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I interviewed three people of different linguistic backgrounds for this assignment. Each interview had different outcomes and the questions as well as the interview itself had to be adapted for each interviewee.

The first person I interviewed was an international student from China and she was very enthusiastic that I wanted to interview her. She is a junior, and came to America to go to school here at the University of Washington about 3 years ago. She never had lived or been to America before coming to school here and spoke only Chinese at home. She learned Chinese in school, and her English was fair, but it was definitely apparent that she was not from here. As the interview started, the first few questions were specific and straight forward which she had no problem answering. Even though some questions could have been answered in a few words, she took the time to think about her answer and provided great answers. As the interview went on, the questions became broader, and on several occasions she did not understand the nature of the question. When this would happen I would try to explain the question in a different manner. I would explain it in an easier way and with more detail so that she could understand it, and sometimes I would use an example of mine to really make it clear. Once I explained the question and she understood it though, she gave me well thought out and interesting answers to my questions. Even at the end of the interview, we went on to talk a bit more with open and free discussion, but which still had the topic in focus. We continued to talk like this at least for another five to seven minutes and discovered some interesting information about the Chinese language.

The second person was my roommate, and he is a second generation immigrant from Mexico. He was born in the state of Washington but speaks Spanish at home. He has taken Spanish in high school but explained that it was mainly to increase his GPA and did not really learn anything. When I had originally asked my roommate if I could interview him, he seemed interested and had allotted a fair amount of time for me in his schedule the next day. When we met up at our apartment though, I instantly sensed that this was not the case anymore. He seemed like he wanted to rush through it a bit, and was giving me pretty basic answers. Even though this was alright for the few specific questions, it was lacking thought and reflection for the broader and more complicated questions. He understood all the questions, so that was not the issue. What I had to do was try and break down the more complicated questions, and based on his answer I would ask another question that would lead him in the right direction. In a sense, this expanded his answer to the overall broad question with multiple leading questions. Overall I was not able to get well thought out answers and this was my least successful interview.

The third person I interviewed was another international student who is from France and will be spending a year here at the University of Washington. He was born in France, speaks French at home, and learned English in school. This interviewee was similar to the first person I interviewed in the sense that some of the question were hard for him to understand. All the specific questions he had no problem with, but the more complicated and broader questions needed some explaining. The difference here was that I know how to speak French and therefore I was able to use this to my advantage. Even though it helped a lot to explain certain question in French, he still struggled to understand certain questions. Like the first interviewee, I had to use some examples and give more description. When he understood the questions though he had no problem giving me well thought out answers. Once the questions were done I asked him if he had any other comments to add, which he did not.

The answers I received did not really have an effect on how I had previously answered these questions, even though some of their answers were completely different than mine. It was interesting having the opportunity to interview someone and see how that process was coming from the other side, as I have always been the one being interviewed.

Antoine,

This is a great memo! You gave a very brief overview of the task you were describing at the beginning, integrated the process and content to show their relationship, and weighed the pros and cons of the process and your utilization of it (although this last part could have been a little stronger). Fantastic job!

**Short Assignment 1.3 Rubric**

See the course syllabus for a discussion of each evaluation category.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Outstanding** | **Strong** | **Good** | **Acceptable** | **Inadequate** |
| **Interview Content:** Memo addresses the content of the interviews and what was learned from them in a brief overview. Memo also reflects on whether these answers were what the interviewer expected. | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Interview Process:** Memo addresses the process of the interviews, including what went well and what could have been adjusted to work better. The author also relates the usefulness of the process in obtaining the information in this manner. | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus**: The memo discusses (briefly) or at least refers to all three interviews. The content of the memo remains focused on the interviews themselves, branching no further than to discuss their usefulness in later assignments or other contexts. | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Tone:** Written in a manner appropriate for a memo and individual, specifically targeted audience. | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Format:** The paper is of the required length and follows appropriate formatting guidelines for a memo. | X |  |  |
| **Complete Submission:** Notes and interview questions were also submitted. | X |  |  |