Open Access

Gunilla Jansson*, Cecilia Wadensjö and Charlotta Plejert

Managing complaints in multilingual care encounters

DOI 10.1515/multi-2016-0043

Abstract: Troubles-telling and complaints are common in contexts of care for older people and need to be managed by care staff in a respectful manner. This paper examines the handling of an older person's complaints in multilingual care encounters that involve participants who do not share a common language. The data consist of video-recordings and ethnographic fieldwork in a residential home for older people in Sweden that is characterised by a variety of languages and backgrounds. The findings are based on analyses of multi-party interactions involving an Arabic-speaking resident and caregivers with different levels of knowledge in different languages. We focus on complaint sequences when the resident expresses a negative stance (displeasure, anger, etc.) towards some difficult circumstance. Using the methodology of conversation analysis, we analyse the affect-regulating work through which the caregivers attempt to turn a pressing situation into a moment of cheerfulness and intimacy. The analyses bring to light the multilingual practices that the caregivers draw upon in pursuing this work, such as translating and giving voice to the resident's complaining.

Keywords: affect-regulating work, care encounters, complaints, conversation analysis, multilingual practices

1 Introduction

Migration and mobility have transformed the modern Swedish workplace, from a monolingual setting to a multilingual one. In many workplace settings

***Corresponding author: Gunilla Jansson**, Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden, E-mail: gunilla.jansson@su.se

Cecilia Wadensjö, Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism; Institute for Interpreting and Translation Studies, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Charlotta Plejert, Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden; Department of Culture and Communication, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden; Department of Social and Welfare Studies, Centre for Dementia Research, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

© 2017 Jansson et al., published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License.

Brought to you by | Linköping University Library
Authenticated

Download Date | 9/5/17 11:40 AM

throughout the world, people make use of a range of linguistic resources to build rapport with clients and co-workers and to achieve their communicative goals while doing their work (e. g. Holmes 2005). The need for handling multilingualism becomes an increasingly important issue for professionals who need to interact with and provide services for individuals with whom they do not share a first language, or even a common language (Gunnarsson 2014; Meyer and Apfelbaum 2010). How different participants in a workplace with diverse backgrounds and roles manage multilingualism in interaction has been the focus of a range of studies in recent research (e. g. Blackledge, Creese and Hu 2015; Creese et al. 2016; see also Angouri 2014). These studies reveal that the role of language and verbal communication in the multilingual workplace varies across jobs, roles and sites. While some studies highlight the heterogeneity of communicative repertoires that people move between in institutional encounters for the purpose of negotiating identity positions and managing everyday tasks (Creese and Blackledge 2015; Blackledge, Creese and Hu 2015; Jansson 2014), other studies cast light on the language regimes that confront and constrain migrant workers (Angouri 2014; Cuban 2008). For instance, communication plays a relatively limited role for a meat-processor worker operating along a conveyer-belt (Piller and Lising 2014) compared to a market trader in a market-hall who in his/her everyday work needs to accomplish commercial transactions with customers from a variety of backgrounds (Blackledge, Creese and Hu 2015). From a linguistic anthropological perspective, these studies have provided insight into the experiences of participants in the kind of linguistically diverse setting we are studying. Marginalisation resulting from an insufficient opportunity to practice the local language at work or in the community, as well as a loss of dignity and sense of frustration from being labelled as unskilled due to a non-standard accent, are all recurrent themes in these studies. There are also studies that account for multilingual settings where participants are positioned as competent bilinguals. In this case, difference is commonplace and something that people live with, and it even can have a unifying effect since engaging with others is a social skill that does not require proficiency in the standard language (e. g. Creese and Blackledge 2015; Blackledge, Creese and Hu 2015).

One place where communication plays a prominent role is the work site of care and healthcare professionals. These individuals often work in multilingual environments and their work tasks require them to manage relationship-building talk and develop empathy and trust with clients (e. g. Erickson and Rittenberg 1987; Jansson 2014; Plejert et al. 2014; Roberts et al. 2004; Yates 2015). The work site under investigation in the present article is a residential home for older people, a setting that is becoming increasingly linguistically diverse. This is not only because the care for the elderly sector employs a high proportion of

migrant workers, but also because the number of elderly in need of long-term care with a foreign background is rapidly increasing in the Scandinavian countries, as well as in many other parts of the world (Plejert et al. 2017). The article highlights the multilingual practices of care workers in coping with the challenges that become increasingly pressing in multilingual residential caregiving contexts, where providing emotional support and trust is paramount. One such challenge that we are concerned with in this study is the management of residents' troubles-telling and complaints.

In most service-providing contexts – such as commerce and marketing, (Blackledge, Creese and Hu 2015), medical settings (Ruusuvuori and Lindfors 2009) and emergency service (Monzoni (2009) – customers' and clients' complaints about services and treatment are featured in interactions. Whatever the institutional setting might be, the management of the service recipient's complaints constitutes a professional challenge for the service provider. As the present article will demonstrate, the service provider's navigating between roles and frames (Goffman 1974) in the care encounter plays a significant role for the development of the complaint interaction. This is in line with previous work on client encounters in other service-providing settings. For example, Blackledge, Creese and Hu (2015) demonstrate how sales assistants at a meat market maintain convivial relationships with their customers in order to make sales interactions proceed smoothly.

With regard to the caregiving setting explored in the present study, the handling of residents' complaints about personal misfortunes and ailments was an everyday phenomenon. In this kind of setting, complaints are often related to the client's privacy and emotional life. The difficulty of handling them tends to increase along with the seriousness and delicacy of the trouble. Arguably, the degree of empathy and engagement in the caregiver's responsive mode is therefore of great importance for the client's well-being. This is something that is emphasised in previous research on carer-elderly relationships (Grainger 1993; Grainger et al. 1990). Several studies have however pointed out that caregivers generally refrain from engaging in extended sequences of troubles-telling. They rather resort to a controlling responsive mode in the course of task-completion. For instance, Grainger et al. (1990) demonstrate how the care recipients' complaints about personal troubles are constantly avoided, made light of or dismissed through compliance-gaining strategies and evasive techniques. Such deflection of troubles-talk, they argue, constrains older people's opportunities to discuss delicate issues.

The socio-relational aspects of complaining have also interested scholars within the tradition of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA; for an introduction to this methodology see Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008). The vast body of CA-research

points towards some issues that are of relevance for the study of complaining, independent of the social context in which it occurs. One such issue is the emergent and co-constructed nature of complaints. As demonstrated by several studies (e. g. Schegloff 2005; Traverso 2009), the progression from a potential complaint into something that can be defined as a complaint proper is a joint activity. Another issue concerns the delicacy of complaining. Several scholars have described complaints as typically introduced in a stepwise fashion and treated as a delicate and problematic activity that concerns personal, often intimate aspects of the complainant's affairs (Edwards 2005; Drew 1998; Mandelbaum 1991/1992). Due to pitfalls and difficulties, the participants tend to engage in the activity for long periods of time (Traverso 2009). Further, Schegloff (2005) notes that parties may orient towards something as a social problem, what he calls "complainables", even without that having been articulated by any overt complaint. Taken together, the observations generated from CA-studies suggest that people do not engage in complaining lightly, something that is valid in the data analysed in the present article.

Although complaints have been explored in a diversity of social contexts, ranging from everyday conversations (Dersley and Wootton 2000; Traverso 2009) to institutional settings (Heinemann 2009; Monzoni 2009; Ruusuviuri and Lindfors 2009), complaints that are articulated and managed in institutional care work is to date, a small domain of sociolinguistic research. The settings in previous studies have been predominantly monolingual. An exception is a case study by Plejert et al. (2014), in which the response practices employed by a caregiver to address an older woman's expression of resistance of taking a shower are investigated. That study demonstrates how the lack of a shared language makes it very difficult for the caregiver to handle the actual content of the care recipient's complaint.

The present study adds to the existing research by examining multi-party settings including two or more caregivers of whom at least one has knowledge – even if in some cases very limited – of the resident's language. Focussing on an Arabic-speaking resident's troubles-talk in caregiving settings where issues of infringement on autonomy and privacy are at stake, we demonstrate how the caregivers deploy a variety of resources to actively and proactively deal with the resident's complaints. Whereas previous scholars have focused on the ways in which complaints are deflected or rejected by care workers, in this article we apply a CA-approach to shed light on other types of responses to complaints, namely mitigation and affect-regulation through strategic performances of cheerfulness. We analyse three examples of everyday events in multilingual caregiving settings that all entail a trouble. Unlike previous research (Plejert et al. 2014), which has highlighted how mutual understanding is jeopardised

due to the lack of a common language, we show how participants manage to achieve their goals with a minimum of shared linguistic resources. Drawing on insights gained from ethnographic fieldwork, we make sense of the ways in which the participants mobilise multiple resources – including language, prosody, gestures and body posture – to handle a pressing situation. The analysis centres on complaint sequences when the resident expresses a negative stance (displeasure, anger, etc.) towards some state of affairs. The examples selected for this study comprise complaints as they are defined in the CA-literature (e. g. Drew 1998; Edwards 2005; Emerson and Messinger 1977; Schegloff 2005). Making a complaint in our definition is “the stage at which sometimes vague perceptions of something being wrong are cast into the public domain” (Emerson and Messinger 1977: 399). In our examples, the complainable matters are external, such as a person, a fact, an object, a situation or a difficult circumstance. Drawing on video-recorded and transcribed sequences of interaction, we demonstrate how a complaint emerges, develops and is repeated both locally and across settings, and how it is received and treated by the caregivers. We analyse multi-party interaction involving at least three people: a resident with a linguistically diverse background and two or more caregivers with different proficiencies in different languages.

Before turning to the analysis of multilingual practices in managing a resident’s complaints, we account for our data and the ethnographic details of the setting. In the conclusion, we discuss the communicative complexity of multilingual caregiving settings, where shared linguistic resources can do much, but are not the sole solution to all challenges.

2 Data collection

This study is part of a larger project about multilingual practices in older people’s care in Sweden. The overall aim of the larger project is to explore how caregivers and trainees in residential care are prepared in vocational education to meet the communicative challenges and complex demands of a multilingual workplace. One of the issues discussed concerns how the diversity of language backgrounds among staff is used as a resource in the workplace. The data for the present study was collected as a part of ethnographic fieldwork carried out by one of the authors in a residential home for older people in Sweden, which consisted of 15-20 hours each week during day and evening shifts, from December 2014 until June 2015. During this period, a combination of participant observation and audio/video-recordings was used to generate both comprehensive insight into the overall routines of the setting and details about

the environment at hand, its inhabitants, and the different activities with which they were engaged.

The fieldwork resulted in approximately 30 hours of video documentation, alongside field notes produced throughout the entire fieldwork period. In addition, semi-structured interviews with the care staff were conducted. During the fieldwork, the researcher also discussed on a regular basis issues related to the everyday life in the residential home with the staff and the residents.

3 Participants and setting

The participants in this study are eight care workers (under the pseudonyms Tara, Jada, Lena, Moa, Medina, Stina, Sandra and Rafa). All are females, as is the resident, here called Adila. The research site is a somatic unit in a residential home for older people in Sweden, whose residents' primary challenges lie in the area of mobility. At the unit, three out of 15 residents have a language background other than Swedish. One of these is Adila, who is an Arabic-speaking woman in her eighties who immigrated to Sweden from Syria during old age to connect with her son. She does not speak Swedish at all. When this study was carried out, Adila had lived seven years at the care unit. Adila is a warm-hearted, convivial and generous person with much humour. This is how the care workers perceived her, and how one of the authors grew acquainted with her during the fieldwork. When it came to the handling of Adila's private belongings, she had precise wishes. In cases when there were violations against her existing care routines, she was frustrated, which resulted in persistent requests and troubles-talk. This may explain why the care workers sometimes perceived her as demanding and tiresome.

Four of the caregivers (Tara, Jada, Medina and Rafa) are multilingual with an immigrant background. All of them were born and socialised in a country outside of Sweden. Swedish is their second or third language. They describe their oral skills in Swedish as well functioning when communicating with the Swedish-speaking residents on the floor. Jada, Medina and Rafa are native speakers of Arabic. Medina is a speaker of the same variety as Adila's, Syrian Arabic, whereas Jada is a speaker of Iraqi Arabic and Rafa speaks a Saudi Arabic variety. All these varieties seemed to function in communication with Adila. Three of the caregivers (Lena, Moa and Stina) are native Swedes, speaking Swedish as their first language. Finally, Tara is a native speaker of Kurdish and Sandra is Spanish speaking. Only Jada, Medina and Rafa describe themselves as proficient speakers of Arabic, while the others' knowledge of the language is very limited or non-existent.

4 Transcriptions

Conversational video-recorded data in Arabic have been transcribed and then translated into Swedish by a proficient speaker of the two languages. Translations from Swedish into English have been made by one of the researchers and proof-read by a Swedish-speaking English native speaker. Each Swedish utterance is given an English translation in italics right beneath it. Translations follow Swedish spoken language style as closely as possible, with the attempt of making them reasonably idiomatic in English. Two translation glosses are provided under each line in Arabic. The first gloss follows the word order of the transcribed talk word-by-word. The second gloss is an idiomatic English translation.

5 Ethical considerations

The study was approved by the Regional Committee for Research Ethics. All caregivers and residents in the study consented to participate. The staff, the residents, and their relatives were informed by means of a letter – and in personal encounters with the researcher who conducted the data collection – about the aims of the study and about their rights as participants. All names are pseudonyms.

6 Empirical data and analysis

Using ethnographic and conversation analytical methodologies, including the systematic observation of the interaction with a resident who has a linguistically diverse background, the present study seeks to unpack the nature and the sequential organisation of complaining in multilingual caregiving settings. The use of conversation analysis (e. g. Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008) for this purpose offers an opportunity to study the routine grounds of everyday work at the care unit by analysing the everyday-talk events that take place therein. This offers a lens through which to examine the nature of complaining as it occurs and is dealt with in the turn-by-turn interaction between the Arabic-speaking resident and the care staff. The ethnographic approach ensures that the analysis relies on continuous and repeated observations.

For this article, we have selected instances of multiparty interaction involving at least two caregivers with various knowledge of the resident's language. Three examples of complaint interaction, divided into five excerpts, and all of which entail a trouble in terms of an upcoming complaint, have been chosen for

closer analysis. The troublesome matters in these examples are all related to clashes between privacy, public space and institutional order (Falk et al. 2012). As will be seen, the analysis of these examples suggests certain similar interactional features between them. Most importantly, the examples all include some form of mitigation and affect-regulation, when the caregivers attempt to turn a pressing situation, when a complaint is underway, into a moment of amusement and cheerfulness. The analysis unravels the communicative practices, encompassing both multiple languages and embodied conduct, deployed by the participants in pursuing this affect-regulating work.

7 Analysis

7.1 Doing cheerfulness

Excerpt 1 illustrates how a caregiver makes efforts to turn a rather pressing atmosphere in the day room, marked by explicit complaining, into a pleasant one by “doing cheerfulness”. The example involves the Arabic-speaking resident (Adila) and two caregivers, one of whom (Jada) is a native speaker of Arabic, whereas the other (Tara) has very limited knowledge of this language. Jada and Sandra are in the kitchen region preparing dinner. Tara is in the day room laying the tables. There is only a counter separating the kitchen from the day room, which allows the caregivers to communicate with each other, both verbally and by gaze. Adila is sitting in her wheelchair in the day room in front of a group of people, a co-resident and her relatives, who are celebrating a birthday party. The complainable in this example is related to the conduct of these people and the difficulty it has caused Adila. This group of people – with the manager’s approval – have placed themselves in a corner of the day room that Adila regards as her private sphere and is normally considered her space by the care staff. In this corner, Adila usually sits in an armchair for the entire day. This particular afternoon, the birthday celebrators are gathered around a table just close to where Adila has her habitual place. Moreover, they have put their coats in Adila’s armchair, resulting in Adila’s not being able to sit there. This circumstance makes Adila distressed and frustrated, and she has expressed complaints to the caregivers the entire afternoon. The excerpt below illustrates a climax when Adila has an outburst regarding her discontent, right in front of the birthday celebrators. We demonstrate how Tara, who is at the centre of where things take place, upholds a positive attitude by using the Arabic word *yalla* (‘hurry up’), which she repeats in a cheery manner in contrast to the resident’s

embodied stance of complaining. When the excerpt begins, Tara has just arrived from the kitchen region with a food trolley in order to prepare the tables for the dinner, and she is currently standing at a table folding serviettes. Adila is sitting in her wheelchair at the opposite side of the table, facing the table with the guests and with her back turned to Tara. In the background, one can hear the buzzing of cheerful voices and laughter from the birthday celebrators.

Excerpt 1. ‘Yalla yalla’. A = Adila (Arabic-speaking resident); T = Tara (Swedish- and Kurdish-speaking caregiver); J = Jada (Swedish- and Arabic-speaking caregiver); S = Sandra (Swedish- and Spanish-speaking caregiver).

01. ((Tara is standing at the table folding
02. serviettes))
03. T: *yalla*.
‘hurry up’
((glances at A))
04. (1.1) ((T is folding serviettes))
05. A: *yalla sh↑o*
hurry up what
‘what hurry up’
((turns her head aside to Tara))
06. T: *jɛa*
07. ‘yeah’
(4.1) ((T is folding serviettes))
08. glances at the table with birthday guests))
09. A: *tarfɛi lech*.
know-2SG-FEM why
‘do you know why’
((gesticulates with right arm))
10. (0.9) ((T folds a serviette; looks at the table
11. with birthday guests))
12. T: *hej la:*.
hello no
‘hello no’
((looks at the table with birthday guests))
13. A: (↑xx) *la*.
‘(xx) no’
14. (1.7) ((T folds a serviette))
15. T: *yalla yalla*.

- 'hurry up hurry up'
16. (1.9) ((T folds and puts a serviette on the table))
17. A: *valla* (*tarfi*.)
 or know-2SG-FEM
 'or do you know'
18. (0.3)
19. T: *hon säger yalla yalla*
 'she says hurry up hurry up'
 ((gesticulates; turns to J in the kitchen))
20. J: *ɛja(h) aɛ hh* ((looks at A))
 'yea(h) a hh'
21. (1.3) ((T puts knives and forks on the table;
22. glances at the birthday guests))
23. A: *stallamo mashallo hada hon*.
 rule-3PL not-let someone here
 'they take the command and do not let anyone stay here'
 ((A gesticulates with left arm))
24. (8.7) ((T looks after a male resident who is
25. sitting at another table))
26. A: *vala vala ma-mahAL e* (.) *L↑I:.*
 no no pla- place (.) me
 'no no pla- place for me'
 ((gesticulates vividly with both arms))
27. (1.3) ((T puts knives and forks on the table))
28. T: *hon e arg.* (.) *hon* (xxxx)
 'she is angry (.) she'
 ((S smiles and looks at Adila))

In line 03, Tara looks up at Adila and issues a summons in Arabic, *yalla* ('hurry up'). This summons is launched without any perceivable action from Adila preceding this turn. In response, Adila challenges the caregiver's summons by asking in return, *yalla sh↑o* ('what hurry up'). Tara responds with a Swedish acknowledgement token, *jɛa* ('yeah') while glancing at the table with the birthday guests. While folding and putting serviettes on a dinner table, she now and then looks up, moving her gaze between Adila and the birthday guests. At line 09, Adila issues an information-seeking question in Arabic, *tarfi lech*. ('do you know why'), while gesticulating with her right arm. After 1.5 seconds of folding serviettes, Tara responds with a

cheerful summons, *hej la:*. ('hello no'), while gazing at the birthday celebrators. Whereas the segment *hej* ('hello') is a Swedish greeting phrase (that also can be used colloquially as a summons to call for someone's attention), *la* ('no') is a negation particle in Arabic. In line 15, Tara recycles the Arabic phrase *yalla yalla* ('hurry up hurry up'), with a loud and cheerful voice, while laying down folded serviettes at the table. Following Adila's turn in line 17, *valla (tarfi)* ('or (do you know)'), Tara addresses her Arabic-speaking colleague Jada who is passing by in the kitchen. In line 19, she reports about Adila's behaviour to Jada. While waving vividly with her right arm, thus animating Adila's indignation and mocking her for her behaviour, she quotes her speech with a cheery voice, *hon säger yalla yalla* ('she says hurry up hurry up'). The item *yalla* ('hurry up') that Tara recycles here is possibly a voicing of the Arabic word *valla* ('or') in Adila's prior turn, here with a vocal equivalent that is recognizable to her. Jada responds with an acknowledgement token, *ja(h)ahh* ('yes'), with laughter in her voice. She then leaves the kitchen while smiling. In line 23, Adila launches a complaint that is formulated as a third party complaint through the use of the verb phrase *stallamo* ('they take the command') in Arabic in which the suffix morpheme *-o* indicates third person plural reference. While gesticulating with her right arm, she describes the party celebrators' conduct as manifestly having been at fault by blaming them in Arabic for having taken command in the day room in a manner that leaves no space for anyone else, *stallamo mashallo hada hon*. ('they take the command and do not let anyone stay here'). This circumstantial account of a transgression that involves a grievance on the part of Adila, the complainer, marks this turn as a complaint. In line 26, when Tara is engaged in looking after a resident who is crumpling the serviettes that Tara has folded, Adila escalates her complaining by means of explicit and unmitigated devices. While gesticulating vividly with her both arms, she expresses her indignation about the guests' conduct. With an affectively charged extreme case formulation (Pomerantz 1986) in Arabic, *vala vala mah-mahAL e (.) L↑I:*. ('no no pla- place for me'), she specifies the difficulty that the guests' behaviour has caused her. The end of this turn is delivered with heightened pitch and in a loud volume. Tara reacts to this squeal of outrage with a report in Swedish on what she perceives as a display of anger on the part of Adila (line 28), *hon e arg* ('she is angry'). This reported depiction attributes a negative affective stance to Adila. Since Tara is out of camera range when producing the report, it is not possible to determine to whom it is addressed. It may be addressed to the resident sitting nearby and/or to Tara's colleague Sandra, who is in the kitchen region and at that moment smiling and gazing at Adila, or the report is a self-directed comment.

In Excerpt 1, "doing cheerfulness" with a restricted repertoire in the resident's language is used as a strategy to cope with a challenging setting. Due to her limited knowledge of Arabic, Tara cannot address the specific content of Adila's complaint turns (cf. Plejert et al. 2014, for similar findings). By means of mitigating devices,

such as cheerful summons, gesticulating and recycling the Arabic word *yalla*, Tara makes efforts to create a nice and pleasant atmosphere. Interestingly, Tara launches her first *yalla*-summons even before Adila has verbalised her frustration, indicating that the caregiver understands the setting as possibly pre-figuring a recognisable course of action. The fact that Tara has gained insight into Adila's concerns since the early afternoon through reports that she has received from her Arabic-speaking colleagues, in addition to her knowledge about Adila's care routines, makes the complainable recognisable for her. Moreover, the perception of Adila's conduct as acts of complaining becomes transparent for Tara through prosody and other nonverbal cues that signal indignation. Despite the fact that the Arabic-speaking caregivers tried to explain to Adila that the corner where she usually sits is a public place (in settings preceding this example), she did not give up her complaining until the birthday celebrators had left.

7.2 Defining a trouble

An essential component of dealing with complaints is the clarification and specification of the nature and seriousness of the troubled situation. This is what the participants are dealing with in Excerpts 2 and 3, where they have limited access to a common language. The excerpts illustrate what Emerson and Messenger (1977) describe as the definitional dimensions of complaints, namely that complaints publicise a trouble and explicate the source of the trouble. The analysis centres on the multiple resources, multimodal as well as multilingual, that the participants draw upon in managing issues of deviance, wrongdoing and remedial attempts. We demonstrate how one caregiver's playing out the role of mediator between the resident and a less experienced colleague helps reducing the resident's discontent and eventually makes her give up her complaint.

Excerpts 2 and 3 are part of a course of complaint events targeting the same complainable matter, and taking place the same afternoon over the course of a couple of hours. Both excerpts are drawn from the mealtime in the late afternoon. The troublesome situation that causes unease in this example is the fact that one of the caregivers, Moa, has violated the existing routines agreed upon among the care staff at the care unit in handling Adila's laundry. Since Moa is a newly recruited staff member at the unit, she has not yet learned Adila's care routines. Also, contrary to her colleague Lena, who has learned some words and phrases in Arabic, Moa does not know any Arabic at all. Normally, Adila gets her laundry back on the same day as the caregivers take it from her apartment to the laundry room. In order to meet the resident's wishes, the caregivers take the

laundry from her room in the morning and have it washed at once. On this particular day, Moa has taken the laundry from Adila's room in the afternoon. Since there was no time for having it washed at once, and not even the same day, Moa has put the laundry in a cupboard in the laundry room, resulting in questions and objections from the resident the entire afternoon about her laundry having disappeared. None of the Arabic-speaking caregivers who could have explained the situation for Adila were in charge this afternoon.

In Excerpt 2, the more experienced caregiver, Lena, navigates between inter-professional interaction with her colleague Moa and face-to-face interaction with the resident. In this sequence, Lena voices the resident by reusing the Arabic word for 'laundry' in Adila's complaint, namely *aasil*, which Lena pronounces as *rasil*. Lena is standing behind the counter in the kitchen region serving the meal to the residents. Moa is standing outside the counter facing the dayroom and leaning against it. Adila, who has already been served her meal in her apartment, is sitting in her wheelchair in the day room right in front of the food counter and well in sight of the caregivers. When the excerpt begins, the caregivers have been talking about some residents, who are in their rooms and who need to be accompanied to the dinner table.

Excerpt 2. 'It is you that she wants to get at.' A = Adila (Arabic-speaking resident); L = Lena and M = Moa (Swedish-speaking caregivers).

01. A: *wen (.) w?en hatteti aasiliti*.
 where put-2SG-FEM laundry-my-FEM
 'where have you put my laundry'
02. (1.3) ((relatives to a co-resident are passing by
 03. and greeting))
04. L: *nu har'u ställt till de sår'u'nte kan*
 now you've got yourself into a mess so you can't
05. *pra[ta me henne heller*
 'talk with her either'
06. A: [*shilti o aasaltin*↑*i*
 take-2SG-FEM and wash-2SG-FEM
 'did you take it and wash it'
07. L: *ras?il (.) de e dej hon vill åt*
 'rasil (.) it's you that she wants to get at'
 ((the caregivers look at A))
08. (0.4)
09. A: *shilti o aasaltin*↑*i*
 take-2SG-FEM and wash-2SG-FEM

- 'did you take it and wash it'
10. (0.3)
11. M: 'va e de'rå (.) tvätten (eller) (0.3) va're de
'what is that then (.) the laundry (0.3) what is that'
12. du sa tidigare (0.3) eller nån svordom
'you said earlier (0.3) or some swearword'
((turns her gaze to L))
13. L: gå å förklara för henne å säj att Mohammed eller,
'go and explain to her and tell her that Mohammed or'
14. (1.9) ((the caregivers gaze at each other))
15. L: ADILa
((turns gaze to A))
16. (0.5)
17. L: MohAMMed
18. (1.1)
19. L: tar din rasçIl (.) MohAMMed rasçIl
'takes your rasil (.) Mohammed rasil'
((leans forward over the counter; looks at A))
20. (1.6) ((L is leaning forward and gazes at A))
21. A: aasçil aasalitli o talaaeto ven.
laundry wash-3SG-FEM and take-3SG-FEM where
'she washed the laundry, where has she taken it'
((makes arm gestures))
22. L: ja men hon vEt inte (.) hon e nY:.
'yes but she doesn't know (.) she is new'
23. (2.3) ((A looks at the caregivers))
24. L: Mohammed i natt (0.3) när du sover
'Mohammed tonight (0.3) when you sleep'
25. (1.3)
26. A: la:.
'no'
((tilts her head back))
27. L: jQ↑:o
'yea'
28. (0.6)
29. A: iljçom iljom.
'today today'
((makes hand gesture))
30. (0.8)

31. L: *nū nū ska du tvätta*
 'now now you have to wash it'
32. (2.1)
33. M: *hm̥:*
34. (0.7) ((L smiles and glances at A))
35. M: **e hon surpuppa nu ell̥er**
 'is she a sourpuss now or'
 ((smiles and glances at A))
36. L: *j̥a:↑a*
 'yea'
 ((nods, smiles and looks at A))

Throughout this sequence, the caregivers inter-collegial talk serves a central function in framing the event as a complaint scene. Following up on Adila's queries, Lena makes use of what Schegloff (1988) labels "negative observations", a rather explicit device used for making complaints. The explicit expression in lines 04-05, targeting Moa's conduct, *nū har'u ställt till de sår'u'nte kan prafta me henne heller* ('now you've got yourself into a mess so you can't talk with her either'), attributes to Moa the role of a troublemaker. By doing so, Lena consolidates the trouble as an interpersonal matter. Picking up on *aasaltil↑i* ('wash') in Adila's query in line 06, Lena voices an approximation of the Arabic word for 'laundry', *rasʔil*, pronouncing this item with a rising intonation that matches the prosodic contour in Adila's prior turn. Subsequently, she reports in Swedish to her colleague that she is now the target of the resident's negative affective valence. The expression, *de e dej hon vill åt* ('it's you that she wants to get at') both depicts the resident as wilful and indexes a complainer-complaine relationship. Adila then reiterates her query about the washing of her laundry in Arabic (line 09). In line 11, Moa requests her colleague for clarification, possibly regarding the item *rasil* highlighted in Lena's turn in line 07, followed by a series of quietly produced candidate understandings (Kurhila 2006). As noted by Kurhila (ibid. 155), a candidate understanding functions as the first pair part of an adjacency pair, since it projects a confirmation or a rejection, followed by an explanation in case of inaccuracy, as a next relevant turn. In the example at hand, Moa's articulations of her interpretation of the resident's vocabulary, one of which represents Adila as one who swears (see line 12, *eller nån svordom*, 'or some swearword'), are not dealt with in the ensuing interaction. This is notable since Moa's interpretation, which aligns with Lena's depiction in Swedish of Adila as angry at her, is inaccurate and in need of an explanation. Instead, Lena prompts her colleague to explain the troublesome situation for Adila with an unmitigated request (line 13).

After the lapse in line 14, when the caregivers gaze at each other, Lena shifts her gaze and bodily orientation towards Adila (line 15). She summons her with a first name address, pronounced with increased volume marking a change of footing (Goffman 1981). She then leans forward over the countertop and announces a remedy to the trouble in mixed Swedish and Arabic, namely that Mohammed, (who works the night shift) will take her laundry. This announcement is recycled in line 19 with a highlight of the keywords that are recognisable for Adila, *MohAMMed raṣil* ('Mohammed laundry'). In response, Adila formulates the history of the trouble by reporting on Moa's action, *aaṣil aasalitli o talaqeto ven*. ('she has washed the laundry, where has she taken it'), while making an arm gesture. Leaving out the resident's query about her laundry, Lena responds with a counterargument in Swedish, which is a relevant next action in a disagreement sequence. *ja men hon vEt inte (.) hon e nY:*. ('yes but she doesn't know (.) she is new'), thereby justifying Moa's action. Thus, she treats the resident's contribution in Arabic as a potential act of blaming that calls for an explanation, even though it is impossible to determine how much of its content is understandable for Lena. She possibly recognises the Arabic segment /aasil/ in *aaṣil* ('laundry'), a word she uses in her interaction both with Adila and Moa (see lines 7 and 19), and 'Mohammed', the name of the person who works the night shift. Lena then makes a renewed effort to announce a remedy (line 24). What follows is a series of oppositional moves signalling disagreement. In line 26, Adila objects to Lena's answer with a negative response particle in Arabic, *la:*. ('no'), emphasised phonetically with a lengthened vowel, and bodily with a tilting head movement. Lena counters with a polarity term in Swedish, *jQ↑:o* ('yea'), to which Adila responds with a further display of opposition (line 29), *ilj̣om iljom*. ('today today'), indicating that she has understood that Lena suggests postponing the handling of her laundry. Here, Lena rephrases the resident's contribution in Arabic into an urgent request in Swedish to Moa, attributing to Moa the responsibility for the resident's discontent (line 31), *nu nu ska du tvätta* ('now now you shall wash'). The urgency of Adila's request is upgraded from 'today' to 'now', a move that escalates the severity of the trouble, which is further strengthened in the subsequent inter-professional exchange (lines 35-36).

In this sequence, the participants work on describing the troublesome situation and defining the source of the trouble, albeit from different perspectives and with different alignments taken towards the severity of the trouble. In the caregivers' inter-collegial interaction in Swedish, Adila, who at least initially only wants to know where the caregivers have put her laundry (see lines 01, 06, 09 and 21), is portrayed as an indignant complainer, an aggrieved party who has been severely transgressed upon. The climax is reached at the

end of the sequence (lines 35-36), where Adila is collaboratively depicted as a ‘sourpuss’ (Sw. *surpuppa*) by the caregivers. Moa, who is defined as the one who is responsible for the troublesome situation, is made accountable for her actions by Lena’s follow-ups in Swedish of Adila’s contributions in Arabic. In sum, Lena here takes on the role of a third party, navigating between the role of a trouble-shooter and an instigator. What is striking in this example is the way in which the participants manage to achieve their goals with a minimum of shared linguistic resources. Except for the item *rasil*, Lena’s approximation of the Arabic word for ‘laundry’, she has so far used only Swedish in her responses to the resident’s contributions in Arabic. Despite this fact, Adila and Lena, at least in parts of the interaction, manage to respond to each other’s moves with a relevant next action. This is evident in the disagreement sequence (lines 24-29), where an argument is followed by a counterargument. For instance, Lena’s claim in Swedish in line 24 is dismissed by Adila’s counterargument in Arabic in line 26, and is met by further opposition in line 29. Adila thereby shapes her responses as affective stances that are recognisable as defiance against Lena’s assurance that Mohammed will bring her laundry. Thus, Adila demonstrates a considerable degree of agency when formulating, revising and redefining the caregiver’s proposed course of action. The fact that Lena in turn rephrases the resident’s protest in Swedish to her non-understanding colleague further strengthens the portrayal of Adila as entitled to control her privacy.

Excerpt 3, which follows upon Excerpt 2, develops after some minutes of inter-collegial interaction between Lena and Moa. The interaction in Excerpt 3 is drawn from an audio recording (the multimodal descriptions in this transcript are based on field notes). The spatial positions of the participants are the same as in Excerpt 2. In this excerpt, Lena pursues her role as a mediator, which generates further accounts of the origin and causes of the trouble as well as justification of the complained-of action. The remedial proposal to wait for Mohammed, the night shift, that was originally contested, is now redefined and accepted as a solution. We demonstrate how the caregiver by way of proximity of the bodies creates intimacy and thereby manages to achieve her goal – to get the resident to align with her proposed remedial course of action.

Excerpt 3. ‘Inshalla inshalla.’

01. A: *wen aasil?it*
 where laundry-my
 ‘where is my laundry’
02. L: *↑AH(.) fsa hon rasil igenf hahahahaha.hh (0.3).h*

03. 'AH (.) she said rasil again'
(1.0)
04. L: *Adila lyssna*.
'Adila listen.'
05. (0.7) ((L leaves the kitchen; sound of
06. shutting door))
07. A: *wen hçattitin*.
where put-3SG-FEM-it
'where has she put it'
08. (0.6) ((L steps forward to A))
09. A: *aakhatin*.
taken-3SG-FEM
'she has taken it'
10. (0.3) ((L bends down on her knees close to A))
11. L: *natten*. (0.4) *Mohammed*,
'the night Mohammed'
12. (1.9)
13. A: *aasalit o (.) tlaat fi*.
washed-3SG-FEM and out went-3SG-FEM with
'she washed and went out with it'
((A points at Moa))
14. (0.7)
15. L: *la::*.
'no'
16. (0.8)
17. A: *valla*
'or'
18. (1.7)
19. L: *hon visste inte*.
'she didn't know'
20. (2.1)
21. A: *e: hattatin matrah*
e: put-3SG-FEM-it somewhere
'e: she has put it somewhere'
22. (1.2)
23. A: *taht el:, (0.4) rah el:.-*
under the (0.4) went the-
'under the (0.4) went the-'
24. L: *lyssna (0.3) Mohammed (.) i natt när du sover*.

- 'listen (0.3) Mohammed (.) tonight when you sleep'
 ((leans head aside and puts hands at her temple))
25. (1.4)
26. (A:) °m°
27. (3.3)
28. A: *inshalla inshalla*.
 if-God-wants if-God-wants
 'God willing God willing'
29. (1.4)
30. L: *shatoura shatoura*.
 good-FEM good-FEM
 'good good'

When the resident asks for her laundry in Arabic in line 01, Lena emits a squeal of vocalisation delivered with loud volume and elevated onset pitch, ↑*AH*, followed by a report to her colleague, produced with smile voice, *£sa hon rasil igen£* ('she said rasil again') and a stream of laughter tailing off into in-breaths. This emotional reaction to Adila's repetitious use of the Arabic word for 'laundry', signalling amused surprise, constitutes what Goffman (1981) has called a "response cry", here accomplishing a change of framing (Goffman 1974) of the event from seriousness to amusement. Lena then calls for Adila's attention, whereupon she leaves the kitchen region and steps forward to the resident (lines 04-06). In what follows, Adila accounts for Moa's past actions (lines 07, 09, 13, 21 and 23) by referring to her in the third person (note the Arabic verb inflections *h_iattitin.*, *aakhatin.*, *aasalit* and *tlaat*), thereby making Moa accountable for the complained-of actions. Lena, for her part, reiterates her argument about Mohammed, the night shift, and justifies her colleague's action as excusable with reference to her status as newly recruited (lines 11, 19 and 24). While doing this, she moves close to Adila and bends down on her knees, which enables her to face Adila from an equal position. In line 24, while issuing her argument about the night shift, she highlights her argument with an iconic gesture by leaning her head aside and putting her hands at her temple. Here, after the 3.3 second pause in line 27, when Lena still is kneeling and gazing at the resident, Adila displays alignment with the caregiver's argument by recycling an Arabic routine phrase, *inshalla inshalla*. ('God willing God willing'). Lena responds by assessing Adila's compliance as praiseworthy with an appraisal term in Arabic, *shatoura shatoura*. ('good good').

In this excerpt, the participants reach a consensus, thus achieving intersubjective understanding. Moreover, at least for the time being, Adila seems to stop worrying about her laundry. Here, the caregiver achieves her goal of

making Adila compliant. As in Excerpt 2, Adila's query about her laundry is not addressed by the caregiver. Still, the caregiver manages to design her turns by means of restricted resources in Arabic, so as to coherently link to Adila's prior turn and thereby accomplish courses of action. For instance, Lena's negation particle in Arabic, *la::*. ('no') in line 15, accomplishing a disclaim, follows as a relevant next action to Adila's report in Arabic on Moa's complained-about actions in line 13. Likewise, Lena's appraisal term in Arabic in line 30, which accomplishes a praise, is launched as a sequence closing assessment of a successful reached-at consensus. After this episode, Adila did not complain any more about her laundry having disappeared.

7.3 Staging a complaint scene

In the following example, divided into two excerpts (Excerpts 4 and 5), it is the caregivers who set the scene for a complaint and invite the resident to partake in staging the complaint scene, thereby forestalling a potentially conflictual situation. We demonstrate how the caregivers frame the complaint scene as a playful and amusing event. This example, where a complaint under way is anticipated by the caregivers' mitigating moves, illustrates what Schegloff refers to as 'complainability'. Schegloff (2005) is concerned with how complainability, the possibility of complaining, can inform interaction without an actual complaint ever being articulated. He demonstrates how the anticipation of a complaint on the way can result in the non-surfacing of the complaint itself. This is what occurs in Excerpts 4 and 5. The excerpts involve Adila, a Swedish-speaking co-resident (Elsa) and three caregivers, two of whom are native speakers of Arabic (Medina and Rafa), and one of whom is a native speaker of Swedish with no knowledge of Arabic (Stina). It is one of the Arabic-speaking caregivers, Medina, who initiates the complaint scene. In the ensuing interaction, she at moments appears to speak on the resident's behalf by translating talk for Stina. Stina is engaged with repotting the pot plants in the corner of the day room where Adila has her habitual place. Rafa is administering the medicine to Elsa, who is sitting in her wheelchair watching the repotting activity. The thing is that Adila regards these plants as her private belongings. She takes care of them and waters them every day. Some of them stem from seeds of exotic fruits that her son has bought for her.

Excerpt 4 illustrates the initial scene setting of the event. The analysis focuses on the caregivers' practices in staging a complainable event that calls for a relevant display of emotion. We demonstrate how the complainable feature of the event is rendered visible and accountable, and how the indignation it

triggers merges into agreeable surprise and amusement. When Excerpt 4 begins, Medina and Adila are approaching in the corridor. Adila has been resting for some hours in her room, and does not know what they are doing with 'her' plants. Thus, the caregivers might have felt that Adila has been transgressed upon, when not having been informed about the repotting of her plants. This is the setting that frames the interaction below.

Excerpt 4. 'What have you to do with my plants?' A = Adila (Arabic-speaking resident; E = Elsa (Swedish-speaking resident); S = Stina (Swedish-speaking caregiver); M = Medina (Swedish- and Arabic-speaking caregiver); R = Rafa (Swedish- and Arabic-speaking caregiver).

01. ((Medina and Adila are coming in the corridor
02. chatting in Arabic with each other))
03. S: *nu e Adila på gång tror ja*
'now Adila is on her way I believe'
04. (0.4) ((S looks aside at A who approaches
05. in her wheelchair))
06. S: *hej Adila.* ((looks at A))
'hello Adila'
07. (0.5) ((A and M are approaching))
08. M: *shoufi [shou aam ya ʿamloulek bi*
look what PRT do-3PL-to-you
'look what they are doing with'
09. S: *[he::j.* ((looks at A))
hello
10. *zara'tek shoufi*
plants-your look
'your plants look'
11. (1.1) ((S leaves hold of the plant; steps
12. forward on the floor gazing at A))
13. A: *shou dakhalltili bi zar'ati*
what put-2SG-in with plants-my
'what do you put in my plants'
((A makes a hand point; Stina
moves the tray with soil on the floor aside))
14. (0.5) ((moving of tray goes on; M smiles))
15. M: *hhhhh(.) ʔva gɛð:r du me mi - he(h) nnesɬ h [hhhhhhh*
'what are you doing with m- her'
((S smiles and looks at A))

16. A: [shou
what
'what'
17. *dakh↑a_l alzar' a[:t.*
have to do-2PL DEF-plants
'have you to do with the plants'
((A gesticulates with right arm; S smiles))
18. M: [hhhh[hhhhhhhhh
((Stina grimaces))
19. R: [hh[hhhhhhh
20. S: [*ʔva ↑E: de.ʔ*
what is it
'what's the matter'
((looks at A and smiles))

In lines 01-02, Stina is rearranging soil in a pot plant and Elsa is sitting beside at the table watching the activity. When Adila and Medina are approaching in the corridor chatting in Arabic, Stina looks up from the pot and announces the arrival of Adila (line 03), *nu e Adila pā gāng tror ja* ('now Adila is on the way I believe'), and greets her (line 06), *hej Adila*. ('hello Adila'). In line 08, Medina bids for Adila's attention with a smile emerging on her face, *shoufi shou[aam ya' amloulek bi zara'tek shoufi* ('look what they are doing with your plants look'). The fact that Medina assesses the event as something remarkable and something that should be examined here and now is corroborated by the fact that she recycles the verb *shoufi* ('look') and refers to the plants as Adila's by use of the Arabic possessive suffix /tek/ ('your') in *zara'tek* ('plants- your'). Thus, she renders the complainable (and surrisable) feature of the event noticeable, thereby calling for a relevant response and giving voice to a potential affect display underway on the part of Adila. When arriving at the place where the repotting occurs, Medina turns away from Adila, and places her wheelchair in a position right in front of Stina, who is standing at the table with the pot plants, where Adila can assess the object of attention and then react to it. She then smilingly takes a step aside, thus allowing Adila to be in the centre of the local scene of events. Stina also makes arrangements to make space for Adila and invite her to participate in the assessment of the triggering event. She greets Adila, steps forward and moves a tray with soil on the floor aside. The caregivers' inviting moves and bid for attention encourage Adila to produce a display of emotion. In line 13, upon seeing her pot plants and the mess of soil and empty pots on the table, she responds with indignation merged with surprise. Pointing with her hand and gazing at the plants on the table, she issues a rhetorical question in Arabic with an indignant voice,

shou dakhalltili bi zar'ati ('what do you put in my plants'), thus assessing the object of attention in the local scene as an unexpected and accountable event. Adila's reaction constitutes a 'response cry' (Goffman 1981), an embodied way of expressing one's emotional stance towards what one is talking about. The triggering of Adila's emotional response is similar to the ways in which a parent triggers a child to respond with surprise to an unexpected event that is rendered visible. In a similar vein, Goodwin and Goodwin (2000) describe the embodied practices through which participants take a stance towards an unexpected event that is made visible within their environment. Following Adila's reaction, Medina starts laughing (line 15). She turns her gaze to Stina and voices Adila's Arabic speech in Swedish for her. Medina's rendition of Adila's response cry is produced with a smiley voice, a high pitch and within-speech laugh particles conveying a stance of amusement, *Eva gʒö:r du me mi- he(h)nnesE h[hhhhhhh* ('what are you doing with m- her'). This change of framing (Goffman 1974) constitutes a shift in affective stance compared to Adila's prior talk, a switch from serious indignation to agreeable surprise and amusement. Overlapping with Medina's turn that dissolves into laughter, Adila turns her gaze to Stina and issues another rhetorical question with a rising contour, increased volume and intensified hand pointing indicative of indignation (lines 16-17), *shou dakh↑al alzar'a:t*. ('what have you to do with the plants'). In response, Medina turns away from Adila and produces a series of stifled laugh particles joined by Rafa's second laugh and accompanied by Stina's grimacing, which is indicative of amused surprise. With a big smile on her face, and while looking at Adila, Stina emits an emotionally charged response cry in Swedish that takes the form of a question mitigated by a smiley voice (line 20), [*Eva ↑E: de.E* ('what's the matter'). The stance of agreeable surprise and amusement in this response cry is conveyed via facial expression, an emphatic stress on the copula that is extended as a whole, *↑E::* ('is'), and prosodically by a rise in pitch. Stina's affect-laden turn is thus done in a way that matches the joyful stance of Medina.

In Excerpt 5, which follows immediately upon Excerpt 4, the Arabic-speaking caregivers explain for Adila what Stina is doing with her plants. We demonstrate how all three caregivers contribute to casting the complainable event, the repotting of Adila's plants, as an activity worthy of praise and how Adila eventually aligns with this frame.

Excerpt 5. 'She thinks bravo.'

21. A: *mi↑n hi je el aam el (0.4) aam.*
 who she that makes that makes
 'who is she who makes who makes'

22. M: *aam behet [oulek (xxxx)*
PRT put-3PL-to-you (xxxx)
 'they are putting to you (xxxx)'
23. A: *[hej ((to the researcher*
'hello'
24. *who passes by))*
25. *(0.7) ((background voices from R and E))*
26. ?: *hhh*
27. M: *aam behoutollon trab ahmar*
PRT put-3PL-to-them soil red
 'they are putting red soil into them'
((M hand points at the table with pot plants))
28. *>ja sa dom [behöver< jo::rd*
 'I said they need soil'
((M moves gaze to Stina))
29. S: *[ny: jo::rd.*
 'new soil'
((S gesticulates and looks at A))
30. S: *ja::a. (.) ja::. (.) (xx)*
 'yea (.) yea (.) (xx)'
((looks at A and smiles; tilts head aside))
31. M: *lazemlen trab ahmar jdjid, (.) hadjeh.*
need-3PL soil red new lady
 'they need red new soil lady'
((M points at the tray with soil on the floor))
32. A: *bra[: ((nods and smiles; gazes at S))*
 'good'
33. S: *[hon tycker de e henne [s blommor*
 'she thinks that they're her flowers'
34. M: *[bra:vo (.)*
 'bravo'
35. *hon [tycker bra:↑vo*
 'she thinks bravo'
36. S: *[hhhhahahhahahahaha [hahahahahaha*
37. M: *[hahahaha*
38. S: *.hh ja::. ((smiles))*
 '.hh yea'

39. R: *ilamalon trab ahmar jdīd*,
collect-3PL soil red new
'they are collecting red new soil'
((smiles and looks at A))
40. M: hehehehe [hhhhh]
41. R: [hhhh]
42. (1.0) ((Stina, Medina and Rafa are looking at Adila
43. while smiling))
44. S: *ja de va ju för väl. (.) annars hade jag inte*
'well that was lucky wasn't it (.) otherwise I
wouldn't'
45. *varit populär.*
'have been so popular'

In line 21, Adila issues a question concerning the subject of what she portrays as potentially reprehensible behaviour, *mi↑n hije el aam el (0.4) aam*. ('who is she who makes who makes'). Following this query, Medina initiates a turn in Arabic about what is going on (line 22). The turn is interrupted by Adila's greeting and background voices from Rafa and Elsa and is resumed in line 27. Here, Medina explains for Adila that they are up to putting fresh soil in the pots, *aam behoutollon trab ahmar* ('they are putting red soil into them'). By emphasising the initial syllable in the Arabic segment *ahmar* ('red'), while making an extended hand pointing at the table with pot plants, she describes the object of event as something worthy of appreciation. She then turns to Stina and reports in Swedish what she just said in Arabic to Adila (line 28), [*>ja sa dom behöver< jo::rd* ('I said they need soil'). Overlapping with Medina's utterance in Swedish, Stina looks at Adila and addresses her with a highlight of the material, the new soil, in Swedish, [*ny: j̥o::rd*. ('new soil'). She lengthens the vowel in *j̥o::rd* ('soil') and gesticulates with both arms as if emphasising the appreciable feature of the material. Immediately following Stina's affiliative acknowledgement tokens in line 30, Medina rephrases in Arabic the information about new soil that they have collectively emphasised in the preceding talk in Swedish, *lezemlen trab ahmar jdīd, (.) hadjeh*. ('they need red new soil lady'). While producing this unit of talk, Medina points at the tray with soil on the floor. In response, Adila evaluates the repotting with new soil as worthy of appreciation with the assessment term *bra*: ('good') in Swedish. She holds her gaze on Stina while smiling and nodding. In line 33, Stina emphatically aligns with Adila's display of indignation in previous turns by confirming the fact that Adila regards the plants as hers, *hon tycker de e henne's blommor* ('she thinks that they're her

flowers'). In overlap, Medina rephrases Adila's assessment turn in Swedish with an upgrade, *bravo* ('bravo') that she subsequently recycles, *hon tycker bra:↑vo* ('she thinks bravo'). Stina responds with a stream of laughter (line 36) and Medina overlaps with further laughter resulting in laughing together until the laughter peters out into breathiness. Rafa, who is assisting Elsa with medication, joins the discussion. She turns her gaze to Adila while smiling and delivers an account in Arabic of what is going on, *ilamalon trab ahmar jdid*, ('they are collecting red new soil'). Like Medina, she emphasises the fact that the soil is new. Following Rafa's account in Arabic, Medina laughs and Rafa overlaps with reciprocal laughter (line 41). When the laughter tails off, all three caregivers and Adila smile together. There is no perceivable sign of reaction on the part of Elsa, who is sitting with her back to the camera, engaged with her medication. In line 45–46, Stina sums up with a sequence-closing assessment in Swedish, evaluating the fact that Adila appreciates the repotting of her plants as praise-worthy despite expectations of the contrary, thereby expressing a sense of relief, *ja de va ju för väl. (.) annars hade jag inte varit populär* ('well that was lucky wasn't it (.) otherwise I wouldn't have been so popular').

In this example (Excerpts 4 and 5), affect-regulating practices such as laughter, prosody and other aspects of speech delivery, what Goffman (Goffman 1981: 124–159) identifies as means by which changes of footing can be accomplished, play a crucial role in setting the scene. What is notable in this example is the way in which a complainable is recognised and rendered noticeable, a job that is pursued by Medina's moving between languages and translating talk. Further, her proactive manoeuvre enables the collaborative staging of a complaint scene as an amusing event. The sequential unfolding of laughter, laughing *with* and laughing *at* (Glenn 2003), plays a central role as a mitigating device in this collaborative construction of intimacy and playfulness. By introducing laughter as a response to a previous complaint turn (see lines 15 and 18), which indicates laughing at rather than laughing with, Medina initiates a move into intimate interaction. Medina's colleagues treat this as an invitation by joining in with shared laughter. When Adila finally aligns with the framing of the repotting as a praise-worthy event, it is Stina, the responsible of the complained-of action, who introduces laughter. Adila's smiling together with the caregivers (see lines 42 and 43) is used as a response to laughter and as an index of affiliation. Thus, reciprocal laughter and smiling in this setting where the participants do not share a common language offers a potential for the interactants to act in unison (Sacks and Jefferson 1995 LC1, Lecture 14). This observation is in line with CA's concern for looking at laughter as an interactional phenomenon that is not necessarily bound to a humorous event (Jefferson 1984; Schenkein 1972). Translating, rephrasing and explaining talk – as well

as giving voice to the resident's complaining in a language that is recognisable for Stina – stand out as essential discourse strategies in this collaborative staging of an amusing event.

8 Concluding discussion

In this article, we have described the communicative practices through which a resident's complaints are managed in multilingual care encounters. Three examples of complaint sequences representing different kinds of troubled situations recurrent in the caregiving setting under observation have been analysed in detail. We have described the affect-regulating work pursued by the caregivers in their efforts to turn a challenging caregiving setting, whether marked by indignation or orientation towards an action as potentially complainable (Schegloff 2005), into a moment of amusement and/or intimacy. This work involves multiple resources including language, prosody, gesture and body posture, integrated into a display of emotionally charged action. In most cases, the caregivers seem to achieve their communicative goals to uphold an intimate and cheerful atmosphere. In some cases, the caregivers manage to get the resident to abandon her concerns (Excerpts 2 and 3). In others, their proactive manoeuvres work to forestall a conflictual situation when a complaint is underway but yet unarticulated (Excerpts 4 and 5). However, as exemplified by Excerpt 1 and the difficult circumstances described here, there are also situations when the caregiver's mitigating strategies (and explanations in settings preceding the excerpt) do not help. These differences in achievements, suggest that there are differences in what can be done to remedy an upcoming complained-about situation in the caregiving setting. Grainger, Atkinson and Coupland (Grainger et al. 1990: 197) point to the *resolvability* of the trouble, arguing that some non-somatic, socio-emotional troubles such as loneliness and homesickness are deemed irresolvable in the institutional nursing home life, 'where there is little likelihood of change' Indeed, the grounds for Adila's complaining in Excerpt 1 appear as a seemingly unresolvable problem. The corner where Adila's co-residents' relatives gathered is a public place; hence, it is no one's private sphere, as viewed from an institutional perspective. However, it may well be the case that Adila's having a specific habitual place in the dayroom has created a sense of home for her and an 'attachment to space' (cf. Falk et al. 2012: 1003). As mentioned earlier, Adila's frustration and persistent complaining in situations like those described here, made the care workers sometimes perceive Adila as a tiresome and demanding person. This perception of Adila's character may explain their proactive manoeuvres, and the way they talked about her as a 'sourpuss'.

Most importantly, the findings from this study provide evidence for the creativity and attentiveness of caregivers with different knowledge in different languages in using their multilingual competence. Pursuing the role of a mediator between the resident and a colleague through translating, rephrasing, and voicing talk stands out as an essential resource in these settings of multiparty interaction, where the participants do not share a common language. As demonstrated, these strategies serve several social functions. For instance, in Excerpts 4 and 5, there is ample proof of how Medina smoothly moves between Arabic and Swedish in order to report for a non-understanding party just what has been said in a language unrecognisable to that party. In so doing, the caregiver makes it possible for all parties to participate in the unfolding complaint event. In this example, translating and rephrasing talk secures inclusion of a party who does not understand the language spoken. For instance, in Excerpt 4, translation and moving between Swedish and Arabic are used as strategies in the staging of the complaint scene as a moment of amusement. Likewise, the same practices are used in Excerpt 5 as a means in the collective framing of the complaint event as a praise-worthy activity. By way of translating and giving voice to Adila, Medina assuages the resident's concern for her plants (see line 31), and demonstrates her confidence for her colleague's ability to take care of Adila's plants (see line 28). Further, Medina uses Arabic not only to translate, but also to reassure the resident that her plants are taken care of in a proper way (see lines 22 and 27). Moreover, translation in this example is not only used between two separate languages. In Excerpt 5, Medina translates from Swedish to Swedish when she rephrases the resident's assessment term *bra* ('good') with an upgrade, thus confirming for her colleague that Adila appreciates the repotting of her plants.

Whereas translation and moving between languages are deployed as resources to secure inclusion in a group of people in Excerpts 4 and 5, the same practices used for handling a complaint in Excerpts 2 and 3 simultaneously exclude one of the parties. By moving into a relationship between workmates in the presence of the resident's challenging requests, for instance by joking in Swedish about Adila being a sourpuss (Excerpt 2), the caregivers exclude the resident from the interaction. As attested in the analyses, such non-serious talk can be used to identify sources for complaints and negotiate possible solutions to solve them. As previous research has shown, engaging in joking/bantering about clients' practices may fill a stress-reducing function (Creese et al. 2016), providing a shelter for role-release (Goffman 1963: 39). In older people's care, where the handling of residents' complaints can be a recurrent and time-consuming challenge, joking about clients may have a unifying effect (cf. Heinemann 2009). Simultaneously, Lena's voicing the resident's complaint, for instance by means of the item *rasil* that refers to Adila's laundry, highlights

the current key issue and sets the scene for all participants involved. Likewise, Lena's rendition of Adila's 'today' in Arabic with the upgrade 'now' in Swedish reconfirms the resident's urgent request to take care of her laundry. What is particularly worth attention in this example (Excerpts 2 and 3) is the way the participants get along in this challenging work setting with a minimum of shared linguistic resources. Strictly speaking, Arabic is not Lena's language. In the quoted sequence, she uses but two Arabic words – *la* ('no') and *shatoura* ('good') – in addition to her own approximation *rasil* of the Arabic word for 'laundry'. However, in the presence of her colleague Moa, who is in training, she is far more acquainted with the complaint repertoire and the preferred care routines of the resident. In this setting of mentor-trainee relationship, she enacts the role of a mediator, both by speaking on behalf of the resident for her colleague and by engaging in prepossessing embodied conduct in relation to the resident.

In sum, the findings from this study highlight the role of multi-party work – such as translating, moving between languages and sensibly moving between framings (conflict, intimacy, amusement) – in addressing issues of wrongdoing, responsibility, accountability and remedial actions. This observation stays in sharp contrast with earlier research on complaint interaction in residential care, which has focused on the deflection and the rejection of the care recipient's complaint talk (Grainger 1993; Grainger et al. 1990; Heinemann 2009; Plejert et al. 2014). The caregiver's anticipation of a potential complaint underway suggests that the complainability of a specific scenario is recognisable for the caregivers by virtue of their acquaintance with the resident's care routines and complaint history. Illustrative examples of this are provided in Excerpt 1 and in the last two excerpts (4 and 5), where the caregivers initiate proactive moves before any complaint is made. These practices bring to the fore the professional knowledge as well as the multilingual competence of the caregivers in a complex caregiving setting. The tension between inclusion and exclusion as reflected in the caregivers' non-serious talk and affect-regulating laughter further illustrates the complexity of the multilingual caregiving setting, where people by necessity draw on a multiplicity of communicative resources in order to achieve their goals.

The findings from this study can be tied to the aim of the overall project; to explore how trainees are prepared to meet the communicative challenges of a multilingual workplace. What we have discovered here about the ways in which complaints are articulated and managed might be part of a vocational education. Based on our data and analyses, the creativity and attentiveness required of caregivers in multilingual settings in which individuals have diverse and singular linguistic repertoires seem to be vital components of effective

caregiving. To build meaningful action with the absence of a shared spoken language is a professional quality that should be highlighted in education. The data in the present article reveal some of the resources that make this possible. Another issue for education concerns how to provide support to multilingual trainees, who in their future work will meet care recipients who speak their language. What is needed is critical awareness of language practices; how language can be used to enable participation in multilingual interaction, at the same time as language practices also can lead to the exclusion of a physically present person.

Finally, the findings have implications for other multilingual work settings in which resources of the kind described here can be drawn upon for managing dealings with colleagues and clients. The creativity and attentiveness, and the willingness to engage with others that we highlight in this article are social skills that are required not only in the care encounters examined here, but also, and importantly, in interactions that occur in multilingual settings more generally.

Acknowledgements: Finally, we thank speech and language pathologist Sabina Al Kass Yousef for assistance transcribing and translating Arabic talk in our examples.

Funding: The current study was supported by The Swedish Research Council (Grant no: 2013-2020). We are thankful also for support from The Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences (F15-1325:1).

Transcription conventions

The following conventions have been used in this chapter. They are adapted with some modifications from Ochs et al. (1996).

:::	Colons are used to indicate the prolongation of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the greater the elongation.
=	The equal sign indicates that utterances follow immediately to each other with no discernible silence between them.
[]	Brackets indicate where overlap begins and where it ends.
((nods))	Double parentheses mark the transcriber's comment on how something is said or what happens in the context.
(1.6)	Numbers in parentheses indicate silence, approximately represented in tenths of a second.
(.)	Indicates micropause.
(xxx)	x in parentheses indicates something being said, but no hearing can be achieved.

°°	Degree signs indicate talk markedly softer or quieter than the adjacent talk.
<u>yes</u>	Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis either by increased loudness or higher pitch.
JA	Upper case indicates raised volume.
.	The period indicates a falling or final intonation contour.
,	A comma indicates “continuing” intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.
¿	The inverted question mark indicates a rise, weaker than a question mark.
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
↑	Indicates marked shift into higher pitch in the utterance-part immediately following the arrow.
> <	Indicate that the talk is compressed or rushed up.
.h	Indicates in-breath aspiration
hhh	Indicate laughter.
ne(h)j	Indicates within-speech laughter
eyes £	Indicate smile voice.

Morphological gloss abbreviations

PRT	particle
DEF	definite article
FEM	the feminine gender
SG	singular
PL	plural
1	1 st person
2	2 nd person
3	3 rd person

References

- Angouri, Jo (ed.). 2014. Multilingualism at work. Special Issue: *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 2014.
- Blackledge, Adrian, Angela Creese & Hu. Rachel 2015. Voice and social relations in a city market. *Working Papers in Translanguaging and Translation* (WP.2). <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx>
- Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge. 2015. Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35. 20–35.
- Creese, Angela, Adrian Blackledge & Hu. Rachel 2016. Noticing and commenting on social difference: A translanguaging and translation perspective. *Working Papers in Translanguaging and Translation* (WP.10). (<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx>)
- Cuban, Sondra. 2008. Home/work: The roles of education, literacy, and learning in the networks and mobility of professional women migrant carers in Cumbria. *Ethnography and Education* 3(1). 81–96
- Dersley, Ian & Anthony Wootton. 2000. Complaint sequences within antagonistic argument. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4). 375–406.

- Drew, Paul. 1998. Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(3). 295–325.
- Edwards, Derek. 2005. Moaning, whining and laughing: The subjective side of complaints. *Discourse Studies* 7(1). 5–29.
- Emerson, Robert M. & Sheldon L. Messinger. 1977. The micro-politics of trouble. *Social Problems* 25(2). 121–134.
- Erickson, Frederick & William Rittenberg. 1987. Topic control and person control: A thorny problem for foreign physicians in interaction with American patients. *Discourse Processes* 10(4). 401–415.
- Falk, Hanna, Helle Wijk & Kristin Falk. 2012. A sense of home in residential care. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 27. 999–1009.
- Glenn, Phillip. 2003. *Laughter in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Behavior in public places*. Notes on the social organization of gatherings. NY: Free Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis. An essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness & Charles Goodwin. (2000). Emotion within situated activity. In Nancy Budwig, Ina Č. Užgiris & James W. Wertsch (eds.), *Communication: An arena of development*, 33–53. Stamford: Alex Publishing Corporation.
- Grainger, Karen. 1993. That's a lovely bath dear: Reality construction in the discourse of elderly care. *Journal of Aging Studies* 7(3). 247–262.
- Grainger, Karen, Karen Atkinson & Nikolas Coupland. 1990. Responding to the elderly: Troubles-talk in the caring context. In Howard Giles, Nikolas Coupland & John M. Wiemann (eds.), *Communication, health and the elderly*, 192–212. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise. 2014. Multilingualism in European workplaces. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 11–33.
- Heinemann, Trine. 2009. Participation and exclusion in third party complaints. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41. 2435–2451.
- Holmes, Janet. 2005. When small talk is a big deal: Sociolinguistic challenges in the workplace. In Michael H. Long (ed.), *Second language needs analysis*, 344–371. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, Ian & Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jansson, Gunilla. 2014. Bridging language barriers in multilingual care encounters. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 201–232.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structure in social interaction. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 346–369. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurhila, Salla. 2006. *Second language interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mandelbaum, Jenny. 1991/1992. Conversational non-cooperation: An exploration of disattended complaints. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 25. 97–138.
- Meyer, Berndt & Birgit Apfelbaum. 2010. *Multilingualism at work. From policies to practices in public, medical and business settings*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Monzoni, Chiara M. 2009. Direct complaints in (Italian) calls to the ambulance: The use of negatively framed questions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41. 2465–2478.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Piller, Ingrid & Loy Lising. 2014. Language, employment and settlement: Temporary meat workers in Australia. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 35–59.
- Plejert, Charlotta, Camilla Lindholm & Robert W. Schrauf. 2017. *Multilingual Interaction and Dementia*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Plejert, Charlotta, Gunilla Jansson & Maziar Yazdanpanah. 2014. Response practices in multilingual interaction with an older Persian woman in a Swedish residential home. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 29(1). 1–23.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1986. Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies* 9. 219–229.
- Roberts, Celia, Srikant Sarangi & Becky Moss. 2004. Presentation of self and symptoms in primary care consultations involving patients from non-English speaking backgrounds. *Communication & Medicine* 12(1). 159–169.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna & Pirjo Lindfors. 2009. Complaining about previous treatment in health care settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41. 2415–2434.
- Sacks, Harvey. & Gail Jefferson (ed.). 1995. *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. I & II). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1988. Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In Paul Drew & Anthony Wootton (eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*, 89–135. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2005. On complainability. *Social Problems* 52(4). 449–476.
- Schenkein, Jim N. 1972. Towards an analysis of natural conversation and the sense of hehe. *Semiotica* 6. 344–377.
- Traverso, Véronique. 2009. The dilemmas of third-party complaints in conversation between friends. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41. 2385–2499.
- Yates, Lynda. 2015. Intercultural communication and the transnational: Managing impressions at work. *Multilingua* 34(6). 773–795.