Language attitudes in interaction[1]

Grit Liebscher and Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain

University of Waterloo, Ontario and University of Alberta

This paper discusses the observation of language attitudes in interaction and argues that these approaches provide invaluable insights for the study of language attitudes. In the first half of the paper, the three different kinds of discourse-based methods of analysis that scholars have used to analyse language attitudes (content-based approaches, turn-internal semantic and pragmatic approaches, and interactional approaches) are discussed. In the second half, then, the third of these approaches is used to illustrate such an analysis with four stretches of conversation in different contexts. In the end, the argument is put forward that discourse-based approaches in general and interactional approaches in particular should be viewed as at least as fundamental to language attitude research as more commonly used quantitative methods of analysis, since the former can provide the researcher with insights that the latter do not.

KEYWORDS: Language attitudes, interaction, ideology, sociolinguistic methods

INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the study of language attitudes has seen a broadening of the scope of its methods by the introduction of qualitative methods to the quantitative paradigm. While the study of language attitudes has traditionally tended to rely exclusively on statistics-based methods of analysis such as the matched-guise technique (e.g. Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum 1960), these methods have also come under intense fire from many quarters. Such criticisms (see Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998 for a summary) have extended from:

- the difficulty in applying these findings to real-life situations;
- the suppression of variability in the findings;
- the separation of the attitude from the language and its speakers;
- the pressure on participants to respond along a scale that has been worked out by researchers; and finally
- the fact that different participants may well mean different things by, for example, checking off a point along a semantic-differential scale.

Many scholars have therefore instead – or, in some cases, in addition – advocated the use of discourse-based approaches to the analysis of language attitudes (Giles and Coupland 1991; Winter 1992; Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998; Riehl 2000; Tophinke and Ziegler 2006; Soukup 2007; Preston forthcoming). Although they do not simultaneously dismiss quantitative forms of analysis, Giles and Coupland (1991: 53), for example, do argue for a perspective in which language attitudes 'are assumed to be inferred by means of *constructive, interpretive* processes drawing upon social actors' reservoirs of contextual and textual knowledge'; Winter (1992: 5) calls for 'the identification of episodes containing language attitudes, the analysis of the source or experience for the attitude and the interactive structure of these episodes'; and Hyrkstedt and Kalaja (1998: 347) argue that researchers should 'concentrate on analyzing how the attitudes or views are constructed by these [speakers] in their talk or writing in the argumentative context of occasion A, as compared with that of occasion B, and what function(s) these may serve in each case'.

We do not mean to align ourselves with the many researchers who have argued against quantitative approaches to the analysis of language attitudes such as the matched-guise technique or attitude-rating scales, as these methods can be quite useful in their own right. However, we do follow these researchers' lead in situating our work within the subset of language-attitude research that takes a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach. In this paper, we lay out what the observation of language attitudes in discourse – and more specifically language attitudes in *interaction* – can provide the researcher that quantitative, statistics-based methods cannot. First, we explore the three different kinds of discourse-based methods of analysis that have thus far been used to analyse language attitudes (content-based approaches, turn-internal semantic and pragmatic approaches, and interactional approaches). Following that, we illustrate the third of these approaches through an analysis of examples from our own research. These examples from two very different social and cultural contexts are discussed to show the importance of local contexts and ideologies in the study of language attitudes. We argue that the approach suggested here should be viewed as at least as fundamental an approach to language-attitude research as more commonly used approaches such as contemporary modifications of the matched-guise technique. In fact, while one of the acknowledged benefits of the matched-guise technique is in its ability to access attitudes indirectly rather than inquiring about them overtly (Lambert et al. 1960), we argue that equally indirect expressions of language attitudes can also be found in conversations, and accessed through the interactional methods of analysis we discuss here.

THREE LEVELS OF DISCOURSE-BASED APPROACHES

Although many scholars have made the case for discourse-based approaches to language attitudes, several different kinds of analysis have been included

under this umbrella term. So, for example, while Hyrkstedt and Kalaja's (1998) analysis is primarily semantic and pragmatic, and Winter's (1992) analysis is both semantic-pragmatic and interactional, these studies are frequently cited in studies that take a purely content-based approach (e.g. Hoare 2000; Lammervo 2005), in order to justify those researchers' 'discourse-based' approaches. We will first examine the three different types of analysis that have been referred to as 'discourse-based' approaches to language attitudes – content-based, turn-internal semantic and pragmatic, and interactional approaches – and detail their similarities and differences. In our treatment of these approaches below, we will show that these are not just three different ways of viewing the data, but three different *levels of analysis*. After all, a content-based approach, which looks only at the content of the expressed language attitudes, is also encompassed by a semantic and pragmatic approach, and an interactional analysis must look at not just interactional features, but also at both the content and the turn-internal linguistic details within the interaction.

Content-based approaches[2]

Content-based approaches to discourse analysis have frequently been used to analyse directly-expressed language attitudes as they appear within discourse, often to lend weight to a quantitative analysis (e.g. Dailey-O'Cain 1997; Deminger 2000; Hoare 2000; Lammervo 2005). Like all discourse-analytic approaches to language attitudes, this approach requires a large corpus of data that the researcher must examine for the occurrence of stretches of conversation in which language attitudes are expressed. The researcher then analyses the content of the attitudes in each example, looks for overall patterns that emerge, and sorts these expressions of attitudes into categories according to the arguments he or she wants to make by providing examples from each category in the discussion. Such an analysis of one case, Example 1 below, is provided here. This stretch of conversation is taken from a study of language attitudes in post-unification Germany (Dailey-O'Cain 1997) in which the primary form of analysis is the quantitative method of perceptual dialectology, an approach which is supplemented by a content-based analysis of conversational interviews. The interactants in this example include the female fieldworker (FW), a woman aged 29 (F29), and a man aged 40 (M40). These latter two are from the northeastern German region of Mecklenburg-West Pomerania.

Example 1[3]

1	FW:	*wo wird hochdeutsch gesprochen?*
		where is Standard German spoken?
2	F29:	*na bei uns natürlich*
		well here of course
3	M40:	*nein nein. ich würde eher sagen so die hannoversche ecke*
		no no. I'd rather say the area like around Hanover

4		*vielleicht (.) bei uns ist doch noch einiges mit (.) platt*
		maybe (.) here there's still a lot of (.) low German stuff
5	F29:	*NEE. bei uns? so direkt mecklenburg vorpommern?*
		no WAY. here? directly in Mecklenburg-West Pomerania?
6		*wir sprechen doch hochdeutsch.*
		we certainly speak Standard German.

In the original study, the analysis of this example is used to argue that the comments that these (and other) eastern German participants make about where Standard German is spoken are more diverse than the comments made by the western Germans, who had overwhelmingly stated that it is only spoken in Hanover (Dailey-O'Cain 1997: 108). The analysis holds up the conflicting attitudes expressed by the two participants in lines 2–6 as evidence for this discontinuity among eastern German participants, and uses this discontinuity to support the findings in the previously presented statistical analysis[4] that there is more disagreement among eastern Germans than there is among western Germans about where the most 'correct' German is spoken. This sort of analysis conveys additional information that the quantitative analysis alone cannot provide, such as the reasons that these participants hold these attitudes, as in line 4, where the man explains that he doesn't think they speak Standard German in their region because there is *doch noch einiges mit Platt* ('still a lot of Low German stuff'). Also, as Dailey-O'Cain (1997) shows, this kind of analysis can be used as a compass that can point researchers toward a better interpretation of quantitative data, by providing specifics about attitudes for which statistics can only provide general information.

Turn-internal semantic and pragmatic approaches

Turn-internal semantic and pragmatic approaches analyse the same sort of data as can be found in the content-based approaches, but require the researcher to examine the specifics of the linguistic features used in individual expressions of these attitudes (e.g. Winter 1992: 10–15; Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998; Soukup 2007: 244–248; Preston forthcoming). Rather than simply analysing the content of the expression of language attitudes in their discursive context, this sort of analysis also encompasses an analysis of the structure and function of particular words, linguistic categories, and other linguistic material. Examples of this include Levinson's (1983) concepts of *assertions*, *entailments*, *presuppositions*, and *comparison and contrast* (e.g. Preston forthcoming), and Chafe's (1986: 266–271) categories of *belief*, *induction*, *deduction*, *reliability*, and *hearsay* (e.g. Winter 1992: 11–12), alongside other linguistic categories. So, for example, an analysis of Example 1 that incorporated a semantic and pragmatic analysis along with the existing content-based analysis might include the observation that the modal particles (cf. Waltereit 2001) *vielleicht* ('maybe') in line 4 and *doch* ('certainly') in line 6 function as hedging devices and strengthening devices, respectively,

conveying uncertainty on the part of the male participant and certainty on the part of the female participant.

This sort of analysis can be found in Preston (forthcoming), which includes an analysis of language attitudes as they are expressed within an interview between a linguistic researcher (F) and a participant in his study (D), both men. One of the examples analysed there appears in Example 2 below.

Example 2

1	F:	so could you tell me a little bit about your dialect?
2	D:	well (.) see the world's getting smaller. (.) we're getting
3		less and less of dialectual (.) inFLUence.

As Preston's (forthcoming) analysis indicates, this stretch of discourse contains two *assertions* by the participant, i.e. the one in line 2 in which he states that 'the world's getting smaller', and the one in lines 2–3 in which he states 'we're getting less and less of dialectual influence'. On its own, the observation of these assertions would be similar to the content-based analysis in the previous section. Preston argues, however, that an analysis of the *presuppositions* in this stretch of discourse can bear more fruit. In line 1, for example, the fieldworker F's request for D to 'tell me a little bit about your dialect' presupposes firstly that dialects exist and secondly that participant D speaks one. More importantly for the analysis of participants' language attitudes, however, D's assertions in lines 2–3 presuppose both that there were more dialects in the past than there are now, and that this situation is due to increased contact among people from different places. Because such attitudes cannot be analysed through a straightforward observation of participants' direct statements, this sort of analysis can uncover another layer of information that neither a more quantitative approach nor a content-only discourse analysis can convey.

Interactional approaches

The third type of discourse-based approach that has been used in the study of language attitudes draws on work in interactional sociolinguistics (e.g. Goffman 1974; Gumperz 1982) and Conversation Analysis (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) and provides a third layer that can be as relevant in the study of language attitudes as the kinds of information that the previous approaches provide. One major advantage to this sort of work is that it expands the analysis beyond the turn, providing another layer of depth. An analysis of language attitudes in interaction (Wetherell and Potter 1992, 1998; Winter 1992: 15–18; Riehl 2000; Tophinke and Ziegler 2006; Soukup 2007: 249) therefore requires the researcher to take features of discourse into account that are either simplified or not observed when the analyst looks only at individual speaker turns (e.g. laughter, interruptions, pauses, pitch changes, intensity changes, conversational overlap).

So, for example, an interactional analysis of Example 1 above might take into account the fact that, in the female participant's first turn in line 2, she makes an assertion that Standard German is spoken in the region of northeastern Germany where they live, that is strengthened through the adverb *natürlich* ('of course'). In lines 3–4, then, we might observe the challenge from the male participant in the form of the alternate, competing attitude that Standard German is spoken in the western German city of Hanover. In lines 5–6, we might note that the female participant introduces her reply with a *NEE* ('no WAY'), pronounced with both falling intonation and much greater intensity, and then paraphrases the male participant's assertion with two terminal high-rises, all of which serve to strengthen her original attitude as expressed. Finally, we can observe that she finishes with a repetition of that first assertion, which she strengthens still further here, and not just through the modal particle *doch* ('certainly'), but also through her falling intonation. Such an analysis illustrates the way that the interactive features of the expression of language attitudes are employed by the participants not just turn-internally, but also in response to each other. Although a more thorough interactional analysis of such an example would also need to look at the stretch of discourse that follows to see how (or whether) this conflict is resolved, even this rather basic analysis shows that this approach can lead to a more complete depiction of the attitudes in question.

In the previous section, we discussed how a semantic and pragmatic approach can shed light on the use of turn-internal linguistic detail in the expression of a language attitude. However, an interactional analysis can strengthen that conclusion by demonstrating on the basis of the turns that follow that this attitude is also understood in the intended way by that speaker's fellow interactants. Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that in studying language attitudes, we are observing not a pure abstraction, but something that is regularly made relevant in everyday life – and in everyday life, expressions of attitudes are rarely (if ever) stated without any sort of back-and-forth with other people. An analysis that examines attitudes in interaction therefore looks at their most contextualised and least abstracted form. Finally, if everything that occurs in the mind evolves through interaction (Vygotsky 1978), then an interactive analysis can point the way toward not just the existence of language attitudes, but the origins of them as well. Language attitudes are created through interaction, and it is through interaction that they are later negotiated.

The analysis of the examples that follow is situated very much within an interactive paradigm. It is perhaps necessary at this point, however, to underscore that we view all three of these levels of discourse-based analysis as relevant and important. A semantic and pragmatic analysis without a simultaneous content-based analysis would be nonsensical, and an interactional analysis with no reference to the linguistic detail in individual speakers' turns would be fruitless. We do, however, mean to encourage more researchers to take the final, interactive level of discourse into account in their discourse-based

approaches to language attitudes, and it is this approach that we argue for in the second part of this paper.

DATA AND METHOD

Our data is drawn from two different research projects. The first data set, which stems from what we refer to here as the 'Saxony project', consists of audio- and videotaped conversational interviews between two fieldworkers (the authors of this paper) and western Germans who migrated to the eastern-German region of Saxony after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. These are conversations rather than structured interviews, and they took place between 2000 and 2003 in Saxony in people's homes or public places. The second data set stems from what we refer to here as the 'German-Canadian project', and consists of audiotaped conversational interviews between one of two native German-speaking research assistants and speakers from the German diaspora in two Canadian cities that were conducted between 2007 and 2008. We have chosen data from quite different social and cultural contexts to show that the expression of language attitudes is a social practice that needs to be seen as embedded within particular contexts. It matters, we will argue, whether attitudes to language varieties are being formulated in Germany during a particular social climate, or outside of Germany, where the knowledge about varieties and the perspective of participants is different from that of people in mainland Germany.

From both data sets, excerpts were identified in which attitudes toward German dialects are discursively constructed by speakers. While our analysis combines all the levels discussed in the last section, it draws most heavily on the interactional analysis. We pay particular attention to the conversational context (e.g. where the conversation takes place, where the speakers are from, speakers' level of familiarity with each other), as this can have an impact on the ways in which attitudes are constructed (Riehl 2000: 145). In addition, we draw on Critical Discourse Analysis (Blommaert 2005) to focus on the ways in which ideology plays a role in the construction of language attitudes. Ideologies, or larger social discourses, are seen here in the sense in which Blommaert (2005: 170–171) uses them, comparing them with the earlier concepts of 'public opinion' and 'world view'.

We analyse language attitudes as expressed in the examples as forms of *positioning*, which is a process by which interactants make their orientations toward social categories relevant (Harré and van Langenhove 1991; van Langenhove and Harré 1993; Wolf 1999). We see positioning as 'a dynamic alternative to the more static concept of role' (Harré and van Langenhove 1991: 393), because these expressed orientations are not permanent, but highly context-dependent, and can even change from one moment to the next for a single individual. As we will show, interpreting the expression of language attitudes in light of positioning can reveal the ways in which social categories are evoked in the expression of language attitudes, as well as the ways in which the conversational context affects their expression.

ANALYSIS

Argument structure, positioning, and the discourse of stigmatisation

All of the examples in the first section below are from the Saxony project. The analysis focuses on the ways in which language attitudes arise from and are part of the argument structure in these examples. In addition, speakers are shown to position themselves with regard to discursive and social identities through the expression of these attitudes. The analysis also reveals that ideology in the form of the discourse of the stigmatisation of the local Saxon dialect is a factor in the way language attitudes are constructed and negotiated. Through this, the relationship between language and social conditions for the formation and the formulation of attitudes becomes evident.

   In the first stretch of conversation, which appears as Example 3 below, the seven speakers include five western-German migrants: Norbert and Lena, their fifteen-year-old son Ralf, and Ralf's two younger brothers. Of the two researchers (GL and JD) who are present, GL is a native German speaker who lived in East Germany until 1992 and JD is a native English speaker who lived in Germany during part of her life. The expression of language attitudes in this example has to be read within the context of a playful disagreement sequence between the younger generation (Ralf, and his brothers) and the older generation (their parents and the researchers).

Example 3

1	Norbert:	*des sächsische is eigentlich ne hochsprache (.) des is*
		Saxon German is actually a standard language (.) it's
2		*ja (.) gibt zwar gewisse lautverschiebungen*
		(.) there are certain sound changes
3		*[(..) aber nur in geringem=*
		[(..) but only in a limited=
4	GL:	*[m-hm*
5	JD:	*[m-hm*
6	Norbert:	*=umfang und es gibt wenig (.) wenig worte die-*
		=way and there are only a few (.) few words that-
7	Ralf:	*sächsisch ist doch der schlimmste dialekt*
		but Saxon is the worst dialect
8	JD:	*WIE? [sächsisch ist WAS?*
		WHAT? [Saxon is WHAT?
9	Brother:[5]	*[hm?*
10	JD:	*der SCHLIMMSTE dia[lekt? (..) wieso?*
		the WORST dia[lect? (..) why?
11	Ralf:	*[der SCHLIMMSTE dialekt*
		[the WORST dialect
12	GL:	*[echt? ja?*
		[really? yeah?

13	(2 sec.)	
14	Ralf:	*weil das so komisch klingt* because it sounds so weird
15	(1 sec.)	
16	Norbert?:	*was komisch?* what do you mean by weird?
17	Lena:	*sächsisch?* Saxon?
18	Ralf:	( )
19	Lena:	*du redst doch auch sächsisch* but you speak Saxon too
20	JD:	*und andere dialekte klingen nicht komisch?* and other dialects don't sound weird?
21	Brother:	*nö* no
22	Ralf:	*nee net ganz* no not as much
23	(2 sec.)	
24	Lena:	*ja aber du redest doch TIEFSTES sächsisch?* yeah but you speak the STRONGEST Saxon?
25	Ralf:	*naja?* so what?
26	Lena:	*doch mit deinen kumpels zusammen* you do when you're with your buddies
27	Ralf:	*ja SCHON aber sä- des klingt einfach nicht so (.) das* yeah MAYbe but Sa- it just sounds bad (.) it's (.)
28		*ist (.) der schlimmste dialekt der welt* the worst dialect in the world
29	Lena:	*behaupten aber viele ne?* lots of people think that don't they?
30	GL:	*ja (..) ja es hat son stigma ne? son negatives-* yeah (..) yeah it has like a stigma right? like a negative-
31	Norbert:	*aber das kommt ( ) das ähm (.) das is ja das (.)* but that comes ( ) that um (.) that's the (.)
32		*FEINDbild mit dem ich groß geworden bin* image of the ENEMY that I grew up with
33	JD:	*ja?* yeah?
34	Norbert:	*der feind (.) kommt von drüben* the enemy (.) comes from the other side of the wall
35	JD:	*ach so* oh

In lines 1–2, Norbert is presenting neutral to positive attitudes about Saxon German by calling it a *Hochsprache* ('standard language') and by toning down its difference to other German varieties. His oldest son Ralf, in line 7, then interrupts him to present a different attitude towards Saxon. The interruption already suggests a disagreement with Norbert, which culminates in the strong negative attitude expressed by Ralf in *der schlimmste dialekt* ('the worst dialect'). The reactions of both JD and one of Ralf's younger brothers indicate that this is, indeed, perceived as a strong evaluation, and possibly as an affront or provocation to others present, including the native Saxon fieldworker GL. After JD in line 10 probes deeper into the reasons for Ralf's evaluation, he repeats the same evaluation in line 11, and points to the dialect's phonology to provide more detailed information as to the source of this evaluation: 'it sounds so weird'. In lines 17 and 19, Lena then expresses a contradiction that she sees, which may be a common perception with regard to the relationship between attitudes and practice: she suggests (by using *doch*, or 'but') that Ralf should feel positive about the Saxon dialect because he uses the dialect himself. Here, Lena locates the evaluation as well as the practice within the speaker's heixis (Bourdieu 1991), and presupposes through her assertion that it is a contradiction to simultaneously evaluate a dialect negatively and speak it. In lines 24 and 26, Lena reinforces this observation. While Ralf acknowledges in lines 27 and 28 that he does speak Saxon with his friends, he persists in the expression of his negative attitude towards Saxon. The practice of speaking the dialect in certain situations, e.g. for bonding purposes with his friends, is not a contradiction for Ralf with his expression of a negative attitude. Perhaps in an effort to solve this contradiction, his mother, in line 29, provides justification for Ralf's attitude by suggesting that a lot of people have a negative attitude towards Saxon. Her suggestion is confirmed by GL (line 30), who, as the only 'native Saxon' and the one who speaks first, positions herself as the authority on this matter. In fact, she suggests that Saxon has a stigma. While the stigma, arguably, had its roots within East Germany (through the Prussian-Saxon opposition), Norbert (lines 31–34) connects it to the social antagonism between East and West Germany during Cold-War times. Thus, his and Lena's neutral-to-positive attitudes in this segment are a sign that they perceive the negative stigma as belonging to Cold-War politics and that they are now reevaluating Saxon in light of the political changes. Norbert's comments make clear that he sees language attitudes as shaped by social and political conditions, and their origins as strongly intertwined with cultural contexts and social relationships (cf. Vygotsky 1978).

In summary, the interactional analysis of Example 3 has revealed several aspects for the study of language attitudes. First, Ralf's formulation of his negative attitude arises within the argument structure, where he asserts himself against his parents and other adults in this conversation. When challenged on it by his mother, this purely negative attitude falls apart and is revealed as contextually specific, in that Ralf does not deny that the dialect may fulfill a positive role for him when he speaks with his friends. Second, Ralf echoes the discourse of

stigmatisation by giving the Saxon dialect the label 'worst dialect', while he does not perceive other dialects as 'weird' (cf. the side sequence between him and JD in lines 20–22). His parents' positive attitudes, on the other hand, speak against this stigmatisation and, thus, resist it. They are, however, aware of the stigma, and in reflecting about the origins of it, they connect it to Cold-War times, i.e. to the past. With their positive attitude, then, they position themselves as people who have moved beyond that past, i.e. as migrants who have positive feelings towards their new environment, towards the local community, and, not least, towards the researchers.

The question could arise as to whether these are the 'true' attitudes of these individuals, given that they are constructed in interaction with others, or whether they are right or wrong in their reflections about the origin of the stigma.[6] We argue that these kinds of questions are fundamentally misguided, as they fail to take both contextual factors and the non-fixedness of attitudes into account. As Ralf's case clearly shows, the construction of his attitude towards Saxon as the local language certainly changes with the group to whom he is speaking, be it his family and the researchers or his friends. In addition, his case may lead us to think that there is a difference between what people *say* about a dialect and what they *do*. If we try to look for attitudes as connected to what people actually do (as, arguably assumed, Ralf would be speaking Saxon with his friends), we may find that their attitudes are positive and negative at the same time. Then the answer to the question about the 'real' attitude becomes even more complex and it seems almost nonsensical that we seem to take what they say, rather than what they do, to express their 'real' attitude.

Example 4, which is also from the Saxony project but from a different conversation, is similar in its discursive structure to Example 3 in that the negotiation of language attitudes is part of an argument between stepfather and stepson. The participants in this stretch of discourse are the researcher GL, the teenaged son of the house, Michael, and his stepfather Walter, the migrant from western Germany. The discussion begins with Michael talking about a cooking class in which he made *salat* ('salad'), a word that, when pronounced with the stress on the first syllable, carries a pronunciation typically identified with Saxon.

Example 4

1	Michael:	*wir ham (.) nen salat gemacht? (.) der hat allen*
		we (.) made a salad? (.) everybody found it
2		*ziemlich gut geschmeckt sogar? (.) hm-hm*
		pretty tasty even? (.) hm-hm
3	Walter:	*das is zum beispiel sächsisch (.) **salat- SALat** (.)*
		that for example is Saxon (.) **'salat'- 'SALat'** (.)
4		*[nich n saLA:T? sondern [(.) **SALat***
		[not a 'saLA:T'? but a [(.) **'SALat'**
5	GL:	*[ja*
		[yeah

6	Michael:		*[ich hab saLAT gesagt*
			[I said 'saLAT'
7	Walter:	*du hast **SALat***	*[gesagt (.) das*
		you said '**SALat**'	[(.) that
8	Michael:		*[ich hab saLAT gesagt*
			[I said 'saLAT'
9	GL:	{laughter}	
10	Walter:	*zurückspulen*	
		rewind the tape	
11	Michael:	*ich hab saLA:T gesagt (..) ich sag nie **SALat***	
		I said 'saLA:T' (..) I never say '**SALat**'	
12	(1 sec.)		
13	Michael:	*dann gabs halt (.) noch ne zwiebelsuppe (..) als*	
		then there was (.) onion soup (..) as an	
14		*vorspeise?*	
		appetizer?	

Michael introduces the German word for 'salad' in line 1, pronouncing it somewhere between the Saxon and the standard form, as the transcription tries to show. In lines 3–4, Walter comments on Michael's pronunciation of the word 'salad' and points out that here we have an example of the Saxon dialect. In line 3, he first repeats Michael's pronunciation and then provides an even stronger Saxon pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable before he, in line 4, presents the non-Saxon way of pronouncing that word: *saLAT.* Walter's comment may have been intended mainly for the researcher who, in line 5, acknowledges it. Michael strongly denies that he pronounced the word the Saxon way, once in line 6 and then again in line 8, after Walter had insisted on the correctness of his observation (line 7). While Michael may be correct in denying the Saxon pronunciation, there are underlying aspects of language attitudes that go beyond considering this a father-and-son-disagreement sequence.

In terms of language attitudes, the first observation that can be made is that in lines 3–4, Walter does not mark the initial juxtaposition of the two pronunciations as a judgment, for example through laughter, stress, or rising intonation. That means that theoretically Walter's assertion could either be understood as a compliment, evaluating Michael's pronunciation as positive, or as a reprimand, evaluating Michael's pronunciation as negative. Michael's turn in line 6 makes clear that he takes Walter's comment as a reprimand, and understands the dialect pronunciation as a 'bad' feature to have. For Michael to adopt a negative perception so easily strongly suggests Michael's awareness of a discourse of stigmatisation of the Saxon dialect. In other words, the larger discourse on stigmatisation of Saxon is part of the contextual understanding between the speakers. Thus, when Walter juxtaposes the two different pronunciations, Michael understands these to mean that one is the

stigmatised form (i.e. the Saxon dialect) and the other the normative, ideal form (i.e. the standard form, which is also closer to the way Walter speaks). Michael's reaction is then one against positioning him as speaker of the stigmatised, negative form, and, by extension, positioning him as a Saxon speaker who carries this negative stigma. When Walter pronounces the word the Saxon way in his juxtaposition, he is only the animator, not the author (Goffman 1974). Thus, Walter positions himself as a non-Saxon, but one who knows about the differences in pronunciation and can therefore be understood to know the stigma attached to Saxon as well. Although the laughter in line 9 is a means of ending the argument, Michael continues it with one more turn in line 11, and tries to strengthen his argument by asserting that he does not use the Saxon pronunciation of this word in any context.

Example 4 shows several aspects about language attitudes. First, the example shows that all participants are aware of the dialect differences in pronunciation, i.e. the dialect pronunciations and the connotations attached to them is general knowledge that speakers draw on but do not resist or challenge here. Second, while the exchange is focused on whether or not Michael has said the word in the Saxon way, fundamentally it is about the juxtaposition of Michael's perception of himself as 'not a dialect speaker' and the perception that Walter has of Michael as 'a dialect speaker', and furthermore, a speaker of the stigmatised local dialect. Language attitudes are therefore strongly connected with positionings and perceptions of the self within the social order. Through these positionings, language attitudes are expressed indirectly rather than overtly, much as they might be in the context of a matched-guise study, and yet by observing these attitudes as they are constructed through interaction, their context-dependence can also be taken into account.

Positioning, authorities, and the German-Canadian diaspora

The cultural context for the German-Canadian project is very different from that of the Saxony project, and this difference may have an effect on the discursive construction and negotiation of language attitudes. Within a regional German-Canadian community such as Kitchener-Waterloo in Ontario, from which the examples below are drawn, speakers who arrive with different dialects often do not find the same exposure to other speakers of these dialects as they would in Germany. Thus, the linguistic diversity found in German-speaking Europe is backgrounded in favour of perceiving common ground in the German language. In addition, language varieties are perceived as less stigmatised. This corresponds with the findings of Dailey-O'Cain and Darling (forthcoming) that the attitudes of German-Canadians (either of the second generation or who have moved to Canada themselves at a very young age) toward European varieties of German are associated neither with the cultural connotations nor with the Germany-specific stereotypes of mainland German speakers' attitudes. Furthermore, in contrasting the way Germans in Canada draw mental maps

of the German-dialect landscape with the mental maps of mainland Germans, the authors found that the Canadian participants tend to draw fewer dialect boundaries. This underscores that German-Canadians mostly use Standard German in their daily lives, and that traditional German dialects have lost their significance.

The conversational interviews from which the two examples below have been chosen were conducted by a research assistant (RA) who is a young, female PhD student who had recently arrived from Germany. For a generation of German-Canadian participants who may see themselves as long-time first or second-generation immigrants to Canada with no or little recent contact with the new Germany, this German student seems to represent the culture of the new Germany on the one hand and academic culture on the other, including the Standard-German norm. The ways in which interactants perceive and position this research assistant may therefore influence the ways in which language attitudes are expressed. In both examples discussed here, it is striking how speakers position themselves and others in their construction of language attitudes and in their negotiation of who has authority over German varieties. As we will show, the construction of language attitudes is quite different from the negotiation of language attitudes in Germany in Examples 3 and 4 above, and these differences can be tied back to the diaspora context.

The speaker in Example 5, Jana, is retirement-age, grew up in Germany in the Palatinate area speaking only German, and emigrated to Canada with her German-speaking husband (who does not speak her dialect) after World War II. The couple later divorced. At the beginning of the example, Jana is filling in the questionnaire with the help of the research assistant, and is just finishing up her answer to the question 'Which languages do you speak?' In response, she has written 'German, English, some French and Dialect.'

Example 5

1	Jana:	*THERE. heeheehee[hee*
2	RA:	$\qquad$ *[was ist das? aha. dialekt.*
		$\qquad$ [what is that? aha. dialect.
3	Jana:	*hahahah[a*
4	RA:	$\quad$ *[aha ok. haha ich habe jetzt überlegt welche*
		$\quad$ [aha ok. haha I just was thinking about what
5		*sprache das ist.*
		language that might be.
6	Jana:	*heehee*
7	RA:	*[ähm.*
8	Jana:	[*well it is a sprache.*
		$\qquad$ language.
9	RA:	*ja. es ist eine sprache. ja klar.*
		yes. it is a language. yes of course.

10	Jana:	*wenn ich dialekt spreche hehe dann bleiben sie zuhause?*
		if I speak dialect hehe then you'll stay at home?
11	RA:	*pfälzischen dialekt? [oder welchen?*
		palatinate dialect? [or which?
12	Jana:	[*yeah well*
13	RA:	*ja. [hm=hm.*
		yeah. [uh-huh.
14	Jana:	[*ja mit mit vielen sachen.*
		[yes in many ways (lit.: with many things).
15	Jana:	[*ja. (.) ja.*
		[yeah. (.) yeah.
16	RA:	[*das glaube ich. das versteht man nicht mehr.*
		[I believe you on that. I wouldn't understand that.
17	Jana:	*mein mann war aus westfalen gekommen und (.) der sagte*
		my husband was from Westphalia and (.) he always
18		*immer (.) <AUSländer>. hehe*
		said (.) <FOReigner>. hehe
19	RA:	*aber westfalen ist nicht so weit weg von der pfalz.*
		but westphalia isn't so far away from palatinate.
20	Jana:	*nein aber die sprechen hochdeutsch.*
		no but they speak Standard German.

When Jana finishes her list of languages she speaks with writing down 'Dialect', she marks it with the word 'THERE.' (line 1). Here, she expresses considerable pride in her dialect, while her laughter (line 3) seems to be a comment on her risk-taking with this unusual way to describe one's language competence, especially within the context of academic culture, of which the RA is a part. In fact, the RA acknowledges that this is an unusual listing of one's language abilities (lines 4–5). In Jana's response (line 8), she reiterates that she sees dialect as a language in its own right. With her pride, she asserts her difference as a particular kind of German speaker in a world where certain dialects are rare and where German speakers are often taken to be from one group of 'German-Canadians'.

In line 10, then, Jana continues with expressing attitudes toward her own dialect but, in an indirect way. Rather than presenting her own perception of the dialect (which, as a negative evaluation, would be in contrast with her expressed pride in her dialect), Jana expresses this attitude as being how *the RA* would react to the dialect, i.e. Jana is the animator (Goffman 1974) of a potential attitude of the RA. This formulation has two possible interpretations: one, an implication on Jana's part that the RA would not like her dialect, or two, that it would be so difficult to understand her speaking dialect that the RA would not be able to follow. In her response in line 11, though, the RA does not treat Jana's formulation in line 10 as a negative self-assessment, in that she does not respond by reacting with a positive contradiction (Pomerantz 1984). Instead, the RA

simply requests more information about the kind of dialect Jana is referring to. After Jana provides this information, the RA agrees in line 16 that she would have a hard time understanding this dialect.

Jana follows up with an anecdote in lines 17 and 18 about her ex-husband labeling her as a 'foreigner'[7] when she speaks this way. Again in an indirect way of expressing an attitude, Jana animates another voice (effectively done by lowering her own voice to mimic her husband's) rather than expressing an attitude through her own voice as the author. This has the effect of presenting others' negative judgements without taking a position herself. Thus, while she had positioned herself as having positive feelings toward her dialect by labeling it as a language on the questionnaire, she also distances herself from taking an overtly positive or negative stance towards the dialect. This ambivalence in expressing her own attitude may be fueled by the fact that the RA does not disagree with Jana's (negative) assessment of her dialect after Jana's turn in line 10. In line 19, the RA, however, disagrees with the perspective of Jana's ex-husband in that she reconceptualises the distances between the dialect areas to mean that her ex-husband's dialect would be similar to Jana's and, therefore, her husband's negative assessment of Jana's dialect would be wrong. Rather than agreeing with the RA (and thus disagreeing with her ex-husband's denigration of her dialect), in line 20, Jana brings a justification in support of her ex-husband's statement, namely that he speaks Standard German, which would contrast with her dialect as non-standard.[8] She still refrains from presenting her attitudes towards the dialect through her own voice, however, which can be a strategy for shifting the authority over the assessment from oneself to someone else in order to make oneself less vulnerable (cf. Riehl 2000). This makes it possible to dodge the RA's possible disagreement, as indicated above, since the RA may be perceived as the authority in several different ways. In addition, it is relevant that Jana is in a German-Canadian context where she does not speak or hear her dialect regularly. This ambivalence may therefore be less a conscious rejection than a result of her isolation from the mainland-German community where the dialect is spoken. Thus, the expression of her attitude is tied to the circumstances in which she lives, and the German-Canadian context becomes especially relevant. As with the previous example, we find here as well that an interactional approach to the analysis of language attitudes can uncover attitudes that are only expressed indirectly, without removing those attitudes from their conversational and cultural contexts.

The situation for Karl and Nora, the participants in Examples 6a and 6b, is different from Jana's in Example 5 in that the speakers here are a couple who came from areas with different German dialects outside of Germany. Similarly to Jana, though, the expressed language attitudes seem to be influenced by the use and non-use of the dialect in daily practice in Canada. Nora and Karl were both part of European German-speaking minorities. Nora and her family, with whom she came to Canada, are part of the Transylvania Germans in Romania, while Karl came from the area that is now the Czech Republic and has Sudeten

German background.[9] They both came to Canada as young people in 1953, after they had known each other for a very brief time. In the example, they are talking with the same RA as in Example 5 about their dialects. At the beginning of this example, Nora explains that they speak 'Saxon' dialect with her brothers, but it is important to note that this is a completely different dialect from what is now known as Saxon dialect within Germany, i.e. the dialect discussed in Examples 3 and 4 above. Nora's Saxon dialect is the variety spoken in Transylvania (cf. Wagner 1990).

Example 6a

1	Nora:	*die familie wenn wir wenn wir mit meinen brüdern zusammenkommen=* the family when we when we get together with my brothers=
2	Karl:	*=oh da sprechen wir deutsch* =oh we speak German there
3	Nora:	*[sprechen wir auch deutsch* [we speak German too
4	RA:	*[a:h okay* [a:h okay
5	Nora:	*weil meine schwägerin ist von österreich und die (.)* because my sister-in-law is from Austria and she (.)
6		*spricht kein äh (.) äh (.) wir (.) ja meine brüder und ich-* doesn't speak uh (.) a (.) we (.) I mean my brother and I-
7		*wir sprechen ein diaLEKt ja de-den sächsischen* we speak a diaLECT right the- the Saxon
8		*dialekt.* dialect.
9	RA:	*kennen sie- können sie den noch?* do you- do you still know it?
10	Nora:	*oh ja oh ja* oh yeah oh yeah
11	RA:	*ja?* yeah?
12	Nora:	*ja ja ja ja* oh yeah oh yeah
13	Karl:	*ja ist ganz erstaunlich ja* yeah it's completely amazing yeah
14	RA:	*ist das- (.) wie hört sich das an dieser* is that- (.) what does it sound like
15		*dialekt* this dialect
16	Karl:	*[oh ich sprech ihn ja nicht* [oh I don't speak it

17   RA: *[also würde ich den verstehen?*
               [well would I understand it?

18   Karl: *ach sprech mal zu ihr*
               come on say something to her

19   Nora: *ich weiß [nicht ob sie hehe den hehe verstehen*
               I don't [know if you hehe understand hehe it

20   RA: *[hehehe*

21   Nora: *[hehehe*
               [heeheehee

22   Karl: *[frag (.) frag ä:hm (.) fräulein klein*
               [ask (.) ask um (.) miss klein

23   *etwas in sächsisch*
               something in Saxon

24   Nora: *hehe was soll ich sagen (0.3)* **wat soll ich dich frägn.**
               heehee what should I say (0.3) **what should I ask you.**

25   RA: *ja doch das versteh ich*   *[hehehehehe*
               no, yeah, I do understand that   [heeheeheehee

26   Nora: *[ja? ja? das verstehen?*
                                                  [yeah? yeah? you

27   *sie ja?*
               understand? that?

28   RA: *ja das geht das is-*
               yeah that goes that is-

29   Nora: *ja ja*
               yeah yeah

30   Karl: *ja die meint das nicht so*
               yeah she doesn't mean it like that

31   Nora: *ja (.) wie soll ich* **sägn** *äh ( ) ä:h (0.4)* **vom heit**
               yeah (.) how should I **say** uh ( ) uh (0.4) today

32   *(0.5)* **über arch duach** *(0.5) äh* **fuhren** *(.)* **fuhren mer en**
               (0.5) **in eight days** (0.5) uh **we will** (.) **go to**

33   **florida.** *(0.5) weil das ist vielleicht selbst ä::h äh*
               Florida. (0.5) because maybe that's self u::h uh

34   *erklärend*
               explanatory

35   Karl: *na dann sags doch noch einmal langsam*
               well then say it again slowly

36   RA: *ja [am anfang hab ich es nicht so*
               yes [I did not understand the beginning

37   Nora: *[ja*
                   [yes

38   RA: *verstanden jaha (.) florida hab ich verstanden   [hahaha*
               understood yeah (.) I understood Florida   [hahaha

39   Nora: *[ja ja ja*
                                                       [yeahyeah

40   Karl: ***vom heit (.) [vom heit***
                 today (.)   [today

41   Nora: *[vom heit (.) heit ueber archt du- arch duag*
                                 [today (.) t'day in eight- eight days

42   *(.) fuhren mer (0.5) an flo- (.) d- der florida*
                         (.) we're going (0.5) to Flo- (.) Florida

In lines 2 and 3, Karl and Nora both say that they speak German with Nora's brothers, but it becomes obvious later that they are not referring to the same variety of German. Nora specifies which German when she speaks of the Saxon dialect in line 7, but Karl, as he says later, claims not to speak Saxon dialect himself, which makes clear that when he says he speaks German, he means the language they all have in common, i.e. Standard German. These differences in perception of what is meant by the same word are important when it comes to the discussion of language attitudes, not only for this example but in general. The first expression of a language attitude comes when Karl, in line 13, admires Nora for still speaking her dialect, which he calls *erstaunlich* ('amazing'). This comment is intrinsically tied to the diaspora situation because only here, not in mainland Germany, is it remarkable that somebody still speaks a dialect. Another reason for his admiration emerges when the RA asks them both to speak this dialect and he answers in line 16 that he cannot speak it himself. His wife's initial reluctance to speak her dialect (lines 19 and 24) does not stem from the fact that she cannot speak it but rather that she does not know whether her dialect would find the accreditation for a normative language from the RA (cf. the RA's authority discussed above). With her reluctance, Nora marks her dialect as strange, as difficult to understand and as outside of the accredited German norm. Encouraged by the RA's appreciation for the dialect voiced in lines 25 and 28 and her husband's encouragement, Nora now provides another example in lines 31–33. In performing her dialect here, she slows down and pauses between phrases, which indicates that she wants the RA to understand her dialect, something that would give herself recognition as speaker of an accepted German variety rather than of a strange dialect. Karl, who claimed earlier that he does not speak the dialect, now joins in this accreditation process by repeating the dialect words (line 40) in response to an implicit request from the RA (line 36) and later even provides a translation (omitted here), through which he also positions himself as an authority on understanding the dialect.

In the omitted part of the conversation, Nora provides the dialect version for the sentence 'today is not a nice day', which both Karl and Nora translate together for the RA. The conversation continues with Example 6b below, which starts with another expression of a positive attitude towards the dialect by Karl.

Example 6b

65	Karl:	*ich mein das ist ne acht hundert jahre alte sprache ne* I mean that's an eight hundred year old language right
66	RA:	*hm=hm (.) ja (.) ham sie (.) [hochdeutsch gelernt* uh=huh (.) yeah (.) did you (.) [learn Standard German
67	Karl:	*[ich versteh alles* [I understand all of it
68	RA:	*oder ham sie=auch einen dia- (.) ja* or did you=also a dia- (.) yeah
69	Karl:	*ich versteh alles aber ich sprech sie nicht.* I understand all of it but I don't speak it.
70	RA:	*haben sie selber als kind auch einen dialekt gesprochen* did you speak a dialect yourself as a child
71		*im [sudetenland oder* in ['Sudeten country' or
72	Karl:	*[oh sicher ich hab eigentlich äh (.) den dialekt* [oh sure I actually uh (.) gave the dialect
73		*dann aufgegeben denn (0.5) äh (0.3) man wurde mit dem* then up because (0.5) uh (0.3) we got teased about
74		*(.) dialekt gelästert in (reinitz) in der wehrmacht* (.) the dialect in the army
75	RA:	*achso* oh
76	Karl:	*ja und dann hab ich einfach schriftdeutsch (.)* yeah and then I simply spoke Standard German (.)
77		*gesprochen (.) und dadurch ähm (.) bin ich diesem* (.) and that way um (.) I escaped
78		*diesem foppen entkommen ne* from this teasing right
79	RA:	*ja:: können sie heute noch den dialekt den sie damals* yeah:: do you still know the dialect that you spoke
80		*gesprochen haben?* back then?
81	Karl:	*well ich ( ) (.) ich mein- (.) sicher ich versteh ihn* well I ( ) (.) I mean- (.) of course I understand it
82		*gu:t (.) ja* well (.) yeah
83	RA:	*sprechen sie- (.) können sie ihn noch [sprechen* do you speak- (.) can you still [speak it
84	Karl:	*[ich kann ihnen* [I can say
85		*auch was sagen ne (0.3) **kalle (.) hol de fard rein.*** something to you too right **hey you (.) bring the horses in.**

86	RA:	*ja: okay das versteh ich ja*
		yeah: okay I understand that yeah
87	Karl:	*[ja*
		[yeah
88	Nora:	*[das ka- das ist nicht zu:: äh (.) [zu eh schwierig*
		[you can- that is not too:: uh (.) [too uh difficult
89	RA:	*[ja:: das ist noch*
		[yeah:: that is still
90		*[etwas ( )*
		[a bit
91	Karl:	*[KE:rl ne [hol die pferde rein*
		[HEY: you [bring the horses in
92	Nora:	*[ja karlle [hol de fard rein*
		[yeah **hey you** [**bring the horses in**
93	RA:	*[ja*
		[yeah
94	Karl:	*ja*
		yeah
95	Nora:	*because äh äh (.) [( )*
96	Karl:	*[obe drobe wo die große pilze wachsen*
		[way up there where the big mushrooms
97		*mit de lange stile*
		grow with the long stems
98	RA:	*[aha ok zum teil hehehe*
		[aha okay partly heeheehee

In line 65, Karl expresses his admiration that the dialect has prevailed for so long. Karl here formulates his positive attitude towards the dialect in terms of a valuable cultural artifact rather than a useful tool for communication, as Nora did. Karl's expression of pride in the dialect's endurance and long history echoes a pride of people living in the diaspora in the survival of their German-speaking language and culture. This formulation of a positive attitude seems to be in contrast with the kind of positive attitude that a mainland German would have toward his or her own dialect, which tends to consist of connotations of home and familiar surroundings (cf. Dailey-O'Cain 1997).

When the RA asks him about his own dialect in line 70, he begins his answer in line 72 with a positive affirmation that he did speak it as a child ('oh sure'). He then explains that he 'gave it up'. The German word *aufgeben* ('to give up') has connotations of abandonment, capitulation, and abdication, which suggests that this was an involuntary loss that he regrets.[10] Karl provides an example of his dialect (line 85) but only after being prompted by the RA twice, once in lines 79–80, and then again in line 83. Differently from his wife's previous reluctance to present a dialect sample, Karl's hesitation here does not suggest

worry about the accreditation of his dialect, because he stresses the importance and justification of dialects in general. Instead, it points to his worries about his own ability to speak the dialect and, as it turns out, to the fact that his dialect, in contrast to his wife's, is not a current object with relevance to his everyday life. Evidence of this can be seen in the fact that Karl's sample of his dialect is very different in content from the one his wife presented earlier. His wife had used the dialect to talk about something current (their travel plans and the weather), while Karl transports himself into the past to recollect an instance where the dialect was used back then. This has a distancing effect, but not because he has a negative attitude toward the dialect, but rather simply because his associations with it are exclusively with the past. This reinforces the difference between his wife's attitude towards her dialect as something that is at least sometimes still of current relevance in her life, and his view of his own dialect as something old and valuable but lost. In interrupting the RA, Karl is eager to volunteer yet another sample of his dialect (line 96), which is notable considering his depiction of it as something he has given up. This second dialect sample, possibly triggered by the memory from the first one and fueled by the RA's interest, is again a sample from the past.

Karl and Nora's example showed that it is not necessarily the better speaker of the dialect who expresses the more positive attitude towards the dialect. Though Karl disclaims that he is a dialect speaker, his attitude towards the dialect is expressed in stronger terms than Nora's, and in more nostalgic terms. In fact, his ability to speak and his attitude are connected: since he feels he cannot speak the dialect as well any more (and was forced to give it up), his nostalgia surrounding it maintains his positive attitude towards it.

Some observations can be made when comparing the attitudes constructed in the German-Canadian project to the examples from the Saxony corpus. In the German-Canadian examples, the construction of attitudes, whether positive or negative, was done with a higher insecurity. Though the exact reasons seemed to have been slightly different in each case, the individuals all seemed to be insecure out of non-familiarity with accepted norms, i.e. the prevailing ideology, as far as the relationship between standard and dialect goes. The young German native speaker who has just recently arrived from Germany may have been seen as an authority over these German norms. It is quite likely that the speakers' attitudes change when this 'authority' is not around. Furthermore, the specifics of the diaspora, i.e. the disconnection from German-speaking Europe with its diversity of dialects, were as much a part of the construction of language attitudes as the individual use or non-use of the dialect. An interactional approach to the study of language attitudes can reveal both these kinds of complexities and the individual reasons for the relationship between attitudes, contexts (local as well as social and cultural) and ideologies.

CONCLUSION

The study of language attitudes-in-interaction begins with the premise that attitudes are not static, i.e. they are not fixed in the minds of individuals and easily retrieved. Instead, they are constructed in interaction through negotiation with interactants, in specific circumstances and with specific interactional intentions. Thus, language attitudes are context dependent in at least two ways: they emerge within the context of the interactional structure, and they are expressed under the influence of the situational context, which includes both larger ideologies present in a culture and the immediate context of the interactants and how they are seen by others. Building on this, it can be said that language attitudes are created and transmitted through talk, but they retain power through larger cultural ideologies that are perpetuated through individual instances of talk. In this sense, attitudes are both created and shaped through interaction, and brought to each individual interaction in the form of ideology. Speakers involuntarily contribute to these ideologies by asserting or rejecting them, and their positionings may be affected by them as well.

In a similar vein, the speakers' geographical location and their geographic distance from or closeness to the languages or varieties that are the focus of the study of language attitudes affect the ways of expressing their attitudes. If attitudes are created in interaction with others, then interactions within different communities shape different language attitudes. It follows from this that individuals construct language attitudes differently depending on which situational context and which communities they see themselves in. As we have shown, language attitudes and ways of positioning oneself with regard to social categories are closely connected. Thus, expressing language attitudes within an interaction is necessarily a means of positioning oneself. In addition, an interactional analysis shows that language attitudes are not only expressed in the formulations of a speaker, but also emerge through the ways in which others react to the speaker. We have also observed that attitudes emerge as a result of being encouraged by other interactants, which gives an indication of how attitudes are shaped and created in the interaction.

These findings suggest that it would be misguided to dismiss interactional analyses of language attitudes as so context-specific and ungeneralisable that they cannot realistically be applied to language-attitude research in general. But the argument that interaction-based methods of analysis require too much effort in order to be truly fruitful (e.g. Casper 2002: 22) is also easily countered with the fact that it has already become fairly commonplace in language-attitude research to counter the limitations of quantitative-only analyses with data drawn from conversational interviews or focus groups. Far too often, however, the analysis of such data stops at surface-level assertions of language attitudes, and as we have shown, this is far from sufficient. A great deal of information is lost when analyses fail to take the linguistic and interactional details into account, and since many researchers are already collecting and analysing discourse in terms

of language attitudes, there is no reason why these second and third levels of analysis should not also be incorporated.

Although this paper deals with discourse approaches to language-attitude analysis, it is undeniable that the vast majority of language-attitude research is still carried out within a purely quantitative paradigm. One needs only to look at recent books summarising the scope of the field to observe that they make only scant mention of the role of discourse and interaction (Casper 2002; Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2003). We find this lamentable, though not because we wish to dismiss quantitative approaches altogether. While we do find an interactional approach to be a superior analytical tool to content-based or turn-internal semantic and pragmatic approaches, the same generalisation cannot be made in comparing interactional approaches with quantitative methods such as the matched-guise technique. In choosing between *these* kinds of tools – or for that matter in deciding to use a combination of them – the research question has to be paramount. We have shown that an interactional approach can be just as adept at uncovering indirectly expressed attitudes as the matched-guise technique can, and that it can shed light on how these attitudes emerge, the ways in which they are ideology driven, and how they are influenced by the immediate context. However, it is much less adept at answering questions that require the researcher to make generalisations about groups, such as an investigation into who tends to have what kinds of attitudes. It is therefore our hope that this paper will not be taken as a call to arms in the battle against quantitative approaches to the analysis of language attitudes, but that it will instead encourage a greater diversity in approaches.

However, it remains a legitimate criticism that while the generalisations that are possible with quantitative methods are valuable, they can also obscure some of the most crucial information about attitudes and how people express them through interaction. If an expression of a language attitude in interaction, whether direct or indirect, is a form of positioning in which both the immediate context and larger cultural ideologies need to be taken into account, then this is no less true of an expression of a language attitude on a semantic-differential scale. Choosing to ignore these larger contexts does not make them any less relevant, and this makes a search for static, context-independent 'true' attitudes futile. Therefore, we align ourselves with Soukup (2007: 150–154) in taking the stance that matched guise and other quantitatively-oriented approaches need to be modified in ways that permit experiments to take place within contexts that are meaning-making activities in all of the same ways that interaction itself is. One way this can be achieved, or at least greatly improved, is to attempt to recreate the process of conversational contextualization within an experimental setting. Soukup (2007: 155–157) does this for the matched-guise technique by simulating the context she wishes to recreate. Others might do it by actually placing the experiment within the desired setting. However, both approaches would allow attitudes to be expressed in much more true-to-life situations and allow for the interpretation of those attitudes with respect to that situation.

Further innovations addressing the inherently static nature of expressing attitudes with respect to preconceived adjective pairs along semantic-differential scales would also be desirable. In any case, discourse-based approaches to language-attitude research should be regarded not simply as a supplement to be tacked on at the end of a far more carefully conceived quantitative study, but instead as fundamental forms of language-attitude research in and of themselves.

NOTES

1. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for supporting this research, specifically the projects '(Inter)acting identities in dialect and discourse: Migrant Western Germans in Eastern Germany' (SSHRC#410-03-0378) and 'German identity in urban Canada: A qualitative and quantitative study of language and discourse' (SSHRC#410-07-2202). We are also grateful for the assistance of Mareike Müller in part of the analysis. We would further like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their extremely careful reading and their very helpful comments and suggestions.

2. Content-based approaches to the analysis of language attitudes should not be confused with *content analysis,* which is a primarily quantitative methodology for studying the content of communication in which researchers analyse the presence and meanings of specific words and concepts in a text, and draw inferences about the text's messages, authors, and audience (e.g. Holsti 1969).

3. Transcription conventions are as follows: German and English utterances are in *italics* and English translations are in normal type directly beneath in. The transcript differs from usual orthographic spelling, e.g. CAPITALISATION in the transcript is used to mark intensity. Rising intonation is indicated with a question mark? and falling intonation is indicated with a period. Slower speech is indicated with <angle brackets> and faster speech is indicated with >reverse angle brackets<. Unclear passages are marked with (single brackets) and = equals signs = are used to indicate immediate latches between utterances by different speakers. Conversational overlap is indicated with [square brackets]. Pauses lasting a beat (.) or two (..) are indicated as shown; longer pauses are indicated in seconds. Dialect passages that are relevant for the analysis are **bolded**. We are aware that some of these conventions recognise the prevailing attitude of the prominence of Standard German over non-standard dialects. This is not unproblematic, but we see it as unavoidable.

4. The specific method of analysis used in the original study is perceptual dialectology (e.g. Preston 1989).

5. This speaker is referred to as 'Brother' because it was impossible to tell from the recording which of Ralf's brothers was speaking.

6. One could argue, for example, that an alternative origin for this stigmatisation is the perceived differences between south-eastern Germany (Saxony) and northern (east) Germany, where the Saxon dialect is not spoken. While this is an association former East Germans are likely to have, former West Germans may connect it to the Cold-War relationships.

7. Despite the fact that her husband may have meant 'foreigner' in a teasing or endearing way, this label positions Jana as a dialect speaker at the margin, whereby the husband positions himself at the centre.

8. It is not clear from the interaction whether this is Jana's own expressed attitude or whether she is still presenting her ex-husband's words.
9. For more information on Transylvania Germans, see Horak et al. (1985), and on Sudeten Germans, see Tampke (2003).
10. While an alternate interpretation of this might involve viewing the use of German *aufgeben* as a literal translation of the English 'give up' as a result of the influence of English on Karl's speech, his other attitudes as previously discussed, especially his cultural bond with the old dialect, strengthen the interpretation of a strong sense of loss.

REFERENCES

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Casper, Klaudia. 2002. *Spracheinstellungen: Theorie und Messung*. Heidelberger Schriften für Sprache und Kultur 6. Heidelberg, Germany: Books On Demand.

Chafe, Wallace. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Chafe Wallace and Johanna Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex. 261–272.

Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. 1997. Geographic and socio-political influences on language ideology and attitudes toward language variation in post-unification Germany. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, Michigan.

Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer and Sarah Darling. Forthcoming. Neue Welt, alte Welt: ein Vergleich der 'perceptual dialectologies' des deutschsprachigen Kanadas und Deutschlands. In Markus Hundt, Christina A. Anders and Alexander Lasch (eds.) *Perceptual Dialectology – Neue Wege der Dialektologie*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: de Gruyter.

Deminger, Szilvia. 2000. Spracheinstellungen in einer Sprachinselsituation: Die deutsche Minderheit in Ungarn. In Szilvia Deminger, Thorsten Fögen, Joachim Scharloth and Simone Zwickl (eds.) *Einstellungsforschung in der Soziolinguistik und Nachbardisziplinen*. Studies in Language Attitudes. Frankfurt/Main, Germany: Peter Lang.

Garrett, Peter, Nikolas Coupland and Angie Williams. 2003. *Investigating Language Attitudes: Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity, and Performance*. Cardiff, U.K.: University of Wales Press.

Giles, Howard and Nikolas Coupland. 1991. *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes, U.K.: Open University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, Rom and Luk vanLangenhove. 1991. Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21: 393–407.

Hoare, Rachel. 2000. Linguistic competence and regional identity in Brittany: Attitudes and perceptions of identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21: 324–346.

Holsti, Ole R. 1969. *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Horak, Stephan M., Richard Blanke, David Crowe, Kenneth C. Farmer, Stephen Fischer-Galati, Peter John Georgeoff, Toussaint Hocevar, Josef Kalvoda, Martin L. Kovacs and Theodor Veiter. 1985. *Eastern European National Minorities, 1919–1980: A Handbook*. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.

Hyrkstedt, Paula and Paula Kalaja. 1998. Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study. *World Englishes* 17: 345–357.

Lambert, Wallace E., Richard C. Hodgson, Robert C. Gardner and Stanley Fillenbaum. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60: 44–51.

Lammervo, Tiina. 2005. Language and culture contact and attitudes among first generation Australian Finns. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Queensland, Australia.

Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Preston, Dennis. 1989. *Perceptual Dialectology: Nonlinguists' Views of Areal Linguistics*. Providence, Rhode Island: Foris.

Preston, Dennis. Forthcoming. Perceptual dialectology in the 21st century. In Markus Hundt, Christina A. Anders and Alexander Lasch (eds.) *Perceptual Dialectology – Neue Wege der Dialektologie*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: de Gruyter.

Riehl, Claudia Maria. 2000. Spracheinstellungen und Stereotype im Lichte diskursiver Praxis. In Szilvia Deminger, Thorsten Fögen, Joachim Scharloth and Simone Zwickl (eds.) *Einstellungsforschung in der Soziolinguistik und Nachbardisziplinen. Studies in Language Attitudes*. Frankfurt/Main, Germany: Peter Lang. 141–160.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel M. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.

Soukup, Barbara. 2007. The strategic use of Austrian dialect in interaction: A sociolinguistic study of contextualization, speech perception, and language attitudes. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Tampke, Jürgen. 2003. *Czech-German Relations and the Politics of Central Europe. From Bohemia to the EU*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tophinke, Doris and Evelyn Ziegler. 2006. 'Aber bitte im Kontext!' Neue Perspektiven der dialektologischen Einstellungsforschung. *Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie* 71: 205–224.

van Langenhove, Luk and Rom Harré. 1993. Positioning and autobiography: Telling your life. In Nikolaus Coupland, John. F. Nussbaum and Alan Grossman (eds). *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*. London, U.K.: Sage, 81–99.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, Ernst. 1990. *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*. Thaur bei Innsbruck, Austria: Wort und Welt Verlag.

Waltereit, Richard. 2001. Modal particles and their functional equivalents: A speech-act-theoretic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1391–1417.

Wetherell, Margaret and Jonathan Potter. 1992. *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wetherell, Margaret and Jonathan Potter. 1998. Discourse and social psychology: Silencing boundaries. *Theory and Psychology* 8: 377–388.

Winter, Joanne. 1992. Discourse as a resource: Methods of collecting language attitudes. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 15: 1–22.
Wolf, Ricarda. 1999. Soziale Positionierung im Gespräch. *Deutsche Sprache* 1: 69–94.

Address correspondence to:

Grit Liebscher
Dept. of Germanic and Slavic Studies
University of Waterloo
200 University Avenue West
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2L 3G1

gliebsch@uwaterloo.ca

Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain
Dept. of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
309-C Arts Building
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6G 2E6

jenniedo@ualberta.ca