

“Es kommt nur *naturally*”:

Language use of sixth grade students in an English-German bilingual program

by

Christine Kampen Robinson

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

German

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2010

© Christine Kampen Robinson 2010

## **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 discusses language use by sixth grade students in the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, Manitoba. This bilingual program started out as a heritage language program in the early 1980s, and continues to be well attended. This project looked at the way in which students used both English and German with a fluently bilingual interviewer in an out-of-classroom setting. The study started with the following research questions:

1. How do children currently being educated in the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, Manitoba use German (the second language or L2) and English in out-of-classroom contexts?
2. What kind of borrowing tendencies do sixth grade students share?
3. What do these tendencies tell us about children's bilingual language use and their communication strategies?

It is often assumed that use of L1 when speaking L2 is a sign of laziness or a sign of low language proficiency. However, based on a thorough linguistic analysis of two interviews as case studies, it became clear that borrowing is used for far more diverse purposes than the simple filling of lexical gaps. After an examination that included cultural vs. core borrowing, structural transference, and discourse-related borrowing, the data suggests that depending on the proficiency of the speaker, borrowing is an extremely important communication tool that not only allows the speaker to become more proficient in their L2, but also a more highly developed bilingual.

## Acknowledgements

Although I am the author of this thesis, there are many people who contributed to its writing in ways great and small. First, I want to thank my supervisor, Dr. Mathias Schulze, for his support of my project, for his insights, helpful explanations, and guidance for my writing. Thank you for having more faith in me than I did in myself at times, and for your precise and constructive feedback. Perhaps most of all, I thank you for allowing me to have a desk by a huge window and the title of “Vorzimmerdame,” which has long been one of my life’s ambitions. ;)

I also want to thank my readers, Dr. Grit Liebscher and Dr. Barbara Schmenk for their valuable comments and helpful suggestions. It is always useful, in a project like this, to hear alternate perspectives in order to develop a clearer picture of the topic at hand. Thank you for challenging me to think harder, and stretch further in my research.

Of course, this thesis would never have come to fruition if it were not for the immediate support I received from all levels of administration of the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, from the school board to the principals, to teachers and parents. Thank you for allowing me to conduct my research in your schools, with your students and children. Thank you for finding me quiet rooms on busy days, for including me in lunch room conversations, and encouraging me throughout my time in Winnipeg. Most of all, I want to thank the thirty-six sixth graders themselves who agreed to talk to me. Thank you for your honesty, for your openness and willingness to speak with me. I wish you all success and that you might achieve the dreams so many of you told me about.

My thanks also go to my parents, Walter and Dorothea, who first instilled in me the

importance of learning German, who supported me throughout my schooling, through my undergraduate degree, and who offered their home and hours of babysitting while I spent time in Winnipeg to conduct my interviews. Thank you for all you have done for me!

At the same time, I would have never even arrived at the thesis stage, never mind made it through to the end without the unwavering support of my husband David. Thank you for agreeing to pack up our lives in Winnipeg to come here to Waterloo so I could pursue my studies. Thank you for patiently listening to my ranting about which theoretical framework I could use. Thank you for picking up the slack around the house and doing far more than your share of child care while I was in the end stages of writing.

And last but not least, thank you to my son, Mateo, who has been with me in this journey of graduate studies every step of the way. Although you do not know it, you help me to remain grounded and keep my perspective right side up.

## **Dedication**

*Für Opi*

## Table of Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Author's Declaration</b>  | <b>ii</b>  |
| <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>iii</b> |
| <b>Acknowledgements</b>  | <b>iv</b>  |
| <b>Dedication</b>  | <b>vi</b>  |
| <b>Table of Contents</b>   | <b>vii</b> |
| <b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Chapter 2: Background &amp; Data Description</b>                            | <b>6</b>   |
| <b>2.1 Bilingual education research</b>  | <b>6</b>   |
| <b>2.2 Background of the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba</b>      | <b>7</b>   |
| <b>2.3 Multilingual Spaces Project Data</b>                                    | <b>13</b>  |
| <b>2.4 Perceptions of the children in the English-German bilingual program</b> | <b>17</b>  |
| 2.4.1 Perceived language use and language ability                              | 18         |
| 2.4.2 Reasons for enrolling in the English-German bilingual program            | 21         |
| 2.4.3 Family background  | 22         |
| 2.4.4 German outside of school   | 24         |
| 2.4.5 Attitudes towards German and French                                      | 26         |
| <b>Chapter 3: Bilingual Language Use and Lexical Borrowing</b>                 | <b>28</b>  |
| <b>3.1 Bilingualism and bilingual language use</b>                             | <b>28</b>  |
| <b>3.2 Lexical borrowing &amp; code switching</b>                              | <b>30</b>  |
| <b>3.3 Mixed code as communicative strategy</b>                                | <b>35</b>  |
| <b>3.4 Language use in bilingual education</b>                                 | <b>36</b>  |
| <b>Chapter 4: Theory and Methodology</b>                                       | <b>39</b>  |
| <b>4.1 Initial steps</b>   | <b>39</b>  |
| <b>4.2 Transcription conventions</b>   | <b>41</b>  |
| <b>4.3 Process of Analysis</b>   | <b>43</b>  |
| <b>4.4 Transference: a theoretical approach</b>                                | <b>44</b>  |
| <b>4.5 A note on phonological transfer in mixed code</b>                       | <b>48</b>  |
| <b>Chapter 5: Analysis</b>   | <b>50</b>  |
| <b>5.1 First Interview: Bethany</b>  | <b>50</b>  |
| 5.1.1 Cultural and contextual borrowing  | 51         |
| 5.1.2 Structural borrowing   | 55         |
| 5.1.3 Pragmatic transference as it relates to discourse-related borrowing      | 61         |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 5.1.4 Communication strategies _____                                     | 64         |
| <b>5.2 Second Interview: Faith _____</b>                                 | <b>65</b>  |
| 5.2.1 Cultural and contextual borrowing _____                            | 67         |
| 5.2.2 Structural borrowing _____   | 68         |
| 5.2.3 Discourse-related borrowing _____                                  | 71         |
| 5.2.4 Communication strategies _____                                     | 72         |
| <b>5.3 Comparison of language use and communication strategies _____</b> | <b>74</b>  |
| <b>Chapter 6: Conclusions and Implications _____</b>                     | <b>78</b>  |
| 6.1 Researcher as participant/ Researcher as insider _____               | 78         |
| 6.2 Further research _____   | 79         |
| 6.3 Es kommt nur naturally _____   | 81         |
| <b>References _____</b>  | <b>85</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 1: Interview Template _____</b>                              | <b>91</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 2: Bethany Interview Transcript _____</b>                    | <b>92</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 3: Faith Interview Transcript _____</b>                      | <b>112</b> |



## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

In many ways, the story of this thesis began on September 4, 1990, when I, with my red backpack in hand, marched into elementary school for the first time. I walked into Frau Redekop's classroom and so began my bilingual academic education. Half my day was spent in German, half my day was spent in English. For the next six years, my days were thus divided. Subjects like math, science, and physical education were taught in English, while subjects like Social Studies, History, Health and Art were taught in German. Of course we were instructed in Language Arts in both languages.

At the time, I gave little thought to the way in which I spoke, whether in English, which, outside of school I spoke outside on the playground and with my sister, or German, which outside of school I spoke at home with my parents, grandparents, and most of my extended family. I took my bilingualism for granted because my whole life was bilingual. In elementary school, I didn't realize how unusual I was, since most of the children in my class came from similar backgrounds; even if they no longer spoke German at home with their parents, they regularly spoke German with their grandparents outside of school.

Although I left the English-German bilingual program once I entered Junior High, the German I had learned remained important in my life; indeed, I am currently pursuing a graduate degree in German Studies. In the twelfth grade, I, along with many of my old elementary school classmates, sat together to write the German Sprachdiplom der Kultusministerkonferenz, an exam that, if passed, serves as documentation for language proficiency high enough to attend a German university. In fact, Manitoba consistently has a very large number of students who write and pass the Sprachdiplom II (Hogue, 2007).

So the English-German bilingual program is important and to a great extent unique in Canada. (There are similar programs in Edmonton and Calgary). By the time I finished sixth grade, the age of the students involved in this study, the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg was almost fifteen years old. By the time I started grad school in 2008, the last official evaluation or significant research of any kind based on the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg was conducted in 1984.

Teachers who have taught in the program for many years, such as one of the teachers interviewed for this project, often speak about how the face of the English-German bilingual program has changed since they began teaching. In 1990, many of the students who started Kindergarten and Grade One had had significant exposure to German in some form or other, primarily from family members who had emigrated from German-speaking countries, or had at least grown up with German as their primary language. Today, this is no longer the case. Where teachers used to be able to focus on teaching content rather than vocabulary and grammar, today, teachers must focus on vocabulary building to such an extent, that according to the teachers I interviewed, the content of the subjects they are meant to teach is sometimes compromised if they only speak German.

When I was in the program, we were encouraged to speak only German in German class, something which I discovered in the interviews still remains the goal of teachers and students. But with students entering the program with little to no previous German language exposure, I wondered how realistic this was. In light of the recent changes in the program in terms of initial language exposure of students, and because of the general lack of research on all aspects of the English-German bilingual program, I developed this project to find out how students were actually using German and English to communicate. A

starting point for me was how students integrate English into their German, in other words, how students might borrow English constructions.

In light of this premise, my central research questions were the following:

1. How do children currently being educated in the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, Manitoba use German (their second language or L2) and English (their L1) in out-of-classroom contexts?
2. What kind of borrowing tendencies do sixth grade students share?
3. What do these tendencies tell us about children's bilingual language use and their communication strategies?

With these as my research questions, I sought to determine whether the borrowing tendencies of the sixth graders at two English-German bilingual schools in fact were simply the issue of laziness or deficient language skills that are so often assumed. My hypothesis was that the students' frequent borrowing into the German matrix language in the interviews can be explained as a communicative strategy, which not only enables them to compensate for an as yet underdeveloped vocabulary, but that also serves many other functions as borrowing and code switching do for more developed bilinguals.

My thesis is divided into six chapters that explore these questions. I want to comment briefly on the order of the chapters, because the order is slightly unusual. Following this introduction, the second chapter already contains the description of my data, rather than the description of my methodology, which follows in Chapter Four. The reason why the data description comes at the beginning of the thesis is that this project

was primarily data driven, and the data itself serves as the underpinning for the discussion of theory and methodology. The purpose of my study was to examine an under-researched phenomenon, and thus, my thesis is structured in much the same way in which the project itself unfolded. Another result of this structure is the fact that the theory I came to use is intertwined with my methodology and analysis, which is why there is no purely methodological or theoretical chapter.

With the reason for the order explained, the chapters are as follows: Chapter Two: Background & Data Description contains a detailed history of the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, Manitoba, the basis on which it was conceptualized, its goals and aims. In this chapter, I also give a detailed description of the data I gathered for this project. I give information about the interviewees, their background, and their experiences in the bilingual program. This chapter concludes with a discussion of student attitudes towards bilingualism, language mixing, German and French. Chapter Three: Bilingual Language Use and Lexical Borrowing consists of a discussion of key terms for this thesis, such as bilingualism, code switching, borrowing, and communication strategies. Discussing previous research on these issues contextualizes my research and sets the stage for my own methodological framework, which is explained in the next chapter. Chapter Four: Theory and Methodology contains a step-by-step process of analysis, including the conceptualization of my framework of analysis, which draws from a number of different sources. Chapter Five: Linguistic Analysis is the chapter in which two interviews are treated as case studies. In this chapter, I analyze these case studies in light of the analytical framework of borrowing, and compare and contrast the interviews to each other. In Chapter Six: Conclusions and Implications, I summarize the findings of this study, and talk

about further research questions which grow out of this project. In addition, I offer some possible implications of this study for the English-German bilingual program.

## **Chapter 2: Background & Data Description**

### **2.1 Bilingual education research**

Through the course of my investigation, I have seen that there has been extensive research done on early childhood bilingualism, even research relating to the code switching and borrowing patterns of early bilingual children (see Cantone, 2007; Baker, 2006). Other studies relating to code switching of bilingual children have primarily to do with language minority children learning English, which is the majority language in the United States and in most parts of Canada (Baker, 2006). Canadian multicultural policy results in the development of different attitudes towards bi- and multilingualism, and therefore also results in the development of different forms of bilingual education (McLeod, 1993, p. i). However, many of these studies have had to do with French, rather than German or other heritage languages (Baker, 2006, p. 240, see Cummins, 1983; Safty, 1988; Landry et al., 2007). Furthermore, much of the research outside of French immersion has been devoted to minority language children learning a majority language, such as Hispanic children in the United States (see Freeman, 2007).

There has been very little research done on the English-German bilingual program available in Canada. The history of the German language in Canada is unique, as are the programs in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Calgary. Studying how the children in the English-German bilingual program borrow and code switch would certainly have implications for children in the Ukrainian or Hebrew bilingual programs that exist elsewhere in Canada. This context interests me in particular because according to Baker (2006), the bilingual environment is one of the most effective ways to teach someone a language (p. 15).

For the purpose of my study, I wish to examine L2<sup>1</sup> use in a bilingual context. Bilingual education is generally achieved using a content-based approach to language learning. The European Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) organization defines the content-based approach as “any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language, thus not usually the first language of the learners involved, is used as a medium in the teaching and learning of non-language content” (CLIL, 2002). In other words, students learn the language by learning about things in the target language, for example, they learn all the L2 terms for parts of the digestive system at the same time as they learn how the digestive system works. This approach generally leads to students having strong comprehension skills, as well as the confidence to express themselves, but can have a less positive effect on grammar acquisition. A study conducted soon after the English-German bilingual program’s development found that since more emphasis is placed on negotiation of meaning rather than negotiation of form, students’ grammar and spelling tend to be weak, although this is certainly not always the case (Manitoba Education, 1988, p. 9; see also Swain, 1985).

## **2.2 Background of the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba**

Fully integrated German bilingual education has been available in Manitoba since the 1980-1981 school year. Before that, German language instruction had been available in Manitoba public schools since the 1950s, but it was not until the late 1970s that the German bilingual education curriculum was developed and implemented (Government of Manitoba, 2005, p.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this study, I will take my cue from the interviewees themselves, who told me that English is their “best language,” and will therefore be referred to throughout this thesis as L1, whereas German is the less comfortable language. Some of the few students who also speak Low German or Plautdietsch consider their Low German better than their High German, but German remains an L2, regardless of whether they learned German or English first.

ii). In addition to the two elementary schools, two further schools offer bilingual education in Winnipeg, a junior high school (grades 7-9) and a high school (grades 10-12).

In the introduction to the German Language Arts Curriculum Framework for the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba, the rationale behind the bilingual program as a whole reads as follows:

German bilingual programming establishes an environment in which both English and German languages are used and needed constantly for purposes of communication, personal satisfaction, and learning. Students have numerous opportunities to learn and use language in meaningful, purposeful ways to meet their needs, interests, and abilities. (Manitoba Education and Training, 2008, p. 1).

According to the Manitoba Curriculum Framework document, the overarching outcome expectation of the Specific Language Component portion is that students “will use German confidently and competently in a variety of situations for communication, personal satisfaction and further learning” (Manitoba Education and Training, 2008, p. 71). Specifically, the expectations for sixth graders in terms of vocabulary use are that they

consistently and independently use all elements of the sound-symbol system[,] recognize that one word may have multiple meanings, and recognize that various words and expressions may express the same idea[,] use basic German mechanical features effectively[, and] use basic German



discourse features independently for effect. (Manitoba Education and Training, 2008, p. 75).

Furthermore, the document contains lists of interactive, interpretive and productive language use strategies which are to be expected of students in the bilingual program. Among these is the expectation that students will “use words from their first language to get their meaning across, e.g., use a literal translation of a phrase in the first language, use a first language word but pronounce it as in the second language,” in other words, that they will make use of borrowing as a communication strategy (Manitoba Education and Training, 2008, p. 131). Additional strategies include

[using] the other speakers’ words in subsequent conversation, [... using] a simple word similar to the concept they want to convey and invite correction, e.g. *Fisch* for *Forelle*, [... asking] for confirmation that a form used is correct, [... using] a range of fillers and hesitation devices to sustain conversations, e.g. *Also...*, *Was wollte ich sagen...*, [... using] circumlocution to compensate for lack of vocabulary, e.g. *Das Ding, aus dem man trinkt* for *Glas*. (Manitoba Education and Training, 2008, p. 131).

It is the goal of the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba to develop German language competence in its students. This aim is at least partly due to the fact that the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba really began as a heritage language program, a means for encouraging and maintaining German language skills. The Ukrainian community implemented its Ukrainian-English bilingual program in 1979, and it quickly flourished (Johnson, 1982, p. 10). This program served as a model for the sizable German-

speaking population in Winnipeg at the time. The German-speaking community was one which was concerned with maintaining the language of their ancestors, and ensuring that their children learned it as well. Interestingly, those involved in the development of the program were predominantly not of German-Canadian background per se. Due to the wartime and post-war prejudice many encountered, their German-Canadian ethnic identity was conflicted to say the least. When Canada revised its immigration policies in 1950, approximately 250 000 ethnic Germans, both *Volks*<sup>2</sup>- and *Reichsdeutsche*<sup>3</sup> immigrated to Canada (Bassler, 1988). Bassler wrote that

in 1964, Maclean's characterized German Canadians to be "almost painfully unassertive." Postwar surveys found more than one-third of German immigrants eager to jettison their identity in favour of "Canadianism."

Census data confirm that German Canadians have been abandoning their mother tongue at a rate superseded only by Scandinavian, Dutch, Flemish and Gaelic immigrants. (Bassler, 1988).

Instead, post-war German-speaking Russian Mennonite<sup>4</sup> immigrants were particularly active in the development of the program, and according to some, it is

---

<sup>2</sup> People of German heritage who lived outside of Germany during the time of the Third Reich.

<sup>3</sup> Germans who lived in Germany during the time of the Third Reich.

<sup>4</sup> As a religious group, Mennonites can be defined as follows: "[they] are a branch of the Christian church, with roots in the radical wing of the 16th century Protestant Reformation. Part of the group known as Anabaptists (because they rebaptized adult believers), the Mennonites took their name from Menno Simons, a Dutch priest who converted to the Anabaptist faith and helped lead it to prominence in Holland by the mid-16th century" (Roth, <http://history.mennonite.net/>). Russian Mennonites in particular, the group with which I am primarily concerned for the purpose of this study, derive their name from their immigration history. Originally immigrating from the Netherlands and northern Germany to Prussia for reasons of religious persecution, these Mennonites originally ended up in Russia and the Ukraine. The term "Russian" refers to the generations they spent in Russia in order to differentiate them from the Swiss Mennonites, who primarily immigrated from southern Germany, Switzerland and Austria directly to the United States in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. Russian Mennonites have historically spoken a variety of Low German that is similar to the current Frisian dialect, called Plautdietsch, as well as High German.

remembered as “an extension of the Mennonite community” (Maunder, 1995, p.10). Russian Mennonites made up a significant portion of Winnipeg’s North Kildonan population (the neighbourhood where all four schools are located) when they immigrated to Canada between 1947-1951 (Regehr, 1996, p. 79), and there are still many Mennonites in that area of Winnipeg today. The post-war Mennonite immigrants were High- and Low German speakers, with Low German being primarily a home language and High German being the language of church and school. High German was strongly connected to Mennonite religious identity rather than ethnic identity, and this is perhaps one of the reasons why it was felt by so many that passing it on to the next generations was so important (Regehr, 1996, p. 312).

Statistics Canada reported in the 1986 census that 65 760 Manitobans identified German as their mother tongue (1986). When the English-German bilingual program began, wrote reporter Cleroux,

8,000 students in Manitoba [took] German, in a full bilingual program, a core program or a supplementary program. The number [was] high partly because of Hutterite<sup>5</sup> colonies and Mennonite communities in the province that have a strong commitment to their ancestral language. (1983, p. 11).

Of these 8000, 103 were enrolled in the English-German bilingual program (Maunder, 1995, p. 10). From that point on, the program grew rapidly. Only fifteen years after the

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia* describes Hutterites as “the Austrian branch of the great Anabaptist movement of the 16th century, [which was and continues to be] characterized by the practice of community of goods” (Friedmann, Hofer, Meier, Hinde, 1989). Today, Hutterites continue to live on colonies in various Canadian provinces and American states. In addition to receiving a provincially mandated education in English, Hutterian children have High German instruction daily throughout the school year (ibid.)

program began with the German Kindergarten and Grade One classes at just one school, 800 children were enrolled in the program in four different schools (two of them the elementary schools involved in this project) in Winnipeg (Maunder, 1995, p. 10).

A decade later still, though enrolment in general in Manitoba schools was dropping, at some grade levels, the bilingual program continued to grow (Hagenlocher, 2006). Many parents sending their children to the bilingual program have Russian Mennonite heritage, and some of them were part of the bilingual program themselves as students. Some teachers in the program now were students when it first began (Hogue, 2007). The parents sending their children to the bilingual program today share the feelings of their own parents and the parents that helped found the program: that learning their ancestral language is important (ibid.) The focus has shifted somewhat however, from German being vital to religious identity to German being important to Canadian identity, in that it is a part of who these children are, to quote Bethany<sup>6</sup>, one of the interviewees, for example, “[Es ist] ein bisschen ein Teil von mir. Ein Teil von mir ist deutsch, ja? Das ist was ich bin“ (Interview Bethany).

Over half of all the children enrolled at the two elementary schools that offer bilingual programming are involved in the bilingual program. There are nine German classroom teachers at one of the schools, as well as one German-speaking music specialist. At the other school, there are eight German classroom teachers who also teach the English portion of the day, and no German-speaking music specialist. Aside from that, however, the students’ days at both schools look very similar. They spend half their day in German, and half their day in English, except in Kindergarten, where their half day at school is spent

---

<sup>6</sup> Names of all children, teachers and administrators involved in this study have been changed.

primarily in German, at the discretion of the teacher (Government of Manitoba, 2005, p. ii). In the school where German and English subjects are taught by different teachers, students “switch” classrooms at the lunch period in the one school, where they have different teachers for the German and English portions of their days. Subjects such as History, Social Studies, Health, Art and Language Arts (Reading, Writing) are taught in German, and subjects such as Science, Math and Language Arts (Reading, Writing) are taught in English. Additionally, students have Physical Education in English, and Music in both English and German.

### **2.3 Multilingual Spaces Project Data**

My initial research for this project was conducted on-site at the two elementary schools using a number of steps. Ideally, I would have liked to collect in-classroom data, to examine the language behaviour of students within the classroom setting. However, at the same time, I wanted to guarantee the maximum number of participants in my project, and especially since I was working with children, I needed parental consent. If even one parent had not consented, I would not have been able to record classroom data. In choosing to do individual interviews with the children, I was able to have many participants, and gather a large quantity of data. At the same time, further benefits of this approach included that each individual student had more talk time than they ever would have if I had done classroom recordings, and also, since the interviews were semi-structured, I had a better basis for comparison of the interviews than what might have been produced in class, over which, of course, I could have no control.

For these reasons, in May, 2010, I interviewed the school principal of one of the two schools with bilingual programs, the classroom teachers of the two sixth grade English-

German bilingual classes, as well as thirty-six sixth grade students. The interviews with the principals and teachers were conducted in English, and were conducted for the purpose of gathering background information on the program and teachers' perceptions of the program and their teaching practices. The interviews with the children were conducted in German, and averaged approximately thirty minutes in length. Before interviewing the students, I spent a day observing them and their teacher in the classroom setting. Unfortunately, due to time constraints, I was unable to interview the students more often than once each.

I kept the interviews with the students fairly open, but took care to cover such topics as their feelings about school in general, about studying German, about their family background, as well as code switching itself. Some of the questions were designed to elicit responses that would result in borrowing or code switching, such as questions pertaining to students' mathematics or science classes, which are taught in English (see de Bot, Broersma, & Isurin, 2009). At the same time, questions regarding German subjects were asked in order to give the students an opportunity to use specialized vocabulary they were taught in that context.

The list of questions I used as an outline for the interview was the following:

1. Was ist dein Lieblingsfach?
2. Wie gefällt dir Mathematik/ Sport/ Naturwissenschaft?
3. Wie läuft dein typischer Schultag?
4. Was machst du in deiner Deutschklasse? Was machst du in deiner Englischklasse?

5. Wie oft denkst du wechselst du Sprachen in deiner Deutschklasse? Wie häufig vermischst du die Sprachen?
6. Was machst du gerne in deiner Freizeit?
7. Warum bist du im bilingualen Programm?
8. Wieviel Deutsch konntest du bevor du mit dem bilingualen Programm anfingst?
9. Woher kommt deine Familie?
10. Wie oft sprichst du außerhalb der Schule Deutsch? Wann? Mit wem?
11. Was hältst du vom Deutschlernen? Wirst du in der 7. Klasse weitermachen? Warum / Warum nicht?
12. Was hältst du vom Französischlernen? Wirst du in der 7. Klasse weitermachen? Warum / Warum nicht?
13. Was hältst du vom Deutschsprechen? Ist es schwer? Einfach? Wichtig? Langweilig? Welche Adjektive würdest du benutzen um Deutschsprechen zu beschreiben?

(see *Appendix 1* for question translations and an example of the interview template).

Although I had planned to interview both principals first, the time that was available to me resulted in slight changes to my original plan. In the first school I visited, I observed the entire school day in the German teacher's classroom. In the morning, it was a group of only grade sixes, and in the afternoon, the group was mixed grade fives and sixes, though my concern was primarily with the sixth graders. The purpose for my observation was twofold: to establish a rapport with the children, and to take notes on teacher practice to elicit information during teacher interviews. After my observation day, I interviewed the school principal about his involvement in the bilingual program and his opinions about it in general, as well as the particular school at which he was working. In both cases, the schools

are dual stream schools, offering K-to Grade six monolingually in English, as well as the K-Grade six English-German bilingual program.

During subsequent days, I interviewed the sixth graders individually in German. After I had interviewed the children, I interviewed the classroom teacher about his involvement in the bilingual program. We discussed his opinions about the program, as well as some of his best practice techniques. I followed virtually the same procedure at the second school, though I was unable to schedule an interview with the principal.

In total, thirty-six student interviews were conducted at two schools over the period of two weeks in May of 2010. Students were interviewed individually, with the average interview lasting approximately thirty minutes. The longest interview lasted forty-six minutes and forty seconds, while the shortest interview lasted eighteen minutes and twenty-eight seconds. They were told in advance of the interview that their use of German and English was going to be looked at. Other than this, unless the students asked specific questions, they were not given any direction prior to or during the interviews about their use of German or English. Sometimes students asked what a particular word was in German, in which case I supplied it. On a number of occasions the students stared at me helplessly in trying to explain a concept, or said “ich weiß nicht wie zu sagen es auf deutsch” or something similar, and if they were particularly frustrated already, I suggested they tell me what they meant in English. In general, however, my direction regarding language use was minimal. As such, though most students used German as their matrix language<sup>7</sup> during the interviews, some students conducted the interviews primarily or

---

<sup>7</sup> The matrix language refers to the language that is used more frequently in a given stretch of discourse – in my case one interview – while the embedded language refers to the constituents which are borrowed into the matrix language.



completely in English, while others spoke what they seemed to believe was German, when really, they spoke almost exclusively English<sup>8</sup>. Regardless of what language the interviewees chose to speak, as the interviewer I intentionally spoke almost exclusively German.

In some ways, the group of sixth grade students in the bilingual program in Manitoba are quite homogeneous, as observed by one of the principals (personal communication, May 4, 2010). For example, nearly all of them started the bilingual program in Kindergarten, and spent their entire schooling at the same school. Wendy, Karl and Sara started the bilingual program in the first grade, since they were in Paraguay during their Kindergarten year. Erin started in the first grade also, when her parents decided to enrol her in the bilingual program. Bailey spent three years away from the bilingual program while living in a different city in Manitoba, but was homeschooled by her mother during this time, who speaks German as her L1. A further exception to the early start in the bilingual program is Fabian, who was in a German language school in Paraguay until the fifth grade, and could therefore make an academically seamless transition into the German bilingual program.

#### **2.4 Perceptions of the children in the English-German bilingual program**

As becomes clear in looking at the interviews, although my primary interest for the purpose of this project was to examine student language use, many of the questions did double-duty in also eliciting student perceptions of a number of issues surrounding the

---

<sup>8</sup> Throughout her interview, Erin talked at length about the importance of learning German to her and her family, and the importance of practicing German at every opportunity. However, she switched to English when she encountered a word search in her first sentence and never returned to German as a matrix language in the interview, despite the fact that the questions were asked exclusively in German.

learning of German and being bilingual. These perceptions provide an interesting backdrop for the analysis of student language use, and therefore bear some examination.

#### **2.4.1 Perceived language use and language ability**

All of the students surveyed agreed that they should be speaking German in German class, realizing that the more they practice, the better they will get. At the same time, however, they also agreed that they spoke more English in German class than German, although the reasons for this were varied. Many of the students at Westmount Elementary School talked about an incentive program that had been implemented in their classroom, which they had developed together with their teacher. They all agreed that having a program where German speaking was rewarded served as an effective reminder for them to make an effort to speak German. A number of students from King George Elementary School talked about having had such incentive programs in the past which had been effective, but that they didn't have such a program in the sixth grade. However, as Bethany observed during her interview, such a program is only effective if the students take it seriously, saying "they have to care." (Interview Bethany)

Many students in both groups mentioned the importance of their teacher as a factor in the amount of German or English they speak. In the group of Westmount students, there was general agreement that speaking German with their teacher Herr Hiebert is what is expected, and so they make their best effort to do so. An acceptable exception to speaking German with their teacher was only switching "wenn ich wisst nicht ein Wort in deutsch" (Interview Perrin.) This was the only truly acceptable exception to speaking German in German class that students agreed upon, though they did cite other reasons why they spoke English. Many students in both groups talked about how easy it is to forget to speak

German in German class, particularly when they come in from recess, where they speak English with their classmates, and then having to switch into “German mode” is difficult (Interview Lauren.) By the same token, according to the King George students when their German teacher speaks English, (which happens for at least part of their day because their German teacher, Mr. Albrecht, teaches them math, which is a subject taught in English) is also influential in how much German they speak during the day.

The overwhelming majority of students cited the fact that they were better able to express themselves in English as the main reason why they speak English in German class. Many students simplified this feeling as “es ist easier” (Interview Petra). None of the students interviewed, even those who reported learning German as their first language, would prefer using German if given the choice between German and English. Even for those who had spent much of their life speaking Low German, English would still be their first choice in language to express themselves. One student maintained that there was so much English in her head since immigrating to Canada from Paraguay, that there was no more room for German in there (Interview Whitney.)

A further reason for speaking English that was only mentioned by one student was that he wanted to fit in with his classmates. Although Fabian acknowledged that speaking German is vital to keeping up one’s language skills, he said that he purposefully speaks English in German class if the other students do, because he wants to be like the other students (Interview Fabian). This factor was alluded to by Lauren as well, when she seemed ashamed by the fact that she uses English when she knows she shouldn’t (Interview Lauren.)

Most of the students were able to fully comprehend my questions in German and answer fully in German. However, those who seemed to me the most proficient seemed to have a surprisingly negative view of their language skills. For example, Bethany says explicitly: “mein deutsch ist nicht sehr gut,” (Interview Bethany.) At one point, in response to a question about why he does not speak more German in German class, Parker laughs and says: “mein deutsch- du kannst sehen ich weiss nicht all die Worte in deutsch” (Interview Parker.) Students seemed to focus on their lexical gaps and felt the need to apologize for them, seeming to believe that this had a significant bearing on their language proficiency.

On the other hand, the confidence level of other students with respect to their language proficiency was fairly high, particularly for those students, Gina and Erin, who used little to no German during the course of the interview. Perhaps the most perplexing thing about the use of English by these two girls is their reiteration throughout the interview about how important speaking German is and how they themselves are German. This issue of identity was less evident in the other students (Brittany, Rowan, Sam, Pierce, and Willa) who used English well over half of the interview, despite the fact that I, the interviewer spoke German only. Of these interviews, however, Brittany, Rowan, Sam and Willa seemed very nervous and relied on English to express themselves fully, while Pierce clearly had no interest in speaking German after the first few minutes of the interview, answering monosyllabically and fidgeting throughout. Other students told me outside of the interview that Gina had bragged about speaking only English during the German interview and not being told to speak German, and I was not sure if this affected the

German language use of others. If anything, I think that her statements made other students less nervous about speaking to me and more willing to make an effort.

#### **2.4.2 Reasons for enrolling in the English-German bilingual program**

The overwhelming majority of students cited family as the reason why they enrolled in the bilingual program in the first place, as well as the reason why they would choose to enrol in it again if they personally were given the choice. What exactly it was about their families that was the reason for their being enrolled in the program varied slightly however. In many cases, the question of why they were enrolled in the bilingual program had somehow to do with their identity, and the importance of German to that identity, for example “meine Familie ist ganz deutsch” (Interview Hanna) or “alle die Leute in meine Familie sind deutsch” (Interview Paige.) Although only a handful of the children said that their parents spoke German, all of them still had living grandparents to whom it was important to speak German. In most cases, these grandparents also speak fluent English, but the children still perceive being able to speak German to their grandparents as something that is important. In general, the children remained vague when asked for specifics about why they thought continuing to learn German might be important to their families, or why learning German might be important for people with German heritage. What they did agree upon was the fact that it was important, to their parents and grandparents, as well as to them personally.

A few students talked about other reasons why they remained enrolled in the bilingual program, and why they would choose to enrol in the program themselves, namely additional benefits of being able to speak another language. Parker talked at length of the importance of German for future jobs he might be interested in, a sentiment that was echoed by a number of others (Interview Parker.) Parker said that speaking German would

allow him to work in Germany, and Paige talked about wanting to go to university in Germany (Interview Paige.) Petra stressed that being enrolled in the bilingual program gives her and her classmates more opportunities, both in the future, such as working and studying abroad, but also currently, such as participating in this research project (Interview Petra.) Paisley said that being enrolled in the bilingual program, she and her classmates are exposed to and learn two foreign languages, German and French, which is better than only French, a requirement in Canadian elementary schools. When asked about how specifically foreign languages are beneficial, Paisley paused for a moment, thinking, and then simply said that knowing languages other than English is “gut für deine Kopf” (Interview Paisley.)

The children who had emigrated from Paraguay had an additional reason for continuing with German, since many of them still have relatives and friends there with whom they converse in Low German. All of the students who had some background in Low German maintained that Plautdietsch is not a written language<sup>9</sup>, and since they want to remain in contact with relatives and friends in South America, who are Low German speaking, they have to use High German to do so.

### **2.4.3 Family background**

As observed by one of the principals, the children enrolled in the English-German bilingual program have similar ethnic backgrounds, primarily Russian Mennonite<sup>10</sup>. A large portion of the students currently enrolled have grandparents who immigrated to Canada from

---

<sup>9</sup> Although it is true that no official consensus exists regarding written Low German, Russian Mennonite Low German in particular has been written about often, and not only do written dictionaries exist, but also novels and plays written in Plautdietsch. See Rempel (1984) *Kjenn Jie Noch Plautdietsch?* and Thiessen (2003) *Mennonite Low German Dictionary/ Mennonitisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

<sup>10</sup> I refer to Russian Mennonite as an ethnic background in the sense of Regehr (1996) and Prokop (2004).

Russia or the Ukraine via Germany in the early 1950s, a familiar pattern for Russian Mennonites (Regehr, 1996, p. 79). Ten students have parents who immigrated to Canada from South America, mostly from Paraguay, but also, in the case of Uri, Brazil. Some of them followed the same route of the post-war refugees, others returning to Canada in the 1990s and 2000s after their ancestors left Manitoba in the 1920s. These children have exposure to Low German either at home or through their grandparents and relatives and friends remaining in Paraguay and Brazil.

In addition, there is a small group of students who has grandparents who immigrated to Canada directly from German-speaking central Europe. Bailey, Petra and Spencer are first generation Canadians on their mother's side, since their mothers were born in Germany and immigrated to Canada when they themselves were young. The other children of German-Canadian heritage who are not connected to Mennonites are Sam, Gillian, Spencer and Erin. Only one student, Kaylee, has heritage other than European, since her father is from Africa. Kaylee and Willa both have one Francophone parent. Kaylee's father came to Canada from Madagascar, and Willa's father is Quebecois, where a large portion of her paternal relatives still live.

Of the thirty-six children interviewed, thirty-three have at least one German speaking parent. Of these, all have at least one set of German-speaking grandparents. Twenty-six of the children come from a Mennonite background, meaning in this case that at least one of their parents has Russian Mennonite ethnic background. Six of the children were born in Paraguay to Low German speaking Mennonite parents (Wendy, Gina, Whitney, Sara, Hanna and Karl.) Of these, four (Whitney, Sara, Hanna, Karl) still regularly speak Low German as well as some English at home with their parents. A further three

students, Waverly, Paisley and Brooke, were born to Low German speaking Mennonite parents who emigrated from Paraguay before their children were born.

#### **2.4.4 German outside of school**

If one looks only at the students' entry point into the program and their ethnic backgrounds, the grade six classes at King George Elementary School and Westmount Elementary School look very similar to the first grade six classes in these schools (in the 1980s). At its inception, the program was supported to a great extent by Russian Mennonite families living in the area where these schools are situated. However, there is a significant difference today: students do not begin the program with prior exposure to the German language anymore, and neither do they have any significant opportunity to speak German outside of their classroom (personal communication with Mr. Hiebert, May 14, 2010).

In my sample, with the exception of two students, Lauren and Bailey, none of the children speak German at home with their immediate family. Some spoke German at home before they started school, like Waverly, but have not done so since they started Kindergarten. No one really speculated on a reason for this change, other than Whitney, who recounted coming to Canada and being taught English without meaning to learn it, because that was all anyone wanted to speak with her.

Most of the students agreed that the very minimal opportunity they have to use German outside of the classroom context is with their grandparents. And although all of the grandparents living in Canada also speak English, in situations where the children are with their grandparents alone, they usually speak German to them. They agreed that for the



most part, they speak German better than their own parents, and that is the main reason why they don't speak German at home with their parents, since, as Brittany said, "it would be awkward" (Interview Brittany.) Some children said they occasionally speak German with their siblings, in preparation for a test, but also if they want to talk about something or somebody who is not German-speaking without that particular person overhearing and understanding. Lauren, who speaks German at home with her brothers, recounted a story about a neighbour boy bullying her youngest brother, and her middle brother becoming very angry and shouting at the bully in German, whereupon the bully left the youngest brother alone (Interview Lauren.) Paisley also mentioned talking to her siblings in German and enjoying that it was like a secret language for them (Interview Paisley.)

The children from families who had recently emigrated from Paraguay showed some different trends with regard to language use at home. Hanna, Whitney, Wendy, Karl, Gina, Sara, Fabian and Uri all reported using Plautdietsch at home at least some of the time. Fabian said that he spoke a mix of High German and Plautdietsch at home with his parents and siblings all of the time. Hanna claimed to speak Plautdietsch most of the time with her parents and English with her siblings. All of the children mentioned above use High German on a regular basis to correspond in writing with friends and family remaining in South America. With some of the children, Whitney, Sara and Gina in particular, it became unclear whether they in fact knew the difference between High German and Plautdietsch, since they continually called Low German "deutsch," and I as the interviewer became confused about which variety they meant.

A few of the children had been to Germany before, and they talked about what a different experience it was to speak German with German people than in school with their

classmates and teachers. Brittany commented on how difficult it was because the children she was spending time with in Germany didn't speak any English (Interview Brittany.) Spencer recounted that he found that Germans spoke very quickly, which made it difficult to understand and hard to think quickly enough to answer them (Interview Spencer.) All of them said that it got easier after a few days of being there. Many of the students interviewed for this project have plans to go to Germany to improve their German, most immediately taking part in the opportunity Grade 11 students in the bilingual program have to spend three months in Germany on exchange.

#### **2.4.5 Attitudes towards German and French**

When asked about their opinion about learning French, many of the students talked about how difficult they found it. Interestingly, many of the same students who talked about continuing German because of how important it is to speak another language told me that although at the English-German bilingual junior high school they are obligated to continue with French in the seventh grade, they would not continue if they had the choice. One of the main reasons they gave for this decision was that they were not very good at French. A secondary reason was that they did not have the same connection to French as they did to German because nobody in their family spoke French. As Petra put it, "it would be kind of lame or something if I did *franzöjisch [sic]*. Meine ganze Familie ist deutsch."

With very few exceptions, children found German to be more important than French. I kept the question "welche Sprache ist wichtiger, Französisch oder Deutsch?" intentionally ambiguous to see how they would answer. Even when pressed about the fact that Canada is an English-French bilingual country, most students acknowledged the importance of French to their country, but maintained that German was still more

important to them personally because of its connection to their families. This familial connection is precisely why two of the students interviewed, Willa and Kaylee, who both have French-speaking fathers, found this to be a very difficult question. After some thought Willa decided she couldn't answer the question. She did say, however, that she would not continue in the bilingual program in favour of French immersion<sup>11</sup>. Kaylee on the other hand said that it depended on what the situation was, finding German to be important with her mother and grandmother, and French to be important with her father.

The interviews I conducted for this project brought up numerous interesting trends and some surprising details that it would be fruitful to research in greater detail. What is listed here is merely a scratching of the surface of the issues that are important to these students and teachers. It does, however, set the stage for the discussion of code switching and borrowing that will occur in the following chapters, in terms of what is important to these students, and what makes this program different from others.

---

<sup>11</sup> French immersion education in Manitoba refers to school days that are conducted completely in French, with the exception of an English Language Arts class. This is a different kind of programming than the English-German bilingual program.

## **Chapter 3: Bilingual Language Use and Lexical Borrowing**

This literature review will serve two main purposes for my thesis. First, I will explore the theoretical conceptualization of my interviewees as bilinguals, and their language use as bilingual language use. In doing so, I will seek to identify how key terms relating to this study have been treated, and how they inform my study. Second, I will situate the particular research on lexical borrowing among bilingual children in a heritage language program within the existing research discourse. In particular, I will show that a gap exists in the research surrounding the area of phonological transfer, not of the L1 on the L2, but rather of the L2 on the L1.

### **3.1 Bilingualism and bilingual language use**

In broad strokes, it is important for me to discuss what I have come to understand under bilingualism, as essentially the existing discourse on bilingualism stands as the foundation of this work. I would define bilingualism simply as the use of more than one language. In this thesis, I will be concentrating on individual, rather than societal bilingualism, as well as how bilingualism can be seen as a benefit rather than interference. Hansegård, (1975, quoted by Romaine, 1995, p. 234), first coined the term “semilingualism,” which is basically the idea that anyone who has not achieved native-like fluency in any given language should be classified as semilingual, a term which suggests deficiency. It is reasonable to assume that this kind of thinking can be traced back to Chomsky’s preoccupation with the “ideal speaker” as the benchmark for evaluating language competence. The resulting monolingual view of bilingualism suggests that bilinguals are two monolinguals in one person, and therefore their language competence, both linguistic and communicative, should be evaluated based on the performance of monolingual speakers.

Grosjean (1985) wrote that contrary to what was previously believed, a bilingual person is not two separate monolinguals in one. Rather, he maintained that all of the language information that exists in any one given person is all in one place, and is continuously activated simultaneously. For this reason, a “wholistic<sup>12</sup> view” of bilingualism should be adopted (p. 12). “Multi-competence,” a phrase coined by Cook (1992), is significantly different from monolingual competence, because along with the competence requirements of the languages individually, bilinguals must be able to determine where languages overlap, intersect and work together in order to communicate what they mean.

So just what exactly is a wholistic view of the bilingual and what implications does such a view have on the study of bilinguals? According to Grosjean, the answer lies in the complementarity principle, a term which he has taken from system theory and adapted to the bilingual context. This principle reads as follows:

Bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people. Different aspects of life normally require different languages. (Grosjean, 2010, p. 29)

The reason why this principle is so important to understanding bilinguals’ language use is that it dispels the myth that has dominated bilingual research—namely that bilinguals are not speaker-hearers in their own right, but rather that their language skills are somehow deficient if they are not as fluent as a monolingual ideal speaker. In actuality, of course, bilingual speaker-hearers use their languages in different contexts and situations, as indicated above, and so therefore have what are often referred to as “lexical gaps” in

---

<sup>12</sup> Grosjean uses the term “wholistic,” rather than “holistic,” presumably to avoid any confusion the association of other words might cause.

areas in which they do not usually use one of their particular languages. This however should not lead to them being viewed as any less competent linguistically than monolingual speaker-hearers.

There are a number of reasons why Grosjean's view is useful and important. In general terms, previous research on bilinguals from a monolingual perspective has had negative effects on the research in general, and the perception of bilinguals and their use of language in particular. At the most basic level, previous research has caused monolinguals and bilinguals themselves to see bilingualism as an abnormal or even negative phenomenon, though approximately half of the world's population is bi- or even multilingual (Romaine, 2000, p. 33). Research on bilingual language use has reinforced this idea in that it has repeatedly evaluated bilingual language competence based on monolingual standards, on perceived fluency or balance, and has studied the bilinguals' use of their two languages individually, rather than as parts of a whole (Grosjean, 2008, p. 12). Furthermore, and perhaps of most importance for this particular thesis, is the fact that language contact in the forms of lexical borrowing or code switching, which will be discussed later in this chapter, is seen largely as accidental, or anomalous at best and intentionally lazy at worst, and has been described in literature as language interference, a term which is problematic not only because it does not reflect the truth, but also because of the negative connotation the word carries in its everyday use (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 210).

### **3.2 Lexical borrowing & code switching**

Defining the term code switching has a history of being problematic in all aspects due to its complex nature, resulting in its being constantly redefined, depending in particular on what

the approach to it is. Clyne (2003) outlines three main ways in which code switching is viewed:

1. as opposed to borrowing,
2. including borrowing or
3. as a function of discourse only (p. 70).

In general, I agree with Myers-Scotton (1993) in her assessment that code switching and borrowing can be seen as opposite ends of a continuum or spectrum of code mixing (quoted in Clyne, 2003, p. 71). Of course, the term code mixing itself has caused confusion among different disciplines. Conversation analysts, such as Auer (1984), for example, propose a difference between code mixing, which is not linguistically meaningful, but rather as a haphazard alternation between languages where the switches do not serve a purpose, and code switching, which is seen as communicatively meaningful. This strikes me as problematic, however, since analysts can never definitively evaluate the participant's purpose or lack of purpose for various elements in any given interaction. For the purpose of my study, however, I want to use the words code mixing and mixed code in a pre-theoretical way, referring simply to the language used by bilingual speakers, one which contains elements of both languages of which the speaker has command.

In his research, Muysken (1997, 2000), working from a generativist framework, identified three types of code switching or code mixing:

- a) insertion: meaning the embedding of languages in an ABA structure, for example, from Faith's<sup>13</sup> interview: [in] das welt ich habe über das **oil spill** in das **usa** [gesprochen] (bold words denote English).
- b) alternation: meaning that two languages remain fairly separate in the utterance, for example, again from Faith's interview: und dann wir haben an eine andere (---) papier und dann wir haben es (--) ahm **tryna draw the same thing over again.**
- c) congruent lexicalization: meaning that two languages share grammatical structure and that lexical items from either language can be used, for example, enumeration from Bethany's interview: da sind sehr viele **palaces** und gebäude. This could just as easily have been rendered "**there are very many schlösser and buildings.**"

Myers-Scotton and Jake (1993, 1997) put forth a model of code switching in order to explain the grammatical and lexical choices in what Myers-Scotton referred to as "classic code switching." In other words, they refer to the code switching that a speaker does who is able to produce well-formed and grammatical utterances in both languages. What they dubbed the Matrix Language Frame Theory (MLF) works on the premise that one of the languages functions as the matrix language, which in turn creates the morphosyntactic framework for the individual constituents, which involves both the matrix language and the embedded language. Within this framework Myers-Scotton's (1993) Markedness Model operates, one which suggests that any given interaction has a series of predetermined

---

<sup>13</sup> Terms and definitions will be exemplified using excerpts from interviews recorded as part of this project. To protect the privacy of those involved, these names have been changed. Please see *Chapter 2: Background and Data Description* for more information.



socioculturally acceptable sets, which would be unmarked, and that code switching marks a portion of discourse that does not conform to acceptability constraints. The MLF is problematic in that it sets out a fairly rigid framework, which does not account for the various reasons why speakers might code switch, and this is why it was strongly criticized when it first was posited, and is also why Myers-Scotton and Jake revised the applicability of their model a number of times.

The contribution of Myers-Scotton and Jake built upon the work of Poplack (1980), to whom Clyne (2003) refers as a “pioneer of code switching constraint studies” (Clyne, 2003, p. 84). Her main concern was to differentiate between the two terms which are of greatest significance to this thesis- code switching and borrowing. She hypothesized the existence of an “equivalence constraint,” which basically holds that balanced bilinguals only code switch at points where the surface syntactic structure is not violated in either language (Poplack, 1978). Poplack (1980), in testing out her hypothesis, concluded that since fluent and non-fluent bilinguals switched languages without violating the grammar of either language, and since code switching in both cases occurred where L1 and L2 surface structures overlapped, code switching is an indicator of bilingual ability, rather than bilingual disability.

In reaction to Myers-Scotton’s MLF, Auer (1984, 1998) developed a somewhat different framework to explain the same phenomena, which according to some (see Wei, 1998), was a more objective framework to analyze borrowing and code switching. Auer suggested that there are two main reasons for code switching to occur, namely participant- and discourse-related switches. Auer views code switching as a tool with which speakers create and negotiate communicative and social meaning (Auer, 1998, p. 1). Auer defines

discourse-related switching as “the use of code switching to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance” (Auer, 1998, p. 4). In other words, these are switches which serve to organize the talk itself as a conversation. Participant-related switching, on the other hand, is when the switch is due to the speaker’s own preferences or the perceived preferences of the speaker’s co-participants. In other words, says Auer (1998),

the basic difference [between them] is that in discourse-related switching, participants search for an account for ‘why that language now?’ within the development of the conversation, while in participant-related switching, they search for an account within the individual who performs this switching or his or her co-participants. (p. 8).

Although Myers-Scotton’s MLF Theory has its limitations, there are a number of points that one can take from her terminology. Myers-Scotton (2006), writes of borrowing: “words from one language appearing in another are *lexical borrowings*” (p. 209, emphasis in the original). Like Myers-Scotton, I will use this term to refer only to lexical items. For the purpose of a clear definition, I define a lexical item as a form unit that has a distinct lexical meaning. In many cases, this is one individual word, but certainly not in every case. Though the focus of this study lies in lexical borrowing, there will be some discussion of grammatical borrowing as well. Further, I will use MacSwan’s (2004) definition of code switching, which is “the alternate use of two (or more) languages within the same utterance” (p. 283). In particular, I am concerned with the fact that lexical borrowing refers to words taken individually into the matrix language, whereas code switching refers to the inclusion of phrases (i.e., more than one word together) into the matrix language. Auer will

be taken up in more detail in the discussion of the methodological framework of this project.

### **3.3 Mixed code as communicative strategy**

It is a common misconception, as already outlined by Grosjean, that code switching or borrowing are signs of laziness. In fact, as already outlined by Poplack, for example, code switching and borrowing are signs of advanced linguistic competence. Bialystok (1990), used the term “communication strategy” to refer to the strategies bilingual speakers use to communicate effectively with other bilinguals. Borrowing and language mixing in general are examples of communicative strategies that bilinguals employ. Bialystok emphasizes the differentiation between process and strategy when it comes to effectively employing them. For the purpose of this thesis, I will only be considering the lexical strategies outlined by Bialystok, of which borrowing and code switching can be a part.

In some ways, Bialystok’s (1990) framework neatly parallels Auer’s model for examining code switching from the dual perspective of discourse- vs. participant-related switching. Bialystok outlines three main types of strategies that are used by speakers of multiple languages, namely productive strategies, learning strategies and social strategies. Productive strategies correlate roughly with Auer’s discourse-related switching, and social strategies correlate roughly with participant-related switches. Learning strategies are unique to Bialystok’s strategic framework, but will not be further examined here, because, since this thesis is concerned primarily with language use rather than language learning, they are beyond the scope of this particular thesis.

As speakers of any language, we use communication strategies all the time, whether we speak only one or multiple languages. However, unlike monolingual speakers, bilinguals have a whole additional realm of strategies they can use in creating and negotiating meaning with other bilinguals. Bialystok (1990) hearkens back to Selinker's (1973) list of communicative strategies, which can be paraphrased as follows:

- a) transfer from the native language, (please see Chapter 4.4 for a detailed discussion of linguistic transfer as it pertains to this study)
- b) overgeneralization,
- c) overelaboration,
- d) avoidance, an umbrella term for a host of strategies, including topic and semantic avoidance, appeal to authority, paraphrasing, message abandonment, as well as code switching and borrowing.

Additional strategies observed in my data include self-repair, elicitation, repetition, and confirmation. These will be discussed further in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

### **3.4 Language use in bilingual education**

The notion of classrooms in general and foreign and heritage language learning environments in particular becoming bilingual would require a significant paradigmatic shift. Until remarkably recently, foreign language learning environments were negotiated under the assumption that they should be monolingual L2 environments. In other words, that students' first language should not be used. The reasoning for this is outlined by Cook (2001) in his paper calling for a re-examination of this assumption. Levine (2003) says that even today it is rare to find an L2 classroom that allows or encourages students and teachers to use their L1.

There is a prevalent belief that use of students' L1 in their L2 learning environment will interfere with their learning the additional language. In studying French immersion students, Safty (1988) found that

although early French immersion students may have achieved by grade 6 a level of comprehension comparable to that of native French speakers, their use of the language is still characterized by functional determinants and intrusions of English syntactic structures, by awkward attempts at translating English idioms, and by systematic borrowing from their growing English vocabulary. (p. 250)

If one looks at the data from the perspective of so-called "correctness," this same finding can no doubt be carried over into other bilingual language programs. The main reason for the significant influence of English on the bilingual language proficiency among students of French and other languages in Canada is the fact that English is the language of their daily lives. In the case of the Manitoba students interviewed for this project, a majority of them had some German speaking background in their family, but little or no opportunity to use German outside of the language classroom.

However, this is no reason to label these students as anything other than developing bilinguals. In her plenary address at the 2010 American Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Conference, Ortega presented a paper in which she made the claim that linguistic research should make a "bilingual turn." She maintained that second language acquisition research is entrenched in a monolingual bias. Rather than continuing to view developing bilinguals as somehow deficient in their language skills from a monolingual point of view,

she suggests, they should be viewed as developing proficiency in a bilingual, multi-competent code in their own right. For this reason, the language of students interviewed for this project will not be labelled as “learner language,” since this term in itself suggests something that is incomplete or deviating from a norm. Instead, the language used by the students will be labelled as a bilingual code or mixed code, in keeping with Grosjean’s wholistic view of the bilingual speaker.

## **Chapter 4: Theory and Methodology**

### **4.1 Initial steps**

At the end of April, 2010, I travelled to Manitoba to conduct my interviews at two English-German bilingual elementary schools, King George Elementary School and Westmount Elementary School. The interviews themselves and the rationale behind using interviews for gathering data are discussed in detail in Chapter 2. In this chapter, I will outline what I did with the interviews and field notes I gathered in order to analyze the use of borrowing. Following that, I will outline the framework I came to use for the linguistic analysis.

Once all the interviews were completed, I created a spreadsheet that I filled out with information from my field notes, and what I felt might be important for the analysis. I noted the school, the name of the student, the pseudonym of the student, the duration of the interview in minutes and seconds, the point at which they began the program, whether they spoke German at home, and where their families are from. Since I knew that transcribing all of the interviews would be far beyond the scope of my project, I then set about writing detailed notes on the content of each individual interview. I listened very carefully to each interview, noting the children's answers to each question, as well as transcribing short sections I thought might be relevant to my analysis, or which struck me as unique or interesting.

The purpose of completing content summaries for all of the interviews was twofold. First, I wanted to use the information I gathered from the content summaries to draw conclusions regarding the similarities and differences between the individual interviewees, thereby determining what I could say about the group as a whole. Second, listening

carefully to each individual interview enabled me to determine how many interviews it was necessary to transcribe to establish the most comprehensive system of borrowing classification I could, acknowledging as many separate instances of borrowing as possible. I did not want to transcribe every interview just to find that many of the interviews simply rendered the same information I already had.

Following this, I selected two interviews to transcribe fully. I selected the longest interview, with Bethany, which lasted forty six minutes and forty seconds, and the shortest interview, with Faith, which lasted eighteen minutes and twenty eight seconds. I selected these interviews in particular because I felt that choosing the interviews based on length was a neutral method of selection, and also would give me a clearer idea of which end of the length spectrum I could draw from to select other interviews to transcribe if I found this to be necessary. The rationale for using length as the main criterion is that research done by the Educational Testing Service, an organization which administers English language tests to foreign students wishing to study in the United States, shows there is a direct correlation between length of a written text and the language proficiency and utterance complexity of the user (Chodorow and Burstein, 2004).

Although the research by Chodorow and Burstein (2004), as well as the findings of Shermis and Burstein (2003), are based on essay texts, they function the same way as my interviews in that they are examples of text produced by developing bilinguals. As a result, it is reasonable to assume that since a longer essay is more likely to be a good essay, a long interview is more likely to be a good interview, in terms of linguistic complexity and fluency. I selected the longest and the shortest interview because I wanted to see which interview held more interesting data related to code switching and borrowing, with my



hypothesis being that the longer the interview, the more interesting the data, since the interviewee was more talkative.

Research<sup>14</sup> shows that language proficiency in a theoretical sense can be operationalized based on three variables: complexity, accuracy and fluency of utterances or written text. Complexity can be explained based on lexical and syntactic diversity and sophistication. In other words, complexity can be judged based on the number of types per token (lexical diversity,) and the number of specialized words or compounds used (lexical sophistication). In addition, the range of constructions (syntactic diversity,) and length of individual turns (syntactic sophistication) inform how complex any given text is. Accuracy can be judged based on how well any given text, whether oral or written meets the expectations of the listener based on the listener's pattern knowledge. Fluency is generally judged based entirely on length of the text. So therefore, it is possible to judge proficiency without specifically running data through a calculation, to make an impressionistic judgement of a speaker's proficiency, albeit only in relation to the proficiency of another speaker. With these guidelines in place, I hypothesized that I was selecting a more proficient and a less proficient language user, and therefore would have a basis for comparing and contrasting their borrowing tendencies and communication strategies.

## **4.2 Transcription conventions**

Deppermann (2001), describes transcription as “die Verschriftung von akustischen oder audiovisuellen (AV) Gesprächsprotokollen nach festgelegten Notationsregeln” (2001, p. 39). For the most part in my transcriptions, I used the conventions of the Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT) (Selting et al., 2008). I chose this

---

<sup>14</sup> See the special issue of *Applied Linguistics* (December, 2009, 30 (4)), for an up-to-date and comprehensive discussion.

method of transcription with some modification because it has a comprehensive set of conventions for the *Basistranskript*, but for the instances of borrowing in the texts, I was able to take some conventions that are used for the *Feintranskript*. In other words, I was able to use a basic transcription system and add more detail based on what was important to my research questions.

For this reason, I avoided the use of capitalization in the transcription, except when I needed to use it for emphasis. In keeping with general GAT guidelines, I also used Standard German orthography, including in cases where words were pronounced slightly differently than standard, for example “order” instead of “oder.” I also used German orthography to account for filled pauses and hesitation markers, although these were usually English fillers and hesitation markers, such as “ahm” and “ah,” which would be rendered as “um” and “uh” if I were using English orthography throughout.

An exception to the general practice of using German orthography was when the students actually used English words, which were then transcribed using Standard Canadian orthography. I used a different way of transcribing instances of phonological transfer. In general, I used German orthography to account for the adopted German pronunciation of English words. For example, from Faith’s interview at line 60: “es hat ein große rote *spott* on es.” Although Faith means the English word “spot,” she actually uses the German word “Spott,” and so I used the spelling for the word she actually said. Additionally, false starts, for which I could not find a GAT convention, are denoted using a single backward slash, in keeping with the conventions of the CHAT transcription system.

In addition to the GAT conventions described above, it was also necessary to add a few conventions to call attention to elements of particular importance to my project. For this reason, instances of English borrowing are highlighted for easy reference by using a bold font, something which is also consistently employed in the examples I have selected for this thesis. Instances of phonological transfer are highlighted for easy reference by using italics and underlining of the word or part of the word that is pronounced according to German standard pronunciation.

### **4.3 Process of Analysis**

I decided to do an in-depth analysis of Bethany's interview first with the rationalization that the complexity of her utterances would potentially result in the most varied instances of borrowing from which to take an inventory and come up with a system of borrowing categorization. I then proceeded to do a complete inventory of all instances of borrowing in Bethany's interview. It soon became clear to me that Bethany made use of a wide variety of borrowing processes, and that the data was so rich that a simple classification system would not suffice in describing or analyzing her language use. The most straightforward instances of borrowing to identify were examples of cultural borrowing as outlined by Myers-Scotton, and a diverse group of borrowings related to structure. Initially, this group consisted mainly of morphological and phonological hybrids, where both German and English morphological and phonological material was used to create new words. There were so many examples of borrowing, however, many of them did not fit neatly into these categories, so I began to look at different ways of organizing an analytical framework.

#### 4.4 Transference: a theoretical approach

In order to make sense of the students' language choices, it was necessary to put together a framework of analysis. For my purposes of this study, I will use Myers-Scotton's notion of a continuum of code switching, but relabel it using Clyne's (2003) framework of transference. Using transference as an umbrella term under which both code switching and borrowing are subsumed makes it much easier to talk about both. Clyne writes that an individual occurrence of transference is called transfer, and this will be the term used in this study as well (Clyne, 2003, p. 72). Clyne developed a terminological framework in order to discuss language shift and language change, in particular relating to bilinguals who grew up speaking one language in a particular country where that language is dominant, and then moved to a different country with a different dominant language while maintaining the use of their L1. At first glance, the group of students involved in my study seems to have nothing in common with Clyne's subjects. A great portion of his framework, however, is very useful for the analysis of my data, and allows for a much finer grained analysis of Bethany and Faith's borrowing choices.

I did not adopt Clyne's framework in its entirety, however, because not all of the categories he outlined are equally relevant to my particular study. I condensed his transference framework as follows:

- a) **Lexical transference**<sup>15</sup>, which refers to the borrowing of one unit of lexical meaning, as outlined earlier in the thesis. Since my definition for lexical unit

---

<sup>15</sup> For the purpose of my framework, the category of lexical transference is divided into two main groups according to Myers-Scotton's definition of cultural vs. core borrowing. See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion of how specific examples fell into these categories.

is clear, Clyne's additional category of multiple transference becomes irrelevant.

- **Example:** dann würden sie ein bisschen mehr **comfortable** sein (Bethany)

b) **Morphological transference**, which refers to the transference of morphemes or morphological patterns. Clyne includes a separate category of morphemic transference, but since the focus of this paper is not to differentiate between types of morphological elements present in code mixes, I find the one category to be sufficient.

- **Example:** sie **cares** nicht (Bethany)

c) **Semantic transference**, which refers to the borrowing of meanings from words in one language to words in another with either morphological or semantic correspondence.

- **Example:** in response to the question "Was ist dein Lieblingsfach?," Bethany answered "das ist hart," which is a literal translation of "that's hard," but her selection means hard in terms of texture, rather than in terms of difficulty.

d) **Syntactic transference**, the transference of the syntactic structure of one language within which constituents are replaced with lexical items from the other language.

- **Example:** es ist spass (Faith); direct translation of the phrase “it is fun”
- e) **Lexicosyntactic transference**, which refers to the transfer of at least one lexical unit within the transfer of a syntactic structure
- **Example:** wenn ich hab mein **hand** auf (Faith); this again is a direct translation of the English phrase „when I have my hand up“
- f) **Semanticosyntactic transference**, the transfer of semantic meanings and the whole syntactic unit, ie. an idiomatic expression
- **Example:** dings wie das (Bethany); translation of the collocation “things like that”
- g) **Phonological transference**, which, to paraphrase Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), refers to the influence of a speaker’s knowledge of one language’s sound system on another language
- **Example:** pronouncing the word “word” as “vurt” (Faith)
- h) **Graphemic transference**, which refers to the transference of phoneme-grapheme relations
- **Example (German):** es hat eine große rote spott an es (Faith)
- i) **Pragmatic transference**, which refers to the transference of various discourse elements, such as discourse markers, politeness norms, etc.

- **Example:** frequent use of the English discourse marker “so”  
(Bethany)

I eliminated the categories prosodic and tonemic transference because they do not have as significant an impact on my data, given the centrality of borrowing to my study.

Despite the detail in Clyne’s framework, I wanted to be able to account for and highlight additional phenomena that occurred in my data, most particularly related to lexical borrowing. Myers-Scotton differentiated between core and cultural borrowing. To clarify, the Oxford Dictionary defines culture as “the ideas, customs, and social behaviour of a particular people or society.” Myers-Scotton’s understanding of cultural refers to phenomena which are specific to one speech community. Therefore, cultural borrowing occurs because there is no word that refers specifically to the word which is borrowed in the other language. This is why words like “email” have been borrowed into German, which has become standard vocabulary (Myers-Scotton, p. 213). Core borrowing on the other hand refers to words that are replaced with an L1 term though an equivalent exists in the L2 (Myers-Scotton, p. 213.) In other words, this would include all the lexical items that are not cultural borrowings. What quickly became clear to me, however, was that Myers-Scotton’s binary system of categorization was not sufficient for my data set. Indeed, there were numerous examples that exhibited characteristics of both core and cultural borrowing, forming a third, hybrid category, which can most usefully be described as contextual borrowing. (see Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion of examples.)

With Clyne’s terminological framework in place, and with Myers-Scotton’s more fine-grained examination of lexical transference, I was able to account for a wide variety of

structure-related borrowing, including instances that did not directly include English lexical items. However, since Clyne's framework related primarily to structural phenomena, it was not sufficient to discuss the wide variety of functions that the different instances of borrowing had. For this reason, I included Auer's (1984) participant- and discourse-related switching into my analytical framework, as well as Bialystok's notion of communication strategies, as ways of explaining the function of the borrowing behaviour of my interviewees.

The students in the English-German bilingual program in Manitoba code switch and borrow in what Grosjean (1992) calls their "bilingual mode," meaning that they know that their classmates, their teacher, and even I, the researcher, are bilingual and will understand any of the English they use while speaking German. In fact, whenever these particular students speak German, they do so in a bilingual, and never in a monolingual mode. In school, where most of them get their only exposure to hearing and speaking German, they know that their teachers and fellow students all speak English as well as German, so they are always functioning in their bilingual mode. For those students who do speak some German outside of school, for example with family members, the people with whom they speak German also speak English, or in a few cases Low German. Due to this, these students are never confronted with situations where they are required to function as monolingual German speakers, a fact which clearly influences their linguistic choices when speaking with a stranger (me, in this case).

#### **4.5 A note on phonological transfer in mixed code**

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) define phonological transfer generally as "the ways in which a person's knowledge of the sound system of one language can affect that person's



perception of speech sounds in another language” (Jarvis and Pavlenko, p. 62). Generally, when transfer of this nature is discussed, it is in the form of L1 transfer into the L2 pronunciation. Perhaps it seems obvious that one’s knowledge of the sound system of one’s native language would colour the pronunciation of one’s subsequent languages. Indeed, there has been research done in the past few years that charts the phonological transfer from learner’s L2 into their L3 (see Marx and Mehlhorn, 2009). Such transfer is common as learners work to negotiate the sound systems in their inventory.

Less common, but highly present in my set of data is the phenomenon of reverse transfer, where the sound system of German (which in most cases is the students’ L2) has a direct impact on their pronunciation of English words (which in most cases is the students’ L1). Reverse transfer is often found in the speech of people who were born in a place where one language is spoken and then moved to a place where another language is spoken while continuing to speak their L1. Andrews (1999) and Mennen (2004) found numerous instances of reverse transfer in suprasegmental situations. But neither of these studies looked at speakers who are learning an L2 in an environment where their L1 is the dominant language, which makes the high level of reverse transfer in my data set surprising. (See Section 5.1.2 for a more detailed discussion of this phenomenon).

## **Chapter 5: Analysis**

This chapter is divided into a number of sections. The first section begins with a detailed look at the longest interview, with Bethany, which I use as a model of analysis. Looking at her interview in detail helped me to develop groupings of similar categories of borrowing, which I then carried over into the subsequent analysis of the second interview. The second section of this chapter contains a second case study, a detailed look at the shortest interview, with Faith, based on the framework of analysis from Bethany's interview. In the last section of this chapter, I compare and contrast the two interviews, particularly in terms of the functional aspects of their borrowing tendencies.

### **5.1 First Interview: Bethany**

Bethany is a student at King George Elementary School. She likes to read, particularly science fiction, and play outside with her friends. Her favourite subject is math, and she is extremely perceptive of the world around her. My impression during the interview was that she was very comfortable in the interview situation, as well as comfortable using German. In general, my impression was that she was highly proficient in German, and that she creatively dealt with situations where she did not know German lexical items.

Throughout the interview she talked at length about different issues without much prompting. Of her 164 turns throughout the interview, 84% were longer than three words, and many of these were lengthy monologues that included rhetorical questions, narratives, and other rhetorical devices. This is one of the reasons why my interview with Bethany was the longest one I had. (See Appendix 2 for the complete interview transcript.)

Bethany talked extensively about her recently completed science project on the planet Saturn, her recently completed Social Studies project on Russia, and spoke freely about what she does outside of school, her family history, and the importance of the German language in her life and heritage. As an analysis of her borrowing choices shows, she is a highly competent bilingual speaker. Furthermore, though English remains her stronger language, her linguistic choices show extensive knowledge of underlying structures and processes of the German language.

### **5.1.1 Cultural and contextual borrowing**

Myers-Scotton's (1993) definitions of cultural as compared to core borrowing are very clear. Due to these clear definitions, it is easy to identify those borrowings that fit into the cultural borrowing category. One of these cultural borrowings is the designation for "English Language Arts," the subject during which students work specifically on their English reading and writing skills. Bethany refers to it in line 186, 188, 192 and 195 by its acronym "ELA," and then also in its full form in line 195. An English class looks very different in German speaking cultures, or even than a German language arts class in institutions of German-speaking cultures, and is therefore a cultural borrowing. The second distinctly cultural borrowing is in line 721: "für meine fünfte klasse ich war in den **split**." The word "split" refers to a North American practice in the educational system of grouping students from two grades into one class when there are not enough children from one grade to form two full sized classes. Although this practice does exist to some extent in Germany, it is generally conceptualized differently, as "jahrgangsübergreifend" rather than "split."

A second group of cultural borrowings encompasses proper nouns. Generally, proper nouns are not considered borrowing, even when they are adopted exactly from another language, since this is common practice among even monolingual speakers (Myers-Scotton, 2006.) However, in the context of the bilingual program, it is common to pronounce proper nouns, names in particular, according to German pronunciation. A number of students introduced themselves by pronouncing their name in a German way, including Bethany when she gave her last name. For this reason, I want to suggest that pronouncing proper nouns in an English way during the German language interview constitutes cultural borrowing, and in Bethany's interview, there are numerous examples of this: in line 21 "Laura Ingalls Wilder," in line 210 "Alexander Parkes," in line 457 and again in line 610 "Eastway," etc.

Other than the instances outlined above, following Myers-Scotton's definitions, we would have to place all other instances of borrowing into the category of core borrowing. It is true that there were clearly some instances of core borrowing, in the cases where the borrowed word stood in for a lexical gap, particularly when the interviewee had already used the German word previously. An example is in line 155, when Bethany says: sie sind **chemicals** auf seinen/ **vladimir lenins body** gemacht," although in line 148 she uses the word "korper," (with non-standard pronunciation) and she uses it again in line 160.

However, I want to suggest that in my data, there is a whole group of borrowings that have characteristics of both the cultural borrowing category and the core borrowing group, which are specific to the context of the English-German bilingual program. Wenger (1998) suggested the term "community of practice" to describe a classroom learning environment. A community of practice is a group of people who share similar beliefs and understandings

of what is important to the community, such as how communication should occur, what acceptable norms are for the group in terms of “specific tools, representations and other artifacts” (Wenger, 1998, p. 125).

The students and teachers in the English-German bilingual program form such a community of practice that creates the specific context that allows core borrowings to become more like cultural borrowings. For example, specific semantic fields they learn about in their English class or using English language research tools such as Wikipedia are learned within a specific cultural context, meaning one that is English. Bethany’s interview shows many examples of this. For example, she talks extensively about her project on the planet Saturn, and borrows a number of words from English. She consistently borrows the word “Saturn” itself (in lines 53, 54, 55, 70) as well as “planet” in lines 51 and 57. In the following passage, from lines 60-63, it is possible to see additional examples:

### **Example 5.1a**

ich habe gelernt dass es hat rings. ich wusste das schon aber  
dass es ahm hat ungefähr einunddreißig **moons** (.) dass sie sind  
sehr interessant eine ist die größte **moon** ja **titan** ist den  
größten und das eine heißt **mimas**

Bethany clearly did all her research and writing for this project in English, and therefore I want to suggest it does not even occur to her that the word “moon,” for which there is a simple translation equivalent in “Mond” would be appropriate. In fact, her community of practice dictates that this is an acceptable choice.

Another project Bethany worked on, but this time in her German class was her country poster project, for which she elected to research Russia. Their instructions for this project were to research any country from which there are immigrants in Manitoba (Interview Bethany). Since there are very few German resources at the appropriate language level available to the students in the English-German bilingual program, they do the research for any given project primarily in English. In my observations, students tended to use Google Translate to find equivalent key terms, a fact many of them confirmed when asked directly in the interview. In the oral presentations I observed and the poster projects I studied, many key terms were still in English. It is not surprising, then, that when Bethany speaks about what she learned about Russia, she uses English terminology, and again I would classify this as contextual borrowing, since she learned the vocabulary within a specific context. Examples in this case are individual units of lexical meaning, such as “the Bolsheviks” (line 111), “Ivan the Terrible” (line 113, 114, 115, 119), “cathedrals” (line 121, 129), “Red Square” (line 122, 128).

Furthermore, just as the community of practice of the English-German bilingual program allows Bethany to use English words to describe concepts that she learned in English, so too it allows her to use English words to describe experiences in her life that she had in English. Her world outside of school is, as she told me in the interview, exclusively English. This is a world in which she reads books, plays with her friends, and goes on trips with her family. For example, in the following excerpt she talks about her experiments in baking with a friend.

### **Example 5.1b**

B: so wir haben ma/ eins mal eine **cake** gemacht wir haben  
probieren eine **cake** zu machen so wir haben ja  
**ingredients we just did random ingredients**

I: oh.

B: **so** wir haben es gecalled **cookake** so es war ein bisschen  
wie eine **cookie** aber es sollte eine **cake** sein und dann  
haben wir noch ein gemacht das wir haben geheit **caycook**  
es war ein **cake** aber es war auch wie **cookie** wir haben es  
probieren es schaffte nicht sehr gut es war okAY↑ aber  
es war nicht den beste **cake**

I: hat's gut geschmeckt?

B: ja wir haben es geessen es war nicht schlecht wir knnten  
es essen es wrde nicht meine Lieblings**cake** sein

In this case as well, words like "cake" are borrowed, as well as the made-up words she and her friend came up with to describe their baking experiments.

### 5.1.2 Structural borrowing

The instances of borrowing which give the most concrete indication of extensive language knowledge are those which fall under the heading of structural borrowing. Most of the categories outlined in Clyne's framework are structural. The number of different types of transference present in Bethany's interview shows that there is a great deal going on under the surface of what one might at first glance simply call an error. In fact, the examples of borrowing where the instance goes somehow wrong can be a lot more telling about a user's language beliefs, than times when they may be using certain words appropriately.

Bethany's interview shows a number of examples of morphological transference, which in Bethany's case refer primarily to English verbs which she borrows but then conjugates according to rules of German conjugation. Examples of this occur in line 341, "sie **ca**ren nicht," line 375, "wenn du **yellst**," line 520, "wir haben so schnell **geswitcht**." What shows knowledge of language structure here is the fact that the same rules are applied to the English root words as would be to the German roots, and then are correctly conjugated. A similar instance to those outlined above occurs at line 380, where Bethany says: "manchmal **tune** ich **aus**." This example is not strictly an instance of conjugation, since although she correctly conjugates the root "tune" she also translates the second part of the lexical meaning unit, ie. to tune out -> austunen. She then conforms the preposition to the rule of a separable prefix, which results in it being placed at the end of the sentence. Although most examples of morph mixing in Bethany's interview have directly to do with verbs, she also has an example of a hybrid compound noun, in line 402, namely "Lieblings**cake**." (See example 5.1b for context). In this case as well, Bethany shows astute knowledge of how to form compound nouns, in that she combines the two constituents with -s-.

Bethany also uses one particularly striking example of semantic transference: a calque or loan translation, which occurs at the lexical level, in lines 116-117:

### Example 5.1c

danach **ivan the terrible** war den regler dann das war **as if** den **throne**  
**was cursed** weil regler nach regler waren nur ein jahre da



In this case, Bethany uses the word “Regler,” instead of “Herrscher.” This one instance shows us a number of things about Bethany’s language knowledge, regardless of whether this knowledge is passive or active. It is reasonable to assume that she knows the word “die Regel,” which translates as “the rule,” since a discussion about rules would be familiar to her from the classroom setting. In English, the word “rule” has various meanings, functioning both as a verb, meaning to govern, as well as a noun, meaning regulation. Thus, Bethany searches for the German translation for the verb to rule, but erroneously chooses the homonym in translation, selecting “regel,” which as a verb incidentally also means “to rule,” or “to regulate,” but which cannot be correctly rendered as a noun for this context.

The next step in the meaning negotiation process is perhaps the most interesting, since it shows astute knowledge of how words are created in German. Bethany knows that it is possible to nominalize German verbs by adding an –er ending to the root, ie. lehren -> Lehrer, which she does here, rendering regeln -> Regler. When looked at in this way, “Regler” becomes a completely reasonable choice for Bethany, although semantically, it could not be considered the “correct” one.

Syntactically, Bethany borrows a number of English language structures which she fills with German constituents. For example, when she talks about Lenin’s mausoleum in Moscow: “**vladimir lenins** korper ist in da” (line 148). Bethany’s transference is usually slightly more complex than simple syntactic transference. Instead, she frequently uses lexicosyntactic or semanticosyntactic transference. This seems to indicate that Bethany is comfortable making a conscious effort to use complex structures in her utterances, although this means that she sometimes relies on English structures to make herself understood.

In terms of instances of lexicosyntactic transference, the example below is typical of Bethany's language use.

### Example 5.1d

I: =welche adjektive ahm verbindest du mit deutsch sprechen?

(---)

B: mmm **like** was meinst du **by** das?

It appears as though Bethany makes a conscience effort to use as much German as possible, even if she is not quite sure of the correct structuring that German requires. Her strategy for dealing with this problem is simply to use German language constituents and use only the most necessary items in English.

Bethany's use of semanticosyntactic transference is interesting particularly because she also makes some use of appropriate German language idioms and phrases, something which she does freely and easily. At times, her speech is fairly colloquial, despite the fact that she uses non-standard grammar fairly frequently. An example is her use of the phrase "warte mal," which she uses at line 176 and 665. Her literal renderings of English language idioms appears to be just as easy for her, suggesting that perhaps she really does not realize that what she is saying is not an appropriate German idiom. For example, at line 336, she uses the phrase "den dings ist," which in English functions as a discourse marker, in the form of "the thing is." Additionally, she uses the phrase "wenn du denkst über es" at line 221, which is "when you think about it." One of the most interesting semanticosyntactic transfers in Bethany's interview is the phrase "dings wie das" at line 202. Literally translated from the English phrase "things like that," it should technically read something

like “dinge wie diese,” since the demonstrative pronoun needs to agree with the subject. Instead, Bethany adds the English plural –s morph to the German word “Ding,” a word which does appear with an –s- in the compound noun “Dingsbums,” and then she simply translates the rest of the phrase directly, “wie das” instead of “like that.” An additional example of a creative translation comes at line 450:

### **Example 5.1e**

```
es ist schön wenn du gehst zum deutschland oder etwas  
dann kannst du deutsch mit sie sprechen und verstehen du  
bist nicht wie waaaAAs?† so du verstehst
```

In this case, Bethany translates “like,” a common English language discourse marker among younger people as “wie,” which is one of the many meanings this word can have. The entire phrase “du bist nicht wie,” which does not make any sense in German on its own, is a direct rendering of the phrase “you’re not like,” in English, which basically means “you don’t say” or “you don’t feel as though” in this particular case. The word “like” in English can serve the function of a quotative as well as a discourse marker, and in this case, it functions as a quotative, which is something that the word “wie” (“how” in English) could never do.

In addition to the borrowings at the lexical and morphological levels, Bethany consistently borrows phonological elements of both language systems. I divided up the instances of mixed phonological systems into three main categories. First, there were numerous instances of mixed pronunciation. These mixed pronunciations could be further grouped into full phonologically German renderings of English words, and German phonological rendering of only part of the word. Second, there were a number of instances

of a phonologically German false start, followed by a phonologically English repair. Third, there were two examples of an English false start with a phonologically German repair.

The following are examples of English lexical meaning units the pronunciation of which was adjusted to the German phonological system: rings (line 60), why, pronounced “vy” (line 98), verbs (line 250), singer (line 259), candy, pronounced “kann-di” (line 333), stupid (line 382). In addition, names of certain European countries are simply adopted from English and she adjusts her pronunciation, for example “Russia” (lines 103, 110, 112), “Poland” (in lines 632, 635, 638) as well as “France,” pronounced “Franz” (in lines 801, 802). The examples of lexical units where only one portion contained phonological elements of German were: “schkool” (line 8), “**cottages**” (line 43), “**volleyball**” (line 78), “**onion**” (line 132), “**french**” (lines 250, 253, 259). The bold lettering in the previous words indicates the section of the word that was pronounced according to German phonology.

There were also a number of instances of false starts that gave information of the user’s language knowledge. For example, in line 8, Bethany says:

### Example 5.1f

ahm kindergarten ich habe für die ganzen/ für meine ganzen  
sch/sch/ schkooooool jahre ja schkool jahre ahah bin ich hier  
gegangen

In this case, the false starts indicate a repair initiation, and also that Bethany most likely knows the lexical item „Schule,“ but seems to have an online problem as she is speaking it, which results in the mixed rendering of „schkool.“ A similar pattern occurs at line 147, where Bethany says, “es ist eine geBÄUDE dass ist aus sch/ ah/

**stone** gemacht,” in line 191, when she says, “wir machen *fr/ french*,” and again at line 446, where she says, “ich war in deutsch kl/ ah den bi/ **bilingual** weil ich mag deutsch.” In each case, Bethany’s repair<sup>16</sup> of the German false start is done in English.

### 5.1.3 Pragmatic transference as it relates to discourse-related borrowing

According to Auer (1984), discourse-related code switching has to do with switches that are about the conversation itself. In other words, discourse-related switches contribute to the interactional meaning of a conversation. Although Auer (1984, 1998) was less concerned with the notion of borrowing than the notion of code switching, his framework works for my purposes as well. Although the conversations I had with the students were interviews, and therefore very structured and cannot truly be considered natural conversation, much of the borrowing that occurred in Bethany’s interview had significant interactional function.

One of the most basic examples of borrowings with interactional function is her frequent use of the word “so.” Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher (2006) conducted a detailed study on the use of discourse markers in a foreign language classroom. Unlike other discourse markers they examined, “so” appeared frequently in both more informal and formal contexts in the foreign language classroom. They suggested a number of different functions that borrowing the word “so” can fulfill in addition to the primary function, namely that it marks some kind of result (Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher, p. 99). The secondary functions they outlined are similar to those found in research on monolingual discourse marker use (see Shiffrin, 1987). These were

---

<sup>16</sup> For the purpose of this thesis, I will use the term “repair” to refer to self-initiated self-repair, where the self-initiation is the false start itself, and the resolution of the trouble source is the repair.

- a) to mark an inference
- b) to mark a transition in the participation framework (e.g. turn transition device in exchange structures)
- c) to mark a motivated action (e.g. claim, request) (Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher, p. 102).

Unlike research on monolingual discourse marker use, however, Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher added the additional dimension of the surrounding talk, noting that the borrowed “so” occurs in English even when the surrounding language is German. I would like to argue that the secondary functions of the German word “also,” which they suggest as a pairing for the English “so,” are subsumed under “so” in my interview with Bethany, since she does not use the word “also.” These additional secondary functions are to mark a thematically coherent example, and to mark a correction or reformulation.

In total, Bethany borrows this word twenty-four times throughout the interview. This discourse marker is used in a number of different ways throughout the interview. In line 41, for example, it is used to mark a reformulation of her previous turn, namely that she likes math. Bethany uses “so” to mark reformulations numerous times throughout the interview (see line 103, line 365, line 643.) But Bethany also uses “so” as a connecting word, to maintain cohesion in her own narrative, and to mark a thematically coherent example (see line 51, line 156, line 533).

Moreover, Bethany frequently uses borrowing to show her stance on certain utterances, in particular when she directly quotes another person, like her teacher, or a resource she used to do research, such as an article from Wikipedia, as in line 116: *das war*

**as if den throne was cursed.** By borrowing in these instances, Bethany distances herself from what she is saying, indicating in the example of the instructions from her teacher that this would not necessarily be her choice for an assignment, but that these instructions were impressed upon her. As for the Wikipedia example, she says in a later turn that she thinks Wikipedia is sometimes “sketchy,” so she is not certain whether the information she found there can be trusted, and therefore wants to make sure that I am aware that she is aware the information she is giving may not be correct (line 154).

### Example 5.1g

B: das ist wo wir haben ist von ein schreib/ **like** ein heft  
und dann gibt er uns eine t/ herr galewski gibt uns eine  
**topic** wie **what would you do with a million dollars** und  
wie/ dings wie das und dann müssen wir schreiben/  
schnell schreiben für **like** zwei minuten über was wir  
denken so wir machen die manchmal (.) was anderes machen  
wir? hm. ja ich weiß nicht wir machen das wir/ oh ja.  
ich weiß wir machen noch eine projekt hah es ist so  
ärgerlich (---) aber wir tun es über/ wir müssen eine  
geschichte schreiben über jemand das etwas gut gemacht  
oder etwas **achieved so** ich mache es an den no- an den  
mann das hat **plastic** gemacht und so er heißt **alexander  
parkes** so was wir müssen machen ist wir müssen jemand  
nehmen und dann müssen wir es **we have to twist it** so  
dass es wär nie ah passieren **so like plastic you have to  
change it** so dass plastik war nicht gemacht

#### 5.1.4 Communication strategies

Bethany uses borrowing as a communication strategy, as examples of discourse-related borrowing show. She also uses a wide variety of transference processes as communication strategies, which are directly related to her language use. However, these are not the only communication strategies Bethany uses. In fact, she uses a whole host of creative and sophisticated strategies to ensure that she understands what is asked, and that her utterances are understood by me. These strategies include:

- a) creative compensation, which refers to a new meaning construction based on something that is only partially understood (line 43)

##### **Example:**

I: mm. okay. und äh gefällt dir naturwissenschaft?

B: ja ich mag natur. wir haben cottages ah sommerhausen so dann sind sie in die natur so ich mag die natur es ist schön.

In this example, Bethany only understands part of the word “Naturwissenschaft,” but based what she was able to understand, she gives an answer about spending time outdoors.

- b) repetition of the last few words of the previous utterance (line 49)

##### **Example:**

I: was macht ihr jetzt in **science**?

B: in **science**?

- c) asking for clarification (line 227, line 744)

##### **Example 1:**



I: was meinst du würden wir benutzen wenn wir kein  
plastik hätten?

B: ich weiß nicht (----) ich würde (--) ja was würden  
wir brauchen anstatt was von plastik ist dass was du  
sagst?

### **Example 2:**

I: =welche adjektive ahm verbindest du mit deutsch  
sprechen?

(---)

B: mmm **like** was meinst du **by** das?

d) repetition of keywords from my turns in her subsequent utterances

### **Example:**

I: weil das die erwartung war, einfach, dass ihr deutsch  
sprecht?

B: ja die erwartung wenn du nicht deutsch sprecht dann  
bekommst du eine **talking to**

The results of the data analysis show that for Bethany, borrowing is a very useful tool for effective communication. In order to understand the importance of borrowing as a communication strategy for Bethany, it is useful to examine a second interview to see what the similarities and differences are.

## **5.2 Second Interview: Faith**

Faith is a student at King George Elementary School. She likes to play soccer and draw. She generally enjoys school and her favourite thing to do is to write stories. Unlike Bethany, however, Faith was not overly articulate during the interview. My general impression was

that she was extremely nervous, though I was unsure whether this was due to speaking German or due to the situation of speaking to an unfamiliar adult. Whatever the reason for her nervousness, the result was that she came across as not very proficient in German, which included her comprehension. There were a number of times where a question had to be repeated or explained and a number of instances where her answers were only loosely related to the question. Faith had to be constantly prompted, and in total, I spoke more during this particular interview than Faith did.

In general, Faith's interview was far less complex than Bethany's interview, both lexically as well as syntactically. During the interview, the duration of which was less than half of the duration of Bethany's interview, Faith had a total of 126 turns. Of these, roughly half of her turns consisted of less than four lexical meaning units, and many of these consisted of only one. As stated earlier, Faith did not elaborate without considerable prompting, and many of her utterances contained lengthy pauses, both filled and silent. (See Appendix 3 for the complete interview transcript).

Despite the fact that Faith is not as proficient and not as linguistically creative as Bethany, most of her borrowing choices fall into categories established in the analysis of Bethany's interview. Faith made repeated use of syntactic transference and lexicosyntactic transference. Proportionately, she used far fewer English lexical units than Bethany did. Although some of the similarities to Bethany's interview will be mentioned in the discussion of Faith's interview itself, a comparison of the differences between the two interviews will follow.

### 5.2.1 Cultural and contextual borrowing

Like Bethany, Faith makes use of English lexical units to refer to relevant aspects of her cultural sphere. In Faith's case, this includes "totally unique speaking club," (line 137) which refers to a regular activity that the students at King George Elementary School take part in as part of their English Language Arts curriculum to practice writing and public speaking. In addition, she uses the word "garage sale" (line 150), which is a typical North American phenomenon that does not really exist in the German-speaking European context. Like Bethany, Faith also borrows English language names for institutions that could be translated into German or pronounced in a German way, such as "university of alberta" (line 154). Many of Faith's instances of borrowing can be considered core borrowing, since it is reasonable to assume that Faith would have been exposed to these words at some point, for example line 181: "wenn wir haben eine **question.**"

As with Bethany, Faith's interview contained examples of borrowing that did not fit comfortably in either the cultural or the core borrowing category, and so here, too, I found evidence of a hybrid category, contextual borrowing, which is allowed by the community of practice that is the English-German bilingual program. Most notably for Faith, this includes her science class and English Language Arts class, for both of which there are numerous borrowing examples. Relating to her science project, Faith borrows the word "science" (lines 48, 77), "solar system" (lines 54, 62), "Jupiter" (line 56), and "planet" (line 62). Relating to the public speaking exercises she does in her English Language Arts class, she uses "news report" (lines 138, 142), "weather report" (line 138), "oil spill" (line 147), "usa" (line 147) and "gulf of mexico" (line 149).

### 5.2.2 Structural borrowing

Faith has only one example of morphological transference, in line 105: “wenn du musst der die or das *usen*.” Faith’s most common forms of transference are syntactic and lexicosyntactic. In fact, she makes use particularly of lexicosyntactic transference more often than Bethany does. For example,

#### Example 5.2a

I: ... wann würdest du da englisch sprechen?

F: wenn wir haben eine **question like** wenn ich hab mein **hand** auf dann  
sag ich es in englisch

The phrase „wenn ich hab mein **hand** auf“ can be translated literally as „when I have my hand up,“ and it is interesting that Faith uses the English word “hand,” although it is a cognate in German. In this particular case, Faith also translates the particle “up,” as in “up the hill,” which can be a preposition in English but not in German (“oben” would be required for this construction), and this is a case of semantic transfer. Syntactically, Faith literally translates other phrases, “es ist spass,” (line 274), which is “it is fun,” as well as “und mehr viel” (line 64), which is “and much more.”

Faith has one particularly interesting instance of semantic transference. When I ask her what she had learned about the planet Jupiter during her planet project, she answers: “das es hat eine große rote *spott* an es.” This answer is interesting for a number of reasons, much like the example of loan translation from Bethany’s interview (See discussion of Example 5.1c). The word “Spott” in German means “ridicule” in English, which of course has absolutely nothing to do with the English word “spot” that Faith believes she is using.

This may simply be a graphemic transfer, that is, Faith sees the word in her mind, and reads it as if it were German, or she recognizes that “Spott” is in fact, a German word, and erroneously believes it is a cognate. Whatever the reason, it is not simply an error; rather it shows that Faith, despite the fact that her utterances are in general less sophisticated than Bethany’s, also possesses a deeper level of language knowledge. Furthermore, she uses a syntactically English language structure instead of saying “darauf,” Faith says “an es,” which is a literal translation of “on it.”

Faith has a number of instances of phonological transfer, which can be explained by graphemic transfer in addition to the one above. One particular word gives her trouble, and she always self-corrects. This word comes up three times throughout the interview and is pronounced with a German accent twice: math, pronounced “met” (see lines 73, 175.) A similar “germanification” with self-correction takes place at line 138, when she says “vetha report,” and self-corrects to “weather report.” Another word Faith pronounces differently from English is the word “word” itself, which she renders as “vurt” (see lines 184, 331).

One interesting phenomenon that I observed in Faith’s interview is her use of the word “würden.” The fact that she was using this word in a non-standard way did not immediately occur to me when I looked at the first example, but it became clearer when I looked at the following three examples together:

### **Example 5.2b**

I: m=hm. und ähm hast du schon mal vietnamesisches essen  
gegessen?

F: nein

I: nein ((laughs))

F: ich würde **but** ich habe nicht

### Example 5.2c

I: welche möglichkeit würdest du wählen wenn du nochmal anfangen könntest?

F: deutsch

I: deutsch. warum?

F: ich finde das sprechen interessant und ich würde es lernen

### Example 5.2d

I: aha. ((laughs)) kannst du dich erinnern (.) welche situationen? wann würdest du mit deiner schwester deutsch sprechen?

F: wenn wir würden

The reason why the use of “würden” in example 5.2b did not immediately strike me is because “I would but I haven’t,” would be a reasonable interpretation of her utterance, and a reasonable answer to the question posed. In taking a closer look at the subsequent examples, it becomes clear however that Faith has used this word differently than its original meaning requires. There are a number of different explanations for Faith’s interpretation. The first example can easily be explained as syntactic transference, where Faith has simply taken German constituents and placed them in an English sentence structure. The second two examples can not be explained this way. These can either be

explained by Faith thinking that “würden” actually means “wollen,” and she used the word with that meaning in mind. Another possibility, which could in fact also explain the first example, is that she uses “würden” as the past tense of the English “would,” as in “when I was little I would cry a lot.”

### 5.2.3 Discourse-related borrowing

Faith makes so little use of discourse markers of any kind that it bears mentioning here. According to Auer’s (1984) code switching spectrum, this would indicate that Faith is nowhere close to developing a mixed code, as he sees it, that is, a fluid bilingual code which incorporates both languages freely. In this case particularly, I tend to agree with him. Faith uses the German word “so” a few times in the English sense, like at line 186: “so ich sagt es in englisch,” but this is with “so” in its primary function, marking a consequence. The two further instances of “so” in the interview do the same. She uses the discourse marker “ich denke” at line 250 as a stand in for “ich glaube,” to mitigate her statement and show doubt. She also uses “but” once, in its role as a conjunction, as well as “like,” which she uses to mark a thematically coherent example, as would be expected from the use of “so” (see Example 5.2a above).

She only rarely comments on her speech in a meta-linguistic way throughout the interview. One example where she does give an aside is at line 39:

#### Example 5.2e:

F: ich mach lernen über das (---) ((very softly)) **oh i**  
**forget** (-----) über interessante dinge über/ (---) das  
(---) ich vergesse was das vurt ist

Of note here is that she repeats the aside in German. Faith seems to be using this kind of aside to get me, the interviewer, to supply her with the lexical items she needs to complete her utterance, without having to ask for the word outright. This is evidently a communication strategy for her, to get someone who knows to supply lexical items she needs without directly asking for them. This particular instance was a turning point in the interview, because up until this point in the interview, Faith did not borrow any English lexical items at all. After she tries her strategy and it fails (since I did not supply the English word she needed, because she did not ask for it specifically), she filled lexical gaps with English borrowing relatively easily.

#### **5.2.4 Communication strategies**

Faith's use of communication strategies in this interview is very limited. If one views transference as a communication strategy, Faith's choices are limited to very simple structural transfers, such as lexicosyntactic transference. As for communication strategies not directly related to language choices, Faith's main strategy seems to be avoidance; she avoids giving long answers, at times she avoids giving answers at all. She does not ask questions when she does not understand something that is asked of her, more often, she is silent until the question is rephrased or the question is abandoned altogether. The example below illustrates a typical response from Faith, and shows her typical coping mechanisms when she is unable to understand something.

#### **Example 5.2f**

I: ja? (---) wie oft/ okay (.) auer mit deiner oma, wie oft sprichst du auerhalb der schule deutsch?

F: (----)



I: verstehst du die frage? (.) nein. außerhalb ist weg  
von der schule (.) also/

F: ja

I: in der schule sprichst du deutsch (.) aber/ und du  
hast gesagt du sprichst manchmal mit deiner oma deutsch  
(.) ahm sprichst du noch mit jemandem deutsch? wenn du  
nicht in der schule bist?

F: mein schwester

In addition, while she seems to want to give appropriate answers, she seems initially to lack the skills to determine what information is being sought. The example below shows that Faith realizes that I would like more from her, but she is unable to determine that I do not simply want a list of different sports she enjoys, but a reason why she enjoys her gym class at school. Because of how Faith answers, the following exchange is an almost complete communication breakdown.

### **Example 5.2g**

I: beides. okay. ah wie gefällt dir mathematik? (---)  
magst du mathematik?

F: ja.

I: ja? äh und sport?

F: fußball.

I: m=hm?

F: schwimmen

### **5.3 Comparison of language use and communication strategies**

Bethany's interview is very different from Faith's. Not only is it longer in minutes and seconds, but it is richer in content and more varied linguistically. Where Bethany used a variety of communication strategies related both to structure and to discourse, Faith used a few communicative strategies repeatedly and others not at all. In general, Faith's responses consisted of many one word utterances, and she repeated the same vocabulary frequently. Her interview was characterized by frequent lexical and structural repetitions.

Due to the length and complexity of Bethany's utterances in the interview situation, it seems safe to say that she is a more proficient German speaker. That is to say, she is proficient in a performative sense, as can be determined by examining the complexity, accuracy and fluency of her utterances in the interview I conducted with her. At the same time, according to common beliefs about code switching and borrowing, (mainly that it is done based solely on a shortage of linguistic resources,) we could assume that Faith should clearly have more examples of borrowing, since she is, according to an examination of the complexity, accuracy and fluency of her utterances in this particular interview situation, a less proficient German speaker. In reality, however, even taking into account that Bethany's interview is much longer than Faith's, Bethany has far more examples and a far greater variety of borrowing. For Bethany, borrowing is a communication strategy, one which she uses effectively in bilingual communication. In general, I would say that Faith's code switching and borrowing seem very much to be a result of lexical gaps, and while the filling of lexical gaps by borrowing is a communication strategy, as indicated earlier, this is one of the very few communication strategies Faith actually uses.

In order to illustrate this more clearly, I want to consider an example from each interview that contains approximately the same number of English lexical items. In lines 60-65, Bethany describes what she learned about the planet Saturn, a project which was done in English.

### Example: Bethany

B: ich habe gelernt dass es hat rings ich wusste das schon, aber das es ahm hat ungefähr einunddreißig **moons**. dass sie sind sehr interessant eine ist die größte **moon** ja **titan** ist den größten und das eine heißt **mimas** und es ist sieht aus wie die dess store/ **death star** in **star wars**.

Bethany's response is clear to the listener. She uses English words to enhance her description, including examples of cultural and contextual borrowing. She does not even pause to conduct word searches; rather, these words are integrated almost seamlessly into her talk.

At line 110-114, Faith is talking about an assignment she did in her art class, an activity that was presumably explained and conducted in German.

### Example: Faith

F: wir haben mit eine (--) **grid** und wir finden eine/ (---)ein (---) **picture** in **magazine** und dann wir haben es an lineal getun und an das **picture** und dann wir haben an eine andere (---) papier und dann wir haben es (---) ahm **tryna draw the same thing over again**

She is talking about drawing the other half of a magazine picture using grid paper, but her explanation is vague and confusing to the listener. The only reason I was able to discern what she meant is that another student had talked about the same project in an earlier interview. Faith is clearly struggling to express herself, as her utterance is filled with lengthy pauses during which she searches for words until she finally gives up and switches to English at the end. Faith's description is missing some basic elements such as a verb in the first utterance and articles (which would need to be present whether the utterance is in English or in German.)

In the five turns following this utterance, Faith only says one word each time, although two of the questions are open-ended:

### **Example 2: Faith**

I: ach so. in jedem/

F: **yeah**

I: in jedem kleinen quadrat

F: **yeah**

I: a=ha. und wie hat das funktioniert?

F: o(h)kay(h)

I: ja? ((laughs)) wie sah dein bild aus?

F: mmmm. O:(h)kay.

I: ((laughs)) hat es so ausgesehen wie das erste bild?

F: ja

It may be that the extensive word searches that were required of her during her previous turn left her so unnerved or frustrated that she had to gather herself again before giving a coherent longer answer again.

The data from both of these interviews illustrates that borrowing can serve as an extremely valuable communication strategy for bilingual speakers speaking with other bilinguals. At the same time, the data also shows that communication strategies seem to have a profound effect on language proficiency. The data from Bethany's interview seem to show that her strategic use of borrowing as well as other tools do not only make her a more competent bilingual, they make her more competent in German, which is her L2. Bethany shows not only astute knowledge of the underlying structure of German, but more importantly, she shows that she has extensive knowledge of how to use language strategically, so that she can repair communication breakdown. Faith's interview data also show how important communication strategies are not only to further communication, but to develop language skills. In her case, she has a much more visible shortage of linguistic resources, but also has a shortage of strategies to help her cope with her lack of resources.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusions and Implications**

### **6.1 Researcher as participant/ Researcher as insider**

Admittedly, it is not necessarily customary for the researcher of such a study to make comments of a personal nature about the material. However, since I am approaching this as an ethnographic study of sorts, in which I was directly involved as the researcher, I feel it necessary to make a few observations. As I mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, I myself attended one of the schools involved in this study when I was younger, and my father taught in the bilingual program for 24 years. He was my sixth grade teacher. My aunt taught in the program for almost 20. She was one of my Kindergarten teachers. My grandfather taught German at the high school level for a number of years. The German bilingual program in Winnipeg is a program that I find valuable and important, in part because I know from personal experience how much work goes into keeping it running.

It is clear that I have a personal connection to the English-German bilingual program, and it is also clear that this kind of closeness to a subject of research has its limitations. For example, the argument could be made that I am not critical enough of the program, and that I, as the interviewer and the researcher who is close to the material make too many assumptions about the content of the interviews because it is familiar and known to me. At the same time, the background knowledge I have about the program, and the fact that I myself was part of the program have a number of benefits that I believe outweigh the limitations to a certain extent. Not only was I able to more quickly form positive relationships with the children, but I also had far more points of reference from which to understand not only what the children were talking about in general, but also

their utterances in particular. As a fully functioning bilingual who is familiar with the way in which these children communicate, I was able to understand them more effectively than someone who has no previous experience in the program, particularly in the cases of non-standard utterances.

This background knowledge gives me an insider's perspective, which allows me to understand how much the program has changed in the years since its inception. Not only are teachers expected to teach content in German, they must now teach much more German language in order to teach German content. The children, many of whom, like the interviewees in this study, do not know German when they begin the program in Kindergarten. The paradigm has always been such that only German should be spoken in German class, although many resources students use for research are in English, since resources on pertinent topics do not exist at their language level. I wonder if we need to shift the paradigm a little bit, to focus more on creating bilinguals in the English-German bilingual program, rather than focussing on how "correct" their German language skills are. Although this study is small, it suggests that encouraging borrowing and code switching would be beneficial for developing language skills. What's more, if using English is viewed as a strategy, and language awareness is raised in this way, that too may help the students to develop their language skills more effectively. What is clearest to me is that borrowing needs to stop being viewed as lazy or a sign of deficient language skills, and rather as a tool that can communicatively empower the students in the English-German bilingual program.

## **6.2 Further research**

In some ways, the research I conducted for this project created more questions than it answered, and at least in part, this was due to the limitations of my study. My study was, by

necessity, limited in a number of ways. First, I was only able to analyze two case studies. Looking in detail at only two interviews excludes all the other interviews where other interesting phenomena occurred. Second, I only interviewed each child once, for approximately thirty minutes. I was not able to meet with the students more than once over time, which might have allowed some students to become more comfortable with me and therefore more open and talkative. Third, the focus of my study was on borrowing and code switching, and like anything with a specific focus, this limited my analysis of other interesting and equally important phenomena that occurred in the data. There is much that can still be examined in the data I have gathered.

I would like to suggest a number of ways in which further research could build on the work of this project. Researching this bilingual program is very important for a number of reasons. First, heritage language or international language programs have been thriving particularly in Western Canada for the past three decades, but very little research has been done on them (see Wu and Bilash, 1998). Wu and Bilash (1998, in press) studied the attitudes of sixth grade students in the Chinese-English and the Ukrainian-English bilingual programs in Alberta towards their ethnic identity, ethnic group and their heritage language program. I was only able to scratch the surface of student attitudes and understandings of German ethnic identity or cultural identity in my research, and this is definitely an issue worth exploring.

Second, I believe that the unique group of students within the bilingual program who come from Paraguay and generally speak Low German at home should be researched further. They, like many of the Chinese-English bilingual students in Bilash and Wu's study, are learning both languages in the program for the first time. It would be useful to take a



closer look at their language use as compared to students that come from primarily monolingual English-speaking homes, to see where their language use differs and is impacted by their use of a third language, namely Low German. Furthermore, it would be interesting to compare the perceived cultural identity of the immigrants from Paraguay as compared to the second-generation Canadians with primarily Russian-Mennonite background who populate the rest of the program. It would also be fruitful to look at the language use of more developed bilinguals within the program, by doing similar interviews with twelfth graders, and then comparing and contrasting language use patterns.

An examination of identity construction of English-German bilingual students is important and meaningful in order to help the bilingual program move forward and continue to help students maintain their German language proficiency. One goal of this kind of focus for me would be to make tentative programming recommendations for the English-German bilingual program, to help ensure that the program is meeting the needs of the students in terms of language, cultural awareness and fostering multiculturalism.

### **6.3 Es kommt nur naturally**

When I started developing this project, I had three main research questions guiding my work. I would like to reiterate them here and offer a brief summary of the most important findings for each.

*How do children currently being educated in the English-German bilingual program in Winnipeg, Manitoba use German (the second language or L2) and English in out-of-classroom contexts?*

The main answer to this question, in my opinion, is: creatively and freely. Every single

student I interviewed for this project used both English and German in their interview. They are aware they have a wider pool of resources from which to draw in order to express themselves. Some students used far more English in the interviews than others, but even those students who used almost exclusively English during their interviews were able to understand nearly all the questions posed to them in German. From what I observed in their classrooms, heard from their teachers, and heard from the students themselves, their use of German and English in the out-of-class interviews seemed to mirror their language behaviours inside their classroom environment, something that indicates that the students, as a community of practice, share the understanding that the use of both languages is acceptable and desirable.

*What kind of borrowing tendencies do sixth grade students share?*

The linguistic analysis of Bethany's interview shows a wide variety of transference, in terms of lexical items, syntactic and morphological structure, among others. What shows very sophisticated understanding and mastery of language, however, is the way in which Bethany uses English in discourse-related functions, to create distance between herself and another speaker, to emphasize her points, to comment on her speech meta-communicatively. Even Faith, whose proficiency is far more limited than Bethany's, as the data shows, made use of English in this way. The students in the English-German bilingual program, exemplified by Bethany and Faith as case studies, borrow lexical items according to Myers-Scotton's binary differentiation, core and cultural borrowing. They borrow core lexical items to fill lexical gaps, they borrow cultural lexical items to fill gaps in the language in general, but they also borrow according to the agreement of their community of practice, contextually, meaning that what they learn in English or experiences they have

in English can constitute acceptable borrowing as well.

*What do these tendencies tell us about children's bilingual language use and their communication strategies?*

The short answer to this question is that for more proficient speakers, borrowing is perhaps the most useful communication strategy available to bilingual speakers, rather than simply a mechanism of avoidance, as Bialystok (based on Selinker, 1973) originally framed it. Using two languages allows these children to achieve far more with their language than they could as monolinguals. The comparison of the two interviews also showed the vital importance of communication strategies in proficiency development, in that the effective use of communication strategies can result in more talk time, and therefore more practice.

One of the strengths of this project is the well-planned, thorough, and comprehensive data gathering I conducted. This data not only provides a starting point for future research, as outlined in 6.2, but it also provided me with an immensely rich context for the qualitative analysis of the two interviews.

In my ethics proposal, I said I would make my thesis available to all interested parents, teachers and administrators. The English-German bilingual program is important to many people. Teachers, parents, principals, trustees, consultants and many others work hard to make this program successful. I was overwhelmed with the response I received from interested adults. In my opinion, and at this stage in my data analysis, there are a few things that I would like to bring to the attention of the adults in the English-German bilingual program school community.

First, the children are doing just fine. I was aware, going into the project, of the reputation the students were getting for lack of “proper” language skills. In general, I was pleasantly surprised at the ease with which the children conversed with me. Their comprehension of German is extremely high, and they were able to talk about complex ideas and difficult concepts, ones that I suspect had not be dealt with in German. Second, it is true that the children use a lot of non-standard grammar, but at this point, when they are in the sixth grade, I would like to suggest that the fact that they are able to communicate so well despite this, opens the door for more explicit grammar instruction in the higher grades.

Third, my research shows evidence that borrowing from L1 enhances L2 and may well have a benefit for proficiency. At the very least, my research shows evidence that there may be a correlation between borrowing and language proficiency. I believe that intentionally creating our classrooms as bilingual spaces would allow the children the security and also the freedom to develop their bilingualism at their own pace, and would allow them to take more risks with German than they currently do. If we explicitly make bilingualism the norm in the German bilingual classroom, I believe the students’ language skills will improve, and they will be validated and empowered as developing bilinguals. Furthermore, teachers should make students aware of their borrowing and how this strategy can help them in learning the language. It shouldn’t be accidental- it can be intentionally used to improve learning.

## References

- Auer, J. C. D. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Auer, J. C. D. (1998). Introduction. *Code switching in conversation*. P. Auer, (Ed.) London, UK: Routledge. p. 1-24.
- Andrews, D. (1999). *Sociocultural perspectives on language change and diaspora: Soviet immigrants in the United States*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism, 4th Ed.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Bassler, G. P. (1988). Germans. *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved July 20, 2010 from <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA000323>  
8.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Bilash, O., Wu, J. (2008). The influence of bilingual education on student self-identity and inter-cultural sensitivity: perspectives from grade 6 children in Chinese and Ukrainian bilingual programs. *Journal of interdisciplinary education*, 2. p. 68-87.
- Cantone, K. F. (2007). *Code switching in bilingual children*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Chodorow, M., Burstein, J. (2004). *Beyond essay length: evaluating e-rater®'s performance on TOEFL® essays*. TOEFL® Research Reports, Report 73.

Cleroux, R. (1983, September 24). New organization signals awakening for multilingual schooling in Manitoba. *The Globe and Mail*, p. 11.

CLIL (2002). Index. In *CLIL compendium*. Retrieved from <http://www.clilcompendium.com/index.html>.

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*, 42 (4), p. 557-591.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, p. 402-423.

Cummins, J. (1983). Language proficiency, biliteracy, and French immersion. *Canadian journal of education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 8(2), p. 117-138.

de Bot, K., Broersma, M., Isurin, L. (2009). Sources of triggering in codeswitching. *Multidisciplinary approaches to code switching*. L. Isurin, D. Winford, K. de Bot, (Eds.) Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins. p. 85-102.

Deppermann, A. (2001). *Gespräche analysieren, eine Einführung. 2nd Edition*. Opladen, Germany: Leske and Budrich.

Freeman, R. (2007). Reviewing the research on language education programs. *Bilingual education, an introductory reader*. O. García, C. Baker, (Eds.) Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd. p. 3-18.

- Friedmann, R., John Hofer, Hans Meier and John V. Hinde. (1989). Hutterian Brethren (Hutterische Brüder). *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online*. Retrieved 24 July 2010, from <http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/H888ME.html>.
- Government of Manitoba. (2005). Kindergarten-Senior 4 Deutsch als Fremdsprache. *Manitoba Rahmenlehrplan*. Winnipeg, MB: Building for the Future.
- Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, p. 467-477.
- Grosjean, F. (1992). Another view of bilingualism. *Cognitive processing in bilinguals*, 83, 51-62.
- Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hagenlocher, H. (2006, December 9). Web Extra: St. Nikolaus. *The Winnipeg Free Press*.
- Hogue, T. (2007, October 18). Schools pump out fluent German grads. *The Winnipeg Herald*, p. 1.
- Jarvis, S., and Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Johnson, W. (1982, June 26). Creating a nation of tongues. *The Globe and Mail*, p. 10.
- Landry, R., R. Allard, and K. Deveau. (2007). Bilingual schooling of the Francophone minority: a cultural autonomy model. *International journal of the sociology of language* 185, p. 133-162.

- Levine, G. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3). p. 343-364.
- Liebscher, G. and Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Code switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), p. 234-247.
- MacSwan, J. (2004). Code switching and grammatical theory. In *The handbook of bilingualism*. T. K. Bhatia, W. C. Ritchie, (Eds.) p. 283-311.
- Manitoba Education and Training. (2008). *English-German bilingual program overview K-6*. Winnipeg, MB: Curriculum support series.
- Marx, N. and Mehlhorn, G. (2010). Pushing the positive: encouraging phonological transfer from L2 to L3. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(1), p. 4 -18.
- Maunder, M. (1995, September 6). German program popular. *The Winnipeg Free Press*, p. 7.
- McLeod, K. (1993). Introduction. *Heritage languages and education: the Canadian experience*. M. Danesi, K. McLeod, S. Morris, (Eds.) Oakville, ON: Mosaic Press. p. i-iv.
- Mennen, I. (2004). Bi-directional interference in the intonation of Dutch speakers of Greek. *Journal of Phonetics*, 32, p. 543-563.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-switching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (1997). Code-switching processes: alternation, insertion, congruent lexicalization. *Language choices*. M. Pütz (Ed.).



- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Lexical borrowing. *Multiple voices: an introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. p. 208-232.
- Ortega, L. (2010). The bilingual turn in SLA. *The American Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Conference*. p. 24.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of codeswitching. *Linguistics* 18, p. 581-618.
- Prokop, M. (2008). The dynamics of German language maintenance in Canada. *Forum Deutsch* 16(2), p. 1-78.
- Regehr, T.D. (1996). *Mennonites in Canada, 1939-1970: a people transformed*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Romaine, S. (2000). Language choice. *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 32-63.
- Roth, J.D. (2010). *History*. Retrieved from <http://history.mennonite.net/> on July 24, 2010.
- Safty, A. (1988). French immersion and the making of a bilingual society: a critical review and discussion. *Canadian journal of education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation* 13(2), p. 243-262.
- Shermis, M., Burstein, J. (2003). *Automated essay scoring : a cross-disciplinary perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Shiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972): "Interlanguage." *International Review Applied Linguistics (IRAL)* 10(3). p. 209–231.
- Selting, M., Auer, P., Barden, B., Bergmann, J., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Günthner, S., Meier, C., ..., Uhmann, S. (1998). Gesprächsanalytische Transkriptionssysteme. *Linguistische Berichte*, 173. p. 91-122.
- Statistics Canada. 1986, *2A Profile, 1986 - Provinces and Territories in Canada* (table), Retrieved July 19, 2010 from [http://estat.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-win/cnsmcgi.exe?Lang=E&EST-Fi=EStat\English\SC\\_RR-eng.htm](http://estat.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-win/cnsmcgi.exe?Lang=E&EST-Fi=EStat\English\SC_RR-eng.htm)
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*. S. M. Gass, C. G. Madden, (Eds.) Rowley: Newbury House. p. 235-253.
- Wei, L. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, P. Auer, (Ed.) London: Routledge. p. 156-179.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, J., Bilash, O. (in press). Bilingual education in practice, a multifunctional model of minority language programs in Western Canada. *Canadian Multicultural Experience: Myths and Realities*. S. Puttangunta & A. Richardson (Eds.). Edmonton: ICRN Press.

## Appendix 1: Interview Template

### Info sheet & General interview outline: STUDENT

Name:

Entry point into bilingual program:

Overall questions:

1. Was ist dein Lieblingsfach? *What is your favourite subject?*
2. Wie gefällt dir Mathematik/ Sport/ Naturwissenschaft? *How do you feel about math/ gym/ science?*
3. Wie läuft dein typischer Schultag? *What is your typical school day like?*
4. Was machst du in deiner Deutschklasse? Was machst du in deiner Englischklasse? *What do you do in your German class? Your English class?*
5. Wieviel denkst du wechselst du Sprachen in deiner Deutschklasse? Wieviel vermischt du die Sprachen? *How much do you feel you switch languages when you are in German class? How much do you mix the languages?*
6. Was machst du gerne in deiner Freizeit? *What do you like to do in your spare time?*
7. Warum bist du im bilingualen Programm? *Why are you in the German bilingual program?*
8. Wieviel Deutsch konntest du bevor du mit dem bilingualen Programm anfingst? *How much German did you know before you started the program?*
9. Woher kommt deine Familie? *Where did your family come from?*
10. Wie oft sprichst du außerhalb der Schule Deutsch? Wann? Mit wem? *How often do you speak German outside of school? What situations? With whom?*
11. Was hältst du vom Deutsch lernen? Wirst du in der 7. Klasse weitermachen? Warum / Warum nicht? *How do you feel about learning German? Do you plan to continue in grade 7? Why/ why not?*
12. Was hältst du vom Französisch lernen? Wirst du in der 7. Klasse weitermachen? Warum / Warum nicht? *How do you feel about learning French? Do you plan to continue in grade 7? Why/ why not?*
13. Was hältst du vom Deutsch sprechen? Ist es schwer? Einfach? Wichtig? Langweilig? Welche Adjektive würdest du benutzen um Deutsch sprechen zu beschreiben? *What do you think about speaking German? Is it easy? Hard? Important? Boring? What adjectives would you use to describe it?*

## Appendix 2: Bethany Interview Transcript

2

I: okay ah wie heißt du?

4

B: ich heiße bethany ( )

I: m=hm. und wann hast du mit dem **german bilingual** programm angefangen?

6

B: ahm kindergarten ich habe für die ganzen/ für meine ganzen sch/sch/ schkooooool jahre ja schkool jahre ahah

8

bin ich hier gegangen

I: okay (.) und was ist dein Lieblingsfach?

10

B: ahm das ist hart ich denke in den deutsche klasse vielleicht mathe ich finde das ein bisschen leicht ah und in das english klasse ah **silent reading** (.) ich mag lesen

12

14

I: aha

16

B: so dann mag ich wenn wir dürfen nur lesen aber ich mag das nur wenn ich habe ein buch zu lesen jetzt hab ich keine buch so es ist nicht meine Lieblingsdings

18

I: was/ was für bücher liest du gern?

20

B: ahm ich gehe von facher zu facher manchmal lese ich **fiction** manchmal lese ich ah **laura ingalls wilder** ich hab das gelesen und dann lese ich **science fiction** und ich lese/ ich gehe von **category to category**

22

I: mhm (.) und liest du auch deutsche bücher?

24

B: ä:::h. sie sind nicht meine Lieblings ich/ wir sollen aber das finde ich/ ja ich lese nicht sehr viel wir sollen und es ist nicht sehr gut ja

26

I: ahm warum gefällt es dir nicht?

28

B: ahm ich (---) ich denke weil mein/ english war meine erste sprache ich denke (.) **so** dann (---) ich habe nur english gelesen und jetzt ich finde english sehr leicht aber deutsch ist ein bisschen schwerer aber ich weiß das wenn du mehr LEEEEESen dann würde es nicht so schwer sein aber es ist nur schwer und es ist nicht so viel ah spass weil ich versteh es nicht so viel ja

30

32

34

I: okay (.) ahm warum gefällt dir mathe?

36

B: mathe? weil ich finde es ein bisschen leicht und ich verstehe mathe ein bisschen besser und ich finde es spassig nicht wie andere fächer in die deutsche klasse

38

I: mhm

40 B: **so** (.) ich mag deutsch/ ähhh/ mathe mathe

I: mm (.) okay (.) und äh gefällt dir naturwissenschaft?

42 B: ja ich mag natur. wir haben **cottages** ah sommerhausen so  
44 dann sind sie in die natur so ich mag die natur es ist schön.

I: aber naturwissenschaft ist **science**.

46 B: oh es ist? oh okay ahm **yeah** (.) ich mag es ein bisschen (.) es ist interessant

48 I: was macht ihr jetzt in **science**?

B: in **science**? jetzt? oh jetzt machen wir/ wir haben gerade  
50 über den **planets** ge/ ah/ wissen **so** wir mussten eine projekt machen an es mussten eine **brochure** machen und  
52 ich machte es an **saturn** und wir versuchten leute zum einladen zum **saturn** zu kommen so wir mussten das machen  
54 dann mussten wir alle information über **saturn** finden und wir machen sie auf den projekten so wir könnten welch-  
56 ah ja/ wir könnten wählen welche **planet** wir machten ((very softly)) wir machten

58 I: und was hast du über saturn gelernt?

B: ich habe gelernt dass es hat **rings** ich wusste das schon,  
60 aber das es ahm hat ungefähr einunddreißig **moons** (.) dass sie sind sehr interessant eine ist die größte **moon**  
62 ja **titan** ist den größten und das eine heißt **mimas** und es ist sieht aus wie die **dess store/ death star in star**  
64 **wars**

I: oh

66 B: sie haben den leute das sind das **website** gemacht haben  
denkten dass das ist **where george lucas got** den **idee** von  
68 **mimas** das war interessant zu wissen dass/ ja (.) weil **saturn/ ja/ so ich finde das interessant**

70 I: m=hm (.) und wie gefällt dir sport?

B: ah::m ich mag es (.) ich würde es ein bisschen mehr  
72 machen wenn ich würde ein bisschen besser sein aber ich/ ich finde es spass

74 I: und was gefällt dir am besten?

B: ahm ich mag **volleyball** (.) ich habe das ein jahr gemacht  
76 und mein papa **was** das lehrere aus der schule aber ja ich mag **volleyball**

78 I: m=hm

B: ja

80 I: und ah kannst du mir mal erzählen wie läuft dein typischer schultag?

82 B: okay (.) ahm wie ich weck auf (.) ja (.) und meine papa  
nimmt mir zu schule dann wenn ich bin bei schule ich  
84 gehe/ ich mach mich fertig wir machen mathe dann haben  
wir mathe und wir lernen dann haben wir den andere  
86 fachen und dann nachmittags es/ gehen wir/ manchmal  
tauschen wir zu die andere klasse dann in den andere  
88 klasse ahhhh macht wir die facher dann gehe ich zu hause  
so/

90 I: okay (.) und wenn du daran denkst was du mit herrn  
albrecht machst was machst du mit herrn albrecht?

92 B: ich habe mathe deutsch ah geschichte und sozialkunde ich  
denke gesundheitslehre und/ ja (.) kunst (.) so die sind  
94 die fächer das ich mache mit herr albrecht

I: und was lernt ihr jetzt zum beispiel in geschichte?

96 B: in geschichte machen wir ah ein ( ) projekt und  
diesmal müssen/ wir haben ja/ die **reason vy** wir machen  
98 diese projekte ist wir haben ein bisschen bisschen über  
ka:/ winniepegs/ die leute das leben in winniepeg all den  
100 kulturen und all den leute da sind ja kanadien und  
anderen ja leute so dann müssen wir eine wählen und ich  
102 habe **russia** gewählt ich mache mit eine von meine freund  
**wendy** und wir machen das projekt und wir müssen es zu  
104 den klasse erzählen was wir haben gelernt/ gelernt ja **so**  
wir machen projekten über kanadas/ den leuten das leben  
106 in kanada

I: okay (.) und was hast du über russland gelernt?

108 B: ahm ich bin nicht GANZ fertig aber ich habe gelernt dass  
durch **russias** geschichte waren da sehr viele probleme  
110 ahm **like** da war ein (--) ein zeit wo **the bolsheviks** ich  
denke sie **sort of took over russia** (---) so das war  
112 nicht sehr gut da war die zeit das **ivan the terrible**  
**ruled** das war nicht sehr gut **ivan the terrible** er machte  
114 sehr viele schlechte dinge und danach **ivan the terrible**  
war den regler dann das war **as if den throne was cursed**  
116 weil regler nach regler waren nur ein jahre da oder  
nicht ein/ nach ein jahre oder zwei jahre aber es war  
118 nicht sehr gut nach **ivan the terrible** war den regler ja  
war nicht sehr gut und was/ habe auch gelernt das moskau  
120 ist sEHR wichtig und dass da sind sehr viele **cathedrals**  
ahm dass ich habe ein bisschen über den **red square**  
122 gelernt und den **kremlin**

I: m=hm und was hast du [über/

124 B: über den **kremlin**] ich habe gelernt dass das ist wo den  
präsidenten lebt da sind sehr viele **palaces** und gebäude  
126 in da in den **kremlin** und es ist auf den fluss habe auch  
gelernt dass das **red square** dass es ist ah sehr groß und  
128 da sind (--) **cathedral after cathedral** da sin/ da ist  
**saint basil's cathedral** das ist den schönste ich denke/

130 I: mit diesen zwiebeln ja?

132 B: ja mit den onion- **onion rings** da sind sehr viele und es  
ist sehr bunt bunt ich habe auch gelernt über **lenin**  
mauselom or das eine gebäude wo ah **vladimir lenin** er war  
134 den leiter den **bolsheviks** so ich habe gelernt über ihm  
und den gebäude

136 I: und/ und das ist ein gebäude für ihn [oder/

138 B: **yeah**, es ist] eine  
gebäude wo **vladimir**  
**lenins** ah korper ist so  
140 ist/

I: aber er ist tot

142 B: ja es ist tot (.) er ist tot

I: ach so ist das ein museum? oder/

144 B: nEIn es it/ ich weiß/ ich hab nur bilder gesehen und ein  
bisschen über es gelernt aber es ist eine geBÄUDE dass  
146 ist aus sch/ ah/ **stone** gemacht und dann (----) **vladimir**  
**lenins** korper ist in es. ich weiß nicht warum ich würde  
148 denken weil so viel schlecht gemacht oder ich weiß nicht  
aber/

150 I: komisch

B: sehr komisch. und sie/ da sind ein paar leute oder da  
152 war/ ich habe dies auf **wikipedia** gefunden so es ist ein  
bisschen **sketchy** aber ahm ich habe gelernt dass da sind  
154 **caretakers who like/** sie sind **chemicals** auf seinen/  
vladimir lenins **body** gemacht **or** etwas wie das **so** jetzt  
156 es ist/ ja/ sie haben etwas zu es gemacht das den  
kleider würde schön bleiben und/ und/ all das

158 I: er sieht immernoch normal aus

B: ja ich denke, ICH hab nicht den korper gesehen aber dies  
160 war auf **wikipedia** so (---) **but/**

I: llllla ((disgusted noise))

162 B: **yeah**, sehr interessANT?

I: jaaa, ewww! ((laughs))

164 B: ((laughs)) ja [das ist=

I: okay]

166 B: =nicht den schönste dings

I: du hast also sehr viel über russland gelernt was ahm was  
168 macht ihr in deutsch?

B: in deutsch? heute fangen wir an ah jemand das heißt frau  
170 schmitt wird gekommen und jetzt lesen wir eine buch wir  
haben/ bevor das wir haben ahm wir haben über den **like**  
172 **commas** gelernen in deutsch und wir haben/ jetzt

174            versuchen wir lernen wem/ wann den wörter zu brauchen  
und **periode** die sprache der die das das zu lernen und ja  
176            ich denke? das/ wart mal (.) war diese projekt für  
geschichte oder deutsch ich weiß nicht jetzt ich denke  
178            es war geschichte aber es/ vielleicht war es deutsch ja  
hm

I:    vielleicht ein bisschen beides

180            B:    ja ein bisschen beides das den projekt es war

I:    und (.) wenn (.) du (.) an die englische hälfte deines  
182            tages denkst/

B:    ja

184            I:    was ah was machst du in englisch mit **mr** galewski?

B:    wir machen **ela** wir machen/

186            I:    was ist das?

B:    **ela english language arts**

188            I:    okay

B:    so es ist lesen und schreiben all das wir machen **science**  
190            wir machen **fr/ french** und eine andere dings erinner es  
nicht wir machen **ela french science yeah** ich denk das  
192            war/ das ist alles

I:    und was macht ihr jetzt in **ela**?

194            B:    in **ela** wir machen ((clicks teeth)) wir machen nicht das  
viel aber jeden tag oder jeden woche ah wir müssen **quick**  
196            **writes** machen

I:    was ist das?

198            B:    das ist wo wir haben/ ist von ein schreib/ **like** ein heft  
und dann gibt er uns eine t/ herr galewski gibt uns eine  
200            **topic** wie **what would you do with a million dollars** und  
wie/ dings wie das und dann müssen wir schreiben/  
202            schnell schreiben für **like** zwei minuten über was wir  
denken so wir machen die manchmal (.) was anderes machen  
204            wir? hm ja ich weiß nicht wir machen das wir/ oh ja ich  
weiß wir machen noch eine projekt hah es ist so  
206            ärgerlich (---) aber wir tun es über/ wir müssen eine  
geschichte schreiben über jemand das etwas gut gemacht  
208            oder etwas **achieved so** ich mache es an den no/ an den  
mann das hat **plastic** gemacht und so er heißt **alexander**  
210            **parkes** so was wir müssen machen ist wir müssen jemand  
nehmen und dann müssen wir es **we have to twist it** so  
212            dass es wär nie ah passieren **so like plastic you have to**  
**change it** so dass plastik war nicht gemacht

214            I:    okay

B:    so dann das ist was wir machen wir müssen eine geschichte  
216            über das schreiben sss ja es ist interessant



I: **so** was passiert ohne plastik?

218 B: da würde nicht plastik sein da würde nicht so viel  
**pollution** den natur würde nicht sterben weil da ist  
220 **pollution** aber da/ wenn du denkst über es es würde eine  
sehr interessantes welt sein ohne plastik

222 I: ja

B: das ist da ist sEHR viel dass ist plastik

224 I: was meinst du würden wir benutzen wenn wir kein plastik  
hätten?

226 B: ich weiß nicht (----) ich würde (--) ja was würden wir  
brauchen anstatt was von plastik ist dass was du sagst?

228 I: m=hm  
(---)

230 B: glass **like** metall ja das ist **what** das ich denke

I: m=hm.

232 B: weil autos könnten wir sie nicht mit etwas anderes  
machen? oder wa/ sehr viele autos sind jetzt plastik ja?  
234 oder den **outside** ist nicht den **engine** das ist aus metall  
**but/**

236 I: ich glaub es sind teile die sind aus plastik und teile  
die sind aus metall

238 B: was könntest du brauchen anstatt? es würde sehr  
interessant zu/ ähm zu leben in eine welt mit ohne  
240 plastik

I: ja das stimmt

242 B: würde es schwer sein ich denke den erste paar tagen und  
jahren aber dann würde es leichter sein ich denke

244 (---)

I: ja (---) schön

246 B: **yup**

I: ahm und was macht ihr in französisch?

248 B: in französisch ahm jetzt machen wir etwas anderes aber  
wir haben ahm **french** wir lernen über den **verbs** ein  
250 bisschen und wir lernen über **like** ah wenn j'ai wenn/  
wenn ai **or** el ja all die wörter das brauchen ahm wir  
252 lern/ und wir sind eine cd gehört das war **french** eine  
**like yeah/** wir haben (.) **songs** was sind **songs again?**

254 I: lieder

256 B: lieder ja wir haben lieder gehört und dann ein paar tagen  
zurück jemand das heißt **jack sheshay or something** er ist  
258 eine singer in french er ist gekommen und dann sind wir  
mit ihm gesungen

I: schön

260 B: so das ist was wir haben gemacht

I: okay ahm wenn du an deine zeit im deutsch/

262 B: ja?

I: in herr albrechts klasse denkst/ wie viel denkst du dass  
264 du sprachen wechselst?

B: **like** deutsch? deutsch?

266 I: welche sprache/ ich frag mal so welche sprache solltest  
du sprechen in deutsch?

268 B: ahm er spricht englisch

I: ((laughs))

270 B: so wir spricht englisch manchmal sagt er ein paar wörtern  
272 in deutsch aber dann ist es meistens in englisch ich  
denk es ist nicht eine sehr gute idee aber wenn wir  
deutsch sprechen dann lernen wir es besser ja?

274 I: m=hm

B: aber wir sprechen englisch es ist nicht sehr gut aber/

276 I: spricht ihr nur englisch weil er englisch spricht/  
spricht oder gibt es andere gründe?

278 B: ja u:::nd wir machen mathe in englisch und dann nach  
280 das ist es wie ob/ **yeah like** wie wir machen noch mathe  
und wir machen andere fächer so wir sprechen **english**  
weiß nicht aber dass ist was wir machen

282 I: hm↑ ja das ist unpraktisch

B: JA wenn du bist in DEUTSCH und dann sollst du deutsch  
284 machen meine mama denkst dass wir sollen auch mathe  
machen in deutsch das würd ein bisschen schwerer sein  
286 ((softly)) ich denke

I: warum?

288 B: weil dann würde da den andere wörter sein sie würden mehr  
kompliziert sein aber ( ) es würde ein bisschen  
290 leichter sein ((slowly)) lei:::chter (.) sein aber ich  
denke es würde nicht sehr leicht sein für mir weil ich  
292 spreche deutsch nicht sehr gut

I: ((laughs)) weil/ weil die wörter schwer sind meinst du?

294 B: ja und da sind ander wörter

296 I: warum meinst du macht ihr fächer wie geschichte auf  
deutsch und ein fach wie mathe auf/ auf englisch?

298 B: ich denke weil das ist den **curriculum** und das ahm mathe,  
(--) ich weiß nicht aber geschichte würde in deutsch  
300 sein weil es ist geschichte das ist nicht eine sehr gute  
**reason** aber (---) lass mich denken hm (.) kay mathe/  
mathe es würde leichter in eng/ in englisch ja? aber/

302 I: aber warUM? warum?

B: warum?

304 I: ja.

306 B: weil das ist unsere erste sprache vielleicht ahm das wir  
immer englisch sprechen so dass wir denken in englisch?  
und **yeah** ( )

308 I: aber/ aber ihr könntet doch/ weil englisch ist eure erste  
310 sprache dann könntet ihr wahrscheinlich auch besser  
geschichte lernen wenn ihr auf/ auf englisch lernen  
würdet

312 B: ja aber dann was ist den **POINT of** den **bilingual program**?

I: das ist eine gute frage

314 B: wenn wir immer in englisch sprechen dann es würde sein ob  
316 wir in ein englisch/ englisch schule machen so was ich  
denke wir sollen deutsch sprechen den/ wenn wir sind in  
318 den morgen wenn wir sind mit herr albrecht wir sollen  
deutsch sprechen wir habe das in den/ frau lancaster war  
320 unsere lehrer/ letzten jahre wir haben ein bisschen  
deutsch gesprochen/ gesprochen aber in den vierte klasse  
haben wir nur deutsch gesprochen wir hatten eine system  
322 das wenn du ahm englisch spreche und jemand hörte dann  
sie sagte **like give me your card or** etwas weil wir  
324 hatten diese karten und wenn du englisch sprichst dann  
musst du zu sie/ zu die anderen mensch geben ah die  
326 karte weil sie sind **they caught you right?** so wir haben  
deutsch gesprochen und dann ah an den ende den klasse an  
328 den ah tag sagst du wieviele karte hast du? und wenn du  
hast zwei dann bekommst du zwei punkte und so dann  
330 bekommst du punkte und dann wenn du **like** zehn punkte  
oder ein hundert punkte habe hatte DANN bekommst du eine  
332 **candy** oder etwas wie das ich denke (---) ja das war den  
system

334 I: m=hm

B: ich denk das war eine gute idee manche leute/ den dings  
336 ist leute hab/ **they have to care** ja? es machst nichts  
mit diese **point system** das wir haben? NIEmand **ca|res**  
338 jetzt so sie sagen wir können eine **movie** zu hause  
anschauen so sie sch/ tun schlechte dinge und dann  
340 bekommen wir **minus** punkte und sie **ca|ren** nicht so wenn du  
hast ein system du musst ein system haben dass leute  
342 machen

I: m=hm

344 B: und das sie werden noch machen sie werden nicht sagen

I: ja

346 B: ah::: das macht nichts

I: m=hm was für ein system denkst du würde funktionieren?

348 B: das weiß ich nicht gerade aber leute sollen deutsch  
sprechen weil sie wollen deutsch sprechen wie kannst du

350 leute sagen das ist den problem von unsere **curriculum**  
ich denke

352 I: m=hm

B: du musst/ was würde schaffen? ( )

354 I: was habt ihr letztes jahr gemacht?

B: letzten jahre jahre haben wir hm was/ ich erinner nicht

356 wir haben deutsch gesprochen wir hatten keine punkte  
aber ich denke es war nur weil wir sollten oder eine/ ah

358 ja (.) ich weiß nicht ich denke/

I: weil das die erwartung war einfach das ihr deutsch  
360 spricht?

B: ja die erwartung wenn du nicht deutsch spricht dann  
362 bekommst du eine **talking to**

I: ach so ((laughs))

364 B: ja **so** du tust es weil du sollst nicht/ (---) weil das ist  
den **expectation** jetzt ist es/ ich denke unser lehrer war

366 ein bisschen strenger dann ah als herr albrecht oder  
**yeah** herr albrecht ist auch streng aber all er tut zu

368 uns ist **yells sometimes not yell** (.) aber er gibt uns  
eine **lecture** das hilft nicht weil wenn leute denkt es

370 ist ein bisschen lustig manchmal ich denke/ aber wenn du  
immer **lectures** gebt das hilft nicht wenn du s/ sprichst/  
372 sprichst/ sprichst das hilft nicht **yeah** weil da sind  
leute in unsere klasse das sind nicht sehr gut aber wenn

374 du **yellst at** sie dann schafft es nicht ich denke wir  
sollen etwas anderes versu/ probieren ich weiß nicht

376 gerADE was aber du sollst etwas anderes machen

I: ja

378 B: nicht/ nicht immer lectures geben weil das ist so  
**exhausting and boring** ich/ ich manchmal **tune** ich **aus**

380 I: ja ((laughs))

B: sie/ (---) ist **stupid** ist was ich denke

382 I: ah was machst du gerne in deiner freizeit?

384 B: meine freizeit, mag ich lesen und mit meine freunde  
spielen

I: was liest du gerne?

386 B: ah::m

I: oder du hast mir das schon gesagt

388 B: ja ich hab den fächer **science fiction fiction** und ahm  
**history sometimes i read** ich habe das gelesen

390 I: und mit deinen freunden was machst du gerne mit deinen  
freunden?

392 B: ahm ich lache ich probiere ideen zu machen u/ aber sie  
schaffen nicht meine freund ((laughs)) ja wir immer ahm

394 wir haben ideee und wir probieren es aber es nicht  
schafft

396 I: zum beispiel was?

B: so wir haben ma/ eins mal eine **cake** gemacht wir haben  
398 probieren eine **cake** zu machen so wir haben ja  
**ingredients we just did random ingredients**

400 I: oh

B: **so** wir haben es gecalld **cookake** so es war ein bisschen  
402 wie eine **cookie** aber es sollte eine **cake** sein und dann  
haben wir noch ein gemacht das wir haben geheit **caycook**

404 es war ein **cake** aber es war auch wie **cookie** wir haben es  
probieren es schaffte nicht sehr gut es war okAY, aber

406 es war nicht den beste **cake**

I: hat's gut geschmeckt?

408 B: ja wir haben es geessen es war nicht schlecht wir knnten  
es essen es wrde nicht meine liebings**cake** sein

410 I: ((laughs)) aber es ging

B: ja es ging

412 I: schn und was noch?

B: und wir habennnnnn (--) wir spielen drauen auf unsere  
414 **trampoline**

I: mm m=hm

416 B: yeah (---) wir- **we play wii**

I: ach so

418 B: und ja wir tun interessante dinge ja jetzt kann ich nicht  
sie alle erinnern aber die sind ein paar dinge das wir

420 machen

422 I: schön und ahm weißt du warum du im bilingualen programm bist?

424 B: mmm weil meine:: mama und papa wollt es wie das und  
vielleicht weil meine omanopa und sie sprechen deutsch  
426 meine/ vielleicht ist es weil meine opa meine große opa  
meine opa ticktack es ist ein bisschen angefangen ein  
bisschen wie das

428 I: m=hm

430 B: ich weiß nicht gerade weil meine mamananpapa wollen es und  
sie sind den/ ja sie sind meine mama und papa so ich  
muss sie anhören

432 I: und wenn du die wahl hättest? weil hier in/ hier in king  
george könntest du ja=

434 B: mm,

I: =nur englisch machen wenn du die wahl hättest

436 B: dies ist was ich denke (.) ich denke das die leute das  
sind in den englisch klasse das spricht nur englisch ahm  
438 ja sie sind nicht (-- ) sie haben ein bisschen schlechte  
**language** und etwas wie das ich denke (-- ) sie/ da sind  
440 schlechte leute/ ich meine nicht das deutsche das sind  
nicht sehr nett aber da sind mehr leute das haben (.)  
442 nicht probleme aber ja das haben wie kann ich dies sagen  
sie sind nicht den beste kinder so dann hast du st/  
444 strenge **teachers** ja und ich war in deutsch kl/ ah den  
be/ **bilingual** weil ich mag deutsch ich mag deutsch ein  
446 bisschen ich denke es ist cool ja **like** das du bist eine  
anderes sprache das ist (---) hils/ ja das hilfst du und  
448 es ist schön wenn du gehst zum deutschland oder etwas  
dann kannst du deutsch mit sie sprechen und verstehen du  
450 bist nicht wie wA:s?† so du verstehst

I: ja

452 B: ja es ist besser ich würde es noch wählen mehr deutsch zu  
nehmen

454 I: willst du nach deutschland?

B: ah ja ich habe einmal/ mit mein papa jeden zweite jahre  
456 mit **eastway** (-- ) und ich einmal haben wir nach/ ja er  
hatte den ah den andere kinder das war in deutschland  
458 sie gehen zu hause und dann sind wir meine mama und  
mein schwester nach ah mein papa zu gegeht/ gegangen  
460 deutschland so wir haben/ **we met him there** und dann sind  
wir drei wochen oder nach ein/ dann sind wir zwei wochen  
462 in deutschland gewesen und ein woche in **i**/ iiland weil  
mein mama wollte da gehen dann sind wir da gegehen

464 I: was habt ihr in deutschland gemacht?

B: wir haben (---) dinge angesehen wir haben mit unsere  
466 kusine und meine papas yeah ich meine meine papas kusine

468           gegangen wir sind (---) ja deutschland gesehen was  
anderes wir haben **yeah** den deutsche **culture** gesehen oder  
etwas alles wie das

470       I:    mhm

472       B:    ja und dann in iiland meine mama wollte sehen den **book of**  
**kells** es ist eine **book** dass den **monks** ist gesch/ sind  
474       geschrieben so mein mama wollte das sehen so dann gehen  
476       wir da und wir haben das gesehen und dann sind wir nur  
in iiland gewesen und wir/ ja um es zu sehen (---) war  
interessant

          I:    mhm

478       B:    ja

          I:    willst du zurück?

480       B:    ((very high pitch)) ja ich denke es war/ ja es war schön  
482       ich würde da/ ich würde zurück gehen ich denke aber ich  
woll/ ich würde nicht alleine gehen ich würde mit jemand  
gehen das würde mehr spaßig sein

484       I:    mhm

          B:    und ja dann würdest duuu mehr spaß haben ja

486       I:    hast du viel deutsch gesprochen in deutschland?

          B:    wir haben probieren ich denke so wir haben ja manchmal  
488       wir sind gesprochen deutsch ja wenn wir waren in  
deutschland sind wir meistens deutsch gesp/ geprochen  
490       nei/ nee/ ne/ ne wir sind deutsch gesprochen wenn ja wir  
492       haben ein bisschen deutsch gesprochen nicht VIEL aber  
wir könnten mehr ah gesprochen **just** ein bisschen ich  
denke aber es war sehr viel es war sehr lang zurück  
494       nicht sehr lang aber wenn ich war acht **or** neun jetzt bin  
ich elf **so** das war ein bisschen zurück gewesen ich/ ich  
496       erinnerst nicht sehr so gut

          I:    kannst du jetzt besser deutsch als damals?

498       B:    vielleICHT, ahm ich den/ jAA ich kann ein bisschen mehr  
deutsch ich kann ein bisschen besser aber ich denke das  
500       ist nicht war/ weil ich habe zu deutschland gewesen ich/  
es ist weil ich habe deutsch hier gelernen und ich bin  
502       ja/ weil ich habe ein bisschen deutsch lesen und ich  
habe ein bisschen deutsch gesprochen meine omas

504       I:    mhm wie viel/ wie viel deutsch meinst du sprichst du  
außerhalb der schule?

506       B:    aaahmmm nicht sehr viel wir haben einmal sind wir es  
508       probieren mit meine familie deutsch zu/ zum sprechen es  
schaffte nicht

          I:    ((laughs)) warum meinst du hat das nicht funktioniert?

510 B: ahm ja wir haben/ wir versuchten dies war bei den  
512 sommerhaus wir sind deutsch gelesen **i**/ ich meine deutsch  
514 gesprochen und wir probierten es von morgens zum  
516 nachmittags zu gehen dann bekommen wir zucker oder  
518 etwas wie das aber dann gehen wir draußen und wir  
gehen ah in den wasser zum spielen und dann ich denk  
wir haben ein wort in englisch gesagt und dann **we**  
**switched to english eh**/ wir können es nicht sehr viel  
gut merken aber war interessant wie wir haben so schnell  
geswitcht

520 I: mm

B: ((barely audible)) es war interessant

522 I: ahm (---) wie viel deutsch konntest du bevor du nach king  
george kamst?

524 B: aaahm nicht sehr viel weil den zeit wann wenn ich geboren  
526 war war be/bälälää (.) kay meine schwester wenn ich war  
geboren meine schwester ist/ sie ist/ sie, wenn sie, war  
528 zu hause dann ist sie deutsch gesprochen aber dann wenn  
ich war **born** dann geht sie zu schule und dann dann  
lernte sie englisch und dann meine mama und papa würde  
530 immer mit sie englisch sprechen

I: m=hm

532 B: und dann ja **so** ich/ neinneineinein sie würde deutsch zu  
534 meine schwester sprechen aber meine schwester würde  
englisch zurück zu sie sprechen so dann ich denk was ich  
536 gehörte **so** dann ich/ fang ich an englisch zu sprechen  
nicht deutsch ich habe ein paar wörter deutsch  
vielleicht gesagt aber nicht sehr viel

538 I: konntest du's verstehen?

B: jaa, ich denke, aber das war se:::hr lang zurück so  
540 erinnere es nicht zu gut aber ja ich denke ich könnte  
deutsch verstehen weil ich habe zum **first mennonite**  
542 gegehen ah **nursery school** so ich denk wir sind deutsch  
da gesprechen bisschen deutsch gelernen da so das ist wo  
544 ich bin deutsch gelernt ich denke und zu hause ein  
bisschen aber nicht zu viel

546 I: und jetzt (--) wenn du daran denkst an sprechen und  
schreiben und lesen und hören [also=

548 B: ja

I: =was] ist für dich am einfachsten und was ist für dich am  
550 schwersten?

B: ah::m was ist/ hm (---) was ist den leichsten? ahm  
552 deutsch sprechen hören oder schreiben?

I: ja

554 B: oder lesen sprechen ich denke



I: ist am leichtesten

556 B: ja weil wenn du sprichst deutsch dann musst du nicht  
immer **grammar** haben und du musst nicht **like spelling**  
558 haben du kannst nur sprechen ja? es ist ist ja macht  
nichts wenn du nicht **proper grammar** hast wenn du ah  
560 sprichst weil **because** du sprichst ja? du musst nicht  
immer **proper grammar** haben es würde gut sein aber du  
562 hast es nicht **so**/

I: ja

564 B: aber wenn du schreibst dann musst du **like yeah** du musst  
den wörter gut haben und den **grammar** haben wenn du (---)  
566 wenn du es lesen musst du den leu/ den wörter lesen und  
sie ist ein bisschen schwer aber **yeah** sprechen und hören  
568 ist den leichtesten

I: und verstehen?

570 B: und verstehen ? ja ich verstehe ah deutsch ich denke ah  
okay aber wenn meine/ ja nicht plattdeutsch oder etwas  
572 wie das aber ich spreche deutsch ja ich verstehe es  
manchmal wenn sie sehr schnell sprichst dann verstehe  
574 ich es nicht so gut und wenn sie große wörter brauchen  
dann versteh es nicht so gut aber ich versteh es

576 I: mhm und und wo gehört verstehen hin wenn wir an lesen  
hören also lesen schreiben sprechen verstehen

578 B: hm! kay! hören würde erst sein ich denke

I: also das verstehen ist am einfachsten

580 B: ja ich denke

I: okay

582 B: ja weil dann musst du nichts machen du musst nur hören  
und ja deine kopf brauchen

584 I: ja

B: dann sprechen und ja dann vielleicht lesen und da::nn  
586 schreiben würde letzt sein für mir (--) weil das ist den  
schwersten weil du brauchst **yaaaah** gut ja schreiben du  
588 musst den wörter zurechtschreiben und du musst den  
**grammar** haben

590 I: ja das stimmt

B: ja

592 I: ah:m haben andere mitglieder deiner familie am  
bilingualen programm teilgenommen

594 B: ja meine ahm meine kusinen alle meine oma sie ist/ sie  
war eine von die ersten lehrer hier so ist eine die  
596 große teile und meine opa ticktack und meine oma  
ticktack so es ist meine papas seite

598 I: was ist ein opa ticktack?

600 B: ah:: wir **like** ticktack wie eine **clock** so das ist was wir nennen sie manchmal aber auch nennen wir sie oma wiebe und opa wiebe

602 I: ach so

B: **yeah** so wir/ ich weiß nicht warum aber wir/

604 I: ticktack das ist ja interessant okay und deine schwester?

B: mein schwe/ schwester sie ist auch hier gegangen

606 I: und dein papa?

608 B: ahm **yup** aber meine mama sie ist zu eine englische (---)  
ah yeah sie ist nur deutsch gesprochen wenn sie gehte zu **eastway** das ist wo ich denke wo sie es anfang ich denke

610 sie ist vielleicht ein bisschen deutsch gesprochen zu  
612 hause weil meine andere omanopa sie sprechen ein  
bisschen deutsch

I: mhm

614 B: ja ich denke/ ich weiß nicht gerade aber ja

I: also du bist schon die zweite generation die hier in der  
616 schule

B: **yup** ja oder dritte nein ja zweite

618 I: war deine oma schülerin hier in der schule?

B: mm **yeah** sie war meine oma ja

620 I: aber sie hat/ damals gab es noch kein deutsches programm

B: das da war eine/ ja nein ich denke da war nicht

622 I: ja

B: aber sie/ ich habe da sind drei gener- generations das  
624 sind hier zu **king george** gegangen

I: wow

626 B: ich denke ja wenn ich denke über meine familie meine oma  
ist meine papa ist und mir (---) und meine schwe:::ster  
628 aber ja

I: schön ahm weißt du woher deine familie komm?

630 B: ah::ja:::† ja ich/ meine papas seite meine papas mama ist  
von russland/ ich meine **poland** gekommen dann sind sie zu  
632 deutschland gegangen deutschland zu::m kanada nein zu  
**paraguay and/** neIIIn† es ist schwer zum erinneren kay  
634 ich denke sie sind von **poland** zu deutschland und dann  
deutschland zu kanada

636 I: weißt du wo deine oma geboren worden ist?

B: poland

638 I: in polen aha okay

640 B: ja (---) und dann meine opa meine mamas papa er ist (---)  
 von ukraine ((strange pronounciation, she is not sure how  
 642 to pronounce it in german)) ich denke und dann/ aber er  
 war geboren in **paraguay so** ich denke ja

I: ja

644 B: ja ich denke (--) und meine mama ihre familie meine mamas  
 646 ommm/ mama sie sind hier gewesen schon meine mamas ja  
 und meine mamas papa sie sind hier gewesen aber meine  
 uomas ich denke nicht ja sie sind/ ja

648 I: aha und/ aber/ aber sie sprechen alle deutsch sie kamen  
 nicht aus deutschland

650 B: sie sprechen bisschen deutsch (---) ahm meine/ nein ich  
 652 denk die einzige dings was sie/ meine omanopa sie  
 sprechen ein bisschen deutsch es/ ich weiß nicht warum  
 654 aber meine uomas/ uomas ja sie spricht deutsch ein  
 bisschen aber das ist wenn wir/ wenn ich **hi** zu sie sagen  
 dann wir sprechen englisch aber wenn wir zu meine oma  
 656 wiebe sprechen wir sprechen deutsch das ist/ sie  
 versteht deutsch und spricht deutsch besser dann sie  
 658 spricht englisch

I: mhm aber (---) aber sie/ sie kommt auch nicht aus  
 660 deutschland

B: sie kam aus poland

662 I: ja warum spricht sie deutsch?

(---)

664 B: weiß ich nicht (---) warte mal oder sind sie von russland  
 666 aber wenn du bist in russland würdest du nicht deutsch  
 sprechen (---) poland ist deutschland und

I: das ist eine gute frage es ist okay dass du nicht die  
 668 antwort weißt

B: okay

670 I: ich/ ich hab mich nur interessiert

B: okay

672 I: okay ahm was denkst du über deutsch lernen? wirst du in  
 der siebten klasse weitermachen?

674 B: ja das werde ich weil jetzt ist es ein bisschen ein teil  
 676 von mir ein teil von mir ist deutsch ja? das ist was ich  
 bin **i was raised** deutsch ja, bisschen **so** jetzt spreche  
 ich deutsch ich werde deutsch sprechen nächsten jahr und

678 ja weil eins von meine dings dass ich will machen wenn  
ich größer sein ist ich will ahm (---) **i wanna travel**  
680 **the world** ich will viele sprechen und sprachen lernen  
und ich will musik und **instruments** spielen

682 I: ah::↑ aha

B: so da::nn werde/ ja weil ich denke es würde so **cool** sein  
684 wenn du könntest zum **like china** gehen oder ja mexiko  
sehen gehen du könntest spanisch sprechen und du  
686 könntest französisch und ja so ich denke es würde sehr  
**cool** sein wenn du könntest sprechen mit andere leute  
688 dann würden sie ein bisschen mehr **comfortable** sein ich  
denke

690 I: m=hm

B: wenn du kannst wenn jemand kannst da/ s/ ah/ seine  
692 **language** dann ist es besser ich denke dann wirst du  
besser more **comfortable**

694 I: mhm

B: so

696 I: wie viele sprachen sprichst du jetzt?

B: jE↑tzt spreche ich **only** ah nur englisch deutsch und ein  
698 sehr sehr sehr sehr kleines französisch französisch ist  
nicht leicht

700 I: nein?

B: und ich habe/ wir fangen französisch an hier in den  
702 vierte klasse und meine lehrerin er war herr kliewer er  
wisste nicht französisch so all das wir machten war wir  
704 haben zum **tapes** gehört (--) dAs hilft nicht wir haben  
keine gut französisch gelernt

706 I: oh

B: und dann (---) so aber den andere klasse frau dallmann  
708 sie wisst ein bisschen französisch so sie/ das klatte/  
klasse ahm sie lernten mehr in französisch aber mir ich  
710 war in herr kliewers klasse wir haben nIE↑ einen test  
gehabt und wir haben nur französisch klassen nur **like**  
712 fünf mal eine **term** gemacht

I: oh

714 B: **so** wir=

I: ja da lernt man nicht viel

716 B: ne↑in↓

I: nein!

718 B: und ich magte/ und es war nicht so viel spass **so** wir  
hatten es nicht sehr viel aber danns/ für meine fünfte



760 ja es ist spass ein bisschen weil du ja sprechen aber  
ich meine schreiben es ist hart ich denke es ist  
762 langweilig bisschen weil ich versteh es nicht **so** dann  
wenn du verstehst etwas nicht dann ist es nicht sehr  
viel spass

764 I: m=hm

B: **so** ahm sch/ schreiben ist nicht sehr spass für mir is  
766 langweilig ich denk es ist hart und ja so schreiben ist  
nnnnhh↑hhhh↓

768 I: ist es wichtig?

B: j:::A! wenn du will:::/ aber das wenn du in deutschland  
770 lebte dann ist schreiben wichtig wenn du hier lebt ahm  
(---) schreiben ist nicht so viel wichtig aber sprechen  
772 ist (.) du brauchst/ wenn du willst deutsch ah machen  
dann brauchst du sprechen du brauchst ja du/ ja/ du  
774 musst sprechen wissen für wenn du willst hier sein aber/  
und wenn du bist in deutschland aber wenn du bist in  
776 deutschland ist schreiben wichtig hier es ist nicht so::  
viel wichtig es ist GUT es ist ahm ja aber es ist nicht  
778 so viel wichtig es ist nicht nicht wichtig aber es ist  
wichtig ein bisschen

780 I: m=hm und wenn du wenn du einfach an die deutsch sprache  
denkst ist die deutsche sprache wichtig?

782 B: ja!

I: warum?

B: weil es ist eine teil von unsere welt und ein/ du kannst  
784 nicht sagen dass deine spreche/ sprache ist nicht ahm  
786 wichtig weil ich spreche deutsch **so** ich/ es ist ein teil  
von mir ich hab schon gesagt aber ja ist/ ich denk es  
788 ist wichtig den deutsche sprache ah ja es ist wichtig

I: und wenn du zum beispiel ahm deutsch und französisch  
790 vergleichst=

B: ja

I: =welche sprache ist wichtiger?  
(----)

B: dasssss **depends** (--) wenn du hier lebt in kanada dann  
794 französisch ist mehr wichtig weil das ist eine von den  
796 **languages** deutsch ist auch aber **like** franzöZisch **is one**  
**of the main languages** und **english** ah aber wenn du bist  
798 **like** in deutschland oder in den andere teil den welt ja  
**like** wenn du bist in deutschland deutsch ist wichtig  
800 wichtiger dann franzöZisch aber wenn du bist in franz  
**like france yeah** dann ist franz mehr wichtig es **depends**  
802 wo du bist

I: okay

804 B: aber hier wenn du bist in kanada ich denke französisch ist  
mehr wichtig für deutsch/ dann deutsch

806 I: ist deutsch trotzdem wichtig in kanada?

808 B: jaa ich denke weil ein/ ah ein große teil von den leute  
das leben hier in kanada sind deutsch und sie kommen von  
ein deutsche hi/ hintergrund so ja dann denke ich

810 deutsch ist auch wichtig du kannst nicht sagen das es  
ist nicht wichtig ja

812 I: gut okay vielen dank

B: bitteschön

814

### Appendix 3: Faith Interview Transcript

2 I: wie heißt du?  
F: faith

4 I: m=hm und wann hast du in dem bilingualen programm angefangen?  
F: kindergarten

6 I: ((softy)) im kindergarten okay was ist dein  
8 Lieblingsfach?  
F: (-----) weiß nicht

10 I: kennst du das wort? fach?  
F: ja

12 I: aber du weißt nicht  
F: nein (.) ich hab nicht ein Lieblings.

14 I: ahm ist da ein fach dass du vielleicht ein bisschen mehr magst als die anderen  
F: (----) schreiben

16 I: ja? auf deutsch oder auf englisch?  
F: beide

18 I: beides okay ah wie gefällt dir mathematik? (---)  
20 magst du mathematik?  
F: ja

22 I: ja? äh und sport?  
F: fußball

24 I: m=hm?  
F: schwimmen

26 I: aha okay und ähm hier an der schule wenn du sport hast macht das spaß oder oder nicht wirklich?  
F: ((very softly)) ich mag es

28 I: ja du magst es? warum?  
F: ich mach rennen und

30 I: aha  
F: andere dinge wie das

32



(---)

34 I: und ähm naturwissenschaft weißt du was das ist?

F: ((very softly)) nein

36 I: das ist **science**

F: oh (-- ) ich mach das

38 I: ja? warum?

F: ich mach lernen über das (---) ((very softly)) **oh i forget** (-----) über interessante dinge über/ (---) das (---) ich vergesse was das vurt ist

40

42 I: dann sag es auf englisch

F: **body** ( )

44 I: ah über den körper

F: ja **different uh systems** (---) das ist warum ich mach das

46

I: schön (.) und was macht ihr jetzt in science

48 F: wir haben nicht viele lernen über **science** jetzt aber wir HAben aber ich hab vergessen was

50 I: ((laughs)) habt ihr etwas über die planeten gelernt?

F: ja

52 I: ja was habt ihr was habt ihr da gemacht?

F: wir haben ein brochure getan über eine (-- ) das/ das **solar system**

54

I: m=hm und ähm welches planet hattest du ausgesucht?

56 F: **jupiter**

I: aha und was hast du gelernt über **jupiter**?

58 F: viele

I: m=hm? (---) zum beispiel?

60 F: ah es hat ein große rote spott on es

I: mhm

62 F: an es es ist das große **planet** in das **solar system**

I: m=hm

64 F: und mehr viel

66 I: m=hm und was hat dir am besten gefallen was du  
ausgefunden hast?

(-----)

68 F: ich denke dass es hat das große rote spott an es

I: aha

70 F: ich fand das interessant

I: ja kannst du mir mal sagen (.) wie läuft dein  
72 typischer schultag? kennst du das wort typisch? typical

F: oh wir haben met/ math erst und dann wir haben  
74 deutsch (---) ahm. und wir haben kunst das ist in das  
deutsche klasse

76 I: m=hm.

F: und in das englisch class wir tun **science** (.)  
78 schreiben und lesen ((extremely softly)) das ist alles  
was wir tun

80 I: und wenn du an den deutschen teil von deinem tag  
denkst was macht ihr zum beispiel in geschichte?

82 F: wir haben lernen über eine andere kulturen in das  
welt das kommen zu manitoba und dann wir haben eine  
84 proJEKT tun über eine kultur das

I: aha und über welche kultur hast du gelernt?

86 F: vietnam

I: a:ha und warum hast du vietnam gewählt?

88 F: ich finde das ein interessante kultur/ kultur und (--  
-) ich habe über es sehr viel finden

90 I: wie zum beispiel was? was hast du gelernt über  
vietnam?

92 F: sie haben andere klEIder und essen ich finde das  
interessant

94 I: m=hm und ähm hast du schon mal vietnamesisches essen  
gegessen?

96 F: nein

I: nein ((laughs))

98 F: ich würde **but** ich habe nicht

I: und äh was macht ihr in deutsch?

100 F: wir haben über ahm **grammar** in deutsch lernen. und  
regeln über das grammar

102 I: m=hm zum beispiel was?  
F: ah (---) **punctuation**

104 I: m=hm  
F: und wenn du musst der die **or** das usen

106 I: hm (.) gibt es regeln dafür? für der die oder das?  
F: ja (.) aber ich hab vergessen

108 I: ja? ((laughs)) das ist nicht schlimm. ähm was macht  
ihr in kunst?

110 F: wir haben mit eine (--) **grid** und wir finden eine/ (--  
112 --)ein (---) **picture** in **magazine** und dann wir haben es  
114 an lineal getun und an das **picture** und dann wir haben an  
eine andere (---) papier und dann wir haben es (---) ahm  
**tryna draw the same thing over again**

I: ach so in jedem

116 F: **yeah**  
I: in jedem kleinen quadrat

118 F: **yeah**  
I: a=ha und wie hat das funktioniert?

120 F: o(h)kay(h)  
I: ja? ((laughs)) wie sah dein bild aus?

122 F: mmmm O:kay.  
I: ((laughs)) hat es so ausgesehen wie das erste bild?

124 F: ja  
I: ja? okay das ist gut ((laughs)) und wenn du an die  
126 englische hälfte denkst was macht ihr zum beispiel in  
schreiben? wie funktioniert das?

128 F: wir müssen ahm (---) **stories** schreiben über ein  
130 subjekt so wie winter order sommer und wir müssen ein  
paragraph schreiben

I: m=hm

132 F: so wie das  
I: okay und ähm ich hab schon ein paarmal gehört von  
134 **tusc**  
F: **yeah tusc**

136 I: was ist das denn?

138 F: **totally unique speaking club** wir müssen ein subjekt  
so wie **newsreport** oder **vetha/ weather report** und dann  
140 wir müssen sagen über das für zwei minuten oder drei  
minuten

I: mm. und was hast du das letzte mal gemacht?

142 F: **newsreport**

I: m=hm. und was hast du da/ worüber hast du erzählt?

144 F: wir müssen **home news** sch/ schule **news** (--) welt **news**  
(very softly) und dann wir müssen über es sprechen

146 I: m=HM und worüber hast du erzählt?

F: in das welt ich habe über das **oil spill** in das **usa**

148 I: m=hm

F: in **gulf of mexico** und im **home news** ich hab gesagt  
150 dass wir habt ein **garage sale** am sa:::mstag?

I: jetzt diesen letzten?

152 F: ja

I: a:ha.

154 F: und im schul/ schule das wir haben ahm das **university**  
**of alberta** kommen und singen für (.) uns

156 I: m=HM

F: das ist alles

158 I: interessant siehst du mal okay wenn du an die  
160 deutsche hälfte denkst welche sprache solltest du  
sprechen?

F: deutsch

162 I: und welche sprache sprichst du?

F: ein bisschen englisch ein bisschen deutsch

164 I: aha welche sprache meinst du sprichst du mehr?

F: englisch

166 I: aha ahm warum?

F: ich finde das ahm (---) **easier** aber ich sprech ein  
168 bisschen deutsch

I: m=hm

170 F: in deutsche klasse

172 I: ahm wenn du darüber nachdenkst gibt es situationen wo  
du mehr englisch sprichst oder mehr deutsch (.) in der  
174 deutschen klasse? wann würdest du mehr englisch  
sprechen?

F: met/ math

176 I: mm (.) m=hm

F: wir lernen das in englisch

178 I: ja (.) und/ und in anderen stunden wie zum beispiel  
180 in geschichte oder deutsch wann würdest du da englisch  
sprechen?

F: wenn wir haben eine **question like** wenn ich hab mein  
182 **hand** auf dann ich sag es in englisch

I: m=hm warum sagst du es auf englisch?

184 F: ahm ich weiß nicht ein deutsche vurt

I: m=hm

186 F: so ich sagt es in englisch

I: m=hm okay (.) ahm was machst du gerne in deiner  
188 freizeit?

F: ahm ich mach fußball spielen und am das (----) **play**  
190 **structure** spielen

I: m=hm.

192 F: und malen

I: ja?

194 F: ja

I: ahm spielst du dann auf einer mannschaft fußball?

196 F: ja

I: aha und ah wann fängt die saison an?

198 F: ich habe anfängen

I: ah das ist schon angefangen

200 F: **yup**

I: und wie oft in der woche spielst du?

202 F: jeden samstag wir haben eine spiel

I: m=hm okay (---) weißt du warum du in dem bilingualen  
204 programm bist?

206 F: ich denke weil ich würde eine andere sprechen  
sprachen

I: m=hm

208 F: lernen

210 I: wie viel deutsch konntest du bevor du nach **king  
george** kamst?

(----)

212 F: ich bin nur zu **king george**

I: aber wie viel DEUTSCH konntest du [sprechen=  
214 F: keine]

I: =bevor du in den kindergarten kamst? gar nichts oh  
216 ähm wenn du wählen könntest wenn du jetzt wieder im  
kindergarten wärst und du sprichst kein deutsch. weil  
218 hier in **king george** gibt es ja zwei möglichkeiten

F: ja

220 I: du kannst deutsch bilingual oder und nur englisch  
machen

222 F: ja

I: welche möglichkeit würdest du wählen wenn du nochmal  
224 anfangen könntest?

F: deutsch

226 I: deutsch warum?

F: ich finde das sprechen interessant und ich würde es  
228 lernen

I: m=hm (---) ahm wirst du in der siebten klasse  
230 weitermachen?

F: ja

232 I: ja? (--) um aber warum/ warum ist es wichtig eine  
andere sprache zu können?

234 (---)

F: ich weiß nicht

236 I: du weißt nicht

F: meine bruder und schwester haben in das deutsche  
238 programm gehen so-

I: ah okay und ahm ist es wichtig gewesen für deine  
240 geschwister? dass sie eine andere sprache können?

F: ja.

242 I: ja? weißt du warum?

F: nein

244 I: die fragen sind zu schwer

F: ja

246 I: ((laughs)) okay ahm weißt du woher deine familie kommt?

248 F: kanada

I: und deine großeltern auch?

250 F: meine oma von **russia** ich denke

I: m=hm okay und ahm spricht deine oma russisch?

252 ((F shakes head))

254 I: nein aber sie kommt aus russland↑ welche sprache spricht sie?

F: deutsch

256 I: deutsch↑ aha und ahm wenn du mit deiner oma zusammen bist sprichst du manchmal mit ihr deutsch?

258 F: ein bisschen

260 I: ja? (---) wie oft/ okay außer mit deiner oma wie oft sprichst du außerhalb der schule deutsch?

((---))

262 I: verstehst du die frage? nein (.) außerhalb ist weg von der schule also/

264 F: ja

266 I: in der schule sprichst du deutsch. aber/ und du hast gesagt du sprichst manchmal mit deiner oma deutsch ahm

268 sprichst du noch mit jemandem deutsch? wenn du nicht in der schule bist?

F: mein schwester

270 I: aha↑

F: ein bisschen

272 I: aha↑ und warum/ warum sprichst du mit deiner schwester deutsch?

274 F: es ist spass

276 I: aha ((laughs)) kannst du dich erinnern (.) welche  
situationen? wann würdest du mit deiner schwester  
deutsch sprechen?

278 F: wenn wir würden

280 I: ach so ((laughs)) okay ahm was denkst du über  
französisch lernen?

F: es ist ein bisschen schwer (.) aber spass

282 I: ein bisschen schwer und warum ist es schwer  
(---)

284 F: es ist ein andere sprechen so ich hab es nicht  
gelernen so ist es schwer

286 I: aber (.) deutsch ist nicht schwer?

288 F: aber ich hab es von kindergarten (.) ich hab  
französisch nur von der vierte klasse

290 I: ja okay und wenn du/ wenn du überlegst deutsch und  
französisch welche sprache ist wichtiger?  
(---)

292 F: ((very softly)) ich weiß nicht  
I: ahm ist eine wichtiger für DICH?

294 F: nein

296 I: nein okay wirst du in der siebten klasse weitermachen  
mit französisch?  
F: ja

298 I: ja. weißt du warum?  
F: ich denke in schule wir müssen französisch lernen in  
die siebte klasse

300 I: ach so. wir haben/ ihr habt keine wahl ihr müsst das  
302 machen  
F: ja wir müssen

304 I: und ahm wenn du etwas auf deutsch schreiben musst als  
306 hausaufgabe ah was machst du da wenn du etwas schreiben  
musst als hausaufgabe?  
(---)

308 F: wir haben nicht sehr viele deutsch hausaufgaben (.)  
mehr **math**.



310 I: ach so mm okay dann/ dann/ weil du hast gesagt du  
312 magst schreiben wenn du in der deutschen klasse bist und  
du etwas schreiben musst (.) erstmal mit der hand was  
machst du wenn du das mit der hand schreiben musst?

314 (---)

316 I: verstehst du? (.) nein okay ähm weil manchmal  
schreibt ihr mit der hand und manchmal schreibt ihr mit  
dem computer

318 F: wir müssen mit der hand

I: ihr müsst immer mit der hand okay

320 F: erst und dann wir/

322 I: ach so:: okay und wenn du etwas schreibst und du ein  
wort nicht kennst was machst du dann?

F: ich frage manchmal

324 I: m=hm

F: ((very softly)) lehrer

326 I: okay und wenn du schon tippst auf dem computer und du  
ein wort nicht kannst was machst du dann?

328 (---)

F: ich frage

330 I: du fragst okay kein wörterbuch? kein/

332 F: wenn ich kann das vurt nicht finden in das wörterbuch  
ich fragen

I: ah okay (---) was denkst du über deutsch lernen? wenn  
334 du dir ein paar adjektive aussuchen solltest ja? welche  
adjektive würdest du dir aussuchen um deutsch lernen zu  
336 beschreiben?

(---)

338 F: schwer

I: aha

340 F: spass

I: aha okay

342 F: interessant

I: warum? warum interessant?

344 F: weil wir lernen andere dinge über deutsch und ich  
finde das interessant

346 I: okay. gut. vielen dank.

348

350