

# German-Polish Borderscapes: Bordering and Debordering of Communication – An Example of Słubice

Barbara Alicja Jańczak<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>German-Polish Research Institute, European University Viadrina, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

Copyright ©2016 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License.

**Abstract** Due to the fact that Germany and Poland are both members of the Schengen Treaty, the role of the political borders between these two states has been reduced to a minimum. On account of the four freedoms, debordering processes have enabled the creation of borderscapes – places of transition, where time and space interact [7] and where cultures and languages underline a cross-border hybridization [6]. The aim of this paper is to present the linguistic behavior and communication strategies of Polish inhabitants on the German-Polish borderland. It presents the partial results of the research project which is being conducted on the Polish side of the German-Polish border. The analysis is focused on the communication strategies of the inhabitants of German-Polish borderscapes (on the example of Słubice inhabitants) and aims at answering the question about bordering (with reference to language choice and use) or debordering of communication as an everyday practice in German-Polish communication.

**Keywords** German-Polish Borderscape, Debordering of Communication, German-Polish Communication Strategies

---

## 1. Introduction

The fact that Germany and Poland are both members of the European Union and signatories of the Schengen Treaty reduces the role of the political borders between these two states to a minimum.<sup>1</sup> On account of the four freedoms (free

movement of goods, capital, services, and people), debordering processes have enabled the creation of borderscapes where cultural and linguistic diffusion may take place. The aim of this paper is to present the linguistic behavior and communication strategies of the Polish inhabitants of the German-Polish borderland, based on the example of the inhabitants of the border town of Słubice. These become manifest in the residents' choice of language.

In the Euroregions, Raasch [1] recommends the acquisition of the neighbor's language rather than the most popular language. Regional policy should support a "lingua culturalis instead of (cultureless) lingua franca" [1, p.14]. German should be for Poles, and Polish for Germans the *linguae culturales*. The question is whether reality mirrors the expectations. Dependent on the communication strategy towards the others (in the case of this study – towards German inhabitants) the communication in borderlands may be an example of bordering or debordering processes.

The analysis conducted in this study focuses on answering the following questions: What are the language relations between Poles and Germans? What are the communication strategies of the inhabitants of German-Polish borderscapes? Do interlocutors tend to put clear borders in their communication with reference to language choice and use, or is debordering (resulting in code-switching, or hybridization of communication forms) an everyday practice in German-Polish communication?

The paper presents the partial results of the author's research project, which is being conducted on the Polish side of the German-Polish border.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Borderscapes and (de)Bordering Processes

---

<sup>1</sup> The regulations enabling border permeability have recently changed in some member states (2015) due to the overwhelming amounts of refugees. The states of the external Schengen Area especially are trying to protect their borders. However, border controls on the German-Polish border have not thus far been reinstated.

<sup>2</sup> The whole project (2013-2015) was financially supported by the German-Polish Science Foundation PNFN [2].

The existence of borders and boundaries suggests the occurrence of bordering processes, whereas globalization is an indicator of debordering processes, as demonstrated by Popescu [5]. Bordering (or in the case of retaining significance – rebordering) consists of drawing or redrawing geographical, economic, social or cultural lines, whereas debordering focuses on the spatial, economic, social and cultural emergence of the world [5].

Due to the work of some researchers, inter alia Gracia Canclini [3], and also Gasparini [4], borderlands are often compared to laboratories. Gasparini [4, p.2-3] underlines that borderlands experience processes of multiculturalism and multilingualism more intensely than other areas. Nevertheless, an analysis of the research conducted on borderlands is sufficient to generalize on the subject at the macro (supranational) level [4].<sup>3</sup> Gracia Canclini [3] in turn focuses more on the processes of the transborder hybridity that illustrates the omnipresent globalization.

The existence of cross-border hybridization of cultures and languages are underlined by Mezzadra and Neilson [6]. Perera [7] refers to borderlands as zones where time and space interact and hybridization appears. He calls them borderscapes. Also Brambilla et al. [8] underline the necessity of understanding the concept of the border in time and space. They stress, after Brambilla [9], the “dynamic character of borders.” Borderscapes are multidimensional, they are “constituted in different symbolic and material forms and functions as well as socio-political and cultural practices.” [8, p.2] One should ask if the borderscape effects resulting in hybridity are also mirrored in language use.

### 3. Method

The paper focuses on only a small extract of empirical data collected in the framework of the author’s research project in eight Polish border locations<sup>4</sup> in 2014. The analysis concentrates on data from Słubice<sup>5</sup>. To examine the social dimension of bilingualism, the Polish inhabitants of the divided towns/villages, and the vendors at the border markets were recorded. The research on the inhabitants was conducted in the form of small talk (relying on short questions, mainly asking directions). In Słubice alone, 50 recordings were made. At the bazaars, the recordings focused on the greeting forms of Polish vendors.

Based on Nodari [10], Rössl [11] and ALTE [12], the author of this paper has created an analysis model of oral

communication competence in terms of receptive and, first of all, productive competence. The model is still in the editing phase.

## 4. Communication Strategies by Kimura

Communication strategies in the German-Polish border region, primarily in formal situations, have been analyzed by Kimura [13]. To determine the strategies, Kimura focuses on the choice of communication language. Depending on the frequency of occurrence, he presents different types of language constellations and indicates the three more frequent types.<sup>6</sup> First, there is the symmetry of languages, relying on the use of German and Polish language with translation (this form occurs, however, in formal situations where translators are at the interlocutor’s command). Kimura (2013) calls the second type asymmetry – use of one of the languages, in the German-Polish case – German. The third type is the use of an external language – the lingua franca, hence in the German-Polish case – English. Rarely, one can notice the use of German and Polish as first languages or second languages, Polish as the partner’s language or use of the Slubfurt<sup>7</sup> language.<sup>8</sup> The use of Sorbian and Polish without translation, or the planned language Esperanto is virtually insignificant.

**Table 1.** Constellation of languages on the German-Polish border by Kimura [13, p.115], translated by B. J.

	often	seldom	quasi insignificant
1. First languages – symmetry	German and Polish with translation	German and Polish as first languages without translation (receptive bilingualism)	Sorbian and Polish without translation (Slavic Interkomprehension)
2. Internal language – asymmetry	German	Polish (Partner language)	-
3. Partner language – symmetry	-	German and Polish as foreign languages (polyglot communication in foreign language)	-
4. External Language – Lingua Franca	English	Slubfurt language (mix of both languages)	Esperanto (planned language)

The Slubfurt language is supposed to be a border variety that is made up of both languages. Kimura presents an

<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, the borderland serves for my theory as a language laboratory, where the language contact of two neighboring national groups can be evidenced more than in any other inland area.

<sup>4</sup> The choice of research location was made according to the number of inhabitants living in a town or village (over 1,000 inhabitants) and its direct location on the German-Polish border with a German neighbor town or village on the other side. There are eight such places on the Polish side of the German-Polish border: 1. Swinoujście 2. Gryfino, 3. Kostrzyn nad Odrą, 4. Słubice 5. Gubin 6. Łęknica 7. Zgorzelec and 8. Porajów.

<sup>5</sup> Słubice is a town with 18,000 inhabitants, located in the central part of the German-Polish border, directly neighboring the German twin town of Frankfurt on Oder on the other side of the Odra River.

<sup>6</sup> The table below presents four constellations of language contact occurring in formal situations, thereof only three happen often.

<sup>7</sup> The name was constructed by mixing the names of the twin towns Słub(ice)+(Frank)furt.

<sup>8</sup> The Slubfurt language is understood as a border variety that is made up of German and Polish. The detailed explanation is given in the paragraph below Table 1.

example of the variety that is postulated and promoted in the top-down logic by the Nowa Amerika Initiative that is characterized by numerous neologisms, intralexical code-switching and balanced use of both languages. The author of this paper finds it problematic, though, because the Slubfurt language perceived by Nowa Amerika in this form is an artificial construct that is not fountabled in reality. This comment does not negate the existence of certain groups of people, especially in the service sector, who tend (in their everyday practice) to mix both languages, and use a mixed language (which we might call Slubfurt language) as a common language strategy in the bottom-up logic. To these groups belong the vendors (in the border markets), hairdressers, motor mechanics and others.

The classification of the communication strategies by Kimura cannot be directly imported into the following analysis. Due to the fact that the author's research was conducted in informal situations, some of the communication strategies do not occur at all, or are rather unlikely to occur (i.e. German and Polish as first languages with translation). Also, the fact that the respondents answered a question posed in German excludes some language constellations. The possible communication strategies are primarily German as an internal language, German and Polish as first languages without translation, and English or the Slubfurt language as external languages. The analysis of the communication strategies will first of all

refer to the choice of language that is influenced in most of the cases by knowledge of the language or language skills.

## 5. Analysis of the Empirical Material

The analysis of the communication strategies shows the linguistic behavior of the inhabitants of Slubice. All the respondents were Poles. 64% of the respondents were female and 36% male. Their age was estimated by the interviewer. Over a half of the respondents were young persons, under 35 years (58%). Only 10% of the respondents were estimated at over 60 years old.

50 persons were asked in German to explain how to get to the post office. Their answers were rated and catalogued on the basis of morphosyntactic, lexical and phonetic-phonological criteria into five categories of oral communication competence: competent/fluent, communicative speech production, basic speech production and (basic) comprehension – receptive skills and none language skills as shown in Table 2 below.

Even if, on the basis of a single statement, one cannot make a global picture of the linguistic competence of the respondent, the answers given may be classified and treated as an indication of it. However, the missing competences can be clearly distinguished.

**Table 2.** Oral communication competence by the author

	Oral communication competence				
	productive skills			receptive skills	-
	competent/fluent speech production	communicative speech production	basic speech production	(basic) comprehension	no language skills
<b>Morphosyntactic competence</b> - complexity of sentence structures, -word order: position of verbs, - congruence, -syntax of noun phrase (use of articles), - morphologic forms (inflexion)	- correct, complex sentence constructions (syntax)	- simple sentences and ellipsis	- single words, ellipsis, possible code switching	- answer in Polish or any other language	-
	- few morphosyntactic errors (error frequency under 9%)	- morphosyntactic errors (error frequency 10%-39%)	- numerous morphosyntactic errors (error frequency 40% +)	-	-
<b>Lexical competence</b> - semantics and lexicon	- varied vocabulary, going beyond theme-related lexicon	- vocabulary matched to the subject	- only basic vocabulary, lots of lexical gaps	-	-
<b>Phonetic-phonological competence</b> -rhythms -sound differentiation	- high phonetic-phonological accuracy	- some errors in the field of accentuation, rhythm and sound differentiation	- numerous errors in the field of accentuation, rhythm and sound differentiation	-	-

The recorded answers of the respondents have been classified according to the former categorization in the Table 3 below.<sup>9</sup>

If one superimposes the classification onto communication strategies identified by Kimura, one can see that most of the respondents acted according to the asymmetric pattern in German (see Table 3). Almost 48% of utterances were produced in German. However, most of the utterances suggest communicative or basic oral competence, as the following example of speaker 49 illustrates in Table 4.

A quite frequent group of respondents used Polish as the first language – but in this case one can hardly assume receptive bilingualism as the communication form, due to the lack of language skills (proved by the difficulties in comprehension), as shown here below in the Table 5.

Only two respondents used the external language pattern, one respondent answering in English (speaker 50) and the second one using a language mix based on intrasyntactic code-switching (speaker 20). The following example in the Table 6 below illustrates the use of a mixed language strategy.

The recordings of the communication strategies on the streets of Słubice show that the main strategy is the choice between German and Polish, in other words, the asymmetric or symmetric solution. In both cases it is difficult to speak about debordering processes. Though the use of German shows openness towards the neighbor’s language, this is unilateral and deepens the linguistic asymmetry of border communication (dominated by German). The symmetrical solution, i.e. the choice of Polish is, in the Słubice case, not proof of linguistic debordering, because in most of the cases it is caused by a lack of language competence, and it is probably quite an ineffective form of communication.

One can still find the examples of debordering processes proving the existence of the German-Polish borderscape. Mixing of both languages as a communication strategy resulting in debordering can be commonly observed in the service sector i.e. in the border markets. Language switching occurs on the inter- and intrasyntactic or even intralexical level. However intrasyntactic code-switching seems to be the most frequent. When analyzing the forms of greetings of Polish vendors in Słubice, one notices that many of them have only basic communication strategy in German. The most frequent communication strategy used by them is mixed language, based on frequent code-switching.

**Table 3.** Categorization of respondents’ answers by the author

Oral communication competence				
Productive skills			Receptive skills	-
competent/fluent speech production (n=2; 4%)	communicative speech production (n=9; 18%)	basic speech production (n=5; 10%)	(basic) comprehension (n=15; 30%)	none language skills (n=11; 22%)
SPK 18; SPK 30  German asymmetry	SPK 7; SPK 12; SPK 15; SPK 24; SPK 39; SPK 42; SPK 44; SPK 47; SPK 49	SPK 13; SPK 20; SPK 36; SPK 41; SPK 46  mix of both languages	answer in Polish: SPK 1; SPK 10; SPK 11; SPK 14; SPK 22; SPK 25; SPK 26; SPK 27; SPK 28; SPK 31; SPK 33; SPK 35; SPK 37; SPK 38; SPK 45  receptive communication	SPK2; SPK 3; SPK 5; SPK 8; SPK 9; SPK 21; SPK 23; SPK 29; SPK 40; SPK 43; SPK 50  English
(n=3; 6%) SPK 4; SPK 17; SPK 48		(n=2; 4%) SPK19; SPK 32;	(n=3; 6%) SPK 6; SPK 16; SPK 34	

<sup>9</sup> The abbreviation SPK means ‘speaker.’

**Table 4.** Speaker 49, Słubice inhabitant, female, 20 years old.<sup>10</sup>

[1]		0 [00:00.0]			
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	((0,9 S.)) Entschuldigung ((0,7 S.)) Entschuldigung, • weißt Du wo die Post ist			
	<b>[trans]</b>	I am sorry, Sorry, do you know where the post is			
[2]		1 [00:04.2]	2 [00:04.8]	3 [00:05.1]	
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	hier • in der Nähe?	Vielleicht?	Ja.	
	<b>[trans]</b>	here, nearby? Maybe? Yes			
	<b>SPK49 [v]</b>	Post?	((unverständlich))	•• Ehm ((verzogen 0,8 S.))	
	<b>[trans]</b>	Post? ((incomprehensible))			
[3]		4 [00:10.0]	5 [00:10.7]	6 [00:11.1]	7 [00:11.4]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Also hier gleich?		Ja	
	<b>[trans]</b>	So right here? Yes			
	<b>SPK49 [v]</b>	Post ist dorthin und rechts,		Ja.	Dort • eh und <u>nt</u> das
	<b>[trans]</b>	A post is there and right Yes There eh and nt that			
[4]		8 [00:16.6]	9 [00:17.4]		
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Ok.			
	<b>SPK49 [v]</b>	ist eh Wojska Polskiego Straße	•• Eh geradeaus, geradeaus und ((0,6		
	<b>[trans]</b>	is eh Polish Army Street Eh straight on, straight on and			
[5]		10 [00:22.4]	11 [00:22.8]	12 [00:23.4]	
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Aber...	Ok.		
	<b>[trans]</b>	But...			
	<b>SPK49 [v]</b>	S.)) an rechts ist • Post. ••	Ehm	Vielleist, ehm ••• das ist elm	
	<b>[trans]</b>	on right is a post office Maybe ehm it is ahm			
[6]		13 [00:28.7]	14 [00:29.8]	15 [00:30.4]	
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Ok. Das geht.			
	<b>[trans]</b>	Ok. It is fine. ((Explanation of the project))			
	<b>SPK49 [v]</b>	((verzogen 0,9 S.)) ein Kilometer •	Ja.		
	<b>[trans]</b>	one kilometer. Yes.			

**Table 5.** Speaker 28, Słubice inhabitant, male, about 50 years old.

[1]		0 [00:00.0]	1 [00:02.2]	2 [00:04.4]			
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Entschuldigung ••	wissen Sie wo das Postamt ist hier in Słubice?				
	<b>[trans]</b>	I am sorry do you	know where the post office is here in Słubice?				
	<b>SPK28 [v]</b>			Bitte?			
[2]		3 [00:04.8]	4 [00:05.8]	5 [00:06.8]	6 [00:07.7]	7 [00:08.7]	8 [00:10.4]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Postamt? ••	Posts		Ja, Post, ja		Aber •
	<b>[trans]</b>	Post office? Post Yes, post, yes But					
	<b>SPK28 [v]</b>		<i>Pocz/po</i>	<i>eh poczta?</i>		<i>eh to chodź, chodź</i>	
	<b>[trans]</b>		Post/po	<i>eh post?</i>		eh well come, come	
[3]		9 [00:12.9]	10 [00:13.7]	11 [00:14.6]			
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	vielleicht zeigen, • einfach zeigen, wo das ist		Ja, Postamt, •	ich muss		
	<b>[trans]</b>	maybe show, just show, where it is		Yes, post office, I must			
	<b>SPK28 [v]</b>		<i>Poczta? •</i>		<i>Dobra to</i>		
	<b>[trans]</b>		Post?		Good		
[4]		12 [00:15.1]	13 [00:15.6]	14 [00:16.1]		15 [00:17.6]	
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Oh nein	aber ich muss dahin noch ••				
	<b>[trans]</b>	Oh no but I have to go there still					
	<b>SPK28 [v]</b>	<i>chodź kawa lek</i>				<i>A to nie, nie, nie.</i>	
	<b>[trans]</b>	then come a little bit Ah well no, no, no.					
[5]		16 [00:20.0]	17 [00:58.0]				
	<b>SPK28 [v]</b>	((1,2 S.))					

<sup>10</sup> Notation of different languages for all the tables and examples below: normal font-style – German, italic bold type – Polish, bold type – English, underlined – incorrectly produced words or morphemes.

**Table 6.** Slubice inhabitant, female, about 50 years old.

[1]		1 [00:00.6]	2 [00:03.9]	3 [00:05.7]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Eh, wissen Sie wo die Post ist hier in Slubice?	Post? Postamt?	
	<b>[trans]</b>	Eh, do you know where the post is here in Slubice? Post? Post office?		
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>		Ja • ja, ja	<i>O jejku jak</i>
	<b>[trans]</b>	Yes, yes, yes Oh gosh how		
[2]		4 [00:07.7]	5 [00:09.3]	6 [00:09.7]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>		Ja	
	<b>[trans]</b>		Yes	
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	<i>tu</i> geh, • <i>o</i> ((1 S.)) geradeaus		((0,6 S.)) <i>is</i> eh ((1,2 S.)) Geschäft Buscher,
	<b>[trans]</b>	here go straight on there is eh a store Buscher		
[3]			7 [00:14.6]	8 [00:17.3]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>		Büchergeschäft, ja, Büchergeschäft, ja	
	<b>[trans]</b>		Bookstore, yes, bookstore, yes	
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	Bücher, Bücher eh •	<u>Bu</u> he, Buche, Buch, Buch <i>jest (ich)</i> Geschäft	geradeaus •
	<b>[trans]</b>	books, books eh Buhe, Buche (beech), a book, a book, there is (their) store straight on		
[4]		9 [00:19.8]	10 [00:21.3]	11 [00:21.7]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Das ist links •		((lacht)) Also
	<b>[trans]</b>	That is left ((laughs)) So		
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	und rechts ((0,9 S.))	<i>A</i>	Entschuldigen Sie links, ja, • ja • Ja, <i>to</i>
	<b>[trans]</b>	and right	Oh I am sorry left, yes, yes	Yes, well then
[5]		13 [00:24.9]	14 [00:26.5]	15 [00:27.5]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	die	Also hier einfach	ja und dann links
	<b>[trans]</b>	That So simply here yes and then left		
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	<i>tak</i> • <i>o</i> • hier Sie gehen	geradeaus hier	Ja, ja, ja und links <i>ale</i> müssen
	<b>[trans]</b>	so you go here straight on here yes, yes, yes and left but you must		
[6]		17 [00:31.7]	18 [00:32.3]	19 [00:32.7]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Mh mh		Mh hm ((0,6 S.))
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	Sie gehen Geschäft Buche	ja	<i>To tam</i> kürze ist <i>do is</i>
	<b>[trans]</b>	go store book	yes	So there short is to is
[7]		21 [00:36.8]	22 [00:41.3]	
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	Straße <i>jest takie jak to glówna, glówna, glówna</i> Haupt? Haupt <i>nie</i> Haupt		
	<b>[trans]</b>	street is as this one main, main, main, main? Main not main?		
[8]		23 [00:41.9]	24 [00:42.2]	25 [00:43.3]
	<b>Interview. [v]</b>	Hauptstraße?		Mh hm
	<b>[trans]</b>	Main street? ((explanation of the project))		
	<b>SPK20 [v]</b>	Hauptstraße	<i>to jest takie glówna</i>	am links ist Post.
	<b>[trans]</b>	Main street it is such main on left there is a post office.		

In most cases the switch takes place on the inter- and intrasyntactic level, hence as code-switching. An example of such behavior is presented below:

Customer: Kleines Körbchen, konkret rund.

Vendor: *A* rund? ↗<sup>11</sup>, • ja, *nie ma*, • ganz kleine,  
Pl. Ger.-----Ger. Pl.-Pl. Ger.---Ger.

*nie, i* andere kleine, • ja, mit Henkel ohne  
Pl.-Pl. Ger.-----Ger.

• Ohne Henkel auch ist, nie, kleine, • ale obły.  
Ger.-----Ger. Pl. Ger. Pl.---Pl.

Example 1, Bazaar Słubice, 2014

In some cases the switching occurs not only at the intra- and intersyntactic level but also at the intralexical level:

Vendor 2: Komm *r'abat*<sup>12</sup>. Rauch<sup>13</sup> zwanzig  
Ger.Pl. Ger.-----Ger.

(Pfund) ((pause)) Hisch (Hirsch), *o jest* noch mit  
Ger.-----Ger.Pl.-Pl. Ger.-Ger.

Knoblauch und Hisch *i* Hirsch auch mit Kräute.  
Ger.-----Ger. Pl. Ger.-----Ger.

*Chcesz* auch probieren bisschen *Schynken*?  
Pl. Ger.-----Ger. IMG

*Nie*, ja? *No* bitte [bítɛ]! ((pause)) Das wirklich gut,  
Pl. Ger. Pl. Ger.-----Ger.

das schmeckt naturale ohne Schimi (Chemie).  
Ger.- -----Ger.

((incomprehensive)) Heute ist nich so viel  
Ger.- ----- Ger.

gute *r'abat* gebe, probiere noch diese gleiche  
Ger. Pl. Ger. -----Ger.

[glajfɛ], wie die/den Hirsch, auch von Hirsch aber  
Ger.-----Ger.

mit Kräuter Pfeffer. Gemix (gemixt) gewürz  
Ger.-----Ger.

[gewɛrc].*Masz, trzymaj*, junge Damen auch,  
Ger. Pl.-----Pl. Ger.- -----Ger.

•• nicht so Deine Welt. Knoblauch verbessern<sup>14</sup>?  
Ger.- -----Ger.

Denn ich habe auch mit Knoblauch.  
Ger.- -----Ger.

Example 2<sup>15</sup>, Bazaar Słubice, 2014

The word Szynten that seems to be quite often used for

ham by the local vendors can be determined as blending due to the superimposing of the grammatical and lexical features of both contact languages.<sup>16</sup> Other words that seem to be constructed in a similar way i.e. recorded in the utterances of other vendors, are Schinetschken or Lachsschinetschken, cf. Jańczak [14]. The repetitive occurrence of mixing both languages indicates the use of mixed language as a communication strategy and the appearance of blended forms points towards hybridization as a debordering phenomenon.

## 6. Conclusions

Mezzadra and Neilson [6] as well as Perera [7] point out that borderlands are places of hybridity, in the author's opinion - also of linguistic hybridity. Research on language contact in the German-Polish border region (i.e. Kimura [13] and Jańczak [14]) as well as in other borderlands (i.e. Stern [15]) stresses the hybridization of communication of borderlands inhabitants which is manifested in frequent code switching and language mixing.

The results of the analysis on communication strategies of Słubice inhabitants show that 22% of the respondents (of which 36% are under the age of 25 and 55% over 60 years old) have no German language skills. 30% of respondents demonstrated elementary comprehension of the language. They chose Polish as a communication language with a German partner. In this case, we can scarcely speak about the strategy of receptive bilingualism – German and Polish as first languages. The most frequent communication strategy was the use of German as an internal language. Most of the respondents tried to answer in German (48%), of which 24% in a communicative way, and 4% fluently. One person spoke in the lingua franca, English, and one person mixed both languages. The results of the communication strategies on the streets of Słubice do not confirm the use of the Słubfurt language as a common communication form.

However, the research into the greeting forms of Polish vendors from Słubice Bazaar proves that code-switching and mixing both languages are common communication strategies amongst certain groups of inhabitants of the border region. The analysis of the linguistic behavior of the vendors demonstrates the existence of a linguistically heterogeneous borderscape in which debordering processes are taking place.

In the author's opinion the presented study should be a starting point to carry out the comparative studies on communication strategies in further locations of the German-Polish borderland. The confirmation of the existence of language mixing and code switching strategies in further locations could suggest the existence of

<sup>11</sup> All the annotation marks has been explained in appendix.

<sup>12</sup> Though the word "discount" sounds similar in Polish (*rabat*) and German (*Rabatt*) the accentuation on the first syllable and the pronunciation suggest its production in Polish language.

<sup>13</sup> ((geräuchert -smoked?))

<sup>14</sup> Polish interference: poprawić czosnkiem – this time with garlic.

<sup>15</sup> Come discount. Smoke ((smoked?)) 20 pounds of venison, oh there is also with garlic and venison and venison also with spices. Would you like to try a bit of ham? No, yes? So please! It is really good. It tastes natural without chemical ingredients. Today there are not many people, good discount. Try also this is similar to the venison, but venison with pepper. Mixed spices. Here you are, take it young lady, it is not your world. This time with garlic? Cause I have also with garlic.

<sup>16</sup> For a detailed discussion of blending phenomena see Jańczak [14].

special linguistic routines along the German-Polish border.

## Appendix - Notation

IMG – Interlinear Morphemic Glossing

↗ - rising intonation

' - Accentuation

• - short pause

•• - longer pause

(()) – comments

() – presumable word

[] – phonetic transcription

---

## REFERENCES

- [1] Raasch, A. (2008). "Grenzkompetenz – von der Definition zur Evaluation zur Anwendung", in: Bieñ-Lietz, M., Vogel, T. (eds.): *Frühstart in die Nachbarsprache. Handbuch für den Spracherwerb in der deutsch-polnischen Grenzregion*, Frankfurt (Oder), 9-15.
- [2] PNFN, Polsko-Niemiecka Fundacja na rzecz Nauki, [www.pnfn.pl](http://www.pnfn.pl) (08.01.2016).
- [3] Gracia, Canclini, N. (1999): *La globalización imaginada*. Mexico City.
- [4] Gasparini, A. (1999/2000): "European Border Towns as Laboratories of Differentiated Integration", *ISIG Quarterly of International Sociology*, 4, 2-3.
- [5] Popescu, G. (2012): *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-first Century. Understanding Borders*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth.
- [6] Mezzadra, S., Neilson, B., (2013): *Border as Method, or, the multiplication of labor*. Durham.
- [7] Perera, S. (2007): "A Pacific Zone? (In)security, Sovereignty, and Stories of the Pacific Borderscape", in: Kumar Rajaram, P., Grundy-Warr, C. (eds.): *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*, Minneapolis, 201–227.
- [8] Brambilla, Ch., Laine, J., Scott, J.W., Bocchi, G. (2015): "Introduction: Thinking, Mapping, Acting and Living Borders under Contemporary Globalisation", in: Brambilla, Ch., Laine, J., Scott, J.W., Bocchi, G. (eds.): *Borderscapes: Imaginations and Practices of Border Making*, London, 1-9.
- [9] Brambilla, Ch. (2014): "Shifting Italy/Libya borderscapes at the interface of EU/Africa borderland: A 'genealogical' outlook from the colonial era to post-colonial scenarios", *ACME – An International E-journal for Critical Geographies*, 13(2), 220–245.
- [10] Nodari, C. (2002): "Was heißt eigentlich Sprachkompetenz", *Barriere Sprachkompetenz. Dokumentation zur Impulstagung vom 2. Nov. 01 im Volkshaus Zürich*, SIBP Schriftenreihe Nummer 18, 9 – 14.
- [11] Rössl, B. (2007): "Sprachkompetenzmodell für 4;6-5;0 jährige Vorschulkinder". Projektzentrum für Bildungsforschung, <http://www.roessler-linguistik.at/download/sprachkompetenzmodell.pdf> (08.01.2016).
- [12] ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe) (2012): *Handbuch zur Entwicklung und Durchführung von Sprachtests. Zur Verwendung mit dem GER*. Erstellt im Auftrag des Europarats /Abteilung für Sprachenpolitik. Frankfurt am Main.
- [13] Kimura, G.Ch. (2013): "Strategie komunikacji językowej na polsko-niemieckim pograniczu", in: Koutny, I., Nowak, P. (eds.): *Language, Communication, Information*, Poznań, 109-124.
- [14] Jańczak, B. (2015): "German-Polish Border: Language Contact and Language Use on the Example of Forms of Address of Polish Vendors from Słubice Bazaar", in: Rellstab, D., Siponkoski, N. (eds.): *Rajojen dynamiikkaa, Gränsernas dynamik, Borders under Negotiation, Grenzen und ihre Dynamik*. VAKKI-symposiumi XXXV 12.–13.2.2015. VAKKI Publications 4, Vaasa, 117-126.
- [15] Stern, D. (2016): "Negotiating Goods and Language on Cross-Border Retail Markets in the Postsocialist Space", in: Kamusella, T., Nomachi M., Gibson C. (eds.): *The Pelgrave Handbook of Slavic Languages, Identities and Borders*. New York: Pelgrave, 495-523.