

Language attitudes, migrant identities and space

JENNIFER DAILEY-O'CAIN and GRIT LIEBSCHER

Abstract

In a previous paper (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2009), we posited that attitudes toward language are not merely static thoughts in people's minds, but are constantly constructed in interaction. Following on this work, in this paper we investigate the ways in which German-speaking migrants and their descendants in urban Canada use language attitudes in interaction to construct a specifically German space within Canada. Our focus is on their attitudes toward each of the various languages and language varieties present in the participants' linguascape: German dialects, standard German and English, and code-mixing, and in our analysis, we observe the ways that these migrants negotiate who has authority over these forms, as well as how attitudes can shift when speakers' connection to their country of origin is interrupted through migration. Though the direct focus of the research questions we address in this paper is on what it means to be German in urban Canada, we also address broader issues of how urban minority groups construct and maintain minority identities after migration.

Keywords: language attitudes; space; identity; German; Canada.

1. Introduction

Migration results not merely in a change of place but also in a (re)construction of space (cf. de Certeau 1988) with regard to the places of origin and arrival. It is clear already that language practices are an intrinsic part of this construction (cf. Johnstone 2010, Mæhlum 2010), but if one proceeds from an understanding that *attitudes* toward language are themselves constructed evaluations of linguistic practices similar to *stance*, it becomes equally clear that these are also effective means for such a construction. The creation of new spaces allows for the possibility of a shift in positioning through the assignment of new indexical

meanings to different languages and language varieties within the migrant context, which involves the need to come to terms with both powerful political symbolism indexed through a particular language as well as emotional links transported through concepts such as heritage and mother tongue. Within the context of German migration in Canada, these processes affect the construction of attitudes toward German dialects, standard German, English, and language mixing.

In recent decades, scholars of language attitudes have made room alongside quantitative analytical methods such as the matched-guise technique (Lambert et al. 1960) for qualitative, discourse-analysis based methods. In an earlier paper, however, (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2009), we have argued that when it comes to the analysis of language attitudes, all discourse analysis is not created equal. We find that the methods that bear the most fruit go beyond just the content of directly expressed language attitudes and their turn-internal semantic and pragmatic features, and also investigate the way language attitudes are interactively co-constructed in conversation. In this paper, then, we use this methodology to investigate the ways in which German-speaking migrants and their descendants in urban Canada use language attitudes in interaction to help negotiate a local space. Our focus is on their attitudes toward each of the various languages and language varieties present in their linguascape: German dialects, standard German and English, and code-mixing. We pay particular attention to how these migrants negotiate who has authority over these forms, as well as how attitudes can shift when speakers’ connection to their country of origin is interrupted through migration.

Though the direct focus of the research questions we address in this paper is on what it means to be German in urban Canada, we also address broader issues of how urban minority groups construct and maintain minority identities after migration. In particular, we investigate the local linguistic and social effects of migration by posing research questions that interrogate the relationship between language attitudes, identity, and space. For example:

- What are the language attitudes that are constructed by members of this community, and which linguistic and interactive phenomena are used to do so?
- What relationship do these attitudes have to the construction of individual migrant identities, and ultimately to the creation of a local migrant space?
- Are there observable differences in the construction of language attitudes among different parts of the community, and what kinds of tensions does that create within the local migrant space?

This paper therefore explores the language attitudes of urban German-speaking immigrants and their descendants in a rapidly changing, English-dominant Canada, but with an eye toward situating these findings within a broader theo-

retical context of the relationship between language attitudes, identity, and space. Though we base our analysis on this locally specific community, the phenomena we uncover can be seen in many communities throughout the world that exist wherever migration has left its mark.

2. Theory and methodology: language attitudes, identity, space

In this paper, we are concerned with the relationship between three phenomena: *language attitudes*, *identity*, and *space*. The focus of our analysis is the attitudes of German immigrants and their descendants in Canada toward the different codes of their linguascape: German dialects, standard German, English, and code-mixing. However, rather than viewing attitudes as psychological phenomena, i.e. something concrete that exists in the minds of speakers and to which researchers must learn how to gain access through indirect methods such as the matched-guise technique (cf. Lambert et al. 1960), we instead see them here as phenomena that are constructed in interaction (cf. Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2009), and therefore best observable by studying them in interaction. Language attitudes, after all (and language ideologies as their counterparts in wider society), do not occur in a vacuum in individual speakers’ minds, but are created and perpetuated through interaction as a part of socialization. By studying language attitudes as they occur in conversations, we are able to see how they are made relevant in everyday life in conjunction with other people, and through this, we can view them in their most contextualized and least abstracted form. Our methodology of the analysis of language attitudes incorporates three levels of analysis: that of the content of assertions about language attitudes, that of turn-internal linguistic detail, and finally that of between-turn interaction, and at all levels, the context is always formulated as a part of the expression of the attitude. By drawing on work in conversation analysis (e.g. Goodwin and Heritage 1990) and membership category analysis (e.g. Sacks 1992), we are able to take into account such larger contexts on the one hand, and interactional phenomena such as laughter, interruptions, pauses, and changes in pitch and intensity on the other. Those methods (whether quantitative or qualitative) that instead view attitudes as abstracted psychological phenomena divorced from any context by necessity lose these essential parts of the data of language attitudes as they are formulated in interaction.

When German immigrants and their descendants construct their attitudes toward the different codes of the German linguascape in Canada, they do so by *positioning* themselves and others through the use of *contextualization cues* (Gumperz 1982). Through this positioning, interactants make relationships to categories relevant (Harré and van Langenhove 1991; Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher 2009), and in doing so, they highlight certain aspects of their

constructed *identity*. Like others who have approached language and identity from a sociocultural perspective (e.g. Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004; Benwell and Stokoe 2006), we view identity, like language attitudes, as a discursive construct that emerges in interaction, or more pointedly, as “the social positioning of self and other” (Bucholtz and Hall 2010: 18). Differing kinds of positioning in the construction of language attitudes can often be attributable to the different historical or present-day cultural constructs the same language or variety can index, i.e. the language or variety’s “layered simultaneity” (Blommaert 2005: 126), i.e. its “meanings simultaneously produced, but not all of them consciously nor similarly accessible to agency”. As a result, this positioning with respect to this language or variety can often be approached either as part of a set of *positive identity practices* (i.e. “those in which individuals engage in order actively to construct a chosen identity”) or of *negative identity practices* (i.e. “those that individuals employ to distance themselves from a rejected identity”) (Bucholtz 1999: 211).

Through acts of positioning, conversation participants do not only draw on categories that are available to them from society, but they also create them, reevaluate them, and establish relationships between them. Therefore, while the focus of our analysis in this paper is on language attitudes, we posit that every formulation of a language attitude in interaction unavoidably includes a formulation of some element of our conversation participants’ identities, both as individual speakers of the languages and varieties they are talking about, and as part of the local migrant space. This approach takes us beyond a reductionist binary positive vs. negative approach to language attitudes and toward a form of analysis that allows for a more diverse set of kinds of positioning, i.e. to a wider variety of *stances*, which can be defined as “the display of evaluative, affective, and epistemic orientations in discourse” (Bucholtz and Hall 2010: 22). Through the construction of their language attitudes, the migrants are taking stances not just on the languages in their social environment, but on the community itself and on their own relationships to it. Positioning is therefore the tool that the migrants use to construct their language attitudes, which in turn ultimately serve to construct a German space in the local context through the construction of their own and others’ places within it.

We view *space* as deriving from, but as not identical to, *place*. In other words, a place (e.g. *Canada*, *Germany*) can be pinned down as a geographic location and is linguistically fixed by naming it, but *space* is a “practiced” place (de Certeau 1988; Baynham 2003: 350) that only results through the practices associated with it. This transformation of place into space can be tangible in the sense that it is a process that is actually occurring (as seen in de Certeau’s [1988] example of the practice of walking that transforms the geometrically defined place of the street into a space), but on the other hand, it, too, is discursively constructed in interaction. We therefore analyze the construction of lan-

guage attitudes as elements of the construction first of the identities of individual migrants, and in turn, of a German space in the local environment. Each of these discursive constructs is negotiable, meaning that the same place can be constructed differently by different people, or even differently by the same people from moment to moment. The ultimate focus in our analysis is these constructed differences and commonalities, which serve both to create external boundaries of the local German space and to divide different groups within it. As such, the construction of space in migrant situations not only involves the first generation of migrants, but also the generations to follow, who find themselves similarly implicated in the need to position themselves.

3. Data

Our data stems from a larger project¹ about language use and identity in two German-speaking urban areas in Canada: Edmonton in western Canada and Kitchener-Waterloo in central Canada. Greater Edmonton is a large city of more than a million people, and the Kitchener-Waterloo area too is an urban area with more than 300,000 inhabitants. The communities are therefore of a very different nature than the rural, primarily Mennonite or Pennsylvania German communities that have made up the largest share of the research on the German language in Canada thus far (e.g. Burrige 1998). The data set comprises a total of 64 audiotaped semi-structured, conversational interviews (cf. Laihonen 2008), each with between one and three participants, which were conducted in 2007 and 2008 by a different native German-speaking research assistant in each of the two urban areas. Both interviewers were female Ph.D. students in their twenties, and both had come from Germany to Canada for their studies within the four years prior to the start of the project. In Kitchener-Waterloo, almost all of the participants responded to a in a local newspaper article in which the project was described and participation from German-speaking immigrants and their direct descendants was requested, while in Edmonton, where the same newspaper article provoked little response, participants were recruited largely through the “friend-of-a-friend” method (e.g. Milroy 1980).

The 91 participants from Edmonton and Kitchener-Waterloo were of different ages and immigrant generations, and their immigrant backgrounds included both Germany and German-speaking speech islands in Europe. The oldest first-generation immigrants were those who had immigrated immediately prior to or immediately following the Second World War, and were of retirement age at the time of the interviews. Some second-generation, i.e. born-in-Canada, immigrants were also of that age, though most of them were around 50 years old. A few older participants were of the so-called 1.5 generation, i.e. they had

immigrated to Canada with their parents as children.² About a third of the total participants (most of whom came from the Edmonton corpus) were recent first-generation immigrants who arrived in Canada only in the 1990s and later. This is therefore a community which is constantly experiencing renewal through continued migration.

In our data, we find that language attitudes are frequently constructed with the help of short illustrative narratives, i.e., by drawing directly on participants’ personal experience or that of people they know. Where this is the case, we regard these narratives as “small stories” (cf. Georgakopoulou 2007), i.e. as narratives as a part of talk-in-interaction. From this perspective, narratives are seen as embedded units rather than detached from the rest of the talk, and they are sequentially managed moment by moment, emergent, and situational. We therefore view the narratives in our data not as stories for stories’ sake, but as a part of a set of tools used to construct language attitudes, migrant identities, and ultimately a local German space.

4. Analysis

Our analysis can be divided into two stages: the first stage, where we looked at the entire data set in order to identify any stretches of talk in which language attitudes toward the various codes of the migrants’ linguascape were made relevant, and the second stage, in which analyzed specific excerpts with the methodology outlined above. The following excerpts were chosen by identifying common themes that came up in the migrants’ attitudes. We then lifted out those excerpts which best exemplified the different ways these attitudes tended to be constructed across the first, second, and third generation groups, and the conflicting ways the local German space is constructed as a result, and subjected them to further analysis. We begin with attitudes toward German dialects, then look at attitudes toward standard German (in particular as how it contrasts with English), and then finally look at attitudes toward code-mixing.

4.1. Attitudes toward German dialects

The excerpts chosen for this section include speakers from different immigrant generations, and we find that the construction of attitudes and spaces is very different among them. The participants in Excerpt 1 are three women, all of retirement age, plus the Waterloo-based interviewer. Berta, Nanda and Suse are all first-generation immigrants who came to Canada in the 1950s or early 1960s, when they were young adults in their twenties.

Excerpt 1.³ First-generation immigrants: old-world dialect vs. new-world standard

- 1 IntW: hat sich denn ihr eigenes deutsch verändert?
'did your own German change?'
- 2 Berta: no.
- 3 Nanda: ja ja ja ja ja.
'yes yes yes yes yes.'
- 4 Suse: a bissel vielleicht a bissel ja ja.
'a little bit maybe a little bit yeah yeah.'
- 5 Berta: ja nen bisschen.
'yeah a little bit.'
- 6 Nanda: see my my brother when I talk to him on the phone in germany,
he grew up as
7 a little boy and he speaks sch eh schwabisch.
'Swar uh Swarbian.'
- 8 Suse: ja.
'yeah.'
- 9 IntW: schwäbisch ja.
'Swabian yeah.'
- 10 Berta: schwäbisch.
'Swabian.'
- 11 Suse: () ja.
'yeah.'
- 12 Nanda: ja and it's so hard to understand him (.) my other sister from new
york, sh-she
'yeah'
13 phoned him on christmas. und she said she couldn't understand
him.
- 14 Suse: ja.
'yeah.'
- 15 IntW: ja.
'yeah.'
- 16 Nanda: because he speaks-
- 17 Berta: ja but he was grown up- growing up over there.
'yeah'
- 18 Nanda: and and we kind of adopted more- like my husband was austrian.
19 a little more to the (.) higher german when we speak it than the
dialects.
- 20 IntW: hmm. ja.
'hmm. yeah.'
- 21 Suse: hmm.
- 22 Nanda: ja.
'yeah.'

23 Suse: then everybody can understand us.

24 Nanda: ja.
‘yeah.’

After being asked by the interviewer whether there have been any changes in their German since arriving in Canada, all three participants eventually express that there have been changes (lines 3–5). Then in lines 6–7, Nanda begins recounting an attempt at talking with her brother in Germany, which must be understood as a comment on the changes in her dialect due to the sequential ordering of the turns. In line 12 she mentions the issue she has with talking with her brother: positioning his dialect as “so hard to understand”,⁴ a positioning that she immediately supports further and without relinquishing the floor, by mentioning that it’s not just Nanda who can’t understand him, but their sister who is also living in North America. Taken in tandem, these positionings paint a picture of a linguistic gap between Old World German speakers (who speak dialects that are hard to understand) and New World German speakers (who speak something else). This characterization is further reinforced through the expressions of agreement from both Suse and the interviewer that immediately follow in lines 14–15, as these serve to co-construct a common language attitude among all participants, in which dialects are not valued. In line 17, then, Berta points out what makes Nanda’s brother speak a variety of German that is so hard for New World German speakers to understand: “he was growing up over there”, i.e. in Germany. The local German space that they construct through these language attitudes is therefore one in which dialects do not persist, since they are relegated to the European German space only.

The last part of the excerpt involves a characterization of what it is that these three New World German speakers speak that contrasts with this hard-to-understand Old World dialect. In line 19, Nanda positions her own German as “a little more to the higher German when we speak it than the dialects”, or closer to the standard along a continuum. The use of the term “higher” could be interpreted as expressing a positive attitude toward her own variety of German, but in any case it certainly corresponds with the German term *Hochdeutsch* or ‘high German’, which is a common way of referring to the standard. Nanda is therefore connecting her stance to practical issues, in that the variety of German that she speaks with her friends in Canada is closer to the standard than the variety her brother speaks. Yet equally relevant is the attitude Nanda constructs in the line immediately prior to this in line 18. By positioning her use of a more standard form as something that she “adopted”, she conveys this as a conscious change in her language use that occurred upon her immigration. And by juxtaposing this positioning with the assertion that her husband was Austrian, she provides the reason for this deliberate change: because in circumstances like her marriage, in which she and her husband had grown up

speaking different dialects of German, it was important to speak standard German. Suse then helps to co-construct this attitude by expressing the reason why they use standard German in the Canadian context: “then everybody can understand us”, to which Nanda replies with agreement, confirming that they are on the same page. Taken as a whole, these positionings characterize their use of standard as a kind of a lingua franca that enables everyone from different parts of the German-speaking world to continue speaking German upon their arrival in Canada.⁵ This positions them as migrant Germans, separate from the German-speaking community in Europe, and the local German space that they construct through this positioning as one of standard German rather than of European German dialects.

The second excerpt in this section is also from the Waterloo corpus, but it involves a second-generation immigrant who, in contrast to Excerpt 1, constructs dialect as something connected not with German speakers in old-world Europe, but with the first generation in Canada. This immigrant, Simon, is also of retirement age, but he was born in Kitchener-Waterloo. His parents came to Canada in the 1920s.

Excerpt 2. Second-generation immigrant: dialect as a first-generation phenomenon

- 1 Simon: whenever there was a a baptism, a marriage, a funeral (.) they all gathered and
 - 2 saxon was being spoken. at that time I found it ha- hard to understand it.
 - 3 IntW: also sie sind damit aufgewachsen, schon [irgendwie, ja hmm.
'so you kind of grew up with it [in a way, yeah hmm.')
 - 4 Simon: [there was some, but it was mostly
 - 5 german.
- ((a few lines omitted))
- 6 IntW: können sie, können sie's imitieren ein bisschen?
'can you, can you imitate it a little?'
 - 7 Simon: eh hh (.) [no.
 - 8 IntW: [wie hört sich- wie hört sich das an? (.)
[‘what does- what does it sound like?’ (.)
 - 9 Simon: it's very similar (.) and yet it's very different. my wife who has studied german
 - 10 at high school and university and lived in germany, she understands nothing.
 - 11 IntW: sie a- sie versteht's nicht?
'she uh- she doesn't understand it?'
 - 12 Simon: she does not understand saxon.

- 35 Simon: na so ebbes.
 ‘hey something like that.’ ((dialect))
- 36 IntW: [achso na so etwas.
 [‘oh hey something like that.’ ((standard))
- 37 Simon: [eh eh ebbes ja.
 [‘uh uh something ((dialect)) yeah.’
- 38 IntW: [ah.
- 39 Simon: [(). na so eppes.
 [(). ‘hey something like that.’
- 40 IntW: aha.
- 41 Simon: ja (.) und eh: my father, I don’t. (.) his int- his education was
 42 interrupted during the first world war.
- 43 IntW: ja.
 ‘yeah.’
- 44 Simon: eh his vi- his town was occupied by the cossacks and there
 45 wasn’t a lot of school going on. so hi- his his german was not
 46 always (.) eh a good
 hochdeutsch.
 ‘standard german.’
- 47 IntW: achso [ja.
 ‘i see [yeah.’
- 48 Simon: [eh so he might say fressen instead of essen [and so on.
 ‘to hog down’ ‘to eat’
- 49 IntW: [ah: ja ja.
 [‘ah: yeah
 yeah.’
- 50 Simon: things that I became aware of when I studied german.
- 51 IntW: hmm.

In the first five lines, Simon first conveys that the extended family he grew up with in Canada as a child in the 1930s and 40s all spoke a dialect called Saxon,⁶ but he construct a conflicting attitude toward it by positioning this dialect as distant from his own everyday language in several ways. First, in line 2, he says that as a child he found it hard to understand. Then in response to the interviewer’s characterization of the Saxon dialect as something that Simon “grew up with” (line 3), Simon positions Saxon as something separate from German (which is what he “mostly” grew up with), i.e. as an additional language common to his extended family rather than a different way of speaking his own language. In addition to these elements, both the distancing deictic pronoun ‘they’ in line 1 and the passive voice in line 2 also have the effect of distancing Simon both from the Saxon dialect and the group that was speaking

it. The Saxon dialect may indeed be a part of the local German space that Simon constructs through his attitudes here, but it is a peripheral part, a part that doesn’t quite belong.

Then in line 6, the interviewer asks Simon whether he can imitate the dialect. After a bit of a hesitation, he says no in line 7, though it is unclear at this point whether he is saying that he’s incapable of imitating the dialect or merely refusing to do so. In line 8, then, the interviewer clarifies why she’s asking — she doesn’t know what this dialect sounds like, and in response, Simon makes an attempt at characterizing it through description. He begins in line 9 by saying that it’s similar and yet different from something yet unnamed, and then clarifies in the lines that follow by characterizing it as something that his wife, who studied German in school, cannot understand. Through this positioning, Simon conveys that his relatives’ Saxon is quite distant from the standard language he spoke as a child and which he refers to as “German” (cf. line 5).

In lines 14–16, then, he positions himself as someone who can understand any German dialect, naming as the reason for this that he and those around him in the German-speaking community of the time “grew up hearing all these interpretations”. The use of the word ‘interpretations’ in this characterization positions standard German or ‘German’ as a sort of mother form from which he thinks of other forms as being derived. Simon’s father, who came from a different part of German-speaking Europe and spoke a different dialect, is also positioned as someone who could understand the Saxon dialect in line 21.

The interviewer’s second attempt to get Simon to imitate a dialect begins in line 27, when she asks him what his father’s Swabian dialect sounded like, and he responds with “normal”. She repeats her plea in line 29, and Simon refuses again, giving as a reason for his inability to imitate, the fact that to him, “everything was normal”. This suggests that he interprets being asked to imitate a dialect as being invited to mock it and that he wouldn’t mock something that’s “normal”. Through these positionings, he characterizes the dialects his parents spoke as a neutral to positive characteristic of his growing up, despite the fact that they were not his own way of speaking. In fact, his resistance to imitate the dialect shows “negative identity” (Bucholtz 1999), i.e. he constructs his attitude in a way that indicates that he is not part of his parents’ generation of dialect speakers. Then the interviewer makes one last attempt to get him to imitate his father’s dialect in line 31, and Simon first responds by saying no, but then by introducing an additional context outside of the interview context in which he *has* sometimes imitated it: when he is with his German friends and trying to make them laugh. By providing this context in which mocking is more natural, in line 33, he is able to provide the imitation the interviewer has been seeking: the phrase “hey something like that”.

In line 34, the interviewer conveys that she has not understood Simon by initiating a repair, after which Simon repeats the phrase in an identical way. The interviewer's resulting "oh" (cf. Schiffrin 1987), in line 36 conveys that she has now understood, and she confirms this by translating the phrase into standard German. Simon then repeats the word that is different from the phrase in the standard language, but precedes this repetition by hesitation markers, as if the interviewer's initial inability to understand him has made him uncertain that he is in fact saying the word correctly. In line 39, then, Simon makes a final attempt at pronouncing the phrase, saying it slightly differently this time, i.e. with the voiceless bilabial stop [p] rather than the voiced bilabial stop [b]. This repetition to render the word more accurately positions the imitated dialect yet again as a language Simon cannot claim as his own, i.e. as something that was ubiquitous in his childhood to the point where he regarded it as normal, but which he is nonetheless uncertain of his ability to reproduce.

In lines 41–42, then, Simon mentions that his father was unable to be educated properly as a young child due to political forces beyond his control. While this seems at face value to be a non sequitur, its location in the sequential ordering of turns suggests that Simon intends this to be interpreted as a comment on why his father spoke the way he did. By doing this, Simon positions dialects such as his father's as characteristic of those first-generation immigrants who haven't been able to have much of a formal education. This positioning is further strengthened by Simon's assertion in lines 45–6 that his father's German was "not always such a good Standard German", and with a direct comparison between a lexical item Simon sees as part of his father's dialect⁷ and the equivalent word in the standard language in line 48. In line 50, he then specifies where he got his knowledge of what does and does not count as "good standard German", i.e. through studying German. According to this attitude, formal education lends an authority that automatically trumps his and others' native speaker knowledge. Dialects are thereby positioned as the possession of the first generation and the uneducated, and standard German as the possession of the second generation and the educated. These attitudes that Simon constructs therefore serve yet again to construct a local German space in which dialects are peripheral as a relic of the past and the standard is regarded as the current community language.

When dialects come up in the final excerpt of this section, another second-generation immigrant defers to the knowledge of German dialects since he has no direct knowledge of them at all. This serves to construct a local German space in which the German language is present, but only in the form of the standard. The participants in this excerpt are the second-generation immigrant Ron, plus the Edmonton-based interviewer. Ron is in his mid-twenties, and his father immigrated to Canada via the U.S. in the 1960s. In part because his mother came to Canada from a different European country (and therefore

- 27 Ron: hmm.
28 IntE: like when i go to one of the little villages around my hometown,
and they speak
29 the dialect, i have no idea what they're talking about.
30 Ron: really?
31 IntE: yeah.
32 Ron: but they can obviously understand you, like, [if i say like,
33 IntE: [yeah (.) but every
34 dialect has their own, like words for stuff like potato is something
different in dialect than in-
35 Ron: whoo. really?
36 IntE: yeah.
37 Ron: so it's not a p- but if you say kartoffel-
'potato'
38 IntE: yeah, well THEY will understand but once THEY start talking
39 about (.) kartoffeln and i don't know (.) the DIAlect word for it and
'potatoes'
40 they only use that word, i won't understand what they're talking
about.
41 Ron: mm hmm. interesting.

Though the participants are talking about German dialects here, just as in the previous excerpts, there are several ways in which Ron positions himself as too unknowledgeable about them to have attitudes toward them, despite his own German background. By doing this, he defers to the interviewer's authority when it comes to dialects. In line 5, for example, he acts as an animator (cf. Goffman 1974) of an unnamed authority's attitude about the 'weirdness' of Berlin German. Then when the interviewer corrects his assertions about various dialects, he accepts those corrections unconditionally in lines 11, 13, and 17, and lends her point of view unquestioning agreement in line 19.

After a few omitted lines, Ron begins a series of questions to the interviewer about German dialects in lines 21 and 23. Far from undermining the interviewer's authority when it comes to dialects, though, Ron's willingness to accept the interviewer's answers to his questions as truth further position her as the authority and himself as someone with little to no knowledge. His agreement with the information she has provided him with in line 25 further strengthens this positioning. The interviewer responds to these questions first with general information in lines 22, 24, and 26, but in line 28, she brings in an example from her personal experience to illustrate what she is saying. This has the effect of backing up what she is saying with evidence. While Ron expresses surprise by the information the interview illustrates with the example, as evidenced by the "really" marked with rising intonation in lines 30 and 35, he

does not question it in any way, and in line 41, marks his unquestioning acceptance of her authority with an affirmative “mm-hmm” and falling intonation, as well as the comment that her information is “interesting”. Taken together, these positionings serve to construct the ultimate absence of any attitudes toward dialects, and through this absence, constructs a local German space in which dialects are similarly absent. This final dialect example also expands upon the findings of Dailey-O’Cain and Darling (2010), who find that while the German language may well remain part of the linguascape of the children of German-speaking immigrants to Canada, they know little about German dialects. Ron is therefore representative of a large number of second- and third-generation Germans in Canada who simply don’t see themselves as having enough of an impression of German dialects to have their own attitudes toward them, since the only relevant form of the German language in their local German space has become the standard language.

In general, the local German space that is constructed through the attitudes in this section is one in which dialects have become increasingly irrelevant. The first generation constructs German dialects as a present but peripheral phenomenon, a set of varieties that they relegate to German-speaking Europe rather than a part of their local German space (as in Excerpt 1), and therefore no longer use themselves. The later generations then increasingly construct the standard as the only community language, and dialects as a first-generation phenomenon (as in Excerpt 2), or in fact not a part of their local German space at all, and a phenomenon that they have to journey to German-speaking Europe to learn about (as in Excerpt 3).

4.2. *Attitudes toward German*

The following excerpts were chosen to illustrate typical attitudes toward the German language in this migrant community, by which they (and in turn, we, in this section) largely limit to standard German. This second section focuses particularly on this form of German, then, particularly as it contrasts with the space assigned to English. It is notable that the great majority of the excerpts in our corpus in which participants made such attitudes toward German relevant came from those who were primarily socialized in Canada (i.e. from the 1.5 generation to the third generation of migrants), and so the excerpts also come from these later generations. However, even there, one can recognize differences between the different ways attitudes toward the German language construct a German space in Canada, which in turn can be attributed to differences between the different immigrant generations.

In Excerpt 4, the participants are Ken from the 1.5 generation, who came to Canada in the 1930s with his family when he was seven years old, and the

Waterloo-based interviewer. The discussion up to the point where the excerpt begins has been about the languages that were used in Ken's extended family, a family that included his Canadian-born wife, her German migrant mother, and her English-speaking Canadian father whose attitudes toward the German language (and toward Germans in general) were very negative and strongly formed by wartime imagery.

Excerpt 4. German indexing first-generation emotion vs. 1.5 generation pragmatism

- 1 IntW: ja also wurde dann in der familie kein deutsch gesprochen- in ihrer familie?
'yeah so was no German spoken in the family then- in your family?'
- 2 mit ihrer frau haben sie englisch gesprochen?
'you spoke English with your wife?'
- 3 Ken: ja.
'yes.'
- 4 IntW: ja.
'yes.'
- 5 Ken: aber ich halts- ich hab manchmal mit meiner schwiegermutter deutsch
'but I spe- I spoke German with my mother-in-law'
- 6 [gesprochen.
['sometimes.'
- 7 IntW: [achso heimlich?
['aha secretly?'
- 8 Ken: ja.
'yes.'
- 9 IntW: [secretly?
- 10 Ken: [ja.
['yes.'
- 11 IntW: @@@@
- 12 Ken: eh (.) ich dachte (.) es ist- das ist ja nur eine sprache nicht?
'uh (.) I thought (.) it's- that's just a language right?'
- 13 IntW: hmm.
- 14 Ken: das ist nicht (.) ich hänge keine fahne nach oben wenn ich deutsch spreche.
'it's not (.) I'm not putting up a flag when I'm speaking German.'
- 15 IntW: ja.
'ja.'
- 16 Ken: oder wenn ich englisch spreche. das ist eine sprache.
'or when I speak English. it's a language.'

- 17 IntW: hmm.
 18 Ken: es is to (.) communicate.
 'it's'
 19 IntW: ja.
 'yeah.'
 20 Ken: ja das ist alles. (.) aber ich wusste dass sie es (.) sie es gern
 hat.
 'yeah that's all. (.) but I knew that she (.) she likes it.'
 21 IntW: achso aha ja.
 'ah aha yeah.'

At the beginning of the segment, Ken confirms that he spoke only English with his family, more specifically with his wife but in line 5 he adds that he spoke German sometimes with his mother-in-law, and in lines 8 and 10 he confirms that this speaking German was done in secret, presumably because his father-in-law wouldn't have approved of the use of German. The German space that is constructed here is one that must be maintained on the sly, away from the judgment of the Canadian father. The interviewer's laughter in line 11 comments on this as a strange or at least notable situation.⁸

It is the section starting in line 12, however, in which Ken's conflicted positioning toward the German language begins to reveal itself, and in which the tension between the practical uses of the German language and the things it indexes begins to play out. This includes the connection made between a language and symbols, emotions, and other indices, as the resulting layered simultaneity. In explaining his choice to speak German to his mother-in-law despite his father-in-law's objections, Ken first trivializes his father-in-law's emotional reaction to the language in line 12 ("that's just a language right?"), then in line 14 directly resists the negative patriotic symbolism the German language can index ("I'm not putting up a flag when I'm speaking German"), thereby positioning the German language as a tool and himself as a user of that tool for purely pragmatic reasons. In lines 16–18, then, Ken strengthens this interpretation by appealing to a comparison with his other language, English. Through this comparison, he puts both languages into the same category of "a language" whose purpose is "to communicate", and even adds "that's all" to underscore that positioning of both languages as purely utilitarian, and himself as a dispassionate user of a tool.

Ken's positioning shifts somewhat in line 20, however, where he states that the reason he persisted in speaking German with his mother-in-law despite his father-in-law's hatred of the language was because his mother-in-law liked speaking her mother tongue. Through this assertion, he juxtaposes his father-in-law's negative attitude resulting from his emotional reaction to the images of war indexed by the language, with his mother-in-law's positive attitude

resulting from her emotional associations with the language of her place of origin. Therefore, Ken creates a local German space in which contradictions emerge because language is overlaid with both sets of connotations simultaneously. Yet at the same time, he is able to maintain his own emotional distance to his two languages by positioning this emotional conflict as one that played out only within the first generation, and for which the only consequences to his own life were practical, in-the-moment ones (such as the choice of which language he once used with his in-laws).

In the next excerpt, another immigrant of the 1.5 generation constructs her own very positive attitude toward the German language by positioning herself through particular positive emotional associations. Though at first glance this attitude seems reminiscent of the contradicting emotionalism attributed to the first generation in Excerpt 4, a closer look reveals that the German language in fact creates a very different sort of German space for this migrant who was socialized in Canada than it did for Ken's in-laws in Excerpt 4. The participants in this excerpt are Viola, who came to Edmonton as a small child after World War II, and the Edmonton interviewer.

Excerpt 5. 1.5 generation immigrant: German as a unifying force of a global community

- 1 Viola: you travel anywhere (.) here in canada (.) you hear the german
- 2 language anywhere you are (.) your antennae go off and
[you go (.) *where from*
- 3 IntE: [yeah yeah yeah.
- 4 Viola: you know? and they go (.) oh whatever (.) and it's like suddenly
- 5 they're your BEST friend (.) they're your neighbor
- 6 IntE: yeah.
- 7 Viola: and the first thing you do (.) is you start babbling german.
- 8 IntE: yeah.
- 9 Viola: and it's just INSTANT
- 10 IntE: yeah.
- 11 Viola: and it doesn't matter where you are (.) and you're not even being
polite-
- 12 [impolite you're just babbling away (.) and the person standing
behind you
- 13 IntE: [yeah
- 14 Viola: says (.) do you know them? NO i've [never MET them
- 15 IntE: [@@@@@@@
- 16 Viola: [they're one of US you know @@@@ like they're- they're-
they're- they're=
- 17 IntE: [@@@ yeah yeah
- 18 Viola: =ONE OF US

- 19 IntE: yeah.
 20 Viola: and so- so that’s why i always chuckle when i go out (.) you- you
 21 almost become best friends
 22 IntE: yeah.
 23 Viola: it doesn’t matter whether you meet in spain (.) it’s (.) somebody
 24 from the HOMELand
 25 IntE: yeah, exactly.

Viola begins the excerpt in line 1 by recounting the experience of overhearing strangers speaking German “anywhere here in Canada”. Viola’s reaction to this experience is one of instinct (“your antennae go off” in line 2) and instant kinship (“they’re your best friend, they’re your neighbor” in line 5). Yet it is important to note that she does not narrate this experience as an example of a specific time when this happened to her, but lends it a universal character through the use of the present tense and the generic pronoun ‘you’. By doing this, she constructs it as something that is not limited to a single event or even just to her own personal experience, but as a generic experience that happens to all German-Canadians. By extension, then, she positions herself as someone to whom such an experience can only happen by virtue of the fact that she speaks German, which in turn makes her part of the wider German space that she is constructing in Canada.

In this generic situation that she illustrates, the reaction to this feeling of kinship is to immediately switch to German. Though Viola expresses this as something that happens without even thinking about it (“it’s just INSTANT” in line 9, “it doesn’t matter where you are” in line 11, and “just babbling away” in line 12), she in fact demonstrates a keen awareness here of both the existence of such a switch and its implications. This includes the awareness expressed in line 11 that an English-speaking companion may not understand them but “you’re not even being impolite” to that person by speaking a language that he or she cannot understand, and then more specifically in lines 12–14 as this companion asks Viola (and by extension, anyone who is a part of the German space in Canada) whether this is someone she knows. Viola recognizes that this generic non-German speaker is excluded by the switch to German, but the force of the German language is constructed as a strong enough one to overcome the desire to appear polite. It is what the language accomplishes in such an instance that is at the root of the positive attitude toward it that Viola constructs throughout this entire excerpt; specifically, it binds strangers together into a single community (e.g. “they’re ONE OF US” in lines 16–18, “you almost become best friends” in lines 20–21), and through that bond, constructs a German space that can persist in an English-dominant part of Canada. Toward the end, Viola even expands this space to make it a worldwide one by underscoring that “it doesn’t matter whether you meet in Spain” in line 23.

Though Viola primarily constructs this space as one based on language, there is another element that also plays a role in its construction, namely that of a migrant trajectory and a different place of origin (e.g. “it’s somebody from the HOMELAND” in lines 23–24). But Viola does not name this “homeland”, nor does she attribute it to the national boundaries of any existing place in the world. By leaving those elements unspecified, she can include not just herself and her family among those who are “from the homeland”, but anyone who is “from” an idealized, abstracted worldwide community of German speakers. Through this, she creates a space that belongs solely to anyone speaking the German language, but which does not index any particular geographical place.

While Viola uses her positive attitude toward the German language to construct a German space in Canada and herself as a part of it, the second-generation immigrant in Excerpt 6 uses his *negative* attitude toward the German language to construct a German space in Canada and himself as *outside* of it. The participants in this excerpt are Bob, who is in his forties and whose parents came to Canada shortly after World War II, and the Waterloo interviewer. Leading up to the point where the excerpt begins, the conversation has been about Bob’s decreasing proficiency in German, as well as his conversion to Buddhism and his turning away from the German-speaking Lutheran church that he had attended previously. Immediately preceding this excerpt, there has been a discussion of this conversion and a word search for a term to describe it.

Excerpt 6. Second-generation immigrant: German as limiting vs. English as worldly

- 1 IntW: so you would say that the german (.) the loss of german is basically came with your religious conversion
- 2
- 3 Bob: ja
- 4 IntW: so this basically the cause for (.) the loss
[of german you would say?
- 5 Bob: [well: (. . .) ja. (. . .) no as much
‘yeah.’
- 6 as i identified with being german was (.) was uh: through the church. (. . .)
- 7 IntW: [ah okay.
- 8 Bob: [and that
- 9 IntW: would you would you say that you identify less german now that
10 you left the church?
- 11 Bob: oh definitely.
- 12 IntW: ja?
‘yeah?’

- 13 (3.0)
 14 IntW: can you- can you explain that a little bit? (.)
 15 Bob: um (.) hm hm (.) i guess identifying with a culture- i (.) don’t
 16 wanna put down german culture (.) is- is making my world
 smaller.
 17 IntW: oh ja.
 18 Bob: uh the more i see (.) the more i see how much bigger the world is
 19 (.) um: (.) hmm. (8 sec.) that uh: (.) Shakespeare comes to
 20 mind (.) where- where Hamlet tells his buddy- uh tells his friend
 21 uh there are more things in heaven and on earth than are dreamt
 of in your philosophy
 22 IntW: hmm.
 23 Bob: and i guess that that small view is what i learned (.) in german
 24 when i was a kid and the bigger view is mostly in english.
 25 IntW: oh.
 26 Bob: this is what i have now.
 27 IntW: ja. oh so you connect german a little bit with a kind of narrow-
 mindedness or so?
 ‘yeah.’
 28 Bob: i guess so yeah.

After Bob confirms the interviewer’s question about whether he would attribute the loss of his German to his conversion to Buddhism, he further responds to this question with an immediate and direct appeal to identity in lines 5–6, stating that his identification with being German had come through his affiliation with his church. The converse positioning, i.e. that now that he is no longer affiliated with the church, he no longer feels German, is not directly stated but still implied, and the interviewer picks up on this in lines 9–10 and asks Bob whether he in fact identifies as less German now. The answer in line 11 is a strong affirmative, and the interviewer urges him to explain this further in line 12, first with rising intonation, and then after a long pause that Bob does not fill, with a direct question.

In response to this question, Bob sets up a series of opposing indices for the German and English languages in the remainder of the example, and through these, he constructs a German space and positions himself squarely outside of it. This section begins in line 15, where after some hesitation markers, he states that “identifying with a culture” is making his world smaller. In formulating that he doesn’t want to “put down German culture” in lines 15–16, Bob indicates that these world-shrinking properties are attributed to “a culture” in general. However, this formulation, which is itself a typical construction in the expression of stereotypes, already projects his ambivalence towards his constructed German space.

Bob then juxtaposes the space that makes his world “smaller” with a “much bigger world” (line 18). By drawing on Shakespeare, he constructs a space for this bigger world which is associated with high culture and worldliness. By contrast, the small world indexes a specifically *migrant* ethnic culture that is not juxtaposed with the place of origin, e.g. German-speaking Europe, but with the English-speaking world in general. In lines 23 and 24, then, he more directly addresses the roles of German and English in that contrast. He identifies the small world as that of his socialization in his family and his childhood in which the German language featured prominently. By contrast, he can only gain access to “the bigger view” through the English language. The German space that Bob constructs is therefore a small one which, although it may be contained within the larger English-speaking society, is nonetheless cut off from that society and its worldly, forward-looking practices through the German-Canadians’ use of German. Similarly, it is also cut off from a worldly or more high-culture German world in which the German language could potentially also transport a bigger view. But for Bob, the German language is so much tied to this non-worldly view of the migrant community in Canada, that to him it cannot serve as a mediator for “worldliness”. Through the construction of these attitudes, he creates a German space in which there is no place for him. In effect, by choosing “the world” and “the bigger view” over “a culture” and “the small view”, Bob chooses English over German in order to become a part of the larger culture.

In the final excerpt in this section, the second-generation immigrant Cara constructs a very positive attitude toward the German language, through which she in turn also constructs a very localized version of a German space that her third-generation children can also participate in. She does this with reference to the local German-speaking school that her children attend, but her own language practices also play an important role in the construction of this shared German space. Like Bob from the previous excerpt, Cara’s parents came to Canada after the war. The participants in the excerpt are Cara and the Edmonton-based interviewer, and the conversation leading up to this point has mostly dealt with Cara’s children’s school.

Excerpt 7. Second-generation immigrant: idealized German space as a goal

- 1 IntE: have you TRIED to speak german to your kids at home? or?
- 2 Cara: ich versuche aber es geht nicht so weit [@@@@
‘I try but it doesn’t get very far’
- 3 IntE: [yeah @@@@ ja, man
kommt aus der
‘yeah you get out of’
- 4 übung [@@@@
‘practice’

- 5 Cara: [@@@@ yeah, and um (.) it- it’s just uh hard. i can only
do [the very
- 6 IntE: [yeah yeah
- 7 basic things and then when you want to get into a more intense
- 8 conversation, you switch [into english (.) you just
- 9 IntE: [yeah yeah (.) the language that you
usually use, yeah.
- 10 Cara: yeah.
(lines omitted, discussion of teacher)
- 11 Cara: and so, she’s been very helpful [in (.) correcting a lot of my
gramMATical
- 12 IntE: [mm hmm
- 13 Cara: errors that i had just been (.) repeating [over and over and over
again and didn’t
- 14 IntE: [yeah
- 15 Cara: know how to self (.) [correct? anymore?
- 16 IntE: [yeah. and now you know.
- 17 Cara: yeah a- aber ich mache die fehler noch immer [@@@@@
‘b- but I still make those mistakes’
- 18 IntE: [ja: das ist
norma:l das ist
[‘yeah: that’s
no:rmal that’s’
- 19 normal.
‘normal.’

In line 1, the interviewer asks Cara whether she has tried to speak German with her children at home as well as exposing them to the language in school, with a strong emphasis on the word ‘tried’. This emphasis may be interpreted as a challenge coming from a German-speaking interviewer, especially in the context of a heritage language ideology that values any attempts among the second generation of migrants to pass the language on to the third generation. Cara responds to the question in line 2, saying that she does try, but doesn’t get very far. However, she switches to German in order to communicate this, which has the effect of positioning her as a German speaker at the same time that she’s criticizing her own failure to use the language in her home. In the context of the interviewer’s question, this has the additional effect of “proving” her alignment with the heritage language ideology, which she may feel that she needs to do since she cannot answer positively to the interviewer’s challenging question about how much German they speak at home. Cara’s laughter at the end of her German utterance also further mitigates that negative response. The interviewer then orients both toward Cara’s laughter and her code choice in her

response in lines 3–4, an alignment with Cara that extends all the way through to Cara's next turn beginning in line 5, when they switch back to English.

Taken as a whole, this interactive work serves to defend an idealized German space against the challenge to it resulting from Cara's inability to put it into practice. This continues on in lines 5–10, where Cara further explains her language practices and what happens when she tries to speak German at home: they start in German but tend to switch back to English "when you want to get into a more intense conversation". The desire to have a German space in their home is therefore ever-present, but never quite realized, so Cara attaches her construction of her positive attitude toward the German language to that wish rather than to any particular language practice. As long as she *wishes* she could have a German space in her home and thereby reinforce the language acquisition that is happening for her children in school, she is still positioning herself as a good heritage language speaker who believes in the ideology of language maintenance.

The conversation then shifts to Cara's children's teacher, in the midst of which Cara says in lines 11–15 that this teacher has been helpful to her as well by helping her recognize some of the German mistakes she has always made and which have become entrenched in her own language. The most interesting point here, however, is Cara's use of the adverb 'anymore' in line 15 when she says that she isn't able to self-correct 'anymore'. This implies that there was a time when she *could* self-correct, a time that she idealizes and thinks back on with a sort of nostalgia. For Cara, then, the positive attitude toward German that she is constructing is directly linked to her ideal of becoming proficient in German as she once was. This further serves to construct that idealized German space that she wishes she could help pass on to her children. Her re-learning of the German she learned as a child thereby becomes a matter of keeping up with her own children. In line 17, however, she admits that these corrections haven't really had an impact on her language use ("but I still make those mistakes"), but just as in line 2, she switches to German in order to state this, which carries the same mitigating effect as it did there. By using German at the same time that she is admitting she still does not use it properly, she positions herself as at least a potential German speaker, and through this, continues to align herself with the heritage speaker language ideology that persists throughout this excerpt.

As far as attitudes toward German go, there are two main ideologies that run through the four excerpts in this section. First, German can be seen as either a positive or negative symbol indexing German cultural artifacts in the world, and this differing symbolism affects whether the constructions of community members' language attitudes are in turn positive or negative. But there are also notable differences between the generations in terms of viewing it as a symbol. The first generation is portrayed in Excerpt 4 as experiencing an emotional

connection to German that results in strong positive or negative attitudes toward the language, specifically through their connection with the European German past. The second generation, however, constructs both their positive and negative language attitudes toward the German language through communication with other German speakers in their local Canadian environment — a thread that persists throughout all four excerpts. Second, German can also be seen as a practical tool for communication with other German speakers, as seen most strongly in Excerpt 4 but in the others as well. This tension between the emotional and the practical is a common thread in all of the excerpts, and the presence of this tension raises a question that remains unanswered: what is at the heart of the ideology of language maintenance and the resulting construction of a German space in Canada — a desire to communicate with other German speakers, or the creation of that space for emotional reasons?

4.3. *Attitudes towards code-mixing*

The excerpts in this final section have been chosen to illustrate the participants’ attitudes towards the mixing of German and English. This includes attitudes toward a mixed variety in Canada, as well as attitudes toward the use of English-language borrowings within European German varieties, both of which we view here as part of the general phenomenon of code-mixing. In the analysis, we will pay attention to how attitudes toward both kinds of mixing are constructed interactionally, how they link to participants’ identities, and how cultural spaces are constructed through them. Similarly to the previous sections, we will also make some observations about differences in these attitudes and the construction of identities and spaces among immigrant generations.

Excerpt 8 is one of many similar excerpts in our corpus in which attitudes towards mixed varieties in Canada and in Germany, and the spaces that result from these attitude constructions, are formulated in similar ways. It is particularly typical for first and 1.5 generation German-Canadians. In this excerpt, the Waterloo interviewer is talking with a married couple, Frida and Tom. They are both of the 1.5 generation, having migrated to Canada each with their parents as young teenagers.

Excerpt 8. 1.5-generation immigrants: Canadian mixing vs. European purism

- 1 IntW: gibt es denn in ihrem- in ihren beiden leben ehm situationen
‘are there situations in your lives- in both of your lives’
- 2 in denen sie AUSSchließlich deutsch sprechen? (. . .)
‘in which you speak solely German? (. . .)’
- 3 Frida: mit gewissen bekannten (.) [in deutschland.
‘with certain friends (.) [in Germany.’

- 4 Tom: [oh ja.
[‘oh yeah.’
- 5 IntW: ah ok (.) ja?
‘ah ok (.) yeah?’
- 6 Frida: ja: mit gewissen bekannten.
‘yeah: with certain friends.’
- 7 Tom: und verwandten sprechen wir deutsch.
‘and relatives we speak German.’
- 8 IntW: wenn sie nach deutschland telefonieren zum beispiel oder::
‘when you call someone in Germany for example or’
- 9 Tom: ja [wir sprechen deutsch (.) ja.
‘yeah [we speak German (.) yeah.’
- 10 Frida: [ja.
[‘yeah.’
- 11 IntW: ja und sie miteinander (.) wie sieht das aus?
‘yeah and you with each other (.) what’s that like?’
- 12 Tom: oh=
- 13 Frida: =wir sprechen engleutsch.
‘=we speak Engleutsch’ ((contraction of ‘English’ and ‘German’))
- 14 IntW: @@@@
- 15 Tom: de- des wechselt sich die ganze zeit.
‘it- it changes all the time.’
- 16 Frida: des- also- wir- als wir das letzte mal aus deutschland zurückkamen
‘the- i mean- we- when we came back from Germany the last time’
- 17 standen wir in frankfurt auf dem flugplatz und da stand so en großer
‘we were standing in Frankfurt at the airport and there was a big man’
- 18 herr neben uns (.) der uns zugehört hatte und der hat (.) uns dann
‘next to us (.) who had been listening to us and he (.) approached us’
- 19 angesprochen und hat gesacht (.) *wieso spricht ihr (.)
‘and said (.) *why are you guys (.) speaking English sometimes’
- 20 mal englisch, (.) mal deutsch (.) en halber satz englisch (.) en halber satz
‘and German sometimes (.) half a sentence of English (.) and half a sentence’
- 21 deutsch?* @@@@⁹ (.) und, dann ham wir ihm erklärt dass wir hier
‘of German?* @@@@ (.) and, then we explained to him that we grew’

- 22 aufgewachsen sind mit beiden sprachen und das es (.) einfach (.)
so:
‘up here with both languages and that it (.) just (.) turned out’
- 23 (.) geworden is @[@@@
‘(.) that way @ [@@@’
- 24 IntW: [@@@ hmhm.
(about 20 lines omitted, discussion of Engleutsch))
- 25 Tom: eh ich lese den spiegel so am compu- pu- puter jeden tag (.)
‘uh i read the spiegel ((a German newsweekly)) on the compu-
pu- puter’
- 26 un des graut mir (.) wie sie- deutsch- wie sie englisch benutzen in
deutsch (.)
‘every day and and I am appalled (.) the way they use German-
the way they’
- 27 des graut mir wirklich.
‘use English in German (.) that really appalls me.’
- 28 IntW: ja?
‘yeah?’
- 29 Tom: könnt sogar weinen @@@@
‘it makes me want to cry @@@@’
- 30 IntW: das gefällt ihnen nicht?
‘you don’t like that?’
- 31 Tom: wenn ich könnte, könnte ich weinen [@@@@
‘if i could, i would cry [@@@@’
- 32 IntW: [ehrllich?
[‘really?’
- 33 Tom: ehrlich ja.
‘yeah really.’
- 34 IntW: aber ihre eigene sprache @@@@ is doch auch so durchsetzt.
‘but your own language @@@@ has been infiltrated like that too.’
- 35 Tom: NATÜRLich @@@@
‘of COURSE @@@@’
- 36 IntW: ja. @@
‘yeah. @@’
- 37 Tom: aber man sieht doch nicht die eigenen fehler man sieht nur die
‘but one doesn’t see one’s own mistakes one only sees other
people’s’
- 38 fehler der anderen.
‘mistakes.’
- 39 IntW: ach so, ach so [@@@@@@@
‘oh I see, oh I see [@@@@@@@’
- 40 Tom: [@@@@@@@

- 41 Frida: ja das is ja hier (.) weil es zweisprachig is ehm sowieso is es auch,
‘yeah here it’s (.) everything is bilingual here anyway,’
- 42 sieht man des nich als fehler, aber wenn in deutschland, weil wir
‘one doesn’t see that as a mistake, but when in Germany, because
we’
- 43 erwarten dass unsere ganzen verwandten und (.) un:::sere (.)
‘expect that all our relatives and (.) our::: (.)’
- 44 M::ITmenschen @@@ in deutschland nur deutsch sprechen.
‘fellow citizens @@@ in Germany only speak German.’
- 45 IntW: hmhm.
- 46 Frida: und weil wir alle englischen worte verstehen ist das (.) komisch.
(.)
‘and because we understand all the English words (.) that’s weird.
(.)’
- 47 Tom: es ist nicht nur die verwandten. (.) die verwandten sprechen
‘it’s not just the relatives (.) the relatives probably’
- 48 wahrscheinlich (.) gutes deutsch frida aber in- in- in den zeitungsen
‘speak (.) good German Frida but in- in- in the newspaper
- 49 (.) und am- im internet (.) d- da sin so ah englische worte da
bie- die
(.) and on- on the internet (.) th- there are so uh english words
that u-
- 50 benutzt werden (.) die werden nur benutzt weil um zu zeigen
that are used (.) they’re only used in order to show
- 51 dass de leude deng- englisch sprechen aber nich weil se besseres
wort is.
that the people speak Ger- English but not because it’s a better
word.
- 52 (.) so denk ich jedenfalls.
(.) that’s what I think anyway.
- 53 IntW: hmhm ok.

In the first part of Excerpt 8, the participants discuss the interviewees’ use of “German”, a discussion that is initiated by the interviewer’s question in lines 1–2. In this question, the “German” is qualified as “solely German”, which the interviewees seem to understand as meaning ‘with no English mixed in’. Frida in line 3 restricts this use of “solely German” to their conversations with German speakers in Germany, thus implying a contrast with the local variety of German spoken in Canada, which is not “solely German”. While Tom in line 4 seems to align himself with this, in line 9, then, he does not restrict speaking German to any particular speakers, but by contrast this seems to refer to speaking German in Canada with German-speaking relatives and friends.

In line 11, the interviewer then asks about their use of German with each other. Tom starts his answer with the change of state token “oh” (Schiffirin 1987), indicating that this question addresses a different matter. Frida also responds immediately by providing a name for their mixed variety, which is a word creation out of “English” and “Deutsch” (‘German’): “engleutsch”. The interviewer responds with laughter, which can potentially be interpreted in two possible ways. On the one hand, it can be seen as giving Frida credit for a funny word creation, but it may also be seen as evaluating code-mixing itself as *laughable* in contrast to the German monolingual standard. However, the way Tom and Frida interpret the interviewer’s evaluation becomes clear through the fact that neither of them joins in with the interviewer’s laughter. This may indicate that they perceive that laughter as positing the mixed variety as different and lower down on a certain hierarchy than the monolingual German norm, and it may also be an assertion of their agency against the construction of hierarchy with regard to both varieties: standard German and “Engleutsch”. Tom and Frida may in fact see nothing unusual or particularly creative in the *term* “Engleutsch”, which they use several additional times throughout the interview.

As the excerpt continues, Frida constructs an attitude toward this variety that is not negative, and indicates that she does not see it as any lower in hierarchy but rather as just a different way of speaking. Frida’s “small story” (cf. Georgakopoulou 2007) in lines 16–23 is essentially about educating a German in Germany about this mixed variety, and, by implication, also educating the interviewer. The European German in the story is positioned as somewhat naive and ignorant about mixed varieties, and to this man, Frida describes their mixed variety as having naturally developed (“just turned out that way”). The attitude that she constructs through this anecdote is not one that sees their mixed variety as special, nor one that sees it as negative, but simply an organic result of the German-Canadian space they grew up in. Frida thus asserts her agency in terms of doing their variety justice as an equal to standard German, and through her laughter in lines 21 and 23 at having educated the European German of the anecdote, she even conveys a certain pride in that variety. Through this short narrative, then, Frida positions herself as a German speaker in Canada in contrast to Germans in Germany. In addition, she constructs a space for the mixed variety in Canada, in which it has an equally natural status to the monolingual European German norm.

This construction of a local space in Canada in which a mixed variety is both natural and ubiquitous continues in line 25. Here, Tom moves their discussion to Germany and expresses his unhappiness about English insertions in the German language there. He constructs his negative attitude through the kind of language he uses to describe his reaction to the variety in line 26 (‘I am appalled’), which he then repeats in line 27. The interviewer in line 28 then

uses a non-specified repair to encourage Tom to explain himself more.¹⁰ Rather than giving a more specific explanation about why he is appalled, Tom adds another expression of his negative feelings through 'I could cry' in line 29, which he repeats in line 31. Each time, he adds laughter to the end of his turn, which the interviewer does not reciprocate. Since the laughter is now his own, it functions to mitigate this assessment about a language variety, which he may be seen as having no authority to assess. Through 'I could cry', Tom expresses a certain helplessness about the state of the world from the perspective of a distant but knowledgeable observer. Thus, he positions himself outside of Germany but as capable of passing judgment on the mixing practices there as an observer who knows better. In lines 37–38, then, it becomes apparent on what grounds he is able to cast himself as this knowledgeable observer: he sees mixing German and English as a 'mistake' in general, i.e. in Canada as well as in Europe. Within the context of this ideology, his experience of mixing languages in Canada has educated him to the point where he is able to draw conclusions about where the influence of English on the German in Europe can lead: to a mixed variety such as the one in Canada, toward which he constructs a negative attitude.

While Tom constructs differences between European and Canadian German spaces as much as Frida does, their attitudes are somewhat different. He evaluates both the Canadian (full-fledged) mixed variety and the (initial-stage) mixed variety in Germany as mistakes, i.e. as negatively. Frida disagrees with Tom about this in lines 42–43, when she does not see the Canadian mixed variety as a mistake and takes a neutral stance toward this variety by drawing on the country's overall bilingual ideology: 'because everything is bilingual here anyway'. But the attitude she constructs here is also in line with that of her husband in a way, in that she suggests that this is because of her 'expectations', i.e. an ideology of 'pure' German in Europe as used by European Germans. When she refers to these European Germans, she uses the term "our fellow people/our fellow citizens" in line 44, but her hesitation markers and laughter simultaneously mark this formulation as unusual. This may be a result of the fact that she has just constructed two separate spaces, but now includes herself as part of the German space in Germany as well, through the use of the term 'fellow'. Obviously, positioning, attitude, space, and place are linked here. Consciously or not, Tom suggests a solution for Frida's dilemma in his next turn: he excludes the couple's German relatives and friends from the perpetuation of a negative mixed language form because they use 'good German' (i.e. pure German). The 'bad' mixed variety is used in the newspapers and on the internet only. Further, an additional ideology is assigned to the use of English in Germany, namely to show off rather than for practical reasons ('because it's a better word', line 51). By implication, English in Canada does not assume this role, which, again, constructs differences between European German and Canadian German spaces.

The next excerpt with a second-generation speaker shows similarities with Excerpt 8 in that a space for Germany is constructed in which German ought to be kept pure from English influences. In contrast to first and 1.5-generation immigrants like Frida who value their Canadian mixed variety, however, the speaker in this next excerpt constructs a far more negative attitude toward the mixed variety, which leads to a different construction of the local German space. Excerpt 9 from the Waterloo corpus is with Sam, a second-generation immigrant. He is in his early seventies at the time of the interview and was born in Canada in the 1930s. His parents immigrated to Canada in the 1920s from German-speaking areas in Europe. Sam claims English as his main language in childhood but he seems to understand German well and still speaks it occasionally. In the interview, however, Sam generally uses English even when the interviewer uses German. At the beginning of this excerpt from the second half of the interview, Sam is talking about his son who is a music student, and, more specifically, his son's interest in German.

Excerpt 9. Second-generation immigrant: Mixing as impure use of German

- 1 Sam: he has a very POSitive attitude towards german. ((*clearing his throat*)) (.)
 2 but it's tied to music.
 3 IntW: achso sie haben das also nich gepusht¹¹ [sozusagen in ihrer familie?
 'oh so you didn't push that in your [family so to speak'
 4 Sam: [no nein
 'no'
 5 Sam: ts (.) *gepusht,* (.) NICE german WORD,
 6 IntW: @@@[@@@@@
 7 Sam: [@@@@@ that's how my parents spoke. [@@@@@
 8 IntW: [ja @@@@@@ ja.
 ['yeah @@@ yeah.'
 9 ehm wa- warum haben sie das nich- nicht mehr unterstützt oder
 'um w- why did- didn't you support it anymore or'
 10 *gepusht?* ((smiling voice))
 '*push* it'
 11 (2.0)
 12 IntW: war es- es war weniger wichtig oder?
 'was it- it was less important right?'
 13 Sam: ((*clearing his throat*)) oh definitely definitely less important.
 14 ((*clearing his throat*)) if it wasn't that important in my own
 life,
 15 it was just carried over less um. (.) I would have loved (.) to
 have
 16 eh my my daughter and youngest son continue in french and

- 17 spanish, especially spanish. but I did not push MY likes on MY children.
- 18 IntW: hmm.

In line 3, the interviewer inserts the word “gepusht” into her otherwise German turn. This insertion is recognized as a borrowing from English by both the interviewer and Sam, and it is through the identification of this mixed form that they each construct their attitudes towards mixing in general. The interviewer initially draws attention to it through the metacomment ‘so to speak’ that follows this word. Through this metacomment, she marks the form ‘gepusht’ as linguistically unusual and further as deviating from a projected pure German norm. Since she continues to position herself as a German from Germany through her use of German even when Sam uses English, she has included herself as part of this European German norm.

In line 5, Sam begins a side-sequence with a metacomment that addresses the interviewer’s use of the word “gepusht”. Although it would be expected for this metacomment to occur in overlap (cf. Goodwin 2002), Sam instead waits for the interviewer to finish before speaking, which draws attention to this comment and lends it weight. He begins by scolding her through a “ts” in line 5 before repeating the word “gepusht”. Through this scolding, he assigns the use of this word in this context negative value, but through his change in voice quality he is able to mark the word as not his, but the interviewer’s. The repetition is followed by another metacomment on the use of “gepusht”: “nice german word”. Both ‘gepusht’ and ‘nice German word’ end in a rising intonation, and both ‘nice’ and ‘word’ are strongly emphasized, which, taken together, function as contextualization cues here that mark the comment as sarcastic. Rather than being offended by this sarcasm, however, the interviewer laughs, thereby expressing her appreciation for the comment as a funny joke. Through this laughter, she also indicates her agreement with Sam that this is not a standard German word. Sam reciprocates the laughter and adds another metacomment in line 7, thereby drawing an explicit connection between the interviewer’s mix of German and English and his parents’ use. This connection emerges as particularly striking in the context of this excerpt because of the interviewer’s positioning of herself throughout the interview as a European German through the speaking of standard German. Through this same comment, Sam also distances himself from this mixed use by relegating it to his parents’ generation. By positioning himself in this way, Sam constructs a European space in which English insertions in German are seen as marked. In addition, he constructs a Canadian space in which the first generation (his parents) speaks a mixed variety, but he and by extension the second generation of immigrants in general, instead promotes an ideology that espouses that the two languages should be kept separate.¹²

In line 8, the interviewer aligns with Sam’s positioning of his parents’ generation through both her agreement (“yes”) and her laughter. Through this alignment, she also agrees with Sam that Germans of the first generation in Canada do speak like that. She then ends the metacommentary side-sequence by repeating, with a slight reformulation, her initial question in lines 9–10. Initially she uses a German equivalent for ‘gepusht’ in this reformulation, namely “supported”. She immediately follows this up, however, by repeating the English “gepush”, which functions as a sort of defiant use after the long metacomment on that very word. She contextualizes her awareness of this defiance through her smiling voice, thereby asserting her authority to use this English loan in her German. Since she has distanced herself from the older first generation German-Canadians who have been identified with this mix in this excerpt, she now claims this mix for her generation of European Germans. Indeed, Sam may see the interviewer’s new positioning here as a challenge, since there is a relatively long 2-second pause in which he leaves the question unanswered. The interviewer then reformulates her question in line 12, to which Sam responds by taking a longer turn. In this turn, he stresses the importance of other languages for his children. The mention of Spanish and French, however, constructs this as a positive attitude toward foreign languages in general but not toward his German “heritage” language in particular. Sam’s use of “push” in line 17 then receives an additional meaning based on the layered simultaneity (Blommaert 2005: 126) overlaid onto it from its previous uses in this same interaction (cf. Bakhtin 1981). This word, which had just been the focus of a metalanguage construction of attitudes and positioning, is now used by Sam in his English speech. Thus, he reclaims this contested word as part of the English language. This is in line with Sam’s construction of a German space in Canada in which German and English should ideally be kept separate.

In Excerpts 8 and 9 analyzed above, the participants’ attitudes toward mixing are constructed in terms of the difference between Canada and German-speaking Europe. There, they construct the spaces with a view to the outward boundary of Canadian German. In the last excerpts that follow, then, participants focus on the construction of boundaries within the German-Canadian space itself. Excerpt 10 is from the Edmonton corpus, and the participants in the larger interview are the Edmonton interviewer and the university student Tara and her mother Elli, though only Tara and the interviewer speak in his excerpt. Both of them were born in Canada, i.e. Elli is of the second generation and Tara of the third generation, and the first generation of the family came to Canada in the 1950s. The excerpt occurs about halfway through the interview, and the interviewer’s comment at the beginning of this excerpt refers back to the very beginning of the interview, when Elli and Tara were filling in the questionnaire. In answering the question “Which languages do you speak today and which

ones did you speak as a child?”, Elli had written ‘Germlish’ for their current language and ‘Denglish’ for the language she spoke as a child.

Excerpt 10. Third generation immigrant: Learning more German as changing the mixing

- 1 IntE: @@@ i really like the- distinction between- germlish and @@@@
2 denglish.
3 Tara: yeah and- and see, we’ve sort of (.) become (.) we’ve sort of been
4 calling it more denglish now too (be)cause (.) you know, we’re
learning more german
5 so it’s more german with english added [in? instead of english with=
6 IntE: [yeah yeah
7 Tara: =german added in? (.) but [(.) it’s (.) and it’s- it’s- it’s really funny
8 IntE: [yeah.
9 Tara: i laugh sometimes i think- like if somebody who only spoke ger-
man or who only [spoke english heard our conversation,
10 (be)cause it would be [(.)
11 IntE: [yeah [yeah.
12 Tara: (.) very @@@@@ weird >
13 IntE: @@@@ pick ONE language
14 Tara: yeah (.) yeah but it’s- [(.) it’s what we speak sometimes.
15 IntE: [yeah. yeah (.) i remember,
16 when i first came here and started teaching german, i was talking
17 to my mom on the phone and i said @@@@ (.) uh, they’re
18 teachen den communicative approach @@[@@ yeah.
19 Tara: [yeah (.) that’s, see
that’s i- it’s hard to
think of examples
20 [but that’s- [we do that too.
21 IntE: [yeah [yeah yeah.

In response to the interviewer’s positive comment on Elli’s word creation for their mixed languages, Tara reevaluates the meaning of these varieties. “Denglish”, which had been used by Elli as the term for her childhood language, receives new meaning by Tara as the current language. The reason given is that “we’re learning more German”, which leads to Denglish, i.e. “more German with English added in”. The German learned at school thus provides an impetus for the mixed variety to change from an English-dominant language to a German-dominant one. Interestingly, this construction of their language corresponds to Myers-Scotton’s (2002) matrix language theory, in which there always has to be a base language and a language that is shifted to, rather than simply a mixing of codes as a variety in and of itself. This suggests that such a

construct is not just present in the evaluations of linguists, but the evaluations of the speakers themselves as well.

Starting in line 9, then, Tara seems to evaluate this mix rather negatively as “weird” (line 12) but the laughter in connection with “weird” already indicates that this is, indeed, not her own perception. This evaluation is spoken through the voice of an animator rather than Tara as the author, namely by “somebody who only spoke German or who only spoke English”. More specifically, it is obvious that those who only know German are to be found in German-speaking Europe, while those who only know English include Canadians who are not also speakers of German. Thus, she implies that those who are familiar with this bilingual language use would not find it “weird”. In fact, in the set-up of this imagined situation, she refers to it as “funny” and “I laugh”, expressing a rather neutral or positive stance herself. What makes this “funny” is not the mix itself but that monolinguals find it “weird”, i.e. that they cannot make sense of it. Underlining Tara’s evaluation is a reassessment of the ideology of monolingualism that looms over varieties such as the mixed variety they use. This becomes all the more obvious in Tara’s reaction to the interviewer’s comment in line 13, where the interviewer refers to the monolingual ideology but detaches herself from it through the laughter. In line 14, Tara posits a strong contradiction to this idea of monolingualism and the dominant ideology of a monolingual standard variety by suggesting that the mixed variety is just as organic as the monolingual ideal: “it’s what we speak sometimes”. This brings us back to the first example, in which Frida of the first generation constructed a similar attitude toward the practical use of their mixed variety.

In the last part of this excerpt, the interviewer aligns with the attitude constructed by Tara by providing an example of mixing German and English from her own language practice as a German speaker in Canada in lines 15–18. By doing this, she positions herself as part of the group of German-Canadians who use this mix. However, while Tara finds this a good example for the kind of mix she means as well, she still positions the interviewer outside of her own group that speaks this variety through her use of “we do that too” in line 20. Through the deictic pronoun “we”, Tara excludes the interviewer from her own group, and once more creates a space in which German-Canadians are an inclusive group, and which does not include German speakers such as the interviewer who are only temporarily in Canada. As this excerpt shows, the third generation may develop a new awareness of the mixed variety that is used at home as they become interested in learning German through school. Compared to the first, the 1.5 or the second generation immigrants in the excerpts above, Tara does not construct a negative attitude of her own towards this mix, but portrays the negative stance only through the voice of an animator.

In each of the three excerpts in this section, a differentiation between the German and the Canadian space can be seen. For the 1.5 and second generation

immigrants discussed in the first two excerpts, this division largely emerges from ideologies assigned to language use in Canada and in Germany, as well as from practical concerns in using the languages. However, mixing in Canada is constructed by these 1.5 and second-generation immigrants as natural and as a part of daily practice, while mixing in Germany is constructed by contrast as a “mistake” that is challenging the ideology of keeping the European German language pure, and through the construction of this negative attitude, they align themselves with this ideology and express the importance of maintaining it. By contrast, the third-generation speaker in Excerpt 10 does not orient toward the German used in German-speaking Europe as the standard against which to measure herself, but toward the German used at local schools and universities, which is the place where she has learned additional German to supplement the mixed language she had spoken at home since childhood and shift it more toward German. For the earlier generations, the German space that is created through the construction of attitudes toward mixing is directly connected to places in German-speaking Europe, while the third generation’s attitudes emerge exclusively from local practice.

5. Conclusions

The three analysis sections discussed this migrant community’s constructed attitudes toward three contrasting sets of codes in their linguascape: German dialects as they contrast with standard German, German as it contrasts with English, and the mix of German and English in Canada as it contrasts with code-mixing in Germany. These three sets of contrasts are not a result of relics from interview questions that set them up as such, but instead emerge naturally in conversation as a result of recurring patterns of membership categorization practices (cf. Sacks 1992) among community members. We then further analyzed how these attitudes serve to construct individual migrant identities, and in turn, a local German space.

In the first analysis section on attitudes toward German dialects, for example, we find that the local German space in Canada is constructed as one in which dialects are relegated to the past, i.e. to Old World Europe on the one hand, but also to the first generation, or those individuals who transported the dialects to Canada. By contrast, standard German is perceived as having current practical and symbolic value for all generations. This means that there is an orientation among first-generation migrants toward a process of exchanging their local dialects for standard German, which, though it may be experienced as an emotional loss, is also perceived as a gain because of their ability to continue using German in Canada with migrants from all different parts of German-speaking Europe. Starting with the second generation, then, perceptions of the relationship

between dialects and standard shift somewhat: dialects are perceived as completely irrelevant to them except as the language of their parents or grandparents, while standard German becomes the language that gets attached to the community ideology of heritage language maintenance. In part, this comes about through the school system’s promotion of standard German. This in turn results in standard German gaining significance as more than just the community language and the common variety of German speakers in Canada, but also as indexing education. The community ideology that emerges as a result of these attitudes is one that views dialects as something worth sacrificing for the benefit of gaining a single community language: German.

It is important to note, however, that this construction of a local German space in which German dialects are increasingly irrelevant is not necessarily based on negative attitudes towards dialects in general. Instead, it results from a stance toward dialects as being simply impractical in Canada due to their inability to connect German speakers from different parts of Europe, a task that standard German can indeed take on. As one moves through the generations, then, one sees an increasing lack of knowledge about German dialects in general, which results in an inability to construct attitudes toward dialects at all among some second and most third-generation speakers, and even this absence of attitudes toward dialects serves to construct a German space in Canada, specifically one in which German is a more uniform language than it is in the European German space with its richness of dialects. However, it is important to note that this perception of the German space in Canada is accompanied by a tolerance for the inclusion of varieties as “standard” that would not be perceived as “standard” in German-speaking Europe. In other words, the common German language in Canada seems to indeed include speakers who have dialect features in their speech, but rather than being perceived as dialect speakers, they are perceived as people who are simply speaking German, with a corresponding understanding that variation is part of a common German space in Canada.¹³

The themes of the construction of attitudes toward language as either emotional symbolism or as a practical tool emerge somewhat in the first section, but they are even more prominent in the second section on attitudes towards German as it contrasts with English. Here, the ways in which the German language indexes different kinds of cultural artifacts and world-views enters even more strongly into the construction of attitudes and the local German space, largely because of its contrast to English as the dominant language of wider communication outside of that German space. This contrast with English is less important for the first generation than for later generations, as can be seen in the attitudes toward English being constructed more among the later generations. These later generations seem to be trying to come to terms with re-indexing the German language, i.e. freeing it from its wartime connotations and remaking it into a means of communication for the community that allows

for personal emotional attachment to a language as mother tongue while leaving aside the loaded symbolism of the past.

This second section also echoes some of the conclusions drawn in the first section, namely that German in general is seen as unifying a community which, in a different context, might be regarded as using different varieties and therefore not so unified at all. Here again, differences between varieties of German are not the most relevant distinction in the community, while the difference between those who can speak any variety of German and those who can speak only English is seen as a much more immediately salient. The construction of this unifying force as positive or as negative corresponds in the data to whether individual migrants wish to construct themselves as a part of that local German space or not, but in both cases the construction of the space as a local one with standard German as the unifying language is strikingly similar. Exclusion here is again due to tying attitudes to dispreferred cultural indices such as associating German with the local and low culture, and English with the worldliness of the wider community and high culture. Inclusion, on the other hand, is possible when the negative cultural symbolism of German is ignored in favor of drawing on the language's communicative and mother tongue value. This can even be the case when the positive attitude toward the German language is constructed as part of a *wish* for a German space rather than tied to any particular language practice.

This construction of German as a unifying force also carries over into the third section on attitudes toward the mixing of German and English. Here, the distinction is between mixing in Canada, which is regarded as a natural and inevitable phenomenon of living in an English-dominant society, and mixing in Germany, which is regarded as incorrect and even as an assault to an ideology of a pure European German that these migrants wish to continue looking to as a standard. However, a difference can be seen between the generations here as well, in that the third generation distances itself from a comparison between practices in Europe and practices in the local community, and instead orients only toward local practice when discussing such mixing. This is the case despite the presence of the native German interviewer, who serves in conversations with earlier-generation migrants as a point of comparison between European German and local language practice. Even the third generation makes a distinction between the mixing that can be found in the German used in a home context and a somewhat purer form of German, but the latter is associated not with German-speaking Europe for the third generation, but with the forms of the language used at local schools and universities. Attending German classes at these schools and universities is seen as causing a shift in the mix away from English and more toward German within the local German space, though not as doing away with the mix entirely. All generations therefore construct the local German space as one that tolerates and supports mixing as

a locally specific practice, despite the differences that are perceived between this practice and the ideal of language purity in other spaces.

As we hope to have demonstrated, analyzing language attitudes in interaction has allowed us to reveal their constructed nature, as well as the effects this construction has for individual positionings toward certain social spaces. It has also revealed the ways in which individuals construct attitudes, identities, and spaces by drawing on different indexical meanings or layered simultaneities, which includes the fact that the same language or variety may be used to construct very different spaces. For example, while one person may negatively associate a particular language with a personally unwanted worldview, another may use the same language to construct positive emotional ties linking an entire immigrant group. In each case, these associations are made possible by drawing on more general language ideologies perpetuated through socialization and linked to the specifics of the local migrant context such as heritage speaker and mother tongue ideology.

One more specific question that this analysis highlights is the one about the role of the name for a language or variety in the construction of attitudes and of the local German space. This includes ways in which different and contradicting meanings are associated with the same name for a language, resulting in ambiguities and the possibility for layered simultaneity. Our analysis reveals that naming a variety, i.e. the specific name used to refer to it, is a central linguistic practice in the construction of language attitudes, so for example, referring to a linguistic variety by the name of that variety (e.g. *Saxon*) rather than by the name *German* allows it to become more important for the construction of spaces than it otherwise would be. But it is perhaps even more relevant to note that this practice is also carried through to the locally specific names used for the mixing of German and English. Thus, even though the urban German variety in Canada does not carry its own name as, for example, *Hunsrückisch* in Brazil or *Südwesterdeutsch* in Namibia does, the German speakers in Canada draw on the same underlying language ideology associated with giving a variety its own name and thereby lending it weight and importance. In addition, through these kinds of naming, they create a local space in which they are included or from which they are excluded.

We draw attention once more to the importance of “small stories” (cf. Georgakopoulou’s 2007) for the construction of attitudes, and through them, identities and spaces. Recounting personal experience in stories, whether lived or imagined, requires interactants to construct evaluations and positionings. Thus, by nature of the genre itself, these stories involve evaluations, including language attitudes. In such stories but also in interaction in general, attitudes are often constructed by drawing on authority and knowledge or hiding behind such, e.g. by speaking as the animator rather than the author (Goffman 1974). However, either case allows for the construction of attitudes, even when an

animator's voice is used because the author's own knowledge base may be missing, as with Ron in Excerpt 3, one of the third-generation immigrants. Such an appeal to personal experience seems to legitimize attitudes, i.e. make them more concrete and authoritative, as if interactants are appealing to evidence to back them up, and a lack of narratives often goes hand in hand with a construction of a lack of authority.

This paper's findings are based specifically on the language attitudes of German-speaking immigrants and their descendants in Canada, but they have implications for any places in the world that have been touched by migration. We find that through the construction of attitudes toward the languages and varieties of their local linguascape, migrants take their attitudes from the home country and use them to construct a local space in the new place. They do this not just themselves, as a first-generation group, but also through the socialization of other generations in the country of migration. However, while the earlier generations draw heavily on a remapping and transformation of old spaces from the places of origin in doing this, the later generations increasingly construct their attitudes with reference only to the local space. Thus, while the languages and varieties of the linguascape may remain after migration, language attitudes toward those varieties will tend to vary depending on how distant an individual community member is from the point of individual migration. Whether these differences in language attitudes also affect differences in language practice remains to be seen, but it seems not just possible, but likely.

*University of Alberta
University of Waterloo*

Correspondence addresses: jenniedo@ualberta.ca and gliebisch@uwaterloo.ca

Notes

1. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for supporting this research with a grant for the project "German identity in urban Canada: A qualitative and quantitative study of language and discourse" (SSHRC#410-07-2202).
2. Immigrants of the so-called 1.5 generation (cf. Lo 1999) are considered to be between the first and the second generation of immigrants because they came with their parents at a very young age. Just like the second-generation speakers who were born in Canada to German-speaking migrants of the first generation, they also received their main socialization in Canada.
3. Pseudonyms are used instead of original names, and any other identifying information has been changed. Transcription conventions are as follows: German and English utterances are in normal type and English translations (where necessary) are in 'single quotes' directly beneath them. The transcript differs from usual orthographic spelling, in that CAPITALIZATION

in the transcript is used to mark intensity, rising intonation is indicated with a question mark? and falling intonation is indicated with a period. Unclear passages are marked with (single brackets) and our commentary with ((double brackets)), while conversational overlap is indicated with [square brackets], a change in voice quality is indicated with *asterisks*, and laughter is indicated with @@@. Pauses lasting a beat (.) or two (. .) are indicated as shown; longer pauses are indicated in seconds.

4. Nanda's professed inability to understand her brother is particularly curious, since presumably he speaks the same dialect on the phone with her that she herself grew up hearing (and possibly even speaking) before she left for Canada in her twenties.
5. A similar characterization of dialect as belonging to the Old World and as accompanied by a certain nostalgia can be seen in Karl, another first-generation participant from the same data set (cf. Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2009, Excerpt 6).
6. This is not the dialect that is known as the Saxon (or *Sächsisch*) dialect in present-day Germany. The Saxon dialect spoken by Simon's mother and her family is the variety spoken in Transylvania (cf. Wagner 1990), which is called by the same name but which is only distantly related.
7. Though Simon characterizes 'fressen' as dialect and 'essen' as standard, both 'fressen' and 'essen' are in fact used to describe eating in the standard language, although 'fressen' specifically describes an animal's eating (or that of a human being who is eating like an animal).
8. More common in migrant families is the use of the migrant's language as a secret code among parents to the exclusion of children, as several interviewees in our data attest. It is possible that the laughter here is also about the deviation from this more general use.
9. It is not clear from the audio recording whether this laughter is part of the reported speech, i.e. the animator's laughter, or Frida's, the author's.
10. The absence of a second assessment by the interviewer but a non-specified repair serves to foreshadow the disagreement that she verbalizes later, beginning in line 34.
11. While a google search suggests that 'gepusht', the past participle of the English borrowing 'pushen', can also be rendered with the somewhat more German spelling 'gepuscht', we have chosen the more English spelling in our transcript here, as both speakers in this excerpt seem to orient to this word as an English one.
12. This may, in fact, be one of the reasons why he chooses to speak English in the interview. In doing so, he is avoiding speaking a variety of German that he may perceive as imperfect or incorrect: a mix or an otherwise non-standard variety.
13. We are talking here about European varieties such as Bavarian, Swiss, Siebenbürgen Saxon, or the Berlin dialect rather than other community languages in Canada, e.g. the language of the Mennonite community.

References

- Antaki, Charles & Sue Widdicombe. 1998. *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, Mike. 2003. Narratives in space and time: beyond "backdrop" accounts of narrative orientation. *Narrative Inquiry* 13(2). 347–366.
- Benwell, Bethan & Elizabeth Stokoe. 2006. *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. "Why be normal?" Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society* 28. 203–223.

- Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2010. Locating identity in language. In Carmen Llamas & Dominic Watt (eds.), *Language and identities*, 18–28. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Burridge, Kate. 1998. Throw the baby from the window a cookie: English and Pennsylvania German in contact. In Barry J. Blake, Anna Siewierska & Jae Jung Song (eds.), *Case, typology and grammar: in honor of Barry J. Blake*, 71–93. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dailey-O’Cain, Jennifer & Sarah Darling. 2010. Neue Welt, alte Welt: ein Vergleich der perceptual dialectologies des deutschsprachigen Kanada und Deutschlands [New world, old world: a comparison of the perceptual dialectologies of German-speaking Canada and Germany]. In Markus Hundt, Christina Ada Anders & Andreas Lasch (eds.), *Perceptual Dialectology — Neue Wege der Dialektologie* [Perceptual dialectology — new ways of doing dialectology], 315–327. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dailey-O’Cain, Jennifer & Grit Liebscher. 2009. Dialect use and discursive identities of migrants from the west in eastern Germany. In Patrick Stevenson & Jenny Carl (eds.), *Language, discourse, and identity in central Europe. The German language in a multilingual space*, 185–202. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Certeau, Michel. 1988. *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small stories, interaction and identities*. John Benjamins: Philadelphia.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2002. Time in action. *Current Anthropology* 43 [Special issue: “Repertoires of timekeeping in anthropology”]. 19–35.
- Goodwin, Charles & John Heritage. 1990. Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19. 283–307.
- Gumperz, John. J. 1982. *Language and social identity: studies in interactional sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harré, Rom & Luk van Langenhove. 1991. Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21. 393–407.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2010. Language and geographical space. In Peter Auer & Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.), *Language and space: theories and methods: an international handbook of linguistic variation*, 1–18. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Laihonen, Petteri. 2008. Language ideologies in interviews: a conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(5). 668–693.
- Lambert, Wallace E., Richard C. Hodgson, Robert C. Gardner & Stanley Fillenbaum. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60. 44–51.
- Liebscher, Grit & Jennifer Dailey-O’Cain. 2009. Language attitudes in interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(2). 195–222.
- Lo, Adrienne. 1999. Codeswitching, speech community membership, and the construction of ethnic identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4). 461–479.
- Mæhlum, Brit. 2010. Language and social spaces. In Peter Auer & Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.), *Language and space: theories and methods: an international handbook of linguistic variation*, 18–32. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Milroy, Leslie. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pavlenko, Aneta & Adrian Blackledge (eds.). 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on conversation*. Vols. 1 & 2. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, Ernst. 1990. *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen* [History of the Saxons of Siebenbürgen]. Thaur bei Innsbruck, Austria: Wort und Welt Verlag.