Language in Society **41**, 97–121.
doi:10.1017/S0047404511000923

Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair

GALINA B. BOLDEN

Department of Communication, Rutgers University 4 Huntington Street, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA
gbolden@rci.rutgers.edu

ABSTRACT

This article examines the interactional construction of language competence in bilingual immigrant communities. The focus is on how participants in social interaction resolve problems of understanding that are demonstrably rooted in their divergent linguistic and cultural expertise. Using the methodology of conversation analysis to examine mundane video-recorded conversations in Russian-American immigrant families, I describe a previously unanalyzed communicative practice for solving understanding problems: by one participant enacting the role of a language broker in a repair sequence. The article thus contributes to the existing research on the interactional construction of language competence, on the one hand, and on the organization of repair and its relationship to social epistemics, on the other. (Language brokering, repair, conversation analysis, social epistemics, multiparty conversation, Russian, immigrant families, intercultural communication)*

INTRODUCTION

One's ability to competently participate in social interaction is ordinarily taken for granted: we treat others as capable of understanding and producing meaningful social actions. However, this assumption of competency may be suspended in interactions with categories of people who might not be seen as "bona fide members" (Garfinkel 1967) of a speech community, such as, young children and other novices (including "foreigners" and "nonnative" language speakers). While one's identity as a novice speaker of a language, for example, may appear to be relatively stable across social occasions, it is enacted in interactions with others through a range of communicative practices that expose one's relative INcompetence. For Garfinkel (1967), competence refers to a member's entitlement to manage "everyday affairs without interference" (57). This article analyzes one form such "interference" can take and describes how it makes salient participants' divergent language competencies. Specifically, the focus is on a conversational practice of repair resolution that consists of one interlocutor brokering (or mediating) understanding problems that are—demonstrably—rooted in participants' divergent linguistic (and

© Cambridge University Press, 2012 0047-4045/12 $15.00

sometimes more broadly conceived cultural)[1] expertise. Using the methodology of conversation analysis to investigate mundane conversations in Russian-American immigrant families, this study aims to further our understanding of the interactional construction of linguistic and cultural competence in bilingual/immigrant communities, on the one hand, and the organization of repair, on the other.

In recent years, the notion of competence—including language expertise—as a cognitive attribute of an individual has been challenged on a variety of grounds (e.g. Firth & Wagner 1997). It has been argued, for example, that language expertise needs to be seen NOT as an essentialist and omnirelvant property of an individual—an exogenous category that has a universally explicatory value—but as a constructed and negotiated feature of social interaction (Seedhouse 1998; Hosoda 2003; Mori 2003; Egbert 2004; Mondada 2004). Research into interactions with nonnative speakers (e.g. Hosoda 2003; Mori 2003; Egbert 2004; Mondada 2004; Kurhila 2006; Seo & Koshik 2010) has shown that just because interlocutors can be characterized as language novices, their relatively low linguistic expertise is not necessarily—or at all times—relevant to or consequential for how an interaction unfolds. This suggests that the "relevance" and the "procedural consequentiality" (Schegloff 1991) of low language expertise needs to be demonstrated in the details of participants' own conduct rather than presupposed by the analyst (cf. Sacks 1972; Wong & Olsher 2000). Studies that have examined language expertise (and the associated identities of a "novice" and "expert" language speaker) from this EMIC (i.e. participant-centered) perspective have found that participants' orientations to language (in)competencies may become evident when mutual understanding is threatened, especially when interlocutors deal with problems of hearing, speaking, or understanding by engaging in conversational REPAIR. (This literature is reviewed in a later section.) This article furthers this line of research by describing additional ways in which repair activity can expose participants' orientations to their divergent linguistic and cultural expertise.

While the vast majority of research on novice language speakers is conducted in pedagogical settings, the findings presented here are based on a close analysis of everyday face-to-face conversations between Russian-American immigrant family members and friends (see DATA and METHOD for more information). Consistent with the intergenerational language shift documented in many immigrant communities in the US (e.g. Fishman 1978; Veltman 1983; Zemskaia, Glovinskaia, & Bobrik 2001; Alba, Logan, Lutz, & Stults 2002), the older family members in my data are dominant in the language of their native country (i.e. Russian) while the younger members are stronger in the language of the immigrant country (i.e. English). In many immigrant communities, the levels of competency in the immigrant and heritage languages are seen as central to one's cultural identity (e.g. Fishman 1978; Zentella 1998; Broeder & Extra 1999). Both the maintenance of the heritage language(s) and the learning of the immigrant language(s) are intimately linked to processes of acculturation and cultural assimilation (Schumann 1986; Remennick 2003). In immigrant communities, heritage language

maintenance may be driven by and seen as an intrinsic part of the preservation of the heritage culture, while language loss might be equated with the loss of culture. The symbolic connection between language competence and cultural membership may manifest itself in everyday interactions in a variety of ways. For instance, as Nishizaka (1995) shows, assessing your interlocutors' language proficiency is one practice for invoking the addressee's identity as a "foreigner" and one's own identity as a "native." Relatedly, Kitzinger & Mandelbaum (2008) demonstrate that to display knowledge of a specialized vocabulary (e.g. a professional jargon or slang) is to make a claim about your own and your interlocutors' sociocultural identities (cf. sociolinguistic research into specialized languages of subcultural groups, such as Widdicombe & Wooffitt (1995), Russell & Murray (2004), Bucholtz (2007)). Additionally, participants may explicitly ascribe gaps in language competence to a cultural group membership (Egbert 2004). We will see here that asymmetries in both language and cultural expertise can become exposed when one interlocutor takes on (or is enlisted into) the role of a language broker to translate, paraphrase, or explain problematic talk of another party.

This article advances our understandi of how conversational repair is organized and, especially, how it is organized in a relatively unexamined domain: interactions that involve more than two interlocutors. The availability of more than two "ratified participants" expands opportunities for their participation in conversational activities (e.g. Goffman 1981; Goodwin 1984; Lerner 1992, 1993; Schegloff 1995), including their participation in conversational repair (Egbert 1997; Bolden 2011). Repair is ordinarily a dyadic exchange organized by reference to two local identities: the SPEAKER of the problematic talk and the (typically, addressed) RECIPIENT (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977). I show that, in interactions involving more than two participants who may be seen as having asymmetrical linguistic and cultural competencies, a person who is neither the speaker of the problematic talk nor the addressed recipient has a systematic opportunity to participate in the repair sequence as a "broker." To BROKER a (potential) problem of understanding is to act as an intermediary between the other participants (i.e. between the speaker of the problematic talk and his/her addressed recipient) and to attempt to resolve the problem in a way that would expose and bridge participants' divergent linguistic and/or cultural expertise—for instance, by providing a translation or a simplified paraphrase of the problematic talk.[2] Unlike some institutional contexts (such as medical offices or courtrooms), where the role of a language broker may be assigned to and occupied by a particular individual (e.g. a language interpreter), in ordinary conversation one or another participant can momentarily inhabit this role. The findings presented here will bring to light the role of socially distributed rights to knowledge—or social epistemics (e.g. Raymond & Heritage 2006)—in the organization of repair.

In what follows, I briefly discuss the data and methodology used in the study and review prior research on how conversational repair can make salient language asymmetries among interlocutors. Then, I analyze how third persons can be (a) enlisted into and (b) volunteer to enact the role of language brokers for the purposes of

resolving (actual or potential) understanding problems and how such brokering displays participants' orientations to their divergent language/cultural competencies.

DATA AND METHOD

The data for this article come from a corpus of everyday, unscripted video-recorded face-to-face interactions between family members and friends who are immigrants from the former Soviet Union currently living in the United States. Recordings come from several families (a total of approximately forty hours). The participants in the study fall into the following three generations (marked on the transcripts with subscript numerals 1, 2, and 3): (i) CHILDREN$_1$ (college age) came to the United States when they were between 1–4 years of age; based on the collected recordings,[3] their primary language is English, but they have proficiency in spoken Russian as well; (ii) PARENTS$_2$ (and others of the same generation) immigrated to the United States as adults and have lived in the US for fifteen to twenty-five years; their primary language is Russian but they have a very good command of English; (iii) GRANDPARENTS$_3$ (and others of the same generation) have also lived in the US for fifteen to twenty-five years; their primary language is Russian, and they have a somewhat limited proficiency in English. In some recordings, friends' and children's romantic partners (some of whom are monolingual English speakers) are also present. For this article, interactions that include at least three participants were selected (the maximum number of participants in recorded interactions is eight).

All data were transcribed and analyzed using the methodology of Conversation Analysis (Heritage 1984). In line with this methodology, sequences of talk in which interlocutors orient to linguistic and cultural asymmetries among them were collected and analyzed. A subcollection of (approximately forty) instances whereby more than two interlocutors engage in resolving problems of understanding was analyzed.

OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH ON REPAIR AND THE PROCEDURAL CONSEQUENTIALITY OF LANGUAGE COMPETENCIES

Conversational repair refers to a set of practices for dealing with problems of hearing, speaking, and understanding talk (Schegloff et al. 1977). In describing the repair machinery, Schegloff and colleagues (1977) distinguish between "repair initiation" and "repair solution" and between "self" (the speaker of the problematic talk) and "other" (the recipient). The initiation of repair (by either self or other) suspends the ongoing course of action until the problem ("the trouble source" or "the repairable") is dealt with. Once the repair solution is provided (by either self or other), the interrupted course of action is resumed. Based on who initiates repair and who provides the repair solution, distinctions are made between SELF-INITIATED

SELF-REPAIR (the speaker initiates and resolves the repair, typically in the same turn, e.g. when one word is replaced with another), SELF-INITIATED OTHER-REPAIR (the speaker initiates repair, but a recipient provides a solution, e.g. when a searched-for word is provided by another participant), OTHER-INITIATED SELF-REPAIR (a recipient initiates repair, e.g. with *What?*, and the trouble-source turn speaker resolves it), and OTHER-INITIATED OTHER-REPAIR (a recipient initiates and resolves the repair, e.g. by correcting something in the other person's talk).

Conversational repair thus addresses problems of intersubjectivity, including those that may be rooted in cultural and linguistic differences between the participants. Prior research has shown that the organization of repair sequences may expose participants' orientations to their divergent linguistic expertise. For instance, speakers' orientations to their interlocutor's identity as a language novice can be displayed in how they respond to other-initiated repair: for example, trouble-source turn speakers may translate the problematic talk into another language (Egbert 2004). This repair operation is illustrated in Excerpt (1), taken from a conversation between Lena and her grandparents, Mira and Tolik. Mira has been telling Lena about Tolik's (referred to as "he" at line 1) upcoming appointment with a cardiologist. (TS stands for trouble source, RI for repair initiator, and RS for repair solution. Transcription conventions can be found in the appendix.)

(1) Lung fluid (I5a)

(45:10)			
1	TS >	$LENA_1$:	Does he have fluid in his lu:ngs?
2			(1.5)
3	RI >	$MIRA_3$:	Shto?/
			what
			'What?'
4			(0.8)
5	RS >	$LENA_1$:	Zhidkast' v lëxkii?/
			fluid in lungs
			'Fluid in his lungs?'
6			(1.0)
7		TOL_3:	D[a/
			yes
			'Yes.'
8		$MIRA_3$:	[Eta: eta vada/
			that that water
			'It's water.'

Mira initiates repair on Lena's question (produced in English) with a Russian "open class" (Drew 1997) repair initiator *Shto?* 'What?' (line 3). Open class repair initiators (such as *What?*, *Huh?*) are not specific about the kind of trouble their speaker experiences and are commonly responded to with (modified) repeats of the trouble-source turn (Schegloff et al. 1977; Drew 1997; Schegloff 2004; Robinson 2006). Here, Lena produces a close translation of her English-language trouble-source turn into Russian as a repair solution, which indicates her orientation

to Mira's repair initiator as indexing a problem of understanding the LANGUAGE of her turn (i.e. English).[4] Note that Lena translates not the entire trouble-source turn but only its key component ('fluid in his lungs'), thus suggesting that the recipient's problem is limited to understanding this rather technical English term (Kitzinger & Mandelbaum 2008). Thus, the way in which Lena responds to the repair initiation displays the procedural relevance of interlocutors' linguistic expertise and, specifically, Mira's culturally bound identity as a nonproficient English language speaker.

Researchers have identified a number of other repair-related practices that expose linguistic differences among interlocutors, including the following: Language novices may produce ordinary lexical items with rising intonation in order to elicit confirmation or correction from a more proficient speaker (Hosoda 2003); Pronunciation, grammar, and lexical choices of language novices may, on occasion, be corrected by other (more expert) interlocutors (Norrick 1991; Kurhila 2006); Cultural and linguistic differences among interlocutors may be topicalized after repair is resolved (Egbert 2004).

Participants' monitoring of their own talk for potential sources of mis- or non-understanding may also reveal their orientation to differences in their linguistic expertise (Ikeda 2007; Greer 2008; Kitzinger & Mandelbaum 2008). For example, in Excerpt (2), Tanya treats a momentary silence (line 3) as indexing her addressee's problem in understanding an English word ('pasta' in line 2). Tanya and her mother-in-law Faina are in the kitchen, preparing a holiday meal. Tanya is cutting up some ingredients. Faina is asking about a salad that Tanya is making. (Curley brackets mark a borrowing from another language.)

(2) Pasta (O16)

(21:00)			
1		FAI_3:	A eta shto vot ↑eta?/ PRT this what PRT this 'And this, what is this?' ((Fiana points to a container; Tanya briefly glances at the container and returns to her cutting; both are looking down throughout the rest of the segment.))
2	TS >	TAN_2:	A- (i) eta: {pa:sta},/ PRT this pasta/paste 'This is {pasta},'
3			(.)
4	RS >	TAN_2:	eta makaronchiki takie,/ this macaroni such 'This is macaroni,'
5			(0.2)
6		FAI_3:	[Mm mm,
7		TAN_2:	[i ja sdelala: eh: ((continues to explain about the salad)) and I made 'And I made eh'

In response to Faina's question, Tanya uses the word 'pasta' (line 2). In Russian, this word means *paste*, but Russian immigrants in the US often use it as an English borrowing to refer to pasta products. When Faina does not acknowledge Tanya's response in any way (see the micropause at line 3), Tanya goes on to reformulate her answer, using a Russian word for a kind of pasta[5] (*makaronchiki* 'macaroni,' line 4). Tanya's self-initiated self-repair (via translation from English to Russian) indicates that she monitors her speech for potential understanding problems, and specifically for potential problems having to do with her interlocutor's limited expertise in English. The way Tanya repairs her talk displays procedural consequentiality of divergent linguistic expertise of the two interlocutors.

It might be tempting to believe that in a conversation that involves interlocutors with divergent levels of linguistic expertise, a low proficiency in the language is an omnirelevant concern. Research shows, however, that this is not the case (Hosoda 2003; Mori 2003; Seo & Koshik 2010). In fact, participants may (and overwhelmingly in my data do) deal with threats to intersubjectivity as if they are not related to language differences. Space considerations prevent a discussion of repair sequences where linguistic differences do NOT surface (see extract (A) in note 4 for an example). However, we will see (e.g. excerpt (7)) that even when one participant is oriented to an interlocutor's low linguistic expertise, another may not be, which argues for viewing language (in)competence as an interactional accomplishment rather than an inevitable byproduct of participants' linguistic characteristics.

The existing research has, thus, identified and described a number of important ways in which participants orient to linguistic differences among them when it comes to solving problems of understanding talk. However, the vast majority of this research has been conducted on dyadic interactions, which is a limitation given that the presence of additional participants may have a profound effect on how understanding problems are resolved (relevant literature is reviewed in the analytic sections below). In interactions with three or more interlocutors, participants may act IN COALITION with others during repair sequences (cf. Lerner 1993). For example, they may enlist others—either their compatriots or more linguistically proficient speakers—in resolving speaking and understanding problems (Mori 2003). Additionally, interlocutors may form momentary alliances along cultural lines by launching successive repair initiators on the same trouble-source turn (Egbert 2004).

This study advances this line of research by examining another role third persons can enact in conversational repair: a language (or culture) broker. The possibility of language brokering in the service of repair has been noted but not systematically investigated. For instance, Del Torto (2008) observed that in trigenerational interactions in immigrant families, second-generation speakers may participate in repair as translators between interlocutors belonging to the younger and the older generations.[6] Furthermore, Ikeda (2007) documented one aspect of language brokering (referred to as "teaching") whereby a "native speaker" steps in to translate,

explain, or paraphrase a potentially problematic utterance by one speaker for the benefit of another. The following analysis expands our understanding of language (and culture) brokering as a method for achieving intersubjectivity. Specifically, I demonstrate that when a recipient of some problematic talk initiates repair on it, she may enlist a third person into the role of a broker by addressing the repair initiation to them (excerpts (3) and (4)); alternatively, a third person may volunteer (or self-select; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974) to provide a repair solution (excerpts (5) and (6)). Moreover, third persons may repair problems in the talk of the current speaker for the benefit of the addressed recipient, thus taking on the role of a broker (excerpt (7)). The analysis demonstrates that interlocutors may deploy their divergent language and cultural expertise as a resource for expanding legitimate opportunities for participation in conversational repair.

ENLISTING LANGUAGE BROKERS

One way in which participants may orient to differences in their language/culture competencies is when they enlist third persons into the role of a language broker so that they may assist in resolving an understanding problem. In this section I discuss one practice for doing so: addressing repair initiation to somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn.

Ordinarily, the person who produces a problematic utterance (i.e. the trouble-source turn) is the one who is (tacitly or explicitly) selected to repair it (Sacks et al. 1974; Lerner 2003; Bolden 2011). This norm may be attributed to the conversational maxim to "speak for yourself" (Lerner 1996), which describes people's special right (and responsibility) to speak on their own behalf (cf. Labov & Fanshel 1977; Sacks 1984); it is also consistent with the structural preference for self-correction (over other-correction) in allowing the speaker of the trouble source to repair their own talk (Schegloff et al. 1977). In another study (Bolden 2011), I have shown that the selection of somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn to provide a repair solution is motivated by two broad considerations: implementing locally distributed rights to knowledge (i.e. social epistemics) and maintaining progressivity of a course of action. Here, I examine how these considerations play out in contexts of language brokering.

Excerpt (3) is taken from a conversation between Lena, her grandmother Mira, Aaron (Mira's brother-in-law), and his wife Zhenya. Just prior to this excerpt, Mira says that she wants to go back to doing needlework. In line 1, Lena jokingly requests that Mira not embroider any "naked ladies" (presumably, to give to Lena and her parents). This turn, which Lena produces in English, becomes the trouble source when Aaron initiates repair on it (in line 4).

(3) Naked ladies (I7a)

(39:00)

1	TS >	$LENA_1$:	No naked ladies Babushka.
			grandma
2			(1.2) ((all look at Lena; Lena looks at Mira))
3		$MIRA_3$:	[t! = Xarash[o/ Kak ty skazhi[sh/ ((smiling))
			well how you say
			'Okay, whatever you say.'
			[[
		ZHE_3:	[((turns to Mira))
		AAR_3:	[((turns to Mira))
		$MIRA_3$:	[((turns to Aaron))
4	RI >	AAR_3:	Sht[o?/ ((to Mira))
			'What?'
5	RS >	$MIRA_3$:	[Eta shtoby: eh golyx zhenschin ja ne vy [ne vyshivala/
			That that naked women I not not embroider
			'That I shouldn't embroider naked women.'
6		ZHE_3:	[Ah hah
7		ZHE_3:	Ne ljubish/ ((to Lena))
			not like
			'You don't like that'
8		AAR_3:	Ne ljubish gholyx zhenschi?n/ ((to Lena))
			not like naked women
			'You don't like naked women?'

Lena's turn in line 1 is a sequence-initiating action (a humorous request) that selects Mira as the next speaker (Sacks et al. 1974; Lerner 2003).[7] Following a gap in line 2 (which indicates some problem with this request), Mira finally responds with compliance (in Russian, line 3), thus displaying her understanding of what Lena has said. Towards to end of her response (line 3), Mira turns to Aaron (who is now looking at her), and Aaron immediately initiates repair with an open-class repair initiator *Shto?* 'What?' line 4). Via accompanying gaze (Lerner 2003), the repair initiation selects as the next speaker not the speaker of the trouble source (Lena), but Mira. Mira then immediately (line 5) provides a repair solution in the form of a Russian-language translation of Lena's trouble-source turn. Note that Aaron's selection of Mira to deal with the trouble source takes place after Mira's displayed understanding of Lena's words (in line 3). By selecting Mira (rather than Lena) to provide a repair solution, Aaron (i) displays his treatment of Lena as potentially being unable to provide an acceptable repair solution (thus, orienting to her low proficiency in Russian[8]), (ii) casts himself as potentially lacking linguistic expertise to understand Lena's repair solution (if it were provided via an English language paraphrase, for example), and (iii) casts Mira into the role of a language broker capable of acting as an intermediary between the two languages. Thus, by addressing his repair initiation to a third person, Aaron makes the participants' divergent linguistic expertise procedurally relevant to this moment in interaction. This analysis is supported by Mira's choice to provide a Russian-language translation of Lena's problematic talk in response to Aaron's initiation of repair and not, for instance, to repair her own immediately preceding turn (as is ordinarily done in

response to open class repair initiators). This demonstrates Mira's understanding that the trouble Aaron experiences has to do with his limited understanding of English (as in (1)). Following Mira's repair solution (line 5), Aaron goes on to question (and thereby challenge) Lena's grounds for her initial request (line 8).

In excerpt (4), a third person is also selected as a language/culture broker after the speaker of the trouble source turn fails to respond to the repair initiation. In line 1, Dima starts a new topic by asking his sister Anna a question about an American comedian, using a recognitional person reference form "Demetri Martin" (Sacks & Schegloff 1979; Schegloff 1996). Their mother Tanya is also present.

(4) Demetri Martin (O10)

(28:15)			
1	TS >	DIM_1:	You ever watch ehm: (0.8) a::m (0.2) az- Demetri: Martin?
			((Dima is looking down throughout))
2			(0.5) ((Tanya looks at Dima))
3		ANN_1:	Everyone talks about i[t.
4		DIM_1:	[He's s:o(h): f(h)unny.
5		ANN_1:	Cus (he's) the same name as you?
6	RI >	TAN_2:	Shto [eta takoe? ((to Dima))
			what that such
			'What is this?'
7		DIM_1:	[No(h) [he's just so funny.
			[((looks at Tanya))
8			(1.0) ((Dima looks down and takes a spoonful;
	>>		Tanya looks at Dima, then turns to Anna))
9		DIM_1:	E[:m
10	RS >	ANN_1:	[Demetri Martin, he'[s a comedian.
11		DIM_1:	[Yeah.
12		DIM_1:	heh-heh-.HH ((continues by impersonating Demetri Martin))

Several seconds into the discussion of Demetri Martin, Tanya initiates repair[9] and addresses it (via gaze) to Dima, thus selecting him as the next speaker (cf. Lerner 2003). The repair initiator *Shto eta takoe?* 'What is this?' or 'What does that mean?' (line 6) is designed to index a general problem of understanding, leaving it up to the recipient to figure out what sort of repair solution will adequately resolve the problem. Given its placement, the repair initiation appears to target the recognitional reference Demitri Martin (or perhaps the entire preceding stretch of talk) as the source of nonunderstanding. The repair initiation gets almost entirely overlapped by Dima's response to Anna's preceding question (lines 5 and 7), which raises the possibility that Dima may not have heard what Tanya said to him (though his brief gaze at Tanya in line 7 suggests that he heard her speaking). Having responded to Anna (line 7), Dima puts a spoonful of food in his mouth (line 8). Seeing this as a sign that Dima will not respond to the repair initiation, Tanya turns her gaze to Anna (line 8), thereby now selecting HER as the next speaker tasked with providing a repair solution. By choosing to select another interlocutor when the initial repair initiation has failed,

Tanya displays an orientation to the progressivity of the repair activity (Stivers & Robinson 2006; Schegloff 2007; Bolden 2011). At the same time, the selection of Anna as the next speaker treats her as capable of providing an adequate repair solution (observe that Anna has shown her understanding of Dima's trouble-source turn by responding to him in line 3). In other words, Tanya selects Anna to speak on Dima's behalf as his repair consociate (cf. Lerner 1992), putting her in a position to mediate the problem.

As a repair solution (line 10), Anna first repeats the name Demetri Martin and, then, immediately explains who the person is by providing a categorical identifier ('comedian'). The repeat treats Tanya's repair initiation as indexing a failure to hear or to "register" the name, and the categorical identifier 'comedian' treats the provided name as a nonrecognitional for Tanya and thereby attributes Tanya's nonunderstanding to her lack of relevant pop-cultural knowledge. In this way, Anna enacts the role of a (pop)culture broker for Dima and Tanya. Dima accepts the first part of Anna's repair with 'Yeah' (line 11) and then, without any further uptake of Anna's repair solution, goes on to impersonate one of the comedian's jokes (line 12). Note that both in this excerpt and in the previous one (excerpt (3)), the speakers of the trouble-source turns (Lena and Dima respectively) tacitly consent to others doing repair "for them" by letting the repair solutions stand uncontested.[10]

In this section, we examined cases in which one interlocutor selects a particular other to broker an understanding problem. While ordinarily, the speaker of a problematic utterance has the right (and the obligation) to repair his or her own talk, the examples above demonstrate that other interlocutors can be recruited into the role of language (or culture) brokers. By enlisting a third person into the role of a broker, the repair initiator shows that the selected person has relevant linguistic (or cultural) expertise to provide a repair solution—expertise that had been locally demonstrated by their engagement with the trouble-source turn. The foregoing analyses of excerpts (3) and (4) point to the possibility that intersubjectivity problems that are rooted in interlocutors' linguistic (or cultural) (in)competencies might be collectively resolved by individuals acting in concert as a single "party of experts" (Lerner 1993; Schegloff 1995).[11] Thus, when a repair initiator selects somebody other than the trouble-source turn speaker to provide a repair solution, she treats that third person as a spokesperson for the trouble-source turn speaker (capable of brokering the problem), and when this third person provides a repair solution, she complies with this role. Furthermore, when the trouble-source turn speaker concedes her rights to repair her own talk, she sanctions the other person as her repair consociate (see also Bolden 2011).

STEPPING IN AS A LANGUAGE BROKER

In the previous section's examples, a third person was selected to resolve a problem of understanding by other participants in a conversation. This section shows that an unselected third person may also step in to mediate an actual or a potential

understanding problem. Two contexts are examined. First, in other-initiated repair sequences, somebody other than the trouble-source turn speaker may self-select to respond to a repair initiation (excerpts (5) and (6)). Second, an unaddressed recipient of some potentially problematic talk may step in to preemptively resolve the problem for the addressed recipient (excerpt (7)).

Resolving understanding problems following an other initiation of repair

As discussed in the previous section, ordinarily, by initiating repair on another's talk, the repair initiator (tacitly) selects the trouble-source turn speaker as the next speaker (Sacks et al. 1974; Lerner 2003). Discussing next-speaker selection, Lerner (2003) writes: "In locating a trouble source in the prior turn, next-turn repair initiators are directed to matters of that turn's production, and therein (when not addressed elsewhere) directed to that turn's producer as the one participant ordinarily entitled to complete the repair (though not necessarily the only participant capable of doing so)" (195). In fact, Egbert (1997) demonstrated that when somebody other than the speaker of the trouble-source turn responds to the repair initiation (first), other interlocutors act in ways that display their orientation to the trouble-source turn speaker as the proper respondent (e.g. the trouble-source turn speaker will provide another repair solution). However, my data (illustrated below) suggest that when repair initiation exposes a linguistic problem, interlocutors might NOT orient to this next-speaker selection rule (unless an explicit addressing technique, such as gaze, is used). Instead, the repair initiation might be understood as having been directed to any incumbent in the "party of language experts" (cf. Sacks et al. 1974:718; Lerner 1993). By offering a repair solution, a third person (who is not the speaker of the trouble source) enacts the role of a language broker between the initiator of the repair and the trouble-source turn speaker.

Excerpt (5) is taken from a conversation between Lena and her parents, Kira (mom) and Seva (dad). On Kira's request, Seva has been retelling events of a Russian TV drama series (about World War II) that he watches and Kira doesn't.

(5) Cracklings (I6a)

(11:30)

1 SEVA$_2$: [Heh .hh [Na shkvarki gavarit tam dedok eë
on cracklings says there grandpa her
'Her old man says for cracklings'

2 n-na >devchonku xatel tam sgarela ta(k) ( ) on ga`rit <
on girl wanted there burned so he says
'the girl he wanted to burn, he says'

3 TS > nu gar`it .hhh Nu gar`t na shkvarki pajdët
PRT says PRT says on cracklings will-go
'he says, he says we can use the girl for cracklings'

4			[d-devchon[ka/
			'girl'
			[((Seva looks at Kira))
5		$KIRA_2$:	[Heh
6	RI >	$LENA_1$:	[* [What does that mean. ((*confused face))
7	RS >	$KIRA_2$:	am- Padzharit' eë [xatel/
			fry her wanted
			'He wanted to fry her.'
			[((Seva looks at Lena))
8			(.) ((Lena raises her eyebrows in shock))
9		$SEVA_2$:	tkt ((lip smacking or chewing))
10		$KIRA_2$:	(E) nu ta:k/
			PRT SO
			'He was just saying it.'

In line 1, Seva sets up to report a phrase from the show that he finds humorous. After a parenthetical explanation (line 2), Seva returns to the report of the humorous phrase, 'We can use the girl for cracklings' (meaning, apparently, that they can cook and eat the girl; lines 3–4). This telling is addressed to both Kira and Lena, as Seva moves his gaze between the two as he speaks. In response, Kira briefly laughs (line 5), claiming her understanding. Lena, however, fails to understand what Seva has said, as evident by her embodied show of confusion (eyebrows drawn together), followed by an initiation of repair (in English), 'What does that mean.' (line 6). When producing her repair initiator, Lena's body and face are oriented towards the space between Seva and Lena, so that both of them can be seen as having been addressed. However, the general rule of repair initiation (discussed above) is that it tacitly selects the speaker of the trouble-source turn (i.e. Seva) as the next speaker (unless something is done to override this tacit selection).

In line 7, immediately following Lena's repair initiation (i.e. with no gap), Kira produces a repair solution by paraphrasing (in a very simple Russian) Seva's immediately preceding unit of talk, thereby treating it as the trouble source (cf. Kitzinger & Mandelbaum 2008).[12] Observe that neither Kira nor Seva orient to Seva having been selected as the next speaker: Kira immediately intervenes with a conditionally relevant response (cf. Lerner 2002), and Seva does not go on to provide his own response to contest Kira's (see lines 8–9), as has been found in such situations (Egbert 1997). Moreover, Seva, who turned his gaze to Kira towards the end of his turn in line 4, continues to look at her while she produces a repair solution (line 7) rather than immediately shifting his gaze to Lena, as a selected speaker would. This lack of the participants' orientation to the applicability of the general next-speaker selection rule suggests the possibility that some problems of understanding—such as those rooted in participants' divergent linguistic expertise—are treated as "collective" problems that can be solved by any interlocutor capable of doing so. In this segment, Kira takes on the role of a language broker by providing a simple paraphrase of a Russian idiom used by Seva that had not been understood by Lena, and Seva (tacitly) concedes her that role by

allowing her repair solution to stand uncontested. This is particularly striking given that Kira has no independent knowledge of (and thus no entitlement to) the narrated events (having asked Seva to tell about the show she does not watch).

In excerpt (6), a third person takes on the role of a language broker by stepping in to provide a repair solution after the speaker of the trouble-source turn has failed in her attempts to do so. The excerpt is taken from a conversation between six people, three of whom take part in the segment: Luba, her daughter Nadia (sitting right next to her), and her niece Irina (sitting on the other side of Nadia). Across the table are Irina's mother (Maria), Luba's husband, and Luba's son (Victor). In line 1, Luba starts a new topic by telling Maria (her primary addressed recipient) about some jewelry they had made (lines 1–4 are in Russian).

(6) Jewelry (M3-2)

```
(17:00)
1   TS >     LUB2:   A  my sdelali vot i::z  kal'ca:: (0.5) mai.x raditelej/
                     PRT we made  PRT from ring          my parents
                     'We made out of my parents' ring'
2                    (1.2) my zhe sdelali Magen Dovidy vsem vnukam/
                           we PRT made  Magen David  all   grandchildren
                           'we made Stars of David for all the grandchildren.'
3                    (1.5) ((Maria nods))
4            LUB2:   vot Mi.sha/ Pasha./ [i: Vitja./ [i Nadja/
                     PRT NAME   NAME and  NAME and NAME
                     'Misha, Pasha, and Victor, and Nadia.'
                                         [((points)) [((looks at Nadia))
5                    (0.2)
6   RI >     NAD1:   What happened¿ ((to Luba))
7                    (1.0)
8   RS >     LUB2:   Ma[de- ((to Nadia))
9            NAD1:      [Khuh ((cough))
10                   (.)
11           LUB2:   David's star.
12                   (0.5)
13                   that we have? there is fro:m: wedding rings
14                   from your: (.) grandmother and grandfather.
15                   (.)
16           IRI1:   ↑O:h↓ really,
17                   (0.5) ((Luba nods))
18           IRI1:   That's ni:ce.
19                   (1.0)
20  RI2 >    NAD1:   What, (I-) I'm gettin' a what? kheh-heh
21                   .hh I don't get it. ((to Luba))
22  RS2 >    IRI1:   They made stars of David from your grandma and grandpa:'s:
23                   ehm wedding rings. ((Nadia continues to look at Luba))
24           NAD1:   >How< ((to Luba))
```

While, in lines 1 through 4, Luba has been directing her talk to Maria (who is sitting across the table from her), when Luba lists her daughter Nadia as one of the

recipients of the Stars of David, she looks at Nadia (the end of line 4) and holds her gaze through the gap in line 5. Nadia, having been addressed via gaze, is now put on the spot to provide a response (e.g. to assess the telling). Instead, Nadia initiates repair (in English) with 'What happened¿" a form of repair initiation that displays little grasp of the prior talk. The repair initiator is addressed to Luba (through gaze) and selects her as the next speaker. Luba treats the repair initiator as indexing Nadia's problem in understanding Russian and haltingly translates her prior turn into English (lines 8 and 11–14). This sort of repair solution displays Luba's orientation to Nadia's relatively low Russian language proficiency.

Following Luba's repair solution, Nadia remains silent (see line 15), suggesting that she may still have failed to understand Luba's words. Irina then takes up Luba's informing as news and positively assesses it (lines 16–18). During the silence at line 19, Nadia and Luba continue to look at each other, and in line 20, Nadia initiates another repair. The new form of repair initiator ("I'm getting a what?") is "stronger" (Schegloff et al. 1977) in that it displays a better grasp of the trouble source turn. Nadia then laughs (end of line 20), perhaps in embarrassment that she has not understood what is being said while others (e.g. Irina) apparently have, and then asserts her lack of understanding ('I don't get it' in line 21). Throughout her turn (lines 20–21), Nadia continues to look at Luba, thus apparently selecting her as the next speaker. However, it is Irina who steps in to provide a repair solution[13] (lines 22–23) in the form of a paraphrase of Luba's trouble-source turn in more fluent (or "correct") English. Irina's response to the second repair initiation displays her orientation to the trouble source having to do with Luba's English language expertise. By stepping in to "translate," Irina takes on the role of the language broker between Nadia (who has displayed a procedurally relevant low proficiency in Russian with her first repair initiator) and Luba (who has displayed a procedurally relevant low proficiency in English in her repair solution). Similarly to excerpt (5), Irina's language-broker role is tacitly accepted as the conversation moves forward (see line 24) without any further attempt on Luba's part to fix the problem.[14]

The two segments examined here suggest that, when a repair initiation indexes a problem of understanding rooted in participants' divergent language competencies, the speaker of the trouble-source turn may not be the only interlocutor having the right to provide a repair solution. Other participants capable of doing so (due to their linguistic expertise) might self-select to respond to the repair initiation and, thereby, enact the role of a language broker. Two pieces of evidence suggest that this mode of participation in the repair sequence is not seen as an encroachment onto the other's interactional territory (or a violation of the turn-taking system; Sacks et al. 1974): First, such responses by third persons may be offered immediately following the repair initiation in an unmitigated fashion (as in excerpt (5)), and, second, unlike parallel situations in which third persons intervene but not for the purposes of language brokering (Egbert 1997), other participants do not contest these responses in any way and the conversation moves forward (see

excerpts (5) and (6)). This suggests that the role of a language broker may be a legitimate mode of participation in repair sequences that address intersubjectivity problems rooted in participants' divergent linguistic expertise. Trouble-source turn speakers appear to orient to the person doing the brokering as their repair consociate, tacitly sanctioning their responses (as argued in the previous section as well).

Monitoring for and repairing potential understanding problems

We have seen that a third person may step in to provide a repair solution when one of the interlocutors displays a lack of understanding by initiating repair on some bit of talk. An example presented in this section shows that unaddressed recipients monitor talk of others for POTENTIAL language-based understanding problems and can step in to attempt to solve them. This monitoring is evident when a third person repairs somebody else's talk for the benefit of another participant (a form of other-initiated other-repair).

Consistent with the conversational maxim to "speak for yourself," other-initiated other-repair (such as other-correction)—whereby a recipient repairs or corrects the speaker's utterance—is a structurally dispreferred form of repair that is quite rare in conversation (when compared to self-repair) (Schegloff et al. 1977). One possible exception to the dispreferred status of other-repair may be story-telling sequences during which "an 'as-of-some-point-non-teller' of a story … may use other-correction of the teller as a bid, or subsequently as a vehicle, for being a co-teller of the story—making, with the initial teller, a 'team'" (Schegloff et al. 1977:380). In these contexts, a co-teller is a "story consociate" who has experiential access to the events being told that is equal to (or greater than) the other teller (Lerner 1992, 1993). Unlike the context of co-telling, in my data (exemplified by excerpt (7) below), the person doing repair on another person's talk has NO epistemic claim to what is being said; instead, she takes on the role of a language broker to "translate" or explain what is being said to another party (the addressed recipient of the talk that is deemed problematic). In other words, a third person may license her entry into a particular action sequence by enacting relevant linguistic or cultural expertise (cf. Ikeda 2007).

Excerpt (7) is from a conversation between Mira, Aaron (her brother-in-law), and Zhenya (Aaron's wife). Lena, Mira's granddaughter, rejoins the conversation just prior to line 1. Mira had just said to others that she used to have beautiful handwriting.

(7) Handwriting (I7a)

(25:10)

1	$MIRA_3$:	Krasivyj u baby byl k- (.) ↓u menja ja imeju vvidu
		beautiful with nana was with me I have in-view
		'Nana had beautiful… What I mean is I had'
2	$LENA_1$:	Heh-heh-[HH

3	TS >	$MIRA_3$:	[Ochen' krasivy pocherk/
			very beautiful handwriting
4			(0.5) ((Aaron turns from Mira to Lena))
5	>>	AAR_3:	[(Ana) pisala/
			she wrote
			[((Mira and Aaron make handwriting gestures))
6	>>	$MIRA_3$:	Krasiva pis[ala/ [panima¿esh/
			beautifully wrote understand
			'I wrote beautifully, you see?'
			[((Lena nods))
7		$LENA_1$:	[Ja panimaju/
			'I understand.'

When Lena returns to the table, Mira recaps for her (in Russian) what she has been talking about (lines 1, 3): her (Mira's) beautiful handwriting. A response from Lena (e.g. an acknowledgement or an assessment) is due following this announcement, but Lena remains silent (see the gap in line 4). During this gap, Aaron turns from Mira to Lena and then explains to Lena—verbally and through gesture—what Mira meant by the word 'handwriting'[15] (line 5). Simultaneously, Mira makes a handwriting gesture and then (in line 5) incorporates Aaron's clarification into her own talk (thus tacitly accepting his repair solution; line 6). Subsequently, Lena claims understanding by nodding and saying 'I understand' (lines 6–7).

By stepping in to do a repair operation on Mira's turn and by choosing to paraphrase and gesturally illustrate the word "handwriting," Aaron displays his orientation to Lena's lack of relevant linguistic knowledge and acts as a language broker. Rather than allowing Mira an opportunity to repair her own talk (according to the preference for self-repair) or for Lena to initiate repair on her own behalf, Aaron steps in and thus claims some level of entitlement to what Mira has said. Aaron's intervention suggests that interlocutors may claim rights to aspects of others' talk on the basis of their linguistic expertise. Unlike situations in which thirds persons act as co-tellers with the main teller by virtue of their shared access to the events being told (Lerner 1992), in examples like excerpt (7), third persons claim rights to the domain of general linguistic knowledge (rather than the particularized knowledge of the events spoken about) by providing clarifications or translations of the words used.

In this section, we examined cases where a third person (e.g. an unaddressed recipient) takes on the role of language broker either in response to a repair-initiation or as a result of his or her own monitoring of others' talk. First, other initiation of repair may be treated as directed to any of the language "experts" (rather than only selecting the speaker of the trouble-source turn; see excerpts (5) and (6)). Second, participants may use their linguistic knowledge to repair the talk of another speaker for the benefit of that speaker's addressed recipient(s) and, thus, claim some level of entitlement to the trouble-source talk (excerpt (7)). All of this suggests that participants can deploy their language expertise as a license to broker (potential) understanding problems for others. Interlocutors seem to orient to the person inhabiting

the broker role as a repair consociate who can, uncontestedly, act in alliance with (or in place of) the trouble-source turn speaker.

CONCLUSIONS

This article examines mundane interactions between family and friends in Russian-American immigrant families. The focus has been on how participants resolve problems of understanding that are demonstrably rooted in their divergent linguistic (and cultural) expertise. Contributing to the extant research on the interactional construction of language (in)competence, on the one hand, and on the organization of repair, on the other, the article has described a previously unanalyzed communicative practice for solving understanding problems: by one participant enacting the role of a language (or culture) broker in a repair sequence. Several ways in which brokering can emerge have been examined. An interlocutor can be recruited into the role of a language broker by a repair initiation addressed to him or her (excerpts (3) and (4)) or he or she may step in (by self-selecting) to respond to a repair initiation addressed to the speaker of the problematic turn (excerpts (5) and (6)). Furthermore, an interlocutor may repair the talk of another speaker for the benefit of the addressed recipient (as a form of other-correction; excerpt (7)). As we have seen, all of these situations display, in various ways, participants' orientations to differences in their language (and cultural) expertise.

Prior research on the organization of repair in conversations with nonnative speakers has examined repair operations that display speakers' orientations to their addressee's relatively low language expertise (such as translations from one language to another and simplification of the trouble source). The findings presented here show that ways of participating in the repair activity are also methods for enacting linguistic and cultural asymmetries (see also Mori 2003; Egbert 2004; Egbert, Niebecker, & Rezzara 2004). Even though the speaker of the problematic talk is ordinarily entitled to and responsible for carrying out repair operations on it, language brokering opens up opportunities for legitimate participation in repair sequences. The data suggest that participants may deal with understanding problems that are rooted in language asymmetries among them as "collective" problems, with the broker acting as a "repair consociate" (Lerner 1992, 1993) of the trouble-source turn speaker. More generally, the presented findings expand our—currently limited—understanding of how repair is accomplished in multiparty interaction (Egbert 1997; Bolden 2011).

In this study, brokering is examined as a role an interlocutor can enact during the repair activity for the purposes of resolving (or averting) an understanding problem. Prior research on communication in immigrant communities has identified language brokering as a role typically taken up by bilingual children to mediate between monolingual family members and outside institutions as a form of community interpreting (Morales & Hanson 2005) and, occasionally, as an activity one bilingual family member takes on to facilitate interactions between older and younger

generations (Ng, He, & Loong 2004; Del Torto 2008). The findings presented here detail conversational mechanisms through which the brokering activity can be accomplished, thus contributing to an understanding of interactional processes involved in doing brokering. In my data, brokering is not restricted to particular family members, nor is it restricted to translations from one language to another. Rather, brokering emerges as a local solution to a particular interactional problem; its form (who brokers, on whose initiative, and in what way) reflects contingencies of the local sequential context.

The findings presented here have implications for our understanding of social epistemics (e.g. Raymond & Heritage 2006), that is, how participants in interaction manage socially distributed rights to knowledge. While, ordinarily, conversationalists have a privileged access to their own experiences and, thereby, a right and a responsibility to speak on their own behalf (Labov & Fanshel 1977; Sacks 1984; Lerner 1996), this study suggests that participants can use asymmetries in their language (and cultural) competencies to gain (and/or be granted) the right to speak on behalf of others (see also Bolden 2011). We have seen that language brokering is an endogenous method for solving understanding problems and thereby promoting intersubjectivity. However, in some circumstances this same communicative practice may have an effect of marginalizing or even excluding language (and culture) novices from social interaction (e.g. when language interpreters speak in place of, rather than for, their clients; see Bolden 2000). Further research into how participants negotiate their entry into others' interactional territories for the purposes of achieving intersubjective understanding would shed additional light on interactions across language and cultural boundaries.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

The transcripts are based on conversation-analytic transcription conventions developed by Jefferson for English (Sacks et al. 1974).

Transcription conventions used for both Russian and English

[ ]	simultaneous or overlapping speech or nonvocal conduct
=	no interval between utterances
(0.2)	timed silences in seconds
(.)	micropause
word	stressed sound
wo:rd	prolonged sound
wo-	cut-off sound
°word°	quieter than surrounding talk
↑ ↓	markedly higher/lower pitch
> word <	quicker speech
< word >	slowed speech
.hh	hearable inhalation
hh	hearable exhalation
wo(h)rd	interspersed laugh tokens
(word)	uncertain hearing
( )	undistinguishable hearting
((looks at Ann))	transcriber's comments and descriptions of nonvocal conduct

Transcription conventions for English

word.	falling intonation
word,	continuing intonation
word?	rising intonation
word¿	somewhat rising intonation

Transcription conventions for Russian

The first line of the transcript represents Russian speech (see Bolden (2008) for an explication of the transliteration system). The second line is a word-for-word translation into English. The third line is idiomatic translation with minimal prosodic information.

Unit boundary intonation

, ? ¿	placed after the syllable carrying the distinct intonation contour (comma or questioning intonation) that will be actualized at the unit boundary
/	unit boundary; if no intonation symbol is placed in the preceding unit, it marks default, somewhat falling pitch contour
./	marks final pitch drop that is larger that the default, unmarked pitch drop

Other marks

{word} English borrowing

Abbreviations

TS	trouble source
RI	repair initiation
RS	repair solution
PRT	particle

NOTES

*I would like to thank Irene Koshik, Jenny Mandelbaum, Jeff Robinson, Jack Sidnell, and the two anonymous referees for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

[1]The relationship between the concepts of "language" and "culture" is, of course, very complex (for a review, see e.g. Duranti 1997). Here, the term "language expertise" (or "linguistic expertise") refers to competence in what is traditionally described as the "grammar" of a language (including its vocabulary).

[2]In the literature on immigrant communities, the term "broker," or "language broker," is often used to refer to an individual who routinely takes on the task of translating or mediating between others (Morales & Hanson 2005; Del Torto 2008). Here, this term is used for an identity bound to the repair activity. See also CONCLUSIONS.

[3]No language-proficiency testing or surveys were administered. In this, the study adopts an EMIC prospective on language expertise. What is important for this study is not measured or reported language proficiency, but how interlocutors themselves observably orient to each other's language abilities in particular interactional moments.

[4]In many (but not all) cases in my collection, the repair initiation is produced in the language that is not the language of the trouble source (as in excerpt (1), line 3). Given that in bilingual conversation the choice of one or the other language can be viewed as a feature of turn design (Szymanski 2003), the repair initiator's shift to another language might contribute to constructing the problem as a LANGUAGE problem. However, the picture is more complicated since this sort of language switch on repair initiations is not always treated by others as indicative of a language problem per se, as illustrated by excerpt (A) (see line 4).

(A) M1-2 (19:20)

1	TS >	IRI_1:	[It's] tra̲shy. = also,
2			(.)
3	RI >	MAR_2:	Shto?/
			'What?'
4	RS >	IRI_1:	It's tra̲:shy.
5			(0.2)
6		MAR_2:	Pachemu¿/
			'Why?'

The choice of a particular language when initiating repair might be accounted for (by participants as well as outside analysts) in a variety of ways: for example, it might be seen to instantiate the speaker's general tendency to use one language over another (e.g. Russian for older speakers and English for younger ones, as in (A)), or as sensitive to the recipients' language competencies. For analyses of various issues involved in conversational codeswitching, see, for example, Auer (1998) and Bailey (2000).

[5]In Russian, there is no one specific word for pasta products in general. *Makarony*, or the diminutive *marakonchiki*, is a Russian word used to refer to pasta varieties that resemble macaroni.

[6]Del Torto's (2008) analysis of language brokering is unfortunately based on audio recordings of face-to-face interactions. The lack of a video recording prevents an examination of nonvocal behaviors that are crucial to understanding how a third party becomes involved in a repair sequence (e.g. whether s/he was selected or not and whether some nonvocal behaviors precipitated the involvement).

[7]While the position immediately following the trouble-source turn is a common site for initiating repair, the underdressed recipients (Aaron and Zhenya) refrain from initiating repair at this junction, respecting Lena's selection of Mira as the next speaker (cf. Schegloff 2000).

[8]Note that there is no other viable account for why Lena would not be able to repair her own talk as she is still fully engaged in the conversation.

[9]Observe that similarly to (3), Tanya refrains from initiating repair immediately following the trouble-source turn (i.e. during the gap in line 2), respecting the fact that Dima's turn was addressed to Anna and selected her as the next speaker (see Schegloff 2000). However, Mom does not respect Anna's selection of Dima as the next speaker at line 5 and interjects with a competing action.

[10]While this is a "negative observation" (Schegloff 2007), its analytic relevance is grounded in the fact that, in conversation, when somebody speaks on behalf of a co-present party, that party has the right and the responsibility to confirm (or reject) what is being said and, in this way, (re)claim their entitlement to speak on their own behalf (e.g. Lerner 1996).

[11]Prior research on repair in multiperson interactions suggests that other sorts of collectivities might be invoked/created via repair sequences, for example, a collectivity of pre-present interactants (able to provide a repair solution) vis-à-vis a new arrival (Lerner 1993).

[12]Kira's choice to provide a Russian language paraphrase rather than an English language translation may have to do with her not (immediately) knowing how to translate this rather uncommon word. However, a simplified paraphrase is another repair operation commonly used with less-than-fully proficient interlocutors.

[13]Irina's stepping in to solve the problem demonstrates her orientation to a preference for progressivity, whereby a response from a nonselected recipient is preferred over no response (Stivers & Robinson 2006). The fact that it is Irina (and not, say, Maria) who provides the repair solution is consistent with Egbert's (1997) observation that, when repair solutions are provided by third persons, it is typically the person who had responded to the trouble-source turn (and, thus, demonstrated an understanding of it), who does it.

[14]Nadia's continuous gaze at Luba throughout Irina's translation in lines 23–24 treats Irina as an "invisible" party who simply translates. Coincidently, this is the recommended gaze configuration for interpreter-mediated interactions in institutional settings.

[15]The Russian word for 'handwriting,' *podcherk*, is morphologically quite removed from the words 'writing' *pisat'* and 'hand' *ruka*, so its meaning would not be obvious to somebody who does not already know the word.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard; John Logan; Amy Lutz; & Brian Stults (2002). Only English by the third generation? Loss and preservation of the mother tongue among the grandchildren of contemporary immigrants. *Demography* 39:467–84.

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

Bailey, Benjamin (2000). Social/interactional functions of code switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics* 10:165–94.

Bolden, Galina B. (2000). Towards understanding practices of medical interpreting: Interpreters' involvement in history taking. *Discourse Studies* 2:387–419.

——— (2008). Reopening Russian conversations: The discourse particle *-to* and the negotiation of interpersonal accountability in closings. *Human Communication Research* 34:99–136.

——— (2011). On the organization of repair in multiperson conversation: The case of "other"-selection in other-initiated repair sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 44:237–62.

Broeder, Peter, & Guus, Extra (1999). *Language, ethnicity and education: Case studies on immigrant minority groups and immigrant minority languages*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Bucholtz, Mary (2007). Word up: Social meanings of slang in California youth culture. In Leila Monaghan & Jane E. Goodman (eds.), *A cultural approach to interpersonal communication: Essential readings*, 243–67. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Del Torto, Lisa M. (2008). Once a broker, always a broker: Non-professional interpreting as identity accomplishment in multigenerational Italian/English bilingual family interaction. *Multilingua* 27:77–97.

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

Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, Maria M. (1997). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 611–34.

——— (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization: Some conversational events that trigger linguistic and regional membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36:1467–98.

———; Lilo Niebecker; & Sabrina Rezzara (2004). Inside first and second language speakers' trouble in understanding. In Rod Gardner & Johannes Wagner (eds.), *Second language conversations*, 178–200. London: Continuum.

Firth, Alan, & Johannes Wagner (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal* 81:285–300.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1978). *Language loyalty in the United States*. New York: Arno Press.

Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, Charles (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 225–46. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Heritage, John (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. New York: Polity Press.

Hosoda, Yuri (2003). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics* 27:25–50.

Ikeda, Tomoko. (2007). *Facilitating participation: Communicative practices in interaction between native and nonnative speakers of Japanese*. Austin: University of Texas, Austin dissertation.

Kitzinger, Celia, & Jenny Mandelbaum (2008). Word selection and social identities in talk. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Kurhila, Salla (2006). *Second language interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Labov, William, & David Fanshel (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Lerner, Gene H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15:247–71.

——— (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13:213–45.

——— (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59:303–21.

——— (2002). Practice does NOT make perfect: Intervening actions in the selection of next speaker. Plenary address to the Conference on Language, Interaction, and Culture, University of Los Angeles, California.

——— (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society* 32:177–201.

Mondada, Lorenza (2004). 'Doing being plurilingual' in international work meetings. In Rod Gardner & Johannes Wagner (eds.), *Second language conversations*, 18–39. London: Continuum.

Morales, Alejandro, & William E. Hanson (2005). Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27:471–503.

Mori, Junko (2003). The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36:143–84.

Ng, Sik Hung; Anping He; & Cynthia Loong (2004). Tri-generational family conversations: Communication accommodation and brokering. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 43:449–64.

Nishizaka, Aug (1995). The interactive constitution of interculturality: How to be a Japanese with words. *Human Studies* 18:301–26.

Norrick, Neal R. (1991). On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16:59–83.

Raymond, Geoffrey, & John Heritage (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society* 35:677–705.

Remennick, Larissa (2003). Language acquisition as the main vehicle of social integration: Russian immigrants of the 1990s in Israel. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 164:83–105.

Robinson, Jeffrey D. (2006). Managing trouble responsibility and relationships during conversational repair. *Communication Monographs* 73:137–61.

Russell, Carol L., & Thomas E. Murray (2004). The life and death of Carnie. *American Speech* 79:400–16.

Sacks, Harvey (1972). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational materials for doing sociology. In David N. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*, 31–74. New York: Free Press.

——— (1984). On doing "being ordinary." In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 413–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———, & Emanuel A. Schegloff (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 97–121. New York: Irvington Publishers.

———; ———; & Gail Jefferson (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In Deirdre Boden & Don H. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and social structure*, 44–70. Cambridge: Polity Press.

——— (1995). Parties and talking together: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In Paul ten Have & George Psathas (eds.), *Situated order: Studies in social organization and embodied activities*, 31–42. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

——— (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In Barbara A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 437–85. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

——— (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics* 21:205–43.

——— (2004). On dispensability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37:95–149.

——— (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———; Gail Jefferson; & Harvey Sacks (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53:361–82.

Schumann, John H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7:379–92.

Seedhouse, Paul (1998). CA and the analysis of foreign language interaction: A reply to Wagner. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30:85–102.

Seo, Mi-Suk, & Irene Koshik (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42:2219–39.

Stivers, Tanya, & Jeffrey D. Robinson (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society* 35:367–92.

Szymanski, Magratet H. (2003). Producing text through talk: Question-answering activity in classroom peer groups. *Linguistics and Education* 13:533–63.

Veltman, Calvin J. (1983). *Language shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Widdicombe, Sue, & Robin Wooffitt (1995). *The language of youth subcultures: Social identity in action*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wong, Jean, & David Olsher (2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11:111–28.

Zemskaia, Elena Andreevna; Marina Iakovlevna Glovinskaia; & Marina Anatolevna Bobrik (2001). *Jazyk russkogo zarubezhja: Obshie processy i rechevye portrety* [*The language of Russian emigration: General processes and linguistic portraits*]. Moscow: Wiener slawistischer Almanach.

Zentella, Ana Celia (1998). Multiple codes, multiple identities: Puerto Rican children in New York City. In C. Hoyle & Carolyn Temple Adger (eds.), *Language practices of older children*, 95–112. New York: Oxford University Press.

(Received 9 October 2010; revision received 20 February 2011;
accepted 24 February 2011; final revision received 25 May 2011)