up, be silent”). Correction is repeated in turn 16, and is followed by other leaders’ correction in turn 17. In turn 12, LMfra explains a rule, concluding with a question that promotes the children’s participation (“So, who was one, two? Tell me!”). In turn 18, LMfra provides another formulation (“So we agree on the fact that you are not silent, right?”), concluded with a request of confirmation (“Is it ok?”). This turn projects the expression of a Jordan child (Mjor)’s perspective. LMfra stresses his interest for this perspective, asking for its completion (turn 21), and projecting M1jor’s participation. In turn 23, LMfra translates in French for his delegation; this rendition is a formulation of the previous turns, which, however, does not stimulate participation, and is followed by a promotional question in English. In turn 27, the leader provides another formulation to summarize the conversation and asks for completion (“then the game was not-“), projecting a Canadian child (M1can)’s collaboration (“going”). In turn 29, LMfra echoes the previous turn and asks a new promotional question, projecting M1can’s turn. In turn 32, LMfra, ignoring an American child (F1usa)’s protest, concludes the sequence, formulating the fundamental aspects of the conversation, and stressing the necessity that children follow adults’ orientations. The sequence is concluded with an invitation to translate.

Extract 10.1

1. LMfra: Ok. People! Eh:: we leaders and staff are happy because your activ-, your two activities went well because you planned. So the girls did a great job and the boys did well also. ((the children laugh))
   But after planning, during the activity, you probably realized how hard is, it is to make the activity go, right? So, can you please, without any word first, can you please raise your hand and tell me what was the worst thing, like the
very, the very first and worst thing in doing the activity, what was the thing that was really hard for you at the very beginning? ((parla molto lentamente))

2. Mcos: Making the girls shut up.
3. Musa: Yes!
4. LMFra: Making the-
5. Musa: Girls!
6. LMFra: Why girls?
7. Mcos: Because only the girls were (?)
8. Fusa: The girls weren’t talking, the boys were!
9. LMFra: Ok, this is a nice one! Ok, making the girls shut up, be silent, we don’t say shut up, be silent!
10. JMspa: Ahahaha
11. SFbra: R. (LMfra) explain the rule (?)
12. LMFra: Don't forget. If I do this ((he raises one finger)), I’m the first one to talk, if I want to talk, someone else want to talk, you go two ((he signs number two with his fingers)) and then three and four ((he shows numbers with his fingers)). Ok? So, who was one, two? Tell me!
13. Fger: Also making the boys -
14. LMFra: So you say making the [boys
15. Fger: [shut up
16. LMFra: Be silent, and you say making the girls be silent and we adults we say
17. Leaders: Making the kids silent, the kids!
18. LMFra: So we agree on the fact that you are not silent, right? Is it ok?
19. Children: Yes!
20. Mjor: And it was hard to get everyone to listen.
21. LMFra: To get everyone?
22. Mjor: To listen.
23. LMFra: To listen? Ok. C'est difficile d'avoir le silence que de faire en sorte que tout le monde écoute, ok? What else?
24. Fjor: Ehmm, I think for girls and boys it was difficult to make them (?)
25. LMFra: Ok.
26. Fjor: And make them listen to us.
27. LMFra: Alright. (5) So then, maybe, it didn't work really well because no one was listening, then no one could understand the game, then the game was not -
28. M1can: Going
29. Lmfra: Going. Not even starting! (4) So what’s the first thing to do, you have to do and we have to do?
30. Mean: Be quiet!
31. Fusa: Oh my God, please don’t!
32. LMFra: So, when we, leaders and staff, we raise our hand and we ask for silence it's because, not because we are fed up with you guys talking, (4) it's because we want to start the activity, but we cannot start if you talk. Is it ok for everyone? Anyone needs translation?
33. Children: Yes.
34. LMFra: Ok, I’ll start quickly.

In extract 10.1, LMFra coordinates the children’s contributions and promotes their participation, through formulations and listening them. However, this promotion of participation is ambiguous, as it is combined with invitations to share meanings and with
stress on adults’ authority.

Extract 10.2 shows the Italian leader(LFita)’s rendition of the complex sequence shown in extract 10.1. This rendition is an upshot formulation. First, LFita stresses the distinction between competent adults (“speriamo, facciamo, vogliamo”) and incompetent children (“capivate, abbiate capito”). Second, the supportive action (“we leaders are happy”) are substituted by a negative judgment (“attività che sono state abbastanza un disastro”), which discourages the children’s contributions. Support is weakly introduced only at the end of the turn (“ci serve il vostro silenzio”), when the children’s cooperation is requested. Finally, LFita’s rendition is very quick, while LMfra’s way of talking was slow.

Extract 10.2

1. LFita Ok, italiano! Eh::, dov’è M. (M1ita)? Ok. Eh:: quando:: cioè speriamo che queste attività, che sono state abbastanza un disastro perché come avete notato, anche quando chiedevate il silenzio, chiedevate l'attenzione anche tra di voi non vi capivate e comunque nessuno faceva silenzio, nessuno vi ascoltava e non riuscivate a spiegare le istruzioni, non riuscivate a fare continuare l'attività, ma nemmeno a farla partire. Eh:: speriamo che abbiate capito che il gesto che facciamo ((she raises her hand)) non è per stizza o perché ci piace alzare la mano eccetera, ma perché veramente vogliamo fare iniziare l'attività e ci serve il vostro silenzio per farla iniziare. ((she speaks fast, the children don’t speak))

This rendition only focuses on LMfra’s educational intention. Interpreting, therefore, seems an educational monologue, which stresses normative expectations, and the distinction between competent adults and incompetent children. The upshot formulation does not promote the children’s participation. While in extract 10.1 LMfra combines promotional contributions and educational guidance, LFita’s renditional formulation only reflects her role of expert, who does not negotiate meanings and does not promote expressions of different perspectives.

5. Educational comments

As we have seen, when Italian children express either their need for clarifications or their perspectives in their first language, their leaders often establish expectations of adults’ educational guidance and correct performances. While leaders promote children’s understanding by clarifying their doubts and answering their questions, their main aim is to guarantee a ‘correct’ development of the activities. Leaders highlight explanations of rules and objectives, while other aspects are not considered relevant, and are frequently not translated. Therefore, children’s contributions can be ignored, as in extract 9 and as in the following extract 11.

Extract 11 concerns the activity “Create a story”, in which groups of children are asked to organise and perform short sketches for the other participants in the village. In turn 1, the Italian JC (JFita) explains the activity, receiving an Italian child (M1ita)’s acknowledgment (turn 2). In turn 3, JFita is interrupted by the Danish JC (JFden)’s question (turn 3), which allows the clarification of a rule of the game. In turn 4, concluding her explanation, JFita introduces translation time. In turns 5 and 6, two Italian children (M1ita and M2ita) ask for translation in Italian, and a third Italian child (F1ita) starts translating (turn 7), thus showing her understanding. In turn 8, the Italian leader (LMita) initiates a multi-turn rendition, introducing some details that were not uttered by JFita, i.e. the delivery of the sheets in which
the characters are written. On the one hand, LMita expands the original utterance, on the other hand however he excludes the assignment of the theme for the sketch. This rendition projects children’s different reactions (turns 9, 10, 12). LMita ignores these reactions, continuing his rendition (turn 13). In turn 13, the rendition (which is a formulation of turns 1 and 4) projects the children’s protests about the activity. In the final turn of this multi-part rendition (turn 17), which reproduces the conclusion of turn 1, LMita answers negatively to M1ita’s question (turn 15) and ignores M2ita’s question (turn 16).

Extract 11

1. JFita: Ok guys, now (. ) we are dividing you into eight groups, and each group will have three characters, and one theme, and each group has to make (. ) a story- an act using these characters and this theme. And then they have to act it in front of all of us and show what they did- what they (?). Ok?
3. JFden: What about (. ) who (. ) doesn’t have a character?
4. JFita: Yeah, who doesn’t have a character just (. ) found- ehm, has to find other characters to put in the story, so: they- you have just to have these three characters, and the others can- you can choose whatever you want to be. °Do you understand°?
(5) Ok, translation time!
5. M2ita: Che gioco è?
6. M1ita: Ok traduci.
7. Fita: Ci dividiamo in otto gruppi↑
8. LMita: In otto gruppi, in ogni gruppo- [a ogni gruppo vengon dati tre foglietti con tre personaggi-
9. M2ita: [Da tre?
10. M1ita: Mmm
11. LMita: E::-
12. Fita: Sirenetta
13. LMita: Vari personaggi (. ) di storie. E voi dovete all’interno di ogni gruppo (. ) ehm:: ideare una storia che contenga questi personaggi. [Ad alcuni non verr- ad alcuni all’interno del gruppo non verrà dato alcun personaggio, quindi dovete decidere all’interno del gruppo che personaggio:: lui deve rappresentare, cioè lo decidete voi.
14. M2ita: °No. No io non lo faccio°
15. M1ita: Dai Marco [possiam stare insieme?
16. M2ita: [°Ma come facciamo::?°
17. LMita: (No), e dopo dovete esibirvi davanti a tutti.

In extract 11, the children’s contributions are ignored or negatively responded. Sometimes, children’s contributions are also followed by adults’ educational comments. In extract 12, children are invited to avoid the destruction of a nation struck by the fall of a huge meteorite. In turn 7, the Italian leader (LFita) translates the Philippine leader(LFphi)’s turns (1, 3, 5) after some continuers by the children (turns 2, 4, 6). Two Italian children (M1ita and M2ita) try to express their preference for developing the activity in a different way from what expected (turns 8, 10). LFita’s reaction is a formulation of LFphi’s instructions (turn 11) which binds their actions to the fixed structure of the activity, rather than promoting their self-expression. In turn 11, LFita introduces her normative expectations preventing the children from changing the way the activity is developed.

Extract 12
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1. LFphi: your countries are really perfect. However, "however, there was a huge meteorite". Everybody knows what a meteorite is?
2. Children: yes, yes
3. LFphi: from the (upper) space?
4. Children: yes
5. LFphi: ((imitating the noise of a falling meteorite)) niaw: pciuf! now, they gave your country a problem, that you have to solve! ah! or else, the country will be dead
6. Children: yes! dead!

(2)

7. LFita: c'è stato un cataclisma che ha praticamente: portato un problema nel vostro- practically se non volete che il vostro pianeta praticamente scompaia there was a catastrophe which created a problem in your- if you don't want your planet to practically disappear

8. M1ita: no ma se but if [lo vogliamo? we want]

9. LFita: [il vostro, la vostra terra, dovete risolvere il problema your, your planet, you must solve the problem]

10. M2ita: se vogliamo (?) if we want (?)

11. LFita: no, non c'è possibilità, dovete assolutamente risolvere il problema che vi è stato dato, ok? dovete parlare, discutere, poi risolvete il vostro problema qua, dite come lo avete risolto. no, there is no other possibility. You must absolutely solve the problem we gave you, ok? You must talk, discuss, then solve your problem, tell us how you solved it.

In extract 13, in turns 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10, two Italian children (M1ita and M2ita) express their doubts and disappointment regarding the meanings of the activity, while another Italian child (F2ita) seems to adapt to its rules, although not agreeing with them (turn 7). The Italian leader (LMita) reacts very ambiguously: in turns 12 and 14, he urges the children to participate, however his tone and words discourage the children’s participation rather than promoting it. This is confirmed by the fact that LMita highlights only the ‘right’ way to perform the activity (turns 9, 17, 19). He pays more attention to the prefixed framework than to the delegates’ points of view. As a consequence, the children hesitate to express their perspectives, staying silent for a long time (turns 11, 16). In particular, F1ita seems to feel uncomfortable in participating (turns 13, 15). In turn 18, M2ita seems to give up his scepticism, and adapts to his leader’s perspective.

Extract 13

1. M1ita: è insensato – it’s senseless –
2. LMita: cosa? what?
3. M1ita: eh, che la peste venga uccisa dalla morte – that death killed the plague –
4. LMita: perché? why?
5. M1ita: eh, perché: vabbè-yes, because; ok-
6. F1ita: perché la peste è una malattia because the plague is a disease
7. F2ita: vabbè: è un gioco
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ok, but it's a game
8. M2ita: un gioco che finisce così:
   a game which is concluded like that:
9. LMita: la morte uccide 'sta malattia, no?
   death kills this illness, right?
10. Mita: vabbé, sì –
    ok, yes –
11. (6)
12. LMita: no, di, (...) parlate, o:h, madonna!
   no, tell me (...) Speak! O:h my gosh!
13. LItita: no, perché-
   erm: because-
14. LMita: di
   speak
15. LItita: e:h-
   erm-
16. (8)
17. LMita: ((annoyed)) praticamente se tu sei un coniglio e ti prende un cacciatore e tu gli devi
dare due bigliettini, ma ne hai solo uno, tu sei morto, e devi entrare qua dentro in questa stanza
   if you are a rabbit and a hunter catches you, you will have to give him two little cards.
   If you have got only one card, you are dead and you must go into this room.
18. M2ita: e quindi chi rimane vince (. ) chi rimane vince –
    indeed, the winner is the one who remains alive (. ) the one who remains is the winner –
19. LMita: eh (. ) e praticamente dice che: tra i conigli, tra volpi, vi potete: aiutare, che ne so,
   vedete che c'è uno che sta vicino a zero, e gliene potete dare un po' (. ) capito?
   Vi ricordate queste cose?
   he says that rabbits and foxes could help each other, for example, when you see who
   is on the point of having zero card, you could give him a few, right? Right? Do you
   remember this?

It is clear that children’s opportunities to participate in interactions in their first language do
not guarantee their personal expression. Frequently, leaders use first languages in a normative
framework: they direct delegates’ actions towards the accomplishment of activities and the
acceptance of values, without listening to their perspectives and normatively managing the
arising conflicts. Children’s opportunities to speak in their first language are bound to their
role performances.

Extract 14 concerns an activity on human rights. The extract shows the Italian leader(LFita)’s
multi-part rendition of the French leader(LMfra)’s explanation of this activity. In turn 2,
LFita translates the last part of LMfra’s turn (“is it ok for everyone?” with “avete capito
tutto?”), as she had previously explained the activity. Following an Italian child(F2ita)’s
negative answer (turn 4), LFita starts to repeat the explanation of the activity (turn 5),
formulating another part of LMfra’s turn. She is interrupted by another Italian child (M1ita),
who ask for more details; LFita repeats her rendition in turn 7, and M1ita acknowledges it. In
turn 9, LFita continues with her renditional formulation, excluding judgments (“non importa
di cosa corretto o sbagliato”), giving value to the children’s contributions (“siete voi che
pensate”) and stressing the limitation of her own contribution (“io vi posso aiutare con la
traduzione e::: basta”). In turn 11, LFita translates LMfra’s example, in order to test the
children’s understanding. This test, however, projects a conflict (turns 11-16), which she tries
to regulate imposing her perspective as an expert (turns 17 and 19). In turn 23, she also
imposes her perspective contrasting F2ita’s further objections (turns 20 and 22). In this way,
the children’s attempts to participate, promoted by the leader’s interpreting, are blocked
through the leaders’ display of normative expectations and judgments.
Extract 14

1. LMFra: Now. You are that person, ok? So why am I asking you to stay in a line? It’s very important. We have here a list of rights, different rights, ok? I need you, every time I speak out one right you step forward if you think that you have this right, being that character. Let’s say a::: I’m a poor person i::n Brazil and I say right- the right to eat every day. I don’t move because I think that as a poor person in Brazil, I don’t have the right. That’s what I think, ok? So you do whatever you want, as long as you think you have or don’t have the right. Is it ok for everyone? Raise your hand if you didn’t get it.

2. LFita: "Avete capito tutto?"
3. M1ita: "Sì"
4. F2ita: "No"
5. LFita: "Adesso vi spiego". Allora, è come vi ho spiegato prima, praticamente voi siete questo personaggio. Lui dirà un diritto – lui dirà un diritto e se voi pensate di avere questo diritto fate un passo avanti, se invece pensate di non averlo state fermi [e
6. M1ita: [ma cos’è che ha detto quando aveva la mano alzata?
7. LFita: Aveva la mano alzata? Se avevate capito.
8. M1ita: Ah, ok!
9. LFita: L’importante è che, cioè voglio dire, non importa che sia corretto o sbagliato, siete voi che pensate. Se voi pensate che ce l’abbia, andate avanti, se no:: niente. Io vi posso aiutare con la traduzione e::: basta.
10. F2ita: Ok.
11. LFita: Ad esempio, ha fatto l’esempio. Se se il vostro personaggio fosse un ragazzo povery che vive in Brasile, lui dice “il diritto di mangiare ogni giorno”, voi fate un passo avanti o no?
12. F2ita e M1ita: Sì!
13. F1ita: No!
14. LFita: No!
15. F2ita: Perché?
16. M2ita: Perché i poveri-
17. LFita: Perché se lui è povero non potrebbe- magari non può mangiare ogni giorno. Capito? In questo senso.
18. M1ita: Eh, ma ha il diritto.
19. LFita: Ha il diritto, ma non [può farlo
20. F2ita: [ma secondo me si!
21. LFita: Ma come fa a mangiare ogni giorno se non ha soldi?
22. F2ita: Sì, ma ha comunque il diritto!
23. LFita: Sì, ma in potenza tutti abbiamo il diritto di::::: espressione o di qualsiasi cosa, ma se in realtà non ce l’ha.

In extract 14, the contradiction between promotion of participation through interpreting and block of participation through education is particularly evident. Dyadic sequences in Italian can promote children’s participation, however LFita’s normative regulation blocks this participation showing her educational objectives.

6. Gist formulations
In our data, the opportunity for Italian children to be heard by the other participants are based on renditions of their turns through gist formulations, which develop previous turns while projecting further active participation. Therefore, renditional gist formulations can promote children’s active participation.

Extracts 15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4 and 15.5 are part of the debriefing session of the activity “Prison break”, in which the children are invited to reflect on the importance of non-verbal communication. In these extracts, the Italian leader (LFita) provides renditional gist formulations of the Italian children’s utterances.

In extract 15.1, turn 1, the Canadian leader (LMcan) asks a question about problems with non-verbal communication. LFita’s rendition includes an expansion of this question (“cioè senza poter parlare”). After a series of turns, in turn 13 LMcan gives the floor to an Italian child (Fita), who raised her hand. However, the Italian child talks directly to LFita in a very low voice, showing the expectation that her leader will translate her contribution to the group; LFita translates the child’s turn.

Extract 15.1

1. LMcan: What problems did you have with non-verbal communication?
2. LFita: Quali problemi avete incontrato nella comunicazione non verbale, cioè senza poter parlare?
3. LMfra: Quelles ont été les difficultés que vous avez rencontrées à faire ce jeu sans parler?
4. LMcan: Ok, does everyone understand? Ok!
5. Fjor: They, they didn’t listen.
6. LMcan: They didn’t listen?
7. M1jor: They all thought that they could do it, they could figure out how, but they all needed to listen.
8. LMcan: Ah!
9. Ffra: (?) 
10. LMfra: She said that everybody was talking- talking and trying to get out all together ehm at the same time.
11. LMcan: M. (M2jor)
12. M2jor: Everyone thought they could do it alone, find his own way but you needed to do it with the guide.
13. LMcan: C. (Fita)
14. Fita: (?) 
15. LFita: Some people couldn’t understand the rules, so they kept on doing things that were wrong because they couldn’t communicate with the others and they couldn’t listen to the others.

Although in extract 15.1 it is not clear what LFita translates of F1ita’s turn, her support of the Italian child is evident; therefore, she satisfies the child’s affective expectations of support. In extract 15.2, LMcan asks a question and a Jordan child (M1jor) raises his hand to answer. However, LMcan asks him to wait for translation, showing his attention for collective participation. In turn 2, LFita translates, but she concludes her rendition with a suspension (“oppure –“), which aims to promote the children’s expression. After The French leader(LMfra)’s contribution (turn 3), LMcan leaves the floor to an Italian child (M1ita), who, as in extract 15.1, talks to LFita in Italian, indirectly asking for her translation. LFita’s
rendition is a formulation, which makes some details explicit and adds other details. “La Cina” is translated as “a country where you don’t know the language that they speak, for example in China”, and “è ovvio che ci serve” is translated as “it’s useful to use sign language and non-verbal communication to have an exchange with them”. This formulation allows to develop M1ita’s utterance. The leader also mitigates the child’s utterance, translating “e non parlano inglese” with “if we find people that don’t speak English”. Finally, LFita adds a non-rendition (“to have an exchange with them”), which introduces the relevance of “exchanges” among people, in line with CISV presuppositions.

Extract 15.2

1. LMcan: Ok, ok, so:: Communicating without talking is a skill. Do you think this skill can be used in your daily life? (4) ((he indicates M1jor, who has raised his hand, then he stops him)) Translation, translation!
2. LFita: La comunicazione non verbale è un’abilità, pensate che questa abilità possa essere utilizzata anche nel vostro quotidiano oppure -?
3. LMFra: La communication non verbale c’est une aptitude, une capacité qu’on acquiert, on gagne. Est-ce que vous pensez que c’est une chose qu’on peut utiliser :h dans la vie de tous les jours? Norway? Norway? Norwegian guys, do you understand the question in English? Yes? Do you want to translate to your friends o:: are you ok? Because C. (LFnor) is not here. ((M1nor translates for his delegation)) Any answer or comment on that?
4. LMcan: E. (M1ita)
5. M1ita: Eh:: ad esempio se siamo in un paese straniero come la Cina e non parlano inglese, e::: è ovvio che ci serve! ((ho looks at LFita))
6. LFita: He said that if you’re abroad in a country where you don’t know the language that they speak, for example in China, and they - and if we find people that don’t speak English it’s useful to use sign language and nonverbal communication to have an exchange with them.

In extract 15.3, turn 1, LMcan involves the participants, through a question (“how did that go?”), which projects the raise of many hands. Once again, LMcan invites to wait for translations. In turn 2, LFita’s rendition, regarding LMcan’s question, it is not effective. LMcan’s utterance shows a personal interest in children’s perspectives (“how did that go”), while the rendition is more neutral (“se lo avete potete portare l’esempio”). Nevertheless, the Italian children contribute to the interaction (turn 4). In turn 5, LFita translates with a renditional formulation, making some details explicit (“qualcos’altro” diventa “a pencil or a pen”, “usavo i segni” diventa “he just makes a sign for a pen and then he can get it”).

Extract 15.3

1. LMcan: Ok, so this last question. Leaders, JCs, staff, you’re free to answer as well if you have an example. So, do you have an example from your life when you had to communicate with someone using this skill, like non-verbally, yeah and how did that go? ((some children raise their hands)) Just wait for translations.
2. LFita: Avete avuto degli episodi nella vostra vita in cui vi è capitato di dover utilizzare un linguaggio non verbale, quindi segni, eccetera? Se lo avete potete portare l’esempio.
3. LMcan: E. (M1ita)
4. M1ita: Ehm a scuola, ad esempio, quando dovevo chiedere una matita o qualcos’altro a un mio compagno che è lontano usavo i segni.

5. LFita: Ok, at school, when he has to ask a classmate for some- for something like a pencil or a pen and this classmate is far away from him, he just makes a sign for a pen and then he can get it.

Extracts 15.4 and 15.5 concern the Italian children’s answers to LMcan’s question. F1ita’s turn in extract 15.4 is expanded through LFita’s rendition. LFita includes one of the principles of CISV narrative, i.e. the importance of non-verbal communication to overcome the problems of communication, which was not expressed in LMcan’s utterance.

Extract 15.4

1. F1ita: °durante il CISV°
2. LFita: Ok, eh:: in all the CISV experience because when she has trouble in communicating with other people in English she can use gesture and it helps.

In extract 15.5, turn 4, LFita’s renditional formulation provides details that enrich F2ita’s contribution.

Extract 15.5

1. F2ita: °Sordomuti°
2. LFita: Uhm?
3. F2ita: °Muti°
4. LFita: Ah! With deaf people you can use gesture because they don’t they don’t listen to you, I mean they can’t hear you speaking.

In these extracts, LFita provides renditional gist formulations of children’s utterances, promoting understanding and sharing of meanings that they uttered. LFita’s renditions make children’s participation possible, making it public. However, LFita expands the children’s contributions and introduce new perspectives, specifying what they said and promoting their participation.

Gist formulations are particularly useful when they are after-sequence, summarized renditions. In these cases, the combination of adults’ active listening of children in dyadic interactions, and after-sequence summarised renditions allows adults (1) to understand and show empathy with children, and (2) to re-construct children’s narrative with the other participants. Moreover interpreters’ initiatives can expand other leaders’ questions, explanations and information, in a way that favours children’s involvement, understanding and active participation. This form of interpreting promotes a form of dialogic mediation. Dialogic mediation means promotion of equally distributed participation, mutual sensitivity and mutual empowerment in the interaction between the parties and upgrades distributed and joint authority in the interaction.

In extract 16, during the final phase of an evaluation activity, SF3ita translates only the question which has to be answered (turns 2, 4), leaving out part of LMusa’s turn (‘these games all you had to collaborate with your time’). Nevertheless, SF3ita’s feedback to her delegates’ turns shows her understanding of their points (turn 10) and opens new spaces for their reflection (turn 11). The use of a first language is fundamental for promoting reflection and children’s perspectives. However, another decisive aspect is that SF3ita translates the
Italian delegates’ perspectives (turn 17), thus also promoting the other participants’ understanding. By acting as recapitulator (Wadensjö 1998), she passes the Italian children’s contributions; she recapitulates their contributions by formulating them; she expands M1ita’s turn (‘because when someone has difficulties in the family you cooperate to solve this problem’), leaving out part of F1ita’s turn (9) ‘anche: presentando delle piccole cose’ (when you have to show little things), and changing the meaning of Mita2’s turn (11), formulating the expression ‘ognuno fa: un lavoro simile’ (everyone does a similar job) as ‘everyone has his tasks’.

Extract 16

1. LMusa: last question ehm: these games all you had to collaborate with your time so: was there some other places in your life (.) where collaboration is very important? When you had to collaborate, two minutes to talk, and then we discuss

2. SF3ita: allora: la cooperazione- so: cooperation-

3. Fitita: eh?

4. SF3ita: dice: in quali altre situazioni della vostra vita è importante cooperare, tra di voi o altri?
**he’s asking what are other situations in your life where cooperation among you or among people is important.**

5. FLita: in progetti!

6. M1ita: e: ma secondo me in tutte quante, perché: te la dicono sempre questa cosa, tipo: metti caso che: una persona è in difficoltà nella famiglia così noi: [collaboriamo] but I think it’s always important, because everyone always says this. For example, if a person has family problems, so we [collaborate]

7. FLita: quindi [in un progetto, therefore]

8. M1ita: oppure noi collaboriamo eh: ehm: beh secondo me in tutta quanta la nostra vita è importante cooperare or we collaborate erm: I think cooperation is always important in our life

9. FLita: per me nei progetti, cioè quando anche: presentando delle cose piccole, comunque devi stare con qualcuno che:
I think in projects, let’s say, when you have to show little things, you must be with someone who:

10. SF3ita: quindi quando devi lavorare con qualcuno ad un progetto, devi collaborare con lui let’s say, whenever you have to work with someone to a project, you have to collaborate with him

11. M2ita: secondo me anche qua al CISV devi cooperare con altri, quando ci sono le pulizie, ognuno fa: un lavoro simile
I think you have to cooperate here, at CISV too, when we have the cleaning groups, everyone does a similar job

[...]

17. SF3ita: L. ((M1ita)) was saying that almost in everything, in everyday life you have to collaborate, he made an example in the family, because when someone has difficulties in the family you cooperate to solve this problem and: L. ((FLita)) was saying that when you are working with someone else at a project, a common project you have to cooperate, and M. ((M2ita)) was saying that even in CISV, like in the cleaning group you have to cooperate because everyone has his tasks.
Renditional gist formulations seem to be particularly important. In extract 17, during a debriefing session, SF2ita asks the Italian delegates to explain the strategies they adopted during the previous activity (turn 2), and then she promotes their understanding, translating the Italian utterances into English. She translates (turn 7) conveying M1ita’s explanation (turn 6), and informing the other participants of the reasons for the latter’s action.

Extract 17

1. SF2ita: lo scopo del gioco era (fare più punti) per tutti, quindi se dicevate per esempio "dai giallo" e poi alla fine davate blu, perdevate tutti e non è che alcuni vincevano, cioè perché facevate questo? (3) o comunque magari nelle negoziazioni dicevate una cosa e poi facevate tutto’

   the aim of the game was (to score more points) for everybody. For example, when you said “give yellow” and at the end you gave blue, each of you lost and it’s not as if someone won, so why did you do like this? (3) Also in negotiations you said something and acted in the opposite way


3. SF2ita: come mai?

4. M1ita: perché se ti capitava il giallo hai più probabilità di perdere o comunque guadagnare meno punti, invece tu devi stavi sperando che: (.) l’altra squadra casse, insomma metteva il giallo, e tu intanto mettevi il blu e guadagnavi più punti e loro li perdevano.

   because if you had yellow, you have more probabilities to lose or anyway earn fewer points.

   Otherwise, you hoped that the other team believed you were putting yellow, while you put blue and they lost points while you gained them.

5. SF2ita: ok. He said if you put yellow was a risk and so - if you put- you hope that the other ones will put yellow and (..) you will put blue so that you will gain (..) more points.

In extracts 16 and 17, SF3ita and SF2ita shift from their role as staff members (asking the children to explain their strategies during the activity) to the role of interpreters (promoting understanding). This is particularly useful to create coordination in the groups. During CISV activities, the two phases of interpreting, i.e. the dyadic interaction in a first language and the rendition of information to other interlocutors through formulations, is particularly important in promoting both understanding and participation among children.

In extract 18, during the debriefing of the activity “Handicap Day”, the Norwegian leader (LMnor) asks a question (turn 1), which is translated in Italian, through a reduced rendition (turn 2), missing the first part and focusing on the second part of the translated turn, which is transformed from interrogative into affirmative. In turn 3, an Italian child (M1ita) expresses his opinion, which is considered a misunderstanding of the question by the Italian leader (LMita). LMita repeats the second part of his turn, but projecting the same answer (turn 5). In turn 6, LMita indicates his understanding with an acknowledgment (“Ah insieme!”), and in turn 8 he clarifies the meaning of his question. In turn 10, another Italian child (F2ita)’s answer projects LMita’s new question for clarification. This opens a sequence involving LMita and two Italian children (F2ita and F1ita) (turns 11-16), interrupted by LMnor, who asks for contributions. At this point, LMita translates the conversation, which obviously was not understood by the Norwegian leader, through a formulation (“They saw people without limbs at all, and also people without neck”), answering to LMnor’s original question (turn 1). LMita confirms this formulation answering to the Indonesian leader (LFind), and F2ita reaffirms her observation (turn 21). Finally, in turn 23, LMita formulates a previous conversation (not shown in this extract).
Extract 18

1. LMnor: Today people were like (..) mute and deaf, beside of both (..) that were here today, do you know any other disabilities or handicaps that people (3) have to live with?
2. LMita: Altri handicap che non c’erano oggi
3. M1ita: Gambe e braccia
4. LMita: Che non c’erano oggi
5. M1ita: Game e braccia
6. LMita: Ah insieme!
7. (?)
8. LMita: No ha chiesto (..) handicap che non abbiamo fatto oggi
9. LFind: Any other. Any other disability
10. F2ita: Quello senza collo
11. LMita: Cioè?
12. F2ita: E’ un handicap!
13. LMita: Come senza collo?
15. F1ita: Beh se non esiste non dirlo
16. F2ita: Esiste (.) perché l’ho visto
17. LMnor: Anything else?
18. LMita: They saw people without limbs at all, and also people without neck
19. LFind: Without neck?
20. LMita: Yeah, s(h)he said- like (3) I don’t know. I haven’t seen it
21. F2ita: L’ho visto io!
22. LMnor: Anyone else?
23. LMita: We- we also talked before about the- the Down syndrome

In extract 19, turn 1, LFind invites the leaders to explain the meaning of her question. This is not a request for translation; it is an explicit invitation to the other leaders’ autonomous interpretation of the question. In turn 2, LMita translates the content of the question, adding a detail (“nella vita (..) in generale”). In turn 3, M2ita answers, and LMita formulates this answer, developing its implicit meaning (“sadness”). In turn 5, LFind invites again to participate and LMita invites the Italian children to answer, adding a comment about the order of contribution. In turn 7, LFind restates part of her first question, regarding the children’s feelings. F2ita asks to translate the question, and LMita reformulates his previous translated question, thus expanding LFind’s new question, which was restricted to the children. In turn 10, F1ita answers to this new question (it is not clear if she understood it or chooses to answer to this part of LMita’s question). However, LMnor intervenes reporting the Norwegian children answers. LMita ignores these contributions and prefers to “prepare” the following rendition of the Italian delegation, explaining the procedure (turn 12). In turn 14, LMita directly invites M1ita to express his perspective, restating his question for the third time. In turn 15, M1ita shows some difficulties in concluding his answer and LMita restates the question, with specific reference to other persons. M1ita answers, stressing that he already did it before, and LMita translates this answer with a new formulation (turn 17).

Extract 19
1. **LFind**: You can explain them the question, and how would they feel like- what were their feelings today and how the people with the same disabilities would feel?

2. **LMita**: Quali erano i vostri sentimenti oggi (..) e quali sono i sentimenti che provano queste persone:: nella vita (..) in generale

3. **M2ita**: Ma che domande:: Non puoi essere felice che ti manca mezzo corpo!

4. **LMita**: Sadness. Sadness about (..) living without part of his- of his body

5. **LFind**: Ok everyone participate

6. **LMita**: Oh! Uno alla volta: rispondete tutti

7. **LFind**: How did you feel today?

8. **F1ita**: Qual è la domanda?

9. **LMita**: Come vi siete sentiti e come si sentono voi queste persone nella vita. Quelle che ce l’hanno veramente

10. **F1ita**: °Mi sono sentita un po’ triste (?)°

11. **LMnor**: They have to think about that they’re:- that they have this for the rest of their lives and they’re kinda used of it. (?) ((M1norsays something in Norwegian)) Mostly what M1nor says is that you have to get the best out of it and try to learn it

12. **LMita**: °Quando ve lo chiedono me lo dite in italiano e io ve lo traduco°

13. **LMnor**: And they don’t know how to feel because they’ve never been handicap (?)

14. **LMita**: Come si sentono secondo te le persone che hanno un handicap?

15. **M1ita**: Eh te l’ho detto, si sentono un po’ ostacolate: devono sempre avere qualcuno che (..) è al loro fianco per

16. (3)

17. **LMita**: Sad and dependent on someone else (..) during their lives

In extracts 18 and 19, the Italian leader clearly acts as an interpreter, in particular with renditional formulations of the children’s turns, previously encouraged in dyadic sequences. In extract 19, in particular, his renditional formulations transform children’s utterances in more abstract and meaningful statements.

Renditional gist formulations can also help when they concern leaders’ coordination of activities. Extract 20 shows how through formulations leaders can avoid gatekeeping and produce support for children. This extract concerns the explanation of an activity regarding human rights, in which small groups of children must write all human rights that they know on a poster. In turns 1 and 3, LMels explains the activity, with F1usa’s help (turn 2), then invites to translate. In turn 4, LFita asks for the children’s attention and starts translation. However, the high level of confusion suggests to LFita to wait. In turn 5, F2ita solicits the translation. In turn 6, LMels adds details about the activity and LFita tries to start translation. In turn 9, her renditional formulation emphasizes teamwork, as in the translated utterance (“you have to talk within your groups”), but also introduces support for the children’s expression (“se non li sapete in inglese potete scriverli in italiano, non c’è problema”). Moreover, LFita avoids to translate “try to explain it”, adding unconditional acceptance of children’s contributions (“non c’è problema”).

Extract 20

1. **LMels** We are going -, we’re gonna give you this piece of paper, ok? ((he indicates a wallpaper)) We would like you to – (8) ((he solicits discussion with gestures))

2. **F1usa** Talk!

3. **LMels** We would like you guys to talk within your group and try to find (..) all the different human rights that you know. (5) Raise your hand if you didn’t get the game. Ok, translations!

4. **LFita**: Italiano!
5. F2ita: E. (LFita)!
6. LMels Even if you don’t know it in English, try to explain it. (3) Is that right for everyone?
7. LFita: I have to – [Italian
8. LMels [Shhh
9. LFita: Eh:: in gruppo bisogna lavora- bisogna lavorare in gruppo e scrivere su quel foglio tutti i diritti umani che vi vengono in mente. Se non li sapete in inglese potete scriverli in italiano, non c’è problema, ok?

8. Conclusions

The lack of both a shared linguistic code and linguistic competence in the lingua franca can create difficulties in communication in CISV villages. In these conditions interpreting is very important to promote children’s understanding and participation. Interpreting in CISV villages is performed in different ways, with different consequences for children’s participation. Adults translate explanations of the activities during translation time and answer children’s questions in first languages. They do so by alternately engaging in dyadic interactions and renditions. After-turn translations are not frequent and are followed by children’s limited participation; this form of interpreting restricts participation in bilingual contexts, as it restricts the opportunities of personal expressions. It is useful only to deliver basic information, which does not require complex interactions. Interpreting presents problems when adults try to control communicative processes and direct them towards pre-fixed expectations, on the basis of their educational goals. These goals influence interpreting, determining forms of gatekeeping in translation, through both selection of information, which excludes children’s utterances, and upshot formulations, which substitute children’s utterances. Renditions have an informational value and are frequently followed by non-verbal forms, signalling understanding, and short answers. Renditions as selections of information promote the pre-arranged structure of activities, rather than children’s personal expression. Adults’ upshot formulations of original utterances guide children’s understanding towards prefixed educational expectations. Both these forms of gatekeeping prevent children from understanding parts of the communication process and from participating in it. The attempt to increase the promotion of children’s active participation may lead adults to encourage dyadic sequences in Italian language, which are welcomed by the Italian children, but which are not understood by the other participants. Dyadic sequences in Italian language may be promoted in the context of prefixed educational expectations. Therefore, children’s contributions are not translated if they are not considered relevant for pre-arranged activities.

To sum up, interpreting reduces children’s active participation when adults:

- Negatively assess children’s actions when they are not aligned to pre-arranged expectations.
- Reduce information about children’s perspectives and/or formulate them as upshot.
- Reduce other participants’ comments, in particular adults’ appreciation of children’s actions, by translating only the information which is useful for the activities.

In these cases, interpreting can be effective in promoting children’s understanding of activities, but its primary function (being a tool for the achievement of activities) determines significant limitations for children’s active participation, highlighting power relations: adults
control the interaction through interpreting. In these cases, the function of interpreting in promoting coordination among children and adults, expressed in different linguistic codes, does not seem to be sufficiently taken into account. These problems can be solved through a form of interpreting that promotes children’s active participation by integrating dyadic sequences in Italian with their renditions as gist formulations. Dyadic interactions in Italian seem to be particularly useful as adults may promote children’s active participation by coordinating their actions and listening actively to their contributions. Adults may highlight the possibility to change decisions and reopen discussions. It seems clear that children’s reflection is promoted by the use of first languages. These dyadic sequences must be followed by renditions that summarise their content in a way that reflects its gist, thus promoting children’s participation and projecting attention for it.

In conclusion, effective interpreting seems to be based on the combination of promotional dyadic interactions and gist renditional formulations, which promotes a dialogic form of language mediation, opening the doors to children’s personal contributions to the CISV activities.
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