

“We call them Tracht”: Transcultural Positioning through Code-Switching and
Repair

“We call them Tracht”: transkulturelle Positionierung durch Code-Switching und
Reparatur

by
Alissa Melitzer

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
and the Universität Mannheim
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Intercultural German Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada/Mannheim, Germany, 2017

© Alissa Melitzer 2017

Author's Declaration:

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

This thesis examines instances of language alternation and code-switching in the context of recorded face-to-face interviews. The participants in this study include two groups: German-speaking immigrants who left Europe to settle in Canada as well as the children of these immigrants. Conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics are used as methods of analysis with a focus on how instances of language alternation and code-switching are oriented to (or not oriented to) through the conversational mechanism of repair and how these repairs are treated by interactants. Using positioning and identity theory, the aim is to further explore how individuals who have knowledge influenced by multiple cultures and languages position themselves and their interlocutors with respect to their cultural experiences. Another key focus is the role that positioning plays in the construction of transcultural identities. From this, the research questions address how interactants deal with “cultural knowledge gaps” between themselves and how in dealing with these gaps cultural identities are made relevant, and thus visible, interactionally.

The results of this research show first that a distinction can be made between language alternation and code-switching that is based on interactants’ orientation to the use of more than one language within an interaction. It is also clear that through the repair impacting some code-switches, interactants addressed, and in many cases bridged, the cultural knowledge gaps which had been identified within the interaction. The results of this study are relevant to the question of how researchers can define and approach code-switching as a conversational phenomenon. In addition to this, repair as it is used as a tool by speakers to construct transcultural identities has

meaningful implications for research in the field of sociolinguistics, in particular within the context of migration and cultural identity.

Acknowledgements

Foremost I would like to express my sincerest thanks to my advisor Dr. Grit Liebscher whose gentle guidance and enduring patience continually made both the research components and writing process of this thesis less daunting.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee for their thought-provoking questions and insight. The perspectives of Dr. Barbara Schmenk and Dr. Emma Betz were invaluable in helping me to revise parts of my thesis.

My heartfelt appreciation to my fellow graduate students in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies and those in the Intercultural German Studies program who optimistically reminded me on more than one occasion that it always gets done.

Finally, I extend my thanks to my loving family who have always enthusiastically supported my ambitions and have helped me immeasurably throughout the course of my studies.

Author's Declaration:	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
1 Introduction	1
2 Theory	3
2.1 Conversation Analysis and Interactional Sociolinguistics	3
2.2 Code-Switching	7
2.3 Positioning and Identity	12
2.4 Transculturality	17
3 Method: Data Collection and Description	22
4 Analysis	25
4.1 Unmarked and Unoriented-to Language Alternation	25
4.2 Relevant Cultural Contexts through Lexical Code-Switching	31
4.3 Cultural Comparisons	50
4.4 Group Membership	62
5 Discussion	76
5.1 Limitations	76
5.2 Implications	79
References	81

1 Introduction

As a multilingual speaker, I have lived in several countries and been exposed to various languages and cultures. Through these experiences I have developed a personal interest in exploring the connections between the languages people speak and the cultural identities they construct for themselves. The questions of how and to what extent language is tied to cultural contexts are not new ones in the field of sociolinguistics. In my own study abroad experiences I encountered the very real issue of certain words being inescapably tied to specific cultural contexts with which they were associated. My own difficulties in expressing concepts and experiences which were personally significant for me to people from outside of these cultural contexts served as my inspiration for this study. From a research perspective, I became interested in how these cultural concepts were expressed conversationally through code-switches and in how interactants treated these instances as relevant to their cultural identities.

Code-switching, broadly speaking, is a term used by researchers to describe the phenomenon of switching from one language, dialect, or register to another in a conversation. When this occurs between interactants who have a shared knowledge of the same language, or “code,” the switch may be unmarked and unoriented to by either interactant. That is, attention is not drawn by either interactant to the fact that more than one language is being used in the conversation. In many discourse communities the use of more than one language in communication is the norm as members have shared cultural experiences which can be expressed through either language. Speakers who engage in this kind of language alternation implicitly

position their interlocutor as belonging to the same group as themselves, a group with access to the same cultural knowledge as themselves.

The connection between language use and cultural knowledge is particularly salient when code-switches *are* oriented to by speakers or their interlocutors. Cultural knowledge in this context refers to the understanding of cultural concepts which a speaker demonstrates and makes relevant through interactional resources. As I will argue in this thesis, resources are used by speakers and their interlocutors to negotiate meaning through the mechanism of repair. In my own study, I focused on how migrants with German and/or European background used code-switching, and language alternation in general, to describe their experiences to an interviewer through storytelling. The term “migrants” refers to both first and second-generation immigrants. My goal was to discover more about the link between how interactants use language to construct interactionally relevant cultural identities. I will address the following questions:

How do interactants address what they treat as “cultural knowledge gaps” between themselves and other participants in an interaction?

In addressing these knowledge gaps, how then do speakers make relevant their own cultural identities and the cultural identities of their interlocutors through positioning?

2 Theory

This chapter provides a general overview of research, preceding and contemporary, which serves as the foundation of my analysis. The following sections will focus on theories developed by researchers associated with a number of different fields including psychology, sociology, linguistics, and anthropology. The purpose of each of these sections is 1) to describe relevant theories pertaining to my analysis and 2) to define the terminology which I use to discuss my own data. The terms ‘code-switching,’ ‘positioning,’ ‘identity,’ and ‘transculturality’ have been used in a variety of contexts over the years by researchers from different academic backgrounds. The overlap between many of these fields has given rise to new interpretations and redefinitions of terminology which often have preexisting and well-established definitions attached to them. In describing this terminology and emphasizing how it is relevant to my study, this chapter will attempt to disambiguate the meaning of these terms and provide background on the theories which inform my analysis. This chapter begins with an overview of the fields of conversation analysis (CA) and interactional sociolinguistics which serve as my methodological approaches to data analysis and provide a theoretical framework within which to interpret what speakers treat as relevant within conversation. The mechanism of repair is also discussed as a conversational tool which is used by speakers to deal with problems of understanding.

2.1 Conversation Analysis and Interactional Sociolinguistics

Conversation analysis is the study of interaction including talk and other paralinguistic features such as gesture and gaze. The objective of CA is “to uncover the tacit reasoning

procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction” (Hutchy & Wooffitt, 1998:15). The conversation analysis I am using for my analysis is combined with interactional sociolinguistics. Rather than assuming qualities such as ethnicity and gender play a role in speakers’ identities, interactional sociolinguistics looks at parameters such as these as not constant but “communicatively produced” (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1:1982). “Therefore, to understand issues of identity and how they affect and are affected by social, political, and ethnic divisions we need to gain insights into the communicative processes by which they arise” (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1:1982). Social and cultural aspects of speakers’ identities are treated as significant in situations where they are made relevant within a given interaction by either of the participants present during the interviews I have analyzed. From this analysis, I am able to make observations about speakers’ transcultural identity constructions by taking into account cultural experiences which are made relevant within the interaction.

More specifically, I am looking at how the conversational mechanism of repair is used by speakers and their interlocutors to address code-switches which deal with the cultural experiences, and by extension the cultural knowledge, of both interactants. My interest in how speakers use repair to construct identities stems from other research which has shown that repair of lexical items can express membership (or non-membership) in a group. “Repair can be used to establish, confirm, or insist on speakers’ belonging to one particular speech community over another” (Maheux-Pelletier & Golato, 2008:689). The definition of repair I am working with is “a set of practices whereby a co-interactant interrupts the ongoing course of action to attend to possible trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding the talk” (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks,

1977). The analysis of each example in my data includes an overview of the relevant turns which precede the repair. As well, each analysis looks at the different components which make up the repair operation as a whole and the resolution of problems of understanding. Repair is a mechanism used by participants in an interaction to address a “breakdown of intersubjectivity” (Schegloff, 1992). In other words, one way in which repair is used in the interaction is to address something that is (presumably) not understandable to an interactant. In my own research, I focus on how repair addresses and bridges cultural knowledge gaps between interactants where code-switches have meanings which are bound to specific cultural contexts. In many cases, interactants have different cultural experiences contributing to problems of understanding which are then addressed and resolved through repair, leading to a joint understanding (Maheux-Pelletier & Golato, 2008). It is important to emphasize here that despite the potential for the term “repair” to imply that a speaker has said something inherently “wrong” thereby necessitating “correction,” the term as it is defined by conversation analysts does not carry any negative connotation and encompasses more than simply correction. Rather, the term is used to describe the operation done by a speaker or their interlocutor on what is viewed by them as being in need of repair. An interactant may treat something as repairable even when it is not clearly recognizable to others as in need of repair. Repair can be described structurally through the way it is 1) initiated and 2) carried out/completed. There are different ways in which repair may be initiated and carried out. Repair can first be split into two categories: self-initiated and other initiated. Self-initiated repair occurs when a speaker treats something they themselves have said as repairable while other-initiated repair occurs when an interlocutor treats what a speaker has said as being repairable. It does not necessarily follow that the interactant who initiates repair

then carries out the repair operation itself. The categories can then be further split into “self-initiated self-repair” “self-initiated other-repair” “other-initiated self-repair” and finally, “other-initiated other-repair.” The focus of this thesis is not on differentiating between self- and other-initiated repairs, nor between the other categories of repair including third turn and third position.

In addition to a conversation analysis perspective in interpreting code-switching and repair, I have also chosen to use interactional sociolinguistics which incorporates multiple perspectives from different fields. Interactional sociolinguistics has been used by researchers to examine cross-cultural miscommunication and the interpretation of meaning. “The term and the perspective are grounded in the work of John Gumperz who blended insights and tools from anthropology, linguistics, interactional pragmatics, and conversation analysis into an interpretive framework for analyzing such meanings” (Bailey, 2008:1). Instances of repair which involve code-switching and are oriented to by one or more interactants serve as conversational tools for interactants to consciously or unconsciously position themselves and others (see below for section on positioning). In my own data, repair is initiated and carried out by the interviewer, interviewee, or by other participants present during the interview. Through these repairs, interactionally-bound identities are co-constructed by interactants. In my data, code-switch repairs occur in connection with a problem of understanding linked to culturally bound terms and experiences. Interactionally-bound identities are accomplished through positioning, which is explained in further detail later in this chapter. In doing this conversational work, interactants demonstrate their own knowledge of cultural concepts and position themselves and others as belonging (and not belonging) to specific groups. The method of conversational analysis focuses on how actions are understood and attributed by interactants; my analysis will concentrate on

how orientation to a code-switch and repair are treated by interactants. It will not consider any external motivations or intentions as the research interest is aimed purely at how transcultural identities can be co-constructed discursively and thus become visible on the surface of interactions. These transcultural identities integrate cultural experiences from different time periods and places which are made relevant by interactants through storytelling in the context of interviews.

2.2 Code-Switching

The use of the term “codes” to talk about language emerged in the 1950s and 60s in research on bilingualism (Vogt, 1954; Diebold, 1961; Jakobson, 1961, 1963). In early discussions surrounding “code-switching” there was no agreed upon meaning of the term, but rather multiple approaches by researchers who examined the phenomenon from a largely psychological perspective. In the decades following, studies on code-switching by researchers in the field of linguistics established its sociolinguistic significance and focused on a variety of contexts and conditions under which code-switching between multilingual speakers occurs (Gumperz, 1977; Scotton & Ury, 1977; Heller, 1988; Poplack, 1988). Researchers demonstrated the link between code-switching and social meaning (Auer, 1984; Blom & Gumperz, 2000) as well as the grammatical constraints which govern code-switching (Poplack, 1979; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Muysken, 1995).

It is clear from these studies that multilingual speakers who make use of more than one code in a conversational interaction do so in a way that is systematic. “Multilingualism” is defined, in the context of this thesis, as having knowledge of more than one language. Although

previously assumed to be a random and unpredictable occurrence in bilingual conversation (Labov, 1971; Lance, 1975), research over the last several decades has shown that code-switching occurs at intra-sententially at specific morphosyntactic boundaries (Poplack 1979, 2001; Myers-Scotton 1993; Muysken 1995). Code-switching is a regular practice which occurs between a number of languages, despite these languages having respectively diverse and varied grammars. Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model operates within a frame called the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF). The Markedness Model differentiates between marked and unmarked code choice based on the speaker's communicative competence including a set of rights and obligations which the speaker is aware of. An unmarked code-switch which occurs within the bounds of the community norm (i.e. the way in which members of a speech community typically communicate with each other) is not oriented to because it is an expected form of communication. A marked code-switch is one which diverges from the community norm and lies outside of the set of rights and obligations known to the speaker (Myers-Scotton, 1983:127). The MLF outlines grammatical constraints that determine how and in what grammatical contexts code-switching can occur. Moving away from a grammatical perspective, the social implications of code choice form the base of more contemporary research in the field, with particular focus on interactionally constructed cultural and ethnic identities (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; De Fina, 2007; Auer, 2005, 2013).

While the term "code-switching" has an established history, and is accepted by many researchers in the field of linguistics, it is problematic for several reasons. In an effort to define code-switching, along with other terms such as "code-mixing," "language-mixing," and "fused lects," the issue of how to appropriately define and discuss the phenomena as well as what to call

them has been a topic of debate among researchers (Poplack & Meechan, 1998: 127; Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998: 29; Auer, 1999). While the terms “code-switching” and “code-mixing” are generally considered to be distinct, earlier definitions of code-switching do not delineate any difference between “switching” and “mixing,” but rather define the practice of code-switching with only general descriptions. Hymes defined it as “a common term for alternative use of two or more languages, varieties of a language or even speech styles” (Hymes, 1962:9) while Gumperz described conversational code-switching as “the juxtaposition of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems, within the same exchange” (Gumperz, 1977:1). Both of these definitions, and countless others, attempt to define code-switching grammatically and from the point of view of the researcher who is observing the use of what they consider to be more than one code. There is however an issue with the terminology surrounding “code” and “code-switching” which Auer presents as the “linguist’s labellings” (Auer, 1998:15). He argues that in order to distinguish between code-switching, code-mixing, and related categories of language alternation, it is necessary to take into account the speakers’ own perceptions of the codes they are using. In Auer’s words, “the definition of the codes used in code-switching may be an interactional achievement which is not prior to the conversation (and to be stated once and for all by the linguist) but subject to negotiation between participants” (Auer, 1998:15).

The difference then between “code-switching” and “code-mixing” is defined first and foremost by the speakers themselves. The distinction between marked and unmarked code-switching outlined earlier by Myers-Scotton is also relevant in defining and illustrating the different sub-categories of language alternation (Myers-Scotton, 1983). Multilingual speakers

may use an unmarked mixed code to communicate in certain conversational situations (i.e. they may engage in language alternation which is not oriented to by either interactant) (Myers-Scotton, 1983:122). While speakers who code-mix may be able to identify the alternation in their speech, it is very often the case that communication through a mixed code is accepted in their culture or community as the norm. There have been countless other terms coined by researchers to describe different kinds of language alternation and it would be outside of the scope of this study to discuss all of them in detail. It is important, however, to recognize the diversity in terminology and research approaches through which endeavours have been made to avoid the trappings of the researcher or monolingual bias (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, Auer, 2007). The monolingual bias refers to the practice of making monolingual speakers the norm in research on multilingualism. This includes terms such as “flexible bilingualism” (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), “translingual practices” (Canagarajah, 2010), and “metrolingualism” (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2011).

While I intend to use, and differentiate between, the terms “language alternation” and “code-switching” throughout this thesis to refer to what is happening conversationally in my own data, I would emphasize that although there are numerous definitions and interpretations attached to these terms, my own interpretation is influenced by the idea that social and cultural identities are dynamic, as opposed to fixed (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Fuller, 2007; Otsuji & Pennycook; 2011). From this it follows that language alternation and code-switching, rather than being automatically indicative of cultural identity, simply have the *potential* to make relevant a speaker’s identity at a given point in time by virtue of the speaker having these linguistic resources at their disposal. The main focus of my own research is on code-switches which are

oriented to by either speaker (interviewer or interviewees). More specifically, my analysis deals with what I have termed “lexical code-switching.” These kinds of code-switches involve words and phrases with lexical meanings attached to them (also referred to as “content words,”) as opposed to code-switches which take the form of interjections or particles. Such examples of lexical code-switching are marked in my data because the speaker or their interlocutor make them salient through repair in contrast to the language alternation which is not oriented to through repair (or other means) by either participant and is therefore unmarked.

Another more specific kind of code-switching deals with the use of “cultural keywords” (Wierzbicka, 2010). Cultural keywords are words which are associated with the culture from which they originate and possess meanings which are difficult to convey in another language. Wierzbicka defines them as words which have “neither a linguistic nor cultural [equivalent]” (Wierzbicka, 2010:8). For example, the German word “Lederhosen” has no equivalent outside of the context to which it belongs, i.e. folk costumes in Germany and Austria, and so the word is used by speakers outside of this context to refer to a specific kind of clothing with cultural significance. Although code-switching and borrowing are generally treated as distinct linguistic phenomena, “cultural borrowing,” as defined by Myers-Scotton, shares commonalities with the use of cultural keywords. She defines them as the use of “words that fill gaps in the recipient language's store of words because they stand for objects or concepts new to the language's culture” (Myers-Scotton, 2006). Both categories of language alternation are used by speakers to fill lexical gaps to talk about concepts or physical objects which are significant in the culture or cultural community context to which they are bound.

Much of the code-switching observable in my own data does not fit neatly into either Wierzbicka's "cultural keyword" or Myers-Scotton's "cultural borrowing" category. For the purpose of this study I am using a combined approach which incorporates elements from both of these definitions. The idea that certain words have a particularly strong association with cultural histories, experiences, and cultural knowledge is relevant for and applicable to the analysis of my own interview data, in migrants give autobiographical accounts of their lives in Germany or their experiences growing up in a German family. I have chosen to refer to some of the code-switches in my data as "cultural keywords" when it is made particularly apparent by a speaker that they are treated as being in some way bound to a specific cultural context. The actual code-switch on its own cannot be assumed to be indicative of social or cultural membership. Rather, it is the orientation to and treatment of a word or phrase where repair and accounts can be seen as positioning either the speaker or interlocutor within an interaction. More specifically, I examine code-switches which speakers demonstrate as having cultural significance based on their own experiences. The repair of these culturally significant code-switches contributes to a mutual understanding between interactants despite them having different cultural experiences.

2.3 Positioning and Identity

Positioning theory, which was developed in the 1990s, is rooted in the field of social psychology but inescapably meshed with linguistics (Harré 1999; Davies & Harré, 1999). One of the most widely recognized researchers the field is Rom Harré, who has contributed much to a collective understanding of how positioning is used to negotiate and construct an individual's

self (Harré, 1999). Harré acknowledges that the implications behind what a speaker says in a given conversation are not fixed, but rather have a “moment by moment significance” (Harré, 2004). His goal in describing “positions” was to move away from earlier concepts of self and identity which were defined in more rigid terms such as “roles” or “frames” (Goffman, 1974:21). Role theory is based on the idea that there exist fixed categories or “roles,” which are dictated in large part by society. Associated with these roles are certain expectations which individuals or groups recognize as inhabiting that role. They are then able to lay claim to rights and responsibilities associated with this role. Positioning theory suggests that individuals construct social identities discursively through the use of categories related to gender, race, class, and personal or social identity which are available to them in a given discourse (Davies & Harré, 1990). These selves, unlike roles, are interactionally constrained and are co-constructed by the speaker and their interlocutor. Rather than defining identity in terms of static categories or attributes which are assigned to an individual, positioning gives interactants the option of rejecting someone else’s positioning of themselves. Categories still exist in positioning theory, but are adaptable and can be interpreted in different ways. “Cultural stereotypes such as nurse/patient, conductor/orchestra, mother/son may be called on as a resource. It is important to remember that these cultural resources may be understood differently by different people” (Davies & Harré, 1990). The categories themselves exist externally, but membership is variable and constructed in conversation. In determining how a category or attribute is understood by a speaker as a researcher, it is necessary to examine positioning as it occurs interactionally.

Positioning can be done either by the speaker (self-positioning) or their interlocutor (other-positioning) (Harré & Van Langenhove, 1991). Both kinds of positioning can occur in the same utterance as positions generally complement one another. For example, a speaker who positions themselves as 'teacher' may by extension position their interlocutor as 'learner' in the moment. As mentioned earlier, it is possible to question, resist, or affiliate with ascribed positions (Deppermann, 2015). An individual who is positioned as 'learner' by their teacher may resist or challenge this positioning by demonstrating their expertise on what is being taught. The construction of identity or identities through positioning is negotiable, meaning that either interactant can resist how they are positioned as well as challenge their interlocutor's positioning. As positioning is accomplished through discourse, aspects of conversation such as code choice can be used as a tool to position one's self, another individual, or entire groups of people. The use of a specific code in a given interaction can index a social category (Auer, 2005). While the use of a specific code is not necessarily always indicative of an ethnic or cultural identity there is the potential for a code-switch occurring in a conversation between multilingual speakers to be interpreted by either interactant as self- or other-positioning. "All identities, including ethnic identity, are negotiable and variable, and there is no one-to-one correspondence between language and ethnic or national identity" (Fuller, 2007:106).

"Identity" is a term which is used by researchers in a variety of contexts. Before discussing the concept of 'transcultural identity,' it is necessary to define what exactly identity is and how it can be constructed interactionally. Early conceptions of identity treated as an "internal project of the self" (cf. Benwell & Stokoe, 2006) as well as something "to be worked on" (Taylor, 1989). An alternative understanding of identity is that it is one's desire and ability to

align or disalign themselves with a group (Tajfel, 1982). The underlying idea in ‘social identity theory’ is that there is both an in-group and an out-group (i.e. a group to which one belongs, and another group to which one does not belong) (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). ‘Community of practice’ is a more recently introduced term referring to groups of people who share the same “domain of interest” (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 2006). These groups are not necessarily permanently established (although groups such as family usually are) and may fluctuate based on changes within the domain, community, or practice (Wenger, 2006:2). In current research the most widely accepted definition of identity is in the postmodern account and constructionist approach which describes it as something “fluid, fragmentary, contingent and constituted in discourse” (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006:17).

If identity is constituted in discourse, then, as Bucholtz and Hall (2005:591) argue, it is not something that can be assumed prior to or outside of this discourse. Instead, identity is something which can be constructed by a speaker in “local interactional contexts” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005:586). Consequently, identity is also not something which can be constructed by an individual in isolation. The “social positioning” which is used to construct one’s own and other’s identities necessitates a discourse whereby an individual’s ‘identity work’ determines how they and their interlocutor perceive them in a given interaction. These identities as they are co-constructed should not be presumed to be deliberate or intentional processes, though in some cases they may be (Burke & Stets, 2009:61). The actions speakers take in a conversation are shaped, enabled, and constrained by social structures (Giddens, 1979, 1984; Ahearn, 2001). These actions are not limited to speech and also include paralinguistic features such as gaze, gesture, and body language (Bourhis, et al., 1973; Holmes, 1997).

The social structures which inform the actions speakers take, either consciously or unconsciously, can be said to be the product of an individual's *habitus*. The concept of habitus was developed by Pierre Bourdieu in the 1970s and has been very influential in the field of sociology. "With habitus, Bourdieu tried to access internalised behaviours, perceptions, and beliefs that individuals carry with them and which, in part, are translated into the practices they transfer to and from the social spaces in which they interact" (Costa & Murphy, 3:2015). It is particularly relevant because of its connection to agency and cultural identity. Instead of assuming that the way individuals think and act is a dichotomous product of their culture, Bourdieu acknowledges that it is our social milieus which affect how individuals perceive the world around them. He outlines his theory of habitus with regard to social class as a "structured and structuring structure" (Bourdieu, 1994d:170). An individual's or group's habitus is "structured" in that it is shaped by past experiences, "structuring" in that it influences how someone will react in present and future practices, and it is a "structure" meaning that it has a predictable pattern, as opposed to being random (Grenfell, 2008:51). By extension, habitus can be established through shared experiences with groups as large as nationality, but other habituses stemming from social groups such as family, gender, and peer group can be simultaneously integrated into one's collective identity (Bourdieu, 1990).

It cannot be assumed that two individuals have the same habitus based on the fact that they were born in the same place. Such an assumption that ethnicity or nationality begets equivalent attributes and perceptions of the world leads to cultural stereotyping. Grouping people of the same nationality together by means of a "mentally encoded set of preformed, enduring and fixed prototypes" (Langenhove & Harré, 1994:361) oversimplifies the concept of cultural

identity. Based on Bourdieu's theory, habitus does not constrain an individual's capacity to act or think a certain way but acts as the link between the "social and the individual" (Glenfell, 2008:53). An individual is shaped by the social environment in which they were raised, but this does not dictate their agency or identity. For example, an individual born and raised in Canada knows intuitively how to dress his or herself appropriately in order to fit into the cultural norm, but he or she also has the option of rejecting this norm in favour of alignment with another social group such as a certain subculture or religious community. Habitus entails the particular "feel" one has for navigating certain social situations. This intrinsic awareness of how to act in a given environment varies based on an individual's life experiences whereby the expected practices appropriate to the situation have been internalized. "the experiences of one's life course may be unique in their particular contents, but are shared in terms of structure with others of the same social class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, occupation, nationality, region, and so forth" (Glenfell, 2008:53).

2.4 Transculturality

Building from the foundation of habitus laid out by Bourdieu, a logical next step is to address how individuals construct or index belonging to more than one social group construct multifaceted identities through language. As discussed above, it can be difficult as the researcher to define the concept of "culture" while effectively sidestepping any preformed biases or stereotypes. Claire Kramsch addresses the complex nature of culture, as well as the relationship between language and culture. She stresses that "culture is not one worldview, shared by all the members of a national speech community; it is multifarious, changing, and, more often than not,

conflictual” (Kramsch, 2002:255). This description of culture as unfixed and contradictory fits with Benwell and Stokoe’s definition of identity as something which is “fluid,” “fragmentary,” and “contingent” (Kramsch, 2006:17). Just as an individual’s identities are impermanent and diverse, so too are the world views collective groups have, even when it can be said that they share the same culture insofar as they have “a common social space and history, and common imaginings” (Kramsch, 1998:10). In shifting away from static concepts such as language and culture, Kramsch’s approach is dynamic and uses terms such as “speakers” and “members of discourse communities” (Kramsch, 2002:255). These terms are useful in analysing multilingual conversations because they do not imply anything about speakers’ intentions or identities, except perhaps that they are subject to change. As the researcher, it is the speaker’s self-ascription that I am interested in rather than whichever group of cultural identity could be imposed on an individual. My analysis focuses on the cultural identities which a speaker “does” through positioning and breaks away from the assumption that ethnicity is something individuals inherently “have” despite their own perceptions of self (Jenkins, 2008a:15).

A multilingual speaker has the option of positioning themselves as belonging to more than one discourse community within an interaction, thereby constructing identities which are, like Kramsch’s description of culture, multifarious, changing, and conflictual (Kramsch, 2002:255). As with identity, it is important to define the concept of culture in a way that adequately captures its many complexities and to reevaluate some of the more established definitions. The traditional definition of culture as a homogenized entity does not account for the features of modern cultures which “are extremely interconnected and entangled with each other” (Welsch, 1999:4). Terms such as “acculturation” (Marden & Meyer, 1968) and

“assimilation” (Taft, 1957) propagate the idea of a monocultural society or the “melting pot” metaphor. This conceptualization of culture is not ideal because it relies heavily on an outmoded understanding of culture as something which homogenous. “Multiculturality” and “interculturality” are similarly problematic because of the same underlying assumption that cultures exist as distinct spheres or islands (Welsch, 1999:2). While cultures in a multicultural or intercultural society can be said to coexist side by side, they are still perceived as separate entities. The metaphor of the “cultural mosaic” which describes multiculturalism through cultural diversity and the immigrant’s capacity to maintain their distinctiveness fails to capture the concept of culture as something other than consistently uniform.

The concept of “transculturality” allows for cultural hybridization and the integration of different cultural components with varying origins both on a macro- and micro-level (Welsch, 1999:5). The macro-level is concerned with integration as it occurs on a societal scale. Economics, migration, and globalisation all come into play here and contribute to the fluctuating and multifaceted structure of a culture. The micro-level deals with the identity formation of individuals who are shaped by a variety of different cultural components. While an individual may feel that their ethnicity is indexical of their belonging to a specific cultural community, this is not a given. Transculturality allows people to integrate those cultural components which they feel to be representative of their respective selves (Welsch, 1999:11). Welsch contrasts monoculturality, multiculturalism, and interculturality in his description of *transculturality* as a concept which “aims for a multi-meshed and inclusive, not separatist and exclusive understanding of culture” simultaneously having “the ability to link and undergo transition” (Welsch, 1999:7). A transcultural society is neither a melting pot nor a cultural

mosaic, but instead something more comparable to a network constantly in flux, where some components overlap and others remain distinct.

Transcultural identities are co-constructed by interactants where cultural knowledge is demonstrated and negotiated through conversational mechanisms such repair. Reaching a mutual cultural understanding occurs through a co-operative effort by speakers to reach a joint understanding in interactions between speakers with different cultural experiences. A code-switch has the potential to act as a springboard for a negotiation and construction of transcultural identities. When a speaker or their interlocutor engage in repairs involving a code-switch, they position themselves and their interlocutor potentially as having relatively more or less knowledge of what is being conveyed through the code-switch (considering that the negotiation of understanding is one reason for repair to occur). In repair, assumptions are made visible by speakers about their interlocutors' cultural knowledge. By making assumptions, speakers position themselves and others as having more knowledge or less knowledge. These positions are not fixed, however, and a speaker's positioning may be challenged by their interlocutor. Heritage argues that "the organization of social action itself is profoundly intertwined with epistemic considerations" (Heritage, 2013:386). Assumptions of others' knowledge can then be understood as beliefs or expectations related to an assumed epistemic status, that is the pre-existing knowledge and experience one is assumed by their interlocutor to possess (Heritage, 2013). As the understanding of identity here is that it is interactionally co-constructed by "doing" rather than "having," I argue that speakers use code-switching (intentionally or unintentionally) as a way to construct identities which are transcultural in that they incorporate different pre-existing cultural experiences and understandings. These resulting identities are interactionally bound, i.e.

their formation and subsequent relevance occurs in and is made relevant for the conversation in which they are constructed.

My own study draws from previous research on how language alternation can index membership in certain social categories. Examining how the speaker and interlocutor position each other through lexical code-switching provides insight into how individuals use linguistic resources such as multiple languages to interactionally construct identities which are transcultural. Through a combined approach which takes into account identity and its connection to cultural experience, my own research serves as a contribution to an ongoing dialogue in the field of interactional sociolinguistics surrounding cultural identity with particular emphasis on the immigration context.

3 Method: Data Collection and Description

The corpus of data used in this thesis is made up of a portion of 110 interviews from the Oral History Project which was organized by the Waterloo Centre for German Studies at the University of Waterloo. The purpose of the OHP was to collect stories about the lives of people who considered themselves to be members of the German-Canadian community in the Waterloo Region in Ontario, Canada. This included migrants who came to Canada between 1938 and 2011 as well as the children of migrants, who were born in Canada. While the interviews focused primarily on the life stories of German-Canadians, many migrants came from different parts of Europe including Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Interviewees were recruited through personal connections, flyers, and local radio and TV broadcasts. Interviews lasted approximately one hour and were conducted by graduate students and professors at the University of Waterloo and by staff from the Waterloo Centre for German Studies. All of the interviewers were fluent in German and English and interviewees were given the option of using either language during the interview. Transcription was done in basic verbatim CHAT by research assistants at the University of Waterloo as well as two external transcription companies. The transcripts were then proofread and coded for content analysis. The interviews were semi-structured, biographical, and dealt with topics surrounding migration including areas such as language, family background, education, and cultural identity. As the aim of the project was to gather personal stories, interviewees were encouraged to talk about the areas of their lives they felt were significant.

Interview excerpts used in my own analysis were selected from the OHP corpus. In a first round of selection, I read the already completed transcripts and noted instances where lexical

code-switching occurred. Interview transcripts were read in alphabetical order by last name of the interviewees. As the OHP corpus is quite large, it would have been outside the scope of this thesis project to read and analyse all 110 of the transcripts. Moreover, some of the interviews were conducted entirely in either English or German where no language alternation or code-switching was observable. I gathered 29 examples for the four sections of my analysis. Initially, I categorized them into three sections: unmarked language alternation, code-switches which involved repairs, and code-switches where speakers provided accounts. While the unmarked language alternation section stayed largely the same, I realized upon further analysis of the accounts section that it would be more logical to amalgamate both the repair and accounts sections as the accounts in my data were also examples of repair. For example, in line 30 of excerpt 12, the speaker gives an account for his use of the German word *tracht* which is also a repair of his previous turn in which he uses the word in his storytelling. Combining these two sections allowed me to do a comparative study which focused on the mechanism of repair and in the ways which it was used differently by interactants. The repair section was then split into three sections: 1) lexical code-switches which made cultural contexts relevant through repair, 2) code-switches which were repaired using culturally equivalent concepts, and 3) code-switches where the repair explicitly indexed group membership. The final number of interview excerpts in my corpus was 29, 13 of which were analysed in further detail and included in my thesis. The other 16 were left out because they were similar in structure to the examples which I chose to include. Relevant code-switches were compiled in a separate document for future reference and given titles to distinguish them. These titles were made up of the words or phrases which could be identified as language alternation or code-switching within the excerpts, making the examples

distinguishable one another. As some of the excerpts involve the same interviewers and interviewees, the number corresponding to the interviewer (ex. INT3) was kept the same as were the names of the interviewees. Permission to use and access to both the transcripts and video recordings of the interviews was granted to me by project coordinator Matthias Schulze and administrator Lori Straus.

Transcribing my interview data was an essential step in my methodology because it allowed me to account for a high level of detail which was important for my analysis. I retranscribed selected interview excerpts in which the language spoken was either German, English, or a mix of both using the Jefferson Transcription System. This is a well-known system with conventions which are recognized globally by conversation analysts. Although the Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT 2) system was developed for and is often used by researchers working with German data (Selting et al., 2009), I chose to transcribe all of my data, German and English, using Jefferson for the sake of consistency. My preference for Jefferson over GAT was also influenced by the fact that there happened to be more interviews in my collection for which English was the preferred language as well as by my prior experience using the Jefferson system and my familiarity with the conventions. In addition to including more details such as pauses, intonation, and emphasis, retranscribing sections of the interviews gave me a better understanding of what was going on interactionally. I used the video recordings taken at the time of the interviews in conjunction with the transcripts already completed in the basic verbatim CHAT format. Features which were previously left out of the original OHP transcripts such as overlap in speech, and latching were included in my own transcriptions.

4 Analysis

My analysis is divided into several sections. Section 1 will present examples of code-switches which are not marked or oriented to by speakers. Section 2 will examine both self- and other-initiated repairs where a code-switch is the source of a repair negotiation between the interviewer and interviewee. Section 3 will also include self- and other-initiated repairs but will focus on the interviewees' use of comparative cultural keywords to repair code-switches. The analysis will conclude with section 4 and code-switches and repairs which are explicitly associated with specific cultural identities and group membership.

The structure of each individual analysis of each example is as follows: a brief summary on the background of both the interviewer(s) and interviewee(s), an excerpt from the interview including conversation before and after the code-switch to provide context, a detailed line by line analysis, and lastly my interpretation of the cultural implications made interactionally relevant by the interactants. Each section will present 3-5 examples. At the end of each sections, I summarize the main points of my analysis of that section.

4.1 Unmarked and Unoriented-to Language Alternation

This section will look at language alternation which is neither marked nor oriented to by interactants. I have chosen to use the term "language alternation" to refer to what is happening in the examples in this chapter in order to avoid a researcher-biased approach and any assumptions of speakers' intentions with regard to code-switching. While code-switching does fall under the definition of language alternation, language alternation cannot always be defined as code-switching. I differentiate the two and demonstrate in the following section that language

alternation which is neither marked nor oriented to is arguably more representative of a shared code than of code-switching. From a conversation analytic perspective, I argue that these instances of language alternation are representative of a shared code and, by extension, a shared cultural knowledge between interviewer and interviewee. This will contrast with the other chapters of this analysis which focus on different ways in which lexical and cultural knowledge gaps are bridged through repair and in which code-switches are marked and oriented to by one or more of the interactants. My argument is based in Sacks and Schegloff's communicative behaviour theory of recipient design which states that "the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants" (Sacks & Schegloff, 1974:727). The language alternation which occurs in the following examples is not treated as a trouble source by the speaker or their interlocutor. Interlocutors do not address any problems of understanding, and therefore repair is unwarranted. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that language alternation is linked with implicit positioning, i.e. in using more than one language in a conversation, speakers position their interlocutors as having shared knowledge of this language. Language alternation, however, is not ipso facto used as a tool by speakers to address cultural knowledge gaps – something that I will discuss in the other sections of my analysis. In the following examples, the fact that language alternation is neither marked nor oriented to by any of the interactants suggests that there is no cultural knowledge gap or, at the very least, that the interactants treat each other's turns as acceptable and understandable.

In this first example, Ida is describing to the interviewer, INT1, the difficulties her family experienced with their business in Germany in the years following the Second World War. Ida

was a teenager in Germany when her family of Polish refugees immigrated to Canada in the 1950s after struggling financially as a result of the post-war economic situation. The interviewer is a Canadian graduate student in her twenties with knowledge of the German language.

Excerpt 1: Wirtschaftswunder

01 Ida: and the business was
02 um uh: three fold.
03 it had a bakery it had a milk store
04 and a general (.) grocery store.
05 it didn't go too well,
06 what we found (.) or my father at least
07 blamed it on that.
08 that he had this accent and he was (.)
09 well a refugee rather than a local.
10 you see,
11 and uh so he felt um (0.6)
12 that uh by nineteen fifty five there
13 was no *wirtschaftswunder*.
14 that didn't start til nineteen sixty three.
15 um: that the future for the five children
16 would be best if we immigrated to another
17 country.

The word *wirtschaftswunder* in line 13 is treated by Ida as a term which will be understood by her interlocutor INT1. This assumption is not challenged by INT1 who by not orienting to the language alternation treats it as unproblematic. In this particular interview, there is also an observer present, OBS1, who is a native speaker of German. The language alternation is not directed to OBS1 by way of body position or gaze as Ida is addressing INT1, a non-native German speaker, for the duration of this excerpt. None of the participants treat the language alternation as out of the ordinary which suggests that this specific language alternation is normal

within the interview context. Ida implicitly positions INT1 someone with knowledge of the German language by using the word *wirtschaftswunder* in her storytelling.

In the excerpt, Ida is talking about a specific time in German history and her father's motivation for leaving the country. The language alternation which occurs in line 13 is linked to this cultural context. Ida informs INT1 that in 1955 the *wirtschaftswunder* had not yet happened. She positions herself as having knowledge of both her father's feelings and on the *wirtschaftswunder* as an historical event. The family left Germany in 1955 before Ida would have been able to personally experience the effects of the *wirtschaftswunder* in 1963, but she demonstrates to the interviewer that she possesses cultural knowledge on the event, i.e. when it started and the economic significance it had for Germany. Neither Ida nor the interviewer orient to the language alternation. Ida does not provide INT1 with an explanation of what the *wirtschaftswunder* was nor does she perform any kind of understanding check to make sure INT1 knows what she is referring to. INT1 does not interject or ask for clarification on the meaning of the term and Ida's storytelling carries on uninterrupted. In addition to this, the language alternation is not marked by a pause, cut-off, or hesitation but is seamlessly integrated into Ida's turn in lines 12 and 13. The word *wirtschaftswunder* refers to a specific cultural event and Ida also implicitly positions INT1 as able to understand the significance of this event within the context of this interaction.

In the following example, language alternation happens on the side of the interviewer, INT2, who is asking Dirk about his border crossing experiences using the German word *grenzgebiet*. The German term *grenzgebiet* was not introduced by Dirk prior to this section.

Earlier in the interview Dirk informs INT2 (in English) that he *lived on the Alsace-Lorraine border*. At the beginning of this excerpt, Dirk is referring to his two brothers, distinguishing between *the one* and *the other one* in telling INT2 when they immigrated to Canada.

Excerpt 2: Grenzgebiet

01 Dirk: the one came five months before me
02 and the other one came two years after me.=
03 INT2: =okay.
04 u:m
05 so being on the grenzgebiet
06 did you go across to france regularly
07 with your fa- with your parents?
08 Dirk: well we went every=
09 =i went every day because i played
10 with the kids.

Interestingly, and unlike the other examples in this analysis section, the language alternation which occurs in this excerpt is not a reference term used by the interviewee to describe his or her own personal experiences. Rather it is the interviewer who uses the German word for “border area” in reference to Dirk’s earlier narration of his childhood experiences growing up so close to the border between Germany and France. INT2’s preamble to his question in lines 06 and 07 marks a topic shift from Dirk’s telling of when his brothers immigrated to Canada to his experiences crossing the border from Germany to France. Dirk answers INT2’s question without orienting to the language alternation. His answer in lines 08-10 treat INT2’s question and use of the word *grenzgebiet* as having made sense to him and, as in the previous example, it is left unmarked and is treated as normal within the interview context. INT2 makes

an assumption here about Dirk's knowledge of the German language which is not challenged by Dirk at any point in this interaction. This positioning by INT2 is taken up by Dirk when he responds to the question by saying *i went every day because i played with the kids*.

Although both interviewer and interviewee position each other in the interaction this is done implicitly. INT2 positions Dirk as someone with knowledge of the German language while simultaneously positioning himself as sharing this knowledge. As the language alternation is unmarked and unoriented to, both interactants treat the meaning of this word as shared lexical knowledge. The way the lexical item is produced within the turn also suggests that INT2 is not anticipating any problem of understanding, an assumption which is confirmed by Dirk who, by not challenging INT2's use of the word, treats the instance of language alternation as acceptable. As a result of this, there is no need for repair or any kind of negotiation between the interactants as a mutual understanding is already shown to exist and there is no "bridging" of a cultural knowledge gap.

This first section of my analysis looked at language alternation which is not marked or oriented to by the interviewer or interviewee. These examples contrast the repair examples in that neither interactant identifies instances of language alternation as in need of commentary, e.g. the use of more than one language is not treated as out of the ordinary within these particular interactions. The contrast between instances of language alternation which are repaired and those which are not illustrates an important point. Definitions and descriptions of code-switching which are imposed from the perspective of the researcher may be inadequate in talking about the phenomenon in a way which takes into account how code-switching or language alternation is

treated by participants within the interactional context. In my own analysis, which has approached code-switching from an interactional sociolinguistic perspective, code-switches in repairs were made relevant in an interaction by the speaker or their interlocutor 1) performing an understanding check, 2) providing a translation, 3) offering a culturally equivalent comparison term, or 4) marking a term as belonging to a specific cultural context. This is not to say that language alternation without repair such as that seen in the *wirtschaftswunder* and *grenzgebiet* examples, which does not fall into any of these categories, should not be examined from a research perspective. In both of these examples, neither speaker identifies these German words as problematic which in and of itself has relevant implications for what the interactants in these examples treat as shared cultural knowledge. Positioning occurs on both sides of the interview where either the interviewer or interviewee assumes their interlocutor is already familiar with the lexical meaning and cultural significance of these words. Assuming based on our knowledge of recipient design and the interview context in which interviewers were instructed to ask for clarification or more information when something was unclear, these instances of unoriented-to language alternation are arguably representative of a shared code. In other words, the interviewer and interviewee treat what is expressed through the language alternation, which entails both language knowledge and cultural significance, as mutually understandable.

4.2 Relevant Cultural Contexts through Lexical Code-Switching

As shown in the section above on language alternation, the use of more than one language cannot be automatically assumed to be indicative of identity work which addresses the cultural experiences of the interactants. In the previous examples, language alternation was not

oriented to by either speaker in the interaction and demonstrates that there is quite possibly a shared code between speakers, i.e. the speakers demonstrate by *not* marking or orienting to the language alternation that they already arguably already share a mutual understanding. In the following section, code-switches which are oriented to by either the interviewer or interviewee will be examined in detail. I am purposely differentiating between the unmarked, unoriented to *language alternation* seen in the examples above and the marked, oriented to examples of *code-switching* which will follow in the next three sections. In these sections, the focus will be on how code-switching which is treated as in need of repair by either the speaker or their interlocutor can address gaps in knowledge which can in turn make relevant the cultural experiences of the speaker or interlocutor. The next five excerpts include examples of code-switching which become increasingly complex in terms of the conversational work done by speakers in unpacking both the meaning and cultural significance of the code-switches. This section includes examples of successful repair operations accomplished through translations, understanding checks, and explanations. Positioning by and of interactants occurs through all three of these actions implicitly and explicitly. The repairs surrounding these code-switches primarily are initiated by what are treated issues of lexical understanding and transculturality is made relevant within these interactions through positioning, which plays a direct role in the identity constructions of the participants involved.

The next example shows how what is treated by an interviewee as a word retrieval problem results in a code-switch and subsequent repair operation. Both Jutte and Franz are being interviewed as a couple by INT2. Jutte, the wife, came to Canada in 1960 and Franz, the

husband, in 1965. The couple is co-narrating Jutte's early experiences working in Canada. The interviewer, INT2, is a university instructor with knowledge of both English and German.

Excerpt 3: Experience

01 Jutte: meine erste arbeitsstelle im büro (.hh)
02 war beim transylvania club in kitchener=
03 =hEhh (.hh)
04 und äh (.) durch die arbeitsstelle bin ich dann (.)
05 Franz: du musst auch sagen es gabs en paycheque
06 nicht jede woche, (.)
07 gabs nur zweimal im monat.
08 Jutte: wo. wo.
09 Franz: bei transylvanian.
10 Jutte: ja no das war norma:l.
11 das war [normal.]
12 Franz: [das war] ziemlich mager [paycheque.]
13 Jutte: [das war]
14 früher damals normal.
15 ja deswegen bin ich.=
16 =hab ich dann ja auch aufgehört und hab dann (.hh)
17 bei einem deutschen gearbeitet [für-]
18 Franz: [oh da]
19 war da dat dat- kmart war noch dazwischen.
20 Jutte: ach ja.
21 no no.
22 ich hab alles angenommen um überhaupt wieder-
23 ich hatte doch überhaupt keine
24 Franz: **>experience.<**
25 Jutte: nichts [in Kanada.]
26 INT2: [erfahrung.]
27 mhm.

Jutte is addressing the interviewer, INT2, at the beginning of this excerpt in line 01 and describing her first office job in Canada at the Transylvania Club. The Transylvania Club is a

Transylvanian Saxon heritage club located in Kitchener, Ontario. Franz adds to her storytelling in line 05 when he interjects by adding what he treats as relevant information, *du musst auch sagen es gabs en paycheque nicht jede woche*, followed by *gabs nur zweimal im monat* in line 07. Jutte responds to her husband by asking *wo*. twice in line 08.

After Franz responds to Jutte's repair initiation by providing Jutte with the name of the club, *bei transylvanian* in line 09, Jutte informs him three separate times (in lines 10, 11, and 13-14) that receiving a paycheque every two weeks, and not every week, was normal at the time. This is arguably an account for why she has not included this fact in the narration of her working experiences at the Transylvania Club. Franz speaks again in line 12 saying *das war ziemlich mager paycheque*. Here he is adding to Jutte's narration by "telling on behalf of another," which has been shown in other research to occur in storytelling involving couples (Mandelbaum, 1987). Jutte then orients to this information and responds by explaining in lines 15-17 that this was the reason she stopped working at the club and found another job. Franz challenges Jutte's explanation in line 19 by repairing her statement. Jutte then shifts from talking about specific work experiences to a more general statement about working in the Canadian context. There is a cut-off in line 22, *ich hab alles angenommen um überhaupt wieder-* which Jutte immediately begins to repair through reformulation, *ich hatte doch überhaupt keine*. She does not complete the repair as Franz interjects again, this time with the code-switch, said rather quickly, *>experience.<* He treats Jutte's previous turn as containing a word search, although this is not made clear by Jutte. There is an indication in the cut-off and beginning of a reformulation that she is looking for a word at the point where Franz provides the English word *experience*. The code-switch, however, is oriented to by the interviewer who provides the German translation

erfahrung in line 26, where there is overlap with Franz's turn, and then gives positive confirmation in line 27.

In this example, Jutte tells a story which is co-narrated by her husband Franz who treats much of what Jutte is saying as repairable. He provides the English word *experience* in Jutte's turn. The code-switch is treated as repairable by INT2 who also interjects with the translation *erfahrung*. With the code-switch, and for much of the interaction, Franz positions himself as also having knowledge of his wife's working experiences in Canada. With the translation, INT2 positions himself as having language knowledge, despite there being no orientation from either Jutte or Franz to the insertion of an English word. The repair is treated resolved by INT2 and there is no further discussion on the word or uptake of any kind from Franz or Jutte after INT2's repair. While the initial code-switch by Franz may have simply been a scenario where the fastest solution to Jutte's perceived word retrieval problem was simply to use the English word, Franz's use of the word *experience* in line 24 is oriented to by INT2 who replaces it with *erfahrung* in line 26. From a transcultural perspective, this is interesting because it is not Franz and Jutte who treat the insertion of an English word as problematic, which is arguably suggestive of a shared, possibly "mixed," code between them. Rather, it is the interviewer who treats Franz's use of the word *experience* as a code-switch requiring repair in the form of a translation.

The next example is relevant in terms of the speaker and their interlocutor positioning each other as having more/less knowledge with regard to language and cultural knowledge. Ida is talking about her family life at the end of the Second World War in West Germany. When Ida was a child, her family came to Germany from Poland as refugees. Years later, in 1955, Ida and

her family left Germany and immigrated to Canada. Here she is describing the difficulties her family experienced with farming after leaving Toruń, Poland to settle in Hoffenheim, Germany. “They” refers here to Ida’s grandparents on her mother’s side who had their own farm in Lviv, Ukraine. Ida is addressing the interviewer, who is a Canadian graduate student in her twenties and has knowledge of the German language, during most of the interview. OBS1, who is addressed by Ida in lines 8-11, is a German graduate student who studies with INT1. Both students are relatively close in age. OBS1 is sitting in on the interview as an observer.

Excerpt 4: Währungsreform

01 Ida: and they were much better at farming.=
02 =my father had no idea how to farm because he
03 was a business man.
04 so they helped along
05 and for the first three years it was very tough
06 until the **währungs (.) reform?**
07 u:h **währungs (.) reform** i think it was called.
08 ((Ida turns to look at OBS1))
09 Ida: [yes?]
10 OBS1:[mhm.] yup.
11 Ida: in nineteen forty eight.
12 and um.
13 uh things changed after that in the
14 economic situation becau:se it uh
15 furnished (.) money, to: (.) west germany
16 to build up an economy.

According to Ida, the hardship she describes lasts up until the currency reform in 1948 which improved the economy in West Germany by introducing the Deutsche Mark. Ida uses the German word *währungsreform* in lines 06 and 07, pausing in the middle both times. In line 06

Ida is clearly hesitating on the word, which indicates a confirmation check. She repeats the word again in line 07 followed by the statement *i think it was called* which is indexed as a problem in remembering.

Ida is being interviewed by a Canadian graduate student (INT1) and the narrative she provides in this excerpt is directed toward the interviewer up until line 08. Ida then shifts her body and gaze towards OBS1, a German graduate student who is present at the interview as an observer. Ida's question *yes?* is directed toward OBS1, positioning OBS1 as having more knowledge with regard to the word *Währungsreform*. OBS1 accepts this position, providing the affirmative responses *mhm.* and *yup.* to Ida's question. Ida accepts these responses as there is no further hesitation or pausing and simply a continuation of her narration beginning again in line 09. This narration is directed once again toward INT1. Describing the improved economic situation in West Germany, Ida positions herself as having knowledge of the *Währungsreform* as an historical event.

The repeated hesitation within the code-switch, *währungs (.) reform*, as well as the rising intonation in line 06 and question directed to the observer in line 09 are all indications that Ida is uncertain about her own use of the German term. Ida treats this as a language issue by asking OBS1, a native German speaker, for confirmation that *währungsreform* is in fact the correct term. Ida's code-switch is interesting because the term *Währungsreform* has a lexical meaning which is bound to a specific economic event in German history. This term is one that has personal relevance for Ida based on her description of own experiences as a child whose family struggled as a direct result of the economic situation in Germany in 1945 up until the *Währungsreform* in 1948. Although Ida positions herself as having more knowledge of her

experiences up to and including the Währungsreform, she quite clearly positions OBS1 as having more knowledge of the German language in this interaction. From a transcultural perspective this is again interesting because Ida aligns herself with another native German speaker despite the significant age difference, and consequently different cultural experiences, between them. Ida positions herself as more knowledgeable on the Währungsreform as an historical event, but not on the German word for the event. What is made relevant within this interaction is the fact that Ida and OBS1 both have some amount of shared knowledge of the German language. Despite their varying cultural experiences, the code-switch in this interaction serves as an opportunity for Ida and OBS1 to work together in reaching a mutual understanding of what the term *währungsreform* refers to.

After receiving confirmation from OBS1 that *währungsreform* is correct, Ida resumes her storytelling. Ida positions OBS1 as having knowledge on that specific term, a position which OBS1 accepts by giving positive confirmation in line 10. By positioning OBS1 as having more knowledge, Ida positions herself as well as INT1, as having less knowledge of the German language in this instance. The salience of this positioning is made even stronger by Ida's body language and gaze. Although both interviewer and observer are not in frame, it is obvious when viewing the recording that Ida goes from addressing INT1 to OBS1 shown by a shift in body position and eye contact as well as by OBS1's response. There is no response from INT1 as she is not the primary addressee in this particular part of the interaction. However, INT1's cultural knowledge is also made implicitly relevant here as she is positioned by Ida as being having less knowledge of the specific German terminology in question. Ida shifts her body and gaze back to INT1 in line 11 where she also resumes her storytelling sequence.

While the code-switch *währungsreform* is treated by Ida as a trouble source for lexical reasons (i.e. Ida is unsure if she is using the correct German word), the more knowledge/less-knowledge positioning that occurs in the repair has implications for all participants in this interaction as Ida positions both OBS1 and INT1 as not having the same knowledge of the German language. Ida makes OBS1's knowledge relevant, drawing on OBS1's knowledge as a native speaker. The exchange between Ida and OBS1 is embedded into the larger interview context. The trouble source is treated as having been successfully repaired and it contributes to the larger cultural context of Ida's storytelling which is directed towards INT1. The conversational work done by Ida and OBS1 resolves the issue surrounding proper terminology. The positioning and identity construction which occur in the interaction between Ida and OBS1 are made relevant for Ida's ongoing interaction with INT1 in which Ida talks about specific events in German history which she herself experienced.

The following example is one where a shared cultural knowledge is questioned and then established between interactants, in this case interviewer and interviewee. The interviewee in this excerpt, Karl, immigrated to Canada with his parents following the Second World War. At the time of the interview he was 75 years old. Karl is describing his own taste in music, drawing on his experiences and exposure to music in Germany. The interviewer is a Canadian graduate student in her twenties with knowledge of the German language and cultural context.

Excerpt 5: Schmalz

01 Karl: no i don't li- i can't ta-
02 i can't tolerate noise.

03 so that's: the reason: why:
04 i never listen to music.
05 INT3: *mhm.*
06 Karl: except classical music.
07 and i like (.) uh w-
08 in germany we didn't like (.)
09 uh <current> german music.
10 ***schmalz.***
11 INT3: (hmm.) (=laughter)
12 Karl you know- have you heard that expression?
13 INT3: *mhm.*
14 Karl: ***schmalz?***
15 INT3: *mhm.*
16 Karl: na this sort of lieder and er
17 i don't °know°
18 anyway.
19 INT3: *yeah.*

The pronoun *we* which Karl uses in line 08 while making the distinction between “classical” and “current German” music creates another distinction between the people in the *we* group and other people in Germany. Karl seems to be distinguishing this *we* group, quite possibly his family, from other Germans. The implications and cultural significance of *we* groups will be discussed in further detail in the third section of this analysis. The code-switch *schmalz* which follows builds on Karl’s previous turn in line 09 and repairs the category <*current*> *german music*. The term elicits laughter from INT3. Her laughter is a possible prompt for Karl’s repair initiation which occurs in the next turn. He initiates a repair by asking INT3 *have you heard that expression?*, the expression being *schmalz*. INT3 gives confirmation that she has heard the expression by giving positive confirmation with *mhm*. Karl repeats *schmalz* with rising

intonation, suggesting that he is inquiring once again about INT3's knowledge of the term in a more precise way, i.e. by using the term itself to ask the question in line 14.

Karl uses a code-switch in lines 10 and 14 to refer to a specific cultural context tied to his own experiences. The goal of repair, as with many other conversational operations, is to reach a mutual understanding through the least amount of collaborative effort on the part of both interactants (Clark & Schaefer, 1989:269). The theory of least collaborative effort is demonstrated by INT3's one word uptakes in lines 11, 13, and 15 and by Karl's very brief explanation, *this sort of lieder* in line 16. Karl's explanation of *lieder* is taken up by INT3 without issue, and as a result treated as acceptable by both interactants. It is clear from lines 08-10 that Karl associates *current german music* (i.e. music that was current within the time frame he is referring to) with *schmalz*. The code-switch demonstrates Karl's cultural knowledge of a genre of German music in that he is using it as a descriptor for this genre. Through the question he poses in line 12, he acknowledges that INT3 may not possess the same cultural knowledge as Karl does and therefore she may not understand the association he is making between the kind of German music he (and other members of the *we* group) did not like and *schmalz*. Karl's question in line 12 in which he asks INT3 whether she has heard the expression addresses INT3's potential lack of knowledge of the expression. For Karl, the word *schmalz* is tied to his own cultural experiences growing up in Germany. INT3, as a student who has grown up in Canada decades after the time period Karl is describing, does not have these same experiences which included exposure to the genre of music classified by Karl as *schmalz*. By initiating a repair, Karl demonstrates an assumption of a problem in understanding. This extends to identity construction on a transcultural level because although INT3 does not have the same

cultural experiences as Karl, both interactants are able to reach a mutual understanding by way of orienting to and repairing the code-switch.

Unlike the *schmalz* code-switch in line 10, the word *lieder* in line 16 is not oriented to by either speaker. This is similar to the first excerpt in this chapter where it was established that language alternation which is *not* oriented to and code-switches which *are* oriented to may both be present in the same interaction. The vagueness in his description of *lieder* which he considers to be *schmalz* does not pose any apparent problem of understanding for INT3. INT3 demonstrates that she is familiar with the term *schmalz* and an exact definition or explanation is not required on the part of Karl in order to make himself understood. In contrast with Karl's use of the word *lieder* in line 16 which is not oriented to by either speaker, Karl's understanding check question in line 12 in combination with his repetition of the term, also in the form of a question with rising intonation, in line 14 both orient to the expression *schmalz*. These orientations to Karl's use of *schmalz* are markers of a potential gap in lexical and cultural knowledge between Karl and INT3. Although Karl treats *schmalz* as potentially problematic for INT3 and questions her knowledge of the term, INT3 rejects this positioning by confirming that she is familiar with the term. It is relevant that Karl orients to the term *schmalz* in line 12 as potentially being an unfamiliar cultural reference, but does not orient to *lieder* in line 16, and therefore does not position INT3 as having less knowledge of the German language in this particular instance (line 16).

In the following example Elke and her husband Lutz are being interviewed by INT3, a Canadian graduate student. Both Elke and Lutz emigrated together from Germany to Canada in

1958. Elke is talking about the different kinds of people she and her husband have met in Canada and both are commenting on the cultural backgrounds of Canadians. The focus here is on the repairs made that Elke and INT3 engage in and on the membership categorization which is made relevant through the code-switch.

Excerpt 6: First Nations People

01 Elke: und wir haben vi:ele
02 ähm
03 (0.2)
04 gute menschen in kanada [kennen]gelernt.
05 INT3: [mm.]
06 Elke: ja.
07 also nicht nur deutscher herkunft.
08 INT3: ja.
09 Elke: sondern auch uh (.) kanadier
10 [die eben schon]
11 Lutz: [aller herkunft.]
12 Elke: die eben schon: äh
13 mehrere generationen (.) hier sind.
14 INT3: mhm.
15 Elke: vielleicht auch noch irgendwo von
16 deutschland oder europa.
17 INT3: ja.
18 Elke: die meisten sind ja schließlich
19 von irgendwoher gekommen.
20 nicht?
21 INT3: ja.
22 Elke: ich mein wir haben auch ein paar
23 kennengelernt
24 (.hh)
25 die eben ähm äh (.)
26 urein von ureinwohnern noch abstammen
27 [nech.]
28 Lutz: [**first**] n↑a tions people.
29 Elke: ja.

30 **first n̄ations people.**
 31 <aber> ähm (.)
 32 es ist egal wo die menschen
 33 herkommen (.) auch.
 34 Lutz: ist ja gewöhnlich ein echo effekt.
 35 INT3: mm.
 36 Elke: ja.
 37 Lutz: mit der verständigung.
 38 Elke: °ja.°
 39 INT3: °mhm.°

In line 01, Elke speaks on behalf of her and her husband by using the pronoun *wir*. The evaluative statement she makes in line 04 that she has met *gute menschen in Kanada* is specified further in line 07 to also include people who do not have a German background (*also nicht nur deutscher herkunft*). In line 11 Lutz contributes to his wife's construction of the group *gute menschen* by supplementing her statement in line 07 with *aller herkunft*. This expands the group's possible members to include people of all backgrounds. Elke continues with her description of the Canadians she and her husband have met who have been in Canada for generations (lines 12-13: *die eben schon: äh mehrere generationen (.) hier sind.*) and provides an example of two places they might have originally come from: Germany or Europe. Elke acknowledges that most of the Canadians in the group she is describing come from somewhere. In line 19, Elke contrasts Canadians who *von irgendwoher kommen* with the two descendants of *ureinwohnern* she and her husband met. She expands on her previous statement, further modifying the group of Canadians she and her husband are co-constructing. The *ureinwohner* represent people not belonging to this group of Canadians who come from somewhere else. Lutz offers the English, and more specifically the Canadian, term for *ureinwohner* in line 28 which is

taken up and oriented to by Elke who repeats the English term with intonation identical to Lutz's. Elke expresses acceptance of her husband's use of *first na↑tions people* as shown by her agreement *ja* and by her repeating the term. This is an other-initiated repair as it is Lutz who interjects with the code-switch *first nations*, treating the German term *ureinwohner*, spoken by Elke, as the trouble source. Although it is initiated by Lutz, Elke closes the repair sequence and marks a return to the main sequence after the insertion sequence in lines 28-30.

The significance of this repair is particularly relevant in the Canadian cultural context because of the term's strong association with specific groups of people and the issue of political correctness surrounding terms of reference and Indigenous Peoples in Canada. "First Nations" has replaced the term "Indian," the use of which is now in decline (Dean, 1998). Although there has been an ongoing discussion about the most appropriate and culturally sensitive way to describe Indigenous Peoples in Canada (Borrows, 1995), the terms *First Nations* and *Ureinwohner* are generally considered to be less offensive than terms like *Indian (Indianer)* or *Native (Eingeborener)*. *First Nations* is used to refer to Indigenous Peoples in the Canadian context. This is how it is used by Lutz, who is repairing his wife's use of the word *ureinwohnern*. It is likely that Lutz is attending to these sensitivities when initiating the repair. In the least, he is raising these sensitivities in the open. It is also possible that Lutz is using a code-switch here to attend to Elke's difficulty in speaking. Elke hesitates in her turn in line 26 (*urein von ureinwohnern noch abstammen*) although this seems to be a reformulation to include the preposition *von* to convey that the couple she is referring to are descended *from ureinwohnern*.

Lutz and Elke both position themselves here as being in agreement on an appropriate term being First Nations People. Through his use of the English phrase Lutz demonstrates his

knowledge of the Canadian context about which Elke is speaking. Elke aligns herself with Lutz and then resumes talking more broadly about people in general. Rather than being directed to the interviewer as in previous examples, the repair operation which happens here shows that Elke and Lutz both have knowledge of the term *first nations*. The repair is not initiated by a check for understanding done to ensure that a mutual understanding between interviewer and interviewee is maintained, as was the case with the examples discussed above. This example does, however, show an established mutual understanding between Lutz and Elke as the repair and agreement demonstrate their shared cultural knowledge of the shift of the term and that the term of reference is acceptable and appropriate in the Canadian context. Lutz attends to norms of appropriate reference terms through his replacement of *ureinwohner* with *first nations*, as does Elke with her subsequent adoption the term.

In the next example, Dirk is talking about his uncle's experience fighting in Stalingrad during the Second World War. Dirk came to Canada with his family in 1952 when he was sixteen years old. This excerpt comes following a description of Dirk's uncle and his receptiveness on immigrating to North America in 1951 after having previously been a prisoner of war in Texas.

Excerpt 7: Heimatschuss

01 Dirk: i- i- i ne-
02 i know he was in stalingrad.
03 INT2: yeah.
04 Dirk: he got his **heimatschuss** there.
05 INT2: yeah,
06 Dirk: do you know what a **heimatschuss** is?=
07 INT2: =no i'm not sure.
08 Dirk: well a **heimatschuss** is one that you're

09 badly wounded so you can't be er uh
10 can't be sent to uh to uh a hospital
11 nearby.
12 but you're badly enough that you'd be
13 sent home.
14 INT2: okay.
15 Dirk: **heimatschuss**.
16 some people tried to shoot themselves
17 in the legs
18 INT2: [sure.]
19 Dirk: [and] so on.
20 INT2: sure.
21 Dirk: they were- they were punished for that.
22 INT2: yep.
23 sure.
24 happened uh in the first world war repeatedly
25 as well.
26 [(.hhh)]
27 Dirk: [yeah.]

Dirk tells INT2 that his uncle got his *heimatschuss* while he was in Stalingrad. After confirmation from INT2, Dirk asks if he knows what a *heimatschuss* is. INT2's negative response *no i'm not sure* in line 06 prompts the explanation from INT2 which follows. By explaining what a *heimatschuss* is to INT2, Dirk positions himself as the having knowledge of the lexical meaning of the word. The term is further made relevant when Dirk repeats it after giving the definition and after INT2 responds to his explanation with *okay*. Dirk also demonstrates knowledge of the historical significance of the term when he gives an example of where people would shoot themselves (*in the legs*) as well as the repercussions for such an action (*they were punished for that*). INT2 acknowledges Dirk's explanation with iterations of *sure*. He positions himself as also having knowledge of the historical significance of *heimatschuss* by providing more information about the act of someone shooting himself to be sent home. He

accomplishes this by drawing a comparison between the Second World War, which Dirk is talking about, and the First World War.

The repair operation initiated by Dirk in line 06 orients to the code-switching in line 04 which Dirk treats as a potential problem in understanding. The repair solution undertaken by Dirk focuses on providing INT2 with the meaning and significance of the term *heimatschuss* and not with a translation such as ‘million-dollar wound,’ which is the term used in the North American context. INT2’s utterance in line 24 suggests that he is familiar with the word’s historical significance and that his answer to the question posed by Dirk in line 06 conveys a German language comprehension problem rather than a problem with the semantic meaning of the word. INT2 rejects the positioning done by Dirk who continues the explanation after INT2 has claimed understanding. INT2 is positioned by Dirk as having knowledge the semantic meaning of *heimatschuss*. INT2 positions himself instead as having knowledge of the term *heimatschuss* and its cultural relevance. In line 14, he supports this claim to understanding.

As with previous examples in this section, the repair here addresses a problem of understanding. Dirk treats INT2’s lack of knowledge on what a *heimatschuss* is as a cultural knowledge gap. The repair is initiated by Dirk who provides an explanation of what a *heimatschuss* is. After this is taken up by INT2 in line 14, the term is repeated by Dirk who then provides INT2 with more background on the cultural significance of the term, i.e. that soldiers tried to get out of active duty through self-inflicted wounds and that they were often punished for this. The trouble source *heimatschuss* looks as though it has been resolved in line 14 with INT2’s *okay*, but Dirk goes on to give additional information which extends beyond the lexical meaning of the word and focuses on informing INT2 of the cultural significance. It is this positioning as

having knowledge on the cultural significance of *heimatschuss* which INT2 challenges by also demonstrating his own knowledge on the term in a slightly different context, i.e. the First World War. By demonstrating his own cultural knowledge to Dirk, INT2 bridges what is treated as a gap by Dirk, with regard his second explanation of the term. Whether this cultural explanation is part of the same repair as the initial explanation given in lines 8-13 is debatable as both interactants do reach a mutual understanding in line 14. Nevertheless, the term *heimatschuss* as a *cultural* concept is treated by Dirk as worthy of further explanation even after the initial resolution of the repair sequence.

The construction of transcultural identities in an interaction has the potential to be made relevant where a code-switch is identified as a trouble source by either the interviewer or interviewee. Some repairs of code-switching, such as those occurring in the *experience* and *währungsreform* examples, are treated by speakers as issues of word retrieval. The question which emerges from this is how repair which is centred around a lexical issue can be used by speakers in the construction of transcultural identities. In both of these examples speakers simultaneously positioned themselves and their interlocutors as having more knowledge or less knowledge of the appropriate German word needed to resolve what was treated as an issue of word retrieval. The solutions to the word retrievals offered by the interviewers in these examples are accepted without issue by the interviewees. Regardless of whether all the interactants in these examples indicated that a solution was necessary, at least one speaker in both of these instances identified a potential gap in cultural knowledge which was then bridged by a solution in the form of positive confirmation as given by JLI in the *währungsreform* example, or a translation, given

by INT2 in the *experience/erfahrung* example. The connection between language and culture is made relevant in these examples as these code-switches are used by these speakers to describe experiences and demonstrate knowledge related to cultural contexts.

The connection between code-switch repair and transcultural identity construction is even more apparent in the *heimatschuss*, *schmalz*, and *ureinwohner* examples where cultural knowledge and identities are challenged, negotiated, and ultimately established as mutually understandable following successful repair operations. The repairs which were initiated and carried out in these examples involved both questions (*do you know what a heimatschuss is?*, *have you heard that expression?*) and translations (*first nations people*) which were treated by speakers as being bound to a very specific cultural context, i.e. the word was given special significance through the cultural experiences that were described by the interviewees.

4.3 Cultural Comparisons

This section will focus on speaker's explicit comparisons of cultural concepts where cultural keywords are made relevant within interactions. Many of the other code-switches and the language alternation discussed in other sections could presumably be clarified as "cultural keywords" under the definition outlined by Wierzbicka as a word which has "neither a linguistic nor cultural [equivalent]" (Wierzbicka, 2010:8). However, Wierzbicka's analysis approach is largely concerned with the semantic properties of the words themselves and the categorization of keywords using the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). Instead of using this approach, I

have chosen to analyse those code-switches which are treated by a speaker or their interlocutor as interactionally and, by extension, culturally relevant. This also differs from Myers-Scotton's conception of "cultural borrowing" as the code-switches I am analysing do not "stand for objects or concepts new to the language's culture," although by drawing comparisons speakers do contribute to filling in cultural knowledge gaps. The next three examples both show the interviewees' ability to draw comparisons between culturally similar concepts. By acknowledging that there is not necessarily an equivalent concept, these speakers demonstrate their knowledge of the similarities and differences between culturally relevant concepts and use this knowledge to bridge potential knowledge gaps between themselves and their interlocutors. The repair mechanism which facilitates these comparisons as well as the uptake by the speaker's co-participants are both contributors to the construction of transcultural identities which are made interactionally relevant.

In addition to this, I will also look at some accounts which are connected to the repair mechanism in a relevant way. Account giving in conversation is centred around "other-attentiveness" in that the speaker is attending to the viewpoints of other interactants (Heritage, 1988:137). "An account is an attempt by one interlocutor to modify (e.g., change, explain, justify, clarify, interpret, rationalize, (re)characterize, etc.), either prospectively or retrospectively, other interlocutors' understandings or assessments of conduct-in-interaction in terms of its "possible breach of relevance rules" (Robinson, 2006). Account giving arises in response to dispreferred actions within an interaction where the social implications may be softened by providing a neutralizing response, an excuse, or a justification.

The woman being interviewed in this excerpt left German in 1951 when she immigrated to Canada. In this example Ada is recounting experiences from her childhood, specifically her involvement in the Bund Deutscher Mädchen, a German youth organization for young girls established in 1930 as part of the Nazi Party youth movement. Ada is addressing the interviewer, a German with knowledge of both German and English. Also present is an observer, a Canadian graduate student who also has knowledge of both languages.

Excerpt 8: Girl Scouts

01 Ada: ich war natürlich im BDM.
02 im bund deutscher mädchen.
03 jeder musste das sein.
04 und auf ich war ein einziges kind.
05 und freute mich dass ich mit anderen zusammen
06 [war.]
07 INT4: [mhm]
08 Ada: einmal in der woche trafen wir uns.
09 es war ähnlich wie **girl scouts**.
10 INT4: mhm,
11 Ada: **girl guides**. ((clears throat))
12 und u:h (.) anseuch- ansonsten
13 der krieg kam ziemlich dichte da- dana↑ch.

Ada states that she was in the BDM and includes the modifier *natürlich*, suggesting that the fact that she was involved with the group was not unusual. This is further expanded on when she gives an account for her participation in the group where she states *jeder musste das sein*, conveying that being a member of the BDM was compulsory at the time. The second account she provides is an explanation for why she enjoyed being in the group. Ada's statement *ich war natürlich im BDM* is clearly indexical; she expresses her past membership in the group Bund

Deutscher Mädchen. In the turn which follows, *jeder musste das sein*, she is accounting for this membership where the reason she gives for her involvement is lack of choice, the implicature being that the laws and social expectations of Nazi Germany did not allow her any choice. The account that she was an *einziges Kind* precedes her explanation that she was happy she could be with others (lines 05-06: *freute mich, dass ich mit anderen zusammen war*). Ada's accounts are used 1) to explain why she was a member in a Nazi sanctioned youth group and 2) to justify the enjoyment she experienced being in the group, despite the negative implications her past membership might suggest.

Following these accounts is the code-switch which occurs in line 09. The term for the American organization is used to draw a comparison between the two youth groups, Girl Scouts and Bund Deutscher Mädel. Here Ada demonstrates cultural knowledge of a specific era in Germany history which she had personal experience with while simultaneously demonstrating that her knowledge of the American cultural context, specifically the Girl Scouts. The repair of her initial code-switch, *girl scouts* to *girl guides*, demonstrates this awareness of the difference between American and Canadian terminology. While the groups are similar, Girl Scouts refers to the organization founded in the United States and Girl Guides to the organization originally founded in Great Britain and adopted by Canadians. Ada's repair is done after the initial code-switch is taken up by INT4, who gives confirmation that she has understood what Ada meant in her comparison between the BDM and the Girl Scouts.

Ada's code-switching and subsequent repair is interesting for several reasons. Ada positions herself in line 3 as more knowledgeable on the cultural experience of the BDM. Her account, *jeder musste das sein*, serves as a justification for why she was involved with the

organization. Ada's use of the term *girl guides* is in line with the notion of recipient design, where talk is designed by a speaker with their interlocutor's assumed knowledge and experience in mind. Ada does not presume that INT4 is familiar with the Bund Deutscher Mädchen nor with the societal expectations of the time which entailed mandatory participation in the group. In the telling of her experience with the BDM, Ada positions herself as more knowledgeable and INT4 as less knowledgeable. However, by using the term *girl scouts* in line 09 and repairing it to *girl guides* in line 11, thereby narrowing the context to an even more "Canadian" one, Ada has designed the turn containing her comparison to be understandable to INT4 without the need for an account or any further repair. Ada makes the assumption that INT4 is familiar with the Girl Guides and will therefore understand the comparison she is making to the BDM. INT4 does not challenge this assumption and Ada returns to her storytelling, shifting the topic to the Second World War. Ada constructs a transcultural identity in this interaction through a demonstration of her own cultural knowledge, i.e. distinguishing but also drawing comparisons between the BDM, Girl Scouts, and Girl Guides. These three distinct terms can be classed as cultural keywords as they are treated by Ada as being associated with specific cultural contexts including her own cultural knowledge of the BDM. In repairing Girl Scouts to Girl Guides she also acknowledges that there is a difference between these two organizations. By initiating and performing a repair operation in this interaction, Ada constructs a transcultural identity whereby she demonstrates to INT3 her ability to compare and differentiate between cultural concepts.

Evidence of recipient turn design through cultural comparison also plays a role in the repair which is initiated in the next example by Karl. In the excerpt, he is talking about his school experience in German, more specifically at the high school and Gymnasium level.

Excerpt 9: Gymnasium

01 Karl: well there was a high school.
02 the public school was across (.)
03 the v- kind of a valley.
04 u:m. (.) and the elsenz.
05 ((Karl clears throat))
06 and so i'd walk to school every day.
07 um when i went to high school it was-
08 well it's not high school it's gkym-
09 well it was.
10 uh **gymnasium**.
11 INT3: mhm,
12 Karl: cause in uh
13 after uh grade four you have to make
14 up a- your mind if you're gonna go (.)
15 university stream or ((clears throat))
16 uh: apprenticeship.
17 INT3: mhm,
18 Karl: an:d uh (.)
19 my parents of course decided on university.
20 my mother wanted me to become an architect.

Karl begins his storytelling in line 01 by describing the types of schools that were in the area around him when he was growing up near the Elsenz. He uses the English terms *public school* and *high school* in lines 01 and 02 in describing to INT3 their geographical location. The description of the schools' locations is a precursor to Karl's informing in line 06, *and so i'd walk to school every day*. Karl interrupts his storytelling in line 07 and after the cut-off it becomes

clear in line 08 that he has identified the term *high school* as a trouble source. Although Karl uses the term *high school* earlier in line 01 without issue, he treats it as inadequate when he begins to talk about his own experiences attending school in Germany. Karl's shift to the present tense in line 08 is interesting because rather than focusing on his own experiences he makes a general statement, *well it's not high school*. This is immediately followed by Karl's initial attempt to repair the term *high school* to *gymnasium*. This repair attempt is unsuccessful as Karl does not say the entire word, but produces the first syllable, *gkym-*. In line 09, Karl repairs his previous statement in line 08, *it's not high school* by saying *well it was*. There is evidence that this is in fact a repair of his prior turn in the cut-off of his initial repair solution and in the way he emphasizes the word was which strongly suggests that he is modifying his previous statement. In line 10 Karl produces the German term *gymnasium*. Karl's issue with which term to use in this particular context, the code-switch in line 10 appears to be, based on his intonation, the *uh* hesitation marker, and the turns prior, an effort to get the word out.

INT3 gives Karl confirmation in line 11, though the slightly rising intonation on her *mhm*, makes it unclear whether she is giving confirmation that she understood the difficulty Karl is having in differentiating between *high school* and *gymnasium* or giving confirmation that she has heard what Karl is saying and encouraging him to provide more information. In line 11, Karl launches into an explanation on how the school system functions in Germany. The *cause* (because) in this line is arguably the beginning of an account for Karl's previous trouble with how to refer to the school he attended in Germany. The explanation he gives deals with the two separate streams that students of German schools had to choose between (*university stream* or *apprenticeship*) which is receipted by INT3 in line 17 with another *mhm*,. In lines 19 and 20,

Karl provides an account for why he attended *gymnasium* by informing INT3 that it was his parents' decision, a result of his mother's desire for Karl to become an architect.

Karl's difficulty in finding or producing a term to treat as adequate in describing his schooling experience in Germany is interesting from a transcultural perspective. Karl orients to his own use of the term *high school* by struggling to find the appropriate term through a repair operation with multiple components. He does not orient to his first use of the term *high school* in line 01 and treats it as unproblematic both for himself and for INT3. The term as a trouble source is isolated to the context of the personal experiences which Karl is describing in this interaction. In other words, *high school* is treated as problematic by Karl when he begins to tell INT3 about his experience actually *going* to school in Germany. Karl's repair initiation and explanation demonstrate an understanding of the differences between *high school* and *gymnasium*. By initiating and making further attempts to reconcile these differences between the two terms, Karl constructs a transcultural identity where his cultural knowledge of both the North American and German schooling systems are made relevant in the narrative of his own cultural experiences.

The next example is taken from a different part of the same interview as the *gymnasium* and *schmalz* examples (see section 4.2). In this excerpt Karl is talking about the games he played as a child living in Germany. Following a code-switch, Karl directs a question to INT3 which, like his previous question regarding *schmalz*, is an understanding check. The repair sequence of the code-switch is more elaborate and takes the form of an explanation as INT3, unlike with *schmalz*, claims unfamiliarity with the term *völkerball* used by Karl in his storytelling.

Excerpt 10: Völkerball

01 Karl: ((clears throat))
02 well we played all kinds of games.
03 in this uh (.) this area.=
04 =or the area around the store where i lived,
05 and wasn't that far
06 was maybe four blocks to open fields,
07 or woods weren't far away.
08 and we'd play cowboys and indians.
09 and (.) uhh (.)
10 Karl: we had all kinds of games with- with balls
11 with w-uh uh **völkerball**?
12 i don't know.
13 do you know what [**völ- völker**]ball is?
14 INT3: [mhhh.]
15 INT3: no i haven't heard of [that before.]
16 Karl: [there's there's]
17 two- two teams lined up here.
18 and a select group (.)
19 i think maybe one or two persons go
20 on this side and from here on this side
21 and you'd throw balls at each other
22 and if you catch it you can hit.
23 if you hit someone he's [out.]
24 INT3: [ahh okay.]
25 [so] a little bit like dodgeball.
26 Karl: [so-]
27 exactly.=
28 INT3: =mhm.

Karl hesitates before the code-switch in line 11, indicative of a possible word search, which results in his use of the German word *völkerball*. He uses *völkerball* as an example of one of the games with balls which he played as a child. The rising intonation in line 11 after the code-

switch is the beginning of a self-initiated repair operation which is then continued by Karl in line 13 when he asks INT3 directly if she knows what *völkerball* is. By asking this question he identifies *völkerball* as the trouble source where the issue is a potential problem in understanding on the part of INT3. INT3 confirms in line 15 that she has not heard the term before, prompting Karl's repair solution in the form of an explanation which then follows. The explanation deals with the mechanics of how the game is played. INT3 interjects with *ahh okay* in line 24 and provides a candidate understanding in line 25, *so a little bit like dodgeball*, which Karl confirms is correct in line 27.

INT3's lack of knowledge, evident in line 15, prompts Karl's explanation of the term. The problem is ultimately solved for both speakers by INT3 offering the English equivalent *dodgeball*. Karl positions himself as having experience with the game *völkerball* when he uses it as an example of one of the games he used to play as a child. After INT3 says she has never heard of *völkerball*, Karl positions himself as having knowledge by providing an explanation of how teams are constructed and the rules of the game. With INT3's uptake of this explanation in line 24 she treats Karl's explanation of the game as sufficient in bridging asymmetry in knowledge. In the following turn, which contains her candidate understanding, she treats the German term *völkerball* as potentially having a partial equivalent in English. She does not fully equate *völkerball* with *dodgeball* and qualifies the comparison by saying that it is *a little bit like dodgeball*. While the two games may not be identical, they certainly have enough similarities for INT3 to make a comparison between them. Having listened to Karl's explanation, she draws a parallel to a game she has knowledge of after and they both come to a mutual understanding shown by Karl's confirmation of INT3's candidate understanding. This solves the initial problem

of understanding — a disconnect between INT3 never having heard the term *völkerball* but having knowledge comparable to Karl's with respect to how the game is actually played.

Karl treats INT3's lack of knowledge on *völkerball* as an opportunity to explain the rules of the game. Through his lengthy explanation of these rules, Karl positions himself as being as having knowledge of the game while simultaneously positioning INT3 as having less knowledge. INT3 accepts this and positions herself in line 25 as more knowledgeable on a similar game which she has knowledge of — *dodgeball*. In line 27, Karl confirms INT3's candidate understanding and by doing so demonstrates that he also has a shared knowledge of *dodgeball* and is therefore able to give positive confirmation directly following INT3's candidate. The cultural knowledge of both Karl and INT3 is made relevant in this interaction by Karl's repair through explanation, INT3's candidate understanding, and the mutual understanding reached by both interactants in line 28. The focus here is not a comparison of the German and North American versions of a game with similar rules, but rather on INT3's understanding of Karl's *völkerball* explanation. By offering the name of the North American game she is familiar with as a comparison, INT3 demonstrates an understanding to Karl. The respective cultural experiences of both interactants are made relevant in the repair sequence closing the knowledge gap and contributing to a mutual transcultural understanding.

In this section speakers from several examples (*BDM*, *gymnasium*, and *völkerball*) demonstrated their ability to make comparisons between German and English terms and acknowledge the differences and similarities between concepts which are culturally bound to either the European or North American contexts being referred to within the interaction. In all three of these examples, speakers were interviewees who used German words to refer to

concepts from their childhoods in Germany. In contrast with the code-switches for which repairs were treated as having a more lexical motivation, these three examples clearly demonstrated the interviewees' and interviewer's ability to use cultural comparisons to make themselves understood to their interlocutors or to demonstrate their own cultural understanding through the use and comparison of culturally bound terms.

The interview context prescribes that the interviewee is doing the narration on events from their past who positions him- or herself as having knowledge of these personal experiences. By going beyond an explanation or confirmation of understanding, the speakers who make use of culturally comparable concepts and terms to construct transcultural identities which draw from different parts of their own experiences. In these examples, speakers describe events and concepts from their childhoods using the German words (*Bund Deutscher Mädchen, Gymnasium, Völkerball*) which are bound to these contexts, i.e. cultural keywords associated with life experiences growing up in Germany and other parts of Europe. However, in addition to this they also provide or demonstrate knowledge of English words (*Girl Scouts/Girl Guides, high school, dodgeball*) which have a comparable meaning and significance in the North American context to which they are bound. This is significant in that these speakers do not simply provide an explanation for German the terms they use, but make a concerted effort with definitions and explanations to ensure that not only the lexical meaning of these words is understandable to their interlocutor but that the differences and similarities between culturally equivalent English terms are also made relevant. Cultural comparisons done through repair bridge what is treated as a knowledge gap between interactants by drawing from both the speakers' own cultural experiences having lived in Germany and their shared cultural knowledge with the interviewers.

4.4 Group Membership

This chapter presents three examples of code-switching which are framed by indexical references to group membership. In all of these examples, speakers use the repair mechanism to mark ownership of a term which takes the form of a code-switch. The speakers' group and cultural identities are made relevant through the marking of this ownership as well as by the positioning done that differentiates between "we" and "they." The code-switches in this chapter differ from the previous examples in that the speakers in the following excerpts acknowledge the code-switch as a term which is tied to a specific cultural group. In the previously discussed *völkerball* example, Karl makes relevant a cultural group who he played games with as a child in Germany. Arguably, the code-switch could also be included as an example of Karl indexing his own membership in this group who referred to the game as *völkerball*. This is, however, less explicit than in the following three examples where the speakers clearly demonstrate that the code-switches they are using belong to a cultural group. By repairing these code-switches and through explicit positioning which clearly indexes group membership (or non-membership), these speakers demonstrate knowledge of cultural concepts and make relevant their significance to a cultural group.

The repairs that are done by these speakers are less focused on lexical aspects of the code-switches but rather on the use of the word in the interview context and the importance of the word in describing events and concepts which are important to the speaker with regard to his or her experiences and the cultural groups they position themselves as belonging to. By orienting to these code-switches, speakers treat these terms which are bound to cultural contexts as

requiring an explanation. The purpose of this final analysis chapter is to illustrate that repair may be done on culturally relevant terms by speakers in a way which demonstrates their own cultural knowledge while simultaneously ensuring that their turns are designed as understandable for their interlocutor.

The interviewee in this excerpt, Karl, left Germany to come to Canada with his parents after the Second World War. Karl is talking about what kind of food his family eats which he explains is influenced by French, German, and east European cuisine. In particular, Karl focuses on the difference between foods eaten in North America (white bread and cereal) and what is eaten in Germany and eastern Europe (rye bread).

Excerpt 11: Wabbelbrot

01 Karl: i love french food.
02 my wife introduced french food
03 into the family.=
04 =but before that it was sort of
05 what my moth- whatever my mother
06 was cooking,
07 and i- i never adapted to (.)
08 white bread or cereal.
09 always had uh rye bread.
10 INT3: mm.
11 Karl: and um (.) we call the- the white bread
12 squishy stuff.
13 wabbelbrot.
14 INT3: hehehehe[heheh.]
15 Karl: [hhh.]
16 with a- with disdain.
17 INT3: [yeah. yeah.]
18 Karl: [you know cuz it's- it's just nothing.

19 INT3: [yeah.]
20 Karl: [it's like] eating foam rubber.
21 INT3: mm.
22 Karl: umm.
23 so food wise we stuck more or less with
24 german [or east] european.
25 INT3: [mm.]
26 Karl: kind of stuff,

Karl informs INT3 in lines 07 and 08 that he was not able to adapt to white bread or cereal, both of which are fairly standard North American foods. In his next turn, line 09, he tells her that he *always had rye bread*, as opposed to the aforementioned white bread. This is taken up by INT3 with *mm*. Karl continues talking about white bread and indexes a “we” group in lines 11 and 23.

Karl makes it clear by using the pronoun *we* that he is not the only person who refers to white bread or the evaluatively termed *squishy stuff* as *wabbelbrot* (lines 11-13). As Karl has previously said he was not able to adapt to white bread, the informing he gives in line 11 suggests he was not alone in his inability to adapt to white bread. Karl’s use of the word *wabbelbrot* elicits laughter from INT3. *Wabbelbrot* is not officially recognized as belonging to the German lexicon (i.e. one would not find the term in a standard German dictionary), but it is a combination of the verb *wabbeln* (to wobble) or adjective *wabbelig* (wobbly) and the noun *Brot* (bread). This makes it a compound noun where the lexeme *wabbel-* describes a quality of the lexeme *brot* resulting in a word which conveys the idea of a type of ‘wobbly bread.’ INT3’s laughter is an indication that she understands what Karl means by *wabbelbrot* and that she treats the term as amusing in some way.

Karl's evaluations in lines 18 and 20 (*it's- it's just nothing. [it's like] eating foam rubber.*) suggest that he was unable to adapt to eating white bread because he does not consider it to have qualities which he associates with good bread. By using the collective pronoun *we*, Karl implies that is not the only person who has such a strong aversion to white bread. Rather there exists an inside group who in addition to sharing a common knowledge of the term presumably also share in Karl's negative assessment. Using *we* takes some of the culpability away from Karl who is expressing a strongly negative opinion about white bread, an action which has the potential to be negatively construed by INT3.

Karl's explanation in line 11 sets up the code-switch which follows in line 13 as being tied to a specific group. By doing this *pre-code-switch* work, Karl treats the term *wabbelbrot* as likely to be unknown, or at least unused, by his interviewer, INT3. He simultaneously indexes himself as belonging to a group of people who have shared opinions and a word which they collectively use to refer to white bread. Through the use of *we* Karl also indexes himself as belonging to a group of people with similar bread opinions in which INT3 is not included in. Karl distances himself from INT3 by positioning her as not belonging to the "we" group, but he provides accounts in lines 18 and 20 for why the "we" group calls white bread *wabbelbrot with disdain*. Karl gives an account after the code-switch *wabbelbrot* by providing INT3 with more information about how the "we" group uses the term, i.e. *with disdain* in line 16. Further information is then given by Karl who gives two accounts for the group's contempt towards the bread. Although Karl acknowledges that he is part of a cultural group which INT3 is not, he does make an effort to provide INT3 with an understanding of the group's opinions on white bread.

This positioning is accepted by INT3 who takes up both of the accounts by giving Karl confirmation that she is following what he is saying.

In the following example, the interviewee gives an account using *we*. Henrik was born in Canada in 1956 to immigrant parents who left Austria a few years earlier in 1953. Here he is being asked about cultural traditions and is talking about German clothing. The interviewer, INT6, is a Canadian graduate student who has knowledge of the German language.

Excerpt 12: Tracht

01 INT6: um (.) is there any other german cultures
02 or traditions that you feel like (.) your
03 parents have (.) raised you with that you
04 still keep?=
05 =or anything like that?
06 Henrik: well we had our own- own uh (.) outfits.
07 stivel?
08 they were like um-
09 well i guess they would been uh-
10 you know what **stivel** are?
11 INT6: no.
12 Henrik: they're like riding boots.
13 the big black [ones,]
14 INT6: [oh okay.]
15 Henrik: and we had these black (.) pants
16 and we had a- a white shirt with
17 all this embroidery on it,
18 [if you've] ever see those around,
20 INT6: [okay.]
21 Henrik: and the women they had really (.)
22 really intricate gowns and stuff.
23 INT6: so the clothing you think was really
24 german then?=
25 Henrik: [=yeah.]

26 INT6: [\$yeah?\$]
 27 [hh okay.]
 28 Henrik: [yeah that was-] my one brother actually
 29 got married with his **tracht-**
 30 we call them **tracht**
 31 (0.8)
 32 Henrik: and my one brother got married with his
 33 **tracht** on.
 34 (went up in X bay.)
 35 INT6: uh huh.
 36 okay, well, (good),
 37 um (.)
 38 are you still involved with the
 39 transylvania club?=
 40 =at [all?]
 41 Henrik: [u:h.] once in a while.

The account which Henrik gives for using the word German word *tracht* is interesting in that it differs from the repair above involving Henrik's use of the word *stivel*. The hesitation and cut-off in line 06 followed by the code-switch in line 07 said with rising intonation mark *stivel* as a potential trouble source. *stivel* ['ʃtrɪv] is phonetically close to the German word for boots, *stiefel* ['ʃti:fl] and is most likely a dialect word although this is unclear in the interaction. Henrik begins to give an explanation which he reformulates before asking INT6 *you know what stivel are?*, potentially circumventing the need for any explanation. INT6, however, gives Henrik a negative answer and so he provides an explanation by comparing *stivel* to *riding boots*. Henrik's explanation is positively taken up by INT6 and the problem of understanding regarding the code-switch is treated by both interactants as having been resolved.

The next code-switch in line 29 is oriented to by Henrik, but in a different way than the code-switch in line 10. The meaning of the term *tracht* is not treated by Henrik as potentially

problematic for INT6 as with *stivel*. Henrik does however put his storytelling on hold in lines 28 and 29 (*my one brother actually got married with his tracht-*) to provide a brief account in line 30 (*we call them tracht*). He does not ask INT6 if she knows what *tracht* is, but instead provides an unelicited explanation. He then resumes the storytelling in line 32 after a 0.8 second pause. INT6 does not treat the code-switch as problematic in any way and after the response *okay, well, (good)*, she changes the topic.

INT6's question *so the clothing you think was really german then?* contains an assessment of Henrik's prior clothing descriptions. Henrik's answer to INT6's original question of whether Henrik has *german cultures or traditions* that he still keeps is a description of clothing which he does not identify as being *really german* until he answers INT6's question. Henrik's answer in line 25 is latched to the question in the previous turn and there is no hesitation on Henrik's part in labelling the clothing as *really german*. Henrik begins his storytelling in line 28 and provides an example of his family's practice of wearing German clothing, which fits with INT6's original question in line 01 about whether Henrik maintains any German traditions. Henrik orients to the code-switch (*tracht*) in line 30 but not by asking a question which checks for INT6's understanding. Henrik gives the account *we call them tracht*, indexing himself through his use of *we* as belonging to a group of people who also refer to the traditional German clothing just described as *tracht*.

The word *tracht* is central to Henrik's story about his brother's wedding and is used by him three times in the course of his storytelling (lines 29 to 33). Using the word *tracht* instead of repeating a partial or full description of his brother's clothing requires less work on Henrik's part but by providing an account in line 30 he demonstrates his anticipation of a potential problem

with his use of the word. The account serves a purpose in that Henrik makes it clear why he uses the word *tracht*, i.e. it is the word he and the group he indexes himself as belonging to use to describe this kind of clothing. While he positions himself as belonging to a group of people who call the clothing *tracht* he simultaneously positions INT6 as someone not belonging to this group. The repair done by Henrik which takes the form of an account has more to do with Henrik's use of *tracht* in the interview context and less to do with the word's lexical qualities including its definition. Henrik acknowledges that the word *tracht* is culturally bound to the context he is describing to INT6. In his account in line 30, Henrik treats the word *tracht* as a term which INT6 may not necessarily be familiar. The account does the work of acknowledging a "possible breach of relevance rules" (Robinson, 2006). In other words, Henrik treats his use of the German word *tracht* as having the potential to be perceived by INT6 as outside of the norms of the conversation. He does not treat the code-switch as a problem of understanding, likely due to the fact that he has already spent a significant amount of time explaining what *tracht* are in lines 6-22). He does, however, account for having code-switched and in doing so, indexes himself as belonging to a group of people who call traditional German clothing *tracht*. He simultaneously positions INT6 as someone not belonging to this group. In terms of transculturality, he acknowledges that a result of INT6 *not* belonging to the same group an account is required to justify his use of the word *tracht* and so as not to disalign himself from INT6. This is different than the earlier repair done on *stivel* which rectified a problem of lexical understanding directly related to the word's meaning (and INT6's knowledge of it) in English.

The next example shows indexing of group membership through the repair of a code-switch. Otto is talking in detail about his father's experiences immigrating to Canada, touching on traumatic events as well as positive relationships that were forged as a result of these experiences. Otto was born in Canada to immigrant parents who identify as Donauschwaben.

Excerpt 13: Landsmann

01 Otto: u:m
02 but it's interesting.
03 my father talks about
04 u:m
05 (2.0)
06 you know the big-
07 (hh.)
08 the big issue for immigrants is
09 you leave everything behind.
10 um, they left behind in a turmoil.
11 they left family in the villages who had ended up in-
12 in labour, camps and died,
13 you know
14 [so i mean]
15 INT7: [yeah.]
16 Otto: so you left everything behind.
17 here they were leaving everything
18 behind again but there's a-
19 (hh)
20 along the road
21 along the voyage
22 ((clears throat))
23 you make new friends
24 new comrades.
25 um there were a lotta germans who
26 were on that voyage
27 a lotta donauschwaben who were on that voyage
28 they all became (.) friends.
29 we hear- my generation hears about the term **landsmann**.
30 and it's kinda cute.

31 INT7: [okay.]
32 Otto: [you know] it sorta-
33 it means somebody that-
34 you know from your area.=
35 INT7: =yup.
36 Otto: um.
37 but these people really became compatriots.
38 they:- the frien- the people he met on the
39 boat (.) were friends (.) forever.
40 no matter where they settled.

Otto is talking about traumatic immigration experiences from his perspective as a second generation immigrant. In line 03 he prefaces his storytelling by saying *my father talks about*. This is followed by the hesitation marker *u:m* and then a 2.0 second pause before Otto adopts a manner of storytelling leaning more on the side of informing INT7 than just recounting his father's experiences in a narrative way. In line 06 Otto uses the discourse marker *you know* before informing INT7 that *the big issue for immigrants is that you leave everything behind*. Otto does not specify any particular group of people here, but broadly refers to *immigrants*, which could include people outside of his family and outside of the German context. His informing extends beyond his own and his father's experience with immigration and remarks on a commonality between immigrants without specifying ethnicity or country of origin. In line 10 Otto goes back to focusing on his family's experiences.

In recounting his family's experiences, Otto provides an example of a specific group of immigrants who left everything behind, including other family members. He reiterates in line 16 that leaving everything behind was what one did as an immigrant by saying *you left everything behind*.

Otto's storytelling changes from recounting the traumatic experiences of his family to focusing on the positive relationships that were formed among immigrants during their voyage. Although, as Otto informs INT7 in lines 17 and 18, the family (*they*) left everything behind on more than one occasion, as suggested by Otto's inclusion of the word *again*, he also remarks that *along the voyage you make new friends*. The phrase *new friends* is repaired to *new comrades*, changing the meaning from something physical to something more emotional and connected to the feelings one might associate with meaningful friendships. The group of people which Otto is referring to is narrowed from potentially all immigrants to specifically *germans* in line 25 and is then narrowed even further as a result of what is potentially a repair in line 27 where *germans* is replaced with *donauschwaben*. The Donauschwaben (in English Danube Swabians) are a German-speaking sub-group of ethnic German people who originate from various countries in southeastern Europe. The distinction between *germans* and *donauschwaben* made by Otto is also relevant in his next turn where he says *they all became friends*. The pronoun *they* seems to refer back to the group of *donauschwaben* who were on the voyage and mentioned previously by Otto.

This is further supported by Otto's account which is given in line 29, *we hear- my generation hears about the term landsmann*. Again, there is a pronoun *we* but this is repaired to *my generation* following a cut-off. Through this repair Otto limits the scope of potential people belonging to the *my generation* group. The *we* group is vaguer and conceivably quite large. While *my generation* is more specific than *we*, it is still somewhat ambiguous in that it could include any person belonging to the same generation as Otto, regardless of which language they speak. However, Otto's previous storytelling and the code-switch in the same line offer

contextual evidence that Otto is not referring to *my generation* in the sense of a collective group of people close to him age.

The repair initiated and carried out by Otto in line 32 is an explanation of what the term *landsmann* means. As in the previous examples, Otto prefaces the code-switch by indexing group membership and distances himself from his interlocutor by positioning her as not belonging to this group. However, the conversational work done in the repair sequence in lines 32-34 is designed for INT7 and contributes to her understanding of the cultural significance of the word used by the Donauschwaben group in Otto's story. Otto acts as a mediator between two groups here. In his previous storytelling, he narrates on behalf of his father. Otto does not identify as part of the Donauschwaben immigrant group but rather as part of the generation of Canadians which followed. The trauma and emotion Otto recounts through his storytelling demonstrates his own understanding of his family's experiences, even though he was not physically present for them. By explaining these events to his interviewer, INT7, and by emphasizing the cultural significance of the term *landsmann*, including his own qualitative evaluation of the term in line 30, Otto contributes to INT7's understanding of the cultural context which he is referring to.

In this section of my analysis, I examined three examples of code-switching which were used by speakers to index membership in a cultural group. By extension, this membership categorization was also used by speakers to distinguish themselves from other cultural groups. Speakers used these code-switches to acknowledge the cultural connection between particular German words and the specific cultural groups they referenced through their use of the pronoun "we." The repair done on these code-switches by the interviewees took the form of an explanation of the term's meaning (*Wabbelbrot* and *Landsmann*) or an account for why they were

using a German word (*Tracht*). Through these orientations to the code-switch speakers demonstrate that these terms have significance within the cultural group they are referring to but also that this significance is not necessarily recognized outside of this group.

An effort was made by the interviewees who prefaced these three code-switches by marking them as belonging to specific cultural groups to provide the interviewers with either an explanation of the term's meaning and cultural significance (*wabbelbrot* and *landsmann*) or an account (*tracht*) for why they used that specific term. In doing this, the speakers bridge a gap between themselves and their interlocutors. A distinction between cultural groups is made by the interviewees in these examples and the use of the pronoun "we" explicitly excludes the interviewees from these respective groups. However, the repairs initiated and performed by the interviewees following the code-switches which are bound to these groups have an important function in that they are used by the interviewees to bridge cultural knowledge gaps between the "we" groups and the interviewers.

The action of bridging knowledge gaps between cultural groups by giving an explanation or an account demonstrates the speakers' construction of transcultural identities. The construction of these identities is initiated first through the speakers' acknowledgement of differences in cultural experiences, and correspondingly specific terminology, between themselves and their interlocutors. This is then followed the speakers' efforts to attend to their interlocutors' lack of cultural experiences in the areas they are discussing. By having acknowledged and attended to the space between the speakers' own cultural knowledge and their interlocutors', the speakers in these examples have constructed identities which make relevant the experiences of multiple cultural groups and are therefore transcultural.

5 Discussion

This chapter will provide a brief overview of my analysis chapters. It will also expand on some of the limitations of my study and implications of my thesis as a whole.

For the most part, speakers adhere to underlying principles of conversation such as recipient design (talk “display[ing] an orientation and sensitivity” to the interlocutor) in order to ensure that they are understood by their interlocutor and that they do not provide more information than is required. The examples of code-switching which have been analysed above are instances of cooperative work being done between interactants through the mechanism of repair. The repair mechanism has two components which are relevant in identifying and repairing problems of understanding — the repair initiation and the repair operation itself. Through my own research it became clear that both of these components served as opportunities for a speaker or their interlocutor to position themselves and their interlocutors as having (or not having) cultural knowledge relevant to the interaction.

Section 4.1 of my analysis shows how speakers who engage in language alternation can position themselves and their interlocutors as having shared knowledge of a language. Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 all demonstrate how repairs related to code-switches can be used by speakers to reach a mutual cultural understanding, they also show that by using the repair to position themselves and their interlocutors, speakers can negotiate and construct transcultural identities.

5.1 Limitations

The research problem of observing “natural speech” is one that was addressed by William Labov in 1972 who pointed out this paradox: “The aim of linguistic research in the community

must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain this data by systematic observation. (Labov, 1972:209)” The use of interviews for the purpose of data collection, a method around which this thesis is based, has been criticized as “artificial” or “inauthentic” (De Fina & Perrino, 2011:1). It is possible, and even likely, that the interview context influenced the style of speech and use of certain words by interviewees. Although interviewees were given the option of using either English or German during the interview, many oriented to their own switching between languages as an error, which they then corrected by resuming their narratives in what they treated as the “prescribed” interview language (in most cases German).

This can be seen in the following excerpt taken from the interview with Ada who, somewhat exasperatedly, realizes she is speaking English in line 02. Her exasperation elicits laughter from INT4 and OBS2, and Ada resumes speaking German in line 06.

Excerpt 8b: Dresden

01 Ada: well i come from dresden
02 which is of course the capital from (.)
03 yup see i speak english again.
04 INT4: ja [eHEhheh.]
05 OBS2: [hehehehehe.]
06 Ada: is die hauptstadt von sachsen.

It is therefore not possible to draw broad conclusions about interactants’ speech styles with regard to language alternation and code-switching, particularly within the interview context where underlying expectations of the appropriateness of language choice definitively played a role. For this reason, my research focused on how individual instances of language alternation

and code-switching were treated by interactants and the implications this has for identity construction within interaction as something which is fluid rather than fixed. Although the interview context may have influenced the speech styles of interactants, these were semi-structured interviews conducted for the purpose of collecting the life stories of German and other European migrants and not to elicit nor prohibit language alternation or code-switching. The narrative style of the interview context makes it conducive to a study on how certain words, in this case code-switches, are treated as being attached to specific cultural contexts.

Another limitation of my study was the nature of the interview video recordings. As I was not present during the interviews, I was unable to control aspects such as camera angle. The Oral History Project, for which these interviews were collected, focused on the stories which the interviewees were telling and not on the role of the interviewers. As a result, the video recordings capture only the facial expressions and body language of the interviewees who appear within the frame. Had the video recordings captured more paralinguistic features on the side of the interviewers, I would have been able to carry out a richer analysis which would have potentially included many non-lexical elements such as facial expression, gaze, and nodding. In the instructions distributed before the interviews took place interviewers were encouraged to provide visual cues to demonstrate interest and to encourage the interviewees to continue talking. The role of the interviewers was more limited in terms of what they expressed verbally during the interviews. Paralinguistic features conveyed by the interviewers could have provided insight into reactions that were not necessarily voiced or seen on camera, and therefore could not be transcribed, but nonetheless may have played a significant role in influencing how interviewees responded in various interactions.

5.2 Implications

This study focused on the connections between code-switching, positioning, and transculturality and analysed how these aspects were treated by German (and other European) immigrants who have, in many cases, either lived in Canada for decades or were born in Canada to immigrant parents. The implications of my findings are relevant to the ongoing discussion surrounding the connection between one's culture and one's identity. As illustrated above in my analysis and discussion of the positioning and identity construction done by both the interviewers and interviewees, it is far more accurate and constructive from a research perspective to talk about *cultures* and *identities* as being plural as opposed to singular. Researchers who move away from static and rigid conceptions of culture in favour of those which are, as Kramsch described them, multifarious, changing, and even conflictual (Kramsch, 2002:255), are better able to account for the complexities inherent to the *multiple* identities people construct in various contexts.

The relevance of the term 'transcultural' is not limited to the academic fields of sociology and linguistics nor are the implications of this study limited to the context of German-Canadian migrants living in the Waterloo region. Although my research focused on migrants' use of code-switching using either German or English in the narration of their experiences, the problem of dealing with cultural knowledge gaps is relevant to many other migrant groups. For many individuals and groups who have resettled in another country through choice or necessity, adapting to a new culture is vastly more difficult than simply learning a new language. Keywords which convey concepts bound to specific cultural contexts are often difficult to convey outside of

one's own cultural group. Migrants may experience difficulty in conveying cultural experiences which are meaningful to them outside of their own cultural group. My research has shown that through the conversational mechanism of repair where speakers offer translations, explanations, cultural comparisons, and accounts, the gap between "us" and "them" can be bridged. The result of a mutual cultural understanding can potentially be the construction of transcultural identities which take into account and incorporate knowledge from multiple cultural groups.

References

- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30(1), 109-137.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1998). From “switching code” to “codeswitching”: Towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Codeswitching in Conversation* (pp. 29-48). London: Routledge
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Auer, P. (1999). From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4), 309-332.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 403-410.
- Bailey, B. (2015). Interactional Sociolinguistics. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-15.
- Benwell B & Stokoe E (2006) *Discourse and Identity*, 1st ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blom, J.P., & Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Codeswitching in Norway. In Li Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader*. London: Routledge.
- Borrows, J. (1995). With or without you: First Nations law (in Canada). *McGill LJ*, 41, 629.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology) (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Giles, H., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Language as a determinant of Welsh identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(4), 447-460.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (2009). *Identity Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

- Clark, H. H., & Schaefer, E. F. (1989). Contributing to discourse. *Cognitive Science*, 13(2), 259-294.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Towards a sociolinguistics of superdiversity. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 13(4), 549-572.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and personhood. *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*, 32-52.
- Dean, H. (1998). NIDDM-Y in First Nation children in Canada. *Clinical Pediatrics*, 37(2), 89-96.
- De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice. *Language in Society*, 36(03), 371-392.
- De Fina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. 'natural' contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society*, 40(1), 1-11.
- Deppermann, A. (2015). Positioning. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*, 369-387
- Diebold, A. R. (1961). Incipient bilingualism. *Language*, 37(1), 97-112.
- Fuller, J. M. (2007). Language choice as a means of shaping identity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(1), 105-129.
- Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELIC Journal*, 8(2), 1-34.
- Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (Eds.), (1998). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of international action*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harré, R. (1999). Positioning theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*.

Heller, M. (Ed.), (1988). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (Vol. 48). Walter de Gruyter.

Holmes, J. (1997). Women, language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 1(2), 195-223.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, 13(53), 11-74.

Jakobson, R. (1961). Linguistics and communication theory. In *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics* (Vol. 12, pp. 245-52).

Jakobson, R (1963). In Daniel Lerner (Ed.), *Parts and Wholes*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 157--162

Jenkins, R. (2008). *Rethinking Ethnicity*. Sage.

Kitzinger C (2013) Repair. In: Sidnell J, Stivers T (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 229–256.

Kramsch, C. (2004). Language, thought, and culture. *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 235-261.

Labov, W. (1971). The notion of system in Creole studies. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 447, 472.

Lance, D. M. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching. *El lenguaje de los chicanos*, 138-153.

Langenhove, L. V., & Harré, R. (1994). Cultural stereotypes and positioning theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 24(4), 359-372.

Lave, J. (1991). Situating learning in communities of practice. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, 2, 63-82.

Maheux-Pelletier, G., & Golato, A. (2008). Repair in membership categorization in French. *Language in Society*, 37(5), 689-712.

Mandelbaum, J. (1987). Couples sharing stories. *Communication Quarterly*, 35(2), 144-170.

Muysken, P. C. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 1983(44), 115-136.

- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in society*, 22(04), 475-503.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). How codeswitching as an available option empowers bilinguals. *Contributions to the Sociology of Language*, 92, 73.
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2011). Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(4), 413-426.
- Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 48, 215-44.
- Poplack, S. (1979). Function and process in a variable phonology.
- Poplack, S. (2001). Code-switching (linguistic). *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences*, 2062-2065.
- Poplack, S., & Meechan, M. (1998). Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. *International journal of bilingualism*, 2(2), 127-138.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *language*, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 361-382.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American journal of sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 1977(13), 5-20.
- Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J. R., Bergmann, P., Birkner, K., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Depperman, A., Gilles, P. Günther, S. & Hartung, M. (2009). Gesprächsanalytisches transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung: Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*.
- Taft, R. (1957). A psychological model for the study of social assimilation. *Human Relations*, 10(2), 141-156.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, 33(1), 1-39.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter group behavior in S Worchel & WG Austin (Eds) *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson.

Taylor, Charles. (1989). *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press

Tileagă, C. (2015). Account-Giving and -Soliciting. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1–10.

Vogt, H. (1954). Language contacts. *Word*, 10(2-3), 365-374.

Wenger, E. (2010) Communities of practice and social learning systems: the career of a concept. In Blackmore, C. (Ed.), *Social Learning Systems and communities of practice*. Springer Verlag and the Open University.

Wenger, E. (2008). Communities of practice: a brief introduction. 2006. Users/noinferiorpleasures/Documents/Azusa/511/Web% 20Pages/Communities% 20of% 20practice.html (accessed 19 June 2017).

Wierzbicka, A. (2010). Cross-cultural communication and miscommunication: The role of cultural keywords. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(1), 1-23.