**OPPORTUNITY AND AVAILABILITY: TWO MORE LINKS
IN SCHUMANN'S ACCULTURATION MODEL FOR
SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
by
SUJATA GILL, B.A.**

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

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
November 28, 1996
©copyright 1997,
Sujata Gill

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-19470-1

Name SUTATA GILL

Dissertation Abstracts International and Masters Abstracts International are arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation or thesis. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
SUBJECT TERM

05326 UMI
SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0727
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journals 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0488
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0277
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0480
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0708
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religion 0527
Science 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0579
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0291
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0391
American 0305
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0332
Canadian (French) 0335
English 0393
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Anthropology 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Economics 0327
Business Administration 0310
General 0272
Accounting 0270
Banking 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics 0501
General 0503
Agricultural 0505
Commerce-Business 0508
Finance 0509
History 0510
Labor 0511
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0364
Geology 0351
History 0578
General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0334
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0385
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and 0617
Relations 0617
Public Administration 0614
Recreation 0614
Social Work 0452
Sociology 0426
General 0427
Criminology and Penology 0938
Demography 0431
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0428
Individual and Family 0429
Studies 0429
Industrial and Labor 0430
Relations 0700
Public and Social Welfare 0344
Social Structure and 0709
Development 0344
Theory and Methods 0709
Transportation 0999
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0285
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and 0475
Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0339
Food Science and 0478
Technology 0479
Forestry and Wildlife 0480
Plant Culture 0817
Plant Pathology 0777
Plant Physiology 0746
Range Management 0304
Wood Technology 0307
Botany 0309
Cell 0329
Ecology 0353
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0353
Immunology 0353
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0357
Neuroscience 0357
Oncology 0416
Physiology 0423
Biochemistry 0421
Veterinary Science 0472
Zoology 0472
Ecophysiology 0476
General 0476
Medical 0476

Geology 0370
Geography 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Microbiology 0411
Paleontology 0426
Paleobotany 0418
Paleogeography 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0748
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Anesthesiology 0772
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0749
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0962
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0367
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and 0554
Safety 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0573
Physiotherapy 0574
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics 0605
Astronomy and 0984
Astrophysics 0604
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0768
Electronics and Electricity 0607
High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0739
Molecular 0610
Nuclear 0752
Optics 0754
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences 0346
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0549
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0745
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

Psychology 0421
General 0384
Clinical 0422
Developmental 0423
Experimental 0424
Industrial 0425
Physiology 0989
Psychobiology 0432
Psychometrics 0432
Social

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**OPPORTUNITY AND AVAILABILITY: TWO MORE LINKS
IN SCHUMANN'S ACCULTURATION MODEL FOR
SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

submitted by **Sujata Gill, B.A.**

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair, Department of Sociology/Anthropology

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University

Abstract

This thesis examines how opportunity and availability, in addition to the social affective factors Schumann identifies in his Acculturation Model, determine the quality and quantity of contact immigrant language learners have with the target language in various social domains. Six Russian speaking immigrant women subjects were interviewed and were found to have positive social and psychological acculturative profiles. However, the number of their opportunities for contact in the work, school and public domain differed, as did their availability for English contacts due to time, money and childcare constraints.

A linguistic analysis using traditional and sociolinguistic measures was done on samples from the women's speech data to measure their English proficiency. The women have had both formal and informal, one and two-way communicative contacts with English, however the results of the linguistic analysis indicate that the women who had more informal two-way communication were further along in their acquisition.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank professor Helmut Zobl for the great deal of time and energy he dedicated from the time this thesis was just an idea right up until its final realization. The advice and guidance I received from him were invaluable. I would also like to thank professor Ellen Cray for her resources and perspective which provided me with many ideas to consider during the evolution of this thesis. I am also grateful for the feedback I received from professor Charlie Laughlin who reminded me that the journey is just as important as the end result.

To my family and friends, words cannot express how much I appreciate your love, words of encouragement, and most of all your patience during these past two years. I especially have to thank my parents because without their emotional and financial support, I could not have completed this thesis.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of tables.....	vi
List of appendices.....	vii
Introduction.....	1-5
Outline of thesis.....	6
Chapter 1-Literature Review.....	7-20
Chapter 2-Development of Thesis.....	21-42
Chapter 3-Methodology and Findings.....	43-89
Chapter 4-Linguistic Analysis.....	90-125
Chapter 5-Conclusion.....	126-130
References.....	131-134
Appendices.....	135-183

List of Tables

	Page
Table 3.1 Similarities and differences among the women.....	51
Table 3.2 The women's responses to the first item from Gardner and Lambert's (1972) attitude and motivation questionnaire.....	61
Table 3.3 The women's responses to the second item from Gardner and Lambert's (1972) attitude and motivation questionnaire.....	62
Table 3.4 The women's use of English in three domains.....	84
Table 3.5 The women's leisure contacts.....	87
Table 3.6 The women's informal contacts.....	89
Table 4.1 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Natalia's speech sample.....	95
Table 4.2 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Sasha's speech sample.....	98
Table 4.3 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Natasha's speech sample.....	101
Table 4.4 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Irina's speech sample.....	104
Table 4.5 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Olga's speech sample.....	107
Table 4.6 Vocabulary, negation, and prepositions from Anna's speech sample.....	110
Table 4.7 Prepositions present in the women's speech samples.....	113
Table 4.8 Elaboration of forms for the verb BE.....	114
Table 4.9 Elaboration of forms for the verb HAVE.....	115
Table 4.10 Elaboration of forms for the verb DO.....	115
Table 4.11 The women's production of three morphemes.....	116
Table 4.12 The number of sociolinguistic items in the women's speech data.....	120

List of Appendices

	Page
Appendix A Questions from the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd interview.....	135-139
Appendix B Questions from the follow-up interview.....	140
Appendix C Informed Consent form.....	141-142
Appendix D Speech samples.....	143-183

:

Introduction

The integration of immigrants into a society whose language and culture differs from their own, usually includes the acquisition of a second language (that of the dominant culture), provided they have contact with it. However the amount and kind of contact immigrants have with the dominant language (through interactions and exposure), and thus the degree to which they acquire the language, is not entirely a matter of personal choice.

So what determines the amount and type of contact immigrants have with the dominant language? Some second language acquisition (SLA) researchers (Schumann, 1978a, b, 1986; Berry, 1980) suggest that it depends on the degree to which immigrants acculturate. Schumann (1986) states his reasoning in the following way: "Acculturation as a remote cause brings the learner into contact with TL [target language] speakers. Verbal interaction with those speakers as a proximate cause brings about the negotiation of appropriate input which then operates as the immediate cause of language acquisition. Acculturation then is of particular importance because it initiates the chain of causality" (385). In this most recent version of Schumann's Acculturation Model for *naturalistic* (i.e. non-instructed) second language acquisition, verbal interactions play a mediating role between acculturation and second language acquisition, whereas in his 1978 version a

more direct relationship between acculturation and second language acquisition was proposed (1978b: 34).

The process of acculturation has commonly been defined as: "those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups" (Herskovits, 1958: 10). However research has identified two different forms of acculturation: *assimilation* and *integration*.¹ Assimilation is defined as "the complete loss of original ethnic identity in an individual or group of individuals leading to absorption into the dominant society" (Weinstock quoted in Lin and Stanford, 1983: 51). Integration is a form of acculturation whereby individuals live in and adapt to the dominant society while maintaining their ethnic or cultural identity. It is an additive rather than a replacement process.

Schumann uses the term "acculturation" somewhat differently in his 1986 Acculturation Model, to refer to the "social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group" (379). For him, one's degree of acculturation is determined by social and affective variables such as attitude and motivation, and is a remote but *major* causal variable in SLA. So according to Schumann, the intensity of

¹Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits note in their 1936 definition that acculturation is to be differentiated from *culture-change* and *diffusion* (which are aspects of acculturation), and from *assimilation* which is sometimes a phase of acculturation.

interactions immigrants have with the dominant group, and the degree to which immigrants acquire the dominant language, depends on the degree to which they socially and psychologically integrate.

In *addition to* the social and affective factors identified by Schumann, that intensify or reduce the communicative contacts second language learners have with the target language in various domains, I contend that the intensity of language contacts depends on 1) the number of opportunities and kinds of contact in these domains made available to learners by the dominant society through education, employment, and public transactions, and 2) the availability of learners to participate in these domains. Consequently, immigrants do not always have *control* over the number or type of interactions they have with the dominant language in public and private contact situations. Also, immigrants cannot always take advantage of the opportunities to speak or hear the dominant language that are available through leisure activities, because the amount of free time immigrants have varies according to their family and/or work commitments. Schumann also recognizes factors determining target language contacts that are beyond an immigrant's control. The ones he identifies are associated with being the member of a social group. In contrast, I am identifying factors of a more situational/personal nature.

Furthermore, the measures used by some researchers to evaluate immigrants' acculturation and second language acquisition (two complex variables) are not in

themselves sufficient. In recent studies (Young and Gardner, 1990; Gardner et al., 1994), only self-reporting attitude and ethnic identity scales were used as measures of the subjects' acculturation; their behaviour in terms of language and culture contact were not considered. The subjects' acculturation was then compared to their second language proficiency which was measured by fluency, accent, vocabulary, grammar, and oral and reading skills. However the acquisition of a second language also means learning the social functions of that language.

Fluency, accent, grammar, and oral and reading proficiency measure language learners' *linguistic competence* and are adequate measures for *foreign* language learners who learn a language outside of its cultural, social, political, and economic context (Lathey, 1994: 83), but these measures are not adequate for second language learners such as immigrants who need to gain *sociolinguistic competence* in addition to linguistic competence. Sociolinguistic competence refers to language learners' ability to produce and understand specific utterances that are appropriate according to the status of the participants, the purpose of the interaction, and the associated norms and conventions in different social contexts (Schmidt, 1983: 151). I suggest that the sociolinguistic aspects of immigrants' second language acquisition, such as the use of idioms, provide a sensitive measure of their acculturation and thus need to be used in connection with purely linguistic measures.

This project is my effort to address some of the shortcomings and gaps in existing research on acculturation and second language acquisition mentioned above by offering my own research findings for consideration. The findings of my research are not generalizable given the small size and specificity of my sample, but are nevertheless valid as they have been corroborated by researchers such as Cummings and Gill (1992).

Outline of Thesis

In chapter 1 I provide a theoretical context for my thesis using Schumann, Peirce, and others who relate socio-psychological factors to second language acquisition.

Chapter 2 is where I develop my thesis that the amount and type of contact immigrants have with the dominant language is not entirely a matter of personal choice because immigrants who want to increase the number of opportunities to speak the language are not always able to, as they have no control over language use in various social domains. Moreover due to personal circumstances, it is not always possible for immigrants to take advantage of the opportunities to speak or hear the dominant language that are available or that do present themselves.

In the third chapter, I provide a description of the selective sample of women used in my study, explain the methodology used to collect the data, and present the data and observations from my research to support my thesis.

In Chapter 4, the results from my linguistic analysis of the women's acquisition of English is presented. These results are then compared to the amount and type of contact the women have had in various social domains (discussed in chapter 3).

Chapter 5 brings together the findings from chapter's 3 and 4 in a discussion on the conclusions and implications of my thesis.

Chapter 1-Literature Review

In the social-psychological tradition of SLA research, acculturation has been linked to second language acquisition by researchers because different forms of acculturation result in different degrees of interaction between individuals from the acculturating and dominant group. It is suggested that the extent to which members from the acculturating group want to become part of the larger society and thus interact with its members, will determine the extent to which they (acculturating individuals) acquire the language of the dominant group.

The interest in the relationship between acculturation and second language proficiency has led to debates among researchers about whether acculturation is a linear or multidimensional process (Gardner et al. 1994: 316). Acculturation as a linear continuum is seen to be a process of assimilation whereby the minority group's culture and language are eventually replaced by the majority's. Acculturation as a multidimensional process allows for the possibility that individuals choose to adapt to a new culture on varying dimensions.

In 1980, J.W. Berry proposed a model of acculturation which conceptualized it as a multidimensional process, with four modes: **assimilation, integration, rejection, and deculturation**. Two key questions are used to determine an individual's current mode of

adaptation: (1) Are positive relations with the dominant society sought? And (2) Is my cultural identity of value and to be retained? A positive response to the first question indicates either integration or assimilation. If individuals then answer "yes" to the second question, they are indicating an integrationist mode. If they answer "no" to the second question, they are indicating an assimilationist mode. Both the integrative and the assimilative mode of acculturation involve interactions with the dominant society, and so it is expected that individuals who choose either one will be interested in learning the language of the dominant society.

On the other hand, a negative response to the first question indicates positive relations with the dominant society are not favored, as rejection and deculturation are the only options. Thus, a "yes" response to the second question reflects rejection while a "no" response reflects deculturation. Individuals showing deculturation tendencies have been described as being "poised in "psychological uncertainty" between two cultures" (Young and Gardner, 1990: 60). Similarly, these individuals have been described as experiencing feelings of alienation and a loss of identity subsequent to their withdrawal from the traditional and the dominant cultures. Nevertheless, it is assumed that they too will have some need for learning the second language because some degree of interaction with the dominant society will be inevitable unless they totally isolate themselves.

It is not clear that an individual's mode of acculturation can be known simply by hearing his/her response to Berry's two questions. It is certainly a good starting point, but further investigation seems warranted to find out an individual's *own* reasoning behind his/her answers. The questions are also open to different interpretations; for instance "positive relations" could be interpreted by someone as no history of conflict between them and the dominant group. If an individual has very little interaction with the dominant group, then it is likely that there will be no conflict of which to speak. An individual may not have chosen an integrationist mode of acculturation but still answered "yes" to wanting "positive relations" with the dominant group, and "yes" to wanting to retain his/her cultural identity.

Schumann's Acculturation Model (1986) distinguishes between two types of acculturation. The first type is where individuals are socially and psychologically integrated into the target language group and thus want and have enough opportunities to interact with members of the target language group such that the linguistic input can be acquired. The second type of acculturation is like the first type, except that individuals also want to adopt the lifestyle and values of the target group.² With both types of acculturation, it is the social and psychological proximity which enable individuals to

²It is unclear whether this second type of acculturation Schumann refers to is what I consider integration (an additive process), or assimilation (a replacement process), or if it includes both integration and assimilation.

acquire the target language (because of the social contact); therefore it is not necessary to adopt the target group's lifestyle and values to successfully acquire their language (1986: 380).³

While a change in lifestyle and values will not determine immigrants' success in acquiring a second language, there will nevertheless be a need to acquire the concepts and vocabulary in order to speak about these new additions in their life with members of the target group and with members of their own group. I am referring to instances where immigrants have no equivalent term in their first language and therefore will be inclined to use the terms from the target language. Turner, in his discussion (1992: 14-15) of Saussure's theory of language, refers to the cultural and social dimensions of language:

Reality is made relative, while the power of constructing "the real" is attributed to the mechanisms of language within the culture. Meaning is revealed to be culturally grounded-even culturally specific....Culture, as the site where meaning is generated and experienced, becomes a determining, productive field through which social realities are constructed, experienced, and interpreted.

So although it may be possible to acquire the target language without individuals having to modify their lifestyle and values, for those who do choose to change in these respects, the

³Based on his research, Schumann concludes that a learner's age as a variable in naturalistic SLA is subordinate to a learner's acculturation profile (1978a: 115). Similarly, he states that a learner's IQ/aptitude is more of a determining factor in instructed not naturalistic second language acquisition (Schumann 1978b: 48).

changes in their "social realities" will have an effect on their patterns of acquisition in areas such as vocabulary elaboration. It is therefore important not only to ask immigrants about any possible changes to their lifestyle, but also to look for domain-specific vocabulary as part of their second language acquisition and as a way of verifying these changes.

Schumann states that the degree to which learners acculturate depends on the amount of **social and psychological distance** between themselves and the target language group. The amount of social distance between the language learning group and the target language group is determined by social variables such as 1) whether the group of second language learners (2LL) are politically, culturally, or economically *dominant*, *nondominant*, or *subordinate* with respect to the target language group; 2) the integration strategy of the acculturating group: assimilation, preservation or adaptation; 3) the *size*, *enclosure*, *cohesiveness*, and *intended length of residency* of the 2LL group; and 4) the *congruency* and *attitudes* of the two groups towards one another (1986: 380-382). So for example, if the acculturating group is dominant or subordinate to the target language group in political, cultural or economic terms, the acculturation model predicts that in both cases the two groups will be socially distant from one another. However in the former case (dominance), the acculturating group will have little *need* to acquire the language of the other group whereas in the latter case (subordination), the acculturating group will *resist* acquiring the language of the other group.

Brown (1980) criticizes the concept of social distance because he says it cannot be objectively quantified, but states that William Acton (in an unpublished doctoral dissertation) has managed to resolve this problem by measuring the social distance *perceived* by an immigrant rather than the actual social distance (1980:160).

Psychological distance has more to do with the individual as an individual, as opposed to an individual as a member of a group, and is determined by what Schumann calls "affective" factors, namely *motivation*, *language shock* and *culture shock*, *culture stress*, and *ego permeability* (1986: 382-384).

Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert were two of the first researchers to consider the effects of attitude and motivation on individuals' second language learning⁴ (Clement and Kruidenier, 1983: 273). They suggested that learners' motivation and success will in part be determined by their attitude towards the target language group, about foreign people in general, and about learning a new language (Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 3). Therefore it is the attitude of learners that sustains their motivation to learn a second language.

According to Gardner and Lambert, language learners are *instrumentally* motivated if they learn a language for utilitarian purposes like improving their socioeconomic status; and language learners are *integratively* motivated if they value and admire the members of the

⁴Gardner and Lambert studied individuals learning a foreign language in their own country whereas the individuals Schumann refers to in his acculturation model are living in the society of the target language group.

target language group, and have a genuine interest in meeting and interacting with them (1972: 3).

Schumann uses Gardner and Lambert's instrumental/integrative motivation orientations to explain how motivation relates to psychological distance. Schumann (1978a) states that instrumentally motivated learners will only need to be as psychologically close to target language speakers as their functional goals require. On the other hand, "the integratively oriented learner would seek maximum proximity in order to meet, talk with, and perhaps even become like speakers of the target language" (91).

Given the relationship between attitude and motivation, it is questionable why Schumann chose to categorize attitude as a *social* factor and motivation as an *affective* factor. Attitude like motivation is an affective factor and should be associated with psychological distance. Both attitude and motivation must be *estimated* using questionnaires, unlike the factors associated with social distance which can be measured to some extent. For example it is possible to determine the political, cultural, or economic dominance, nondominance, or subordination of both groups by comparing and weighing facts about each group's government, economic institutions, and technology. Similarly, the size, and intended length of residence of the 2LL group can easily be quantified. Therefore in my own research, I have included attitude as a factor in psychological distance.

Implicit in Schumann's model is that language acquirers are somewhat responsible for the degree to which social and affective factors interfere with their acquisition of the target language. In other words, as far as social and affective factors are concerned, second language acquirers could *minimize* the amount of social and psychological distance between themselves and the target language group and *maximize* the likelihood of acquiring the target language for example by assimilating and giving up their own life style and values to adopt those of the target language group, rather than choosing adaptation as an integration strategy. Another way to reduce psychological distance is by being sufficiently motivated to acquire the target language. Yet to burden second language acquirers in this way suggests that they are aware of and have control over the degree of their integration into the dominant society and the degree to which they have contact with the dominant language. In reality, the dominant culture may be more of an influencing force as I will illustrate in the coming chapters. An immigrant's degree of language proficiency may also in fact affect his/her degree of acculturation. Immigrants who have a good command of the language may have an easier time acculturating than immigrants who have limited proficiency.

Stephen Krashen (1985) has also tried to conceptualize how attitude and motivation and other affective variables (self-confidence and anxiety) interfere with an individual's second language acquisition, but his *Affective Filter Hypothesis* is meant to explain why

there is unsuccessful acquisition in situations where there is sufficient linguistic input (through exposure and contact) from the language learning environment (1985: 44).

The hypothesis states that comprehensible input may be inaccessible to second language acquirers if there is a "mental-block"; meaning the affective filter is "up". When acquirers are not motivated or confident, and are worried about unsuccessful language acquisition, the filter goes up (Krashen, 1985: 3). The filter is "down" when the opposite affective conditions are present and this allows the linguistic input to be taken in.

In McLaughlin's (1987) discussion of the Affective Filter⁵, he explains that it was first introduced by M. Duly and H. Burt in 1977 and was then expanded upon by Duly, Burt, and Krashen in 1982. It was described as: "...that part of the internal processing system that subconsciously screens incoming language based on what psychologists call "affect": the learner's motives, needs, attitudes, and emotional states" (1987: 53). It was also stated as having four functions: determining "...which language models the learner will select,...which part of the language will be attended to first,...when the language acquisition efforts should cease, and....how fast a learner can acquire a language" (1987: 53).

⁵McLaughlin criticizes Krashen and his Affective Filter Hypothesis stating: "Krashen has provided no coherent explanation for the development of the affective filter and no basis for relating the affective filter to individual differences in language learning" (55).

In an article called *Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning* (1995), Bonny Norton Peirce takes a critical stance against what she calls the "arbitrary mapping [by SLA researchers] of particular factors [motivation, anxiety, self-confidence] on either the individual or the social, with little rigorous justification" (11). Rather than trying to identify variables in language learning as either individual or social, Peirce believes that what is needed is a theory of social identity that brings the language learner and the language learning context together. She argues against the way language learners are conceived of as being motivated/unmotivated, introverted/extroverted, etc., in favour of adopting a poststructuralist view of the individual wherein an individual has a social identity that is more complex and fluid. The definition of social identity or subjectivity Peirce cites is: "the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world (1995: 15). She discusses how social identity is a site of struggle, stating that it is multiple and contradictory, and how thinking of social identity in this way helps to explain the conditions under which learners speak or remain silent.

Peirce points out that SLA researchers have not given enough attention to how inequitable relations of power affect native-non-native speaker interactions. She observes that theories of the good language learner assume that learners "can choose under what conditions they will interact with members of the target language community", and that

the more motivated learners are, the more opportunities they will have to interact with target language speakers (1995: 12). Her theory of social identity is based on the fact that relations of power affect social interactions, because a language learner's social identity is continually being shaped and reshaped by the different subject positions he or she occupies within social discourses. For example if a language learner is positioned as an "outsider" while speaking with a member of the target language community, the learner may, or may not, feel they are able to challenge this subject position.

Peirce argues that what determines a learner's decision to speak or not, is his or her investment. She offers the concept of investment as an alternative to motivation which is often presented in the SLA literature as a fixed personality trait rather than as a dependent variable. She explains that her notion of investment has been informed by social theory, and that it can be best explained using the economic metaphor of "cultural capital" that Bourdieu uses in his work. She goes on to write: "Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) use the term cultural capital to reference knowledge and modes of thought that characterize different classes and groups in relation to specific sets of social forms" (1995: 17). Peirce believes that if individuals invest in learning a second language, they are also investing in their social identity and they expect to acquire a wider range of what she calls "symbolic and material resources". Symbolic resources are language, education, and friendship, while material resources include capital goods, real estate, and money; these resources will

increase the value of a learner's cultural capital. In addition, she feels that the actual and perceived return on the investment should be considered as proportionate to the effort put into learning the second language.

Drawing on her own case study research of immigrant women and their language learning experiences in Canada, Peirce illustrates how "Despite being highly motivated [to learn English] there were particular conditions under which the women in my study were most uncomfortable and unlikely to speak" (1995: 19). For instance, one woman felt uneasy when speaking with anglophone professionals because of her affective investment in her own status as a professional.

I share Peirce's view that an individual's motivation to speak with native speakers of the language depends on their language learning investment, and on their social identity within various social discourses. However Peirce fails to recognize that opportunities to speak the dominant language both inside and outside of the classroom are not only limited by "inequitable relations of power", but also by the nature of existing social structures in the dominant society that do not provide some immigrants with enough places to speak the target language. Therefore even if immigrants claim the right to speak, it does not mean they will always have the opportunity to exercise that right. It is important that immigrants claim the right to speak, but it is equally important for Peirce to acknowledge that changes to existing relations between immigrants and members of the dominant

society requires the cooperation of the dominant society. Again, the burden of responsibility for creating opportunities to practice speaking the language should not solely rest with language learners.

After reviewing the literature, it is clear that an immigrant's mode of acculturation, and affective state whilst learning a second language, plays an important role in the outcome of that learning process. The key ideas from the literature are reviewed below.

Berry (1980), hypothesizes with his multidimensional conception of acculturation that the mode of acculturation chosen by individuals will, in part, determine their degree of acquiring the dominant language. The implication here is that immigrants *decide* shortly after their arrival or sometime thereafter, on the amount of distance there should be between themselves and the dominant group. This hypothesis slightly differs from Schumann's because even though in terms of social distance immigrants choose their own integration strategy, they would seem to have no control over whether the target language group is politically, culturally or economically superior or subordinate to their group, or how different their group is to the target language group.

Schumann, with his Acculturation Model (1978a and b, 1986), suggests the degree to which an individual acculturates is determined by the amount of social and psychological distance between themselves and the target language group. This determines the amount of contact there is between the two groups, which in turn determines the degree to which

they acquire the language. Factors which influence social distance include: degree of integration (assimilation, adaptation, or preservation) and enclosure, the dominance/subordinate relations between the two groups, and the size and congruency of the two groups. Psychological distance is influenced by the immigrant's motivation to acquire the second language, and ability to deal with living in a new culture (language and culture shock).

Krashen (1985) shares this view of the association between affective variables and second language learning with Schumann. He took it a step further however, conceptualizing an internal mental mechanism called an affective filter which he believes controls the process of linguistic input becoming intake once the input has been provided.

Peirce (1995) says that an immigrant's degree of acquisition of the language is largely determined by whether or not their investment in learning the language is proportionate to the personal and social gains, both derived and perceived.

In the next chapter, I attempt to go beyond the social and affective factors that were presented here from the SLA literature, and argue that opportunity and availability to participate in the various social domains where different amounts and kinds of language contact are provided also determine the intensity of a learner's communicative contacts.

Chapter 2-Development of Thesis

In this chapter I will identify various social domains which are sites for communicative contacts, and discuss how opportunity and availability can be factors which limit an immigrant's participation in these domains.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Terms

Acquisition

Acquisition is most often defined in opposition to *learning*. Stephen Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, as presented by McLaughlin (1987: 20), originally defined acquisition as a subconscious process that focuses on meaning rather than form, and which takes place within the context of a natural communication environment. Learning is defined as a conscious process which involves attention to form and error detection by knowing the rules of grammar and is characteristic of the formal classroom setting. However Krashen has since modified his position stating that he does acknowledge that acquisition can occur in formal settings, and learning can happen in an informal milieu.

According to Krashen, adult second language learners can either use acquisition or learning to develop ability in the second language (1985: 1). His hypothesis is that

acquisition enables people to understand and speak a second language spontaneously (just as it does with a first language), while learning simply has an editorial function once the language has been acquired. Krashen's dichotomy has not gone unchallenged by other researchers, but I use the term acquisition to refer to the subconscious internalization of a grammar in the course of communicating in the language, which results in intuitive knowledge.

It can safely be assumed that whilst living in an English environment and having had ESL instruction, the six women in my study have gained ability in English through acquisition and learning.⁶ Their acquired knowledge was operationally defined by their ability to *spontaneously* and *creatively* produce meaningful continuous utterances in English (many of which were also grammatically correct) during the interviews. Krashen 'states that a speaker who focuses on form *and* meaning in conversational situations requires more time to respond which may interfere with communication (1985: 2). Given the spontaneity of the women's speech, there is little chance that the utterances they produced were the result of them concentrating on form and meaning at the same time.

⁶Although Schumann's acculturation model (the focus of my research) is meant to explain only *informal* second language acquisition, I have no reservations about having used informants who have also had ESL instruction since attitude and motivation (two affective variables from the model) have already been found to have an effect on classroom learning by Gardner and Lambert (1972).

The transcripts from the interviews therefore served as the speech data for the linguistic analysis of the women's acquisition of English.

The interview data also provided information about the women's sociolinguistic competence without my having to use specific elicitation techniques.

Acculturation

My understanding of acculturation derives from an expanded version of the definition by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits that was given in the introduction. It is as follows: it occurs when individuals from different cultural groups come into continuous first-hand contact, resulting in the modification in attitudes, knowledge, and behaviour through the addition, deletion, and reorganization of cultural elements of either or both groups.

Two kinds of questions were used to assess the women's acculturation. The first set of questions were designed to examine their acculturation in terms of Schumann's psychological distance;⁷ but with the additional factor of the women's attitudes. Thus the women's attitude and motivation to learn English and towards English Canadians was estimated using self-reporting scales. The second set of questions focused attention on their acculturative behaviour (celebration of Canadian holidays and traditions, leisure

⁷Since the women all belong to the same social group, and there is general congruency between their group and English Canadians, psychological distance is more pertinent than social distance.

contacts with English, etc.); which is a more common focus within anthropology (see Clark, Kaufman, and Pierce, 1976; Long, 1984). Again, I relied on *reported* behaviour since my personal observations of behaviour were limited. The questions about their acculturative behaviour were used to cross-validate the women's earlier responses about their attitude and motivation. I have gone further than previous research by measuring an immigrant's acculturation in terms of reported attitude *and* behaviour.

In this thesis I will show that even though all the women in my study reportedly have positive acculturation profiles due to their integrative attitudes, their high degree of motivation, and the fact that they are actively trying to learn English, their contact with English in various societal domains is limited. It is my contention that personal and social obstacles, not social or psychological distance, limited the women's contact with English in these domains where varying degrees and kinds of contact are available. I suspect it is the various kinds of contact they have had which account for their different patterns of acquisition. Spolsky states: "Whatever the language learner brings to the task, whether innate ability, a language acquisition device, attitudes, previous knowledge, and experience of languages and language learning, the outcome of language learning depends in large measure on the amount and kind of exposure to the target language" (1989: 166).

Nature of input in the Linguistic Environment

It should be pointed out that in the following discussion and comparison of the different kinds of exposure language learners can have to a language, I am not proposing that only one source be used. My purpose is to make the reader aware that not all forms of input in the linguistic environment are thought to be equally beneficial, and so if anything, they should be used in combination with each other. Similarly, my discussion does not pertain to language learners who have no knowledge of the language and so would have problems understanding input at even the most elementary level. Rather it pertains to individuals who have acquired enough of the language to speak it, but want to build on their linguistic competence by having as much contact with the language as possible.

In the introduction it was stated that there must be contact with the target language if acquisition is to take place, and there are two ways in which non-native speakers can come into contact with the target language in the language learning environment. One, through interaction with native speakers (in formal or informal settings), or two, through printed or verbal media such as books, newspapers, radio, and television. The first option involves two-way communication and requires the cooperation of another person, while the second option involves unidirectional communication from the source to the language learner.

However, as Krashen points out, exposure to a language does not ensure acquisition; the linguistic input must be understood by learners before they can "take it in". First, there must be no affective interference, meaning that learners are motivated and not anxious. Second, acquisition is said to occur when the input slightly exceeds $(i + 1)$, a learner's current level of competence (i) (Krashen, 1985: 2). If this is so, then one would think that using the one-way communication option to come into contact with the target language would be the more effective means of the two for learning, because learners are not expected to respond, and therefore will not experience anxiety about their linguistic performance. Another advantage of language contact through various forms of media is that language learners have more control over when and how much input of the target language they receive. For example when reading, learners can always re-read something they do not understand.

That being said, Long (cited in Krashen 1985: 34) found that two-way interactions are more beneficial because the native speaker and the learner can negotiate meanings and verify comprehension, which should increase the amount of comprehensible input. In fact in Schumann's Acculturation Model (1986), it is stated that the "negotiation of appropriate input" is the immediate cause of language acquisition. The advantage of practicing to speak the language is that there is at least the possibility for clarification of meaning, and it allows learners to test their hypotheses about the language. Learners can ask their native-

speaking partner about any unfamiliar words which come up in the exchange, and hopefully they will oblige. Another advantage of two-way communication within a natural context is that it provides learners with the opportunity to hear and use idiomatic expressions. Thus two-way communication should be thought of as the preferred source of linguistic input because it is more likely to provide input that is comprehensible to the language learner.

In the ideal language learning environment then, native-non-native interactions involve minimal amounts of miscommunication⁸ and anxiety on the part of non-native speakers, and whenever the situation arises, the native speaker will assume a cooperative role in the exchange. It is rarely, if ever, the case that native speakers provide corrective feedback for non-native speakers (outside the language classroom), and even if strangers would oblige and help them, in all probability non-native speakers will not want to expose their linguistic weaknesses and so will not ask strangers to explain something which they do not understand. This is the reality of the situation for non-native speakers, who have little or no control over when they will receive the kind of linguistic input they need. They must depend on speakers of the target language to cooperate and be patient with them. Therefore while the input that results from two-way communication is more beneficial

⁸Some L2 researchers however have found a certain degree of miscommunication to be beneficial to the learner for testing and refining their own hypotheses about the L2.

than the input from one-way communication, the former can also be somewhat less available to language acquirers than the latter.

The issue of language contact will now be discussed specifically in relation to immigrant language learners in the Canadian context by examining the opportunities and amount and kind of contact with English particular social domains provide, and the personal factors which can limit an immigrant's availability to take advantage of those opportunities for contact.

Societal Domains and the Opportunities for Language Contact they Provide

Work, school, home/family, friendship, church, leisure, and government have all been identified in the literature on bilingualism as distinct domains of social interaction where either the mother tongue or the second language is used (Haugen, 1964; Weinreich, 1966; and Fishman, 1976). In Schumann's Acculturation Model (1978a,b; 1986) reference is made to these domains in the section on enclosure (one of the social factors that either encourage or discourage contact between the 2LL group and the target language group). Enclosure is stated as being: "...the degree to which the 2LL group and the TL group share the same churches, schools, clubs, recreational facilities, crafts, professions and trades" (1978b: 30). The more domains of social activity the two groups share (i.e. low

enclosure), the greater number of opportunities for contact and for acquiring the second language.

While immigrant language learners generally have the freedom to choose which language to use in the domains of home, friendship, church, and leisure, they may have no other choice than to use the dominant language in the domains of work, school, and government (Haugen, 1964). Nevertheless, for immigrants who want to participate and use the dominant language in any or all of the above domains, it is not simply a matter of choice (as Schumann seems to imply) but rather of opportunity and availability as well.

Work

In Canada, contact with English can occur in the public (e.g.: work, school) and/or private domain (e.g.: home). English being the dominant language (outside of Quebec), it is hard to imagine that in public, few opportunities arise for immigrants to practice their English speaking skills. However employment in Canada does not ensure the use of the dominant language by immigrants. First of all, in the workplace, the need to speak English varies according to occupation and job location. The extent to which the language is used at work will depend on the number of opportunities to speak with co-workers or customers during the course of a day. Occupations such as factory work tend to be individualized, and thus require less communication with others than jobs in the service

industry or in professional fields (lawyer, engineer, teacher) where knowledge of the language and communication skills are compulsory.

The location of one's employment is also important when considering the likelihood of having to speak English while at work. If immigrants work within their own cultural community, in all probability there will be minimal use of English. One of the reasons ethnolinguistic communities are established within the dominant society is to provide its members with a whole range of services in their first language. At the same time ethnolinguistic communities provide job opportunities for its members who have little or no English speaking skills.

All work-related opportunities for conversation in English, especially with peers, are also eliminated for immigrants who are unemployed. The lack of interaction with peers who are native speakers of the target language can have limiting effects on the benefits of natural exposure to the language (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982: 17). The fact that immigrants would like to work in their occupations in Canada does not mean they will. Once they have managed to overcome the language barriers, they must then deal with the high unemployment rate (about ten percent). Also, they must compete for jobs with other Canadians whose English skills are better than theirs. So immigrants and Canadians alike who depend on others for jobs must wait for the employment opportunities to arise. For

immigrants then, gaining access to an English workplace is the first step towards actively participating in an English environment.

School

School is another domain where immigrants can have contact with English and English speakers, either by attending content courses (computers, accounting, etc.) and/or by attending ESL (English as a Second Language) classes. In content classes, English is the *medium* of instruction and the classroom is filled with many native speaker models who can provide authentic input. In ESL classes, English is the *focus* of instruction and the teacher is the only native speaker. For immigrants who have completed their education before coming to Canada and are qualified to work here, but have little or no knowledge of English, ESL classes will naturally have a higher priority than content classes which immigrants must pay for, and where a certain degree of English proficiency is needed.

There are two important advantages of the ESL classroom. First, it is a safer environment for some learners to practice speaking and test their hypotheses about the language than in the natural environment; and second, research has shown that formal language instruction can increase the *rate* of second language acquisition (Freeman and Long, 1991: 321). However, the number of opportunities learners have to practice speaking in a class of ten or more students is limited by the fact that the majority of the

input from the teacher is aimed at the entire class while learners are more likely to generate output when the input is directed at them personally. D'Anglejan sums up the problem with classroom learning in the following way: "Both from a qualitative and a quantitative standpoint, the sample of the target language to which the classroom learner is exposed tends to be sharply reduced and affords limited potential for the formation and testing of hypotheses regarding syntactic and morphological rules" (1978: 225). This underlines how important it is for learners to have communicative contacts outside the classroom in order to further their language development.

ESL classes are free for immigrants because they are funded by the government, but unfortunately if immigrants feel that the class is not serving their individual needs, they may find attending the classes to be a waste of their time and stop going. Or if they decide to stay in the class, they may be uninterested or bored (affective interference) and not pay attention (input will not become intake). Switching programs might not be a possibility for some immigrants either because of the inconvenience of changing course location, or because not all ESL programs offer courses in the summer for those immigrants who want to study English all year round. Nor do all programs offer night courses for those immigrants who cannot attend classes during the day because they work.

Therefore, even though learners can and do benefit from taking ESL courses, the amount and kind of input language classes provide to individual learners is limited because

of the size of the class, and the fact that the teacher is the only native speaker present.

The location, cost, and times of the ESL classes are further limiting factors for immigrants which may leave them with no other choice but to continue in language courses that are less than satisfying.

Public Transactions

Other than work and school, immigrants spend time in the public domain to shop, to bank, to go to doctor's appointments, to obtain government services, etc. These excursions do not require immigrants to speak at length in English, nor do they provide much in terms of input. Grocery shopping provides little or no occasions for immigrants to speak, let alone have conversations. It is possible to make small talk with the cashier and other employees, but that is all it would amount to "small" talk. Shopping for non-food items like clothes can involve dialogue, but if you can help yourself, there is no reason to ask for assistance. The questions customers usually ask sales people anyways are: "How much is it?" "Do you have it in a size X?" "Do you accept Visa?" These types of questions are simple and easy to remember, and do not require much effort on the part of immigrants. The same is true when greeting neighbors or acquaintances; you ask how the person is, what is new in his/her life, and maybe comment on the weather. Similarly, regular transactions at the bank (deposit, withdrawal, bill payments) can be done without

even speaking in most cases; it is simply a matter of handing the teller your bank book and a deposit or withdrawal slip. What all these activities have in common is that they, and the associated utterances (output), have become routine. Krashen speaks of the related problem of appropriate but limited input from a particular work environment (such as a gas station), that provides the learner with input that is characterized by, "...routines and patterns, a limited range of vocabulary, and little new syntax" (1985: 43). These examples illustrate that immigrants have few chances for meaningful communication in English during everyday public transactions.

Home

It is usually assumed that one has more control over the home environment than the public or collective environment, but this is not necessarily true because private interactions in the home also require the cooperation of another person.

Immigrants often delegate their children as English speakers because they are being educated in English and have had extended exposure to the language. Thus for immigrants, any two-way communication in English in the home will likely be with the children; *if* the children oblige. While some children may be very willing to speak English with their parents, others may not be as cooperative. As parents, they have authority over the children, but as language learners, immigrants are subservient to their children who

know more English than they, and so may feel they are not in a position to force the children to speak English with them, if they refuse. This is a perfect example of what Peirce (1995) refers to when she talks about one's social identity being multiple and contradictory. Therefore it is possible that immigrants might not have control over family members who could provide comprehensible input within the home environment.

I have cited the social domains of work, school, public transactions, and home and tried to show the different kinds and amounts of English contact they provide and how opportunities for meaningful two-way communication, in part, depends on the cooperativeness of English speaking interlocutors. To reiterate, the work place is a potential source of English contact for immigrants, *if* they find jobs. Then their occupation must either require or allow for the use of English with co-workers and/or customers in order for them to practice their conversational English and to benefit from the linguistic input. For immigrants who must work in occupations where very little opportunity is provided for them to practice their English, they must look elsewhere.

In the school domain, immigrants can benefit linguistically from taking content classes and/or ESL classes. While content classes provide plenty of authentic input, they also require students to have some previous knowledge of English. An ESL classroom is a sheltered environment wherein learners can use the language with minimal negative

consequences, however input and output is restricted because there is only one native speaker to provide input for ten or more students.

Finally, the encounters immigrants have with the public in shopping centers, or with neighbors are short and routine, and so do not contribute very much in terms of linguistic input or opportunity to produce output.

In the following section I will discuss the personal factors that can get in the way of the attempts by immigrants to maximize their contacts with English.

Personal Factors

Leisure Time

Time is a major consideration when participating in the leisure domain. The amount of leisure time immigrants have to read, watch television and/or movies, listen to the radio, socialize and make friends (sources of English language and culture), depends on their daily schedule. Once the demands of family, work, and/or school have been met, little time is left for leisure contacts. Learners may be hearing and using English at work and/or at school, but leisure contacts with English are different from work or school contacts because there is no pressure to take in all the linguistic input being provided. Through leisure contacts, learners can take in the input without any anxiety, and can do it at their own pace by selectively attending to particular aspects of the input. Another important

difference between the input language learners receive from the leisure domain compared to the input they receive in the school domain is that leisure domain input is on the whole informal, in terms of style or register.

Child Care

Child care responsibility is another factor which interferes with some immigrants making full use of language learning opportunities. For example, immigrants, especially women, might be unable to work or attend ESL classes during the day if they have pre-school age children at home and there is no one else who can look after the children. There is daycare; but is it very expensive, and it may be more economical *not* to work outside of the home while the children are young than it would be to work and pay for daycare. When only one of the parents can work outside the home full-time, the family's income is limited.

Financial Situation

The availability of immigrants to attend ESL classes is similarly constrained by their financial situation. Unless immigrants are financially secure, they will need to make work their first priority and ESL classes their second priority. Ironically, immigrants might not be able to work in the jobs they are qualified to do because their knowledge of English is

insufficient. Thus they will have to find jobs where their current level of English is acceptable in order to pay the bills, and take ESL classes part-time. Taking ESL classes only part-time can further delay immigrants from working in their professions and improving their financial situation.

A lack of financial resources can also prevent those immigrants who are dissatisfied with government-sponsored language courses from taking private courses. Private English classes would only have one or two students per teacher so they would get individual attention, but unfortunately it comes at a price few immigrants can afford.

A case study of a group of thirteen first-generation Indo-Canadian immigrant women from the Punjab done by Alister Cumming and Jaswinder Gill (1992) lends support to my argument that personal circumstances can interfere with immigrants' language learning opportunities. At the time of the study, the women had been living in Canada for an average of six years but had never taken an ESL class despite knowing very little English. Cumming and Gill's research approach consisted of setting up a six month ESL literacy course that was culturally relevant for these women in order to: "...understand how language education might better serve one population of immigrant women..." (1992: 241).

What they discovered was that:

The women's decisions to participate in the classes at this time related to a complex set of facilitating and constraining factors, including length of residence in Canada, current economic positions, family roles and support, knowledge of English and literacy, expectations for further education or work, and an awareness of educational and other public institutions in Canada (1992: 244).

First of all, the course appealed to the women because it was being taught by a woman who was from the Punjab herself, and because child care services were provided by other Indo-Canadian women at the course location for free. Having a teacher who shared the same cultural background and language meant that either the teacher or the women could resort to speaking Punjabi if problems arise when using English. Also, there was no need for the women to explain their sociocultural situation because the teacher was already aware of it (1992: 247).

After spending a number of years adjusting to their new environment and family life, the women were finally able to focus on their personal growth and attend the ESL classes. All but two of the women had husbands who were well established at work and made a good living, which meant that for some of the women who had to work in low status jobs shortly after their arrival in Canada, they did not have to continue working if they did not want to. Their financial stability also made it possible for them to pay for language courses if they decided to take more after the six month course they were already attending.

The women's family situations were such that they previously had very little need to learn English. Living in traditional patriarchal households, their husbands did all the banking and shopping while they spent most of their time looking after the children and visiting relatives. This reduced the number of interactions the women had with the dominant society, and as a result they had little knowledge of public institutions and services, and had no English-speaking friends or acquaintances. However their desire to further their education, get a job they would enjoy, and have greater independence is what motivated them to improve their English. The English literacy program taught the women things like how to find a job, what health care services are available, and introduced them to local libraries and banking procedures.

This group of women have both typical and atypical circumstances as immigrants, and it is the atypical ones that allowed these women to participate in ESL classes at their convenience. For example, the average household income of the women was forty thousand dollars; their economic stability not only allowed them to pay for any language courses they might want to take, but it is what permitted some of them to spend the initial years of their life in Canada to just settle in because they were not under financial pressure to learn English. Not very many immigrants have this luxury and so must take ESL classes shortly after they arrive so that they can look for jobs in their fields as soon as possible. Similarly, the women had husbands who had already been living in Canada or

England for more than ten years before they joined them, and they had also been educated in English. Their husbands' knowledge of the language and public institutions meant that they did not need to learn English right away because the day-to-day household matters were being taken care of by their husbands. When husbands and wives emigrate together, they are more likely to have similar levels of English proficiency and thus must initially rely on relatives already living in Canada (if they have any) to help them find a place to live, show them where the grocery stores and schools are, explain the transit system, and enroll them in ESL classes.

These women are typical of other women immigrants in that they are primarily responsible for looking after the children, and so would benefit from having daycare facilities wherever ESL classes are held. Also, gaining personal and financial independence by working or by furthering one's education is a common goal for many women. A third similarity between this group of women and other women immigrants is that they had very little free time during the day to have leisure contacts with English Canadians and so consequently do not have any friends who are English Canadians.

Some of the factors that Cummings and Gill found interfered with the women's participation in the ESL literacy program are the same and some are different to ones I initially identified that can determine the amount of contact immigrants will have with English. Not only am I arguing that personal factors such as lack of child care or financial

instability prevent some immigrants from taking advantage of the opportunities to use English that are available. I am arguing that in any case, during daily public contact with English speakers there are few opportunities for conversation (outside of work and school), and that immigrants have no control over that reality.

The above discussion is meant to draw attention to the fact that opportunities to hear and to use the dominant language are not as accessible to immigrants as one might think. The next chapter examines how opportunity and availability factors affect six immigrant women who want to gain competence in English.

Chapter 3-Methodology and Findings

In this chapter, the methodology used to collect the data will be explained, the interview contexts will be described in detail, and the findings of my case study with six Russian speaking immigrant women living in Ottawa will be presented. An overview of the characteristics of the six women is provided before introducing them individually.

Methodology

Dependant and Independent Variable

The dependant variable in this study is the women's language acquisition, and access to real-world communicative opportunities is the independent variable. In order to demonstrate change in the dependant variable, base line data needs to be gathered and a longitudinal study conducted. However, this was not possible due to limited time and resources, and therefore the women's acquisition was only measured at one point in time. Thus this research is exploratory rather than empirical in nature.

Controlled and Uncontrolled Variables in my Sample

Steps were taken to control for sex, first language, level of education, the presence or absence of school-age children in the home (a possible source of language input for adult

learners), and social distance. My sample of women is linguistically rather than ethnically uniform. All six of the women are former citizens of the now dissolved Soviet Union and speak Russian as a first language, but belong to three different ethnic groups. Four of them identified themselves as being Russian, one as Ukrainian, and one as Estonian. The women have all had a post-secondary education: five of the women have had four or five years of university education and have professional degrees, while the sixth woman went to college to receive her professional degree. They all have school-age children except one woman, who is here on a working visa; but she is a live-in nanny for an English speaking Canadian couple and takes care of school-age children. As I do not speak Russian, it was necessary for the women to be able to understand and speak enough English to answer my questions. The problem with using a selective sample such as this is that the women's ability to speak English, the fact they have immigrated with their families (except for the nanny), and the fact that their education has probably opened their minds to experiencing different things, may be possible biasing factors in the attitudes they expressed.

Due to the fact that my sample was one of availability, I was unable to control for age, length of stay in Canada, and amount of English instruction before coming to Canada. For the most part, the women's previous knowledge of English can be considered passive since they did not have much opportunity to use English in the Republics outside of the

classroom. Whether in fact it even matters that the women in my study range in age from thirty to fifty years is perhaps less relevant than the fact that all are adult learners, since most of the research to date has centered around the debate concerning the effects of age differences on second language acquisition in terms of child vs adult learners, child vs adolescent learners, or adolescent vs adult learners. The women's length of residence in Canada ranged from eleven months to three years at the time of the study.

Of the six women, four are landed immigrants, one has a working visa but is in the process of getting her landed immigrant status, and one has refugee status because she left Russia in 1992 when there was a general upheaval after the collapse of the Soviet Union a year earlier. Regardless of the women's different entry status, their main reasons for coming to Canada were the same, namely, the economic opportunities and to escape from the political and social unrest in the Republics. Furthermore, they all intend to reside in Canada permanently and want to become Canadian citizens, with the exception of one woman (one of the landed immigrants) who feels that if she cannot find work in Canada, it would be better for her to go back to Russia than have to collect welfare.

In terms of social distance (political, cultural, and economic dominance, nondominance, or subordination; integration strategy; enclosure; cohesiveness; and intended length of residence), Canada is not dominant or subordinate to the Republics. As far as the integration strategy of the six women is concerned, the data indicates they are

adapting rather than assimilating into Canadian society. Similarly, enclosure appears to be low as they all live in mixed neighborhoods and have English Canadian acquaintances if not friends. Only one of the women reported having contact with the Russian community in Ottawa, and that was through the Russian church she attends.

Use of Case Study Approach

In order to collect substantial descriptive data on each of the women, a case study approach was used. Participation in the study was strictly on a voluntary basis, and informants were limited to Russian speaking women with a post-secondary education who had school-age children in the home, and were able to speak and understand enough English to answer the questions.

Finding the Informants

After speaking with the coordinator of an ESL program for immigrants (run by the Ottawa Separate School Board) about my research, I was permitted access to the students. During two following visits to the school, an ESL teacher introduced me to some of the other teachers, and a few of the students from his class and from other classes, so that I could explain the nature of my research and ask for volunteers. At the

time, my intention was to find male and female informants of different ethno-linguistic backgrounds, and so I initially did not make restrictions on the sex or first language of potential informants. It was then decided that the sex and first language of the informants should be the same in order to control for as many variables in second language acquisition as possible. As it so happened, there were four Russian speaking immigrant women among those who had already agreed to participate; therefore Russian speaking women became the focus group for the study. The women were together in two's when I was introduced to them, as two of them are sister-in-laws, and the other two are friends. I was unable to find more Russian speaking women at the school willing to participate, even after waiting three weeks for the summer ESL registration to take place in case any other Russian speaking women might have registered. However one of the teachers at the school also taught ESL in the evening at a school run by the Ottawa Board of Education, and suggested that I contact the administrator of that program and inquire if teachers could ask the Russian speaking women in their class if they would be willing to participate in the study. The administrator called me the following day to inform me that two women at the school had agreed to speak with me, bringing the total number of informants to six.

The Informants

Natalia

Natalia is thirty years old, and was born in Siberia, Russia. In Russia she completed a degree in geophysics (which takes five years of university). Her education in Russia included studying English from grade five to grade ten. She is a landed immigrant and had been living in Canada for eleven months when I interviewed her for the first time. She is married and has two sons ages three and seven. Since being in Canada she has taken two ESL courses.

Sasha

Sasha is Natalia's sister-in-law, and immigrated to Canada with her husband and ten-year-old daughter a month before Natalia. Sasha is thirty-three years old and was born in Ivannava, Russia. She has a university degree in hydrogeology, but changed her profession while in Russia and became a cartographer. She had five years of English before university, and then took another three years of English while at university. In Canada she has had three private English courses at Berlitz.

Natasha

Natasha is Jewish, was born in Kherson, Ukraine, and is forty-three years of age. She is married and has a thirteen-and-a-half and a fifteen-and-a-half year old son. She had English instruction from grade five to grade ten. She went to university for four years where she studied alternative medicine. She is a landed immigrant and had been living in Canada for two years and four months at the time of the first interview and has had two ESL courses. She and her family lived in Toronto for the first eight months, then lived in Montreal for one year, and now live in Ottawa.

Irina

Irina was born in Finland and grew up in Estonia. After high school, Irina attended college and received a degree in cooking management. She is forty years old, married and has a ten-year-old son and a fifteen-year-old daughter. In Estonia she learned French from grade five to grade ten. She and her family immigrated to Canada three years ago. Before moving to Ottawa (where she has had three ESL courses), they spent two years in Montreal where Irina continued to learn French. Irina and Natasha are friends.

Olga

Olga is fifty years old and was born in Moscow, Russia. Before coming to Canada she lived in Australia for a year. She has been in Canada for two years and ten months on a working visa, but is in the process of applying for landed immigrant status. In Russia, she studied at university to be an editor of children's literature, yet she chose to work instead as a nanny, and continues to work as one here in Canada looking after three children. She has two grown children of her own in Russia and has been married twice; her first husband passed away, and she is divorced from her second husband. The two ESL courses she has had in Canada are the only English instruction she has ever had.

Anna

Anna is thirty-five years old and is a refugee from Russia. She had been living in Canada with her husband, six-year-old son, and thirteen-year-old daughter for a year-and-a-half at the time of the first interview. In Russia she went to university for five years and graduated with a degree in electronical engineering. She had English courses from grade five to grade ten, and in university she used technical texts that were in English. Since being in Canada, she has taken three ESL courses.

Table 3.1 Some Similarities and Differences Among the Women

	Age	Length of Residence	Moved as family	EFL	ESL
Natalia	30	11 months	yes	1hr/2xwk for 5yrs.	2 courses
Sasha	33	1 year	yes	2hrs/2xwk for 8yrs.	3 (private)
Natasha	43	2yrs.4mos.*	yes	45mins/1xwk for 5yrs.	2 courses
Irina	40	3 years**	yes	none	3courses
Olga	50	3 years	no	none	2 courses
Anna	35	1 ½ years	yes	1hr/2xwk for 5 yrs.	2 courses

*One year of this was spent in Montreal where French is the dominant language.

**Similarly, Irina spent most of her first two years in Montreal where she learned French.

The above table shows that the women are comparable in terms of age and ESL instruction, but differ in terms of length of residence and EFL (English as a foreign language) instruction; two variables that will be discussed in the next chapter.

The Interviews

The interviews were conducted over a period of five months: from June to October 1995. Each of the six women were interviewed on three separate occasions, except for Anna whose second and third interview was held on the same day due to her time constraints. The purpose of interviewing the women over three, one-hour sessions was to reduce the chance of the women becoming tired and/or bored. The three interviews provided me with a way in which to structure the different kinds of questions that were asked (described in the next section). The interviews were scheduled at the women's convenience, usually right before their morning, afternoon or evening ESL classes. A follow-up interview with each of the women was conducted a year later in August or early September because at the time of the initial interviews, it did not occur to me to ask them to quantify their contacts with English.

In any interview situation, the interview context such as the time, place, interruptions, seating arrangements during the interviews, the interviewee's state of mind (for instance if he/she was in a hurry etc.), has an effect on the nature (i.e. interpretation, truthfulness) of the questions being asked and the responses being given (see Briggs, 1986). More specifically, the interview settings described below may have affected the quality and quantity of the women's spoken English. For instance, the women who were interviewed in the evening may have been tired and as a result may have been less able to express

themselves than the women who were interviewed first thing in the morning. Similarly, those who were interviewed at home may have felt more comfortable because they were in their own surroundings as opposed to the women who were interviewed at school or elsewhere. The interruptions during some of the interviews may have been distracting and caused the women to lose their train of thought. Finally, if any of the women were in a hurry, they may not have elaborated on their answers or given them as much thought as they would under normal circumstances. It is therefore necessary to include details about the context in which the interviews took place in order to provide the reader with all the needed information to understand and evaluate the data. The conditions mentioned above have particular significance for the third interview, because the women's speech performance was evaluated based on speech samples from this interview. No matter how positive or negative the conditions were for the women during the third interview, it was thought to be in the women's favour to use the third interview for the linguistic analysis because it was felt that by the third interview the women would have felt most comfortable speaking with me.

Natalia, Sasha, Natasha and Irina were first interviewed in June in the final weeks of their winter/spring ESL classes, and I spoke with them between twelve and one o'clock in the afternoon when they were on a break between their morning and afternoon classes. The first interview I conducted was with Natalia in an empty classroom at the school.

where we sat at one of the three long tables that were set up in a u-shape. However for Sasha's, Natasha's, and Irina's first interview, I used the school conference room which had one long table in the middle of the room with comfortable chairs around it because in the classroom, Natalia and I were interrupted a number of times. While using the conference room there was only one interruption, which occurred during Irina's interview when Irina's husband entered the room to tell her that their class was about to start. Irina told him she would join him later. Natasha and Irina were in the room during each other's first interview despite my polite hints to wanting to interview them without the other one being present. Fortunately Natasha proved to be a help during Irina's interview, as she repeated what I said in Russian in the few instances when Irina did not understand a question or a particular word in a question. A week after Natasha's first interview I was fortunate to be invited to her home for an informal chat and some borscht (a Russian/Ukrainian dish).

The second and third interviews with Natalia, Sasha, and Natasha took place in August. Irina's second interview was also in August, but her third one was in October. Actually, on the day of Irina's second interview I was supposed to be interviewing Sasha, but she did not show up. Sasha later explained to me that when I called, all she understood was that it was about an interview at a school but she did not know who was calling or which school the caller was from even though she agreed to the meeting. Irina's

second interview was therefore unscheduled, still, she seemed more relaxed and was more talkative than during the first interview. She seemed the most relaxed, and was the most talkative during her third interview.

Natalia's and Sasha's second and third interviews were conducted between eleven o'clock in the morning and one o'clock in the afternoon at their apartments because Sasha did not attend ESL classes during the summer, and Natalia was attending evening classes. When I interviewed Natalia and Sasha at their apartments, their children were home and on occasion entered the room where we were speaking. Also, for at least the first fifteen minutes of Natalia's second interview we had to contend with the noise of construction going on outside. During Sasha's second and third interview we were briefly interrupted by a telephone call (answered by Sasha's daughter). Aside from these temporary distractions, Natalia and Sasha may have felt more at ease being interviewed in their own apartments. The visits to Natalia's, Sasha's, and Natasha's home allowed me to *observe* the women's speech behaviour in the home environment and are indicative of the informal nature of our relationship.

For Natasha's second and third interview she suggested we speak in one of the portables in the school yard where her class and a few other ESL classes were being held during the summer because the portables were cooler than the classrooms inside the school. Her second interview was conducted at noon and the third interview at nine

o'clock in the morning. During her second interview Natasha was notably concerned about how long the interview would take because she said she had to get home to her son who had recently broken his arm. Shortly after the interview was underway, her husband briefly interrupted us to tell Natasha that he would be going home, which permitted her more time to speak with me. Nevertheless, before the end of the interview she asked if we were finished.

Olga and Anna attend ESL classes at night and so they were always interviewed at six o'clock (one hour before their classes started). Also, since the interviews with Olga and Anna were conducted before classes started for the evening, no one disturbed us in the small resource room that we were using at the school.

The interviews were semi-structured and the questions were prepared beforehand (see appendix A). By asking the questions myself, I was able to establish a personal rapport with the women and was present to clarify anything they did not understand. The women were asked to answer the questions as honestly as possible, and were informed orally and in writing that they have the right to withdraw their participation at any time, or to not answer any particular questions they may find too personal. A copy of the final research paper will also be made available to the women and to the coordinator and administrator of the ESL programs. I had the women's written consent to tape record the interviews after assuring them of confidentiality (see appendix C). The tapes which were about one

hour in length, were then transcribed. I used the first interview to test my questions. The women were naturally a bit nervous during the first interview, as I myself was, but as the initial fear of not being understood faded on both sides, I think we were more relaxed.

I am aware of the possibility that because I am a member of the dominant group in question (English Canadians), the women would answer favourably so as not to offend me. However sitting face-to-face with the women for the interviews, I could see their facial expressions and reactions to my questions which helped me gauge the truthfulness of their answers. There is always the problem of validity of the data when mainly using questionnaires (self-reports) to collect information, and that is why occasionally I asked a question at the beginning of the interview and then later asked a similar question that was worded somewhat differently to check the consistency of the women's responses. Upon review of the data, some discrepancies in a few of the women's answers concerning their attitudes were found.

The Questions

During the first round of interviews, I collected background information on each of the women. I recorded their age, place of birth, parents' place of birth, languages spoken other than Russian and English, their marital status, if they have any children, their

individual and/or household income, their occupation, the number of years of education, the number of English classes they have had in Canada or abroad, the number of years they have lived in Canada, and their entry status.

I also tried to get some sense of the women's motivations to learn English, as well as their attitudes toward learning English and English Canadians by using some of the statements from Gardner and Lambert's attitude and motivation questionnaire. For example, the women were asked if they *strongly agree*, *agree*, *do not agree*, or *strongly disagree* with the following statement: "The more you get to know English Canadians, the more you want to be able to speak their language." However, I did not make any assumptions about their motivation being either instrumental or integrative.

The final part of the first interview was meant to reveal each of the women's English speaking and reading habits in the private and public domain, and to find out how well *they* feel they can speak, read, and write English.

The aim of the second interview was primarily to get the women to speak freely and at length, so the questions were more open-ended. For instance, the women were asked to talk about an English television program or movie they had recently seen. I thought this would not only provide me with a sample of their free speech in order to examine their acquisition of English, but would also provide me with information about their leisure contacts with English. Unfortunately, this particular elicitation technique only proved to

be useful in the case of Natalia, Sasha, and Irina, as Natasha, Olga, and Anna told me they either do not have a lot of time to watch television or they mostly watch the news.

The questions in the third and final interview were intended to discover which aspects of a Canadian or North American lifestyle, if any, they have *chosen* to adopt. Asking about any changes in their daily behaviour, other than with respect to language, would provide a more complete picture of their acculturation. Among the questions posed was if they have added any North American meals to their cooking. I also inquired as to whether or not they celebrate any Canadian holidays and traditions. Within the privacy of their own homes, the women and their families are not subject to any form of public pressure to conform, thus any changes in their behaviour patterns towards a more "Canadian way of life" would be by choice.

My research also included sitting in and observing an ESL class, once I received permission from the coordinator of the program, the teacher, and the class. It was a chance to see for myself what goes on in an ESL class, and to cross-validate the accounts given by the women of their classroom experiences. I recorded my observations of the classroom dynamics, as well as of the lessons taught in the class.

In August or September 1996, each of the women took part in a follow-up daytime interview at their homes; except for Olga's which took place at six o'clock in the evening at a quiet cafe. Each interview lasted twenty-minutes to half-an-hour and allowed me to

ask the women how many hours per week they watched television and movies last summer, how many hours they listened to the radio, how many times a week they read an English newspaper, etc. The interviews also provided me with the opportunity to clarify information they previously supplied and to ask any questions I forgot to ask during the initial interviews (see appendix B). I am aware of the difficulty the women may have had in trying to remember approximately how many hours of television they watched or how many hours of radio they listened to a year ago, but after giving it some thought, they were able to recall the information.

Findings

Psychological Distance

Attitude and Motivation

The women's attitude towards English Canadians was estimated using two of the items borrowed from Gardner and Lambert's (1972) attitude and motivation questionnaire. The first one (question #2) involved the women saying if they a) strongly agree, b) agree, c) do not agree, or d) strongly disagree with the following statement: *The more you get to know English Canadians, the more you want to be able to speak their language.* The results are listed in table 3.2:

Table 3.2 The Women's Responses to the First Item Adapted from Gardner and Lambert's (1972) Attitude and Motivation Questionnaire.

	<u>strongly agree</u>	<u>agree</u>	<u>do not agree</u>	<u>strongly disagree</u>
Natalia		X		
Sasha		X		
Natasha	could not give a response			
Irina	could not give a response			
Olga	X			
Anna		X		

As the above table shows, half of the women said they "agree" with the statement: Natalia qualified her answer by adding: "I cannot say that I strongly agree". Anna said: "I don't think it's no big different in the first and second, and I agree." Sasha simply said: "I agree". Olga said: "Yes of course, I'm strong agree." Natasha and Irina told me that they do not have any English Canadian friends and so felt they could not give any response, but when

asked if they like the English Canadians they have had interactions with, they said that they were "happy", "friendly" and "very open people".

The second item: *You like English Canadians...* a) very much, b) a little, or c) not at all, was presented to the women five questions later (as question #7), and their responses were expected to correlate with their responses to the first item. The results are presented in table 3.3:

Table 3.3 The Women's Responses to the Second Item Adapted from Gardner and Lambert's (1972) Attitude and Motivation Questionnaire.

	<u>very much</u>	<u>a little</u>	<u>not at all</u>
Natalia	X		
Sasha		X	
Natasha	X		
Irina	X		
Olga	did not give a response		
Anna		X	

Interestingly, only Natasha and Irina, who told me they do not have any English Canadian friends, indicated that they like English Canadians "very much". After saying that she "strongly agrees" with the first statement: *the more you get to know English Canadians the more you want to be able to speak their language*, in response to the second item Olga said she is not a critical person and avoided the question. Likewise, Sasha said she agreed with the first statement, and then said she likes English Canadians only "a little". I would suggest that the apparent discrepancy between some of the women's answers to the first and second item is the result of their interpretation of the first item. For instance, perhaps Natasha and Irina felt they could not respond to the first item because they do not know any English Canadians *personally*, but they like English Canadians *in general*, and so responded to the second item. Another problem may have been the limited choices available to them in the second item as indicated in Natalia's complete response: "Yes, I like, I've very much it's better than a little. Because I like, it's very friendly, it's very helpful for us, it's when we came first we don't know anybody-I like very much people." Her answer is ambiguous because it seems she felt compelled to choose "very much", but given the choice might have chosen an adverb that is in between "very much" and "a little". Anna had the same difficulty in choosing between "very much" and "a little", so I said that her answer could be somewhere in between the two.

As an added measure of the women's attitudes, in the final interview the respondents were asked to specifically name two things they like and dislike about Canada. This gives a better idea of what they think of the country as a whole and of Canadians in particular. Natalia said she liked the museums and the people who she finds to be very friendly and patient with her language problems. Olga and Anna also mentioned Canadians among the things they like, because they find them to be law-abiding and non-racist citizens. Sasha and Irina value the sense of dignity they have in Canada, and Irina also likes the fact that in Canada people do not have to give up their ethnic identity to enjoy Canadian citizenship. For Natasha, it is the personal and political freedom as well as the degree of personal safety as compared to that in Russia and the Republics. What made the women decide to come to Canada in the first place was the fact that is safer to live here than in the former Republics where there is social and political unrest.

The things they do not like about Canada included education; most of the women felt it was not as good as the education one receives in the Republics. Abuse of the welfare system by Canadians was another thing the women did not like, and was the reason Sasha gave for only liking English Canadians "a little". Also mentioned was the economic situation, the unemployment rate, and the national unity problem with Quebec was even brought up. Natasha was the exception with her response, and I quote: "Now I...I uh see

Canada in pink colour, you know?...And I can uh...can't say anything uh bad about Canada, because I love this country."

When asked about what they think of the Canadian government, Anna was the only one who offered an opinion. She said she thinks the government is "very smart" for being able to provide a good life for its citizens and blames the Russian government for failing to do so. Natalia and Natasha told me only that they like the changes to the welfare system that the Ontario government had implemented. Sasha, Irina, and Olga said they are not interested in politics.

Their attitude as far as learning English is concerned was found to be positive as the women said that they would learn English even if their future employment did not depend on it. They informed me that they are learning English so that they can "live" in Canada; as Olga put it: "Because I'm...it's not life only in ze job at work, it's life everywhere and people everywhere." Also, given the choice to learn any language in the world, five of the six women chose English. For some of them the appeal was its status as an international language, and for others it was the "sound" of the language.

It was also important to know what their attitudes were towards their ESL classes, as their opinions about the kind of formal English training they receive is going have an effect on their behaviour (attendance, class participation) and learning. Were their ESL classes fulfilling their individual learning needs? Did they like their teachers? Initially, all the

women reported that what they were learning in their ESL classes was interesting.

Natalia, Natasha, Irina, and Anna said they liked their teachers (who are English Canadians) "very much"; and described them as being "nice", "wonderful", or "beautiful". Sasha had just started the course and so she felt she could not offer an opinion, and Olga said she respects the efforts of any teacher and so likes all teachers. Some of the women however voiced their concerns about not getting enough practice speaking English in the classroom. They all expressed that speaking English was the most desired but the most difficult skill for them. The problem seems to lie in the fact that after successfully completing the intermediate level, they were placed in advanced ESL classes where much of the class time is dedicated to the improvement of writing skills.

When I asked the women for two examples of how their English classes in Canada have helped them, each one said that prior to them taking the classes, they did not attempt communication with English speakers, even though most of them knew a few English words and a bit of grammar before coming to Canada. The women's initial reluctance to speak is characteristic of "the silent period" which is a phenomena observed in child second language acquisition (Krashen, 1985: 9). Children acquiring a second language spend the first few months in the new environment listening (for the most part) to comprehensible input which helps them develop competence in the language. One of the two corollaries from Krashen's Input Hypothesis is that when a language learner has

become more competent as a result of there being sufficient comprehensible input, speech will "emerge" (Krashen, 1985: 2). However the reason why the women credit their formal instruction for their ability to speak is probably because the ESL classroom provided them with a comfortable environment in which they could practice speaking and build confidence in their abilities.

Sasha and Irina have both seen their language learning efforts rewarded in other ways as well. For example, Sasha received a raise at work after she completed her first English course. Money is one of the *material* resources Peirce (1995) says language learners hope to gain. Irina on the other hand, has become more independent since she began speaking English, as she told me that she no longer has to take her husband shopping with her:

- I.O.: Oh ven we come in Ottawa I uh must uh...go wiz my husband because uh...I don't can speak English. But now...
 S.G.: You can go by yourself!
 I.O.: No! [she probably thought I meant *can't* go by herself] I don't vant go vis my husband. [laughing] I vant go alone!
 S.G.: You would-you'd rather go alone now?
 I.O.: Yah, it's more better because ven I go in se store, every husband tell wifes it's so long! I don't vant wait, but now I can go.

Although independence is not included in Peirce's list of *symbolic* resources, it should be because the women in Cumming and Gill's (1992) case study similarly gained some independence as a result of learning English.

The women in my study also have obvious economic motivations to learn English. During the course of the interviews, none of the women except Olga was gainfully employed; Natalia's, Sasha's, and Anna's husband worked, but they worked in low paying jobs, so all of the women (except Olga) were receiving some form of social assistance. Olga's individual income, and the household income of the other women is less than twenty thousand dollars. However the women's motivation to learn English can also be attributed to the fact that all the women are highly educated (2-5 years of post-secondary schooling) and it is important for them to work in their chosen professions. They realize however that in order to be able to work in their fields, they need to improve their English. When asked about their short and long-term goals, improving their English was usually given as an immediate goal, stating that would help them to achieve their future goals i.e. to work in their professions or to have their own business. The exception is Olga, who has chosen not to work in her profession as an editor of children's literature, but who is nonetheless motivated as she is required to speak English for her current occupation as a nanny.

Another motivating force for the women would seem to be their desire to feel like Canadians. When asked whether they agree or disagree with the statement, *If you learn English you will feel more like a Canadian*, five out of the six women said they agreed; Natalia disagreed explaining that even if she knows English very well, she will still feel

more Russian than Canadian but added that her children will feel like Canadians. I would suggest that Natalia said that her children will feel more like Canadians than she will because she expects that they will be more fluent speakers of English and will know the culture more than she ever will. I would like to note that in response to a previous question about how learning English will help her, Natasha said: "...I think uh...when English-when English uh come-a good English...You feel as Canadian." She came up with this analogy on her own, which attests to the truthfulness of her response to the statement in question.

The results of the self-reports by my informants about their attitudes and motivations indicate that they are eager to acquire English. Some of them are optimistic about future employment prospects in Canada, while others are trying to create jobs for themselves. All of them though, are interested in becoming Canadian citizens.

Language Shock and Culture Shock

Schumann defines culture shock as: "anxiety resulting from the disorientation encountered upon entering a new culture" (1986: 383) which can lead to a learner's energy and attention being directed away from language learning. Of the six women, only Sasha and Olga reported experiencing culture shock, and both said that it did not interfere with their learning of English, and they are now over it.

Language shock is described by Schumann (1986) as anxiety learners experience as a result of not always being able to correctly name objects and ideas in a second language. This anxiety, defined as language shock, may also be labeled *communication apprehension* and *fear of negative evaluation*. Communication apprehension is: "a type of shyness characterized by fear or anxiety about communicating with people" (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1991: 30). Watson and Friend (as cited in Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1991: 31) defined fear of negative evaluation as: "apprehension about others' evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively."

I asked the women about how they feel when speaking with English Canadians face-to-face, and how they feel when speaking with them over the phone in order to learn about their language performance anxiety. The women all told me that they found speaking English on the telephone more difficult than speaking to someone in person because people often speak very quickly on the phone, and in face-to-face interactions they can use their hands and facial expressions whenever their English fails them. They also said they feel more comfortable asking someone to repeat themselves in person than over the phone. Although all of the women are concerned about not being understood by their interlocutor (including me), in contrast to Anna who said she feels "terrible" when speaking in person, the other five women said they feel "comfortable", "very good", or

"normal" when speaking English with others, and feel free to ask the other person to explain if they do not understand something. During the interviews Anna's shyness was apparent, just as the other women appeared at ease and were not afraid to ask me to repeat a question or to help them understand what I meant. Anna's uneasiness leads me to believe that she has communication apprehension or experiences language shock; however she might also be characterized by SLA researchers such as Krashen, as having a high affective filter. Despite Anna's communication apprehension or her high affective filter, she agreed to speak with me. Perhaps as Peirce (1995) would suggest, it was her investment in learning English that made her take advantage of the opportunity to practice speaking English.

The second type of anxiety, fear of negative evaluation, was only expressed by Olga, who said that she is afraid of being judged by people who speak English better than she does, especially native speakers of English:

O.M.: If...if I'm alone, I'm not shy; if somebody will beside me who knows...English... perfectly, I will be shy.
 [a few lines later]
 O.M.: Because I think that if I will be with you, somewhere, I will not shy. And I have experience speak with you, and you not, you not looking at me like...like a judge.
 S.G.: Yah.
 O.M.: No uh...chudge, no chudge uh...in ze court!
 S.G.: Oh uh...judge!
 O.M.: Judge, yes like a judge. And I have boyfriend, who looking at me *all* time like a

chudge. And I...I'm feeling so, so badly...

She told me that it was only once she started attending ESL classes that she realized that she was speaking English incorrectly, and then felt ashamed of how she spoke English. Again, Peirce (1995) describes this reaction as being the result of having an affective investment in one's social identity which is tied to a particular group of speakers who could be members of your own ethnolinguistic community, or members of the target language community. Speaking with someone from the target language group can make the language learner feel inferior to the "legitimate speakers" of English whom they so much want to speak like (21). These feelings can in turn cause the learner to avoid similar speaking situations. Olga stressed that while she does not have a problem speaking English with people when they approach her while waiting for the bus, or speaking to sales people in the shopping center, she is shy about speaking English when she is with someone who speaks English better than her.

Overall the psychological distance between these six women and English Canadians seems to be low due to their positive attitude towards English Canadians and towards integrating into Canadian society, their resolution of culture shock, and the fact that their motivation to learn English has helped them overcome language shock.

Acculturative Behaviour

The following data on the women's acculturative behaviour patterns complements the above data about their attitudes. Information was elicited about their use of English in the various societal domains that were identified in chapter 2 (work, school, public transactions, home, and leisure). The women's degree of participation and use of English in these domains varies according to opportunity and availability.

Work

Participation in the work domain is a common desire among the women; however their ability to participate in this domain was limited by their opportunities and availability for employment. While Olga was the only one who was gainfully employed at the time of the interviews, Anna was helping her husband set up a photography business from their home, and planned to work with her husband as a designer. Anna and her husband are both engineers, and realizing the difficulty of finding work in their fields, they were creating their own opportunities for employment. Similarly, Natasha would like to open her own alternative health center in the near future and provide services in Russian and English. When I spoke with her though, she was taking ESL classes, and putting together a Russian magazine on alternative healing, which she was trying to get published. Olga, Anna, and Natasha's work involved various degrees of interaction with English speakers.

Olga had more occasions to speak English than Natasha or Anna, as she worked with English Canadian children all day. Anna had business meetings in English which allowed her to speak English for one or two hours a day, for a total of six or seven hours per week; and Natasha had an English typographer working on her magazine who she spoke in English with for one hour a day, three or four times a week.

Prior to the first interview, Sasha had been working for ten months as a cartographer but was laid-off. She was optimistic, however, about returning to her job. Knowing the difficulty of gaining access to an English workplace, she said that for the time being she was only available to work for her previous employer. She told me that due to her initial difficulties in understanding, and of being understood by co-workers, on average, she spoke English six hours a week while at work. Irina wanted to finish her ESL classes and computer course and then take accounting courses in order to improve her chances of employment before she looks for work in her profession. Natalia told me that at present she could not look for work, nor attend ESL classes full-time during the summer. She could only take night classes because her youngest son had not started school yet, and her husband worked part-time during the day. She pointed out how if she were to work, all her salary would go to daycare. She also told me that she would like her husband to find a job in his profession before she starts to look for a job in her field; she even said she might change professions.

Thus despite wanting to work, due to child care, financial, and family concerns, Natalia was unavailable for work and had a limited amount of time to dedicate to ESL classes. Anna and Natasha were trying to employ themselves rather than waiting for someone to employ them; Sasha was making herself available for reemployment where she used to work by not seeking out other job opportunities; Irina was trying to make herself more employable by improving her English and learning computers; and Olga was already employed.

School

Like many other recently arrived adult immigrants, these six women had completed their education before coming to Canada, and so the majority of them were attending only ESL classes. However, Natasha and Irina were taking a computer course in addition to their ESL class.

Opportunity and availability also played a role in the women's participation in the school domain. The women's attendance at ESL classes was occasionally interrupted due to their family and work responsibilities, and their opinions about the kind of English language training they have received. For example, Natalia, who has a pre-schooler at home and whose husband works part-time, could only take ESL classes part-time (three hours twice a week) over the summer. In a similar vein, Natasha, who in the weeks prior

to the first issue of her Russian magazine being published, devoted all her time and attention to the magazine, and so stopped attending ESL classes for a while.

Sasha on the other hand stopped going to her ESL classes over the summer because she felt it was a waste of her time and because she wanted to practice her English conversation in class instead of playing grammar games (a practice I observed):

"...you want some-you want ah hmm, I mean I want to speak, or I want to read, maybe grammar I mean somesing thinks it's very difficult to understand, not just uh tense you know; past, present, and somesing what I know very difficult in English language and somesing else. But it's not that I want to speak uh like game you know it's somesing else, it's very easy and it's uh I don't know, I don't want to spend time like this."

I asked her why she chose the ESL course in the first place and she told me that she did not have much choice because she had finished working just before the summer, and so did not have time to look around for other courses. She knew summer courses were being offered at this particular school, so she registered.

Not everyone felt the way Sasha did about grammar games. Olga found them to be interesting and useful because for her grammar is the most important component of her ESL training. She said that if it were not for her job, she would attend ESL classes every night instead of just twice a week.

Even though ESL classes provide the women with some opportunities to speak English during, between, and after classes (something I observed Natasha and Irina do on more

than one occasion), their interlocutors are fellow language learners and so they cannot provide the women with authentic input. In contrast to ESL classes, private English classes such as those Sasha attended, consist of informal discussions with the teacher, and thus the input is comparable to that heard outside the classroom. Natalia and Sasha told me that the English classes they have had in the past (language instruction for new Canadians (LINC) and Berlitz (private) respectively) also included lessons about life in Canada. They were told about the national holidays and how we celebrate them, they were warned about the winters, and they were also given practical information about how to find an apartment.

The women's degree of participation in the school domain was therefore limited by their availability, while the classroom setting limited the type of input and opportunities for output.

Public Transactions

The third source of cultural and linguistic input for the women is in the domain of public transactions. Of the three sources, public transactions provide the least amount of linguistic input and few opportunities for output because they are brief and have become routine (the women were therefore not asked to quantify these contacts with English).

Since the encounters are brief, few words are exchanged, and because they are routine exchanges, the women usually use the same phrases over and over again.

Natasha made this point very clear to me when I suggested she should try and put herself in situations where she could speak English with others:

N.R.: But I understand uh...uh...if I don't start...speak with uh...Canadian people, my English don't improve. I...I'm sure.

S.G.: Yah.

N.R.: How...how long I can uh take course?

S.G.: True, true. But then I guess you have to...create opportunities, you know in the public, to speak, as much as possible.

N.R.: Uh...uh Sujata how, how often do you see uh our...neighbor? How often?

S.G.: I know, I know it's-no it's true it it's it's very difficult.

N.R.: O.k.

S.G.: Even uh...uh...

N.R.: Hi! Hi! Hi! How are you? How are things with you? Great with it, O.k., O.k., O.k. bye.

The women said it is the same when they go clothes shopping. If they need help from a sales person, they ask for what they want or where to find it, and that is usually the extent of the conversation. When they have a doctors appointment, dealings with government offices, or a meeting with their children's teacher, they prepare what they want to say beforehand by looking up the vocabulary words they will need.

Home

I questioned the women about the frequency of their use of English in the home, about any changes in their lifestyle (e.g., dress, diet, etc.), and about their celebration of Canadian holidays and traditions. Although a certain number of changes to an immigrant's lifestyle are imposed upon them by the norms and conventions of the host culture, some immigrants nevertheless try to maintain aspects of their previous lifestyle, for example by eating traditional foods, by wearing their traditional dress, or by following some of their own customs. In other words some immigrants prefer to *acculturate* than give up their cultural identity and *assimilate*. The six women in this study have acculturated not assimilated, as they continue to eat traditional dishes, celebrate Russian holidays, and speak Russian in the home, but at the same time have also added certain Canadian foods to their diet, celebrate Canadian holidays, and are learning English.

In all but one case (Olga, the live-in nanny), Russian is the only language spoken extensively in the home, and in two cases (Natalia and Irina) it is a household rule to speak *only* Russian. This should not be interpreted as behaviour which contradicts my view of the women as being motivated to learn English; rather it should be seen as an effort on their part to prevent their children from losing their first language, in the process of acquiring a second. It demonstrates that they have chosen to acculturate not assimilate. Thus for these women the use of English is basically limited to outside the home. I say

limited because as I already discussed, the interactions the women have with English speakers in the public domain are few and brief.

Often it is the children who bring English into immigrant homes; children tend to use English when they discuss matters relating to school with their parents, when speaking with siblings, or when their friends visit. However, when it comes to helping their parents, children usually take on the role of translator rather than teacher. Whenever I called Anna or Irina at home, their daughters answered and would translate for them, until they realized it was me and then they would speak to me directly. While visiting with Natasha and Sasha, I noticed that they also had their children answer the phone in case the person on the other end spoke English. Their children would establish who was calling and for what reason and then wait for further instructions from their parents. Of course when the children are not home, they will answer the phone themselves. The women's behaviour is also the result of their anxiety about speaking and understanding English on the phone.

Natasha, who does not have a household rule to speak only Russian, and Irina, indicated how they would like their children to speak English with them, but they refuse. Natasha and Irina therefore mainly use English at home when English-speaking friends or acquaintances visit. Sometimes Natasha also speaks English with her husband. The reason they think their children will not speak English with them is that their children feel

that they (their mothers) cannot speak English well enough to be able to communicate with them, as Irina explains:

I.O.: ...when we come in Canada I zink my children forgot uh Russia [Russian], ven ve uh starting speak in uh English, in our home.

S.G.: Oh you do...

I.O.: And I tell in home only Russian. And now for children it's very good but for me... now ven I tell my children speak vis me little bit...

S.G.: In English?

I.O.: ...no mummy! No zey don't vant.

S.G.: Why...why...why don't they want to speak English with you?

I.O.: Um...maybe he have uh...he know uh zey know but zey speak uh in home Russia.

S.G.: Yah. Maybe it's...it's easier for them to speak Russian with you...than English.

I.O.: But uh first time I don't uh...knew English, and children uh know zat. But now I, I can...I...vant!

This illustrates my point that the opportunities to practice speaking English in the home environment, as in the public domain, depends on the cooperativeness of others. Perhaps the children's lack of interest and desire to practice English with their parents is due to the fact that speaking with someone who is less fluent in a language than yourself is a very draining exercise and requires a great deal of patience. I would add that Natasha's children also do not want to teach her English because they feel a sense of power being more fluent in a language than their mother. Natasha told me that her sons sometimes speak English or French in front of her when they do not want her to understand what they are saying.

It is evident that one of the reasons these women want to learn English is so that they can understand their children when they speak English. Natalia has noticed that when her oldest son plays alone, he speaks in English. Similarly, Sasha said that when her daughter tells her something about school, she says it in English. In Natalia's case, there is a household rule to speak only Russian, but Natalia and Sasha are both aware (as are the other women) that their children will eventually speak more and more English as they continue to try and "fit in" as new Canadians. So the women are feeling pressure (either directly or indirectly) from their children to learn and speak English, especially when in public as Anna explained: "And when I speak uh Russian....maybe in shopping center or maybe in school; my daughter: "Stop Russian, are you Canadian?" [She replies]: "Yes." [Daughter]: "Speak only English." Anna tries to practice speaking English with her husband for twenty minutes every day, up to three hours a week.

With respect to the women's non-linguistic acculturative behaviour, the most significant change in their lifestyle has been how much easier day-to-day chores have become for these women since coming to Canada. For example the women no longer need to do the grocery shopping once or twice a day; and Sasha commented how in Russia she used to have to spend one day of her weekend in the kitchen in order to prepare the food for cooking. The women only reported minor changes in their diet due to the availability of certain fruits, vegetables, and other items here, that were either

unavailable in their country or were simply too expensive to buy. The women still cook Russian dishes but seem open to trying new foods as most of the women have eaten at McDonalds, some have tried a poutine, and Natalia decided to try parmesan cheese after she spoke with a woman who was promoting it at her local supermarket.

In terms of dress, in contrast to the casual clothing styles most Canadians prefer to wear (given the choice), these women prefer to dress up whenever they leave the house. Natasha commented how poorly people dress here compared to Ukraine; especially the women, because in Ukraine the women put on make-up and wear high heeled shoes when they go out in public to the bazaar or anywhere else.

The women indicated some interest and participation in Canadian and/or North American holidays and traditions. Sasha and Natasha named Canada Day as one of the holidays they celebrate. All of them celebrate Halloween by giving out candy and having their children dress up and go trick-or-treating. The women were not as familiar with Thanksgiving as with Halloween, so only some of them celebrate this holiday. The "English" and "Russian" Christmas are both celebrated, as well as New Years.

Table 3.4 The Women's Use of English in Three Domains

	work	school (ESL)	school (content classes)	home
Natalia	----	3hrs/2xweek	----	everyday
Sasha	6hrs/week	4hrs/2xweek	----	once in a while
Natasha	3-4hrs/week	3hrs/5xweek	3hrs/5xweek (computers)	sometimes
Irina	----	3hrs/5xweek	3hrs/5xweek (computers)	sometimes
Olga	55hrs/week	4hrs/2xweek	----	every night
Anna	6-7hrs/week	3hrs/2-5xweek		3hrs a week

Leisure Contacts with English

All the women read English newspapers; however their decision to listen to the radio and/or watch television depended on three things: (1) the amount of leisure time they had (2) their personal preference with respect to what kinds of things they liked to watch; (3) their opinions concerning the benefits derived from using these media.

It is evident from the data that the amount of free time the women had to relax, watch television or do whatever else they liked to do, varied. For example, Natasha has little

free time in between trying to put together her Russian magazine and her ESL classes. She has about six hours of spare time during the week to sit down with her sons and watch television with them. She does not find it necessary to have a radio in the house because they have a television, and so she only listens to the radio about half an hour each day when she is in the car.

Similarly, Olga and Anna work during the day and attend ESL classes at night, and have very little free time. During the day when Olga is home alone with the children, she has no time to listen to the radio, and when she is not working or at her ESL class, she is too tired to do anything, but tries to listen to the radio at least two hours a week. Olga also said that usually she can only watch one hour of television per week. Unfortunately, even when she does have the time to watch more television (for instance during her summer vacation), she does not enjoy the programs:

O.M.: You know...now I...could be, I could have time, I should have time.

S.G.: Right.

O.M.: And I have nosing what watch.

S.G.: There's nothing you, you *want* to watch or...?

O.M.: Nosing what I *want* watch.

S.G.: That you want to watch.

O.M.: Yes, I sink it's a lots of, lots of garbage.

She also feels that American movies are too violent, and prefers Canadian television movies. She, like most if not all of the women, watches the news whenever she can.

Irina, who does not work and has the time to watch movies, also said that they are too violent and contain English slang and so she prefers to watch the Learning Channel. She watches five hours of television a week.

Anna was busy day and night trying to start the photography business with her husband from their home, but managed to watch five to six hours of television a week. When I asked Anna if she felt that watching television would help improve her English she said this:

A.G.: No, not really by watching, I think by *hearing*.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Radio I think it's much better.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: When I watching I see a lot of interesting....dresses or something else!

S.G.: So do you find you're not as concentrating as much about the language, you're just watching...?

A.G.: Fifty percent....watching and fifty percent listening.

Irina had a different opinion: "Because only, ven you only uh listen uh....you must know...English!" She believes that reading is the best way for her to improve her English, but she still listens to the radio up to five hours a week.

Natalia and Sasha, who do not work, spend respectively up to twenty or thirty hours a week watching television and movies. Natalia's daily encounters with English speakers usually occur in the park behind the apartment building where she lives. She makes small talk with the other parents who are there watching their children play.

I also asked the women how many of their friends are English Canadians, and only Natalia reported having any; however all of the women have acquaintances who are English Canadian, and some of the women have non-Russian immigrant friends with whom they speak English. It is not surprising though that these women do not have any English Canadian friends given their limited free time; and despite living in mixed neighbourhoods, their lack of opportunity for intensive contact with English Canadians.

Table 3.5 Summary of the Women's Leisure Contacts

	television	movies	radio	news- papers	acquaint- ances	friends
Natalia	15- 20hrs/wk	2- 4x/month	----	once a wk	----	10
Sasha	30hrs/wk	3x/month	15hrs/wk	3x a wk	10	---
Natasha	6hrs/wk	4x/month	3.5hrs/wk	3-7x a wk	2-3 families	----
Irina	5hrs/wk	2x/month	5hrs/wk	5x a wk	10	----
Olga	1hr/wk	----	2hrs/wk	7x a wk	6 or 7	----
Anna	5-6hrs/wk	----	1hr/wk	1-2x a wk	15-20	----

Social and psychological distance do not seem to be the major variables determining the amount of contact the women have had with the target language. Limited input and opportunity to use English in various social domains, together with personal constraining factors, presented more of a problem for these women. In the next chapter, the issue of appropriate input (the second link in Schumann's "chain of causality" for second language acquisition) will be examined, by seeing if any patterns emerged with respect to the women's acquisition of English and the amount of informal contact they have had.

The importance of receiving informal linguistic input from one-way and especially two-way communication sources in the target language environment such as in the leisure domain cannot be overemphasized. The positive effect the women's informal contacts (table 3.6) have had on their acquisition of English will provide evidence in support of the above statement.

Table 3.6 The Women's Informal Contacts with English

	Natalia	Sasha	Natasha	Irina	Olga	Anna
work	----	6hrs/wk	3-4hrs/wk	----	55hrs/wk	6-7hrs/wk
t.v.	15- 20hrs/wk	30hrs/wk	6hrs/wk	5hrs/wk	1hr/wk	5-6hrs/wk
movies	2-4x/mo.	3xmo.	4xmo.	2x/mo.	----	----
radio	----	15hrs/wk	3.5hrs/wk	5hrs/wk	2hrs/wk	1hr/wk
acqnts.	----	10	2-3 families	10	6 or 7	15-20
friends	10	----	----	----	----	----
home	everyday	once in a while	some- times	some- times	everyday	20mins. /day

Chapter 4- Linguistic Analysis

Methodology

The women's acquisition of English was first evaluated independently of each other to provide the reader with a linguistic profile of each of the women. This is followed by an intra-group comparison to illustrate that the women have different degrees of proficiency. Proficiency is used in the sense of global mastery, and includes comprehension, grammar, accuracy, pronunciation, and fluency. Their level of proficiency relative to each other is then related to the amount and type of contact they have had in the various social domains that were discussed in the previous chapter.

The women's first thousand words from the third interview were used for the linguistic analysis (see appendix D); immediate self-repetitions were only counted once. Similarly, I did not include any of the women's utterances where I suspected they were imitating something they had just heard me say; however if a word or phrase later appeared in their speech without me having said it, I credited them with the knowledge. The number of words used for the analysis was arbitrarily chosen. The speech sample was taken from the third interview because it was felt that by the third interview a personal rapport with the women had been established. Furthermore, because the women had already had some practice speaking with me, they may have experienced less performance anxiety than

during the first two interviews, and as a result, may have monitored their speech to a lesser degree. By using the same number of words from the same part of the same interview, it ensured that the women were provided with an equal opportunity to speak by being asked to perform the same speech acts such as giving an opinion, describing something, etc. In addition, this allowed for comparisons to be made.

For the analysis of the women's sociolinguistic knowledge however, it was necessary to use the data from all three of the interviews in order to obtain a sufficient sample of idiomatic expressions. Idioms appear less frequently in speech compared to some of the other structures that were used for the linguistic analysis.

The six women were evaluated according to:

- 1) the diversity of their vocabulary through the use of modal verbs, adjectives, and adverbs
- 2) their verb tense distinction⁹
- 3) their suppliance of the grammatical plural morpheme *-s*, past regular *-ed*, and the irregular past
- 4) their use of negation
- 5) their use of prepositions
- 6) their use of idioms and domain-specific vocabulary
- 7) their English pronunciation

⁹In the speech samples used in the analysis, the women are talking about the changes in their lifestyle, and about the things they like and don't like about Canada, so it is not unusual that they spoke mostly in the simple present and simple past tense.

The use of modal verbs (can, should, will, etc.) is significant because they are a distinct class of verbs which are not inflected and which "express a variety of moods or attitudes towards a possible state or action" (Close, 1975: 263). The variety of adjectives and adverbs present in the women's speech is used as a measure of their acquisition of English vocabulary. Very commonly used adjectives such as big, different, and good were excluded from the women's speech samples.

Schumann (1978a) did an extensive analysis of one of his learner's (Alberto) acquisition of copulas and auxiliaries by grouping the utterances from his speech samples according to the copula or auxiliary that should have been provided but was not always supplied. In instances where a copula or an auxiliary other than the required one was used, or where the copula or auxiliary was omitted altogether, a negative sign followed by the required copula/auxiliary was placed beside the listed utterances (e.g. -is *This a good book*). The percentage of utterances where the correct copula or auxiliary was supplied was then calculated by dividing the number of obligatory contexts for the copula/auxiliary into the number of times the correct copula/auxiliary was actually supplied. This method was used to compare my subjects' elaboration of forms for the verbs BE, HAVE, and DO, except that the results are presented only as fractions. Single occurrences of a form were thought to be insufficient evidence of acquisition and therefore were not considered. Also, in my

table of the women's elaboration of forms for the verb DO, negative utterances containing *don't*, *doesn't*, and *didn't* were not counted as obligatory contexts for *do* since they appear to be memorized wholes and so it would be misleading to include them.

SLA morpheme studies also rely on percentage of occurrence in obligatory contexts to establish acquisition. They have found that there is an acquisition order for particular groups of English morphemes and that learners will follow it with or without formal instruction and whatever their first language (Larsen-Freeman, 1976). Group one (the first group of morphemes to be acquired), consists of the present progressive *-ing*, the plural *-s*, and the copula *to be*; group two consists of the auxiliary *to be* and the articles *the* and *a*; group three is irregular past forms; and group four consists of the regular past *-ed*, the third person singular *-s*, and the possessive *-s* (Krashen, 1982 cited in Littlewood, 1988).

It is important to mention that suppliance of a grammatical structure in ninety percent of obligatory contexts for three consecutive samples, with a minimum of five obligatory contexts in each sample, is how the point of acquisition has been defined in some of the SLA literature. However one of the problems with obligatory contexts according to Larsen-Freeman and Long is that they are not always easy to identify, such as with modal verbs: "The use of a modal verb is entirely dependent on a speaker's intended meaning,

something that is not always available for a researcher's inspection" (1991: 40).

Percentage of occurrence in obligatory contexts should therefore not be the only criterion on which to base estimations of acquisition.

I therefore looked at the women's developmental sequences of English negation in addition to their acquisition of certain grammatical structures. Schumann (1978a) also examined his subjects' use of the different forms of negation as a measure of their acquisition of English. He found a developmental sequence of four major stages for negation by ESL learners. The four stages in order are: *no* + X, *no/don't* + Verb (pre-verbal negation), auxiliary + negator (not, n't) (post-verbal negation), and analyzed *don't* (doesn't, didn't). In my analysis I attempt to identify which stage the six women are at based on the forms of negation predominantly used by them, but it should be pointed out that there is overlap between the stages which leaves room for uncertainty.

Finally, the reader should keep in mind that this analysis provides only a profile (i.e. a partial and synchronic picture) of these women's "acquisition" of English because it is based on a single speech sample.

Table 4.1 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Natalia's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
easier	quickly	can	post-verbal negation:	in
wonderful	always	must	<i>don't, didn't, cannot/</i>	of
patient	only	will	<i>can't</i>	for
aggressive	really		not	to
normal	often		never	with
similar	sometimes		no	on
oldest	usually			at
	normally			after
				before

Looking at the number of adjectives and adverbs from Natalia's speech sample, we see that she used seven different adjectives and nine different adverbs (table 4.1). What is particularly noteworthy about her adjectives and adverbs is the adjective *easier* because of its comparative form, and *oldest* for its superlative form; the adjective *normal* and its adverbial form *normally* which would seem to indicate that she is aware of the distinction between the two in terms of form and function; and the variety of frequency adverbs such as *always*, *often*, *sometimes*, and *usually*. She also used three out of ten possible modal verbs, one of which was the modal *will* which she used to express the future (however *would* should have been used) in the following sentence: "Yah, and she told me let's try it, and she will call me and ask how I like it."

There is evidence which suggests that Natalia has not yet acquired the rule of how to form the present and past progressive, as in the following utterance where she omitted the plural auxiliary *were*: "Now ya, when all summer and winter we [] visiting...". However she does seem to have acquired the progressive ending *-ing*. I would also suggest that *it's* is a memorized and an unanalyzed form even though there are five instances where she uses the uncontracted form of the copula *is*. Support for this suggestion includes this sentence where *it is* is clearly required but not supplied: "Uh, you know it uh I don't know how it's in Canada, I can't compare...", and also this sentence where *is* should have been

used instead of *it's*: "All housework it's different; cooking, washing, cleaning". Moreover, elsewhere she uses *it's* as a substitute for the plural contraction *they're*.

Natalia uses the present and past tense of the verb DO in the affirmative (*do*, *did*), and in the negative uses the auxiliaries *don't* and *didn't*; which is a good indication that she has acquired the tense distinction. However it seems that the forms *don't* and *didn't* are still not analyzed as being made up of Do (aux) + neg. as there is no evidence of her using *do* and *did* as auxiliaries. *Cannot* also seems to be an unanalyzed form in her speech even though she uses *can* (an auxiliary) in the affirmative. Her post-verbal negation, analyzed or not, is characteristic of stage 3 negation. Also, she uses *don't* and *didn't* with at least three different verbs which suggests that she is not relying on formulaic utterances for negation. In addition to the negator *not*, she uses *no* (when responding to yes/no questions), and *never*.

Natalia has control of the plural morpheme *-s*, as it was supplied in 22/23 obligatory contexts, but she has some difficulty with the past regular morpheme *-ed* as it was supplied in less than half (6/14) of the obligatory contexts. On the other hand, she produced six different verbs in the irregular past.

Table 4.2 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Sasha's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
better	usually	can	post-verbal negation:	to
expensive	never	must	<i>don't, doesn't, didn't,</i>	in
enough	sometimes		<i>can't</i>	by
broken	too			after
clear				for
funny				about
highest				on
worse				from
				with

Sasha used eight adjectives, four adverbs, and two modal verbs (table 4.2). There are two comparative adjectives (*better* and *worse*), one superlative adjective (*highest*), and three different frequency adverbs (*usually*, *never* and *sometimes*). In the only utterance where the modal *must* appears, Sasha uses it instead of *had to* since the main verb *had* does not seem to be part of her acquired grammar; nevertheless the intended meaning was still conveyed because the error is really only a matter of tense (present instead of past).

Her negation is post-verbal and on the whole is varied to mark different persons and tenses (*don't*, *doesn't*, *didn't* and *can't*), however there were a few cases where she did not control for the past tense. Again, *don't*, *doesn't*, *didn't* and *can't* seem to be unanalyzed forms, but are effective none the less. Other negators used include *no* (in response to yes/no questions), *not*, and *never*. Thus Sasha appears to be at the third stage of negation.

The conditional appears in her speech sample in three instances, and it is always introduced by *if*: "and if you have it's too expensive" "Yes you need b-uh you know if it's uh...uh...import uh I mean not Russian" "and if you buy Russian, it's you know...you don't have guarantee...".

The above example also illustrates her use of *it's* which is an unanalyzed form in her language system but which, like contractions in general, is also very common in the speech of native English speakers.

There is a high frequency in the data of obligatory contexts for the plural *-s*, and Sasha supplied it twenty-five out of the thirty times it was required. However there is only four obligatory contexts for the past regular *-ed*, and it was supplied in two instances. There were five types of irregular past in her speech sample.

Table 4.3 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Natasha's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
interesting	quicker/quickly	can	don't + verb	about
popular	often	must	had + not	in
comfortable	seldom		no	before
older	sometimes		not	after
	nicely			to
	only			for
	too			with
				off
				of
				from
				on
				at

There were four adjectives, six adverbs, and two modal verbs in Natasha's speech sample (table 4.3). Of the four adjectives, one is a comparative (*older*); and of the six adverbs, two are frequency adverbs (*often* and *seldom*) and two are focusing adverbs (*only* and *too*). While Natasha employs the modals *can* and *must* correctly, it is not clear whether she has acquired the rule that "the full verb which follows a modal will always be in the bare infinitive, except in the case of ought, thus: *can see*, *could see*, *must see*, but *ought to see*" (Close, 1975: 13), because she produced utterances such as: "I can to buy this food" and "what I must to do" as many times as she used *can* correctly as in: "If I [don't] know uh any words I can take dictionary."

In terms of negation, Natasha appears to be at stage 2 because the dominant form she uses is *don't V*. There are at least three instances in her speech where she should have used *didn't* or *doesn't*, but used *don't*. On the other hand, there are a few utterances where she attempts to form the negative by placing the negator *not* after the verb. For example in the following utterance she uses *is not*: "I try but I don't know for sure maybe i...i...i...is...is not uh Canadian" The presence of more than one form is to be expected due to the overlapping between stages. Also, Natasha occasionally mixes up *no* with *not*, and say things like "no often".

Natasha does not seem to have acquired the copula *be* since *is* is almost always produced in the contracted form *it's* or else it is not supplied at all.

The only two instances where the present and past progressive forms were attempted, the auxiliaries were not supplied but the *-ing* ending was: "I [] doing the same sing" "and we [] sitting in nice dress". Conditional clauses are much more frequent in Natasha's speech, eleven in total.

The data seems to indicate that she has acquired the plural morpheme *-s* as her production of it in obligatory contexts is high (22/29). She also supplied the regular past *-ed* three of the four times it was required. There were three different verbs in the irregular past.

Table 4.4 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Irina's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
normal	only	must	don't + verb	in
beautiful	quickly	can		for
difficult				about
happy				after
hard (as in difficult)				from
				out
				with

Irina's speech sample contained five adjectives and two adverbs, one of which (*only*) is a focusing adverb (table 4.4). Her use of the adjective *hard* is worth mentioning since she uses it in the abstract sense of difficult. She uses the two modals *must* and *can*, but fails to use *had to* when she is speaking about something in the past tense, as in this sentence where she is talking about how often she used to have to go shopping for groceries: "And...I must go *everyday*, maybe twice, it's so crazy situation, I spent more my time..." .

Her reliance on the *don't V* form to negate is characteristic of the second stage of negation. There is not a single instance in her speech sample where she uses *didn't* or *doesn't*, whereas constructions such as "don't can" and "don't must" appear quite frequently. *Isn't* is also used on occasion, but almost always appears as the phrase *it/this isn't normal* which suggests that *isn't* is but part of a formulaic utterance that Irina has memorized and integrated into her language system.

I am led to believe that *it's* might be an analyzed form in Irina's speech due to the fact that she produces both the uncontracted copula *is* and the contracted form *it's*, and because *it is* and *it was* also occur in the data.

The auxiliaries *am*, *is*, and *was* were not supplied, but the *-ing* ending was, for the few present and past progressive utterances in Irina's speech sample: "only about zat I zinking"

"Our...country fighting" "But in my country ven...ve go in ze church I everytime I zinking..."

Irina supplied the plural *-s* in eight of the nineteen obligatory contexts, and supplied the past tense *-ed* in two out of three times it was required. There were two cases of the irregular past in her speech sample.

Table 4.5 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Olga's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
close	originally	must	don't + verb	in
intelligent	never	can	have + no	of
enough	soon	will	never	for
unusual	usually	should	nothing	to
interesting	too		no	about
worse			not	before
better			un-	from
rude				with
(un) happy				on
aboriginal				
proud				
disappointed				
beautiful				
perfect				

Olga's speech sample contained fourteen adjectives, five adverbs and four modal verbs, which shows she has quite a diverse vocabulary (table 4.5). Two of the fifteen adjectives are comparatives; *better* and *worse*, and *never* and *usually* are frequency adverbs. She also has two adjectives with the negative prefix *-un*: *unusual* and *unhappy*. Olga is able to convey her intended meaning through the effective use of four specific modals: *must*, *can*, *will*, and *should*.

It is difficult to decide what stage of negation Olga is at based on her use of the negative in the sample because there are only three instances where she uses *I don't know* and one instance of *I don't want*; both of which could be formulaic utterances. She uses DO in the affirmative, but again it is always in the formulaic utterance *do you know*. Furthermore, where she should have used *don't have*, she uses *have no*. She also uses the negators *never*, *not*, and *nothing* on a few occasions.

Both the present and past progressive appear in Olga's speech sample but only in the first person. All the present progressive utterances are with *I'm* (an unanalyzed form) and all the past progressive utterances are with *I was*, therefore it is not possible to know whether or not her use of the progressive is varied to mark person as well as tense.

The copula *is* appears a number of times in the data but more often than not it is used incorrectly; the rest of the time *it's* is used or else nothing at all, which would suggest that *it's* is an unanalyzed form. This is further evidenced by the fact that *it's* is not always used

correctly: "Because of course it's everything different", "It's uh doesn't matter for me", etc.

The data do however contain twenty-two obligatory contexts for the plural *-s* of which Olga supplies nineteen. She produced the past regular *-ed* in one of the four contexts and produced one irregular past.

Table 4.6 Vocabulary, Negation, and Prepositions from Anna's Speech Sample

<i>Adjectives</i>	<i>Adverbs</i>	<i>Modal Verbs</i>	<i>Negation</i>	<i>Prepositions</i>
native	really	can	post-verbal negation:	of
clear	mostly	must	<i>don't, didn't, can't</i>	at
broken		could	not	after
terrible			no	with
interesting				in
better				on
ordinary				by
close				to
simple				for
comfortable				before
enough				
traditional				

There are twelve adjectives, two adverbs, and three modal verbs in Anna's speech sample (table 4.6). There is only one comparative adjective; *better*, and one frequency and intensifying adverb; *mostly* and *really* respectively. The three modal verbs are used correctly by Anna in the few instances where they appear.

Her formation of the negative using the different tense forms *don't*, *didn't*, and *can't* (post-verbal) seems to indicate that she is at stage three. They appear with a variety of verbs; *have*, *see*, *like*, *do*, *know*, and *get* which excludes the possibility that Anna relies on formulaic utterances to form the negative. Other negators she employs include *no* and *not*.

Examples of the present progressive are few and contradictory. For instance *I'm use*, *I watching*, and *I'm not driving* all occur in the data. However the intended form of the sentence in which *I'm use* appears: "I'm use uh...rental uh...on the first floor in our building" is ambiguous because Anna might have meant to use the simple present *I use*. In any case, *I'm* in all likelihood is an unanalyzed form, and Anna has probably not yet mastered the present progressive. Further evidence is provided by the one example of the past progressive, for which she does not supply the auxiliary *were*: "ninety-nine percent women um...working". Conditional clauses can also be found in her sample: "I think if I compare wis uh Moscow, maybe a little bit less." "If I compare wis *my*...uh my town...more than in my town." "And if woman...uh try to found a job like a teacher of

course...nobody...nobody stop...stop maybe her."

Anna supplied the plural *-s* seven out of the thirteen times it was required, and supplied the past regular *-ed* 3/3 times. There were three different irregular past verbs in her speech sample.

Comparing the various English grammatical structures present in the six women's speech samples, it is evident that first of all the women differ in the number of adjectives and adverbs they used. Olga has the most adjectives in her sample (15) and the third most adverbs (5), Anna scored second in terms of adjectives (12) but has only two adverbs. Natalia has seven adjectives and nine adverbs, Sasha has more adjectives (8) than Natalia but has only four adverbs, Natasha follows with four adjectives and six adverbs, and finally there is Irina with five adjectives and two adverbs.

Table 4.7 Prepositions Present in the Women's Speech Samples

	Natalia	Sasha	Natasha	Irina	Olga	Anna
in	x	x	x	x	x	x
for	x	x	x	x	x	x
with	x	x	x	x	x	x
after	x	x	x	x	x	x
to	x	x	x		x	x
of	x	x	x		x	x
on	x	x	x		x	x
before	x		x		x	x
about		x	x	x	x	
from		x	x	x	x	
by		x			x	x
at	x		x			x
off			x			
out				x		

As far as prepositions are concerned, table 4.7 shows that there is a core of seven prepositions that all the women use except for Irina, who only produces four of the seven. The three prepositions Irina does not use include *to*, *of*, and *on*. Use of the preposition *of* by the other five women is noteworthy because it is purely grammatical and does not translate into any physical meaning as do the prepositions *in*, *on* and *with*. There were

also fewer prepositions in Irina's speech sample compared to the other women; Natasha producing the greatest number of prepositions with twelve.

Table 4.8 Elaboration of Forms For the Verb BE

		Natalia	Sasha	Natasha	Irina	Olga	Anna
present singular of BE	am					8/8	3/5
	are						
	is	5/22	4/33		8/29	2/21	3/15
present plural of BE	are	2/8	2/8		4/11		
past singular of BE	was	7/7			4/7	16/20	2/2
	were						
past plural of BE	were						

Table 4.9 Elaboration of Forms For the Verb HAVE

		<u>Natalia</u>	<u>Sasha</u>	<u>Natasha</u>	<u>Irina</u>	<u>Olga</u>	<u>Anna</u>
present tense of HAVE	have	2/2	18/18	10/10	28/29	13/13	5/6
	has		4/4				2/2
past tense of HAVE	had			2/2	3/3	8/9	

Table 4.10 Elaboration of Forms For the Verb DO

	<u>Natalia</u>	<u>Sasha</u>	<u>Natasha</u>	<u>Irina</u>	<u>Olga</u>	<u>Anna</u>
present tense of DO	do 4/4	8/9		2/2		4/4
	does					
past tense of DO	did 2/2					

The women also differ in terms of their elaboration of forms of the verbs BE, HAVE, and DO (tables 4.8–4.10). When learners have more than one form of a verb in their grammar system, they must be able to choose correctly among the different forms, and so correct usage of the verb is strong evidence of acquisition. Natalia and Irina have number (*is, are*) and tense (*was*) contrast for the verb BE. Olga and Anna have person (*am, is*) and tense (*was*) contrast. Sasha has only number contrast (*is, are*), and Natasha did not have contrasts of any kind for the verb BE in her speech sample.

For the verb HAVE, Sasha and Anna have person contrast (*have, has*); Natasha, Irina, and Olga have tense contrast (*have, had*); while Natalia has no contrasts to report. However Natalia is the only one to have a contrast for the verb DO, and it is for tense (*do, did*).

Table 4.11 The Women's Production of Three Different Morphemes

	<u>Plural -s</u>	%	<u>Past -ed</u>	%	<u>Irregular past</u> (types)
Natalia	22/23	96	6/14	43	6 (saw, came, said, found, told, bought)
Sasha	25/30	83	2/4	50	5 (saw, spent, broke, spoke, bought)
Natasha	22/29	76	3/4	75	3 (found(ed), told, spoke)
Irina	8/19	42	2/3	67	2 (spent, lost)
Olga	19/22	86	1/4	25	1 (came)
Anna	7/13	54	3/3	100	4 (saw, came, found, took)

Irina has the lowest percentage of the women (42%) for suppliance of the plural *-s*, which is one of the first English morphemes acquired. Irina also has fewer types of the irregular past in her speech sample than all the other women with the exception of Olga. The number of obligatory contexts for the regular past in the speech samples is low and therefore no conclusions can be drawn about the women's acquisition of this morpheme.

The women's English pronunciation was rated on a scale of increasing nativeness from one to five by three native English speakers, and then the average of the three scores was used to rank them. There was a high degree of agreement from all three of the judges. The women's respective ranking and average score are as follows: Sasha (3.8), Olga (3.5), Anna (3.5), Natalia (2.3), Natasha (2.2), and Irina (2.2).

Sociolinguistic Competence

The women's sociolinguistic competence refers to their use of idiomatic expressions, and to domain-specific vocabulary used by them. I suggest that the presence of domain-specific concepts in the women's speech are the by-products of their participation in various social domains. Also, because the meaning of many idiomatic expressions differ from the literal meaning of the words which make them up, anyone using them would need to know "the broader social context in which the language is used" (Samora and Deane, 1956).

An example of how the women's vocabulary is evidence of their participation in various domains, is provided by Sasha. In order to relate her experience of being temporarily let go from her job as a cartographer to her parents (who live in Russia), and to me, she used the term *laid-off*. I immediately understood what she meant, but her parents did not because there is no equivalent term in Russian, and so they assumed being laid-off meant being fired. Other terms with no Russian equivalents such as *full-time job*, *part-time job*, *human resources*, and *tax refund* have similarly become contextualized and meaningful to Sasha mainly through her participation in the work domain. Sasha also used the word *boss*, however Natalia who has not worked since being in Canada, had to use circumlocution in order to convey the meaning: "...he work for this man". All of these terms that have become part of Sasha's usual speech behaviour.

Natalia also provides an example. As result of her leisure time contacts, she is familiar with the names of movie and television characters and the movies/shows in which they appear. The following excerpt is from the second interview with Natalia when I asked her to talk about an English movie she had recently seen; she had just finished telling me about the movie *Free Willy*:

N.G.: Oh, also I like the movie-now I remember.

S.G.: O.k.

N.G.: Twins.

S.G.: Twins?

N.G.: Yah, about Schwarzenegger...

N.G.: We..we saw also like umm...about-Schindler List.

S.G.: Schindler's List, yes. *That's* a very good movie.

N.G.: And uh...Jurassic Park, it's one...uh director?

The presence of idiomatic expressions can have the effect of making an acquirer's speech appear more native-like (Schmidt, 1983: 150). Thus Sasha's continual use of three formulaic utterances; *I don't know how to say*, *you know* and *of course* is significant. The first utterance is used as a filler when she is having difficulty explaining something or has trouble coming up with a particular word. It also appears in the shortened form *how to say*. Her use of the other two utterances is interesting; especially *you know* because it is a speech strategy she uses in much the same way native speakers of English do when they cannot think of the words to explain exactly what they mean, so they try to unburden themselves by saying *you know* [what I'm trying to say]. The expression *of course* is used by Sasha in the following utterance to convey that as to be expected, language has been the main difficulty for her since she has been in Canada: "Yes, uh...in Canada it's...it's very difficult at first it's language of course and...."

There are idiomatic expressions in the other women's speech samples as well which gives their speech a colloquial flavour. In addition to the expressions *first of all*, *you*

know, for example take...., pick up it (as in learn routinely), *I try little bit everything, I don't think so*, and *for sure* which all appear in Natalia's speech, Natalia would insert *like* every so often, which is a common element in everyday speech. The expressions *for example* and *for sure* were also used by Natasha, in addition to *I ('ll) kill myself*, and *OK*. *I didn't catch it, of course, not really*, and *for sure* were some of the expressions found in Anna's speech sample. Olga's speech sample contained the expressions *of course, do you know, OK*, and *it doesn't matter for (to) me*. *OK* and *he's crazy about...* were two of the idiomatic expressions in Irina's speech sample.

Table 4.12 The Number of Sociolinguistic Items in the Women's Speech Data

	Natalia	Sasha	Natasha	Irina	Olga	Anna
# of idioms	15	13	11	6	13	9
domain specific voc.	15	17	6	6	2	6
total	30	30	17	12	15	15

Discussion

The above comparative analysis of the women's English acquisition revealed that they have different levels of proficiency in terms of both structure and function. Length of residence and amount of EFL instruction are two variables among the women which might account for these differences, however they have not proven to be determining factors. Both Irina and Olga did not have any EFL instruction, yet Olga's acquisition of English is better than Irina's in terms of vocabulary, negation, her production of the plural morpheme *-s*, and her use of prepositions. In fact on most of the linguistic measures used, and in terms of sociolinguistic items acquired, Irina demonstrated the lowest level of proficiency of all the women. One possible explanation for Irina's limited degree of acquisition in comparison to the other women could be that she was in the process of learning French when she had to switch to learning English. Notwithstanding, there is research evidence that acquisition of a second language actually helps in the acquisition of a third language (Thomas, 1988). Alternatively, it is the amount and type of contact Irina, and the other women have had with English that accounts for their proficiency levels.

When the type of contact Irina and Olga have had with English is compared, it is evident that Irina has had more classroom than real-world contact with English, whereas the opposite is true of Olga. For the most part, Irina's contact with English took place at school, where she spent thirty hours a week learning English and computers. Although

the language classroom should be recognized as a source of input for learners, it has been observed that formal classroom learning may not be readily transferable to situations outside the classroom (D'Angeljan, 1978; Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982). Apart from school, Irina spent five hours a week in leisure time watching the news and the Learning Channel; two sources of speech styles that are formal and non-spontaneous. Therefore most of Irina's communicative contacts with English were one-way; from the source to her. Olga, unlike Irina, has been living and working full-time in an English environment as a nanny since she has been here, and prior to her arrival, lived in Australia for a year. Olga therefore has had ample opportunity for two-way communication with native English speakers and to listen to their spontaneous speech. Speaking with children is less threatening than speaking with adults because children are less judgemental. Moreover, caretaker speech usually follows the "here and now" principle (see Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982), and so it is less complex and thus more comprehensible, as is the input caretakers receive from children.

Length of residence in Canada (at the time of the third interview) also appears to lack explanatory power in the case of these women's acquisition of English. For example, Natalia and Sasha are two of the most proficient speakers, and yet they have lived in Canada for fewer years than anyone else (a year and one month and a year and two months respectively). Natalia's and Sasha's progress could be attributed in part to the

number of years of English instruction they received in Russia, however it would not account for the number of idiomatic expressions and much of the domain-specific vocabulary in their speech data (table 4.12) which have more likely been acquired through the meaningful interactions they have had with native speakers while living in Canada. Furthermore, Natasha, who had lived and spoken English in Canada for two-and-a-half years, had had five years of EFL instruction, the same as Natalia. However she ranks below Natalia and Sasha, and probably even Anna. Anna also had five years of EFL, but had been living here for only a year and eight months. What Natalia, Sasha, and Anna have in common is that they have all had more opportunities for real-world, two-way communicative contacts than Natasha.

Natasha had eleven-and-a-half hours per week of leisure contacts, which included listening to the radio, watching television programs with her family such as *Beverly Hills 90210* and *Wheel of Fortune*, and renting English movies. She spent thirty hours a week learning English and computers at school; and if she was not in school, Natasha was engaged in meetings with her magazine typographer wherein formal as opposed to informal speech registers are more likely to be used. In contrast, Natalia spent six hours a week in ESL classes and around twenty hours a week watching television. During the day she would often speak with neighbors while watching her children play in the park behind her apartment complex. Soon after arriving in Canada, Natalia also started attending an

English Baptist church as a way to meet people and make English speaking friends. Sasha was fortunate to have many opportunities to practice speaking English through formal and informal interactions at work and during her private English classes which consisted mainly of informal discussions with the teacher and the only other student in the class. She continued to receive plenty of informal input after her private lessons ended and her departure from work by spending forty-five hours a week on leisure contacts such as watching English television and movies, and listening to the radio. Then there is Anna, who spent six to fifteen hours per week in ESL classes, and seven hours in leisure contacts watching English sitcoms and listening to the radio. She and her husband also spent twenty minutes a day practicing to speak English.

If the women were to be grouped according to their overall level of proficiency, Natalia and Sasha would be grouped together at the top, Olga and Anna would be together in the middle, and Natasha and Irina would be grouped together at the bottom. Although this order does not hold for all the linguistic measures, with the exception of Natasha, this grouping order is reflected in table 4.12 which shows the number of sociolinguistic items in each of the women's speech data. It therefore also patterns with the amount of informal contact each of the women have had except for Olga (table 3.6). Even though Olga has had the most informal contact, it has been mainly with small children. This automatically limits the number of idioms that would be present in her daily

input and would explain why she did not have the most idioms in her speech data. Also, it is unusual that Natasha would have as many idioms in her speech data as she does since both her and Irina's contacts are classroom-based. Nevertheless, Natasha's and Irina's lack of two-way communicative contacts, and their stage two negation is what differentiates them from the rest of the women.

It is more than mere coincidence that the women who had mostly real-world contacts with English were more proficient speakers than the women whose contacts were mostly classroom-based. That is not to say that ESL classes are of no value, only that they do not provide the kind of spontaneous informal input or output provided by real-world one-way and two-way communications. The women who had mostly formal contacts through ESL classes also did not have many occasions outside of school for meaningful two-way communication. No correlations were found between the women's length of residence, amount of EFL instruction, and level of English proficiency. The only variable found to pattern together in any way with the women's level of proficiency was the amount of informal input they received from real-world contacts.

Chapter 5-Conclusion

No generalizations can be made from this case-study of six individuals either in support of, or against Schumann's Acculturation Model; nor was this my intention. The purpose of this research was to offer evidence of variables in addition to social and psychological distance, which might account for the amount of contact learners have with the target language and its speakers. A case was made for the amount and type of contact language learners have with the target language being determined by the cooperativeness of the dominant society in providing occasions for both participation and use of the language in domains such as work and school. The other determining variable argued for was the availability of learners to take advantage of the opportunities they do have for contact. It was shown how a learner's availability can be limited by time, money, family and childcare obligations.

Not only have the six women in this study had different amounts of contact with English, they have also had different types of contact. In chapter two, the various possible kinds of language contact were discussed along with their respective advantages and disadvantages. It was suggested that two-way communication with native speakers is the most beneficial because it allows learners to test their hypotheses about the language, and provide authentic input that is more comprehensible. Unfortunately it can also be the least

accessible because it requires the cooperation of another person. It was also suggested that language contacts through certain leisure activities are advantageous because there is little or no performance anxiety, and can provide learners with casual speech models. A major obstacle to having leisure contacts, however, is finding the time.

In order to rule out social and psychological distance as determining factors, it was necessary to establish that the women were all socially and psychologically integrated (i.e. acculturated) into Canadian society, but still had limited and differential contact with English, and different levels of proficiency in the language. This was accomplished in the third chapter by investigating their acculturative attitudes and behaviour, and then doing a linguistic analysis on the interview data in chapter four. Even in instances where some of the women's social or psychological integrativeness was questionable because they reported certain attitudes and/or behaviour that might be considered negative by Schumann and others, the women in question still managed to be the furthest along in their acquisition of English. For example, Sasha and Olga are both from the top half of the group in terms of acquisition; yet Sasha indicated that she was not committed to staying in Canada if she cannot find work, and Olga experiences fear of negative evaluation when speaking English. In short, in these cases the women's attitude and behaviour were not accurate predictors of their proficiency in English.

It is perhaps necessary at this point to evaluate the linguistic measures used to compare the women's acquisition of English. While there were many different linguistic measures to choose from, I opted for ones that would be most appropriate for interview speech data. Therefore no structured exercises nor any kind of test format was used to evaluate the women.

Instead, the women's formation of the negative and their production of three grammatical morphemes (plural *-s*, past *-ed*, and the irregular past) were used as two of the measures, because learners have been found to acquire them in developmental stages. The difficulty in using developmental stages to measure proficiency in English however, is that it is not always clear what stage a learner is at because of overlap between the stages. Nevertheless, these are structures that frequently occur in free speech which makes them ideal when working with speech samples. In hindsight, five thousand words would have been a more adequate sample than the thousand word samples actually used in the linguistic analysis.

The women's use of idioms and domain-specific vocabulary is a sensitive measure of their acculturation. The domain-specific vocabulary is important because it reflects their participation in various social domains, and the use of idioms is part of the integrative and expressive functions of language. This demonstrates that the women are not restricted to the purely communicative function of language (referential and denotative). Indeed they

were able to express their likes, dislikes, attitudes, and feelings; perhaps not as easily as native speakers but commendably nonetheless.

The optimal empirical research project on Schumann's Acculturation Model would look somewhat different from the pilot study presented here. In order to determine the precise effect acculturation has on naturalistic second language acquisition one would have to control for the numerous variables involved in second language acquisition and acculturation, so that the number of intervening factors is kept to a minimum. Also, the number of subjects would need to be increased to at least twenty, and their second language acquisition would have to be measured over a period of time so that any changes in their acquisition could be demonstrated by comparing the findings to the base line data. A speech sample of no less than five thousand words should also be used for the analysis. These are just a few of the methodology issues that need to be kept in mind when taking an empirical approach to this study.

Research Implications

Two important realizations from this research are first, that opportunities for contact with the target language are not a given simply because it is the dominant language, and second, just because opportunities for contact are available does not mean that learners are able to take advantage of them. Acquisition of a second language requires more than

having the right attitude and motivation, because without opportunities to hear and use the language in meaningful ways, a learner's positive attitude and motivation will not be sustained. The same is true of a learner whose major source of contact with the language is the classroom and who does not have occasion to build on what he or she has learned through meaningful interactions with native speakers of the language. Target language speakers need to do their part in creating opportunities for learners to speak the target language outside the classroom. One way of doing this that comes to mind is by volunteering to speak informally with language learners; it may prove to be a rewarding experience for both parties.

References

- Berry, J. W.
1980 "Acculturation as Varieties of Adaptation." Pp. 9-25 in A.M. Padilla (ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings*. Boulder: Westview Press
- Brown, Douglas H.
1980 "The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition." *TESOL Quarterly* 14 (2):157-164.
- Clark, Margaret & Kaufman, Sharon & Pierce, Robert C.
1976 "Explorations of Acculturation: Toward a Model of Ethnic Identity." *Human Organization* 35 (3):231-238.
- Clement, Richard & Kruidenier, Bastian
1983 "Orientations in Second Language Acquisition: The Effects of Ethnicity, Milieu, and Target Language on their Emergence." *Language Learning* 33 (3):273-291.
- Close, R. A.
1975 *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. London: Longman Group, Ltd.
- Cumming, Alister & Gill Jaswinder
1992 "Motivation or Accessibility? Factors Permitting Indo-Canadian Women to Pursue ESL Literacy Instruction." Pp. 241-252 in Barbara Burnaby, and Alister Cumming (eds.), *Socio-Political Aspects of ESL*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
- D'Anglejan, Alison
1978 "Language Learning in and out of Classrooms." Pp. 218-237 in Jack C. Richards (ed.), *Understanding Second & Foreign Language Learning: Issues and Approaches*. Massachusettes: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

- Dulay, H. & Burt, M. & Krashen, S.
1982 *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Fishman, Joshua A.
1976 "The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society." Pp. 217-404 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., The Hague
- Gardner, Robert & Lambert, Wallace E.
1972 *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Gardner, Robert C. & Lanca, Margaret & Alksnis, Christine & Roese, Neil
1994 "Effects of Language Choice on Acculturation: A Study of Portuguese Immigrants in a Multicultural Setting." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13 (3):315-330.
- Haugen, Einar
1964 *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press
- Herskovits, Melville J.
1958 *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact*. Gloucester, Massachusetts: P. Smith
- Horwitz, Elaine K. & Horwitz, Michael B. & Cope, Jo Ann
1991 "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety." Pp. 27-36 in Elaine Horwitz, and Dolly Young (eds.), *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall
- Krashen, Stephen D.
1985 *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane
1976 "An Explanation for the Morpheme Acquisition Order of Second Language Learners." *Language Learning* 26 (1):125-134.

- Larsen-Freeman, Diane & Long, Michael H.
1991 *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Longman Group UK, Ltd.
- Lattey, Elsa
1994 "Contexts for Second Language Acquisition." In Carol A. Blackshire-Belay (ed.), *Current Issues in Second Language Acquisition and Development*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.
- Lin, Jenn-Shann & Stanford, L. Marckworth
1983 "The Acculturation of Chinese in North America: A Sociolinguistic Profile of an Advantaged Immigrant group in Edmonton." *Bilingual Review* 10:47-51.
- Littlewood, William
1988 *Foreign and Second Language Learning: Language Acquisition Research and its Implications for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Long, Violet
1984 "Degrees of Acculturation in Guambia, Colombia." *Anthropological Linguistics* 26 (4):445-456.
- McLaughlin, Barry
1987 *Theories in Second Language Learning*. Baltimore: Edward Arnold
- Peirce, Bonny Norton
1995 "Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning." *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1):9-31.
- Samora, Julian & Deane, William N.
1956 "Language Usage as a Possible Index of Acculturation." *Sociology and Social Research* 40:307-311
- Schmidt, Richard W.
1983 "Interaction, Acculturation, and the Acquisition of Communicative Competence: A Case Study of an Adult." Pp. 137-174 in Nancy Wolfson and Judd Elliot (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

- Schumann, John H.
 1978a *The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition*.
 Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- 1978b "The Acculturation Model For Second-Language Acquisition." Pp. 27-50 in
 Rosario C. Gingras (ed.), *Second-Language Acquisition & Foreign Language
 Teaching*. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics
- Schumann, John H.
 1986 "Research on the Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition."
Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 7 (5):379-392.
- Spolsky, Bernard
 1989 *Conditions for Second Language Learning: Introduction to a General Theory*.
 Toronto: Oxford University Press
- Thomas, Jacqueline
 1988 "The Role Played by Metalinguistic Awareness in Second and Third Language
 Learning." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9 (3):
 235-246.
- Turner, Graeme
 1992 *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, Chapman
 and Hall, Inc.
- Weinreich, Uriel
 1966 *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Netherlands: Mouton
 & Co., The Hague
- Young, M. Y. & Gardner, Robert C.
 1990 "Modes of Acculturation and Second Language Proficiency." *Canadian
 Journal of Behavioural Science* 22 (1):59-71.

Appendix A

Questions for the First Interview

Background Information

- 1) How old are you?
- 2) What is your first language? What other languages do you speak?
- 3) Where were you born? Where were your parents born?
- 4) What is your ethnicity?
- 5) Are you married? Do you have children? How old are they?
- 6) How long have you lived in Canada? Are you a landed immigrant or a refugee?
- 7) How many English classes have you had in your life?
- 8) What is the highest level of schooling you have completed here, and in your country?
- 9) Are you working now? If not, what do you do everyday after your English classes?
- 10) What is your household income?
- 11) Do you think that there will be jobs available for you when you finish your English classes?
- 12) What are your goals in one year's time? In five years?

- *-Why do you think I want to ask you questions? *These three questions were
 *-What do you think my role as a researcher is? dropped from the questionnaire
 *-What do you expect from these interviews? as they proved to be too difficult
 for the first four informants.
-

Part I: *Attitude and Motivation*

- 1) Do you think that learning English will help you in some way? If so, in what way(s)?
If not, why not?
- 2) The more you get to know English Canadians, the more you want to be able to speak
their language.
a) Strongly agree b) Agree c) Do not agree d) Strongly disagree
- 3) If you could get a good job without having to speak or understand English, would you
try and learn English anyway?
- 4) What you're learning in your English class has been of interest to you.
a) Agree b) Disagree
- 5) Do you like your English teacher.....
a) Very much b) A little c) Not at all
- 6) If you learn English you will feel more like a Canadian.
a) Agree b) Disagree
- 7) You like English Canadians.....
a) Very much b) A little c) In between "very much" and "a little" d) Not at all

8) Learning English has let you meet more English-speaking people.

- a) Agree b) Disagree

9) If you had a choice to learn any language in the world, what language would you choose?

Part II: *Language behaviour*

1) How often do you think about the words and ideas that you learn in your English class?

- a) Once in a while b) Hardly ever c) A lot (often)

2) You _____ try to practice your English.

- a) Never b) Sometimes c) Always d) Most of the time

3) Do you read English newspapers?

4) Name two English newspapers.

5) How many of your friends are English-speaking Canadians?

6) Not at all A little Fairly well Very well

You speak English

You read English

You write English

7) Do you sometimes think in English?

8) How does one learn (a language) in your culture?

- 9) Do you ever speak English at home?
- 10) You use English when speaking with.....
- a) Friends b) Family c) Co-workers d) Strangers
- 11) Compared to others in your English course, do you think you.....
- a) Do more studying than most of them
 - b) Do less studying than most of them
 - c) Study about as much as them

Questions for the Second Interview

- 1) When you first came to Canada, which city did you live in, and for how long?
- 2) Do you go to *every* class of your English course?
- 3) Why did you choose the English classes here at [name of school]?
- 4) How did you find out about the E.S.L. classes here?
- 5) Can you give me two examples of how your English classes have helped you?
- 6) How do you feel when you are speaking with English Canadians face-to-face? And over the phone?
- 7) Can you describe for me *in detail*, what you do in your English class?
- 8) If a friend were to ask you, "How do I go about opening a bank account, and what will the bank ask me for in terms of information?" What would you say?
- 9) Have you seen an English movie or an English program on t.v. recently? If so, can you tell me about it?

10) In which public places do you find yourself speaking English the most?

Questions for the Third Interview

Acculturative Behaviour

- 1) Can you tell me of two things you do differently now that you are living in Canada?
- 2) Name two things you like the most about Canada.
- 3) Name two things you don't like about Canada.
- 4) Have you added any North American meals to your cooking?
- 5) Do you listen to the radio?
- 6) Have your children changed the way they do things?
- 7) Have you adopted any Canadian traditions, such as celebrating Canadian holidays?
- 8) Would you say that there is less entertainment, such as ballet or theater in Canada than in your country?
- 9) Is there equality between men and women in your country?
- 10) What do you think of the Canadian government?

Appendix B

Questions for the Follow-up Interview

- 1) About how many hours a week would you watch television?
- 2) About how many times a week did you rent an English movie?
- 3) About how many hours a week would you say you listened to the radio?
- 4) How many days a week did you read English newspapers?
- 5) How many hours a week did you attend your ESL classes?
- 6) (For those who work) Approximately how many hours a week did you speak English due to your job?
- 7) How often did you speak English at home?
 - a) everyday b) sometimes c) once in a while d) never
- 8) How many hours a week did you have English classes in your country, and what were they like?
- 9) Approximately how many English acquaintances did you have?
- 10) Do have any associations with the Russian community in Ottawa? Explain.
- 11) Culture shock was explained to the women if they were not familiar with the term, and then they were asked if they themselves had experienced it.

Appendix C

Case Study Research on the Effects of Attitude and Motivation on Second Language Acquisition as an Aspect of Acculturation

Informed Consent

A consent form records an individual's willingness to participate in the research on the basis of what is said to be involved. It is important that the person volunteering is aware of everything that is involved in the research *before* agreeing to take part in it, so that there is no deception on the researcher's part.

The research will be undertaken as part of my Master's Thesis in Anthropology, which I am doing at Carleton University here in Ottawa. With your permission, I would like to take notes and tape record the interviews. Also, with your permission, I would like to ask your teacher(s) about their assessment of your English.

Description of Thesis Research

The aim of the study is to find out in what way(s) an immigrant's motivations and attitudes towards English as a second language affects their learning of English, and how they integrate into, or become part of, Canadian society.

I am interested in speaking with six Russian-speaking women in E.S.L. classes about their personal and/or economic motivations to learn English, and about their attitudes towards learning English, towards English Canadians, and towards the English language training they are currently receiving. Furthermore, I would like to ask each informant about their English speaking and reading practices. In order to observe your practical knowledge of English, I will be asking you to explain how one uses certain public institutions such as banks; or how one applies for various social services such as unemployment insurance.

This will require three, forty-five minutes to one-hour interviews with each of the six informants. The interviews will be conducted at an agreed upon location. During the first interview, I will need to get background information on each of the informants; your age, languages spoken, education, and family income.

You have the right to withdraw your participation or to not answer any particular questions that you may find too personal. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, I will not be using your name in any written or oral reports; with the exception of my own personal research notes, which no one else but myself will see. Also, if at any time you would like me to destroy any record of information that you have provided me with, I will do so immediately. If you would like a copy of the final research paper, I will be more than happy to provide you with one.

If you have any questions before, during, or after the research, you can contact me -Sujata Gill (the researcher) by phone, at (514) 683-3901 in Montreal, Quebec.

Should you have any complaints concerning the research, you may contact Flo Kellner who is the Chair of the department of Anthropology at Carleton University, her number is (613) 788-2583.

Signing this form in no way means that the research subject has given up her rights.

Researcher

Subject

Appendix D

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #1

S.G.: Um, can you tell me of two things, you do differently now that you are living in Canada?

N.G.: Different uh..what I..I did in Russia?

S.G.: Yah, yah.

N.G.: [sighs] This things, what kind of things? And...cause I don't know.

S.G.: It could be anything...umm...

S.G.: For instance uhh...

N.G.: I...I..I don't work now-

S.G.: Right, o.k....

N.G.: First of all.

S.G.: ...but but something that say is-you do differently because you're specifically in Canada.

N.G.: I do shopping, once a week.

S.G.: O.k.

N.G.: Before I did it everyday.

S.G.: O.k.

N.G.: And, I don't know what else. Now it's my...things can be only...like home-housework different. All housework it's different; cooking, washing, cleaning.

S.G.: O.k. how..how is it...

N.G.: Here it's much easier...then it was in Russia.

S.G.: It...It's easier because of...?

N.G.: Yah, it's uh [sighs]...how.....because uh for example take cooking...

S.G.: Uh-hm.

N.G.: I ...all products-all food is like prepared or...

S.G.: To cook.

N.G.: Cooking yah. Before I need uh...do a lot of work before I can cook you know.

S.G.: O.k. o.k. Yah Sasha was saying that like you'd get big pieces of something and...

N.G.: Yah, and I need to separate, and also....first of all I have to *found* this...

S.G.: O.k.,o.k.

N.G.:...food...

S.G.: Right, o.k.

N.G.: ...before I cook.

S.G.: O.k., so housework and...and shopping [talking to myself], o.k. Um, name two things uh you like the most about Canada.

N.G.: Museum-na-museums.

S.G.: Museums?

N.G.: Now ya, when all...a summer and winter we visiting, I don't know may-not everything, but uh most of all museums, it's wonderful.

S.G.: Uh-huh.

N.G.: And....I don't know what else. It's hard to remin-remember now, quickly. I like uh skating, here it's....[long pause] people here it's-everybody with whom we speak, it's like friendly always smiling, ready to explain everything, patient with our language.

S.G.: Do find people in...in in Russia were not so patient-I mean I know you spook-spoke their language but...

N.G.: Ah...they're friendly also but now it's ah very hard time and uh people you know always like aggressive now.

S.G.: O.k.

N.G.: Always like uh...to explose....ready...now, hard time and.

S.G.: O.k. O.k. And name two things that you *don't* like about Canada.

N.G.: I don't like ah teen-agers, when I saw how zey-hmm how to say...o.k. when I saw how teenagers for example sit on zee bus, with his feet on the seat-I...I *hate* it.

S.G.: O.k. So the way they behave?

N.G.: Behave?

S.G.: The way they behave, act.

N.G.: Yah, they ah...And and also in school, I don't like when I...I saw ho-how my oldest son when he goes in school, uh one time we came in class children you know zey walk around, jumping, shouting: after that I ask him it was uh time between like...

S.G.: Like recess?

N.G.: Recess yah. He said-he says, "no, it was lesson-it was class."

S.G.: Really.

N.G.: And I know that it's-teacher cannot say anything to chil...to children that stopped it and uh you know, punish them or....he look on the swimming pool [referring to her youngest son who is standing beside her]

S.G.: Ohh. o.k.

N.G.: And uh, I think its must be more discipined...in class.

S.G.: O.k., o.k. [silence] O.k. umm, I can't remember, did you say that you don't like-do you like watching English television?

N.G.: Yes.
 S.G.: You do, o.k. And do find that it's helped you um...
 N.G.: With language?
 S.G.: Improve your English?
 N.G.: Yes.
 S.G.: Yah.
 N.G.: For sure, yah.
 S.G.: In what way?
 N.G.: Ahh, I can listen how people uh talk, you know it's like pronunciation, and uh...uh what I-some words I don't understand but I can see how-what does it mean, you know sometimes they show and I can remember it.
 S.G.: O.k. o.k. so.
 N.G.: Like expression also, I can see it's....idioms.
 S.G.: Umm...have you added any North American or Canadian meals, to your uh...when you cook?
 N.G.: Ahh...I don't understand arted?
 S.G.: Added.
 N.G.: Added.
 S.G.: Uh ...like incorporated. Like for instance do you...do you cook uh any North American dishes?
 N.G.: Ah what North American dishes? [we both laugh]
 S.G.: Ah o.k. it's a tricky one, o.k. Umm, well things that like for instance do you...cook tradi...do you cook a lot of Russian dishes, or do you...you also cook uh....?
 N.G.: Yah, now I....cook some Russian, some Italian-I like Italian food, so I....But it also I don't know, we use meat...and I-maybe its more Russian way to prepare...
 S.G.: O.k. but it's the same...
 N.G.: Yah, but I think-yah it's the same-maybe I don't use spices because it's so different what I use in...use in Russia. So nobody knows.
 S.G.: Wha..wha..what kind of spices do they have like in Russia?
 N.G.: I don't know, I use only salt and pepper, and sometime a special like uh...cu-cumin.
 S.G.: Cumin.
 N.G.: Yah.
 S.G.: O.k.
 N.G.: And that's it.
 S.G.: O.k. And here you find there's a lot more?
 N.G.: Yah, and I try little bit, everything but...I cannot say that I like it.

S.G.: O.k. but you...you would cook things like chicken and all that?

N.G.: Yes.

S.G.: You know that would be-have you tried uh anything like for instance ah in Quebec there's a big thing-poutine...have you tried that, that's french fries with gravy and um cheese curds.

N.G.: No.

S.G.: You haven't tried that.

N.G.: A few days ago I try-you know before I never used uh cheese, what I can use, I don't know it's like...

S.G.: Grated cheese-parmesan

N.G.: Yah, like parmesan, yah. And I try, and I like it-I found that I like it.

S.G.: With spaghetti or..?

N.G.: With spaghetti, yah...

S.G.: Oh you never had it before?

N.G.: Yah, I...I even never buy it because I didn't know what ah...

S.G.: It was.

N.G.: But a few days ago, in our mall, woman they like umm they-this is new product and zey...

S.G.: They were promoting it?

N.G.: Yah, and she told me let's try it, and she will call me and ask how I like it. And so I try it, and find I like it.

S.G.: And you liked it? O.k. Anything else you've tried umm what else could we really... have you tried the...the fast food? Have you been to the fast food restaurants?

N.G.: Yes.

S.G.: Like McDonalds, and...

N.G.: Yes, but hmm I not really like it.

S.G.: No.

N.G.: It's it's (?) when you're doing shopping, you know just little bit eat but uh normally I prefer like nor..normal food you know.

S.G.: Not junk food-that's considered junk food.

N.G.: [repeating to herself] junk food.

S.G.: Yah, yah, o.k. Hmm but you still prepare ah traditional Russian dishes?

N.G.: Yah.

S.G.: Like Borsch or...

N.G.: Yah, and know we have pilveenie, it's uh....meat with um like ravioli!

S.G.: O.k.

N.G.: And here in our...ah store I found special things for this, it's it's Chinese but it's

very similar with Russian, and now I used to it, it's much easier, I don't need to prepare hmm things wis ah flour and salt you know when you mix it you get....

S.G.: A batter?

N.G.: [she looks the word up in her Russian-English dictionary] Dough....

S.G.: Dough!

N.G.: Dough yah, I don't need to prepare it.

S.G.: Oo.k. It's already...

N.G.: It's very good,yah. And also meat is ready one hour and even half hour and it's ready.

S.G.: O.k. Umm do you listen to the radio?

N.G.: Yah-ah not very often just sometimes.

S.G.: Not very often, so you find the...is that just because you...prefer to watch...

N.G.: No, even in Russia, I didn't like to listen radio, I prefer ah t.v.

S.G.: To watch the t.v. That was exactly the opposite of what Sasha said.

N.G.: Yah, yah I know she often listen radio but.

S.G.: She says she understands it...better than...watching t.v.

N.G.: I know that it's ah radio, I...I maybe I must to listen-start to listen radio because it also help.

S.G.: Huh hmm, huh hmm.

N.G.: But I don't know, maybe later.

S.G.: O.k. O.k. Umm have your children changed the way, they do things, since they've been in Canada?

N.G.: No, I don't think so, they...you know they were small when we...and now they're still small and so-they yah do everything as they want, you know.

S.G.: Right, but they haven't-like for instance your oldest son is in school, right? And uh has he picked up any...habits or ways of doing things that uh...are very different from Russia or...the way you're used to doing things?

N.G.: Maybe he start like you know new games like this but... I cannot say (?)...

S.G.: Nothing in terms of their behaviour?

N.G.:any different.

S.G.: O.k. Umm have you adopted any Canadian traditions? Uh for instance Hallowe'en? Or do you celebrate these?

N.G.: [sighs] Last year we celebrate, but it...it was in school you know my oldest son he celebrated it in school, he was wearing a costume, and we celebrate it in my school when I was studying. But at home, no it's one year.

S.G.: So you didn't...you didn't hand out candy...and your boys didn't go out?

N.G.: But umm, last year I like I bought candies for because people told me that

somebody can knock the door, and I...I...I bought specially for this but nobody knocked-maybe because it's building....

S.G.: Yah, that's one of the reasons because children don't like to...

N.G.: Yah, go out...

S.G.: Unless it's just the children that are in the building they might go.

N.G.: Just asking

S.G.: And your boys didn't go out trick-or-treating

N.G.: No, but uh you know he-it uh was uh year ago and he did know he didn't have many friends and uh he didn't know how to do this

S.G.: Oh, okay

N.G.: Okay,

S.G.: Okay. Do you think next year he'll...

N.G.: I don't know...

S.G.: This year, that's right

N.G.: I don't know, maybe next year.

S.G.: And/or um. Thanksgiving?

N.G.: I don't know...we...it's always uh holidays different from Russian and it-we cannot you know pick up it so quickly maybe later, but now...

S.G.: You just sort of...know they're going on and just...

N.G.: Yah, we know this thing is, but we don't celebrate it...

S.G.: Okay....um [pauses] would you say that there's less entertainment in Canada, like like in terms of uh like Ballet, theatre, uh, that kind of ...uh...

N.G.: I cannot say anything because, I...I've never go in cinema, theatre here and I don't know this kind of life here...

S.G.: Okay, but is it...is it uh like my understanding is in Russia that it's...it's uh highly promoted like the Ballet...and...and...that kind of cultural uh...

N.G.: Dancing, singing...

S.G.: Yah...

N.G.: Uh, you know it uh I don't know how it's in Canada, I can't compare...

S.G.: Right, but do you notice the difference in the types of entertainment...that you see here, like...uh... like for instance television is a big thing and then if you go to the movies it's another thing, uh concerts like rock concerts is another big thing in in North America... whereas like in Russia what is the...the major sort of entertainment...

N.G.: What do people prefer?

S.G.: Yah...

N.G.: Uh, it also depends some people prefer like uh classic music, some, uh, uh

Canadians usually prefer Rock concerts

S.G.: Are there many rock bands in...in Russia...

N.G.: Yah, now it's many...

S.G.: Okay, but like let's say for people your age would they, what would you...
if you wanted to have some entertainment what would you...

N.G.: I like to see

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #2

S.G.: Umm o.k. can you tell me of two things you do differently, now that you are living in Canada?

S.L.: Ah yes, uh the first things is my housework, I do differently, and uh my work-I mean job.

S.G.: O.k.

S.L.: Differently. It depends with uh communicate? with people my job but housework because it's uh-I have many things to help me, and uh it's uh doesn't take a lot time to make housework, and it's very easy...

S.G.: Like for instance in Russia did you have like a vacuum cleaner?

S.L.: Yes I have vacuum cleaner, and I have just one room but I have many things in this room, and uh you know it's uh...I don't know how to say, and my...I don't...I don't have uh...uh laundry uh like in my building now, and I can't wash my clothes and everything by hand, and uh so a lot of course. And uh then prepare food it takes a lot money because usually you buy um...uh like one piece you know, and then you uh...separate and uh it's a lot lot time usually one...of...one day of my weekend I spent in kitchen, and...

S.G.: Really?

S.L.: Yah and I never do this in Canada, and uh cleaner uh clear up the rooms I don't know but usually my daughter vacuums and uh it's...it's fine and I never do wis (?) but in Russia we have one small room, and uh many things and uh I must clean this umm after...after two days or third days. So and uh...how to say, when you don't have lot uh a lot uh...space uh you have uh...you don't have uh I don't know-I don't know how to say in English uh you can uh clean up it's every, everytime because you can move, you can...

S.G.: Right, right, it's easier t..to get around things.

S.L.: ...when you have uh lot place it's not-it doesn't matter and uh so.

S.G.: So eas...[writing it down]o.k.so it takes you less time...and effort.

S.L.: And uh I think there are many uh...uh cleaners I mean uh I use...

S.G.: Products.

S.L.: Cleaners products yah, they very strong, and they very uh they very help of course.

S.G.: So what would you use in Russia?

S.L.: Oh nothing because I don't have too much, and if you have it's too expensive you know I don't have enough money to buy this, just soap or uh...I don't know how is cleaner product for uh..laundry...

S.G.: O.k. detergent.

S.L.: Deter..detergent yes. And that's it Russian's detergent and uh...it's too strong too... when you laundry by hand it's uh.

S.G.: Yah, yah. o.k.umm. [pause] I can't...I can't imagine having to do all my laundry by hand I-cause now you know uh certain materials like if I have a silk blouse they tell you wash by hand. And even when I have one blouse, it'll take me...like three weeks before I get around to doing it by hand.

S.L.: I know me too, but sometimes I have uh one things and another, then I have uh two things and I *need* to laundry this, yes I feel sick and I can't do this and I-you know I think about this all day, all day, but then I do this of course but uh usually yes (?) I like this laundry.

S.G.: O.k. But they...they they have washers and driers in Russia, it's just that you need money to buy them right?

S.L.: Yes, you need b-oney you know if it's uh....uh uh import uh I mean not Russian...

S.G.: Imported.

S.L.: Imported uh laundry or dishwashers you can buy of course, it's very very expensive and then you have problem if somesing broken on this.

S.G.: Right, to get it repaired.

S.L.: Yes, you can't do ev-anything, and if you buy Russian, it's you know...you don't have guarantee too, and uh you have a lot of problem and everything else so uh I never buy.

S.G.: O.k. but you had seen them like for instance when you came to Canada, umm did you know how to operate a washer and drier?

S.L.: Uhh...no I didn't know about operate but it's...it's very easy, and uh of course it's not problem, but uh...I...I saw dishwasher in Russia. I never use but I saw when we were, when we visit one family, and uh they didn't work with this dishwasher because they usually broke and uh they...they tried uh to....to use this not a lot but sometimes, sometimes....

S.G.: If there was a big party or something.

S.L.: Yah, yah and so but in Canada I see that people usually use and uh...

S.G.: Everyday.

S.L.: Everyday yes and it's it's no problem and so I think that if...if you know that if you buy this thing and it doesn't have uh a problem-a lot of problem with this of course and this thing is very expensive of course you...don't buy this.

S.G.: Right, right.

S.L.: But I don't have money for this thing.

S.G.: Yah, yah, we don't...we don't have a dishwasher either. Because some pe-I find

them uh actually more work, than washing the dishes because you still have to load the dishwasher, unload the dishwasher you know, some of them you have to rinse even the plates before you put them in there, it doesn't do pots, so we just think it's it's.

S.L.: But it's very clear...uh uh dish-dishes from uh from the dishwasher...

S.G.: Yes, yah that's true.

S.L.: But you know funny story, my sister uh from uh Ukraine, she has uh dishwasher, laundry, everything, everything, everything, but she doesn't have water in (?) and it's very funny and....

S.G.: So why, why does she have them?

S.L.: Why? Because she has money and you know!

S.G.: So she just-but she can't use them.

S.L.: Her husband bought this last year, and uh now she has, but uh usually they have uh water two hours uh...

S.G.: A day.

S.L.: A day, yes. In the morning or in the evening, so one week in the morning, one week in the evening, she tried to do somesing and to push uh-so it's funny, it's funny of course and when she said me that she has, I say why? If you don't have-and sometimes she doesn't have electricity so...

S.G.: Oh my goodness!

S.L.: Yes it's funny, and I don't know why.

S.G.: Maybe just for...status. You know like, to show other people that she...

S.L.: Maybe but uh I don't know, she...she doesn't have friend in Sevastopol and uh who can see her uh her rich (?) I don't know.

S.G.: O.k. ah the other thing you said was...work....that you do differently.

S.L.: Yah, uh the first thing because uh...uh the people they are Canadian not Russian people, and uh it's another, another mmm...you know how um when I...when I spoke with my colleagues in uh Russia, it was one thing maybe because I feel much better, I feel, uh I feeled uh...I don't know, like in my house you know...

S.G.: More comfortable.

S.L.: Yes, uh...in Canada it's...it's very difficult at first it's language of course and uh when people...don't understand you, you feel not very comfortable, and uh the second uh...uh it's the same work what I did in Russia but it's another ways, you know sometimes it's a little, little things but it's different and uh it was-so it's-and uh it's how to say uh...we worked in Russia from eight a.m. to five p.m. but you can do...I don't know you can't smoke, you can uh to drink coffee, tea uh...and not uh special time but I want now to drink coffee so I can do this and-but in Canada just

fifty minutes after ten, and that's it, it's your coffee and then lunch time and it's very very uh strong-not very very stro-but it's strong *this* time not when I want!

S.G.: Right, right, yes you have to have it at that time.

S.L.: Yes, and I mean many, many things uh...that's difference between Russian and uh Canada it's not because uh...uh-how to say-it's worse or better, it's another, and uh...

S.G.: O.k. it's different.

S.L.: It's different yes, and...I mean this way it's...

S.G.: O.k. O.k. O.k. Name two things that you like most about Canada.

S.L.: Oh I don't know, it's many things but how to say....it's again uh maybe....your uh... comfortable life and house, I don't know how to say.

S.G.: Like...

S.L.: Mo...mo...mo....[sighs] I know that you feels like...human you know how to say it I don't know you can do anything uh....

S.G.: You have more freedom...you mean?

S.L.: No, no, no freedom. Mmm....maybe freedom but uh I mean that uh...you can feel uh I...I can do...uh shopping with big, big uh bags you know, and then to take bus and move from-to the city and uh...and uh I can't uh...I don't need to find uh...food, to find uh-maybe clothes somesing but I can't uh...I...I don't need to find food and I feel uh more like uh you know like uh....like human, like a woman you know...I don't know how to say it's a....a....mmm...highest level in life.

S.G.: A...a higher standard of living.

S.L.: Yes.

S.G.: There's a higher standard of living and there's uh-I know what you mean-um, I don't even know how to say it.

S.L.: I don't know it's one thing, uh many thing but uh maybe...most of all I like in Canada this because I'll never feel, like now, in Russia.

S.G.: Right.

S.L.: Yes. I have friend, and I have...I have friends and everything in Russia; my parents, but you know I feel...much better

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #3

- S.G.: O.k. uh...can you tell me of two things you do differently now that you are living in Canada?
- N.R.: No, same. I doing the same sing uh.....uh about what you mmm think when you...ask me this question? Uh what uh I must to do?
- S.G.: Uh just to see if uh you know since you've come to Canada, you've changed the way you do anything.
- N.R.: No I don't change!
- S.G.: No?
- N.R.: No.
- S.G.: Not even like uh...for instance-housework?
- N.R.: No! I uh I work in my house same uh like Russia, like Russia.
- S.G.: Is it...is it any easier, or no?
- N.R.: No.
- S.G.: No?
- N.R.: No. I have uh same e...e...equickment.
- S.G.: Equipment.
- N.R.: Equickment, like in Russia.
- S.G.: O.k. So it's...it's not any easier. What about cooking?
- N.R.: Cooking...? Maybe...only some type pizza but uh I think uh...uh my children uh eat uh same food like Russia because they uh...know this food and like this food.
- S.G.: O.k.
- N.R.: No I think uh...
- S.G.: Even, even in the...the preparation it's not any easier? Like...
- N.R.: If I...if I uh cook a borsh, what can be easy?
- S.G.: O.k. but-no it's just ah...I was speaking to some other women and they said that um in Russia they had to separate the food all the time, and now everything is prepared and ready to cook.
- N.R.: No...in Russia we ha-we had uh prepared food too! Um I don't know how this word in English, in Russian [says the word in Russian] maybe half food. Half food. And eh if I uh must to...cook uh qui eh qui...
- S.G.: Quickly?
- N.R.: Quickly. I...can to buy this food and use.

S.G.: O.k. O.k. Um...so you can't think of anything really that you do differently at all?

N.R.: No.

S.G.: No?

N.R.: No.

S.G.: Mk.

N.R.: Maybe, maybe only...a little bit quicker. Because in Russia we...we...*before* we had not uh...toaster. For example. Now, now my friends uh...uh...our friends have anything.

S.G.: O.k. And you uh you also had a washer and drier in Russia?

N.R.: Yah, washer yah! Uh drier uh no...no often, but if I *want* to buy, I can.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: Here I uh don't use dishwasher uh very...often. Because uh if my son, today for example, uh eat in eight o'clock and go to school he-what what he eat? Sandwich and tea or coffee.

S.G.: Right.

N.R.: Yah? I don't uh use dishwasher. Dishes yes. If, if uh I um have a party, if or Sunday or Saturday my family eats together. It's o.k.

S.G.: Then, then you have more (?)

N.R.: I think same! Maybe uh when *teenagers* come, many...things uh...different. On our- in our age, I think...

S.G.: Everything is the same.

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: O.k. Um...k name two things you like the most about Canada.

N.R.: Place or...only place?

S.G.: No-no, anything, in Canada. The two things you like the most.

N.R.: People, people.

S.G.: You like the people?

N.R.: Yah. People and freedom.

S.G.: And freedom, o.k. When you...when you say freedom, in...in what-political freedom or...personal freedom?

N.R.: All ways.

S.G.: Both of them?

N.R.: A Both.

S.G.: Both?

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: O.k. Like you...you feel you, you can uh...you have more movement in...

N.R.: In my country...for example, you know maybe [says the name of someone] he uh

worked in t.v.-Russian t.v. after...few month, uh he was...uh founded uh...killer....
k...killed! He...he was killed!

S.G.: O.k. he was murdered.

N.R.: Yah. Because maybe he uh told us things uh who don't like uh government and
other rich people.

S.G.: Mhuh, mhuh. So here-here you don't...

N.R.: More uh more safety here I think.

S.G.: Yah, there's less-do you think that-you feel there's less crime?

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: Less crime than....

N.R.: In Ottawa for sure.

S.G.: O.k. name two things uh you don't like about Canada.

N.R.: I don't know. I like. No!

S.G.: Is there any-you're...you're saying...you're saying though last time about in the
television or in the movie that....

N.R.: I think this not a problem. This eh...only m-opinion. only opinion; I...I...I don't see a
large problem with this. If I like, I see; if I don't like, I turn off this uh program. No
I think uh...

S.G.: But you don't see it around you? Like you don't see uh among young people, the
teenagers that...

N.R.: Now I...I uh see Canada in pink colour, you know?

S.G.: Yah.

N.R.: And I can uh...can't uh to say anything uh bad about Canada, because I love this
country.

S.G.: Mhuh. O.k. K you were telling me before that uh you don't really enjoy watching
television, very much.

N.R.: No enjoy. I have no ti....eh eh eh a lot...a lot of time.

S.G.: Time to do it.

N.R.: Yah because I have other...work.

S.G.: O.k. But do you think that uh watching English television would help you improve
your English?

N.R.: Yes, for sure. I uh I see uh I see special program uh...which I liked...which I like uh
I forget uh channel...twenty-four, twenty-four because uh sometime I don't, don't
see this uh program. One a...man...from I...I think he he from church-church.

S.G.: Church.

N.R.: Church. He...he told people to, he told people how people must to live with God,
with uh good uh....relationship, another, other, other interesting things I, I, I see

news, because it's very interesting for me. I, I don't uh see movie...

S.G.: Oh o.k. you don't really watch movies.

N.R.: Because they very long.

S.G.: And d...do these uh-when you watch t.v. does it help your uh vocabulary?

N.R.: Yah. If I know uh any words I can take dictionary and uh...and uh I have uh...captioning.

S.G.: Cl-o.k. yah close caption!

N.R.: Close yah and I can read, and if I uh don't understand mm...dictor, when she or he spoke very quickly I can uh read more easy.

S.G.: And, and does it help you um like (?) correct pronunciation of words and that sort of thing?

N.R.: Mhuh.

S.G.: O.k. Uh you're...uh you were saying did-have you added any um North American or Canadian...uh dishes to your cooking?

N.R.: Uh...I, I, I try uh...I think I do-many this no Canadian food....because here many...Chinese, Italic-Italians, I don't sure, I don't sure maybe.

S.G.: You haven't try them or you don't want to...

N.R.: I try but I don't know for sure maybe i...i...is..is not uh Canadian.

S.G.: Oh o.k. o.k. I see what you mean.

N.R.: Maybe this Italic or China, I, I don't-I'm not sure.

S.G.: O.k., o.k. But you try to...incorporate...

N.R.: Yah, yah.

S.G.: ...you don't just cook Russian...dishes?

N.R.: Eh no, no.

S.G.: So you cook uh chicken and whatever, whatever else? Have you tried some of the...like for instance, a thing popular in Quebec is um a poutine.

N.R.: Mhuh.

S.G.: Which is-have you heard of that?

N.R.: No uh...uh my, my uh friend from Toronto give me uh interesting recip, I think this Italic cookna...uh spaghetti squash.

S.G.: Sp...Spaghetti sauce or squash?

N.R.: Spaghetti squash.

S.G.: Squash!

N.R.: Squash.

S.G.: Oh.

N.R.: Yah, very...very interesting prepare uh...this from ve..vegetable, yah?

S.G.: Yah.

N.R.: But where uh you prepare this uh...food, you sink maybe you uh...you uh...u...use uh macaroni or spaghetti...

S.G.: Right.

N.R.: ...but uh no.

S.G.: You don't, o.k.

N.R.: You don't...uh I don't because it's uh spaghetti from eh uh ve...vegetable.

S.G.: Oh is it uh...uh what do you call it....spinach-is it spinach...pasta?

N.R.: No! No, no, no, no, no-no.

S.G.: It's...it's spaghetti from veget...

N.R.: From vegetable yah! Looks like uh sp-macaronia spaghetti, yah?

S.G.: O.k. But it's not pasta?

N.R.: No, no, no.

S.G.: It's a vegetable?

N.R.: Yah, it's very interesting.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: I try.

S.G.: O.k. But you haven't tried like-have you gone to any of the uh fast food restaurants?

N.R.: Yah, why no?

S.G.: Like McDonalds...

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: ...Harveys...

N.R.: Chinese, Italian buf-buffet, yah.

S.G.: Mhuh.

N.R.: Yah, I know.

S.G.: Do you...do you like them?

N.R.: No, I don't like, my...my sons like. I wis uh...them.

S.G.: Oh o.k. so if you go out for...for dinner, you just go where...

N.R.: No for dinner! Maybe we mm on um...trip.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: Maybe we...we were in uh Niagara Fall passing. We....use.

S.G.: Oh you just stopped....

N.R.: McDonalds, buffet, yah. I...whe...where uh we here in, in...Ottawa, for example we don't use uh many time because when we go to beach even I uh I take some...some food yah.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: But we use!

S.G.: O.k. Uhh do you listen to the radio?

N.R.: Radia?.....only in....in the car.
 S.G.: Only in the car?
 N.R.: Long time. Yah.
 S.G.: O.k. Cause w..don't you think that....
 N.R.: We, we, we don-we...don't have...radio in house.
 S.G.: Oh you don't have one!
 N.R.: No.
 S.G.: O.k. Because that might also help you uh...
 N.R.: Yes but when we have uh...t.v. in house, you don't uh need radio.
 S.G.: O.k. Cause some uh-one lady told me that uh it's easier to-for her to listen to the radio because it's, like when watching t.v. it's distracting cause you're always watching the picture, and then you-if you try and understand then you miss what's going on.
 N.R.: Yah, yah, but uh....but uh...I, I think if I have t.v.; it's no problem. But I uh....very seldom, I listen uh cassette....with English lesson.
 S.G.: Oh with English lesson!
 N.R.: Yah.
 S.G.: O.k.
 N.R.: Russian lessons, in English.
 S.G.: Oh o.k.
 N.R.: Yah. Very popular. In Russian.
 S.G.: O.k. Umm have your, have your children changed the way they do things....since they've been...?
 N.R.: Yah, they, they feel here...more...
 S.G.: Comfortable...or?
 N.R.: No comfortable.....uh comfortable in....in Russia too. Uh.....[says it in Russian] O.k. uh they feel uh like uh adults here, I think uh if we live maybe in Russian-in Ukrain now, they feel same because it's age.
 S.G.: O.k.
 N.R.: Yah. Very, very...
 S.G.: Like they have...power...
 N.R.: Adults yah.
 S.G.: Rely on you less; more independant.
 N.R.: My older, older son uh delivery mmm....now, now delivery....
 S.G.: Flyers?
 N.R.: Flyers.
 S.G.: Mhuh.

N.R.: One women from (?) he...she has um a sports groups aerobic, and she eh gives uh sometime work for her-for him. O.k. ten, fifteen dollars (?) he...he...feel...

S.G.: Like a (?)

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: Yah cause he has...he has his own money now and works.

N.R.: Work now like Canadian., yah o.k. He ha-he have uh chance uh sent his money in McDonald.

S.G.: O.k. spend it in McDonalds, right.

N.R.: Yah, very adult. (?) spend.

S.G.: [laughing] That way you don't have to go, cause he can go.

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: And, and does he uh...have they changed the way they...they dress at all?

N.R.: Yah, yes, for sure.

S.G.: Yah?

N.R.: Um in Ukrain uh all people go more...more nicely. I, I think.

S.G.: They dress up more?

N.R.: Yah. More European, yah. Few uh...

S.G.: T-shirts?

N.R.: T-shirts with long sleeves yah. (?) And uh woman even she uh go to...bazarre, or shopping, she take-she take uh on shoes on the...

S.G.: High heels.

N.R.: High heels yah she...

S.G.: O.k. All the make-up.

N.R.: Make up yah, yah, yah. Here no.

S.G.: Yah we're more relaxed, casual.

N.R.: Yah, and uh I don't like this uh...

S.G.: No.

N.R.: No. At, at home, it's uh it's o.k. Comfortable, I like in Russia.

S.G.: Right.

N.R.: Here uh dress it uh shirt from my husband, large like a short dress for me, I like. But uh in the street no.

S.G.: You feel that-you prefer to get dressed up for it.

N.R.: Yah but if uh...if I uh dress it....nice, I feel more....[says it in Russian] for sure no, no.

S.G.: Confident?

N.R.: Com...comfortable...con...con?

S.G.: Confident.

N.R.: Maybe confident, yah. Confident yah.

S.G.: Oh that's good. And have your children changed their...like their hairstyle, do they try to keep up with the other teenagers?

N.R.: Yes, yes, yes.

S.G.: Cause have you seen the...the style of clothes like you know pants that are....very big and....they haven't, they haven't asked you to buy clothes like that and....and you know big shirts and....

N.R.: Yah, the...they uh they ask uh ask for clothes, we try uh explain them, it's o.k. at home, in sports game maybe. But uh we try-we try uh...o.k. they, they have uh (?) for example where we um...have-had uh...uh holiday Nuer-New Year, New Year yah? We uh we...had this uh holiday, all our family, and we sitting in nice dress and my sons and husband in suits with....

S.G.: Tie.

N.R.: Tie yah.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: And they, they like it.

S.G.: Oh they'd like it!

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: That's surprising cause most uh kids don't like....ties and-even you know guys my age they hate wearing ties, they prefer just casual jacket or something. O.k.

N.R.: Maybe they don't want like uh....to be like father. Because he don't like tie but uh where his business uh...

S.G. & N.R.: Meeting.

N.R.: Or...

S.G.: Then he has to wear a tie.

N.R.: Yah.

S.G.: O.k. Have they uh...you know a lot of the teenage, teenagers now have these skateboards.

N.R.: Oh yah.

S.G.: He has a skateboard.

N.R.: Yes.

S.G.: And he takes it everywhere he goes?

N.R.: Yes, yes.

S.G.: O.k.

N.R.: Skateboard and uh shoes with uh....skate...

S.G.: Oh a rollerblades? Like rollerskates-rollerblade thing?

N.R.: Yah, yah, yah.

S.G.: The-the new rollerblades? They've got a....

N.R.: Shoes with uh uh.....[takes out her dictionary] I don't know this word.

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #4

- S.G.: Uh can you tell me of two things, you do differently now that you are living in Canada?
- I.O.: Differently?
- S.G.: Yah, from when you lived in Russia.
- I.O.: Mmm uh zis is first time...ven I come...I don't know maybe I don't uh...had zat situation. Maybe after I had...but...I zink in Canada ve have many, many, many nationalit...national...
- S.G.: Nationalities.
- I.O.: Nationality. Nationality and all zat people is maybe little bit eh...eh...zey are togezer. Because Arabic is for Arabic, maybe yes-it's normal. It's normal but uh...ve don't have um zat situation ven one people tell it's...my ground, I must live zis and all come out. It's uh...
- S.G.: You mean, you mean...like uh different groups wanting to...uh...maintain their culture; is that what you mean or...?
- I.O.: But in my country ve have zat situation ven Estonian tell uh...Estonia from...Estonia. Ve are first and anozer...must work...for us.
- S.G.: O.k. so you mean the attitude of-that you're the-you're better than...other...
- I.O.: Yes, and now ve have zat situation ven Estonian haves citizen paper, and anozer...must do oh I don't know what zink! But many peoples uh live uh now live about uh...fives years...in uh...liberty.
- S.G.: Right, freedom.
- I.O.: Estonia, but zey don't have citizen paper.
- S.G.: O.k.
- I.O.: A...but exza...za...zat people may be *born* in Estonia.
- S.G.: Mhuh.
- I.O.: And live maybe zirty, maybe more years, but zey don't uh...can....
- S.G.: Claim citizenship?
- I.O.: Zey don't have...zat paper. Uh o.k. I zink uh zat people don't have place and zey go, and zey have after zat paper, but vy so hard?
- S.G.: Mhuh, mhuh.
- I.O.: Vy one people must uh do...um...very hard for anozer people?
- S.G.: O.k.
- I.O.: But in Canada zis is...anozer situation. It is very good.
- S.G.: So you think that here, all the cultures...are treated equally?

I.O.: Yes. And uh ven people in your heart zey uh...feel herself uh...liberty....
 S.G.: Yah, freedom.
 I.O.: (?)
 S.G.: Freedom.
 I.O.: Free, yah!
 S.G.: Freedom!
 I.O.: Zey mu-zey can zinking zey uh...are people.
 S.G.: Right.
 I.O.: Zey...uh..
 S.G.: They feel equal to....
 I.O.: Uh....animal.
 S.G.: Right, right, they feel equal with...a human being.
 I.O.: And...zis is very, very good uh...zing-and about zat! Uh...ven mmm...only about zat
 I zinking o.k. maybe uh...ve have now hard time because ve must study English, ve
 must...ve have more, more, more crazy situation, and Canada now have economic
 uh...
 S.G.: Problems.
 I.O.: ...very crazy situation o.k.but it isn't maybe nosing-nothing because...ve feel...us...
 people.
 S.G.: Right.
 I.O.: And I zink....my people uh my children feel uh...himself maybe...very (?) in
 Canada.
 S.G.: O.k., o.k. So it's that sense of...of being equal, even if you're not in your own
 country.
 I.O.: Yah, now all world is uh...beginning crazy. Our...country fighting and...it's-I don't
 understand.
 S.G.: Mhuh, mhuh.
 I.O.: But eh Canada is very um...peace country. It's very good...sing.
 S.G.: But d...d...do you find that you've done anything differently like um...like the way
 you did things in...in your country as opposed to here, like for instance um...like
 your housework, or your clothing, or any of that has that changed from the way um
 you had it...in Estonia?
 I.O.: Houseworking?
 S.G.: Yah, was housework....
 I.O.: [laughs] Houseworking. I zink it's maybe...same but um...zis ve have uh um...
 anozer maybe culture because um...in my country was very difficul when I uh...I
 don't can go...once week in za story and buy all food ven I uh...

S.G.: Right, when you need it.
 I.O.: ...must have from week.
 S.G.: Right.
 I.O.: And...I must go *everyday*, maybe twice, it's so crazy situation, I spent more my time...
 S.G.: Just shopping.
 I.O.: ...shopping. Because ven I come in se store, I look o.k. I have zat, zat; but zat I don't have, and zat I...same I don't have. O.k. I bring vonna-vat I have but I *must* go anozer time.
 S.G.: O.k. Would you-you-would you have to go to another store, or later in the *day*, would they maybe have different items? Uh at the same store.
 I.O.: Ven I start go in za anozer stores, I don't have time. Because I must um...coming from work. And uh...I must uh look children. Children was uh...very...
 S.G.: Younger.
 I.O.:young. Because my daughter um was uh ten years and boy uh was six years. But in my country...it isn't normal vell-ven family had uh...mm..people who look about children.
 S.G.: Uh-yah.
 I.O.: It isn't normal ven uh...in my country uh...anozer people tell oh it's aristocrat, it's...
 S.G.: Yah.
 I.O.: Because uh it's....um...it was uh...our regime; it's communism, it's...
 S.G.: Right, right, o.k.
 I.O.: Yah. All people is same, all people must do same zings, and ven anozer zink, uh not about ze...how all...zis isn't normal!
 S.G.: Right, o.k.
 I.O.: I know many-many people who uh...uh...who want tell uh maybe uh anozer vat... zink our government. Zey must go in ze j...jai!
 S.G.: Jail.
 I.O.: Jail.
 S.G.: They...they'll be arrested (?), yah.
 I.O.: Yah, many, many people. And ve have zat situation an...uh...out in our country, out in Soviet Union can go only who? Only government.
 S.G.: Right.
 I.O.: But anozer normal people...don't can go out.
 S.G.: Right, right, you were stuck in...right.
 I.O.: And ve don't-ve don't know know uh...only zat and our country is so beautiful, ve

are free, ve are....so uh...so much good country ven uh people is very happy, but in ze peer? Oh anozer country uh zat people don uh...don't uh free, people and gouvernement don't zink about people, uh ze have so much pollution, and only smoke in ze city!

S.G.: [I laugh]

I.O.: Yah, yah, it's true! Because-and ven I can read zat because ve don't have free uh literature?

S.G.: Right, right.

I.O.: Uh ve have in ze library uh all zing ve have only zat literature uh...

S.G.: That the government wants you to read.

I.O.: But uh...vas looking...lisiens! And after zat litera must go.

S.G.: Right, right. O.k.

I.O.: Ve don't can uh read um book about spirit. No! Because ve don't have God. And ...ve don't can go in ze church, uh...in zis country I'm free! Ven I vant, I *can* go. But in my country ven...ve go in ze church I everytime I zinking oh maybe it's isn't possible because my husband lost her, her job.

S.G.: Mhuh, mhuh.

I.O.: It's very crazy situation. And it's second!

S.G.: O.k.

I.O.: People can do zat abo-uh...vat zey want.

S.G.: The freedom, o.k.

I.O.: No, now, now uh...in m...my uh country it's changing, now all people uh...can go.

S.G.: Right, right.

I.O.: But uh...o.k.

S.G.: But not since you're...there?

I.O.: But...many people now go...eh...to God maybe about zey zink a-ha all go, and I must go.

S.G.: Mhuh.

I.O.: Because uh...after...uh...so many years, people don't can uh change so quickly.

S.G.: Right, yah, it takes time. It takes time.

I.O.: And ven ve go uh...ven ve...mmm...go married-vent married...

S.G.: Get married.

I.O.: ...vis my husband, ve uh...uh drive in ze village-village...it's same?

S.G.: Yah-village, village.

I.O.: Villages...in za village and uh...uh...ve go in za church; but only I, my husband, and her mozer because anozer people don't must look about zat.

S.G.: Ohhh k. Ohhh boy!

I.O.: Yah!
 S.G.: It's very different eh? Well.
 I.O.: Only in ze gouvernement you must writing...
 S.G.: Right.
 I.O.: You are married, and only, only about zat.
 S.G.: O.k., o.k. I understand...o.k. Um o.k. so-uh you might of already sort of answered this but name two things um, you like the most about Canada.
 I.O.: Most?
 S.G.: Mhuh.
 I.O.: [pause] I now answer zat!
 S.G.: Yah, yah, you did. O.k. the freedom...the...the freedom.
 I.O.: But it's uh...maybe anozer. But most, most I...zink people must do..ve-vat zey vant.

 S.G.: What they want; the freedom, o.k.
 I.O.: And all people is free. And uh...
 S.G.: O.k.
 I.O.: I uh...nationals.
 S.G.: And the natio-o.k.citizenship.
 I.O.: Nationality! Nationality.
 S.G.: Or citizenship?
 I.O.: And all nationality can live togezer.
 S.G.: Right. Mk.
 I.O.: Because now ve have more uh crazy situation is in Gruzia, in Armenia, in Yougoslav, it's...foo!
 S.G.: Yah, yah, I know. O.k.
 I.O.: But anozer country in Europe vey zey don't...don't have work, it's uh no...it's not zat uh..but zey don't have zat uh situation, zey don't have zat problem-zey *have* zat problem! But only it's problem very hard in *Germany*! Many, many time, ve have zat problem, but uh...maybe it's uh life ve don't one place more war.
 S.G.: More what?
 I.O.: More war-war.
 S.G.: War!
 I.O.: War.
 S.G.: O.k.
 I.O.: In one place ve have uh only one war, i-ven it's, ven it's Europe, now ve have one war. I don't know why uh...it's come...from zat.
 S.G.: Yah, I don't know. I don't know either.

I.O.: But Europe is very uh...old country, *very* old uh...continent, and uh Europe had so bad, so crazy...uh past.

S.G.: Yah, history.

I.O.: And now....Europe zat so many situation. But um American continent, it's uh no sol old, and uh American continent I don't know why but uh...it's uh...more friendly!

S.G.: Mhuh, mhuh.

I.O.: It's very good.

S.G.: O.k. Um...o.k. can, can you name two things uh that you don't like about Canada.

I.O.: Vat I don't like about Canada...economic situation!

S.G.: O.k.

I.O.: Yes it's...and I zink um...it's come about zat but

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #5

- S.G.: Ah can you tell me of two things, that you do differently now that you are living in Canada?
- O.M.: Mhm, different-two different things?
- S.G.: Things that you've done differently since you've been here, as opposed to in Russia?
- O.M.: Mhuh. Different compare with Russia?
- S.G.: Yah, in your lifestyle, in...in any aspect of your life.
- O.M.: Yes my...my lifestyle.
- S.G.: Your lifestyle?
- O.M.: *Very* different...zan was in Russia.
- S.G.: O.k.
- O.M.: Very! How it's explain? I'm more hard working.
- S.G.: Here?
- O.M.: Yes, in Canada, maybe first time in my life I'm working *so* hard.
- S.G.: O.k.
- O.M.: Yes. And...so hard feeling.
- S.G.: You...you mean feeling bad or?
- O.M.: No it's not-do you know what is bad it's...it's a *different* my feelings now *different* than was in Can-in Moscow.
- S.G.: Mhuh.
- O.M.: So different. Because I'm first time *overseas*, first time in my life.
- S.G.: O.k.
- O.M.: Because of course it's everthing different.
- S.G.: Right, right.
- O.M.: Yah.
- S.G.: Of course, yah, yah. So when you say that you've um...never worked as hard as you have *here*, do you know why that is? Why...why would that be?
- O.M.: [sighs] Maybe I know why, maybe I know why. Mhm. Maybe because...I like by self, work, like zat.
- S.G.: Could you say that again, sorry?
- O.M.: I like by self-my-no. How it's...how it's figure? Uh I like work, hard like I'm working.
- S.G.: O.k. you like to do-you like hard work?
- O.M.: Yes, yes. Mmm because do you know, I have...I have different life, I have no my

close friends.

S.G.: Mhuh.

O.M.: I have no my own apartment.

S.G.: Right, o.k.

O.M.: I'm like sometimes; it's maybe rude, sometimes I'm like a slave.

S.G.: Mhuh.

O.M.: Yah, and do you know it's so difficult for person who intelligent, who have enough high uh education.

S.G.: Yes, yes.

O.M.: Be slave.

S.G.: Yes.

O.M.: Yes, because of course my life *so* different.

S.G.: Yah, yah, of course. You expect certain things when you have a-that level of education, and so you-to be doing less than that it's...it's difficult to except.

O.M.: Oh no, do you know what um...I had um...in Russia, in Russia ten years before I came to Canada, I was working as a nana and...housekeeper.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: Because...just maybe little bit I was slave.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: It's uh doesn't matter for me. In Canada different because I have no my own apartment.

S.G.: Right.

O.M.: You know I all time I everysing I must ask.

S.G.: Right.

O.M.: Every, every time I must sink about can I hurt somebody my employers or somebody, it's all time I must fix m..mm..not fix...look after myself, after my feelings, after my mimics on my face...

S.G.: Yes, you don't have the freedom, yes you have to be aware of everything.

O.M.: I can, I can re...relax.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: Never.

S.G.: O.k., o.k. Yah I understand.

O.M.: Yah because it's uh...

S.G.: Yah it's like-it's being-it's like being a permanent guest.

O.M.: Yes, yes! Yes! Four years.

S.G.: Yes, a four years guest. Yah. That's right. And I mean that's why the saying "there's no place like home", is so true.

O.M.: Yes, yes.

S.G.: Because it really is-even, even family! I...I went to my sister's, and as close as we are it's still not the same thing, you still-you are aware that it's not your house, and that you must ask, and that you must...you know reserve certain things you do, because you don't have the privacy of your own home.

O.M.: And just I can say one thing, I can say about myself I'm unhappy-no I'm happy!

S.G.: Mhuh, o.k.

O.M.: Because I have now everyting what I want. Yah just maybe I'm not uh...before when I was in Moscow, I can sink about it's will be *so* hard. And, I expect, I expect, somesing like zat.

S.G.: O.k., o.k.

O.M.: Yes, because it's...it's o.k. It's o.k.

S.G.: So is there, is there no possibility of getting your own apartment? Or is one of the conditions of living-of the job, you have to live there?

O.M.: No I have now, I have now...umm...permission.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: I can live where I want.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: In zis city.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: In Ottawa. And...do you know I'm believer. And I know for sure, for everyting should be God's will, what is it God's will? It's should be will or my employment, or somesing I don't know, or somebody make me proposal-marriage proposal! Or I don't know, somesing what can move me from zis place.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: I can do by self, say, "O.k. I don't want anymore, and I will move."

S.G.: O.k. you feel you can't do that?

O.M.: No.

S.G.: You have to wait for...something to take you out of that?

O.M.: Yes, yes.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: Somesing or maybe somebody, I don't know what is it!

S.G.: Right, o.k.

O.M.: And I know for sure it will be very, very soon because I have no more energy.

S.G.: Oo.k. I hope, I hope it does...work for you as well. O.k.

O.M.: What I mm...I mmm...questioned....?

S.G.: Eh you answered well-o.k. you said one that you worked harder than you ever did

before, uh can you give me a specific second example?

O.M.: [sighs] [thinking] Second example? Do you know it's learning all my time, all my life learning, uh what is it? Oh! Maybe yes! I had...boyfriend! Was I never, never have boyfriend like zat!

S.G.: You nev-what do you mean you never had a boyfriend like that?

O.M.: Very, very unusual person. Very unusual.

S.G.: But do you think that's just because you're in Canada? You mean you don't think you could find someone...?

O.M.: No it's interesting because it's-this man originally Russian.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: And *never* was in Russia because was born in Belgere, in Brussel, and when was sirty-two moved to Canada, and just originally Russian and Russian language, and another I don't know Canadian or Belgian or I don't know who is it. And I expect Russian person!

S.G.: O.k, o.k. so he's not characteristically Russian?

O.M.: Yes, yes! Because it was so difficult for me.

S.G.: O.k. O.k. Umm...

O.M.: I don't know how it's interesting for you.

S.G.: Yes! No it's ver...

O.M.: Maybe, maybe some young person uh...tell to you...more interesting...

S.G.: No, no, no to...to be honest with you uh...it was uh...some women said housework was different because they had appliances here in Canada like a washer, dryer, and in Russia they had to hand wash...clothes. So it was just things like that, I just wanted to know if there was anything...specifically that you had noticed or perhaps clothing, do you find there's any change in that?

O.M.: Do you know uh...when I was living uh...in Moscow....I have been...how it's explain? I have been living...not worse than you.

S.G.: N...not what?

O.M.: Not worse than Canadian person!

S.G.: O.k., o.k. o.k.

O.M.: Because I had in Moscow eversing.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: I had a...a country house, I had very nice apartment-big apartment in uh downtown.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: I had a...a...a dog, a nice dog in my family, I had umm...a car.

S.G.: Right, right.

O.M.: I had....uh..big refrigerator, and I had...I had everything.
 S.G.: So that's actually-it's interesting because you're actually the reverse-your standard of living you might say has actually *decreased*....from Russia.
 O.M.: Yes!
 S.G.: You actually have less than you did in Russia.
 O.M.: Yes! Because...when I came to Australia, and after Australia uh in Canada, nosing you can uh Canada nosing can me uh surprised.
 S.G.: Right.
 O.M.: Yes.
 S.G.: O.k.
 O.M.: I just can maybe compare, and see what you have worse, what you have better.
 S.G.: Right, right, o.k. O.k. um name two things you like the most about Canada.
 O.M.: Oh, I like uh Canadian people.
 S.G.: People...o.k.
 O.M.: You're very friendly, very happy; if compare with Russian people, because we have different history, different life, and different problem.
 S.G.: Right, right, of course.
 O.M.: Yes, and...I like it, I like it uh...Canadian people.
 S.G.: O.k.
 O.M.: Why I like it? Yes because friendly, because have no...hmm...no ra..racism.
 S.G.: Right, racism o.k.
 O.M.: Yah, it's it's very nice because do you know, uh...when I have been in Russia, I sink every Russian; especially, especially intelligent maybe little bit, little bit have racism.
 S.G.: O.k.
 O.M.: Yah.
 S.G.: O.k.
 O.M.: And I was, I was too, and when I came to Canada [laughs] I was understanding a lots of, lots of sings...about-because I was in Moscow um...aboriginal who was born in Moscow and all life living is Moscow because sometimes I was very, very proud wis my uh beautiful Russian language and I was so uh disappointed if somebody speaking like uh....and now, now I situation yes! Because I...I understood lots of, lots of sings. And I sink zis mm...comparing made me better-much better, like a person.
 S.G.: Yah.
 O.M.: Yah.

S.G.: O.k. And anything else?
O.M.: I sink no, I sink I said everysing!
S.G.: So the...the thing you like the most is the people?
O.M.: Yes people, and country do you know country like in Russia.
S.G.: Mhuh.
O.M.: Yes because we have uh I sink nature very close, very close, climate very close wis Russia too.
S.G.: Right, right.
O.M.: Yes what, what else? What else uh...? I don't know, and I can say true education I sink, in kindergarden, in high school; in Russia better.
S.G.: O.k.
O.M.: Yah. Zan Canada.
S.G.: O.k. tha...tha-my next question would be name two things you don't like about Canada.
O.M.: Ah, I nosing don't like, I like everysing!
S.G.: Well, o.k. like...like less....
O.M.: I can compare!
S.G.: O.k. yes. O.k.
O.M.: Yes and just say what maybe better, what maybe worse.
S.G.: Yah, yah sure that's fine. O.k. so for you education would be better in Russia?
O.M.: Kindergarden, in Russia just perfect, just perfect.
S.G.: O.k.
O.M.: For kids it's-do you know it's uh kid came to kindergarden from uh....came in sree years old.
S.G.: Oh in Russia?
O.M.: Yes.
S.G.: O.k.
O.M.: And finish now sixen, before was seven years old.
S.G.: Really?
O.M.: Yes.
S.G.: Kindergarden?
O.M.: Yes, kindergarden. And in ze kindergarden kid umm...uh...usually full day, from seven o'clock to seven o'clock. If...if mozer can take five o'clock o.k., four o'clock it's o.k.
S.G.: O.k.
O.M.: Yes. And everyday kids from three to six years old have two lessons.
S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: One lesson-why I know zat because I was a...teacher in kindergarden.

S.G.: Oh you taught kindergarden?

O.M.: Yes, I was sree years.

S.G.: Oh wow!

O.M.: When my kid was small....and I was teacher.

S.G.: O.k.

O.M.: Yes.....do you know when kid, finish kindergarden and going to school,

Transcription of 3rd Interview with Informant #6

- S.G.: Um can you tell me of two things, you do differently now, that you are living in Canada?
- A.G.: Yes, we do two different things right now with my husband and first of all I'd like photographer, and um I'm like a designer, and second he's a student in Algonquin College, and he took the course uh C Programming Language because he and I am engineer, and uh we save our money, and he study at college, and after that when he came to home he repeat and study wis me, and we are study together!
- S.G.: O.k., o.k. that's good. Um any, anything differently in terms of um...of...things at home you do differently in your lifestyle that's changed uh...from the way you lived in Russia to the way you live here?
- A.G.: At home? Not at home, my family...four people same in Russia same in...Canada, same language!
- S.G.: O.k. o.k.
- A.G.: Native language, and uh...maybe...no! No different.
- S.G.: No? Ah clothing is the same, you dress the same, you haven't changed, adopted any...?
- A.G.: Oh no, I like my...dress style, I...
- S.G.: O.k., o.k. And anything like with respect to...housework? It's the same?
- A.G.: Same.
- S.G.: The same? So when you were in Russia you had...all the same appliances as here; you had a washer, dryer...?
- A.G.: I don't uh...have right now...my own washer and dryer.
- S.G.: O.k.
- A.G.: I'm use uh...rental uh...on the first floor in our building.
- S.G.: Right, right.
- A.G.: Yes, maybe...no! Same. Same.
- S.G.: Yah, and food preparation is the same?
- A.G.: Yes, same! And microwave and processor?
- S.G.: You had all that in...
- A.G.: Oh! One new thing, I do right now, I do uh...bread, bread in...slice of bread...
- S.G.: Toast?
- A.G.: Toaster! Toaster.
- S.G.: O.k.
- A.G.: In Russia I...didn't have...

S.G.: Toaster.
A.G.: Just toaster yes.
S.G.: O.k., o.k.
A.G.: And right now I don't have a ver.
S.G.: O.k. Um name two things you like the most about Canada.
A.G.: [long pause] Ah maybe at first of all it's very clear....outside and inside;
everywhere...in the building, in the street...
S.G.: Clean you mean?
A.G.: Clean.
S.G.: Clean? O.k.
A.G.: And in the street and uh I didn't see a broke um...broke...telephone maybe, or door,
or window; gla-glass window, at first of all.
S.G.: Mhuh.
A.G.: And....every people...mmm....oh! I can't found the word for it wis me, when people
...do everything by law.
S.G.: O.k. they're law-abiding citizens?
A.G.: Yes, yes.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: I like it...very...strong. Everysing knows what...can...you do or...you can't.
S.G.: O.k. and what you cannot do.
A.G.: Yes, in my country...no. Everybody do what....he wants.
S.G.: Really?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: Ohh o.k.
A.G.: And sometimes...it's terrible.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: I know in Canada a lot of...same but...
S.G.: Mhuh. Those things you noticed...more.
A.G.: Yes, but...of course...you understand?
S.G.: Yah, o.k. Um...name two things you *don't* like about Canada.
A.G.: Don't like in Cana-oh....When I...came to Canada, I think Canada don't have a....
problems. Maybe this country or....it's not like my country but Canada has a problem
at first of all uh...Quebec and....
S.G.: The rest of Canada, yah. Yah.
A.G.: At first of all, and uh...very...mm..ten percent of un-unemployment....in Canada.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: I put like two...three or four...is much better!

S.G.: Yah, yah, ten percent. O.k.
A.G.: But ten percent.
S.G.: Do you, do you think that the...the situation with Quebec, do you think that would affect you? If Quebec separates?
A.G.: Yes because uh...I lived in uh my country...and I know situation whend uh-ah my country has-*had* uh fifteen republics.
S.G.: Right, right, Soviet Union.
A.G.: And I know what is that, some of them it's very....just separate and nothing more.
S.G.: Mhuh.
A.G.: But I know situation like Chechnya or...something.
S.G.: Right, right which...becomes...violent.
A.G.: Yes, yes, and...worry my husband oh no! It's uh civilization. But know what is that.
S.G.: Yah, yah. / I worry about it cause I live in Quebec. So...I don't want...you know I...I like Montreal, and...I'd like to stay in Canada but...you know...I don't know. O.k.
Um I know you said you don't really have that much *time* to watch...English television but um do you that...by watching English television um it would help you improve your English?
A.G.: No, not really by watching, I think by *hearing*.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: Radio I think it's much better.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: When I watching I see a lot of interesting...dresses or something else!
S.G.: So do you find you're not as concentrating as much about the language, you're just watching...?
A.G.: Fifty percent...[we laugh]...watching and fifty percent listening.
S.G.: Right, right, o.k. Um...o.k. have you added any...uh North American meals to your cooking?
A.G.: Mmm....hotdog.
S.G.: H..hotdogs?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: Exactly.
S.G.: O.k. Anything else?
A.G.: I think no.
S.G.: No? So you cook uh-most of your meals are all....Russian?
A.G.: And I try (?)
S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Maybe...somesing special...Chinese food but it's uh...very close to...food when my mom cooked for us.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Very close.

S.G.: O.k. That's interesting cause the other women I'm spoken to you're the only one that really only cooks Russian...food. Most of the other ones they all...of adopted...the traditional meals, and some say that it's difficult to get the...ingredients they need...to cook...uh certain...um Russian dishes. But I don't know cause my, my friend's Russian, and her mother cooks...food all the time and she doesn't have a problem with it so.

A.G.: Oh and one more!

S.G.: Alright.

A.G.: Right now I...eat cauliflower, visout uh preparation or...[end of first side of tape]

S.G.: K. O.k. [talking to myself] You answered that question already. Um have your children changed the way they do things at all...Have they changed-have they adapted any uh like you know with younger people they get into fashion and they want certain types of clothes. I don't know if you've noticed uh among-a lot of teenagers they wear these baggy, baggy...pants. Have you noticed that among, among teenagers like as if they're five sizes too big for them? But it's the style, and they wear big baggy shirts, and they look very sloppy.

A.G.: No, I don't like it, and uh...my mm...daughter and son, see like I wear; my, my style, and uh I try to.....teach him...wear the clothes uh like ordinary people, like size five more.

S.G.: Yah, yah.

A.G.: And uh I think she and he understand me and wear very simple, and very nice and comfortable...uh suit or jeans, or something else...

S.G.: Right, right, o.k.

A.G.: It's very nice and...

S.G.: O.k. Uh have they, they perhaps asked you for uh...you know like these rollerblades have you seen these rollerblades, they look like uh skates, but they've got wheels? And like boots, and they-you see people on the street all the time, they go pla-and they wear a helmut.

A.G.: Ah! I know, I know that. No, my...my..mm daughter and son prefer the bicycle.

S.G.: Bicycle.

A.G.: Yes

S.G.: O.k. So there's nothing they've really...uh picked up that you could call Canadian? Or North American?

A.G.: No.
 S.G.: No? They-they're more or less the same as they were...they were before. O.k. Um have you adopted any...Canadian traditions like um for instance celebrating the holidays we have here like Hallowe'en?
 A.G.: Yes! I like it.
 S.G.: Yuh, you like Hallowe'en?
 A.G.: I like holiday. *Every* holiday!
 S.G.: Every holiday, Thanks...
 A.G.: It's funny!
 S.G.: Thanksgiving?
 A.G.: Yes. Trick-or-treat!
 S.G.: O.k. Did you give out candy?
 A.G.: Yes! Last time, yes...
 S.G.: And your children, and your children went out?
 A.G.: No, not me my children of course! I didn't do it.
 S.G.: O.k., o.k. But you, you still um celebrate Russian...holidays like...
 A.G.: Yes! At first all um...I celebrate the English, Canadian mm...Christmas, after that New Year, and after that uh...Russian New Year! *Every* holiday, I like it!
 S.G.: O.k. yah, it's longer party that way! O.k. Um would say that there is less entertainment um things like ballet, theatre, those kinds of things in *Canada*, than in Russia?
 A.G.: Oh I can say because um...right now I don't have enough money, to go to the ballet I like it. In Russia, I used to be...in Moscow and I was in um...how in English?-[says it in Russian] or same...big, big theatre maybe.
 S.G.: O.k. Yah, yah.
 A.G.: How to translate yes. And I saw a lot of very interesting opera, ballet and uh....in theatre?
 S.G.: Plays?
 A.G.: Drama! Drama! But right now I...right now I can't.
 S.G.: O.k. But...
 A.G.: I hope!
 S.G.: Have, have you noticed like the advertisements in the paper do you find that...there's, there's quite a lot of them...as compared to Russia or...much less?
 A.G.: No, I...I think uh if I compare wis uh Moscow, maybe a little bit less. If I compare wis *my*...uh my town...more...than in my town.
 S.G.: More than in your town. O.k.
 A.G.: It depends...

S.G.: Yah, where you are.
A.G.: Yah.
S.G.: Right. O.k. Um...is there equality between...men and women, in Russia?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: Yah? In terms of uh-like for instance uh...in terms of profession, if a man and a woman have the same...uh education, and they have the same profession, would they receive the same salary?
A.G.: No, not same.
S.G.: No?
A.G.: Not same.
S.G.: Who, who would get more?
A.G.: I think, I think man.
S.G.: The men would get the higher salary?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: O.k.
A.G.: And they are a lot of...different...between a man and woman. You...I didn't see uh woman like a driver in Russia; right now yes, but *before*...
S.G.: Like truck driver?
A.G.: No, just driver! An ordinary car!
S.G.: Really?
A.G.: Ninety-nine percent man!
S.G.: Really?
A.G.: Really! It's uh...
S.G.: Wow!
A.G.: Yes. And...when I saw the woman...woa it's...
S.G.: Wh...why do you think that is, that there was mostly men drivers, than women?
A.G.: Mmm maybe like traditional maybe, I don't know! Maybe...people, people more poor and uh...in Canada I think every family, has a-have a car or maybe-has a car or maybe *two* car for husband and wife, and Russian people couldn't...
S.G.: You couldn't afford to?
A.G.: Yes, yes.
S.G.: But you..you-women were free to go and get their license; their driver's license, if they wished?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: Yah?
A.G.: Yes.
S.G.: So did you learn to drive here, or in Canada? Uh-in Russia?

A.G.: Here.

S.G.: You learned to drive here?

A.G.: No...n...I learned by-wis my husband but I...didn't...uh-don't-didn't get uh driver's license yet.

S.G.: Oh you don't have your driver's license yet and you're driving?

A.G.: No! It just like student wis my husband.

S.G.: O.k., o.k. No, it's just because you have to be careful, if you, if you're driving alone; like you drove here today alone?

A.G.: No! I'm not driving alone.

S.G.: Ohh k. o.k. your husband? Your husband drove you?

A.G.: Yes.

S.G.: I was just going to warn you that, otherwise you can find yourself-Um o.k. so uh...in in any other respects are-you think women and men are...are equal though? Like-cause when I first asked you, you said "yes" that they were equal.

A.G.: Yes, but after that...yes I think...not equal of course. And an oder?

S.G.: In terms of um...uh like woman are just as much encouraged...to...find work...as men?

A.G.: Mmm I think no.

S.G.: No?

A.G.: No. It depends what kind of...uh professional because in Russia...teacher only woman. Ninety-nine percent, and-and nine percent woman!

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Ah in the government, only men.

S.G.: O.k., o.k. so there...are specific.

A.G.: Yes, research com-company of course and uh...engineer half-and-half.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Maybe. And uh...mm...translator and entrepreneur; mostly woman of course.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: And if woman...uh try to found a job like a teacher of course...nobody...nobody stop...stop maybe her.

S.G.: O.k. would stop her, right, o.k. So um...uh what was I gonna say?...Um uh...oh when...like when women-mothers are bringing up their children, like do they teach their...daughters um...that they...that they can go out and find work, and that it...it's it's uh alright for them to have a...a profession? Or do-are they taught to-you know brought up in the traditional way of...you know you will be the main...caretaker and um you'll-you know like they're *raised* to be...housewives, and to be mothers, rather than um...a housewife, and mother *and* a professional?

A.G.: Mmm...when I was in Russia it's uh...two and...not two maybe...no of course two years ago...ninety-nine percent woman um....working.

S.G.: O.k. Ninety-nine percent?

A.G.: Yes, nine-and maybe one percent like uh...hou..houseke...housewife.

S.G.: Oh really?

A.G.: Really.

S.G.: O.k.

A.G.: Because uh...only man couldn't uh-can't, can't get a...a enough of...money for... food, for...rent, for something else. And uh...each of them, and hu...husband and wife um...must go to the...

S.G.: O.k. so it's...it's like *here*?

A.G.: Yes.

S.G.: It's become the same situation where you need *two* incomes...to support the household.

A.G.: Yes, of course to support household. But right now I think uh...little bit different situation in my country, uh...a lot of...uh...woman can stay at home because...like if you has a...husband like business man, or...engineer wis computer science, right now um man...get uh more money than before, and som-some of the woman,