Arnulf Deppermann*, Ibrahim Cindark, Lari Kotilainen, Salla Kurhila and Inkeri Lehtimaja

Self-translations in multilingual workplace interaction

https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2024-4002

Abstract: In multi-lingual workplace interaction involving L2-speakers with different levels of proficiency, L1-speakers can be seen to use self-translation of their own prior contributions as a repair-practice to restore intersubjectivity. This paper shows that self-translations are produced in three environments: (a) in response to repair-initiation by recipients, (b) in response to inadequate or missing responses, (c) after disaffiliative responses in order to elicit a more favorable uptake. Self-translations therefore are not only used to deal with linguistic understanding problems, but can also use linguistic diversity as a resource for dealing with lack of affiliation and alignment. Self-translations are produced by a switch to the addressee's L1 or to a lingua franca. They are only partial, being restricted to a translation of the core semantic content of the turn to be translated, thus relying heavily on a shared understanding of the pragmatic context and being designed so as to support interactional progression. Data come from video-taped meetings in Finland involving Finnish and Russian L1-speakers and various kinds of professional trainings in Germany involving instructors with German as L1 and refugees with various linguistic backgrounds.

Keywords: conversation analysis; second-language conversation; self-translations; multilingual practices; workplace interaction

1 Introduction

Globalization, digitalization and mobility have transformed work life in recent years. One key change, at least in Western societies, has been the expansion of linguistic diversity: workplaces are increasingly multilingual environments, where several

***Corresponding author: Arnulf Deppermann**, Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim, Germany; and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland, E-mail: deppermann@ids-mannheim.de
Ibrahim Cindark, Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim, Germany, E-mail: cindark@ids-mannheim.de
Lari Kotilainen and Salla Kurhila, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland, E-mail: lari.kotilainen@helsinki.fi (L. Kotilainen), salla.kurhila@helsinki.fi (S. Kurhila)
Inkeri Lehtimaja, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland, E-mail: inkeri.lehtimaja@aalto.fi

languages can be used, and the main working language is spoken by employees at different proficiency levels. This may cause challenges for interaction, however, if the language skills of one or more participants are clearly limited. For example, troubles in understanding and turn-construction can hinder opportunities for participation and negatively affect the performance of professional tasks.

In this paper, we discuss an interactional practice that can be used to tackle problems arising from asymmetric or restricted skills in L1-L2 professional interaction: speakers' self-translations of their prior utterances. In particular, we will focus on self-translations as a response to interactional troubles, as becoming evident by repair initiations or insufficient responses by the recipient. Our questions are: When do participants use self-translations as a means to solve problems related to asymmetric language skills in multilingual workplace settings and what do such self-translations look like? Prior research on non-professional interpreters interpreting during social interaction (starting with Wadensjö 1998) has focused on translations carried out by third parties, whose main or only role in the interaction consists of language-brokering. Our paper, in contrast, focuses on interactions in which the primary participants performing the professional tasks act as interpreters of their own speech (Harjunpää and Mäkilähde 2016). We will argue that self-translations are overwhelmingly used to maintain intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity in our context means shared understanding, as it is displayed by participants in social interaction by the ways in which they respond to others' actions, which, in turn, must be (at least implicitly) confirmed by the producers of the original action (Schegloff 1992; Sorjonen et al. 2021). Intersubjectivity in this way is a prerequisite for successful joint action, as joint action builds on sufficiently shared understandings. However, self-translations can also be employed to overcome disaffiliation and resistance, which may not necessarily arise from problems of (linguistic) understanding. Thus, not all problems in L1-L2 interaction that are treated as linguistic problems do actually stem from language limitations.

Our methodological starting point is Conversation Analysis (CA; see, e.g., Sidnell and Stivers 2013). CA is designed to analyse the situated, moment-to-moment unfolding interaction. Its emic principles – i.e. the categories applied in the analysis should capture what the participants orient to as being relevant for their exchange – are well suited for uncovering interactional practices in their naturally occurring contexts. The data of this study come from two countries: Finland and Germany. The Finnish data have been collected within a non-governmental organisation (NGO); the German data are from various professional training settings.

In Section 2, we review conversation analytic studies on multilingual workplaces, on interpreting and on repair practices in interaction. Section 3 introduces our data. The main body of this paper is the analytical part, Section 4. We start with cases in which the L2 speaker initiates repair because they have a (language)

problem with the L1 speaker's prior turn (4.1), followed by cases in which the L1 speaker's self-translation is preceded by an insufficient response by the L2 speaker (4.2), ending with examples in which the L1 speaker uses self-translation for dealing with a disaffiliative move of the L2 speaker, who, however, displays that they did not have an understanding problem (4.3). The paper ends with a discussion and conclusions in Section 5.

2 Literature review

2.1 Multilingual workplaces and Conversation Analysis

Multilingual workplace interaction has been the focus of research of diverse traditions, such as International Business research (more specifically, language-sensitive research in International Business; e.g., Piekkari et al. 2022; Śliwa and Johansson 2014), Interactional Sociolinguistics (e.g., Kim and Angouri 2023; Roberts 2010), Discourse Analysis (Vine and Holmes 2023), and Conversation Analysis (e.g., Spencer and Svennevig 2018) (see also the special issue "Multilingualism in the workplace", Angouri 2014). Since we are interested in uncovering interactional practices, our choice of method is Conversation Analysis (CA), which has already been used to study social interaction in a wide range of institutional settings (e.g., Arminen 2005; Drew and Heritage 1992; Heritage and Clayman 2010).

Within CA, an increasing interest in multilingual workplace settings has emerged recently. The role of second-language speakers and participants' language skills in workplace contexts have been subject to study, especially in view of work-based immigration. Interactional practices in multilingual workplaces have been studied in meeting contexts (e.g., Kurhila et al. 2021; Markaki et al. 2012; Mondada 2004, 2012; Oittinen 2022; Vöge 2011) and in manual work contexts (e.g., Deppermann and Cindark 2018; Svennevig 2018; Urbanik 2021). In multilingual meetings, ad hoc interpreting has been studied by Traverso (2012), and the role of language brokers in construction sites has been examined by Kraft (2020). However, self-translations have yet to be investigated in work contexts.

Multilingual workplace interaction can also be approached from the point of view of language learning, especially in the current societal situation in which employers in many Western countries are recruiting large numbers of second-language speakers, whose language skills are expected to develop while working. A key moment for language learning at work is professional training (cf. the approach of 'Content and language integrated learning' (CLIL), e.g., Coyle et al. 2010). A traineeship often is the first workplace environment in the new society for second language speakers. Earlier CA studies have explored data from training

interaction or instructional interaction in vocational education to uncover, for instance, mechanisms of conveying meaning through different linguistic and multimodal resources (e.g. Lehtimaja et al. 2021; Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh 2022). In this article, we zoom in on the achievement of intersubjectivity and the challenges that employees' limited language skills pose to mutual understanding and the progress of the interaction. However, although not being the focus of our study, the aspect of (professional) language learning is also occasionally oriented to by the participants.

2.2 Repair and self-translations

Repair is one of the main orders of conversational organisation that CA has identified. Together with turn-taking and sequential organisation, it provides the infrastructure of social interaction (Schegloff et al. 1977). Repair organisation offers participants resources to identify and remedy moments in which intersubjectivity between the participants is (potentially) broken. Previous research has identified a wealth of repair practices that participants use to overcome interactional trouble (see, e.g., Drew 1997; Haakana et al. 2021; Hayashi et al. 2013; Robinson 2006; Schegloff 1992, 1997). Since repair practices are the participants' mechanism to address problems of speaking, hearing and understanding, such practices have often been investigated in L1-L2 interaction (e.g., Kurhila 2006; Lilja 2014; Svennevig 2004; Theódórsdóttir 2018).

CA distinguishes between initiating and performing repair, on one hand, and between self and other as the relevant parties in repair sequences, on the other hand. Self-repair is performed by the speaker of the trouble turn, and other-repair by the recipient of the trouble turn (Schegloff et al. 1977: 364). Repair practices have been shown to be universal to a large degree. Different types of other-initiations of repair indicate the nature of the trouble-source figure similarly even in typologically unrelated languages (Dingemanse and Enfield 2015). For example, a (partial) repeat focuses specifically on the repeated item, whereas open-class repair initiations (such as *what?*, *huh?*; see Drew 1997) leave open in which way the prior talk is problematic. The latter types are typically treated as indexing a hearing problem; and followed by a repetition of the previous turn (Drew 1997; Enfield et al. 2013) - but they can also be treated as indexing a semantic or an acceptability problem.

Other-initiations of repair function as first pair-parts, projecting repair as the next relevant turn. However, repair can occur systematically without repair initiations as well. Schegloff (1992) has investigated cases which he terms "third-position repair". These can be schematized as follows:

Speaker A: trouble turn T1 (produced by A and received by B as non-problematic)
Speaker B: response to trouble turn T2 (T2, however, shows to A that B has misunderstood T1)
Speaker A: third-position repair (A repairs B's interpretation of T1 by way of self-repair)

Third-position repairs differ from other-initiations of repair in that speaker B does not display having trouble in hearing or understanding T1, whereas speaker A sees the need to repair B's understanding of T1.

In our data, A's self-translation occurs both after B's initiation of repair (Section 4.1) and as third-position repair after B's responses that are somehow insufficient or otherwise contrary to the expectations of A (Sections 4.2 & 4.3). Our focus sequence can be described schematically as follows:

Speaker A: trouble turn
Speaker B: other-initiation of repair / insufficient response
Speaker A: translation (of part) of the trouble turn

2.3 Self-translating as interactional activity

Research on self-translations goes back to early work on code-switching by Gumperz (1982: 59), defining it "as the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems". It fulfils various functions in conversation and can be used as a contextualisation cue.[1] One use of code-switching is repetition of content and/or action: "Often a message in one code is repeated in another code, either verbatim or in modified form. In some cases such repetitions may serve to clarify what is being said, but often they simply reinforce or emphasise a message" (Gumperz 1982: 78). Five out of six examples of repetitions in Gumperz (1982) are self-translations. However, they are not shown in their sequential context and lack the representation of embodied actions to which self-translations respond.

Auer (1984a, 1984b) discusses self-translations in bilingual interaction between Italian adolescents in Germany. He was the first to analyse code-switching in interaction with the method of CA. Auer (1984a) notes that code-switches often occur after repair initiation and for recycling the first parts of an adjacency pair (repetition of a question, request, etc.). Regarding self-translations of a first pair-part that was not responded to, he calls them "code-switching on non-first firsts" (1984a) or "second attempts" (Auer 1998). Auer (1984a) shows self-translations in third position, after an "open-repair initiation" ('I don't understand'), and after a missing verbal response.

1 A contextualization cue is "any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signalling of contextual presuppositions" (Gumperz 1982: 131).

There are many reasons why interactants fail to produce a next action: "the other party couldn't hear or understand it, […] doesn't know how to respond, doesn't know how to interpret the first pair part, etc." (Auer 1984a: 98). Auer underscores that competence and preference play an important role for code-switches to occur. A first pair-part of an adjacency pair is mostly self-translated if it was not produced in the preferred language; otherwise it is repeated in the same language. Auer (1984b) analyses self-translations within a turn as same-turn self-initiated self-repairs. He distinguishes between reformulations (Auer 1984b: 52–55) and repetitions (Auer 1984b: 86–92). In his terminology, other-language reformulation annuls the reparandum, while repetition is not a correction but a specification, elaboration or summary.

Heller (1982) also sees lack of competence and different preferences as reasons for using self-translation. She studied encounters between strangers at a hospital in Montreal (Canada). Since many of the residents are French-English bilinguals, implicit language negotiation often takes place. Heller found self-translation to be often used when first actions are not responded to. In interactions among Puerto Rican children in New York and with their parents, Zentella (1997: 96) finds self-translation to be the primary strategy to respond to 'What?' (*¿Que?*) repair-initiations. Later research on everyday communication in bilingual communities worldwide showed cases of self-translations in third position in reaction to repair initiations and missing responses: for example, among Dominican Americans (Bailey 2000: 185), bilingual Rwandans in Belgium (Gafaranga 2012: 510–511) and Russian-American immigrant families (Bolden 2012: 101–103). Greer (2008) finds that translations in Japanese-English multiparty interactions can serve to include interlocutors who may have been excluded from a previous conversation conducted in their weaker language. Interestingly, self-translations are used in Greer's data, even though recipients had displayed their understanding of what was said. Greer argues that speakers in this way present themselves as experts for both languages, while recipients are positioned as novices of the translated language. Self-translations are pervasive in foreign-language classes. For example, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 313–314) found that teachers use self-translations to reformulate unanswered questions or to encourage learners to produce turns in L2.

One of the most recent works on self-translations or reiterations (Harjunpää and Mäkilähde 2016) analysed (Brazilian) Portuguese-Finnish everyday conversations versus drama texts. They show that self-translations do not only occur in repair sequences. In only one of their four examples, when a Finnish question was answered inappropriately, the question was subsequently self-translated into the lingua franca (English). In two of their examples, reiterations occurred in teasing

sequences, repeating the punchline or provoking a reaction. Self-translation was also used as a sequence-closing summary.

Our study is the first to study self-translations in the context of task-related activities of various kinds. It goes beyond prior research in analysing in more detail the kinds of actions (other than repair initiations) that give rise to self-translations. Importantly, we also take into account bodily actions, both when occasioning and when implementing self-translations, and focus on the linguistic details of self-translations, which often do not amount to a full translation of the trouble-source turn.

3 Data

Our analyses are based on complementary L1-L2 workplace interaction data collected in Finland and Germany. The data represent employees at white-collar and blue-collar jobs and extend from professional training to work meetings. All data have been recorded with written informed consent by all participants to use videos and transcripts in scientific contexts; names in the extracts are pseudonyms.

The Finnish data were video-recorded in a Finnish NGO operating in the field of immigration. The recordings include online and face-to-face meetings held either internally within the NGO or with the NGO staff and various collaborators and stakeholders. The organisation under study is extensively multilingual (see Kurhila et al. 2021). The employees have either a Russian or Finnish background. Most of them are able to communicate in both languages, their second-language skills varying between elementary knowledge and fluent bilingualism. In the meetings with external collaborators, English is also used as a lingua franca. In total, the data amount to 65 h.

The German data come from the research project “German at Work: The Linguistic-Communicative Integration of Refugees” started in 2016 at the Institute for the German Language (IDS Mannheim). Ethnographic field studies and video recordings were made in occupational trainings in metal-working, wood-working and cooking, in which more than 30 refugees participated. The video recordings total nearly 32 h. Only about one third of the refugees could speak German at a level that allowed them to follow conversations and instructions at the workplace without major problems. The vast majority of them had only been in Germany for a few months and took part in the measures without a previous German course.

There are some notable differences between the two sets of data. In general, the work contexts in the Finnish data are more linguistically demanding than those in the German data. The Finnish data include more talk-dominated activities, such as argumentation and decision-making, whereas the German data include mainly practical and manual activities, such as instructional sequences. Thus, the L2

participants in the Finnish data are more advanced in their respective second languages than the L2 participants in the German data. Despite these disparities, we maintain that using two data sets is advantageous for the aims of our study. First, incorporating diverse data ensures comprehensive coverage of a wide range of activities and work contexts. Secondly, although the two data sets stem from different workplace settings, countries, and languages, our focus phenomenon occurs in both. The same self-translation practices can be found across all interaction types and participation frameworks that we investigated.

4 Analysis

In this paper, our analytical focus is on instances where one participant translates their previous turn or part of that turn in order to overcome an interactional problem. These cases share some sequential commonalities: they all contain a turn by the proficient speaker A, followed by the second language speaker B's action, which then triggers the self-translation by A. In the following, the analysis is organised according to the interactional actions by Speaker B to which the self-translation responds.

4.1 Translations after repair initiation

We start by discussing cases of self-translation as a response to a repair-initiation by the L2 speaker. The repair initiation indexes an understanding problem, which the self-translation tries to solve. We provide two examples in which the self-translation is triggered by different types of repair initiation; these self-translations also serve slightly different functions (Data are transcribed according to Jefferson (1984), see Appendix for the notation system. Utterances in a language that is not the base-code of the interaction (Russian, English, and Spanish in our data) are marked with bold letters.).

Example 1 illustrates a case in which a partial repeat by the L2-speaker is treated by their interlocutor as indicating trouble of understanding. Katja, Suvi and Jegor are having a video meeting; their cameras are switched off, so no one is visible on the screen. Suvi and Katja speak Finnish fluently, while Jegor's Finnish skills are more restricted. The topic of the discussion is a publication by the NGO. The extract begins with Katja's longer turn, reflecting on the suitable writing style: how "kevyesti" ('lightly', line 9; in this context 'simply'/'superficially') they should write. The word *kevyesti*, however, turns out to be problematic for Jegor.

Example 1: Lightly (Publication 3, 2:24–2:57)

```
01 Katja:   kuulosta (0.3) hyvältä, (0.2) et [se voi olla,
            sounds         good           so  it can be

02 Suvi:                                      [(--)

03 Katja:   .hhhh se vähän (0.5) sellainen et (0.5) mmm,
                  it a little   like      that

04          (1.3) mä oon niinku itse miettinyt (2.4)
                 I have like myself thought

05          a:: hhh (1.6) .hhh se tietysti me etsitään
                                it of course we are looking for

06          se se (.) sävy (0.4) .hh [et miten, .hhhhh
            the the   tone            so how

07 Suvi:                             [nii;
                                      yeah

08 Katja:   (0.6) miten niinku hhhm (0.5) ((smack)) (0.4)
                  how   like

09          kevyesti me #kerrotaan#.
            lightly we tell

10          (0.4)

11 Suvi:    nii-[i;
            yeah

12 Jegor:       [°kevyesti°,
                  lightly

13          (0.5)

-> Katja:   kevyt, (0.8) ljohkij;
            light        light

15          (0.8)

16 Jegor:   m-h[m,

17 Katja:      [miten (.) kevyesti me kerrotaan #asioista#;
                how       lightly we tell about things

18          (.) vai (.) mennäänks me joissakin #asioissa
                or      do we go     in some things

19          (0.2) jotenkin niinku#;
                  somehow like

20          (0.9)

21 Suvi:    syvään [päähän,
            to the deep end
```

After Katja's longer turn (line 9), Jegor repeats the word "kevyesti" in a soft voice (line 12) with level intonation. Partial repeats, especially when accompanied by questioning prosody, typically implement repair initiation (Dingemanse et al. 2014; Schegloff et al. 1977; for Finnish conversation see Kurhila and Lilja 2017). Jegor's repeat is indeed treated as a sign of language trouble by Katja: She first provides the adjective ("kevyt", line 14), from which the adverb *kevyesti* is derived, and after that utters the Russian translation of the adjective. Jegor receives the translation with an acknowledgement token (line 16).

As Example 1 shows, using a translation can be an efficient way to achieve intersubjectivity. As the repair initiation points out the problematic item, the co-participants can exploit the resources of the other language they share; the repair operation can be accomplished through a single adjective. Explaining the word in the original language (Finnish) would take more time and effort. Using translation as a repair thus helps keep the repair sequence short and thereby concurs with the preference for the progressivity of the talk (Stivers and Robinson 2006).

Previous research has shown that in L1-L2 conversations, L2-speakers' repeats are generally treated as indicating the speaker's unfamiliarity with the repeated word (Lilja 2010). It is worth noting, however, that in this case the more proficient speaker A does not produce a straight translation, which would resolve the unfamiliarity problem, but instead provides the Finnish adjective (*kevyt*, 'light') that is the root for the target adverb (*kevyesti*, 'lightly'). In other words, she does not act just as an interpreter, translating the repeated word verbatim. Instead, she offers speaker B linguistic resources to analyse the unfamiliar word linguistically by relating the adverb (that was used) to the adjective root morpheme. As Russian translation, she also provides the basic adjective (лёгкий), not the adverb (легко). Thus, while the more proficient speaker A resolves the trouble by giving a translation, she does so pedagogically by giving linguistic information to speaker B, encouraging him to engage in learning rather than simply equipping him with the verbatim translation.

The next example illustrates an instance of a more indeterminate other-initiation of repair. Instead of focusing on any specific linguistic item, speaker B produces an open-class repair initiation (Drew 1997). The extract comes from professional training in a metal workshop in Germany. The instructor (WS) is building a bicycle stand with the trainee (DE). They have just welded two tubes together and now have to check that the metal bars are straight.

Example 2: Red waterlevel (Geschnitten_Perfplus_Metall_5.8._teil8; 00:49-01:12)

```
01    WS    hier (.) müss mer bündig sein. (.) so.
            here   we have to be flush with    like this

02    DE    ((clears throat))
03    WS    SIEHste?
            D'you see

04          (0.9)
05    WS    schau (.) ich mach grade so,
            look      I   straighten it up like this

06    DE    ja.
            yes

07          (1.9)
08    WS    und,
            and

09          (1.17)~(0.2)
      ws-h        ~gaze back right, then left, then in front of him -->13

10          ähm,
            uhm

11          (1.2)
12          ham wa(.) eine wasserwaage~ #(.) +äh,
            do we have a water level          uh
      fig                                 #Fig.1
      ws-g                          -->~
      ws-b                                    +points in front of him-->24

13          (-)^*
      de-g     ^looks at WS-->20
      de-b      *straightens his torso-->17

14    WS    denyal. #(-) die+ (.) rote wasserwaage.*
            Denyal       the       red water level
      de-b                                      -->*
      fig           #Fig.2

15    DE    #ä:h,*
             uh
      fig   #Fig.3
      de-b      *turns around-->21

16    WS    the RED (.) °the° red.*
17          #(-)^
            #Fig.4
      de-g   -->^
      de-b                    -->*

18    DE    äh *JA.
            uh yes
```

```
      de-b     *walks towards work bench holding water level-->28

19    WS    (-) (rüber)+
                (over there)
      ws-b          -->+

20          (0.7)
21    WS    DES da.
            this over there

22          (0.3)+(0.33)
      ws-h     +points in front of him→

23    WS    ~des da ja+~*-
            this over there yes
      ws-h  ~nods slightly ~
      ws-b        -->+
      de-b          -->*

24          *(0.8)
      de-h  *grasps water level—>
25    WS    un des nehm mer,
            and we take this
```

Figure 1: Instructor asks and looks at trainee, who is still gazing at welded pipe.

Figure 2: Instructor points, trainee gazes at him.

Figure 3: Trainee stands up still facing the instructor, who continues pointing.

Figure 4: Trainee turns around into direction designated by instructor's point.

After welding two pipes, the instructor announces "here we have to be flush" (line 01), meaning that they have to make sure that the two pipes have the same height. To check this, they need a water level. The trainer stands up, scans the environment (lines 09–12) and asks the trainee if they have a water level (line 12). The trainee does not respond to the question, but continues to look at the welded pipes (Figure 1). Since the two interactants are standing very close to each other, it is not likely that the trainee did not hear the instructor. Rather, it seems that the trainee does not react because he did not understand the instructor's question. In order to get the trainee's attention, the instructor addresses him by name (line 14, Figure 2) and tells him that they now need the red water level (line 14). He points towards a domain of scrutiny in the trainee's back, making clear that he requests the trainee to fetch the object. The trainee now indexes his lack of understanding with an open-class repair-initiation "uh" (line 15, Figure 3). The trainer's continuing point in the direction of the trainee's back makes the latter turn around (lines 12–15, Figure 4). Yet, only when the trainer resorts to a partial self-translation of line 14 into the lingua franca English, saying "the red (.) the red" (line 16), the trainee recognizes the targeted object and walks off in the right direction to fetch the water level lying on the workbench (lines 18–24). In this case, a minimal,

partial self-translation, containing only the colour adjective specifying the desired object, is sufficient to lead the addressee to a proper understanding of a request that was not understood in two earlier versions in German. It may be noted that the choice of precisely only the colour term is a way of most economically securing reference concerning the requested item, as the action meaning as a request can be taken as understood, while the technical term water level to be used for object-identification is probably known neither by the instructor nor the apprentice in English.

In the examples in Section 4.1, self-translations are produced by Speaker A as a potential remedy to the interactional trouble that Speaker B has signalled by his other-initiation of repair. Speaker B's repair initiation can be specific, pointing out the exact word that causes trouble (Example 1), or an open initiation (Example 2) that signals that Speaker B is at a loss as to how to respond to Speaker A's previous talk. It is worth noting that the self-translations in our data are very minimal. In Example 1, Speaker A merely translates the root of the problematic word repeated in the repair initiation (kevyesti vs. kevyt); in Example 2, the translation repeats just the content word (red) of the original request, which most economically allows for identifying the problematic referent. In other words, self-translators aim to resolve the interactional problem as economically as possible, making use of their shared linguistic repertoire so as to provide just enough linguistic elements to secure intersubjectivity and the progressivity of the course of action. In our cases, notwithstanding the specificity of the repair initiation, Speaker A treats the trouble as stemming from restricted language skills, and attempts to repair the trouble by exploiting linguistic elements from other languages.

Next we will discuss instances where the self-translation is not preceded by a repair-initiation. Nevertheless, in these cases the translation still serves as a means to resolve problems of understanding.

4.2 Translations after inadequate responses

In this section, we examine cases in which the self-translation comes after a response by the L2-speaker B that is somehow inadequate (from Speaker A's point of view) with regard to what A's turn has projected. There is thus a misalignment between A's turn and B's response. Problematic responses may be verbal or embodied. In the latter case, it is Speaker B's physical action that indicates to Speaker A that there has been a lack of understanding. In both cases, Speaker A uses self-translation to elicit a more appropriate response by Speaker B; hence, these self-translations can be seen as performing a third-position repair.

The first example of a self-translation after an inadequate response comes from the German data. It is from a catering course for refugees. In this course, the instructor (FR) stages mock job interviews for the benefit of the refugees. Before the extract, the instructor asked the apprentice about his dream job in the gastronomic domain. In the extract, the instructor shifts to the apprentice's professional CV, asking where he worked before.

Example 3: have you worked (Gastro_2.Kurs_1.Phase_3.Tag_00035; 04:48–05:02)

```
01    FR    GUT. ((lipsmack)) und hast du wo HAST du gearbeitet?
            fine and have you- where have you worked

02          (0.9)

03    FR    HAST du schon mal in gast- in restaurant gearbeitet,=hotel?
            have you ever in gast- worked in restaurant hotel?

04    AT    (0.3) hotel ja,
                  hotel yes

05    FR    (0.3) HAST du schon mal?
                  have you ever

06          (0.3)

07    FR    HAVE you worked?

08    AT    (0.3) nein nein.
                  no no
09    FR    na?
            PTCL

10    ME    [xxx xxx xxx xxx] xxx xxx xxx xxx

11    AT    [nein.          ]
             no

12    FR    okay JA? okay.
            okay yes fine okay
```

The instructor first asks the apprentice an open *wh*-question about where he worked (line 01). Since they had talked about the apprentice's wishes for a future job before, the instructor puts particular stress on the perfect auxiliary "HAST" in order to indicate the topic shift to the apprentice's professional biography. As the latter does not answer, the instructor reformulates his question, now using a thematically narrower polar interrogative (see Svennevig 2013), which inquires if the apprentice worked in a restaurant or at a hotel (line 03). The apprentice confirms (line 04). The instructor initiates repair, however, again highlighting the auxiliary (line 05). The prosodic design of his partial self-repeat indexes that he assumes that the apprentice has not understood the grammatical/topical shift to the past and therefore has confirmed erroneously.[2] After a short lapse, the instructor self-translates his question from German into English, again using the analeptic short variant "HAVE you

2 From prior training and from his CVs, FR knows that AT did not work in a hotel before. FR's question is therefore a sort of known-information question (Davidson 1984).

worked" (line 07), thus presupposing that the apprentice has understood and retained the object reference (hotel). The apprentice now disconfirms (line 08). With a particle response, the instructor treats the apprentice's self-correction as conforming with his expectations (line 09). After the apprentice's reconfirmation (line 11), the instructor indexes that the communicative task has been successfully completed and closes the sequence (line 12).

The next instance of self-translation after an inadequate response represents a case where the L2 speaker B produces an answer that does not fit the formal expectations of the question by Speaker A. The example comes from the Finnish NGO data. The extract is from a remote meeting, where Risto, the head of the organization, asks the employees to describe their ongoing projects. Jegor has just reported in Finnish that their newsletter has received 330 new subscribers during the weekend due to a publicity campaign they launched earlier. The extract starts with Risto's follow-up question (lines 01–05).

Example 4: Three hundred now or during the weekend (IMM1805, 5:51–6:23)

```
01 Risto:   ((smack)) .hhhh hienoo; (0.2) krhh .hhhh ja
                        great                    and

02           tuliks sieltä niinku kolmesataa uutta,
             was there like three hundred new

03           (0.2) viikollopun aikana, (.) vai onks se
                   during the weekend     or is it

04           kolmesataa uutta nyt yhteensä sen jälkeen
             three hundred new altogether since

05           ku (.) lanseerattiin tää.=
             we launched this

06 Jegor:   =°m-hmm°,

07           (2.8)

08 Risto:   oliks vaikee kysymys,
            was it a difficult question

->          (1.5) tri:sta
                  three hundred

10           sej↑čav- sej (.) čas ö: (.) vse↑vo novih.
             at the moment              altogether new

11           .hh vot (.) vot v tečenii (0.2) m uikenda;
                 so during the weekend

12 Jegor:   [°da°
               yes

13 Risto:   [.hhh (0.2) ili trista (.) vsevo
                        or three hundred altogether
```

```
14            [novih posle] (0.2) posle vot: publikatsii
               new so since the launching

15 Jegor:    [(--)       ]

16 Risto:     vot etava lista;
              of the list

17           (0.5)

18 Jegor:    ((smack)) .hhh  #er:[:::::::::#

19 Risto:                     [.hhh

20 Jegor:    posle načala p- pervava anonsa;
             after the first announcement

21           (s- sob[stvenna mi im kagda mi ananširavali;
              so from the moment we published

22 Risto:             [da (-) >da da da da da<.
                       yeah    yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah
```

After giving positive feedback (line 01), Risto asks a specifying question: did Jegor mean 300 new subscribers during the weekend or since the launching of the campaign (lines 02–05)? As a response, Jegor quietly produces a very minimal response particle (line 06), which could function as a continuer. However, since Risto has just asked an alternative question, the particle does not fit as a type-conforming answer (cf. Raymond 2003): It does not determine which one of Risto's propositions was correct. Jegor's insufficient response is followed by a lengthy pause (line 07), after which Risto asks whether his question was difficult (line 08). He thus makes explicit that Jegor's answer was inadequate. After another pause, Risto begins translating the question into Russian. Doing so indicates that he has interpreted the problem as Jegor's limited skills in Finnish. When Risto has reformulated the alternatives in Russian, Jegor begins answering the question (lines 20–21). The self-translation by Speaker A has thus resolved the understanding problem and allows the conversation to progress.

Responses that attest to a misunderstanding or non-understanding can also be embodied. This is particularly relevant in the case of requests and instructions that call for embodied compliance, as in Example 6. It comes from the German catering course. The instructor (FR) has started rolling dough for cookies. He asks the apprentice (AP) to continue his work, getting the dough even thinner (lines 03–04).

Example 5: much thinner (Gastro_1.Kurs_2.Phase_1.Tag_00006; 00:12-00:50)

01	FR	mach deine sa (.) hände trocken, *dry your hands*
02		(5.6)
03		und mach schön weiter. ja schön noch dünner. (-) *and just carry on yes nice still thinner*
04		+meh- (.) noch dünner.* *mo- still thinner*
	fr-h	+distance gesture with right hand*
05		(0.3)*#(0.7)*+(0.4)#+(0.5)
	ap-h	*grasps cookie cutter*
	fr-h	+takes cookie cutter+
	fig	#Fig.5 #Fig.6
06	FR	**MÁS fino.** *thinner*
07		(1.0)
08		**que ha que lo ha- (.) que lo hagas MÁS fino.** *you must- you must it- you must make it thinner*
09		**eso.** *exactly*
10		(6.6)
11		**y si la masa cola? a este instrumento?** *and if the material glues at this instrument*
13		(1.7)
14		**tienes que cambiar tu:::- (0.8) es äh strategia.** *you have to change your stra- erm strategy*
15		(2.3)
16		ein bisschen. *a bit*
17		(1.1)
18		SO. okay sehr schön. *alright okay very nice*

Figure 5: Instructor makes distance gesture, apprentice grasps cookie cutter, while looking at instructor.

Figure 6: Instructor takes cookie cutter from apprentice (and lays it down).

The instructor asks the apprentice to take over rolling the dough until it is much thinner (lines 03–04). He accompanies his directive with a distance gesture (Streeck 2008). The apprentice grasps the cookie cutter, presents it looking at the instructor (line 05, Figure 5). In this way, he produces an embodied candidate understanding (Antaki 2012) of the next action that the instructor's request makes relevant (i.e., cutting the cookies). Obviously, this understanding does not depend on linguistic comprehension of the instructor's turn, but on pragmatic inferencing. It seems to build on knowledge about the workflow of baking cookies, mistaking the instructor's distance gesture as referring to the cookie cutter, expecting the apprentice to perform the next step of the procedure. Yet, this attempt at replacing a lack of linguistic knowledge by pragmatic (professional) competence fails. The instructor takes the cookie cutter and puts it aside (Figure 6). He treats the apprentice's inadequate response as caused by an insufficient knowledge of German and switches to a lingua franca: He self-translates his request from lines 03–04 from German into Spanish "MAS fino" (line 06). This third-position self-repair is followed by the instructor continuing his code-switch into Spanish, instructing the apprentice how to roll the dough properly (lines 08–14). The instructor only switches back to German (lines 16/18) when AP executes the task properly. In this case, the apprentice's embodied response attests a misunderstanding that obviously rests in not having understood the instruction. The self-translation resorts to a lingua franca (Spanish),

the choice of which is based on specific personal knowledge about the other's language proficiencies. In other cases in the German data, English is used as a default lingua franca in the absence of specific information about the addressee's language proficiency (cf. Extract 2).

In Section 4.2, we have presented three examples in which Speaker A produces a self-translation after an inadequate response by Speaker B. We have referred to three different types of responses as "inadequate": in Example 3, Speaker B produces a turn that is unlikely to be true; in Example 4, Speaker B's answer is not type-conforming and does not deliver the projected information; in Example 5, Speaker B produces an embodied candidate understanding that makes a misunderstanding of the projected action available. In all these cases, Speaker B's response contradicts either the known facts or the projections created by the previous turn. The examples in this section resemble those presented in Section 4.1, as self-translations are used to secure intersubjectivity. However, self-translations after inadequate responses seem to belong to a more restrictive environment; they only occur after a strong normative expectation of a response has not been fulfilled (e.g., after first pair-parts of adjacency pairs). In such contexts, understanding must be demonstrated by a suitable verbal or embodied response. If Speaker B does not respond in a projected way, an understanding problem becomes obvious and Speaker A responds with a self-translation.

In the final section of our analysis, we will examine cases where a self-translation by Speaker A follows Speaker B's turn that somehow fails to show affiliation with the preceding talk.

4.3 Translations after disaffiliative responses

While Speaker A's self-translations can deal with inadequate responses by Speaker B that rest on non- or misunderstandings (4.2), self-translations can also be a resource to deal with a lack of affiliation. Affiliation (in our data) concerns the endorsement of speaker's deontic, epsietmic, or affective stance, and acting in accordance with prior speaker's preferences for next actions (Lindström and Sorjonen 2012). In these cases, self-translations are not so much used to solve an understanding problem, but rather produced in pursuit of a preferred response. Typical environments are requests that are not complied with, or proposals, advice, suggestions and similar actions that are not accepted.

Example 6 from the German catering course is a case of non-compliance with a request, which is pursued by self-translation. A large public dinner is about to be served. The dishes have been prepared in the kitchen and are to be distributed.

Example 6: go go go (Gastro_1.Kurs_2.Phase_2.Tag_00033; 05:44–06:13)

```
01    OT    okay noch EIN [(teller vegetarisch);]
            okay still one vegetarian plate

02    FR    so (.) also   [jetzt geht ihr       ] mal und hier fehlt,
            alright so you just walk and here is missing

03          was fehlt hier?
            what is missing here?

04          ge+nau so;
            exactly this way
      fr-h    +spreads bell pepper on dish--->

05          (0.8)+(0.3)
      fr-h     ->+...

06    FR    alim geh du mal+*# ja?
            Alim you just walk right?
      fr-h  ...............+gives plate to AL
      al-h                 *takes plate and puts it on table--->
      fig                   #Fig.7

07          (0.6)
08    FR    und guck* dass es +dass bisschen (0.5) nett #is+ [ja; ]
            and mind that it that (is) a bit nice right?
      al-h       -->*
      fr-h  ..................+adjusts items on plate------+
      fig                                              #Fig.8

09    AL                                                    [ja- ]
                                                             yes
10          (1.1)#
      fig        #Fig.9

11    FR    so >GEH GEH DU [KOMM #GO GO GO<,     ]
            so go go  c'mon
      fig                        #Fig.10

12    AL                   [zusa- nicht zusammen?]
                            toge- not together

13    FR    nein nein nein [das wi-] dauert zu lange.
            no no no this wi- takes too long
14    AL                   [okay; ]
                            okay

15    XM    (inaudible) paprika?
                        bell pepper

16    FR    genau alles paprika sehr gut.
            exactly everything bell pepper very good
```

17 AL noch eine
another one

18 FR ÄH: ALIM KOMM (DREI) AUF KOMM **GO,**
erm Alim c'mon (three) get up c'mon

Figure 7: FR (right) hands plate over to AL (left).

Figure 8: FR adjusts items on plate.

Figure 9: Alim has put down the plate again.

The instructor (FR) asks the apprentices to start serving the dishes (line 02), specifically addressing the apprentice Alim (AL) again in line 06. However, the instructor at the same time realises that some of the dishes are not yet ready to be served and need some adjustments, which he requests from the apprentices (lines 02–03 and 08). He hands a plate to Alim (Figure 7), but then adjusts the items on the plate himself (Figure 8). In this way, a complex, possibly contradictory expectation of immediately serving versus first

improving and only then serving the dishes is created for the apprentices. In other words, it might not be clear to them if the dishes are already ready to be served or not. Alim confirms (line 09), but does not grasp the plate again, which he put down in the meantime (Figure 9). In line 11, FR responds to AL's inaction with an upgraded, repeated request to dispatch the dishes. He first uses a repeated German imperative ("GEH GEH DU KOMM,"), then switches to an English self-translation in a fast and loud voice, again repeating the imperative (">GO GO GO,<"; Figure 10).[3] This turn-design conveys urgency of the requested action (Mondada 2017). Already in overlap with the instructor's repeated request, Alim accounts for his inaction by asking "nicht zusammen" ('not together', line 12). He thus indexes that his inaction rests on a discrepant expectation concerning the serving procedure: While the instructor asks the apprentices to serve each dish as soon as its preparation is finished, Alim (who is an experienced servant) expects that several plates should be served at once. This implies that he waits until more plates are ready for serving. His account makes clear that his inaction was not caused by any problem of linguistic understanding concerning the instructor's requests, but was motivated by the assumption of a different prodecure for distributing the food. In line 13, the instructor rejects Alim's alternative logic, claiming that it will take too long. However, Alim still does not comply with the request and instead asks to wait for still another plate (line 17). The instructor responds with another upgraded request to start serving immediately, again using repetition, loud and fast prosodic delivery, and self-translation (line 18).

In this extract, self-translation does not solve the action coordination problem. While by using self-translation, Speaker A treats Speaker B's lack of compliance as a

Figure 10: Instructor points at plate.

3 Although "go go go" may also be used in non-English speaking environments to speed up work, this is the only sequence in which it is used in our entire corpus. Therefore we have to assume that it is used here as a self-translation of the German imperative.

linguistic problem, B's responses make clear that there is no linguistic understanding problem, but a mismatch of expectations concerning the task-related workflow, which is at issue. However, even when Speaker A's and B's different conceptions have become obvious to both of them, A still uses self-translation as a way to insist on his directive, as B continues not to comply.

Our last example also illustrates a case in which the L2 speaker rejects the need for self-translation, claiming explicitly that she has understood the previous turn. Example 7 is from the Finnish NGO data, a bit later on in the same conversation as Example 1. The participants have talked (switching between Finnish and Russian) about different ways of collecting feedback at an event. Before the extract, Risto has proposed distributing a questionnaire to the participants, after which Jelena has posed a question (in Russian) about the relevance of filling out a form on the spot. In the extract, Risto explains in Finnish why he thinks it is a good solution.

Example 7: Everybody participates (Museum planning 1, 234, 5:50–6:29)

```
* jelena  head
ø jelena  gaze
^ risto   hands
ˇ risto   upper body

01 Risto:   .hhhhh >ni ni tota koska muuten sit< (.)
                   so so     because otherwise then

02          me- menee se keskustelu helposti siihen
            the discussion goes easily so that

03          että .hhhh ^#että# (0.2) ^sinä  puhut^(0.2)^
            that        that         you talk
   ris                  ^.............^points at J^,,,,,^

04          ^<sinä puhut>   ^.hhh^hh (0.2)
             you talk
   ris      ^points at Katja^,,,,^
05          sitte(m) puhuu (.) museoj*johtaja tai*
            then talks the    museum director or
   jel                              *nods-------*

06          osasto*päällikkö* sit puhuu toine päällikkö
            the head of the department then talks the other director
   jel           *nods-----*

07          (0.4) ja muut on >sillee ninku< joo joo joo
                  and the others are like   yes yes yes

08          joh[taja sanoo ni nyt [mä oo hiljaa;
            the director says so now I remain silent

09 Katja:      [mhm:,
10 Jelena:                       [£mhm:,£
```

```
11 Katja:    ↑m:h[m:.

12 Risto:          [tulee *auktoriteettiasia tulee kaikki*ø et
                    it becomes an authority matter becomes everything

   jel                   *nods--------------------------*
   jel                                                  øgaze down->

13           tällä päästää sit auktoriteetøtiasioista saadaan
             with this we get rid of authority matters we get
   jel                                  ->øgaze Risto------->

14           *kaikki osallis#øtumaan#. .hhhø[hhh*
             everybody to participate
   jel       *nods------------------------------>*
   jel                      ->øgaze Katja---øgaze down->

15 Katja:                                       [mhm:,

16           (0.6)ø(1.4)
   jel          ->øgaze forward->

17 Risto:    (ponja[øl.)
              did you understand ((masculine form of the verb))
   jel           ->ø

18 Jelena:          [((smack)) okei,=

19 Risto:     =(la)=
              ((feminine ending of the verb))

20 Jelena:    *=m:-:?
   jel        *nods several times quickly->

21            (0.4)

22 Risto:     .hhh (0.2) zna*čit vse učastvujut
                         everybody thus participates
   jel                    ->*

23            vse (.) svajo [mnenije dadut.=
              everybody  tells their opinion

24 Katja:                   [mhm?

25 Jelena:    =↑daa ja ponjala.
                yes I understood

26           m[:↑m: m: m m: m:↑;

27 Risto:      [daa daa.˘
                yes yes
   ris                 leans backwards->

28 Jelena:   [mhm:?˘
   ris          ->˘

29 Katja:    [.hhh juu. .hhhh ↑#sit se# et mitem me↑ (0.2)
                yeah          then the that how do we

30           nähdään (0.8) ton niinku tulevan työn.
             see           the like future work
```

Risto gives reasons for his opinion in lines 01–08, summarising his point of view ('getting everybody to participate') in lines 12–14. Katja acknowledges this summarising turn verbally (line 15), but Jelena does not say anything. She produces a series of slight head nods (line 14), similar to the ones she produced earlier, while Risto explained his reasoning (lines 05, 06, and 12). At the end of Risto's turn, Jelena shifts her gaze from Risto, first towards Katja (line 14), then down (line 15) and then forward, looking somewhere between Risto and Katja (line 16).

Jelena's participation is thus fairly minimal after Risto has summarised his point of view. Given that Risto has provided an explanation for why they should do the action Jelena has questioned earlier, it seems that Risto is waiting for a more substantial response from Jelena. When no response follows (line 16), Risto explicitly asks Jelena if she has understood what was said (line 17), now switching to Russian, which is Jelena's strongest language. Both his question and his code-switch imply that he treats Jelena's minimal participation as potentially signalling some trouble of understanding. Almost at the same time, Jelena responds with the particle "okei" (line 18). The particle indicates 'no problem' and could also be interpreted as accepting Risto's suggestion (Koivisto and Sorjonen 2021). Right afterwards, Jelena glances at Risto and produces a minimal response accompanied by several nods (line 20). However, Risto does not treat Jelena's actions as a sufficient response: He switches to Russian and starts translating his prior turn (lines 22–23). In response, Jelena makes explicit that she understands, using a prosodically prominent (high onset) verbalisation of understanding (line 25). Risto acknowledges Jelena's turn by reduplicated confirming particles (line 27); he leans backwards, displaying nonverbally that he withdraws from his prior action, and does not continue his translation.

Jelena's position as a second language-speaker of Finnish makes it possible for Risto to treat her minimal responses as a sign of an understanding trouble. It is worth noting, however, that Jelena and Risto have had different opinions of how to perform the action in question; therefore, Jelena's minimal participation may also index reservations against Risto's proposal. Jelena's restricted language skills in Finnish offer Risto an additional opportunity to promote his idea; by switching to Russian, Risto manages to verbalise his opinion once more and thereby pursue a (positive) response from Jelena. However, Jelena treats Risto's Russian turn as specifically targeting a trouble of understanding – she does not comment on the content of the turn, but verbalises that the translation is not necessary.

In Examples 6 and 7, Speaker A uses self-translation to deal with Speaker B's lack of affiliation concerning A's prior action, such as a request (Example 6) or a proposal (Example 7). As in the cases of inadequate responses (4.2), self-translation is used as a third-positioned resource to repair a problem of intersubjectivity. However, the cases in Section 4.3 do not concern problems of (linguistic) understanding, but rather

problems of non-shared expectations concerning the organisation of an activity (Example 6) or a difference in opinion (Example 7). That is, it is not so much the notional-epistemic side of intersubjectivity that is at stake here, but the more practical-normative side concerning consensus about appropriate procedures and (joint) actions. Sometimes, the L2 speaker clearly indexes that their response to A's action is not caused by a lack of understanding (as in Example 7), but, for example, by a different idea of how to perform a task in a joint activity (see Example 6). Nevertheless, A's choice of self-translation as a resource for redoing a first action and eliciting a modified, more acceptable response from B exploits the possibility of treating B's response as indexing a linguistic understanding problem. In other words, self-translation is used here as a resource for pursuing affiliation that specifically builds on affordances created by the particulars of a participation framework involving an L2 speaker. However, since proficiency-related understanding problems of the L2 speaker occur repeatedly (to a varying extent), there seems to be a continuum between:

(a) cases in which self-translation is used in response to an action by B that A considers to be insufficient because of B's linguistic non- or misunderstanding, while in fact B has understood correctly, but does not affiliate; and
(b) cases in which A uses self-translation as a resource that strategically treats B's dispreferred response as seemingly based on a linguistic problem.

5 Discussion

This paper has reported on uses of self-translations in Finnish and German multiparty workplace interactions involving L2 speakers. In contrast to interpreter-mediated interactions, in our data translations are used by the producers of the original turns as a resource to deal locally with problems of accomplishing intersubjectivity. While such self-translations have been studied earlier in the context of code-switching in private conversations and in classroom interaction in various languages, our study is the first to study them in task-oriented workplace interaction, crucially involving practical activities and embodied actions. The particular focus of our study has been on the actions and interactional events that occasion self-translation in the workplace context. We found three recurrent sequential environments in which self-translations are used as a resource to deal with problems of accomplishing intersubjectivity. Self-translations are produced:

– in response to repair-initiations by an L2 speaker,
– when an L2 speaker has failed to produce an adequate response when some reaction was conditionally relevant, or
– in response to disaffiliative responses by the L2 speaker.

In all cases, self-translation works as repair, redoing the original action of the more proficient speaker. In particular after inadequate or disaffiliative responses, the self-translation is used to elicit a more appropriate or affiliative action from the L2 speaker.

It is important to note, however, that these distinctions are not always clear-cut. Vocalisations and particle responses produced by L2 speakers are sometimes indeterminate in the sense that it is not clear if they are produced as repair-initiators or rather as hesitation phenomena that index a problem in selecting a response (see Example 2). Such phenomena can be used to make the first speaker redo their turn in order to preempt the projectable disaffiliative response (see Davidson 1984).

Self-translations treat problems of intersubjectivity as arising from linguistic non-understanding due to a lack of proficiency. This attribution of the cause of the problem can be compared with what has been observed in L1 interaction. Open repair initiations usually are preferentially treated as indexing a hearing problem (Svennevig 2008). However, when produced by L2 speakers, they are overwhelmingly treated by L1 speakers as indexing a linguistic problem of understanding (Overath 2023; see Lilja 2010 specifically for responses to other-repeats by L2 speakers). Similarly, while third-positioned self-translations treat a prior response as exhibiting a lack of understanding, the prior turn may actually have displayed disaffiliation, in which case no linguistic problem was in play. The use of self-translation as a resource to treat the problem as a linguistic issue and not as an issue of affiliation can be a means to try eliciting a more favourable response, while avoiding making discrepant preferences or expectations overt and accountable.

Our study is not concerned with interpreter-mediated talk, but with self-translations being used as a local resource of code-switching by the primary participants themselves. The fact that translation is not a default mode in these interactions but rather a locally occasioned resource is also reflected by the linguistic design of the self-translations. As has been demonstrated in the analyses of the examples, they do not necessarily amount to a full translation of the turn that is the source of trouble. Rather, they are very selective, delivering a summary or condensed paraphrase of a multi-unit turn or even restricting themselves to translating just the most important content word that is crucial for eliciting a proper response by the L2 speaker (e.g., for identifying an intended referent or the intended action unambiguously). These reduced varieties of self-translations are produced for all practical purposes and in keeping with a preference for progressivity (Stivers and Robinson 2006). Yet, their lean design can additionally be motivated by a lack of proficiency of the self-translator and/or the addressee in the language of the translation.

In contrast to prior studies, our paper focuses on task-based workplace interaction. The different kinds of settings we have studied allows us to better understand how activity-types and characteristics of the participants occasion and affect

practices of self-translation. In workplace interaction, "let it pass" (Firth 1996) is much less an option to respond to non-understanding and insufficient responses than in mundane interaction, because proper understanding is a prerequisite for the accomplishment of joint projects. Failures of understanding here would inevitably cause cooperation problems. This is particularly evident in the case of instructions and requests, which prevail in the German data. In the practical activities of cooking, metal work, and wood work, non- and misunderstandings become unambiguously manifest by missing or inadequate responses, because a proper response is crucial for progressing or completing the task at hand. Mostly, the relevant response is not verbal, but consists of an appropriate manual action.

In terms of participants, the relationship between participants' levels of proficiency in L1, L2 and available lingua francas is crucial for when and how self-translations are produced.

Finnish L2 speakers in our data generally exhibit a much higher level of proficiency (approximately from A2 to B2, according to CEFR) than the L2 speakers in the German data (from A0 to A2).

Therefore, in the German data, most basic problems concerning understanding referential terms and expected actions prevail; in the Finnish data, in contrast, problems are rather caused by the use of specialised terminologies (language for special purposes) and by multi-unit turns that put forward some complex argumentation. While in the Finnish data mostly a switch to Russian is used, being the L1 of the participant who has exhibited (or is ascribed to) an understanding problem, in the German data it is English (or more seldom Spanish) that is used as a lingua franca for implementing the self-translation. This choice, however, is not only motivated by the missing language proficiency of the self-translator of the addressee's L1. The use of a lingua franca also importantly motivated by the multi-party participation framework of group interaction, which requires using a language that is most likely to be shared by everybody present, that is, in just this local, transient community of practice.

Appendix: Transcription symbols (Jefferson 1984)

word	utterances in Finnish/German
word	utterances in Russian/Spanish/English
word	English translations of the utterances
[ ]	starting point and end point of overlapping talk
=	latching between two utterances
(1.5)	silence measured in seconds
(.)	micro pause (less than 0.2 s)

(continued)

.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
,	level intonation
;	slightly falling intonation
word	emphasis of the underlined sounds
WORD	loud voice
°word°	quieter than the surrounding talk
↑↓	raise or fall in pitch
<word>	slower speech rate than surrounding talk
>word<	faster speech rate than surrounding talk
wo:rd	stretching of the preceding sound
wo-	cut-off of the preceding word
#word#	creaky voice
(())	transcriber's comments
(word - -)	unclear segment of talk
.hh	inhalation
hh	exhalation
££	smiley voice
->	line of interest
Embodied conduct:	
#	location of the figure in relation to talk and non-verbal action
* —>	gesture or action described continue across subsequent lines
—>*	gesture or action described continue until the same symbol is reached
–>9	gesture or action described continue until the line mentioned
….	action's preparation
„„	action's retraction

References

Angouri, Jo. 2014. Multilingualism in the workplace: Language practices in multilingual contexts. *Multilingua* 33(1–2). 1–9.

Antaki, Charles. 2012. Affiliative and disaffiliative candidate understandings. *Discourse Studies* 14(5). 531–547.

Arminen, Ilkka. 2005. *Institutional interaction: Studies of talk at work*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Auer, Peter. 1984a. On the meaning of conversational code-switching. In Peter Auer & Aldo di Luzio (eds.). *Interpretive sociolinguistics*, 87–112. Tübingen: Narr.

Auer, Peter. 1984b. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Auer, Peter (ed.). 1998. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bailey, Benjamin. 2000. Social/interactional functions of code switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics* 10(2). 165–193.

Bolden, Galina. 2012. Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair. *Language in Society* 41(1). 97–121.

Coyle, Do, Philip Hood & David Marsh. 2010. *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Davidson, Judy. 1984. Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In John Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, 102–128. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Deppermann, Arnulf & Ibrahim Cindark. 2018. Instruktion und Verständigung unter fragilen Interaktionsbedingungen: Gesprächsanalytische Untersuchungen zu beruflichen Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen für Flüchtlinge. [Instruction and sense-making under fragile conditions: Conversation analytic studies on professional trainings for refugees]. *Deutsche Sprache* 46(3). 245–288.

Dingemanse, Mark, Joe Blythe & Tyko Dirksmeyer. 2014. Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages: An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Language* 38(1). 5–43.

Dingemanse, Mark & Nick Enfield. 2015. Other-initiated repair across languages: Towards a typology of conversational structures. *Open Linguistics* 1. 96–118.

Drew, Paul. 1997. Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(1). 69–101.

Drew, Paul & John Heritage (eds.). 1992. *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Enfield, Nick J., Mark Dingemanse, Julija Baranova, Joe Blythe, Penelope Brown, Tyko Dirksmeyer, Paul Drew, Simeon Floyd, Sonja Gipper, Rósa S. Gísladóttir, Gertie Hoymann, Kobin H. Kendrick, Stephen C. Levinson, Lilla Magyari, Elizabeth Manrique, Giovanni Rossi, Lila San Roque & Francisco Torreira. 2013. Huh? What? – a first survey in twenty-one languages. In Makoto Hayashi, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding*, 343–380. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Firth, Alan. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality on 'lingua franca' English and Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26. 237–259.

Gafaranga, Joseph. 2012. Language alternation and conversational repair in bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16(4). 501–527.

Greer, Tim. 2008. Accomplishing difference in bilingual interaction: Translation as backwards-oriented medium repair. *Multilingua* 27(1-2). 99–127.

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haakana, Markku, Salla Kurhila, Niina Lilja & Marjo Savijärvi. 2021. Extending sequences of other-initiated repair in Finnish conversation. In Jan Lindström, Ritva Laury, Anssi Peräkylä & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), *Intersubjectivity in action: Studies in language and social interaction*, 231–250. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Harjunpää, Katariina & Aleksi Mäkilähde. 2016. Reiteration: At the intersection of code-switching and translation. *Multilingua* 35(2). 163–201.

Hayashi, Makoto, Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell. 2013. On the place of hesitating in delicate formulations: A turn-constructional infrastructure for collaborative indiscretion In Makoto Hayashi. In Geoffrey Raymond & Jack Sidnell (eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding*, 95–134. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Heller, Monica. 1982. Negotiations of language choice in Montreal. In John Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity*, 108–118. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Heritage, John & Steven Clayman. 2010. *Talk in action*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984. Transcription notation. In John Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*, ix–xvi. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Kraft, Kamilla. 2020. Trajectory of a language broker: Between privilege and precarity. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 17(1). 80–96.
Kim, Kyoungmi & Jo Angouri. 2023. "It's hard for them to even understand what we are saying". Language and power in the multinational workplace. *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 19(1). 27–45.
Koivisto, Aino & Marja-Leena, Sorjonen. 2021. OKAY as a response to informings in Finnish. In Emma Betz, Arnulf Deppermann, Lorenza Mondada & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), *OKAY across languages: Toward a comparative approach to its use in talk-in-interaction*, 206–233. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Kurhila, Salla. 2006. *Second language interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Kurhila, Salla, Lari Kotilainen & Inkeri Lehtimaja. 2021. Orienting to the language learner role in multilingual workplace meetings. *Applied Linguistics Review* 14(4). 697–721.
Kurhila, Salla & Niina Lilja. 2017. Toisto ja korjauksen rajat [Repetition and the boundaries of repair]. *Virittäjä* 121(2). 213–243.
Lehtimaja, Inkeri, Aija Virtanen & Minna Suni. 2021. Finnish L2 proficiency for working life: Towards research-based language education and supervision practices. *Nordand: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Andrespråksforskning* 16(1). 57–76.
Lilja, Niina. 2010. *Ongelmista oppimiseen: Toisen aloittamat korjausjaksot kakkoskielisessä keskustelussa [Other-initiated repair sequences in Finnish second language interactions]*. Jyväskylä studies in humanities 146. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä PhD dissertation.
Lilja, Niina. 2014. Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 71(5). 98–116.
Lilja, Niina & Arja Piirainen-Marsh. 2022. Recipient design by gestures: How depictive gestures embody actions in cooking instructions. *Social Interaction* 5(1). https://doi.org/10.7146/si.v5i2.130874.
Lindström, Anna & Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2012. Affiliation in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 350–369. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
Markaki, Vassiliki, Sara Merlino, Lorenza Mondada, Florence Oloff & Véronique Traverso. 2012. Choix de langues et gestion de la participation dans les réunions internationales. In Lorenza Mondada & Luci Nussbaum (eds.), *Interactions cosmopolites. L'organisation de la participation plurilingue*, 99–131. Limoges: Lambert Lucas.
Mondada, Lorenza. 2004. Ways of 'doing being plurilingual' in international work meetings. In Rod Gardner & Johannes Wagner (eds.), *Second language conversations: Studies of communication in everyday settings*, 27–60. London: Continuum.
Mondada, Lorenza. 2012. Video analysis and the temporality of inscriptions within social interaction: The case of architects at work. *Qualitative Research* 12(3). 304–333.
Mondada, Lorenza. 2017. Precision timing and timed embeddedness of imperatives in embodied courses of action. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Liisa Raevaara & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*, 65–101. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Oittinen, Tuire. 2022. Multimodal and collaborative practices in the organization of word searches in lingua franca military meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 192. 41–55.
Overath, Santana. 2023. *Interaktionskompetenz im Ausbildungskontext. Eine Untersuchung der Reparaturpraktiken von Geflüchteten in betrieblichen Gesprächen und ihre longitudinale Entwicklung*. [Interactional competence in professional training. A study of repair practices of refugees at the workplace and their longitudinal development]. Heidelberg: Winter.
Piekkari, Rebecca, Claudine Gaibrois & Marjana Johansson. 2022. A review of language-sensitive research in international business: A multi-paradigmatic reading. *Journal of Comparative International Management* 25(1). 144–174.
Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68(6). 939–967.

Roberts, Celia. 2010. Language socialization in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 30. 211–227.
Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2006. Managing trouble responsibility and relationships during conversational repair. *Communication Monographs* 73. 137–161.
Schegloff, Emanuel. 1992. Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97(5). 1295–1345.
Schegloff, Emanuel. 1997. Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23(3). 499–545.
Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2). 361–382.
Sidnell, Jack & Tanya Stivers (eds.). 2013. *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
Śliwa, Martyna & Marjana Johansson. 2014. The discourse of meritocracy contested/reproduced: Foreign women academics in UK business schools. *Organization* 21(6). 821–843.
Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, Anssi Peräkylä, Ritva Laury & Jan Lindström. 2021. Intersubjectivity in action: An introduction. In Jan Lindström, Ritva Laury, Anssi Peräkylä & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), *Intersubjectivity in action*, 1–22. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Spencer, Hazel & Jan Svennevig. 2018. Multilingual workplaces – Interactional dynamics of the contemporary international workforce. *Journal of Pragmatics* 126. 1–9.
Stivers, Tanya & Jeffrey D. Robinson. 2006. A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society* 35(3). 367–392.
Streeck, Jürgen. 2008. *Gesture craft. The manufacture of meaning*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Svennevig, Jan. 2004. Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies* 6(4). 489–516.
Svennevig, Jan. 2008. Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(2). 333–348.
Svennevig, Jan. 2013. Reformulation of questions with candidate answers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 17(2). 189–204.
Svennevig, Jan. 2018. "What's it called in Norwegian?" Acquiring L2 vocabulary items in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics* 126. 68–77.
Theódórsdóttir, Guðrún. 2018. L2 teaching in the wild: A closer look at correction and explanation practices in everyday L2 interaction. *Modern Language Journal* 102. 30–45.
Traverso, Véronique. 2012. Ad hoc-interpreting in multilingual work meetings – Who translates for whom? In Claudio Baraldi & Laura Gavioli (eds.), *Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting*, 149–176. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Urbanik, Paweł. 2021. Directives in the construction site: Grammatical design and work phases in second language interactions with crane operators. *Journal of Pragmatics* 178. 43–67.
Üstünel, Eda & Paul Seedhouse. 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(3). 302–325.
Vine, Bernadette & Janet Holmes. 2023. Doing leadership in style: Pragmatic markers in New Zealand workplace interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 20(1). 1–27.
Vöge, Monika. 2011. Employing multilingualism for doing identity work and generating laughter in business meetings: A case study. In Gabriele Pallotti & Johannes Wagner (eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*, 237–264. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.
Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as interaction*. London: Routledge.
Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual. Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bionotes

Arnulf Deppermann
Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim, Germany
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
deppermann@ids-mannheim.de

Arnulf Deppermann is head of the "Pragmatics"-department, Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim (Germany) and was visiting professor at Helsinki University 2018-23. He has published widely on Interactional Linguistics and Conversation Analysis. Recent foci of interested have been on multimodal interaction in practical activities and at the workplace, instructions in various settings (e.g., driving lessons, theater rehearsals, manual work), grammar, semantics, and action ascription in social interaction.

Ibrahim Cindark
Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim, Germany
cindark@ids-mannheim.de

Ibrahim Cindark is a researcher at the Leibniz Institute for the German Language and head of the project "communicative repertoires of migrants". His research interests include language and communication at work, second-language interaction and multilingual practices. His latest publications deal with the communicative repertoire in times of globalization and workplaces as sites of language learning.

Lari Kotilainen
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
lari.kotilainen@helsinki.fi

Lari Kotilainen is a senior lecturer in Finnish language and culture at the University of Helsinki. He has published on multilingual practices and language learning outside traditional educational settings, especially in the workplace.

Salla Kurhila
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
salla.kurhila@helsinki.fi

Salla Kurhila is a professor in Interactional Linguistics at the University of Helsinki. She has published peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and edited volumes on second-language interaction, ways of dealing with problems of understanding, interaction in different professional environments, and language learning in interaction. She is currently leading a 4-year-project on plurilingual practices in workplace interaction

Inkeri Lehtimaja
Aalto University, Espoo, Finland
inkeri.lehtimaja@aalto.fi

Inkeri Lehtimaja is a researcher at the University of Helsinki and a university lecturer in Finnish language at Aalto University. She has recently published on multilingual practices at work and professional language learning in interaction. Her research interests also cover second language teaching and learning, and classroom interaction.