University of Alberta

"More German than the Germans:" A linguistic examination of representation and identity in two German-Canadian communities

by

Barbara L. Hilden

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Germanic Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics

Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Spring 2014
Edmonton, Alberta

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a linguistic examination of the construction of identity in two urban German-Canadian Canadian communities: Edmonton, Alberta and Waterloo, Ontario. Combining the complementary frameworks of van Dijk's (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis and Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural Discourse Analysis, this thesis takes a cultural approach to examine how German-Canadian immigrants construct identity, position membership, and enact belonging. Through an examination of 91 interviews recorded with self-described German-Canadians, this thesis identifies specific linguistic tools by which these participants make *Germanness* and *Canadianness* relevant in conversation. It examines the means by which community and belonging are expressed, and it considers the categories of membership which participants wittingly and unwittingly construct.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I extend my gratitude and heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor and academic mentor, Dr. Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain. This thesis is the latest demonstration of the unending support, limitless patience, and unflagging enthusiasm she has offered over the past six years. Her willingness to indulge my curiosities (and to re-direct when necessary) has been always gracious. She has been generous with her time, with her knowledge, with her materials, and with her encouragement—and I am richer for it.

Thanks are due as well to my committee, Dr. Alla Nedashkivska and Dr. Andie Palmer, whose work in sociolinguistics was foundational to my own understanding of the field and which greatly informed this thesis. I would also like to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for their financial support.

Finally, I wish to thank my colleagues in the Applied Linguistics and German programs. They assisted, commiserated, clarified, and generally bettered the whole process. Thank you to my family and friends for their abilities to entertain, to inspire, to understand. And thank you to Tom Long for all the same and for his love, care, and indefatigable support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The 1884 *Henderson Directory*[1] records the only German man in Edmonton at the time: a blacksmith named Edward Lorely (221).

Over the next 20 years, Edmonton grew from a single-German-resident-community to a thriving hub. In 1905, it boasted a German-language newspaper *(The Alberta Herold),* German bookstore, German school, German club (The Edelweiss Club), at least one German restaurant, a handful of German-run businesses, and several German churches. Today, there remains a German-language newspaper, German grocery, German Cultural Centre and club, as well as several German-language churches, although the "German section" of town no longer occupies an identifiable quadrant of the city as it once did[2].

Waterloo, in contrast, was a German settlement from its foundation. A group comprised of German Mennonite immigrants operating as The German Company of Pennsylvania purchased a large tract of land in 1803—a section later incorporated into the new Waterloo Township (Bloomfield 2006). Though other nationalities would join these early settlers, the Mennonite (and later European-German) population remained the predominant group. Today, the native German-speaker population of Kitchener/Waterloo is the largest of all immigrant groups in both number and relative percentage of population (Government of Canada 2011).

Over 400,000 respondents in Canada claim German as their mother tongue (Government of Canada 2011). Statistics and head counts, however, tell little of the story. What is it to be a German-speaking person in Canada? How does it influence belonging and membership? How do German-Canadians express their identity conversationally? How do they perceive "being German?" How do these perceptions affect actions, belonging, and membership? What is the role of language in these actions? In the community?

I. BACKGROUND OF THIS STUDY

The relationship between language and identity has been explored for years, with evolving approaches but little consensus. Over the past 20 years or so,

[1] *Henderson's Directories* were city directories—the phone books of their day. They contained the names and addresses of citizens and businesses in cities across the Canadian prairies and were published, in various forms, from 1878-1978.
[2] See Manfred Prokop for more on the history of German settlement in Alberta.

however, academic understanding of identity has moved away from its essentialist roots. Widely favoured[3] in the field of sociolinguistics is a constructivist perspective that views identity as a construct, as a discursive and ongoing *process* (see, among others, Antaki & Widdicombe 1998: 3, Bucholtz & Hall 2005: 585, Davies & Harré 1990: 45).

It is within this latest evolution of thought that this study appears. This study examines the ways in which individuals discursively and linguistically enact identity. Two populations are taken as the site of examination: the German-Canadian communities of Edmonton, Alberta, and of Waterloo, Ontario. How people in each of these two groups speak about belonging, membership, and identity; what linguistic tools they use to discursively construct their identities; how they position themselves as members of various groups are the questions this study is devoted to answering.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What specific linguistic tools do German-Canadian immigrants use to construct identity and position membership? How do they make belonging and membership relevant in conversation—how do they linguistically enact identity? These are not new questions. Theories to explain these self-same phenomena exist; numerous analyses have already been performed. Researchers have even analysed the same data set I use here, investigating very similar questions. Lacking in these analyses, however, is a socio-cultural approach—a framework which looks at these questions considering aspects of community and culture. The purpose of this study is to examine language and identity in a cultural context: to look at the specific linguistic means by which German-Canadians (and other minority immigrant groups, by extrapolation) enact their membership as members of that culture and group.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The goal of this study is to contribute to our understanding of identity and belonging. It furthers the notion that identity is flexible and changeable. Using two German-Canadian communities as sites of exploration, it facilitates insights into the ways minority language-speakers of many cultures appreciate their places within a linguistic- and cultural-majority.

From an academic perspective, this thesis combines two frameworks into one, enriching and widening the analytic possibilities thereby. It highlights the cultural

[3] There are, of course, the inevitable dissenters.

component in linguistic identity analysis. And, within the rapidly-expanding field of identity study, it situates linguistics as a primary site of analysis.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

A variety of technical terms are required to perform and parse such an analysis. Most will be explained as they arise. But a few fundamentally affect understanding of this study and, as such, warrant immediate clarification.

Community

Community is a fraught term. Over the years, it has been used to imperfectly describe a group of speakers who share social norms (Gumperz 1968: a *speech community*). It has been used to indicate a group of people "who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic" (Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder 2002: 4). Each of these definitions has its own problems. Community can create, according to Gee (2005), a perception of unity or belonging not necessarily shared by the community's members. Its very appellation might encourage a false sense of belonging. And membership in a community means so many different things to different people, Gee writes that it "is not clear membership is a truly helpful notion" (214).

Difficulties notwithstanding, I believe community remains a viable and valuable description. Recognizing that the people who participated in these interviews live in a place which itself constitutes a community of sorts; realizing that this analysis is rooted in *culture* and *society* and that community is included in these related but distinct terms; presuming neither membership nor unanimity on what constitutes belonging; and accepting that community has its own inherent shortcomings, I have chosen to adopt a term expressly rejected by others.

This is a study of individuals. These individuals are part of groups (Canadian, German, German-Canadian, and many others) and each participant conceives of and constructs belonging to these groups uniquely. It is likely that many different individual understandings of communities of belonging are at work in these interviews (expressed and unexpressed, explicit and implicit, conscious and unconscious). Rather than see this as a weakness in the data, however, I believe it is precisely these differences which enable a study of the individual and varied ways in which communities are constructed, enacted, and made relevant. The way in which I understand community will be expanded in the next chapter.

German-Canadian

Participants for this study were self-selected: advertisements were placed and volunteers solicited based not on any imposed definition of "Germanness." There were no restrictions on who could or could not participate in the interviews. People with varying degrees of self-perceived German heritage are included—third-generation Canadians, temporary workers from Germany, the adult children of German-speaking immigrants from Poland, Russia, and the Czech Republic. Similarly, there were no language proficiency standards. Interviewees selected the language of conversation.

Membership

The category of *Membership* has some of the same problems which attend community*:* does everyone understand their membership—or the group they perceive belonging to—the same way? Does everyone belong in the same way? Describing ephemera is difficult, as it requires insight into mental processes which cannot easily be gained without follow-up interviews and observation. When considering a group of individuals, it must be acknowledged that everyone brings different understandings of these concepts, the more so because we are dealing with frequently unexpressed, underlying ideologies. It is therefore impossible to draw conclusions about membership in the German-Canadian community, or to consider the community as an entity.

But, exactly as with community, it is precisely these variations which reveal meaning. And close analysis of language can reveal these mental processes—we can learn how speakers conceive of the groups to which they belong by examining the way they talk about it. Membership and belonging are therefore used throughout this analysis, recognizing and celebrating the fact that each individual's understanding of these terms probably does differ.

Space and Place

The *space/place* distinction will not be a primary focus of this analysis, but the difference is still important. In this thesis, I use the term *place* to refer to a tangible location, following Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013: 15). Places can have associated functions (i.e., library/study; restaurant/eat) that come to be related in the minds of users. Though these functions may vary (a server, for example, might associate *restaurant* more with *work* than with *eat*), the physicality of the place itself remains unchanged (both patron and staff will agree on the placement, appearance, and layout of the restaurant).

Space is different, again according to Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013). Space is an abstraction. There is no objective standard or collective agreement about a given space; indeed, everyone who conceives of it may do so with slight

variations. These differences even help to construct a space, as space is created through interaction. Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain write that space is constructed "through the practices habitually carried out in" it (16). Thus, when the server and customer interact (place orders, make enquiries, deliver food), they are constructing the space of the restaurant. And analysing the way they address each other, for example, or what customs and practices they observe as they interact, can reveal their perceptions of their shared space.

This is not a study of restaurant workers and patrons. It is of German-Canadians. But the principles are the same: by examining, closely, the speech and conversation of German-Canadians, we can learn how they conceive of their German-Canadian spaces and communities. As mentioned, the space/place distinction is foundational to Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain's work, and it is their model to which this thesis adheres.

V. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The third chapter will explain my methodology and elaborate the specific theoretical frameworks which inform my analysis. At this point, it is necessary only to point out that this is a qualitative study employing a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach. The actual CDA analysis is performed by combining two complementary frameworks: van Dijk's (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis, and Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural Discourse Analysis. Both take an ethnographic approach and focus on the practices of communication. They are rooted in interculturality. This study uses that perspective to understand how culture shapes communication practices.

Making meaning out of sociolinguistic variation is an approach now in its third conceptual incarnation. Eckert (2012: 87) outlines the three phases by thusly. The first phase, she says, focused on finding meaning between speech and broad categories of belonging: gender, age, class, ethnicity (see, among others, Labov 1966: 6, Trudgill 1974: 31). The second wave continued this trend, but refined it slightly by with the added consideration of social agency—viewing, for example, vernacular language as a positive feature and form of social currency (Cheshire 1982, Milroy 1980). The third and current wave of variation study argues that variation in language expresses not only some but *all* of a given community's concerns, constructing, not reflecting, social meaning (Eckert 2012). According to Eckert, speech variables no longer have one fixed meaning, but must be considered in context, as they arise. And it is variation itself that constructs meaning—it has come to be seen as the force for social change (94).

This latest wave is the background and provides the accepted premises for this thesis.

VI. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

With the above in mind, then, the following questions guide this thesis:

1. What specific linguistic tools do German-Canadian immigrants use to construct identity and position membership?
2. How does language enact identity and make categories of membership or belonging relevant?

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This research is presented in four chapters. Chapter One presents the study: the background, the problem, the significance. It defines some key terms and introduces frameworks to help situate the study within the larger body of research. It also sets out the research questions.

Chapter Two presents a review of the literature and expands some of the operational definitions. It considers the work of Cohen (1985) and his descriptions of boundary and community; it introduces *positioning theory* (Harré and van Langenhove 1991) and explains how *positioning* influences this analysis. In the literature review, researchers' work on membership (Sacks 1966) and culture (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013) are explained and supported with examples from my data.

Chapter Three outlines the methodology of this study: participant selection and data collection. It also describes the frameworks employed in analysis (van Dijk 1995 and Carbaugh 2007). The results of this analysis are presented in Chapter Four, including a step-by-step application of the governing frameworks evidenced by empirical examples. A bibliography and appendices (interview questions, transcription conventions) follow.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is "an inseparable part of our identity" (Pescher 2007: 193). The ways in which language shapes, both affects and effects, or demonstrates facets of identity have been examined in many different lights—a cursory search brings up papers exploring every imaginable relationship. Migration, language acquisition, nationalism, bilingualism: it seems every linguistic phenomenon can be related, in some way, to the discussion of identity.

The field is too broad to discuss in its entirety. This chapter aims rather to provide an overview of the most salient of studies and to explain how they influence and where they situate this analysis. The focus of this thesis is membership and belonging; the studies discussed below will relate accordingly. This thesis is a small addition to a long-established but ongoing discussion about the interaction of identity and language.

II. RECENT WORK

Recently, a study appeared which relates closely to this one. It is important to position this paper in relation to the work of Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013). Using the same dataset—91 interviews with German-Canadians in Waterloo and Edmonton—Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013) investigated the construction of identity and the creation of space, examining the role of language in these processes. They find that the ways participants conceive individually of their German, Canadian, and German-Canadian identities affect the perceptions of the group as a whole and the spaces the group creates (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 2). They propose a new framework for analysing the relationship between language and identity, one which can be applied to other instances of migration.

It is an important study, and the framework they propose is a good one. But the focus of their analysis is space—Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain examine the reciprocal interaction of linguistic and non-linguistic factors in the creation of a sociolinguistic space. My analysis will focus on the role of culture and community in the linguistic construction of identity. The ideas of community and membership will feature prominently, the goal being an elaborated and different understanding of German-Canadianness and belonging.

Community includes variation—that is, as we have already seen, one of the potential problems with the term. But this is a study focused on variation. We will see differences between cities, between interviews, between participants, between generations. We will even see differences and contradictions from a single person in the course of one conversation. Rather than view this as a failing, however, I have chosen to embrace the variation, realize the contradictions that compose community are some of the same which compose *identity*, and use them to help more fully understand.

Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013) expressly reject the concept of community in their analysis, favouring the idea of space. That was one approach to the data. This is another. I believe there is value in re-introducing a cultural- and community-based approach to the linguistic analysis of identity construction, and the ways I define and delineate community are explained below.

III. COMMUNITIES

Symbolic Community and Communities of Meaning

Community will be, in accordance with Cohen (1985: 12), understood as a relation. Members of a community share some commonality—are like other group members in some fashion—and are also, as a group, different from those outside the community. Some communities are physical, with defined and visible boundaries. Some communities are intangible but ratified by external forces (such as the courts, for example). Other communities are abstract—bounded by invisible religious or racial or linguistic forces. It is this latter category, an invisible but inviolable boundary, a community of cultural identity with which this thesis is concerned.

The *symbolic community* is one that may be recognized by others outside the community, by members within the community, and/or it may mean very different things to all concerned (Cohen 1985: 13). It is observation of boundaries which creates the community. And these boundaries "are themselves largely constituted by people in interaction" (Cohen 1985: 13). Cohen's assertion that communities are better described from within, from the perspective of its members, informs this analysis.

The German-Canadian immigrant community is vast, imperfectly delineated, and widely varied. Participants for this study were recruited as self-identified German-Canadians or descendant therefrom. Attempts to classify this community from *without* would be fruitless. In order to understand the boundaries this group draws around itself, its commonalities, its shared symbols,

and its unifying features, the interaction of its members needs to be examined from *within*.

Boundaries

Cohen writes that communities become most clearly defined at their boundaries. Speaking, as I am, of cultural communities, Cohen (1985) suggests that "people become most sensitive to their own culture when they encounter others'" (70). This analysis focuses on sites of cultural interaction: explicit and implicit mention of culture, identity, belonging, and community. It focuses on a minority culture existing and interacting within a dominant group. The boundaries in my study are ever-changing and dependant largely upon the individual: to study identity construction is to study a specific moment at a precise time. Identity is a moment-to-moment construction and has, at that given time, its own definitions and relevances to the person acting the identity. An individual makes something relevant or reveals something in discourse, an aspect of self or group belonging that can be changed, contradicted, or amended moments later. This is why the boundaries of this study are shifting. Participants define themselves against other things. Sometimes the line between cultures is German/Canadian. Sometimes it is German/not-German. Sometimes it is Canadian/not-Canadian.

The Individual within the Community

The role of the individual within the collective will be based in Cohen's (1996) exploration of "the association that individuals make between themselves and the nation" (802). He investigates nationalism—a large and generic, general entity; and the individual—a small and highly specific entity. He argues that individuals "construe" group membership in highly personalized, individual ways (803). Membership in an "ethnic, kinship, or descent" group is a collective which denies individual agency and difference (803). Cohen suggests that the "nation" is "one of the resources on which individuals draw to formulate their sense of selfhood" (803). His argument is that identity cannot be "determined by or derived from" membership in the nation—or "from any other collective," but rather is highly personal (803). The nation, according to him, figures in the personal construction of identity, not the other way around.

This will ground my analysis. Cohen (1996) advances the idea that individuals position themselves as members—even of the same group—in individual ways. These ways can seem discordant or incongruous. But it is precisely these incongruent and unique methods of linguistic positioning with which this thesis is concerned.

It is through the large symbols of nationalism (history, literature, folklore, tradition, language, music, landscapes, and foods: Cohen [1996: 805]) that individuals personalize and attach to as their culture. Not each of these categories was mentioned in each of the interviews upon which my analysis is based (or some categories, indeed, ever at all), but others (such as food and tradition) featured prominently, either asked after deliberately or inevitably raised. It is important to remember that, though differing in the means, an expression of membership will be an individual expression; that the ways an individual understands the group (be it the city, club, society, linguistic community, or nation) will be unique to him or her. But these individual expressions do not negate, undermine, nor eliminate the group; rather, they comprise it.

Sociolinguistic Space

Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013) study the enactment of identity and the creation of space among German-Canadians. Similar to Cohen (1996), Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain use an abstraction of community, an idea they call *sociolinguistic space*. In so doing, they move the discussion of identity and belonging away from the traditional sites of analysis and categories of belonging earlier researchers identified—sites like *speech communities* or *communities of practice* (c.f, among others, Gumperz 1968: 66, Chomsky 1965: 3, and Labov 1972: 248)—and refocus the analysis on the interactants and their interactions.

Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013) define place as a physical, tangible location and space as a more ephemeral but nevertheless defined "location[-] of human practice" (2013: 16). "The bottom-up process of interaction between the human beings who occupy [a space] and make reference to it" is the construction of sociolinguistic space, and describes the speech events with which this thesis is also concerned (2013: 16). Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain aim, through their book, to uncover how members of the German-Canadian community define the Germanness of their German-Canadian space. As already discussed, this thesis will focus more on how the members' cultural ideologies influence belonging and descriptions of membership. Culture and community, as explained by Cohen above, will aid in this examination of the specific linguistic tools group members employ as they do.

IV. IDENTITY ENACTED THROUGH LANGUAGE

Understanding identity as a discursive action has become the dominant approach in sociolinguistics and related fields. According to Harré and van Langenhove (1991: 405), conversation is the generator of the social world. Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 607) assert that identity is not the accidental by-product

of conversation, but rather the direct result thereof. Clark (2009: 16) discusses speakers' investment with the ideologies of the language and its culture and the ways these are made visible in conversation. Identity is a social and cultural event, not an internal process, the result of which is displayed through interaction, and therefore conversation—even guided conversation, such as in my study—are viable, important places for the study of identity enactment.

Positioning

Positioning describes the activities that interlocutors employ to demonstrate specific characteristics or social categories (Wolf 1999). Positioning is how social relations during discussions are established. It can be explicit, can be a description of past situations, can revolve around personal experiences, or can even be other-centred narration (Wolf 1999: 73). Positioning can also be implicit, in which case repeated mentions or references might be expected.

Positioning is the construction of identity—the making of relevance and meaning in a social act (conversation). It is speakers situating themselves relative to something or someone else. It is categories and belonging made clear. It is highlights or obfuscations of identity. It is a way of finding meaning. Sometimes positioning is active—a speaker can position him-/herself in conversation; sometimes it is passive—a speaker can be positioned by others in conversation. However it is done, positioning involves locating a self in conversation (Harré and van Langenhove 1991).

Harré and van Langenhove (1991) outline several types of positioning, to be elaborated and explained below. The examples which illustrate their concepts are taken from my own dataset—although there are many other analyses (including their own) with which I could have demonstrated their ideas, I chose to use my own data for several reasons[4]. First, I wanted to introduce participants from whom longer samples are analysed later in the thesis. Using the same recordings also provides a sense of the type of interview, conversation, and speech to be analysed later. It provides a bit of flavour. And it demonstrates that Harré and van Langenhove's principles can apply equally well to German as to English. Positioning happens every day in conversations, in texts, in interactions of all kinds. These interviews are no exception and, therefore, were chosen to illustrate these phenomena.

First-order positioning is the first type we will examine. First-order positioning implies a value judgement, authority assumed and accepted, such as when an instruction is given and complied with. In the following excerpt, the participant

[4] It follows that the analysis of these examples is also my own.

Ron positions himself, is re-positioned by the interviewer, and accepts her authority.

Excerpt 2.1: First-order positioning

1 Ron:	but it was part of the austria hungarian empire at the time
2	and (.) my grandmother on my father's side was born in
3	dinkesbühl?
4 IntE:	mmhmm
5 Ron:	i think
6 IntE:	yeah
7 Ron:	which is in (.) northern bavaria?
8 IntE:	probably
9 Ron:	i think
10 IntE:	yeah (.) oh yeah you're (.) bavarian (.) not german
11 Ron:	yeah
12 IntE:	bavarian ((laughs))
13 Ron:	baVArian ((whispers))
14 IntE:	yeah

Ron positions himself as German by virtue of his paternal grandmother's birth in a Bavarian town. Bavaria, a province of Germany, is cited in evidence of Ron's German heritage. But then the interviewer positions Ron as "not German" by saying he is, instead, "Bavarian." Ron accepts IntE's authority in this positioning explicitly by agreeing ("yeah"), and implicitly by repeating the interviewer's label ("Bavarian"). As he does these things, Ron adopts IntE's positioning and positions himself, this time, as Bavarian.

If the command is not obliged, if authority is assumed by one participant but rejected by another, second-order positioning occurs. The following is an abstract example of second-order positioning—the participant speaks of being labeled a "displaced person" by the Canadian government. "Displaced Persons" were abbreviated "DPs" and the term, almost universally, was pejorative. Meant to distinguish and identify, and not positively. By labelling her a DP, the authorities positioned Viola as immigrant and, with that, as a less important, less worthy individual. She talks about how she reclaimed the title in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 2.2: Second-order positioning

1 Viola:	when we arrived we were called DISplaced persons
2 IntE:	mm
3 Viola:	and it was a label that we carried throughOUT school
4 IntE:	mm hm
5 Viola:	for EVERY form or anything (.) had your name on it with

6 the title d p [behind] it (.)
7 IntE: [mm hmm] (.)
8 Viola: i now translate that as damn proud and damn privileged

The DP label was intended to position as different, as marked, as lesser. Viola rejects this positioning and reclaims the term, imbues it with her own meaning, and makes it into a label of pride and privilege—something she is proud to be. She flouts the authority that would position her as lower-status.

The 91 recorded interviews which are the conversational basis for this study contain countless instances of positioning—For my analysis, however, several particular aspects of positioning were most relevant. Intentional positioning is the first. This occurs frequently in interviews, as participants discuss aspects of their identities:

Excerpt 2.3: Intentional positioning
1 Sabine: weil wir sind (.) u:m (.) deutsch
because we are (.) u:m (.) german

The subject makes an explicit statement of identity by saying we (her family) are German. She includes herself in this group, positioning herself and her family as German. It is a clear and unequivocal statement of nationality, identity, and ethnicity.

Intentional positioning, according to Harré and van Langenhove (1991), often indicates a goal, evidences a desire to be seen in a certain light. It carries a certain amount of inherent performance—a deliberate decision and wish to present in a certain light. By applying Sacks' (1966) MCD and Carbaugh's (2007) CuDA to passages of positioning, we can see how participants make categories of membership relevant in less obvious ways.

The second most important type of positioning in this analysis is *collective positioning* (Harré and van Langenhove (1991). This describes the position taken by a group. Though my interviews consist mostly of one-on-one interactions, once a participant has established himself as a member of a given group, positioning of the group can happen, as in the following:

Excerpt 2.4: Collective positioning by inclusion
1 Viola: i am more german than the germans

Several kinds of positioning are happening in this excerpt. It appears, at first glance, that Viola is positioning herself as German. Her statement is preceded by discussion of German jokes, music, culture, and communication. And then the

first four words she uses: "*i am more german*" appear to be an unequivocal statement of Germanness—intentional positioning.

By direct statement, supported with citations of her proficiency in German culture, Viola attempts to position herself as German. By declaring herself "German," she superficially positions herself as a member of the German community. Upon closer examination, however, Viola actually distances herself from the German community. *"I am more German than the Germans,"* she says. With this statement, she positions herself as apart from "the Germans." She makes "the Germans" a second group, one of which she is not a part. What that makes Viola, to what group she then belongs, is neither apparent nor important at this moment. In Viola's statement, there are two groups: Viola, who is by implication, the most German, and "the Germans," who are less German than she. She creates a group, "the Germans" and collectively positions them as a group "less German."

Viola collectively positions "the Germans" in the previous example, and she positions herself apart. One can also position oneself as a member of a group. In analysing these instances, the researcher must consider individual differences. People differ not only in their abilities to position, but also in their respective willingness to perform the necessary positioning, as well as in the power they have to effect their desired positioning (Harré and van Langenhove 1991). Not all participants use the same means to establish membership, even though they may be speaking about belonging to the same group. In the following excerpt, the participant indicates she and her siblings, all born in Germany but living in Canada from a young age, became Canadian.

Excerpt 2.5: Collective positioning by implication

1 Sabine:	u:m (..) so: no (.) we assimilated
2 IntW:	yeah [yeah
3 Sabine:	[we assimilated we (.) we kept the (.) the language at
4	home
5 IntW:	mmhmm
6 Sabine:	and we were taught german at home until we went to
7	school (.)
8 IntW:	yeah
9 Sabine:	but (.) with my parents as we grew older (.) we became
10	teenagers (.) then young adults (..) the (.) german was
11	really left behind

Sabine collectively positions herself and her siblings as Canadian. She does this with terminology like "assimilated" and "left behind" and with repetition. She states explicitly that German became less and less important to her and her

siblings as they grew. She implies that English, in contrast, became more important as German became less important. She pauses and hedges frequently, indicating an uncertainty in her word choices and/or a discomfort with the topic. Indirectly, she downplays the importance of German in her life and implies a membership and belonging with Canada.

Sabine implies Canadianness by stating that she "assimilated," by downplaying the role German played in her upbringing, and by emphasizing the lack of Germanness in her adult life. She speaks of "leaving behind" her German language skills, implying the culture was "left" with the language. Sabine positions herself as part of a Canadian group by positioning herself as not-German.

Contrast Sabine with the following participant, who positions herself as unequivocally Canadian.

Excerpt 2.6: Collective positioning by declaration

1 Uta: most of the people are like me (.) they're first generation
2 canadians

Or Norbert, who clearly states that he is not German, both by virtue of the cities he's lived in and his ancestry. This final example is of several kinds of simultaneous positioning, both accepted and rejected.

Excerpt 2.7: Positioning accepted and rejected

1 Norbert: (.) like I'M not a german i'm (1.0) i lived in (.) twelve years
2 in hungary (.)
3 IntE: mm hmm
4 Norbert: and ten years in vienna
((lines omitted))
5 Veronika: but you're a GERMAN WA::Y back (.) my dear (.)
6 Norbert: no i was (.) seven hundred years ago (.) they came from
7 bavaria into [hungary
8 IntE: [that's still a german ((laughs))
9 Veronika: ((laughs)) you have a
10 german name (.) you're all german there

At the end of this excerpt, both the interviewer and Norbert's wife position him as German. IntE and Veronika believe Norbert is German because he has a German name and German ancestry. Veronika even calls him "all German." These are examples of *collective positioning,* as Norbert and his family are positioned as members of a wider German group. Norbert doesn't perceive of the same group. Hungary is, according to IntE, "still German" and Norbert's

name is “German.” Norbert resists this classification, protesting that he lived in Austria and Hungary and that his family has Bavarian roots, none of which is German to him.

This excerpt is also an example of *second-order positioning*, because Norbert rejects the authority presumed by both women. Norbert positions himself, from the outset, as not German. Immediately before this excerpt, Norbert has been talking about a local society of Germans from Russia, and he follows this by saying “I’M not a German.” The first word is loud, emphasized, intended to highlight the contrast between the Germans from Russia and himself—German from Russia and not German. He positions himself as not-German, explicitly, another example of *intentional positioning.*

These examples have been chosen to help explain the various types of positioning, as well as to demonstrate the highly individual ways in which participants position. In the next section, we will look at some of the specific linguistic tools by which they accomplish this positioning.

Positioning through Speech Acts

Speech acts are the variable ways by which, in conversation, speakers make roles, placement, and membership relevant or not relevant at different places and different times, with various speakers and changeable groups. Or, put differently, speech acts are the way by which “an individual emerges through the processes of social interaction not as […] a fixed end product” (Davis and Harré 1990: 46). Positioning is a process, an active discursive and recursive action through which interlocutors make categories of self less or more relevant. The speech acts are the actions of the processes.

Davis and Harré (1990) write that “extracting the autobiographical aspects of a conversation” is how the positions taken up by a speaker become apparent. When so identified, the following should be considered as key in positioning—and so it is in my analysis:

1. images and metaphors;
2. the forms of language a participant uses are assumed, by the participant, to be appropriate for the setting of interaction;
3. the setting each participant presumes may not be the same for every participant in the same situation;
4. positioning (positions) follow a non-linear (fragmented) trajectory;
5. the positions may be either firm and visible or shifting and ephemeral

van Dijk (1995) outlines eight features with which to analyse these positioning speech acts. His framework will be elaborated in the next chapter; it, specifically, is the one with which my analysis was performed. van Dijk’s approach, however,

echoes Davis and Harré's (1990) points above; his framework clarifies and elaborates the positions speakers take and provides a specific approach to analyse them. Davis and Harré's (1990) summary of speech acts is included as background because they did, indeed, inform my reading of the data.

V. MEMBERSHIP

Positioning describes how, in conversation, belonging and membership become relevant. To further explain the idea of *membership,* we turn to Sacks' Membership Categorization Device (1992 [1966]). In so doing, this thesis joins a long tradition of membership categorization analysis in sociolinguistic study (among others: Antaki and Widdicombe 1998, Baker 1997, Elgin and Hester 1999).

Sacks first introduced the theories that would become his Membership Categorization Device (MCD) in a series of lectures in the spring of 1966. According to Sacks, members of a group are identifiable by the actions they take and the ways they describe these actions. The researcher recognizes actions as demonstrations of relationships not evident. In conversation and in story-telling, a member describes his actions and the hearers interpret and extrapolate relationships, memberships, and belonging based on these actions. This thesis employs Sacks' instructions for "recognizing a description" when a member "does describing" (Sacks 1992 [1966]: 243).

For example: the following excerpt is taken from an interview with a woman born in Germany who emigrated at quite a young age with her family. By Vera's account, she soon "refused to speak German at home," though her parents continued to speak to her in German. Early in the interview, Vera talks about traditions:

Excerpt 2.8: Membership categorization

1 Vera: yeah (.) yeah (.) so traditions we have (..) well christmas is
2 big and easter is also very german (.) and uh: (2.0) let's
3 see (2.0) yeah i think we always mashed christmas (.) i was
4 happy because we did the twenty-fourth at our house and
5 then when i married a canadian we were free to do all the
6 right things on christmas morning

Using Sacks' framework, we can recognize several groups of belonging in the above. Vera describes two different groups of **we**. First, there is her birth family *we*: "**we** did the twenty-fourth at our house." The fact that by *our house* she means her parents' home is revealed in the second part of the sentence: "and then when I married a Canadian…." *And then* establishes a temporal relationship:

first—birth family **we**; later—married family **we**. The first group to which Vera describes belonging is her birth family. In this we can recognize Vera's membership and extrapolate from it possible roles such as granddaughter, daughter, niece, and sister.

Vera belongs to a first group of *family*, the one into which she was born, to which she still feels close. She refers to it as "our house." Her action of taking ownership in the house, *ours*, describes her as still invested/attached to the family that lives there: it can be inferred from this that members of her birth family are still alive and living in the house, which establishes a range of possible ongoing roles (i.e., groups) for Vera: daughter, sister, aunt.

Vera also belongs to a second group of *family,* her married family. The action of "marrying a Canadian" describes membership in this second group, and creates for Vera the role of wife. This is the last **we** in the excerpt: "**we** were free to do all the right things on Christmas morning[5]." This creates other possible memberships: daughter-in-law, sister-in-law, aunt, mother.

This is just one application of Sacks' MCD. His instructions for recognizing a described action and for extrapolating meaning and membership therefrom inform my analysis throughout. I also rely on his assessment of "category-bound activities" (Sacks 1992 [1966]: 248). Members perceive particular activities as those performed by members. While not performing these activities doesn't necessarily exclude people from a given group, performing them does automatically include them. This perspective is of particular importance to my analysis, as I look at ways participants describe their own actions and the actions of others.

The way people talk, the terms which refer to speakers and to others, and the roles people are cast in are the focus of MCD. Using this to identify intersecting circles of membership not only allows greater understanding of belonging and membership, it also helps to more clearly identify the groups of membership. Sacks' MCD will be further elaborated in the methodology chapter; now we turn to a discussion of culture.

VI. CULTURE

Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2013) illustrate the shortcomings of traditional sociolinguistic terms *speech community* and *community of practice* (14-15). They do so in defense of their conception of *space*, and the book is devoted to

[5] This phrase, "all the right things" is full of implications for Vera's perception of Germanness and Canadianness. Regrettably, it is not an analysis that belongs here.

explaining the ways in which language, identity, and migration combine to inform and to constitute the creation of an immigrant space.

Peripherally included in their analysis are the interactions of ideology and culture to this construction. They discuss the effects of *place of origin* with *place of living* among immigrant populations—that is, how the culture and customs of origin manifest in a new location. But they do so primarily with a focus on the effects on the group—the consequences of these practices on the new social space and the individuals' position within this space (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 17). My thesis accepts their analysis of immigrant space and uses it to ground a discussion about the role of culture in the construction of membership categories, belonging, and identity, with an increased emphasis on the individual. This thesis doesn't discredit or reject their theories; it simply proposes an alternative.

Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain argue, drawing on Harré and van Langenhove (1991), Buchholtz and Hall (2005), and Georgakopoulou (2007), that linguistic interaction and conversation form the basis of social interactions and that this creates a sociolinguistic space (17). This thesis will accept these premises, but will take the perspective that space, along with interaction, conversation, membership, category, and belonging, is one part of a complexity of factors that interact with ideologies and ethnicities to produce a culturally-influenced portrait of belonging. This thesis takes the work of previous scholars (including Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain) as background, uses it to inform the analysis, but approaches the material with a different focus. I focus on the role culture and culturally-influenced ideologies play in the construction of membership and belonging. Therefore, van Dijk's (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis and Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural Discourse Analysis (CuDA) are the most logical frameworks to apply to my research questions, and should produce different results to different questions, even when the same datasets are analysed.

VII. CONCLUSION

One could be forgiven for thinking that everything which could be examined with respect to language and identity has already been thought of. Language and belonging, however, are such broad categories and encompass so many aspects of identity that the existing work only enables further investigation—how does a given phenomenon, identified by one researcher in one community, work in a different situation? Does a new group evidence belonging in the same way as another group? Can the same linguistic tools be employed by different individuals for similar purposes? The combination of Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis and CuDA in this thesis proposes a new way of looking at an already-examined data set to answer different questions. It is a continuation of a

discussion which has already been taking place for a long while—and which will continue for the foreseeable future. This chapter provided a brief outline of some of the most relevant and most important existing research, hopefully to provide a background to this project and to demonstrate that there remains, still, work to be done. The next chapter will outline the methodology with which I undertake this work.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this study is to investigate the ways language enacts identity—to determine how participants make categories of belonging or membership relevant in conversation. I am specifically concerned with two communities of German-Canadians and examine, through a series of interviews, the ways in which individuals construct identity and position membership as a cultural and linguistic minority in Canada.

The methodology of this investigation will be explained in this chapter. There are three sections to the chapter: the first details instrumentation and data collection; the second describes the selection of participants; the third outlines the analytic frameworks employed in analysis.

II. INSTRUMENTATION & DATA COLLECTION

The raw data for this analysis were provided by Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain. Between 2008 and 2011, 91 interviews were conducted with self-identified members of the German-Canadian community in two urban Canadian centres (Waterloo, Ontario and Edmonton, Alberta). These interviews, recorded and transcribed, were generously made available for my study and analysis.

The interviews were conducted as semi-structured and open-ended. Though the interviewers had guideline questions (see appendix A), they were encouraged not to refer to lists and not to conduct a formal interview, but rather to subtly direct a quasi-organic conversation (for more on this method, see Merriam 1988 and Sowell & Casey 1982).

The interviewers were two female PhD students, native speakers of German, fluent in both German and English. The Waterloo interviews were all conducted by the same interviewer (referred to in the transcriptions as "IntW"); the Edmonton interviews also by a single researcher ("IntE"). There are notable differences in the styles of each woman: IntW, for example, directs the interview language much more than IntE, posing questions and speaking more frequently in German. IntE responds to the cues of her participants more. One result of this is that language is used and mixed differently in the two cities than it might have been if the same interviewer had conducted all the interviews. I do not believe this is a failing of the data, however, but see it rather as an opportunity to

explore even more language use and language mix possibilities. This interview-style difference will be little explored in my analysis, however, as neither code-switching nor the English/German distinction factors prominently in my research.

The interviews were conducted in English, German, or a mixture of both. The participants were generally free to choose their preferred language (with the caveats noted above). Interviews began as the participants completed a questionnaire with information about biographical details (year of immigration, education, and employment), frequency of contact with German (reading German materials, consuming German media), and frequency of visit to German-speaking countries. From there, the interviews began. Interviews were conducted in public places (usually coffee shops or restaurants), recorded, and subsequently transcribed.

III. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Participants were individuals in the Edmonton and Waterloo areas who self-identified as "German," "German-speaking," or "German descendant." Most of the 53 interviewees from Waterloo responded to an article in a local paper which described Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain's research project about language use and identity, seeking participation from "German-speaking immigrants and their direct descendants" (Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher 2011: 319). Similar advertisements in Edmonton elicited few respondents, and the 38 participants there were recruited using the friend-of-a-friend method (for more on this, see Milroy 1980).

Participants discuss wide ranges of Germanness. Some are immigrants newly arrived from Germany. Others are third-generation Canadians—born in Canada to Canadian-born parents, whose grandparents had immigrated from Europe. Participants range in age from 18 to 89. Interviews were conducted either one-on-one (one interviewer, one interviewee) or one-on-two (one interviewer and two interviewees—a couple, for example, or a parent and adult child).

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

This is a quantitative study using the interdisciplinary approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Relevant passages for analysis were located by using Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) Membership Categorization Device (MCD). Analysis was performed by combining the frameworks of van Dijk's (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis and Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural

Discourse Analysis (CuDA). Following an overview of the sociolinguistic field, each approach is elaborated on below.

These approaches were chosen specifically because they privilege aspects of community and ideology. Both frameworks make culture an integral part of understanding how communication happens and how identity is acted. They combine and strengthen, each the other, our understanding of culture in discourse. They provide specific analytic tools to unpack and examine how culture influences the discursive construction of identity.

van Dijk's framework (1995) helps uncover how ideology is revealed in conversation. I am most interested in exploring the impact of community and the role of culture in the linguistic enactment of identity. Community brings with it notions of culture and built environment. Ideologies, often latent and unarticulated, inform these constructions and representations of community.

If van Dijk introduces the ideological focus of this framework, Carbaugh (2007) fleshes out the cultural component. Carbaugh's CuDA is an ethnographic approach to discourse analysis. It focuses on the ways culture emerges in communicative practices. Together, the two frameworks work at both the basic syntactical level of language and the broader meaning-making level to provide a full picture of identity construction.

Community is not *the correct way* to approach the linguistic construction of identity. It is *another* way. This analysis provides a way of considering identity as an inextricably cultural and ideological construction. An analysis of *space,* such as the one performed by Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013), affords broad understanding of identity in construction, one that permits radiants of meaning along many different levels. It does not fundamentally include elements of culture in its analysis. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2013) focus on how participants "define the 'Germanness' that binds them together" (19). Rather than look at the creation of a category of meaning, however, this study will focus on cultural and ethnic ideologies that underlie Germanness. This thesis is primarily concerned with the influence of culture on the creation of membership categories, belonging, and group identity—and the ways language evidences these ideologies. The framework employed by Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2013) was best suited to answer the research questions they define; this thesis focuses more on the influence and role of culture and will therefore employ a different framework better suited to answer these types of questions.

Third Wave Variationist Studies

Variation is an essential, not incidental, feature of language use. Variation in speech serves many roles—it can distinguish membership or can distinguish

among members; it can express opinions, perspectives, or attitudes. Taken together, a group's linguistic variations form a web of intersecting, ideologically-related meanings (Eckert 2013: 94). The particular variation expressed by a group forms a combination specific to that group—a linguistic fingerprint created by the very fact of speakers' memberships.

This thesis appears within the third wave of variationist studies, as identified by Eckert (2012). Eckert posits that variation in speech expresses changeable individual and communal features of membership and belonging—that speakers "place themselves in the social landscape" (94). Where the first two waves of variationist studies took a more essentialist approach to language and identity, current variationist studies focus on the concept of agency. Speakers are considered "stylistic agents" who "tailor linguistic styles in […] projects of self-construction" (97-98).

In accordance with Eckert, I also take the view that participants in this study actively shape and construct images of self throughout the conversations. Ideologies are, to use Eckert's words, "located […] in language itself" (98).

Membership Categorization Device

To identify passages for analysis in the more than 100 hours of recorded data, I employed the 1974 study by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson from which arose the Membership Categorization Device (MCD).

Sacks et. al.'s study proposes an apparatus to identify the way in which activities performed by members of a group "are done, and done recognizably" (218). This system provides a way of identifying and understanding "any collection of membership categories" (218)—ways of drawing common lines around individuals who "go together" (219). The researcher is then able to identify broad categories of belonging, or group membership in the data.

According to the rules Sacks et. al. outline, a *single reference* to any category within the membership collection is sufficient for that individual's membership to be inferred[6]; i.e., the speaker can but is not required to make continual or multiple references to the group (219). Once a speaker expresses a single instance of belonging, it is assumed that s/he belongs to the group and analysis can proceed.

Secondly, once the speaker has established membership in one collection, membership in "group 1" can be used to further classify members of a second

[6] "The Economy Rule"

collection ("group 2") [7]; i.e., members of a second collection can be categorized in relation to the first (219). Membership in the first group can be used to make meaning in and out of other groups.

Membership is confirmed largely through "category-bound activities" (222). That is, individuals' actions establish group membership by examining whether other members of the group perform the same activities. These activities also establish group norms, as well as order, consequence, and correctness of behaviour (226).

Sacks et. al.'s MCD helps to isolate references to belonging, membership, and/or exclusion in my data. As mentioned earlier, language ideologies often need to be "teased out." While some participants in my study do make explicit reference to belonging or identity, many (often the more interesting, more revealing references) are implicit. Sacks et. al.'s MCD aids in identifying these references and elaborating them, pulling them apart to investigate which boundaries are drawn and how membership is asserted. As much of my data involves people not known to each other but from similar circumstances, finding commonalities in actions or similar references to activities allows me to establish group membership. We are also able to identify categories of belonging by finding similar references in various interviews, as per the consistency rule (225).

Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis

As early as 1995, van Dijk was arguing that ideologies are expressed *in* and *through* talk. Though concerned primarily with the discourse of media, van Dijk demonstrates that discourse is a "preferential site for the explicit, verbal formulation and the persuasive communication of ideological propositions" (17).

The interaction of society, discourse, and social cognition forms the framework of van Dijk's approach. He writes that ideologies are the frameworks which organize group connections; ideologies are the "interface" between cognitive representation and the underlying structures thereof (18). According to van Dijk, "members of a specific group, society, or culture" share a "sociocultural knowledge" as well as a "system of mental representations" (18). Ideologies organize perspective and, similarly to the approach of Sacks et. al., inform the "actions that define membership" (19).

Van Dijk's framework acknowledges the reciprocal and simultaneous influence between the twin roles of *individual* and *group member* that exist in an individual. According to van Dijk's framework, analysis must focus first on those segments of discourse which "express or signal the opinions, perspective,

[7] "The Consistency Rule"

position, interests or other properties of groups" (22). These are, he notes, often signalled by an "*us* versus *them,*" manner, a positive versus a negative (22).

"Surface structures" of talk—or the words and sentences—are the manifestation of underlying ideologies (23). In and of themselves, these structures lack meaning. Rather, they convey—through linguistic features such as intonation, stress, volume, syntax and agency, lexicon, local and global semantics, schematic structures, rhetoric, and pragmatics—other "hidden" meanings. "After all," van Dijk writes, "ideologies seldom express themselves directly in text and talk" (33).

It is precisely these indirect, hidden ideologies with which my study is concerned. A close analysis of speech identifies meaning behind the structures. By looking especially at lexicon, semantic strategies, surface structures, and rhetoric, we are able to identify instances of belonging and membership.

His discussion of groups also helps us find categories of meaning and membership among the participants. Defining a group as a collection of individuals possessed of shared knowledge and shared perspective—perspective we are able to identify by analysing the linguistic characteristics outlined above—enables us to pinpoint the collective and individual identities being enacted in conversation.

Cultural Discourse Analysis

If ideology is the first consideration of my analysis, interculturality is the second. Interviews took place in Canada, in both English and German. As such, the passages need to be analysed considering the context within which they arose: an intercultural one. Here, Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Analysis (2007), a framework which focuses on "actual practices of communication" in intercultural encounters is applied (167).

CuDA combines an anthropological approach with the ethnography of communication. The result are five investigative modes designed to answer the central question: "how is communication shaped as a cultural practice?" (168). CuDA investigates the "significance" and "meaning" of communication (168). It echoes the above approaches insofar as it asserts that "communication presumes and constitutes social realities" (168).

Carbaugh's framework has five modes of inquiry. The first, the Theoretical Mode, identifies the conceptual problem of the researcher's study. The second mode, the Descriptive Mode, describes what "actually happened" as a result of the communication in question (171). This mode isolates a series of examples from the researcher's data for analysis. The third mode, the Interpretive Mode,

investigates the significance of the thus-identified phenomenon to each of the participants (172).

The fourth mode is the Comparative Mode, and the one which contrasts the communication practices in question with norms of other cultural discourses (175). The final mode, the Critical Mode, draws wider responsibility into the research, and asks whether a given discourse pattern unfairly privileges some people at the expense of others (175).

To complete this, Carbaugh elucidates "hubs of cultural meaning" (175). Each of these so-called hubs form part of the CuDA structure—they are intersecting and complementary ways of "render[ing] an enriched reading" of the data (174). They permit greater understanding along the radiants of personhood and identity, relating and relationships, acting and action, feeling and emotion, place, dwelling, and environment.

What CuDA adds to my analysis is the understanding, essential to this study, of "how culture is an integral part and a product of discourse systems" (169). My central research question is essentially the same as one Carbaugh suggests CuDA is ideally suited to answer: "what is getting done when people communicate in this way?" (169). The first three modes of inquiry he identifies (Theoretical, Descriptive, and Interpretive) will be used in concert with Sacks et. al.'s MCD and van Dijk's ideology analysis. I use all three systems to isolate passages for analysis and then apply Carbaugh's interpretive questions ("What is the significance and importance of this [passage] to participants?" and "What meanings does this practice hold?" [173]). Carbaugh's fourth mode of inquiry is especially useful to me, as contrast is examined not only between the two primary cultures in question (German, Canadian), but also among the many other, smaller cultures made relevant by the participants in this study.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter outlined the methodology of this study: participants, data collection, and analysis. It solidified the primary questions of this study. It explained the manner in which participants were selected. It presented and justified the manner of data collection by citing several studies which affirm the benefits of open-ended interviews. This chapter situated my study in the third wave of variationist studies. It also presented the complementary frameworks (CuDA, ideology analysis) which informed my analysis. It explained the theories (MCD, CuDA) I applied to identify relevant sections of data. And it justified their application by reframing the discussion from merely discourse analysis to a broader ideological and cultural analysis. Results of this analysis are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyses the ways in which the German-Canadian participants of this study enact identity. I first present the results of an application of van Dijk's (1995) Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis, discussing each of the eight phenomena (surface structures, syntax, lexicon, local semantics, global semantics, schematic structures, rhetoric, and pragmatics) individually with supporting examples. Then I analyse these passages for meaning by applying Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural Discourse Analysis and the five radiants of meaning (personhood and identity; relating and relationships; acting and action; feeling or emotion; dwelling, place, and environment). This chapter presents the results and analysis of this thesis' research questions: it identifies the linguistic phenomena at work, the tools which participants use to indicate membership or belonging, and the ways in which identity is made relevant.

A note about the examples: this dataset contains 91 separate interviews. There are thousands and thousands of transcribed pages and roughly 100 hours of recorded data. These interviews, as noted previously, are most often conversations, with both the interviewer and interviewee asking and answering questions, negotiating shifting identities, and advancing agendas both hidden and overt. In a document of this length, including and analysing every instance of identity enactment would be impossible.

In performing my analysis, each and every one of the interviews was examined at least once. Some interviews naturally contained more references to Germanness, to communities, to membership. But all evidence the phenomena we are about to examine. Repeatedly. Sometimes the interview would need to be considered as a whole in order to illustrate a given radiant of meaning. Sometimes excerpting a salient example would require several pages of transcription. While each of these interviews is an act of identity in itself and contains multiple instances of identity enactment within, I was forced to select only a few participants and excerpts to present here. I have therefore striven to include a wide range of participants—men and women, young and old, German- and English-speaking, first- and third-generation immigrants—each with widely varying levels of German contact and Canadian integration. The voices below are intended to represent and to include the others rendered sadly invisible by space limitations, and not to obfuscate or to silence them.

II. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS IDEOLOGY ANALYSIS

Ideologies are revealed through discourse. But more than passive revelation, discourse also actively constructs, persuades, and confirms ideology (van Dijk 1995: 22). van Dijk identifies eight properties of discourse which "express, establish, confirm or emphasize a self-interested group opinion, perspective or position" as sites for ideological examination (1995: 23). These eight structures (surface structures, syntax, lexicon, local semantics, global semantics, schematic structures, rhetoric, and pragmatics) are explored individually below.

Surface Structures

Surface structures refer to the "realization" of abstract elements of discourse (van Dijk 1995: 23). Surface structures manifest the *meaning* of speech or text. They seldom have explicit or inherent meanings of their own; rather, speakers imply or convey meaning beyond the syntactic level through surface structures (23). Tone, for example, is a surface structure: it can convey politeness, impoliteness, humour, irony. Pronunciation, exaggerated or slurred, can convey information about intent. Capital letters in a text can be emphasis. Gesture and facial expression can "signal interpersonal and social relations" (24). Surface structures express various meanings and functions; the one commonality is that they "must be out of the ordinary and violate communicative rules or principles" in order to signal hidden meanings (23). It is through these violations that a special meaning is signalled and becomes relevant for ideological analysis, as these deviations from normal interactional rules may belie the similarly deviant ideologies which create them.

van Dijk identifies six different surface structures. Of these, I have chosen to discuss pauses, laughter, and volume. These features were chosen for their frequent appearance in the data, their multiple interpretations, and most importantly for their relation to the research questions. The other three surface structures are not included. Graphic emphasis was precluded because this is a strictly auditory study and images are not part of the dataset. Non-verbal communication was regrettably not possible because the interviews involved audio recordings only and information on gesture, proximity, and facial expression was not available (see the section on Opportunities for Further Research for more on this limitation). Finally, neither sociolects nor dialects were analysed as surface structures, as they appeared far too infrequently to be considered a reliable variable.

Pauses

Pauses serve a variety of conversational purposes that vary from language to language and culture to culture (for a discussion about pauses in conversation and narration see, among others, Kjellmer 2003: 171; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 67; Rühlemann, Bagoutdinov, & O'Donnell 2011: 200). Pauses can mark discomfort or hesitation. They can be used for emphasis. They can indicate uncertainty and be used as an implicit request for elaboration. Pauses can also indicate thought. In the following example, the participant pauses while she contemplates her answer.

Excerpt 4.1: Pause indicating mental calculation

1 Orla:	ersten jahre wir sind ja ah ah: : : : : (4.0) im November
	first years we came yes um um: : : : : (4.0) in November
2	sechsundachtzig nach schweden
	sixty-eight to Sweden

In these interviews as elsewhere, pauses also frequently precede instances of code-switching. Code-switching (moving from one language to another within a single conversation) and pauses could be an entire study in itself. Believing this to have been extensively and thoroughly examined already (see, among others, Auer 2005: 404; Hlavac 2011: 3796; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 112), this thesis focuses little on it. But code-switching and the way it manifests identity cannot be entirely excluded from the discussion.

A code-switch often indexes Germanness or Canadianness: the speaker, consciously or not, chooses a word in another language which better expresses or more clearly represents the community to which he feels, at that moment, most aligned. Or to which he wants to signal alliance. Or he chooses a word which *feels* more appropriate in that situation (see Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 93 for more on this). It is clear only that the code-switch signals a change: whether the code-switch is the *result* of this shift or the *cause* of it is unclear. Perhaps it is both at once.

A code-switch can be preceded by a pause. This pause can indicate a "word search," where the participant mentally looks for the term (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 94). It could foreshadow the change, could draw and focus the listener's attention, could evidence the speaker's mental processes (see Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013 for more on all these). Whatever its role, a pause during code switching marks the transition as significant.

The following excerpt features a Canadian-born participant who grew up speaking mostly English. Her parents, however, came from Germany and she herself attended German Saturday school. At this point in the (mostly-English)

interview, Uta is asked whether her family observed any German traditions when she was growing up.

Excerpt 4.2: Pause before code-switch

1	Uta:	and then we'd have our (.) weihnachtsabend [or whatever]
2	IntE:	[yeah]
3	Uta:	together (.) so uh (.) yeah (.) so that that one they did and
4		i'm trying to think if there were any other (.) things that
5		are german traditions otherwise (.) oh (.) um (1.0) saint
6		niklaustag (.) we had our shoes put out

Uta switches to German to describe the German holidays she celebrated with her family. English words exist for each of the occasions she references *(Christmas Eve* and *Saint Nicholas Day*, respectively) but she uses the German expressions. And she precedes the term, each time, with a pause. The German words are set off from the rest of Uta's speech. *Weihnachtsabend* is doubly marked—preceded by a pause and followed by "or whatever." She sets the word apart. It is not part of a fluid statement; rather it stands alone, tied loosely to the preceding sentence but broken from it after. *Saint Niklaustag* also represents a break in Uta's speech—it is preceded with two hesitation markers ("oh," "um") and several pauses, and then followed by another pause and the start, not the resumption, of a new sentence. These pauses and markers suggest Uta's code-switch is not the result of a word search—she doesn't insert a German word into an English sentence. More likely, the pauses are to mark the transition as significant. Uta chooses the words which feel most appropriate to describe the traditions; as such, the German words are a conscious expression of the culture and community that surround and attend these traditions. The German words are a marked statement of belonging.

The lack of pause can be equally significant. No pause where a pause would be otherwise expected, in the normal course of conversational turn-taking, can be an instance of positioning. Overlap or interruption can indicate enthusiastic uptake or rejection of a suggestion, idea, implication, or insinuation. In the following excerpt, for example, the participant is anxious to express her agreement of IntW's positioning.

Excerpt 4.3: Significant lack of pause

1	IntW:	die großeltern haben englisch mit ihnen geredet (.) ja?
		the grandparents spoke english with you right?
2	Orla:	ausschließlich englisch ja
		exclusively english yes
3	IntW:	die haben nur untereinander dann diesen dialekt
		then they only spoke their dialect between

4 ge[sprochen?
th[emselves?
5 Orla: [JA ja und mit meinem vater auch
[YES yes and with my father as well

Orla positions herself as a non-dialect speaker. Orla doesn't let the interviewer finish her question—she interrupts to assert that her grandparents did not speak in dialect with her. She interrupts IntW to agree loudly and repeatedly ("JA ja") that her grandparents only spoke their dialect with each other. In fact, she agrees emphatically with this statement even though it is untrue. Right after Orla agrees that her grandparents only spoke their dialect with each other, she has to add that they also spoke in dialect with her father. The immediacy of the acceptance—interrupting to express agreement—as well as the repetition, increased volume, and the later amendment indicate a definitiveness and an anxiety to not belong with this group. Orla's strategies are an instance of positioning herself as a non-dialect speaker. She does not express a belonging with her grandparents and father (the dialect speakers). Where a pause would have indicated hesitation or at least consideration, Orla is anxious that she not be positioned as part of this group.

Volume

Volume can be used to emphasize, to express strong agreement or disagreement, to highlight a feature of speech (van Dijk 1995: 23). We saw an example in the above excerpt, when Orla interrupted the interviewer with raised voice. In the following, Orla again uses volume to stress the importance of her point.

Excerpt 4.4: Volume to express emphasis

1 IntW: hat ihr vater hat sie mal besucht als sie in deutschland
did your father did ever visit you when you were in
2 waren?
germany?
3 Orla: NEin
No
4 IntW: nie
never
5 Orla: NEIN
NO

The superficial meaning of her statement is that her father did not return to Germany. But the volume and repetition she employs to do so reveal the underlying ideology behind her words. Volume and repetition reveal how important these statements are. Orla highlights how out-of-the-question her

father's return to Germany was. The emphasis makes her father's lack of return more than a simple statement of fact—she positions him as not-German. She is not merely saying her father failed to return to Germany; Orla is emphasizing that her father left Germany, his belonging, membership, and attachment to it behind.

Laughter

Laughter serves many conversational purposes (Houts-Smith 2006, Vettin & Todt 2004). It is not only, not even primarily, a marker of mirth. Laughter doesn't only attend jokes or humour. It can mitigate something harsh, express reservation or embarrassment, indicate understanding or sympathy. Laughter often marks a strange situation, something worthy of comment or notice.

This last function arises frequently with regards to expressions of belonging or group membership which appear, superficially at least, contradictory. The participant in the following is a German-born woman who emigrated at age 23. She grew up speaking German, conducts the interview in German, has family and friends in Germany whom she visits with relative frequency, but doesn't maintain many German customs.

Excerpt 4.5: Laughter to mark a statement

1 Jutta:	ja (2.0)
	yeah (2.0)
2 IntE:	aber (2.0)
	but (2.0)
3 Jutta:	aber ja (.) sagma nicht das jetzt alles so: (1.0) so so deutsch
	but yeah (.) it's not always still so: (1.0) i'm not so so
4	bin ich nicht mehr
	german anymore
5 IntE:	hahaha (.) nicht mehr
	hahaha (.) not anymore
6 Jutta:	ne ich habe auch jahre lang muß ich ehrlich sagen mit
	no for years now i have to say honestly i've had little
7	deutschen kaum kontakt gehabt
	contact with germans

The interviewer's laughter indicates she finds Jutta's statement ironic or unlikely. IntE repeats part of Jutta's statement ("not anymore"/*nicht mehr*) to highlight the fact that Jutta was, once, German, and the interviewer laughs. Since nothing is inherently funny in Jutta's statement, IntE must be commenting on another aspect of speech. Perhaps IntE feels embarrassed at having made strong statements of German identity to someone who doesn't share them. Perhaps IntE is trying to mitigate a strong statement of identity. Or perhaps IntE sees

Jutta's statement as ironic—a statement of non-German identity uttered in German.

In any event, Jutta doesn't join in the laughter; she doesn't share whatever emotion or perspective has prompted the interviewer to laugh. Jutta is earnest in her statement of identity and she further entrenches her position as "not so German" (*nicht so deutsch*), when she elaborates "I have […] little contact with Germans" (*ich habe […] mit dem deutschen kaum kontakt*). Jutta makes an explicit statement of belonging by indicating the group she does not belong to. The interviewer's laughter marks Jutta's comment as unusual or noteworthy, but Jutta does not share the contradiction. Jutta seems to separate language and belonging—she is comfortable expressing a distance from Germany in German language.

The next excerpt is an example of laughter which, I posit, arises for several different reasons. Neil is Canadian-born, 21 years old. His father emigrated from Germany in the 1970s and his mother was born in Canada to German parents. As Neil fills in the interview questionnaire, he stumbles over how to address his language facility.

Excerpt 4.6: Laughter to mitigate

1	Neil:	it's like (10.0) do I put german? even though (.) I don't
2		speak it that well
3	IntE:	((laughs))
4	Neil:	((chuckles))
5	IntE:	yeah well [it's] up to you to decide ((laughs))
6	Neil:	[okay]

Both parties laugh when Neil says he doesn't speak German well. It isn't an inherently funny statement. IntE's laughter is likely intended to soften or to mitigate Neil's assertion. To a researcher, it also marks Neil's statement as attention-worthy. IntE finds Neil's language (in)competence, the fact that that he cannot speak German well, noteworthy—either IntE finds it unusual in the context of a interview about German-Canadian identity, or she finds it incongruous with the German-Canadian identity Neil has already claimed, or both. IntE seems to indicate that a certain proficiency in German is expected.

Neil joins mutedly with the interviewer's laughter. Neil's laughter is probably embarrassment at his admission and/or at the way the interviewer has interpreted it. Though he indicates a reluctance to count German as a language he speaks, he seems to feel he should speak German. Neil's laughter expresses nervousness and perhaps embarrassment at this "failing" of his Germanness.

The third instance of laughter follows IntE's instruction to Neil. This instance of laughter is an attempt to soften a direction and lessen the potential harshness of the statement. Neil doesn't join in. Neil takes IntE's instruction seriously, and suddenly needs to decide whether he belongs to the community of German-speakers.

The above section explored pause, volume, and laughter as expressions of ideology. We looked at ways these surface structures of language evidence, beyond what is apparent in the words themselves, underlying belonging or positioning as German immigrant/descendant. The next section will continue to examine hidden ideologies through agency.

Syntax

Analysis in this section will focus primarily on *agency,* working from the idea that syntactic agency reflects underlying semantic agency (van Dijk 1995: 24). In English and in German, grammatical agency is ascribed by placing the subject in the first position—this highlights the actor (or agent) and focuses the listener's attention on it.

Agency can be used to highlight positive and negative qualities. Negative properties can be attached to an "out-group" by making them agents in an unpleasant action (van Dijk 1995: 24). Emphasizing the actions of a particular person or group in unpleasant doings serves to make them more responsible for the actions. It attaches negative qualities of the action to the person/group.

The obverse can also be true. Positive attributes of the "in-group" can be highlighted by playing up the agency of positive actions. The following example comes from Viola, a middle-aged woman who emigrated from Germany with her family when she was four weeks old.

Excerpt 4.7: Positive actions and agency

1 Viola:	i still feel very (.) very german
2 IntE:	mm hmm
3 Viola:	i feel probably more ((laughs)) german now than i've EVER
4	felt ((laughs))
((lines omitted))	
5 Viola:	looking back on prejudice NOW (.) i'd say that immigrants
6	(.) have much the same problems worldWIDE (1.0)
7	however (.) I feel that germany is doing a much better job
8	right now (.) um (.)amalgamating or culturally making
9	them sensitive to what the german culture is
10 IntE:	mm hmm
11 Viola:	whereas the canadians could learn from that

In this excerpt, Viola highlights the positive actions of Germany, a group to which she has just expressed belonging. "I feel more German than I've ever felt[8]," she says, and then praises the positive actions of Germany. Germany is active, a visible actor of positive works. Viola uses "Germany" as synecdoche—it stands for German people, possibly the German government—and its improved enculturation is what Viola draws attention to. She states, explicitly, her affiliation and in-group membership to this group, then underscores the positivity of this group (and by extension, herself) by making them visible agents in an actively positive process.

Negative actions of the in-group can be downplayed by not ascribing agency. This has a similar affect to the previous example, in that the best possible representation of the in-group is given. To downplay negative actions, speakers will avoid agency altogether by using the passive voice. This neither admits nor ascribes responsibility. In the following excerpt, Tom, born in 1939 Germany and emigrated to Canada in 1952, repeatedly uses passive sentence structures to talk about actions during WWII.

Excerpt 4.8: Negative actions and the absence of ascription of agency

1 Tom:	noch etwas anderes was wir sehr sehr ah ah ich hab
	somethine else that we really really uh uh i have
2	sehr darin darunter gelitten unter den holocaust w-
	really suffered with it under the holocost wh-
3	was dem juden geschehen ist in deutschland (1.0)
	what was done to the jews in germany (1.0)
4	sechsmillionen plus oder minus (.) was es damals war (.)
	six million plus or minus (.) as it was (.)
5	menschen gestorben sind ich denke immer und habe
	people died i always think and have
6	immer gedacht (.) es ich könnte das auch selbst gewesen
	always thought (.) it could have been me
7	sein der vernichtet worden war und da ah vor viele
	who was taken and there uh for many
8	jahre hatte ich albträume über das was im krieg
	years i had nightmares about what was suffered
9	geschehen ist (.) was diesen menschen zu getan wurde
	in the war (.) what was done to these people

[8] Viola further demonstrates her German-group affiliation by setting apart a second group in this excerpt—"the Canadians." She refers to Canadians as Other, as separate, a group to which she does not belong. Using the *the* article makes a different group out of Canadians, setting *them* apart from Germans and from herself.

Tom goes on to explain some coping strategies with which he manages the bad dreams and (though he never uses this word) the implied guilt he feels for the actions of Germans and Germany. While it might be natural for many people, regardless of nationality, to speak of such horrors in a semi-detached fashion, Tom uses words and phrases which deliberately make the actors of these events invisible. He talks about the events of WWII in ways which obfuscate the actions and the actors. Through this, we can infer a level of belonging and group membership—Tom does not distance himself or the German people from the activities he describes; rather, he downplays and obfuscates their agency in the actions: "what was done to the Jews" (*was dem juden geschehen ist*), "what was suffered in the war" *(was im Krieg geschehen ist),* "what was done to these people" *(was diesen menschen zu getan wurde).* Instead of ascribing negative actions to his in-group, Tom makes the actors invisible.

This section has explained the concept of agency and discussed ways in which it highlights or downplays actions. Through agency, positive and negative qualities of actors are ascribed to the group, and the speaker's feelings of belonging become evident. The next section will look at the words a speaker chooses to refer to his own community and others and how they express belonging.

Lexicon

Lexicon refers to the semantic choices a speaker makes when choosing words to refer to something else. There can be several different words with which speakers refer to "the same persons, groups, social relations or social issues;" the word a speaker chooses can therefore reveal mood, formality, social context, or ideological perspective (van Dijk 1995: 25). These words enact ideologies, power, relationships.

We see very clearly in the following excerpt how a speaker can distinguish between and speak differently of two groups of ostensibly the same people. The excerpt begins with the interviewer asking Dagmar (born in Britain, raised in Germany, immigrated to Canada at age 20) what changes she's noticed in Germany since she left.

Excerpt 4.9: Lexicon to distinguish among groups

1 IntW:	was für veränderungen fallen ihnen da auf?
	what sort of changes do you notice?
2 Dagmar:	ähm viel mehr ausländer hehe=
	um many more foreigners haha=
3 IntW:	=ah so he[he
	=i see ha[ha

4 Dagmar: [also zu meiner
[well in my time
5 zeit es waren viele gastarbeiter da aber es sind jetzt sind
there were lots of guest workers there but now there are
6 (.) sind (.) sie meh ich weiß nicht ob ich es nicht so gemerkt
(.) are (.) they hmm i don't know if i didn't really notice
7 habe mit den gastarbeitern (.) jetzt sind sie wirklich
it with the guest workers (.) now they are really
8 ausländer (..) ich mein die gastarbeiter war mehr dass sie
foreigners (..) i mean the guest worker was more that
9 sich- mehr den deutschen äh (..) *you know* dass es- sie
*they- more the german uh (..)*you know* that it- they*
10 sich nicht so: : so: ausländisch war als=
weren't so: : so: foreign as=
11 IntW: =ach so (..) ich habe
=i see (..) i never
12 nicht in westdeutschland gelebt ich hab in
lived in west germany i lived in
13 ost[deutschland ge-] (.) also ich kenn das nicht (.)
east [germany] so i don't know this (.)
14 Dagmar: [ach so ja]
[i see yes]
15 IntW: wie die sich integriert haben oder nicht integriert haben (.)
how they integrated themselves or didn't integrate (.)
16 also (.) würden sie sagen dass die sich früher besser
um (.)would you say that before they integrated
17 integriert haben als heute ja?
themselves better than now?
18 Dagmar: ja oder oder (.) das wir uns (.) da gar nicht mehr (.) so sehr
yes or or (.) that we (.) don't anymore (.) like it
19 weil es halt immer die selben gruppen waren (.) es waren
because it was always the same groups (.) it was
20 italiener (.) griechen und (.) und jugoslawen und so waren
italians (.) greeks and (.) and yugoslavians and such were
21 die gastarbeiter die nach frankfurt kamen (..)
the guest workers who came to frankfurt
22 IntW: mhm
mmhmm
23 Dagmar: und dass das halt nicht so bemerkbar war wie jetzt wo
and that that simply wasn't as noticeable as today where
24 die ganzen also arabischen und [ähm so] und ähm japaner
the whole uh arabs and [um yeah] and japanese
25 IntW: [ach so]

[i see]

26 Dagmar: chinesen und was nicht alles (.) ich mein da- da merkt man
chinese and what-not (.) i mean one- one notices

27 sehr viel mehr als die griechen (.) italiener und so weiter (.)
that much more than the greeks (.) italians and so forth (.)

28 die- die fallen meiner meinung nach
they- they stand out in my opinion

The major change Dagmar has noticed, in the 35 years since she left, is the increased number of non-German nationals who now live and work in Germany. The first term she uses to describe this group is "foreigners" *(ausländer).* She giggles after she does this, signalling perhaps a certain amount of unease and/or offering IntW the chance to express her discomfort with the term. When the interviewer does not, Dagmar interprets agreement or openness, and she elaborates. She immediately mentions another group of non-German nationals, but this time Dagmar refers to them as "guest workers" (*gastarbeiter*). And it quickly becomes clear that although she presents the two terms (foreigners and guest workers) as interchangeable, they do in fact refer to two different groups.

When Dagmar speaks about Arabs, Japanese, and Chinese, she uses the term "foreigners" *(ausländer).* To refer to the Italians, Greeks, and Yugoslavians who worked in Germany when she lived there, Dagmar says "guest workers" (*gastarbeiter*). From the outset, Dagmar differentiates between "foreigners" and "guest workers." Although the two groups are fundamentally the same—both non-German-nationals working in Germany, both officially "guest workers" (*gastarbeiter*)—Dagmar separates them. She names them differently and, as she does, distinguishes two different groups.

Dagmar uses the term "foreign" to mean "other" and "different." "Foreign" is negative—apart, unknown, and (by implication) unwelcome. Dagmar both names the group with this negative quality: "foreigners" *(ausländer*) and associates it with them: "they are really foreigners" *(sie sind wirklich ausländer).* They don't integrate and they stand out. "Guest worker" (*gastarbeiter*), in contrast, is positive—it has a positive action attached to it (working) and describes a contributory group. Dagmar associates positive actions with this group—being "more [like] the Germans" (*mehr [wie] den deutschen*), "integrating better" (*besser integriert*), and "being not so noticeable" (*nicht so bemerkbar*).

She refers to what is ostensibly the same category of people, non-German nationals, by two different terms, differentiating between them. She creates two different groups and two different ways of belonging. Today's non-German nationals are *the foreigners.* This term implies an element of outsider, of

Otherness, of not belonging. Still excluded from the category of *German* are the *guest workers* of old Germany: Italians, Greeks, and Yugoslavians who integrated better into the fabric of German society and were less noticeable. Dagmar is drawing categories of belonging and membership when she refers to these two groups differently: she is revealing a different regard for each and a different associated ideology.

This section examined a way of identifying and distinguishing among groups using different terminology. The next relates to lexicon, but will focus more on presenting and discussing groups with even more implicitness.

Local Semantics

This section will be devoted to exploring meaning management at a local level. Related to the section on Syntax (of course none of these sections should be considered in isolation), Local Semantics also concerns the positive presentation of an in-group and the negative presentation of an out-group. An analysis of local semantics, however, involves the sharing and transfer of meaning at a smaller level than the previously-discussed elements. At the local level, "parts of models may be known to recipients," and "speakers are allowed to presuppose […] information" (van Dijk 1995:26). This is meaning-making from shared ideologies.

Local semantics also concerns itself with impression management. Self-definition of the speaker is generally positive, or negative impressions are, at the very least, mitigated. In the following example, we see Jutta imply and then state the unpleasant nature of a segment of Edmonton's German community.

Excerpt 4.10: Negative representation of out-group

1 Jutta:	ne ich habe auch jahre lang muß ich ehrlich sagen mit
	no i have had for years now i must say honestly little
2	deutschen kaum kontakt gehabt
	contact with germans
3 IntE:	hmm
	hmm
4 Jutta:	und zwar auch bewußt (.) es gab sogar hinten (.) hm (.)
	and it was even intentionally (.) there was before (.) hm (.)
5	deutschen klub
	german club
6 IntE:	ja
	yeah
7 Jutta:	ja die waren aber alle so in den fünfzigern sechzigern
	yeah but they all immigrated in the
8	eingewandert

fifties and sixties

9 IntE: hmm:
hmm:

10 Jutta: und das war zum teil (.) ähm (.) wie soll ich sagen (..) es
and it was in part (.) um (.) how should i say (.) there

11 gab einpaar nette da- und da- aber der größte teil war-
was a couple of nice people there and- but- the largest part

12 ich hätte mit in deutschland mit ihnen auch
was- i wouldn't have had anything to do with them in

13 nichts zu tun ((xxx))=
germany either ((xxx))=

14 IntE: =ja ja
=yeah yeah

15 Jutta: warum soll ich nur weil ich- weil ich in kanada sitze mit
why should i just because i- because i'm sitting in

16 denen was zu tun habe?
canada have anything to do with them?

16 IntE: hm
hmm

17 Jutta: aber wirklich primitive leute auch zum teil
i mean really primitive people too some of them

((lines omitted))

18 mit den meisten wollte ich ja nichts zu tun haben
most of whom i didn't want anything to do with

Jutta refers to "Germans" (*Deutschen*) at the beginning of this excerpt, establishing from the outset a separate group to which she does not belong. She describes the German community in Edmonton as undesirable and negative: people with whom she wanted "nothing to do" (*nichts zu tun haben*)[9]. Jutta positions herself apart from this German community in part by portraying them as unpleasant.

The implicit knowledge of why Jutta dislikes this group is revealed at several points. It isn't *all Germans* she finds objectionable—she is careful to include and to speak negatively only about some of the Germans she has met here. Jutta never creates a sweeping negative category of "German," as she would if it were all Germans she felt dissociated from. Neither is it the entire German community in Edmonton she dislikes—she admits "there were a few nice people" (*ein paar nette*). It is, rather, a particular generation of Germans in Edmonton—Germans who left Germany in the 1950s and 60s—that she distances herself from. Jutta

[9] Jutta is able to do this at least in part because IntE shares Jutta's opinions—earlier, they commiserated about the quality of Germans in Edmonton. Jutta is thereby free to speak about the "German group" in Edmonton, of which neither she nor IntE are a part.

defines the German community in Edmonton, the one which she dislikes and to which she feels no belonging, as the older generation. Given Germany's history and post-WWII emigration, as well as the term she uses to describe this group ("primitive"/*primitive*), we can infer that Jutta is speaking implicitly of a Nazi-influenced or Nazi-sympathetic group. This is the group from which she is anxious to dissociate herself. Knowledge of German history and timelines is required to understand Jutta's meaning. The German community to which Jutta does feel belonging (if any) is not clear in this excerpt, but it seems to be none of the ones she creates here.

This second excerpt also relies heavily on implicitness and shared knowledge. Understanding what the participant, Julia, means requires an understanding of the situation and prejudices many Turks face in Germany.

Excerpt 4.11: Negative implicit representation

1 IntE:	wieso seid ihr in die- in die türkei gegangen?
	why did you go to- to turkey?
2 Julia:	mein ma[nn ist] von der türkei=
	my hus[band is] from turkey=
3 IntE:	[auch ähm] =ach so
	[oh um] =i see
4 Julia:	der ist türke und er hatte damals in ankara einen job und
	he is turkish and back then he had a job in ankara
5	hat in ankara an der universität gearbeitet
	and worked in ankara at the university
6 IntE:	ach so mhm
	i see mhm
7 Julia:	ja
	yeah
8 IntE:	ist ja sehr international ((laughs))
	that's very international ((laughs))
9 Julia:	ja? wir äh- das ist nämlich auch ein anderen grund warum
	yeah? we uh- that is namely also another reason why
10	ich eigentlich edmonton ganz prima finde.
	i actually find edmonton really great
11	also ich könnte mir vorstellen wenn mein mann deutscher
	um i could imagine if my husband were
12	wäre dann hätte ich eher das gefühl irgendwie wir
	german then i might have the sense somehow we
13	könnten vielleicht in deutschland leben [aber
	could maybe live in germany [but
14 IntE:	[mhm
	[mhm

15 Julia: für uns ist eigentlich ähm hier zu leben viel viel besser weil
for us it's really um much better to live here because
16 in deutschland habe ich immer das gefühl ich muss so
in germany i always have the feeling i have to prove
17 beweisen oder so ein projektion schaffen.
something or project a [positive] image
18 IntE: ja (.) ja
yeah (.) yeah
19 Julia: dass mein mann kein unmensch ist weil er ja
that my husband isn't a monster just because he happens
20 eigentlich türke ist
to be turkish

Here we see the participant, Julia, create a community of belonging through implicit references which only eventually become explicit.

The interviewer observes that Julia's marriage to a Turkish man is "very international" (*sehr international*). Her laughter marks the statement—again, it's not inherently funny—as comment on a situation that is unusual or noteworthy. Julia doesn't join in the laughter. She ignores it altogether and instead asks IntE "is it?" (*ja*?). Whether IntE means Julia's marriage itself or her life in various countries is "international," Julia interprets it to refer to her relationship and uses IntE's marking of the situation as a chance to clarify what about Edmonton it is that she likes—that people in Edmonton don't find her situation unusual. Julia says "that is namely another reason why I actually find edmonton really great" (*das ist nämlich auch ein anderen grund warum ich eigentlich edmonton ganz prima finde*)—"that" refers to the attention IntE draws to Julia's situation. Julia implies the Edmonton community does not give her interracial marriage the same kind of attention.

Julia then creates several communities, largely relying on shared understandings and implicit knowledge to do so. Drawing on IntE's observance of internationality, Julia first hints that many Germans feel the same way as IntE. Julia positions IntE as German in so doing, creating a community of tolerance in Edmonton where Julia's marriage is not remarked upon by Canadians. After she hints at the situation in Germany, Julia then makes her meaning more explicit, saying that she could only live in Germany "if [her] husband were German" (*wenn [ihr] mann deutscher wäre*). Though more explicit, this too requires a shared understanding of how her life would be different. Julia has not yet said the problem stems from the fact that her husband is Turkish, but someone with insider knowledge of the German community will have gleaned this by now. Having received support and understanding (non-verbal and verbal) from IntE,

Julia feels safe in finally making her meaning explicit by saying that in Germany she needs to prove that her husband is "not a monster" *(kein unmensch).*

Julia creates several communities in this excerpt. There is one group of tolerant individuals in Edmonton, to which she feels she belongs. She accomplishes this by speaking positively of Edmonton. Julia also positions another community of intolerant Germans in Germany, to which she does not belong. She is still connected to this community loosely—she "could maybe live in Germany" (*könnte[-] vielleicht in deutschland leben*)—but she is not a member of it. Most of the ways Julia shapes and conveys her belonging through this excerpt draw on a knowledge shared by her and IntE.

This section explored the creation of communities through a shared implicit knowledge. We saw the participant indicate membership through reference and implication. The next will discuss communities shaped and strengthened by the choice of topic.

Global Semantics

Global semantics concerns the emphasis or downplay of topics during in-group discourse. Topics which negatively affect out-group image easily come up, which both highlights membership in the in-group and denigrates out-group communities. Similarly, topics which adversely affect interpretations of the speaker's community will generally not be raised in in-group discourse (van Dijk 1995: 28).

Given the structure of this study and the nature of the interviews, there were fewer examples of this phenomenon than one might expect in unstructured conversation. Though participants were encouraged to have a relatively free discourse, it was still a semi-structured interview with questions posed and answered, and the path of discourse largely guided. This mostly precluded free raising or complete avoidance of topics. But participants still make references to the groups to which they feel a belonging and, in the following excerpt, we see a participant highlight the positive aspects of her own community and the negative aspects of another. Over the course of several minutes, Tina (a 41-year old German-born woman who had come to Canada about eight years before) states several times and in several different ways that she feels more belonging with Canadians than with Germans.

Excerpt 4.12: Positive in-group characteristics

1 Tina:	wir leben in- in einer kleinen sackgasse (.) ähm wir haben
	we live in- in a small cul-de-sac (.) um we have
2	su:per nachbarn
	su:per neighbours

3 IntE: mmhmm
mmhmm
4 Tina: und ich glaube das ist das was du dir selbst [kreierst
and i think that it is what you make for [yourself
5 IntE: [ja ja
[yeah yeah
6 Tina: ähm (.) also ich kann mor- ich kann mir nichts besseres
uh (.) um i can mor- i can't imagine anything
7 vorstellen ähm (.) wir kommen aus dem urlaub nach hause
better uh (.) we come back home from vacation (.)
8 (.) da stehen selbst gebackene kekse (.) und die haben im
there are home-made cookies (.) and from the italian
9 italienischen centre für uns eingekauft (.) alle die sachen
centre they bought us groceries (.) all the things
10 die wir mögen
that we like
11 IntE: ja
yeah
12 Tina: ein blumenstrauß auf dem tisch
a bouquet of flowers on the table
((lines omitted))
13 aber das ist das was du kreierst [und] wie du dein umfeld
but it is what you make [and] how you shape
14 IntE: [ja]
[yeah]
15 Tina: gestaltest
your environment
16 IntE: ja
yes
17 Tina: denke ich (.) und so (1.0) bin ich damals auch an an die
i think (.) and so (1.0) i also once approached the
18 *german canadian business association*herangegangen (.)
**german canadian business association* (.) however*
19 allerdings sind da zu viel DEUtsche die haben mir die ZAHn
there were too many GERMans there who pretty quickly
20 ziemlich schnell gezogen= ((laughs))
showed me their teeth= ((laughs))
21 IntE: =((laughs))
=((laughs))
((lines omitted))
22 Tina: wir waren (.) im ersten jahr als wir hergekommen (.) sind
we were (.) in the first years when we got here (.) we
23 waren wir einmal da (.) und ich habe (.) gedacht eher

went there once (.) and i thought (.) i'd rather
24 erschiesse ich mich [als] das ich wieder hingehe
shoot myself [than] go back there
((lines omitted))
24 IntE: [ja]
[yeah]
25 Tina: der einzige der mit mir gesprochen hat (.) ähm (1.0) war
the only one who spoke to me (.) um (1.0) was
26 ein kanadier (.) die deutschen die haben mich weder
a canadian (.) the germans they didn't say
27 willkommen geheißen noch gefragt wer ich bin [oder]
welcome nor ask who i was [or]
28 IntE [ja]
[yeah]
29 Tina: sonst wie
anything else

Reference to the kindness of her Canadian neighbours creates a positive Canadian community to which Tina feels she belongs. She portrays a small, tight-knit group, describing the physical closeness of living in "a small cul-de-sac" (*einer kleinen sackgasse*). This is a close community she has "created" (*kreieren*) for herself. Tina highlights the group's positive actions (buying groceries, making cookies, looking after her house). And then, in contrast, Tina creates a second group, the German-Canadians. Of them, she has only negative words and stories of unfriendliness. She portrays them as a closed and unwelcoming group, which highlights her distance from them. The in-group to which Tina belongs is Canadian; she uses terminology, negative examples, and metaphor to emphasize the undesirability of the German-Canadian Edmontonians, making them the out-group. Her stories, just as van Dijk explains, topicalize the negative image she has of the Other. She does not share any stories of Canadian unpleasantness, nor any of positive German-Canadian manner.

In the next excerpt, Tina further constructs a negative image of the German-Canadians. She links tradition with stodginess and close-mindedness, setting it opposite youth, activity, and energy.

Excerpt 4.13: Negative out-group characteristics

1 Tina: ähm (.) wenn du siehst so die griechen wie die alle
um (.) when you see like the greeks how they all
2 zusammen [halten] und und was die zusammen machen (.)
stayed [together] and and what they do together (.)
3 IntE: [ja]
[yeah]

4 Tina:	und dann hatten die doch so ein paar tanzgruppen da (.)
	and then had the uh a few dance groups there (.) and lots
5	und viele junge leute da auch aktiv sind (.)
	of young people there also being active (.)
6 IntE:	ja
	yeah
7 Tina:	ähm und nicht nicht irgendwelche *FREAKS* echt
	*uh and not some kind of *FREAKS* real*
8	[moderne junge] leute (.) ähm und dann wenn du so die
	[modern young] people (.) uh and then when you see like
9 IntE:	[ja ja]
	[yeah yeah]
10 Tina:	deutschen siehst (.) wo es nur mit BACKstabbing und und
	*the germans (.) where it's just with *BACKstabbing* and*
11	wie die manchmal schlecht über einander reden (.) und
	how they sometimes talk badly about each other (.) and
12 Tina:	und beobachten und so viel gossip [und]echt echt schlimm
	and watch and so much gossip [and] really really awful
13 IntE:	[ja]
	[yeah]
14 Tina	(.) und alles was deutsche kultur für die ist (2.0) wir
	(.) and everything that's german culture for them (2.0) we
15	mussten die bavarian schuhplattler da haben (.)
	have to have the bavarian schuhplattler[10] there (.)
16 IntE:	natürlich
	naturally
17 Tina:	ähm da- da- da- gibt es nichts anderes
	uh there- there- there isn't anything else
((lines omitted))	
18	fehlt nur noch das hakenkreuz an der [wand] hängt (.)
	all that's missing is the swastika [hanging on the wall
19 IntE:	[ja]
	[yeah]

Tina compares the German-Canadian club (and the German-Canadian community, by extension) unfavourably to other immigrant groups. The Greeks, she says, are "active" (*aktiv),* have "lots of young people there" (*viele junge leute da*), and are "real modern young people" (*echt moderne junge leute*). She sets youth, vitality, and modernity against "freaks" who "gossip," and "backstab." This group of unfriendly German-Canadians is old by comparison, mired in out-dated customs and out of touch with contemporary German culture. This is only implied in the first few lines, implied by contrast to the other groups she

[10] an Edmonton-based Bavarian folk music group

mentions, but finally in the last lines Tina obliquely refers to the unfriendly Germans at this club as Nazis, saying all that the club lacks is the "swastika hanging on the wall" (*das hakenkreuz an der wand*).

Tina continues to explain that the German club members "probably still live exactly as they did when they left Germany at fifteen" (*leben wahrscheinlich immer noch so wie es war als sie mit fünfzehn dann weggegangen sind*), continuing her implication that they preserve a fossilized perspective, custom, and way of life which existed in Germany some 60 years ago[11]. This is another link between the German-Canadian club and Nazism, and another statement of distance. Tina highlights again negative aspects of the group. She implies that the German-Canadian club members preserve a particular undesirable mindset, and this is not a community to which she belongs.

Tina makes the German-Canadian group into an Other—old, out-of-touch, unfriendly, racist. She portrays them as a closed group, unwelcoming and distant, and disparages their customs (food, music) as archaic and representative of a Germany that existed when these older immigrants left Germany long ago. Tina also denigrates their representation of German culture (claiming they reduce all of German culture to Bavarian culture) and makes them appear cold, unfriendly, difficult. She is very clear in her positive portrayal of Canadians and definite about to which group she feels most aligned. She emphasizes and focuses on topics that are negative to the German-Canadian group and positive to her and her group. What sort of community Tina feels a member of isn't exactly clear—maybe a younger group of German-Canadians, immigrant Canadians, or merely Canadians—but it is clear it is not the German-Canadians from the organized, self-identified membership.

In this section, we saw the topicalization of discourses. We saw positive in-group characteristics highlighted and we saw negative out-group characteristics equally highlighted. In the next section, we will explore how rearranging and privileging certain topics in conversation can reveal ideology.

Schematic Structures

Ideology is understood in accordance with van Dijk's (1995) tripartite model: an interaction between "society, discourse, and social cognition" (17). Ideology describes the basic framework by which members organize their shared understandings of their social group and surroundings. Ideologies are the "interfaces" which mediate the underlying processes of discourse and the "interests of social groups" (18). It describes the link, therefore, between

[11] See Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2013: 189) for an elaborated discussion on the role age at immigration plays in the maintenance, revitalization, and evolution of a German-Canadian space.

individual discourses and social structure. A group shares and imparts its ideology to new members; a group's ideology includes the individual and the collective "social reproduction" and "social characteristics" of the group (18).

All discourses are organized according to "conventional schemata" (van Dijk 1995: 28). There are rules of order, steps of progression, conventions of interaction. These organizational structures exist independently of ideology—one would expect two discourses in favour of opposing views to follow the same rules of progression.

Ideology is revealed in the rearrangement of this order. When the relationship between topics is manipulated, the movement can signal conversational goals: downgrading of a 'main topic' that doesn't fit with the in-group narrative, for example, or upgrading of an otherwise 'minor topic' that does. These derivations can often be quite subtle, and other syntactical features will frequently be relied upon to reveal what is being accomplished with speech—lexicon, rhetoric, and agency, and surface structures remain very important and relevant in performing an analysis of schematic structure.

Argumentation is a time when these rules of order can frequently be manipulated, and in which, therefore, ideologies become evident. Self-serving arguments can be emphasized by speakers, made explicit and more prominent, while disadvantageous arguments are left alone or implicit (van Dijk 1995: 29). In the following, Viola makes a case for her Canadian identity. Even though she does admit to German aspects of identity, she makes more overt statements which indicate a Canadian belonging:

Excerpt 4.14: Upgrading of us-positive arguments

1 Viola:	you then become a permanent resident (.) I'VE even had it
2	where i was invited to a very special function (.) and a
3	canadian said (.) why are YOU as a ca- as a canadian (.) as
4	an IMMIGRANT entitled to go to something like this? i (.)
5	was (.) a canadian citizen for twenty five years
6 IntE:	mmhmm
7 Viola:	at the time
8 IntE:	mmhmm
9 Viola:	your passport forever shows [where] you were born
10 IntE:	[yeah yeah]
11 Viola:	so (.) you ALWAYS have that iDENtity (.) you're up against
12	it
13 IntE:	yeah
14 Viola:	all the time
15 IntE:	yeah

16 Viola: if you come late in life (.) then you have the accent
17 IntE: yeah
18 Viola: so that's why i say (.) i don't have the accent

Viola uses metaphor ("up against it"), explicit statements of belonging ("I was a Canadian citizen for 25 years at the time"), and implicit reference ("I don't have the accent") to support her argument of Canadian identity. She furthers her case for belonging to a Canadian group by citing the length of time she has been here. Immediately after this assertion, as further proof, she adds that she "[doesn't] have the [German] accent." She later says that having a German accent "make[s] it hard," where "it," following a discussion of blending and integration and Canadian belonging, is understood to refer to belonging in Canada. There are certainly aspects of Viola's identity which remain German, such as her passport. But this she mentions only briefly. In fact, still holding a German passport, a factor some might consider an important marker of identity, Viola views as something to be "overcome."

This section elaborated the link between ideology and identity—both group and individual. It also explored how a rearrangement of expected conversational structure reveals ideology by either highlighting or downplaying aspects of membership. The next section will look at specific features of language which do the same.

Rhetoric

This linguistic element broadly includes features of discourse which downplay or highlight negative information: over-/under-statement, hyperbole, euphemism, mitigation, metaphor, and repetition (van Dijk 1995: 29). Typically, these features belie ideological positions when us-negative information is downplayed, or them-negative information highlighted.

In the following example, Tom discusses the code-mixing he frequently encounters in German media. He uses unequivocally pejorative terms to do so. As he does, he reveals a distaste for the group of European-Germans who, he believes, should not be mixing the two languages.

Excerpt 4.15: Rhetorical features of speech

1 Tom: es graut mir wie sie deutsch- wie sie englisch
it horrifies me how they use german- how they use
2 benutzen in deutsch (.) das graut mir wirklich
english in german (.) it horrifies me really
3 IntW: ja
yeah

4 Tom: es tut mir sogar leid [hahaha
it even hurts me [hahaha
5 IntW: [es gefällt ihnen nicht haha
[you really don't like it haha
6 Tom: wenn ich könnte könnte ich weinen ha ha [ha
i could cry if i could cry haha[ha
7 IntW: [EHRLICH ha
[HONESTLY ha
8 Tom: ehrlich ja
honestly yes
9 IntW: aber ihre eigene sprache ha ha ist doch auch so durchsetzt
but your own speech ha ha ist also so intermingled
10 Tom: natürlich [ha ha ha]
of course [ha ha ah]
11 IntW: [ja ha] ((beide lachen))
[yeah ha] ((both laugh))
12 Tom: aber man sieht doch nicht eigenen fehler man sieht nur
but one doesn't see his own faults one sees only the faults
13 fehler der anderen
of others
14 IntW: ah so ha
i see ha
15 Tom: ha ha ((beide lachen))
ha ha ((both laugh))
16 Frida: ja das ist ja hier weil es zweisprachig ist ah sowieso ist es
yeah that is because here it's bilingual uh anyway it's
17 auch- sieht man es nicht als fehler aber wenn in
also- one doesn't see it as a fault but
18 deutschland weil wir erwarten dass unsere ganzen
in germany because we expect that all our
19 verwandten und unsere (.) mitmenschen in deutschland
relatives and our (.) fellow citizens in germany
20 nur deutsch sprechen
only speak german
21 IntW: mmhmm
mmhmm
22 Frida: und weil wir alle englischen worte verstehen ist das
and because we understand all the english words it's
23 komisch
strange
24 Tom: es ist nicht nur die verwandten die freunde
it's not only the relatives the friends
25 sprechen wahrscheinlich gutes deutsch ((frida)) aber in

probably speak good german ((frida)) but in
26 den zeitungen und im internet da da sind so englische
the newspapers and on the internet many english
27 wörte die benutzt werden- die werden NUR benutzt
words are- are used there- are used- are ONLY used
28 von (.) hmm (.) zu zeigen dass der wollte den
in order (.) hmm (.) to show that he wanted to
29 englisch sprechen und nicht weiß was besseres wort ist (.)
speak english and didn't know what a better word was (.)
30 so denke ich jedenfalls
or so i think at any rate

In this excerpt, Tom constructs a group—Germans like himself and his wife who live overseas and for whom mixed-language speech is not only acceptable but expected. These Germans are different from European-Germans, from whom Tom expects a different standard of speech and to whom he ascribes different motivations for mixing the languages.

Tom uses strong language, metaphor and hyperbole to highlight failings of code-mixing he hears in Germany. He says "it horrifies him" (*es graut mir*), that he "could cry" over it (*ich könnte weinen*), and that he is physically "pained by it" (*es tut mir wirklich leid*). All of these demonstrate the shortcomings, in Tom's opinion, of the European-Germans who code-mix. He posits that German newspapers and internet sites use English words because they "don't know a better word" (*nicht weiß was besseres wort ist*). Tom uses "better" (*besser*) to mean German—by implication, English, then, is "worse."

Tom says that non-mixed German is "good German" (*gutes deutsch*) and English mixed into German is "horrifying." When IntW laughs and points out that Tom himself code-mixes, he laughs as well and makes a joke. The fact that Tom joins in the laughter and does not rush to elaborate or defend his statement indicates he is unconcerned about this apparent double-standard. Tom's wife Frida, however, interjects at this point to say that they live in a bilingual country, and implies it is this which affords them the ability to code-mix: "that is because here it's bilingual" (*weil es [hier] zweisprachig ist*). Frida essentially creates another group at this moment, a group of Germans from whom code-mixed German is acceptable. This group (in which she includes at least herself and Tom; it is not clear whether others belong or not) is not based on the inherent merits of either language, nor on Tom and Frida's facilities with both languages, or even on the fact that they live in an English-speaking country. Rather, Tom and Frida can and do code-mix—and it is acceptable—because they live in a country which is bilingual.

But Tom doesn't take up this group, and he rejects Frida's notion that his own code-mixed German is acceptable by virtue of the fact that he doesn't live in Germany. Tom claims his friends and relatives (members of his in-group) who do live in Germany "probably speak good German" (*sprechen wahrscheinlich gutes deutsch)*. Therefore, according to Tom, it is possible to live in Germany and to speak good German. His in-group in Germany does. Tom seems unwilling to concede that code-mixed German can ever be acceptable, and he stands by his original assertion that "good German" is simply not code-mixed German. As might be expected of one's in-group, Tom references his German friends and relatives as evidence of proper German-speaking people, and creates another outside group—people on the internet and in the media in Germany—of those who speak "bad" German.

In this excerpt, rhetorical features of discourse emphasize negative aspects of an "other" group (European-Germans not part of Tom's communities) and distance the speaker from them. Tom creates *us* and *them* groups: an *us* for whom code-mixing is perfectly acceptable, and a *them* from whom code-mixing is "horrifying." Frida creates different *us* and *them* groups: an *us* which consists of herself and Tom, Germans who live in a bilingual country for whom code-mixing is acceptable, and an implied *them* of others who live in a monolingual country and are therefore expected to use one language exclusively. Tom in particular employs several strategies to make his point: hyperbole ("horrifying" *das graut mir*), repetition ("horrifies me" *das graut mir, es graut mir*), emphasis ("truly" *echt* and "honestly" *ehrlich*), over-statement ("I could cry" *ich könnte weinen*), and pejorative terms (calling code-mixing a "fault"/*fehler*). He downplays the effects of his own code-mixing. And by using such strong terms to condemn the code-mixing of this other group, he implies that it is a regrettable, problematic situation.

Tom and Frida repeatedly create a variety of overlapping and conflicting membership groups. They both clearly express belonging to some German groups. The interview is conducted largely in German. Tom consumes German media daily. Several of their eight children, all of whom went to German Saturday school, now live (or have lived) in Germany, and Tom and Frida make regular visits to their numerous relatives there. When asked whether they "tried" to pass on German traditions to their children, Frida says "we didn't try to do it. It just is, simply because we still live in the German tradition" (*Das haben wir nicht versucht. So ist es*, w*eil wir einfach noch nach deutscher tradition leben)*. When asked, specifically, whether they'd say they are German or Canadian, Tom claims a third option, seen in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 4.16: Rhetoric to clearly express belonging

1 Tom: ich sehe mich zwischen zwei- zwei verschiedenen ah oder
i see myself as between two- two different uh or
2 drei verschiedenen=
three different=
3 IntW: =was ist die [dritte
=*what is the [third*
4 Tom: [zeiten oh österreich[12]
[sides oh austria
5 IntW: ah österreich weil ihre familie daher kommt
ah austria because your family comes from there
((lines omitted))
6 Frida: die meisten leute sie kanadier die uns kennen würden
most people the canadians who know us would say that
7 sagen wir sind sehr deutsch. Die deutschen die uns kennen
we are very german. the germans who know us
8 würden sagen wir sind schon sehr [kanadisch.
would say we are actually very [canadian
9 Tom: [sehr kanadisch ja
[very canadian yes

Tom agrees more readily with Frida's positioning as Canadian than he did with the interviewer's positioning as German. But as he still claims strong German ties, his belonging is not quite so straightforward—he seems to feel aligned with a third group (not only the Austrians he mentioned above), but rather a category of German-Canadians who can code-mix without injury, who wear German clothes and observe German customs, but do not belong to German clubs or churches. The metaphor is Frida's, but I think it apt here:

> "First generation immigrants have to sit on the fence. They must have one foot in the culture of their parents and the other in the culture of their new country. ((lines omitted). I think it's that way with us."
>
> *Die [ersten Generation Migranten] müssen auf dem zaun sitzen und mit einem fuß müssen sie in der kultur sein wie die eltern und mit dem anderen fuß in der kultur dieses landes. ((lines omitted)) und ich denke so ist es bei uns.*

[12] This is especially interesting, because Tom lists his birthplace as Mittenwald, a small town in southern Germany near the Austrian border but still in Bavaria. Most other times when he talks about where he's from, Tom says "Bavaria" (*Bayern)*. Tom seems unwilling to position himself or to be positioned as German.

This section dealt with the syntactic features of language which express ideology and belonging: rhetoric. We saw expressions of belonging both straightforward and convoluted, clear and oblique. We analysed the ways many different memberships can be created, simultaneously and sometimes contradictorily. We explored the ways rhetoric and abstraction can be used to reference belonging. The next section is the final element of van Dijk's framework and concerns the way meaning is made out of context.

Pragmatics

The final elements of discourse analysis to reveal ideology, according to van Dijk, involves the manifestation of ideologies through speech acts. Pragmatics refers to ideology manifest through interactional strategies and speech participation. It includes negative evaluations and "relations of inequality" which materialize as speech acts—commands, for example, where one speaker presumes the right to issue them. Or threats which evidence an intent to dominate or control (van Dijk 1995: 30). Less ominously, speech acts can also evidence a perception of inferiority in the giving of advice or making of assertions, when not invited, which "presuppose ignorance of the recipient" (van Dijk 1995: 30).

This supposition of need occurs in the following. Dagmar discusses how she, a German-Canadian, was born in England; she explains that her father is English and her mother is from a German city that was under British occupation. But the German word for "occupation" fails her and she hesitates. IntW, after a few moments, supplies the missing German word.

Excerpt 4.17: Presumption of authority

1 Dagmar:	und äh: war äh hat die stadt wo meine mutter geboren ist
	and um: was um had the city where my mother was born
2	das war unter englischer (.) äm (1.0)
	it was under english (.) um (1.0)
3 IntW:	äh besatzungs[zone] ja ja
	um occupied [zone] yeah yeah
4 Dagmar:	[besatzung ja]
	[occupation yes]
5	und da war er dann da und hat meine mutter
	and he was there then and got to know my
6	kennengelernt
	mother

Several assumptions appear in this excerpt. First, the interviewer assumes that the pause in line 2 is due to Dagmar's failure to come up with the right German word, not that Dagmar is thinking about her answer. IntW interprets the pause as a hesitation and evidence of a word-search. Rather than allowing Dagmar to

continue to search, however, IntW then supplies the failing word. IntW presumes an authority as the more fluent, more capable German speaker. This positions Dagmar as the less capable German speaker.

This positioning may be due to several factors—first, although the interview is only a few minutes old, Dagmar has already revealed she has been in Canada for longer than IntW. This positions IntW as part of a more-German group, as possessed of more German knowledge. Dagmar therefore belongs to a less-German group, one which code-switches and hesitates (the only instances of code-mixing at this point in the interview have been English into an otherwise German discourse, all by Dagmar). IntW presumes the more-German authority and, in effect, corrects Dagmar's speech.

This relationship is also due, in part, to Dagmar's own positioning. Some of the very first lines of dialogue in the interview involve Dagmar asking IntW for clarification.

Excerpt 4.18: Unintentional positiong

1 Dagmar: weil ich bin äh (.) weiß jetzt nicht wie man dazu
because i am uh (.) don't know now how one
2 in deutsch sagt *d: d: disabled? like on a disability
*says in german *d: d: disabled? like on a disability*
3 pen[sion?
pen[sion?

4 IntW: [ja ja ähm=
[yeah yeah um=
4 Dagmar: =was ist der deutsche aus[druck?
=what is the german expre[ssion
5 IntW: [würden wir
[would we
6 sagen also *disabled wird meist mit behindert
*say um * disabled is mostly translated as*
7 über[setzt und dann (.) [ja
dis [abled and then (.) [yeah
8 Dagmar: [ja ja weil- weil ich gesundheit ich habe (.)
[yeah yeah because- because i have health (.)

Dagmar positions herself as the less-competent German speaker in the dialogue and the dynamic remains throughout the interview. Sometimes the interviewer

interrupts Dagmar, who has used an English word, to supply the German one, even when not asked, as she does in the following excerpt[13].

Excerpt 4.19: Intentional positioning

1 Dagmar:	ja weil er er hat äh sehr viel drum gegeben dass wir unser
	yeah because he he gave a lot of effort to make sure
2	englisch beibehalten er hat alles mögliche ge: (.) haha (.)
	we kept our english he did everything pos- haha –ssible to
3	tan damit wir weiterhin englisch sprechen obwohl ich
	make sure we continued to speak english even though i
4	nicht (.) äh (2.0) äh *fluid* haha[ha
	*wasn't uh (2.0) uh *fluid* haha[ha*
5 IntW:	[äh fließend=
	[uh fluid=
6 Dagmar:	=fließend war
	=fluid ((was))

The pause that precedes Dagmar's code-switch could be perceived as a request for assistance, but Dagmar's German is quite good and she herself seems unbothered by code-switching. IntW is essentially correcting what is, to her, an improper use of German. IntW presumes several things with her interruption: first, that Dagmar does not know the German word for *fluid*; second, that Dagmar would have used the German word had she known it; third, that Dagmar wants to know the German word. And IntW assumes this authority as the more proficient German speaker.

This final section explored the manifestation of ideologies through speech acts—specifically, corrections on the basis of a presumed authority. This brings us to the end of van Dijk's eight properties of discourse and completes the first section of analysis. The next section will elaborate on these excerpts and invoke others, as we delve more deeply into the cultural component of our analysis. Carbaugh's (2007) Cultural Discourse Analysis commences below.

III. CULTURAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS—MAKING MEANING

With van Dijk's framework, we looked at belonging and actions of identity at the syntactic level of language. The second phase of analysis is the application of Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Analysis (CuDA). The goal of this combined framework is a richer understanding of the roles of culture and community in the enactment of identity. CuDA will widen the scope of analysis, helping to connect

[13] It is important to note that IntW does not do this with all participants. She seems to be, at least in part, responding to the position Dagmar takes as a less competent speaker.

van Dijk's syntactic-level analysis with the broader role of culture and community in the construction of identity. A brief recap of the theory of CuDA is below, followed by excerpts from the data which are analysed according to Carbaugh's five *radiants of meaning*.

As people communicate, they transmit meaning. Words convey meaning in themselves, but cultural messages are also encoded in the discourse: information about who the speaker is, how the speaker is related to others (both absent and in the discourse), what is proceeding, how the speaker understands and feels about the discourse, and about the quality or nature of the surroundings in which the discourse takes place. Carbaugh (2007) identifies these five radiants of meaning—"personhood, relationships, action, emotion, and dwelling"—as active parts of communication. These, therefore, are the sites of analysis for researchers wanting to draw a richer, fuller understanding of the coded cultural messages in discourse (Carbaugh 2007: 174). We will first explore the personhood radiant.

Meanings about Being and Personhood

Messages of personal identity occur at both cultural and personal levels. Meaning such as "what beliefs are presumed in order to be a person" in this culture (Carbaugh 2007: 175)? What positions in the society—mother/child, employer/employee—are established, and how do they structure communication? Personal radiants of meaning also come into focus in this analysis, as the unique qualities of an individual become evident and demand consideration. Sometimes these meanings, personal and social, are explicitly coded through use of certain pronouns and forms of address; sometimes they are implicitly coded. Discourse is culturally and individually influenced, from the words participants choose to the manner in which they use them, and this particular radiant provides a way of analysing the meaning which is produced and replicated through such discourses.

Consider, for example, meanings of personhood in the following brief excerpt, as Jutta's Canadian-born son discusses his pending travels.

Excerpt 4.20: Statement of identity resulting from personhood

1 Jutta: hat er mir gesagt (..) ich gehe zurück ((nach deutschland))
he told me (..) i'm going back ((to germany))

This statement reveals several presuppositions of identity and personhood. Use of the word "back" (*zurück*) implies a return. Jutta's son, however, had never been to Germany. By using "back" (*zurück*), he positions himself as someone who *can* go back to Germany. He implies he has an origin there, a claim of belonging. Only someone who has *been* to a place can *return* to it—Jutta's son

assumes a connection through his mother's German identity. Through his mother, the son expresses belonging to the (European-)German community. His social identity, his relationship as *son* to his *mother,* allows him to make this claim of personhood. And it is a personal statement of identity as well as a cultural one, as Jutta's son has internalized the Germanness of his mother in his own personal way.

In excerpt 4.19 earlier, we saw IntW interrupt a German-speaking participant to, unbidden, supply a German word. If we analyse this interaction along the personhood and identity radiant, we can see the social identities and beliefs about personhood which underlie this exchange and which facilitate the correction. Dagmar, remember, is a British-born, German-raised woman in her 50s who immigrated to Canada in 1974, roughly 40 years ago.

The unique qualities of the two participants and their respective roles in the conversation are what facilitate IntW's correction. Dagmar has, as we already saw, positioned herself as the less competent German speaker. The roles that each participant has assumed in the interaction give IntW the authority to interrupt. Their social relationship allows the correction: the interviewer presumes a status, as the more recently-arrived and more proficient speaker, which allows her to correct Dagmar. Dagmar assumes a position as the less-competent speaker which invites these corrections. The social relationship—newly-arrived German and long-settled German-Canadian—furthers this.

This section has explored meanings of personhood at both personal and social levels. One statement—one word, really—revealed personal and social layers of cultural identity—what it means to Jutta's son to be German and to be Canadian, and the social roles which allow him to claim these memberships. We also applied CuDA to an earlier excerpt to reveal the social relationships which facilitated a particular interaction. The next section will examine cultural belonging as manifest through relationships.

Meanings about Relating and Relationships

The second radiant of meaning is that of relating. Through discourse, people "are being related to one another" (Carbaugh 2007: 175). Sometimes this relation is pre-existing; sometimes it is created in the communication. Sometimes the relationship is explicit, referenced through terms of address or relationship; sometimes it is coded implicitly.

In analysing membership and belonging, of course, this radiant has particular importance. In the following excerpt, Vera and the interviewer describe relationships and belonging in both implicit and explicit ways. As they talk, the

relationships they create—individual and shared ones—reveal memberships and communities of belonging.

Excerpt 4.21: Statement of identity resulting from relationships

1 IntE:	yeah (.) i find myself telling people that i'm european
2 Vera:	and (.) you know (.) i think that most (.) many germans do
3	that (.) i think (.) i tell my students that many germans do
4	say they are european (.) you know (.) you (.) there's all
5	sorts of things that have to be side-stepped (.) you know
6 IntE:	but i have to say i feel much more european now than
7	german
8 Vera:	and- and- and so you should
9 IntE:	yeah

The interviewer describes her relationship to Germany and to Europe explicitly: she belongs to a European, not a German, community. She expresses no relationship to "Germans." She in fact expresses distance from Germany. Not explicitly at first—IntE introduces the idea by saying "I find myself telling people that I'm European." That her "being European" is at the expense of "being German" only becomes clear after Vera responds positively to IntE's implication with an expression of support and makes it clear that IntE is not alone in her act of belonging. Vera, in essence, is the first to offer an alternate community of belonging for IntE: other Germans who similarly do not identify as German. The way IntE first expresses her relationship indicates an involuntary realization, of sorts, and not a conscious decision: "I find myself…." Through this phrase, IntE implies that her lack of belonging to Germany has been a natural occurrence and not a deliberate moving away. It is a relationship which, she insinuates, developed without her awareness.

After Vera creates this second community, this group of Germans-who-do-not-belong-to-Germany, however, IntE rejects it. IntE firmly establishes a relationship with the community of Europeans. The interviewer defends and clarifies her original statement by saying she not only *says* she's European—she truly *feels* European: "but I have to say I feel much more European now than German." The *but* at the start of IntE's sentence sets her utterance against Vera's comment, which implies that many Germans claim to be European so they don't have to be German; IntE rejects the implication that she avoids being German because of unspecified-but-understood negative qualities associated with Germany ("all sorts of things that have to be, you know, side-stepped"). The rest of IntE's sentence then indicates an unequivocal relationship to Europe—she acts a belonging to Europe and not to Germany.

If IntE makes her relation known explicitly, Vera, in contrast, describes hers implicitly. (Vera was born in Germany and came to Canada with her family at a very young age. Now in her 50s, she is a native speaker of both English and German and has extensive contact with German in personal and professional spheres.) Vera belongs to neither a German nor a European community. This is evident in the way she supports IntE's first statement ("I think that many Germans do that") without expressing solidarity—she does not include herself in the group. A second time, Vera speaks of "many Germans," again expressing understanding but not including herself in the group of people who perform the action. The third and final opportunity Vera has to indicate a relationship to the European-German community arises after IntE says she feels "more European than German." Vera indicates understanding for IntE's situation, but no personal involvement: "and so you should." Vera relates to none of the communities which arise in this excerpt: neither German, German-but-claiming-European-membership, nor European.

As they talk, however, Vera and IntE do create a shared relationship of "not-German." Neither expresses belonging to the German community. IntE creates distance by favouring "being European." Vera creates distance by talking about Germans and Germany with detachment and no personal relationship. They therefore create a community of non-German: IntE and Vera share this relationship, even though they both create and maintain it using different linguistic tools.

Analysing communication by studying relations and relationships involves exploring how the discourse "works to relate people," either to each other or to a group (Carbaugh 2007: 174). It requires an exploration of what relationships are presumed and engaged. In the above excerpt, we saw how two people made their relationships to Germany relevant and, through that, their relationships to each other and to the wider European community. In the next section, we will explore how *acting* and *action* are made relevant.

Meanings about Acting and Action

What communicants perceive or announce themselves to be doing is a particular action which, by nature or implication, means that the participants believe themselves to be doing *that thing* and not *another thing* (Carbaugh 2007: 176). The type of thing being done and analysis thereof carries meaning and demonstrates what the participants find most significant about their communication. As ever, these actions can be explicit or implicit.

In the following example, the participant asserts her German identity. Jenn talks about how she maintains her Germanness. She makes definite links between her actions and the German identity that results.

Excerpt 4.22: Statement of identity resulting from action

1 IntW: ähm haben sie denn über (..) im laufe der zeit vielleicht
uh have you maybe through (..) as time goes by perhaps
2 festgestellt dass sie ihr deutschsein verlieren oder ist das
noticed that you are losing your germanness or is it
3 immer[noch
st[ill
4 Jenn: [glaub ich nicht nee glaub ich nicht nee nee
[i don't believe so no: i don't believe so no: no:
5 IntW: würden sie nicht sagen?
you wouldn't say so?
6 Jenn: no (..) in welcher hinsicht kann man das verlieren?
no (..) in what sense can one lose it?
7 IntW: ähm dass man sich vielleicht stärker mit [den
um that one perhaps more strongly with [the
8 Jenn: [nee wenn man
[no: if one were
9 den kanadischen KUCHEN isst hahaha=
to eat the canadian CAKES hahaha=
10 IntW: =nee weiß ich nicht
=no i don't know
hehe=
hehe=
11 Jenn: =hehehe=
=hehehe=
12 IntW: =naja (..)
=yeah well (..)

13 Jenn: nee nee ich (.) bevorzuge immernoch deutsches essen und
no no i (.) still prefer german food and
14 ich koche auch nach deutscher art (..)
i still cook in german fashion (..)

Jenn then says she still likes German art and goes to see German films. By following up her avowal of Germanness with a discussion of German-related customs and actions, Jenn explicitly links the maintenance of her "Germanness" (*deutschsein*) with food and customs. In this case, the actions she talks about actively maintain Jenn's membership in the German community and connection to it—they are how she continues to belong (in itself, also an action). The belonging is the implied action of the sequence—she never uses the word or talks explicitly about she continues to maintain Germanness by cooking; rather

she implicitly links membership standing and maintenance through these other actions.

This section explored belonging through speaking about actions. We saw Jenn implicitly link her continued Germanness with her cooking and consumption of German food and media. The next section will examine how feeling and emotion create groups of membership.

Meanings about Feeling and Emotion

How participants feel about the discourse in which they are engaged is the fourth meaning-making radiant of analysis. The tone, the key, and the emotions within the communication reveal cultural codes of appropriateness and socialized norms. Analysis of the structure and conveyance of emotion in the discourse "is critical" to teasing out the meaning (Carbaugh 2007: 176).

Although interlocutors do convey feelings through tone, vocabulary, and emotion terms, the implicit, nonverbal messages are frequently more evident. As what we have to analyse from these interviews are only audio recordings and transcriptions, some important dynamics of meaning are lost.

But not all.

In the following excerpt, Elli speaks about the difficulty of conveying emotion in another language. She uses the same expression several times during her interview:

Excerpt 4.23: Statement of identity resulting from feeling

1 Elli: but (.) you know (.) when you have to speak from the heart
2 (.) it's better to speak in your (..) own language

The "own language" to which she refers is German. Elli was born in Canada. Her parents had emigrated, separately, from Germany to Canada, where they met and married. Elli grew up speaking German at home and first learned English in school. The interview is conducted mostly in English, and Elli says of her own German, "my grammar is terrible" (*mein grammatik ist schlecht*). In her daily life, Elli uses German only occasionally and has travelled to Germany just a handful of times. Though she retains German customs and sent her daughter to German Saturday school, English is a much greater part of her life today.

But the language of childhood obviously, for Elli, retains its importance into adulthood. She even posits that it becomes *more* important over time:

Excerpt 4.24: Increased importance of childhood language

1 Elli: so (.) you know i think i- (.) when people (1.0) become old or very ill (.) they revert back to their first language

She equates emotion and feeling with the German parts of her identity, using expressions like "more comfortable" and "part of yourself that you hold on to" to indicate that German serves important, highly sentimental functions in her life. The close, emotional aspects of her adult life are better expressed in German, which evidences a lingering and intimate belonging with the group.

Tom and Frida echo this sense that German is appropriate language of emotion and the intimate sphere. IntW asks them which of their two languages they speak with each other when. They discuss this for a bit, and Frida says she has made observances of everyday Canadian life in German, which "sound strange" to her (*hört sich das für [s]ich komisch an*). Therefore English, they decide, is the language of "public life" (*das öffentliche leben*), and German is the language for "personal things" (*vertrauenssachen*). German, their first language, is the language of choice for private, emotional conversations.

Through this, we see how Tom and Frida feel about the two groups to which they belong. They belong in Canadian society, and feel that English is the appropriate language to express and to discuss this. They associate specific emotions with their Canadian identity. English feels most suited to these actions. German, a group to which Tom and Frida also belong (as we saw earlier, in excerpt 4.16), is a different sphere and therefore requires a different language. Tom and Frida express intimate, personal things in German; either because of or as a result of this, their German belonging has different feelings associated with it.

This concludes the discussion of how feeling and emotion can reveal cultural membership. We saw several people who associated different languages with different groups and explored the implications these associations have for their respective belongings. Now we turn to our fifth section of CuDA analysis and examine meanings of place.

Meanings about Dwelling, Place, and Environment

The final radiant of meaning concerns where the communicants are located and their senses of this place. The words people use to refer to their locations—place names, directional information, locational formulations—convey messages about the place itself (Carbaugh 2007:176). Messages about place and environment locate a cultural discourse, ground it in a physical location. The previous four radiants of meaning have demonstrated that participants conceive of their surroundings in very individual ways. But studying discourse can bring

analysts, broadly, to an understanding of what people say about the places they inhabit, how they relate to them, and what they do while inhabiting them.

And it might be worth reiterating, once more, that this refers specifically to tangible, physical locations. Participants do not all mean the same things when they speak about places, but by examining the words and phrases by which they refer to these places, we can better understand their respective ideas and draw conclusions about the group as a whole.

Two places are considered in this analysis: Germany, and some specific German-speaking places outside the national borders of Germany. People in both places speak German and practice customs describable as "German;" only people from the former group, however, have German citizenship. The rest come from German-speaking regions in Eastern Europe such as Poland, Russia, Romania, and the Czech Republic.

The terms for these two groups are *Reichsdeutsch* and *Volksdeutsch. Reichsdeutsch* describes Germans-from-Germany, and *Volksdeutsch* describes Germans-from-elsewhere. These terms can be problematic, however—they arose and were used primarily during the Nazi era. Vestiges of racism remain attached, and they aren't in popular use any more. Many of our participants used the terms themselves, however, and for purposes of clarity and accuracy, they will be repeated here.

Franz is a German-born 64-year-old man who has lived in Canada since he was seven. In the following, he discusses where his family originated and what it meant to him.

Excerpt 4.25: Statement of identity resulting from place

1 IntW:	sie haben gesagt (.) dass ihre eltern aus litauen [kamen]?
	you said (.) that your parents came from [Lithuania?
2 Franz:	[ja]
	[yes]
3 IntW:	sagen ihnen die die worte volksdeutsche reichsdeutsche
	*do the- the words *volksdeutsche reichsdeutsche* mean*
4	etwas?
	anything to you?
5 Franz:	*no* (.) volksdeutsche
	**no* (.) volksdeutsche*
6 IntW:	ihre eltern waren *volksdeutsche*?
	*your parents were *volksdeutsche*?*
7 Franz:	ja
	yes

IntW: ehm did this ever become like ehm matter or something? (.) did this ever matter that your parents were volksdeutsche here in canada?

((lines omitted))

Franz: did it ever matter?

IntW: or did [you

Franz: [it mattered in germany too

IntW: in germany [yeah

Franz: [oh yeah (..) during after the war during the war was a big problem eh ehm

IntW: did it ever matter here in canada? like did (.) for example (.) you [ever

Franz: [no, no just everybody was painted with the same colour with the same brush

IntW: ((laughs))

Franz: it was german

IntW: yeah

Franz: that's it (1.0) finished (..)

IntW: yeah (1.0) also (.) among the germans (.) basically did you ever feel there is a difference?

Franz: no (.) no because everybody came from another place

IntW: mmhmm

Franz: yeah (.) they were under the german label (..) because they felt that they (.) uh (.) probably just like us (.) you know (.) were german (1.0) ok yeah we lived in other countries (1.0) but our ties were still to germany

IntW: yeah

Franz: the support was to germany (1.0) uhm we had a strong nationalistic feeling to germany even though the times were as terrible as what they were (.) you know that was still (1.0) you didn't see that part (2.0) and here in canada they either came from holland, hungary , yugoslavia, russia or they come from lithuania or some other place that was all a mish mash that they were all under the german

IntW: mmhmm

Franz: you know (1.0) i no- i never at least- i never realized it you know (.) oh well (.) you are not a reichsdeutsche (..) you weren't born you were born in germany but your parents should have been born there too

IntW: mmhmm

Franz: it didn't seem to come up at all (.)

Franz creates several different groups of place and of belonging in this excerpt. He has already described himself as "German-Canadian." Immediately after he does this, IntW asks where his parents are from, and this excerpt begins. Whether Franz would have used the term *Volksdeutsch* himself is not clear—the interviewer suggests it. But Franz adopts it and with it, creates two places—one where the *Volksdeutsch/Reichsdeutsch* distinction matters (Nazi Germany), and one where it does not (Canada). In Nazi Germany, Franz says, a person's country of birth mattered—his parents were considered *Volksdeutsch.* His parents came from a different place and therefore belonged to a different group. In Canada, however, Franz says place of birth was not a salient marker of group membership. The reason it didn't matter in Canada was that "everyone was painted with the same brush." Franz uses the passive voice to imply that Canadians did not observe differences between German nationals and German-speakers. This is the second place Franz speaks of—a place in Canada where all German-speakers are German.

On closer investigation, however, it appears that this second community—this group in Canada where all German-speakers are German—includes only *Volksdeutsch* Germans and specifically *not Reichsdeutsch* Germans. IntW asks whether, in Canada, Franz noted any differences within the German community and he says no because, "everybody came from another place." When he adds that "they were under the German label," and admits that "ok yeah we lived in other countries," it becomes clear that he means the German community he was part of in Canada was comprised of V*olksdeutsch.* "Everybody came from another place" does not mean "[a different] place within Germany—" it means "[a different] place outside of Germany." German nationals are no part of this Canadian community.

Franz then talks about the "German label," which implies an unfair or erroneous assignment. He feels it is an overgeneralization. He implies that his community would more accurately be assigned a different label. And then Franz says "we lived in other countries"—not *most* or *many* or *some* lived in other countries. The implication is *all: everyone* lived in "other countries" (i.e., countries that are not Germany). Franz also goes to lengths to stress the relationship between these other countries and Germany, citing "ties," "close nationalistic feeling," "support," even suggesting a willingness to "[not] see" the "terrible" parts of WWII out of loyalty and affinity for Germany. These relationships would not have to be emphasized if he were speaking about the place of Germany. Later he lists countries from which his fellow German-Canadians are from—Germany is not among them.

Franz creates two different communities by distinguishing between the ways place is important to these communities. He talks about Germany as a country

where place of birth was important; he talks about Canada as a country that specifically *ignored* place of birth and ascribed cultural membership using language as the sole marker of group belonging.

In this section, we have seen how belonging makes meaning out of place. We saw how the different ways two communities (Germany, Canada) understand place contribute to a different understanding and positioning of the people who are associated with those places. We also discussed the *Volksdeutsch/Reichsdeutsch* distinction.

This concludes the analysis section of the chapter—an application of van Dijk's and Carbaugh's frameworks to understand positioning, group membership, and acts of identity of this study's participants. In the final sections, we will explore opportunities to apply this analysis and for further research; the thesis then concludes with a brief summary.

IV. OPPORTUNITIES

Opportunities for Application

This thesis is an analysis of interviews conducted with residents of two Canadian cities, residents who claim some degree of German heritage. The German-Canadian community, as many other immigrant groups in Canada, is frequently spoken about as a unified whole. It is hoped that this thesis can contribute, in some small way, to illuminating the differences within this community.

Just as the combination of van Dijk and Carbaugh's frameworks provide a way of uncovering elements of German-Canadian identity constructed in discourse, so can it illuminate similar moments in other communities as well. No part of this analysis or these frameworks are unique to the German-Canadian community. Indeed, it is hoped that the perspective taken here, one which privileges the elements of culture and community in understanding identity, could be applied to many different groups.

Understanding the ways minorities construct identity, both as individuals and as a collective, allows for a wider understanding and greater sensitivity of the challenges these groups face. It also arms policy-makers with the tools to plan inclusive and supportive strategies. Non-members benefit by appreciating the different groups and communities within one whole, as well as the subtleties and complexities of belonging. In a multi-cultural country like Canada, a nuanced understanding of the ways immigrant and minority groups understand themselves can only improve relations.

Anyone who works with minority groups should be able to apply the theories of this paper to his or her own work, whether that be in language-related fields or others—law, government, education. But even more broadly, anyone who works at the intersection of two cultures should find the cultural approaches taken here of value. Better understanding the radiants of meaning inherent in every act of speech—intercultural or not, discursive or not—should lead to improved communication.

There is also value to be found in approaching the discourse of a single culture—majority or minority—with this framework. Although this study took place at the intersection of two national cultures, it could equally well apply to small cultures: workplace interactions, media discourses, public institutions. CuDA is especially well-suited to uncover these hidden ideologies; when combined with van Dijk's discourse analysis, an elaborated framework for understanding the cultural construction of identity emerges.

Opportunities for Further Research

We will never explore all the possibilities for understanding the rich and complicated relationship between language and identity. This thesis proposes a way of understanding the culturally-influenced ideologies which underlie communication; there are many other possible approaches to understanding identity. Surely each one would result in subtly different results. This same dataset could be examined using any of them, and a different picture might emerge.

This particular combination of approaches was well suited to examine the construction of identity in a multi-cultural setting, but I could apply the same frameworks to a majority society, different immigrant group, or even smaller sub-set of cultures. Insights about identity, positioning, linguistic representation, and cultural belonging/membership would result.

Though a possibility, this thesis did not explore much the differences which arose between the Edmonton and Waterloo datasets. Differences were noted (though not substantively enough to adversely affect this analysis), and an investigation into the similarities and differences of identity construction in two different Canadian cities would almost certainly be fruitful. Each interviewer brought to her interviews differences in style, in tone, in approach, in register, and in personality—differences which varied not only by person and city, but also by day and by setting. Just as the identities examined in this thesis are not static constructions, it must also be remembered that neither are they individual constructions. Identities are discursively co-constructed in interaction. This analysis privileged the voices of the interviewees almost exclusively, but a rich

study could be performed by shifting the focus and type of research questions to include the interviewers in the analysis.

Other potential differences that were not closely examined include: the variations in identity construction between immigrant generations, the differences between German groups, the degree to which integration in the Canadian community affects the linguistic construction of identity, relative age of the participants, etc. Each of these dynamics could be more thoroughly examined as a variable. As well, the role of code-mixing in the positioning of belonging was touched on only briefly.

The limitations of data collection mean that the opportunities for analysis were restricted. The meaning inherent in gesture, body language, facial expression, and proximity are seldom to be found in these audio recordings. Video components to these interviews would enable richer analysis along these lines; practicalities of data collection and the potential for inhibition need be balanced against the prospects for research, however, and I believe the methods used here afford the optimal balance of practicality and feasibility.

One other consideration for future studies is the selection of participants. The advertisements solicited volunteers of "German-speaking immigrants and their direct descendants" (Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher 2011: 319). This means, by definition, only participants who perceive a certain level of ongoing Germanness will include themselves, and others who might well fit this criteria but self-identify differently will be reluctant to respond. This is always a problem where self-selected participation is relied upon; indeed, as we saw in Edmonton, the recruitment method proved altogether unsuccessful and other means were required. Though I don't have a viable alternative to propose, it is wise to remember that the dataset will be, from the outset, inclined in a particular direction.

Finally, asking the same questions and applying the same frameworks to a different dataset would yield a fuller understanding of the role of culture in the construction of identity. It would also preclude the possibility that the phenomena observed here are peculiar to the German-Canadian community.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis proposed a way of understanding some aspects of expressed identity from a linguistic perspective within a cultural framework. It took a constructivist approach. It privileged the ideas of community and belonging. It examined, at a close linguistic level, the specific syntactic features of language—in English and in German—by which participants construct belonging and group membership. It

applied a secondary analysis to this close description to draw even broader meaning out of these features.

We saw how participants from two urban German-Canadian communities used language(s) to make their groups, membership, belonging, and relationships evident. In Chapter One, the research questions were defined. Important definitions were explained. And the theoretical framework was introduced.

Chapter Two presented an overview of the field—a brief review of the most important literature and a positioning of this thesis in relation to it. The operational definitions of this thesis, including this approach to *community, boundary,* and the role of the *individual* were set forth. It clarified the *space/place* distinction as understood in this thesis and outlined positioning theory, using examples from the data. It also explained Sacks et. al.'s Membership Categorization Device and how that was used in understanding group belonging. This thesis was again positioned in relation to other sociolinguistic studies, and the contrasts and uniqueness of its perspective were presented.

Chapter Three covered the methodology of this thesis: instrumentation, data collection, participants, and analytic approaches. Eckert's third wave of variationist studies was explained, as well as the direct applications of the MCD. van Dijk's Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis was presented in its entirety, along with Carbaugh's CuDA. This thesis' particular combination thereof, application to, and reasons therefore were also explained in this chapter.

Finally, the fourth chapter presented the results of this analytic framework. Step by step, van Dijk's eight discourse particles were elaborated, and sections of the data were analysed accordingly. Carbaugh's five radiants of meaning were then explored, analysing new and already-presented sections of interviews to fully tease apart all the radiants of meaning. Opportunities for elaboration were then presented—possible applications of this study were considered and future research possibilities.

This thesis explored the ways in which (among others) German, Canadian, German-Canadian, and Canadian-German communities are established and membership therein made relevant. I found that there is no one way of doing so. Belonging is not described in one single "correct," or "easiest," or "most effective" way. Throughout these interviews, a multiplicity of identities, groups, and memberships are made evident. Members of these various communities establish belonging and distance from all of these communities repeatedly, frequently, and sometimes contradictorily.

Identity must therefore be seen as changeable and fluid. How else can we understand participants, such as Viola and Tina and Tom, who indicate strong belonging to the German community moments before or after professing Canadian allegiance? Does the second declaration make a lie of the first? Does the first announcement undermine the validity of anything that follows? I hope to have demonstrated it does not. Both statements of belonging—whether explicit or implicit—are equally valid. They are equally true for that participant in those moments.

Relatedly, while it can sometimes be deliberate, I hope also to have demonstrated that identity is, as often as not, an unconscious performance. There were certainly occasions where participants announced or declared or demonstrated membership with full intention. But, as these frameworks reveal, identity can also be crafted subtly. It can be evidenced by words carefully chosen or avoided, by volume or tone, by topics raised and downplayed. Even in interviews such as these, where one expects a focus on culture and belonging, some of the most telling moments of identity enactment were the quiet ones, the indications revealed only in analysis. I hope to have offered a toolkit for parsing identity and teasing out meaning.

This thesis appears in dialogue with the recent work of Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013). Both works use the same dataset to ask questions about language and identity. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, however, propose a theoretical framework for understanding the construction of social spaces as a function of German-Canadian identity. Their book explores the definition and performance of Germanness by examining the spaces these participants construct both individually and collectively. They privilege the idea of sociolinguistic space in their examination of migration, ethnicity, and identity.

Far from negating these findings, this thesis aims to support and to widen Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain's conclusions. Both works examine the signals and the creation of identity. Where Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain examine the role of the individual in the creation of a German space, I examine the role of culture on the individual. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain consider how individuals construct and maintain a German space, and I consider how individuals conceive of and understand their various communities. Though superficially contradictory (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain enumerate several criticisms which result in their eschew of the terms *community* and *membership*), I believe these two approaches can actually be complementary. At the very least, they can be seen as alternatives, each best suited to a particular frame and theoretical approach.

It is hoped that this thesis has contributed to a wider understanding of the roles of culture and community in identity construction. It uses two German-Canadian

populations to explore the linguistic features of conversation which enact and reveal identity. It does not draw conclusions about the German-Canadian communities: 91 interviews with self-identified members cannot facilitate such sweeping declarations. And this is especially true given the highly individualistic ways in which this thesis defined terms like community, membership, and belonging—all of which are celebrated here as varying, variable terms. The German-Canadian community is layered and complex and, rather than seek to make wide (and unsupportable) generalizations about it, this thesis has rather used some of the individuals within this community to illuminate ways individuals in many different communities create belong.

The contributions this thesis stands to offer, then, lie less within the field of German/-Canadian study and more within linguistics, sociolinguistics, and cultural studies arenas. Rather than describe the way German-Canadians create identity, it is hoped this thesis has examined and revealed the ways members of a minority culture enact identity. This thesis explores the ways people talk about being a minority. It considers the ways people talk about living between two cultures. It investigates the ways culture affects, shapes, informs, and even allows these discussions.

We explored identity at a close linguistic level. We explored what it means to be *German*, what it means to be *Canadian*, and how these identities, and others, are acted in conversation. We demonstrated the multiplicity of groups to which individuals and groups can belong—all at once. We looked at the ways language builds belonging, the ways words evidence alliance. We saw how entire groups of belonging can be created or dismissed with a single word.

These conclusions are justified because the frameworks enable them. These are not the only possible interpretations. This thesis took a cultural approach to understanding the linguistic construction of identity and community—there are numerous other possibilities and approaches. By privileging culture, however, and by considering ephemeral aspects of group construction, it is hoped that the invisible became rather more understandable.

Bibliography

Antaki, Charles and Sue Widdicombe. 1998. *Identities in Talk.* London: Sage.

Auer, Peter. 2005. “A Postscript: Code-switching and Social Identity.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 37. 403-410.

Baker, Carolyn. 1997. “Membership Categorization and Interview Accounts.” In *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice.* D. Silverman, editor. London: Sage.

Bloomfield, Elizabeth. 2006 [1996]. *Waterloo Township Through Two Centuries*. Kitchener: Waterloo Historical Society.

Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall. 2005. "Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach." *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5). 585-614.

Carbaugh, Donal. 2007. “Cultural Discourse Analysis: Communication Practices and Intercultural Practices.” *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 36 (3). 167-182.

Clark, Julie Byrd. 2009. *Multilingualism, Citizenship, and Identity: Voices of Youth and Symbolic Investments in an Urban, Globalized World.* New York: Continuum Press.

Cheshire, Jenny. 1982. *Variation in an English Dialect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Cohen, Anthony P. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community.* New York: Routledge.

Cohen, Anthony P. 1996. “Personal Nationalism: A Scottish View of some Rites, Rights, and Wrongs.” *American Ethnologist* 23 (4). 802-815.

Dailey-O’Cain, Jennifer and Grit Liebscher. 2009. “Dialect Use and Discursive Identities of Migrants from the West in Eastern Germany.” In *Language, Discourse and Identity in Central Europe: The German Language in a Multilingual Space*. J. Carl and P. Stevenson, editors. New York: St Martin’s Press. 185-202.

Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer and Grit Liebscher. 2011. "Germans from Different Places: Constructing a German Space in Urban Canada." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 23 (4). 315-345.

Davies, Bronwyn and Rom Harré. 1990. "Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20 (1). 43-63.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. "Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41. 87-100.

Eglin, Peter and Stephen Hester. 1999. "Moral Order and the Montreal Massacre: A Story of Membership Categorization Analysis." In *Media Studies: Ethnomethodological Approaches*. P. L. Jalbert, editor. New York: University Press of America.

Gee, James Paul. 2005. "Semiotic Social Spaces and Affinity Spaces: From *The Age of Mythology* to Today's Schools." In *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power and Social Context.* D. Barton and K. Tusting, editors. New York : Cambridge University Press.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small Stories, Interaction, and Identities.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Government of Canada. 2011. "Census Profile: Canada." Accessed 09 January 2014. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011

Gumperz, John. 2009 [1968]. "The Speech Community." In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader (2nd Edition).* A. Duranti, editor. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Harré, Rom and Luk van Langenhove. 1991. "Varieties of Positioning." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21 (4). 393-407.

Henderson Directories. 1884. *Henderson's Manitoba and Northwest Territories Gazetteer and Directory.* Winnipeg: Henderson Directory Co.

Henderson Directories. 1905. *Henderson's Manitoba and Northwest Territories Gazetteer and Directory.* Winnipeg: Henderson Directory Co.

Hlavac, Jim. 2011. "Hesitation and Monitoring Phenomena in Bilingual Speech: A Consequence of Code-Switching or a Strategy to Facilitate its Incorporation?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 3793-3806.

Houts-Smith, Linda. 2006. “Funny Ha-ha or Funny Strange: The Structure and Meaning of Laughter in Conversation.” PhD diss., University of North Dakota.

Kjellmer, Göran. 2003. “Hesitation: In Defence of ER and ERM.” *English Studies* (84) 2. 170-198.

Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, William. 1991. [1972.] *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Liebscher, Grit and Jennifer Dailey-O’Cain. 2013. *Language, Space, and Identity in Migration.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Merriam, Sharan B. 1988. *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Milroy, Leslie. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Prescher, Petra. 2007. “Identity, Immigration, and First Language Attrition.” In *Language Attrition: Theoretical Perspectives*. B. Köper, M. S. Schmidt, M. Kijtzer, and S. Dostert, editors. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rühlemann, Christoph, Andrej Bagoutdinov, & Matthew Brook O'Donnell. 2011. “Windows on the Mind: Pauses in Conversational Narrative.” *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 16 (2). 198-230.

Sacks, Harvey. 1974. “On the Analysability of Stories by Children.” In *Ethnomethodology.* Roy Turner, editor. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992 [1966]. *Lectures on Conversation (I, II)*. G. Jefferson, editor. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, & Gail Jefferson. 1974. “A Simplest Schematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation.” *Language* 50 (4). 696-735.

Sowell, Evelyn J. and Rita J. Casey. 1982. *Research Methods in Education*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 1974. *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, Teun. 1995. "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis." In *Language and Peace.* C. Schaffner and A. L. Wenden, editors. Dartmouth: Aldershot.

Vettin, Julia and Dietmar Todt. 2004. "Laughter in Conversation: Features of Occurrence and Acoustic Structure." *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 28 (2). 93-115.

Wenger, Etienne, Richard A. McDermott, & William Snyder. 2002. *Cultivating Communities of Practice : A Guide to Managing Knowledge.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Wolf, Ricarda. 1999. "Soziale Positionierung im Gespräch."*Deutsche Sprache* 1. 69-94.

Appendix A

Instrumentation: Interview Questions[14]

1. Why did you/your family leave Germany?
2. Why did you/your family choose Canada? Why Waterloo/Edmonton?
3. When you/your family first came to Canada, did you actively look for other Germans to help you adjust to life in a new country? If so, where did you look and how did you know where to look? Was it helpful?
4. Do you consider yourself to be Canadian or German? Why? (Only if they bring it up.)
5. What do you think of the German community in Waterloo/Edmonton? Have you noticed any changes over the years? If so, what has changed?
6. Do you feel part of this community?/ Why/why not? (Are you actively involved in the German community? If so, what do you do?)
7. Why is there a difference (if at all) between the language(s) you spoke as a child and you speak now? In your everyday life, do you use more English or German? Which language do you speak at home?
8. How do you feel when you speak German? What kind of German do you speak, what's that German like, can you imitate it, how is this different from the German taught in Saturday school or at the university, or the German in Germany? Are there more people in this area who speak like you or who speak a different German than you do? How do you feel when you speak English? What is your English like?
9. Are there situations now in which you exclusively use German? If so, what are those situations? Are there situations in which you feel more comfortable in either of the two languages?
10. Do you have children? If so, do you speak German to them? Why or why not? Did you speak German to them when they were growing up? Did they take it up or did they refuse to speak German? Why do you think that happened?
11. If you don't have children yet, but want to have some, do you plan on speaking German to them? Why or why not?
12. Are there any differences between the kinds of German people in this area? Do they speak differently from each other and how?
13. Is there anything you did as a child that you think is typically German? (For example when it comes to Christmas? Did you exchange gifts on the

[14] Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2013: 270

24th or the 25th? Did you have an Adventskranz and so on?)

14. Are you still keeping up these traditions? Are you planning on passing them on to your children? Are they passing them on to their children? Why or why not?
15. Have you ever felt as if you were losing your German or your Germanness? If so, when and why?
16. Are there differences between your customs and German customs in Germany?
17. Do you think German people in this community are trying to keep up with what is happening in Germany, culturally and politically?
18. Could you imagine leaving Canada and moving to Germany? Why or why not?
19. What do you think about Saturday school? What do you think about the traditions in the area?
20. In which way(s) do you think you are German? Canadian?

Appendix B

Transcription Conventions

(.)	small pause
(..)	longer pause
(1.0)	pause indicated in seconds
?	rising tone
CAPITALIZATION	volume/intensity
:	elongated sound
[	overlap in conversation
=	latching
((xxx))	unintelligible word or phrase
((double brackets))	transcriber commentary
asterisk	word that appears untranslated from original (i.e., is in same form in both utterances)