
Chapter 4: Dialect Leveling in Haloze

4.1 INTRODUCTION

As is evident from the earlier chapters of this book, a significant amount of dialect research has focused on the most archaic forms of the dialects being studied. This emphasis on archaic forms has significant value for diachronic questions and has been a major aim of European dialectology for some time. If a dialectologist must seek out the most “authentic” dialect speakers in a community, the obvious conclusion is that many archaic features are being lost and that the dialect is changing. In fact, it is often pointed out that many dialects are dying (Wolfram). This might be said about the dialects of Haloze as well.

There is significant variation in contemporary dialect usage in Haloze. As was noted in chapter 2, the oldest living generation speaks a quite archaic form of the dialect. Many young people, as well as speakers from other generations, also continue to speak a local variant of the language. This version of the dialect clearly differs from the standard language, yet it also differs from that spoken by the oldest generation. Despite the obvious generational variation in modern dialect usage, almost all of these people consider themselves to be dialect speakers. This is not only true in Haloze. The overwhelming majority of Slovenes from all regions of the country claim to speak dialect. In a recent study including over 500 respondents from all across the country, 84% of Slovenes claimed to speak dialect at home, and over 80% claimed to be fluent dialect speakers (Lundberg 2010). Even higher percentages in Haloze claim to be dialect speakers.²⁵

²⁵ In 2009 I conducted a similar survey in the Haloze villages of Zavrč, Cirkulane, Leskovec and Podlehnik. 239 valid responses were collected. 97% of respondents claimed to speak dialect at home, and 92% claimed to be fluent in the local dialect, meaning they could understand and express themselves without difficulty. When asked if dialect was important to their identity, 81% said that it was very important,

The results of the surveys cited above and in the preceding footnote seem to run counter to tendencies toward linguistic standardization and claims of dialect death. It is my contention that the lack of uniformity in modern dialects at the same time that most speakers claim to speak the dialect is the result of local dialect leveling toward a regional koine. Lack of uniformity in a dialect community has been associated with dialect leveling (Auer and di Luzio 7). In Haloze most of the leveling is toward the regional koine spoken in and around Ptuj rather than toward the standard language spoken in Central Slovenia. The fact that the regional koine is composed of dialect forms and is considered a regional dialect helps to explain why so many Slovenes claim to be fluent dialect speakers, even as linguists record dialect attrition and variation. Local speakers do continue to speak with dialect forms, but the dialect is becoming more a variant of the regional dialect than the original village dialect. I will support this claim by describing the dialect situation in Haloze based on more than a decade of fieldwork in the area and extensive interviews with dialect speakers from different generations. I will also review the results of a recent survey on dialect use and dialect and language contact, which was conducted in Haloze during 2010 and 2011.

4.2 LEVELING

The recent rapid growth in geographical mobility along with access to mass media and universal education has put dialect and other language varieties in contact at a level never seen before (Auer and Hinskens 4). This leads to standardization, koineization and, of particular interest for our present discussion, regional dialect leveling. Regional dialect leveling is a decrease in the variation across a dialect region leading to homogenization of the speech of an area. Kerswill has described this process in parts of Italy where new regional varieties have emerged centered around a local town or city (671). A similar development has been described in western Slovenia

17% said it was somewhat important and only 2% said dialect was not important to their identity. I would like to thank Andrew Perkins, a former student, for helping me compile and organize the 2009 survey. See appendix 2 for the full survey.

by Kenda-Jež. A regional koine has emerged in and around Cerčno that is closer to the local dialects than to the standard language and which exerts pressure on the surrounding dialects (68).

Regional dialect leveling seems to develop according to processes like those described for Accommodation Theory (Giles, Taylor and Bourhis). Trudgill uses a modified version of Giles' theory to explain how leveling takes place, first short term and then, possibly, long term. According to Trudgill, some linguistic features, indicators, are not subject to modification in contact situations. Others, he calls them markers, are higher in a speaker's consciousness. The increased awareness of these markers allows speakers to modify them based on the social context and the speaker's desire to be understood (10). Trudgill identifies several factors that make a feature a marker, therefore more salient and likely to be modified in contact situations. 1) The feature is stigmatized, often because it does not match the orthography. 2) It is involved in current linguistic change. 3) The feature is phonetically radically different. 4) The feature is involved in the maintenance of a phonetic contrast (11). The desire to be understood plays a significant role in determining which features are subject to modification, but modification is variable. Different speakers have different rates of accommodation (22). Lexical accommodation usually occurs first, before phonological, because lexical differences are highly salient and can lead to obvious intelligibility problems (25).

In regional dialect leveling, like in Trudgill's modification of Accommodation Theory, more marked forms, having a more restricted geographical distribution, are more likely to be lost or modified (Auer and Hinskens 14). The dialects of an area become more homogenous as they accommodate to a regional koine. The most salient lexical and phonological features of the local dialect are modified in the direction of the regional dialect. As in other parts of Europe, this is likely happening all over Slovenia. As I noted above, it is occurring in Cerčno, and it is taking place in the micro dialects of Haloze. The Haloze dialect is being leveled toward the regional dialect of the nearest large town, Ptuj. See map 1 in chapter 2 for the relative location of Ptuj and Haloze.

4.3 GENERATIONAL LANGUAGE USE

Until recently traditional local dialects in much of Europe were relatively mono-stylistic (Auer and Hinskens 11). This is no longer the case in some parts of the Slovene speech area. In Haloze there is a great deal of variation among speakers of different generations and based on other social factors. This variation is not simply based on the influence of the standard language. Regional dialects have an influence as well. Contemporary dialect speakers are different than they used to be. They have exposure to and varying degrees of proficiency in several varieties of the language. Notwithstanding this variation in the dialect, an overwhelming majority of people from Haloze claim to be proficient dialect speakers.²⁶

The state of the modern rural dialect makes traditional methods of dialectology insufficient (Auer and di Luzio 6). Finding archaic forms is still an important role of descriptive dialectology, but that alone is an incomplete description of the modern dialect. If a description only includes the speech of the oldest informants, it implies that all other variations are not “pure” dialect and, therefore, signs of dialect death. This approach misses much of the reality of modern dialect speech.

Having earlier described the most archaic forms of the dialect area of Haloze using traditional methods, I will now attempt to describe the variation in modern usage with a combination of approaches including sociolinguistic, descriptive and perceptual dialectology. What follows immediately is an anecdotal account of the language and dialect usage of three living generations in Haloze.²⁷

²⁶ See surveys cited at the beginning of the paper.

²⁷ During the first few days of my initial visit to Haloze I met a family that came to be some of my best dialect informants. The family lives in two homes on a hill-top farm and vineyard in Belavšek, which is located several miles from the main road that runs from Ptuj through Zgornji Leskovec to Trakoščan in Croatia. The family contains members from each of the three generations that I will discuss. The oldest generation is the grandparents. They are both in their early 80s. Their son, his wife and several of his siblings are the middle generation. They are in their late 30s and 40s. The youngest generation is made up of several grandchildren. The oldest is in his early 20s. This family is a focal point of the description that

4.4 OLDEST GENERATION

There have been local schools in several of the villages of Haloze for over 200 years. The schools in Cirkulane (Prašički 179) and Zgroni Leskovec (Srđinšek 6) were founded in the middle of the 18th century. At the start of the 20th century the official language of these schools was German, although, the language of instruction was mostly Slovene (Srđinšek 9). By 1918 Slovene was acknowledged as the language of instruction throughout Slovenia (Ciperle 125). With the exception of the occupation during World War II, when schools in Haloze were staffed with German teachers and all instruction was in German (Srđinšek 15), all living residents of Haloze have had some schooling in the Slovene standard language. The oldest living generation went to school in the 30s, 40s and 50s, when the amount and type of elementary education was different from today, especially in isolated rural areas, but the language of their education was Slovene. Many of this generation only went to school until age 14 or 15 and had no schooling outside of the local village or beyond elementary school. Until very recently Haloze was one of the most isolated and underdeveloped regions of Slovenia. Even as late as 1999 some regularly inhabited homes in central Haloze were without electricity; some still got their drinking water from springs because they had no running water in their homes.²⁸ Only about half of the villages had phone lines. Much of the farm work was still done by hand from cutting and hauling hay to pressing grapes for wine.

The basic level of education for this group was low. Details from western Haloze illustrate this point very well. In 1961 more than 17% of adults had less than four grades of school, and in some villages the number was higher than 40%. Even more striking is the fact that only 7% of adults had completed the entire block of elementary school education. Even as late as 1971 only 34% of adults in western Haloze had finished a basic elementary school education (Bračič 1982: 129–30).

follows, but the discussion of dialect and language use in Haloze will also include the experiences from other families in all parts of the region.

²⁸ When I first met the family mentioned in the footnote above, they collected rain water for bathing and for the animals in cisterns, and they carried water in buckets from a spring below their home for drinking and cooking. This was not unusual in the remoter parts of Haloze at that time.

We may take the grandmother of the family mentioned above as an example of a member of her generation. She was born in central Haloze in 1930. She attended elementary school until she was 15 in Podlehnik. Two years of her education were in German because of the occupation, so she only received six years of formal education in Slovene. At 15 she left school to work on the farm because she was needed at home. Another woman of this generation, who now lives near Cirkulane, was born in 1923 and went to school through the 6th grade in Cirkulane. At around the age of 13 she dropped out of school to work on the farm. She was married at 18 and spent her entire life in rural Haloze. Even now she rarely leaves the local village. She has not even been as far as Ptuj in two years.

There are, of course, members of this generation who are better educated and have lived outside of the dialect area. They are more comfortable switching between dialect and the standard language, but they are the exception. Most of the older generation only has the local dialect available to them. They do not significantly change the way they speak based on the social situation because they are largely monolingual as regards varieties of Slovene. They are aware that some dialect words will be hard to understand, and they claim to pick words more carefully when speaking to someone from outside of the dialect, but they do not change their pronunciation. Some members of this older generation have remarked that certain members of the dialect community are changing the way they speak. One woman in her 90s said that the local priest and some others in the village are starting to sound like people from the flat lands surrounding the hills of Haloze.²⁹

4.5 MIDDLE GENERATION

Representatives of the middle generation were born in the 60s, 70s and early 80s. Most of them still live on small farms with a few animals, pigs, cows, chickens, a vineyard and vegetable garden, but the farm only helps

²⁹ She lives near Cirkulane in eastern Haloze. This woman indicated that people are starting to sound like *poljanci*, which comes from the word for field or plain. In Haloze *poljanci* are people from the flat areas surrounding the hills of Haloze. It is also used to refer to the dialect speakers around Ptuj.

with subsistence. They do not make a living from agriculture. Even though Haloze is well known as a wine-producing area, few people are able to sell their grapes and even fewer sell wine. There is a small amount of farm tourism, mostly around Cirkulane, but generally local farmers produce wine for themselves and their families.

This generation generally has more exposure to formal education than their parents had. For example, the elementary school in Cirkulane was expanded to eight grades in 1957 (Prašički 179). Almost all of this generation has completed at least the 8th grade of a primary education, and many have some secondary education. This is usually made up of three to four years at a vocational school in Ptuj or Maribor. Even if they do not have an educational experience outside of the dialect area, at least one member of every family works outside of the dialect area, usually in Ptuj, Kidričevo or Maribor, some as far away as Celje. Many people of this generation are married to someone from outside of the dialect area, so their children have a mixed dialect influence at home.

Compared to their parents, the middle generation from Haloze has more exposure to the standard language as well as significantly more interaction with surrounding dialects, especially varieties spoken in and around Ptuj. These influences can be seen in the far more significant levels of variation in the dialect of the middle generation. Some members of this generation maintain a quite archaic variant of the dialect. For example, one female informant from central Haloze,³⁰ who was born near Leskovec in 1969 and works at home on the farm in close contact with her mother and father-in-law, speaks very much like the older generation. She never changes her basic pronunciation. Members of the village think of her as an authentic or old-fashioned dialect speaker. She is different from the older generation in that she is more aware of the differences between her dialect and the regional variant of Ptuj. She avoids dialect terms when she thinks they will not be understood. For example, she tries to avoid dialect words when she goes to the doctor or a government office. Beyond that minor accommodation, she does not alter her language. Others of this middle generation, at varying rates, have simply lost some of the more salient pronunciation features of

³⁰ She is part of the family from Belavšek.

the dialect such as a diphthongal pronunciation of vowels or a prothetic *v* before *u*.³¹ They still maintain the basic dialect pronunciation without some of the most striking local features. The most interesting point is that there is a lack of uniformity in the dialect speech of this generation.

4.6 YOUNGEST GENERATION

This generation is defined here as those born in or after the middle of the 1980s. Like the middle generation in Haloze, it is a smaller group than previous populations because people have been leaving the area since the middle of the 20th century (Bračič 1967: 212). For example, the elementary school in Zgornji Leskovec had 435 students during the 1946–47 school year but only had 111 during the 2003–04 school year (Srđinšek 19). The long-term trend toward depopulation may be changing. Some local teachers have mentioned a rise in the number of children who will be entering school in the next few years. In 2010 the elementary school in Leskovec had to combine the first and second grades because they only had three first graders and six second graders. In 2011 they had ten students in the first grade.

This generation was (is being) raised by parents with competence in several varieties of the Slovene language. One of those parents may have been born outside of the dialect area and almost certainly works outside of the dialect area every day. They have regular access through TV and radio to the standard language and colloquial varieties from central Slovenia. The educational situation is also different from that of their parents. In 1999 Slovenia began switching from an eight-year to a nine-year system of elementary education. Children began entering school at age six rather than seven, so that they attended for nine years (Štraus 188). Schools in Haloze adopted the nine-year system in 2000 (Prašički 179). Local school teachers in Leskovec have indicated that almost all students go on to some form of secondary education. They have the options of four years at a college-prep high school or three or four years at a vocational school. All education after ninth grade must be completed outside of Haloze, usually in Ptuj.

³¹ I will provide more details of the changes in pronunciation later in the chapter.

If this generation finds work after finishing compulsory education, not an easy thing to do, the work is almost certainly not in Haloze. There is very little work in the region. Each village has an inn or two and a small store. A few young people find limited work at home in the dialect area, but the rest leave the village to find work. Many move to surrounding towns. Some live at home in the dialect area and travel into Ptuj or Maribor to work. This generation has regular contact with the regional dialect of Slovene spoken in and around Ptuj. They usually still speak with a recognizable Haloze accent, but they do not use or often even remember and recognize archaic dialect terms. They avoid the most salient dialect features so as to be better understood. They equate dialect with slang³² and the regional koine and speak the same way at school in Ptuj as they do at home. They do not need to alter much in their speech in order to be understood by other students because their dialect is becoming more like the regional dialect. They often claim to speak štajersko³³ when asked about their dialect.

The preceding brief description of dialect and language usage is partially anecdotal, but it is based on over a decade of observations and extensive interviews with dialect speakers from all across Haloze. It does not replace descriptive phonological analysis, but it helps to explain why traditional methods of dialectology are not sufficient in many modern dialects. A description of the speech of a small number of the most archaic dialect speakers misses most of the variation that is an undeniable part of the modern dialect area. It is an oversimplification to explain the rest as a result of the spread of the standard language. The detailing of the way three generations use dialect and interact with other varieties of the language helps to explain why there is significant variation in the dialect and what the source of that variation may be, i.e., leveling toward the regional dialect around Ptuj. In what follows we will attempt to further clarify the contemporary dialect situation in Haloze by discussing the results of a survey on dialect use and attitudes among people of the local area.

³² Skubic also claims that younger speakers, under 25, identify more with slang than with the rural dialect (298).

³³ This is the large dialect base that covers much of eastern Slovenia as well as Maribor and Ptuj. See map 3 in chapter 3.

4.7 SURVEY

During 2010 and 2011 a study on language use and attitudes toward the local dialect, surrounding regional dialects and the standard language was conducted in Haloze, Slovenia.³⁴ This type of survey is an important tool in the attempt to understand a modern dialect with a significant amount of variation in speech. Speakers' perceptions can play a role in language change (Preston 1999: xxiv). The findings of this survey illustrate the way locals think their dialect is changing and which varieties of the Slovene language exert the most influence on the local dialect. This information also gives us insights into the future of the dialect.

The questionnaire was administered during the summer of 2010.³⁵ The sample is made up of 300 responses. Of the respondents 84% were born in Haloze. 67% were female, and 33% were male. The ages of the respondents ranged from 15 to 73, and the mean age was 40. For the purposes of this analysis age groups were divided as follows: 15–30, 31–40, 41–50, 51–73. Questionnaires were collected in four villages and their surrounding communities, Zavrč (18%), Cirkulane (34%), Leskovec (19%), Podlehnik (29%).³⁶ Of the respondents 34% had an educational background that included completion of a vocational high school or less; 59% had attended no more than a college-prep high school; 7% had some form of post-secondary education.

The survey is composed of nine questions. Six of the questions deal with the informants' attitudes about dialect use and its future. These six questions will be the foundation of the initial part of the following discussion. The remaining three questions in the survey deal with the perceived influence

³⁴ The contents of this chapter were developed under a grant from the Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. The original data collection and analysis in 2010 were funded by a research grant from the College of Humanities of Brigham Young University. Follow up interviews in 2011 were performed with funding from the Department of Education administered by the Center for the Study of Europe at Brigham Young University.

³⁵ The data were organized and analyzed using PASW Statistics 18.

³⁶ See map 2 in chapter 2.

of surrounding dialects or other varieties of Slovene on the local dialect. These contact and influence questions will be discussed last. The entire questionnaire can be found in appendix 1.

4.8 USAGE AND MAINTENANCE

The first part of the survey focuses on dialect usage. We wanted to know who speaks dialect and how well they claim to know the dialect. We were also interested in informants' attitudes about their dialect and its maintenance. The full questions on this topic and a discussion of results follow below.

Figure 30: Command of Local Dialect

My command of my local dialects is:		<u>Good</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Weak</u>	<u>Zero</u>
Overall:		87	11	1	1
By Gender:	male	85	13	0	2
	female	87	11	2	0
By Age:	15–30	93	7	0	0
	31–40	88	10	2	0
	41–50	86	12	0	2
	51–73	85	15	0	0
By Education:	voc	87	13	0	0
	coll prep	87	10	2	1
	post sec	69	26	5	0
By Region:	Zavrč	87	13	0	0
	Cirkulane	87	10	1	2
	Leskovec	83	15	2	0
	Podlehnik	89	9	2	0
By Birth:	in Haloze	91	8	1	0
	not in H	65	31	2	2

This first question is about perceived proficiency in the local dialect. In the survey the possible answers were accompanied by a short explanation in parentheses: good (speak and understand), adequate (understand and can make myself understood), weak (only understand), zero. Based on these explanations, 87% of respondents claimed to have full proficiency in the local dialect. If we combine those who claimed full proficiency with those who claimed adequate, which means they understand and can communicate, nearly 100% of respondents claim to use the local dialect. There was no statistically significant difference based on gender, age, education level or region of residence. People from Haloze answered uniformly across these divisions. The responses from those with post-secondary education seem different: 69, 26, 5, 0. Fewer respondents in this category claimed to have full command of the dialect, and more claimed passive knowledge. These differences were likely not statistically significant because the group was so small compared to the other education categories. There was clear statistical significance based on region of birth (chi-square .000). Those born outside of Haloze claimed about the same level of proficiency in the local dialect as those with post-secondary education.

It is worth noting that 63% of respondents claimed that the youth of the region do speak the local dialect most of the time.³⁷ This is a relatively high number considering the prevalent stereotype that the younger generation is abandoning the dialect. Of course, that means that nearly 40% claimed that the youth do not primarily speak the dialect. Of those under 30 only 50% claimed that the youth of Haloze speak the dialect. People answered this question uniformly across most demographic categories. There were statistically significant differences in the four regions of Haloze (chi-square .022). Zavrč was high with 80% of respondents claiming that the youth spoke primarily in the dialect, and Podlehnik was low with 54% responding that the youth spoke dialect.

³⁷ Zemljak Jontes and Pulko have also recently reported regular dialect use among young people.

Figure 31: *Dialect Usage among Youth*

Do youth from Haloze primarily speak in the local dialect?		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Overall:		63	37
By Gender:	male	61	39
	female	64	36
By Age:	15–30	50	50
	31–40	61	39
	41–50	63	37
	51–73	69	31
By Education:	voc	66	34
	coll prep	59	41
	post sec	68	32
By Region:	Zavrč	80	20
	Cirkulane	63	37
	Leskovec	63	37
	Podlehnik	54	46
By Birth:	in Haloze	63	37
	not in H	63	37

Half of the respondents to this survey think that the local dialect is dying in Haloze. The percentages are higher for older and more educated people. 68% of those over 50 and 58% of those with some post-secondary education think the local dialect is dying. As with the last question discussed, here the differences between the regions of Haloze were statistically significant (chi-square .001). It is interesting that only 26% of those from Zavrč claimed

the dialect is dying. This is another instance in which Zavrč appears to be more conservative than other regions of Haloze as regards dialect usage. We will discuss these regional differences in more detail later in the chapter.

Figure 32: *Future of the Dialect*

Is your local dialect dying?		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Overall:		50	50
By Gender:	male	55	45
	female	48	52
By Age:	15–30	43	57
	31–40	49	51
	41–50	56	44
	51–73	68	32
By Education:	voc	44	56
	coll prep	54	46
	post sec	58	42
By Region:	Zavrč	26	74
	Cirkulane	60	40
	Leskovec	57	43
	Podlehnik	49	51
By Birth:	in Haloze	49	51
	not in H	56	44

For the next three questions, respondents were asked to rank the dialect of Haloze on a scale from 1 to 7, 1 being the most negative and 7 being the most positive, for beauty and comprehensibility.

Figure 33: Respondents' Aesthetic Judgments of Haloze Dialect

The Haloze dialect is ugly-beautiful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7.		Mean
Overall:		5.69
By Gender:	male	4.46
	female	5.79
By Age:	15–30	6.10
	31–40	5.57
	41–50	5.42
	51–73	5.68
By Education:	voc	5.68
	coll prep	5.66
	post sec	5.63
By Region:	Zavrč	5.66
	(high) Cirkulane	6.21 (Turkey, 2 from 3: .000, 2 from 4: .001)
	(low) Leskovec	5.17
	(low) Podlehnik	5.48 (ANOVA .000)
By Birth:	in Haloze	5.81
	not in H	5.00 (ANOVA .000)

The overall mean for this question of 5.69 shows a positive view of the dialect on a scale from 1 to 7. It is not surprising that people rate their own dialect highly on a question like this. Other studies of Slovene dialects have shown that, when asked which dialect region is the most beautiful, people general indicate their own dialect as the most beautiful (Lundberg 2007: 103).³⁸ Nonetheless, the mean for Haloze is relatively high. In 2007 the author asked nearly 500 Slovenes to rate their own dialect for beauty on a scale from 1 to 7.³⁹ The results follow below.

Figure 34: *Dialect Beauty*

Primorsko	6.7
Gorenjsko	5.83
Štajersko	5.44
Prekmursko	5.39
Dolenjsko	5.2
Ljubljansko	4.83

Dialect speakers from Haloze rate their own dialect positively compared to other dialect speakers in Slovenia. There appears to be a small gender difference. Women rated the dialect as more beautiful than men. This is interesting given the stereotype that women, especially older women, tend to be more archaic dialect speakers than men.

One-way analysis of variance and post-hoc Turkey tests were performed on each of the demographic categories listed in figure 33 to determine if the means differed in a statistically significant way. The differences by region of residence are significant (ANOVA .000). Cirkulane indicated a particularly positive aesthetic view of the local dialect, and Podlehnik and Leskovec had a significantly lower view of the beauty of the dialect spoken

³⁸ In the study cited above, Slovenes found primorščina to be the most beautiful and ljubljansčina to be the ugliest.

³⁹ This question was a part of the survey cited above in Lundberg 2007, but these particular results were not published as part of that article.

there. It is not surprising that those born in Haloze had a significantly more positive view of the beauty of the dialect than those born outside of Haloze (ANOVA .000). This corresponds with the point made earlier about people rating their native dialect as the most beautiful.

Figure 35: Outsiders' View of Haloze

A person not from Haloze probably thinks that the Haloze dialect is ugly-beautiful		Mean
1 2 3 4 5 6 7.		
Overall:		3.86
By Gender:	male	3.93
	female	3.83
By Age:	15–30	4.17
	31–40	3.55
	41–50	3.96
	51–73	3.87
By Education:	voc	3.67
	coll prep	4.02
	post sec	3.26
By Region:	(low) Zavrč	3.23 (Turkey, 1 from 2: .002)
	(high) Cirkulane	4.30 (ANOVA .002)
	Leskovec	3.61
	Podlehnik	3.92
By Birth:	in Haloze	3.88
	not in H	3.72

The overall mean for this question is much lower, 3.86. This likely reflects the way Haloze dialect speakers think they are viewed by outsiders. It is not clear from this question that respondents think that their dialect is considered ugly by outsiders. There have been correlations made in other studies between aesthetic judgments and intelligibility (van Bezooijen 2002: 15). Positive aesthetic judgments are correlated with intelligibility and low aesthetic judgments with lower levels of comprehensibility. Essentially we are asking about intelligibility rather than beauty with this type of question. There is a statistically significant result in the answers by region of residence (ANOVA .002). Cirkulane again had the highest aesthetic opinion of the local dialect for this question.

Figure 36 below represents a different approach to the same kind of information. The answers to this question are similar to those of the last. This provides further evidence of the connection between aesthetic judgments and judgments of intelligibility. In the 2007 survey cited above the author asked Slovenes from across all of Slovenia to rate dialects for comprehensibility on a scale from 1 to 7. The results follow: Štajersko 5.7, Ljubljansko 5.68, Gorenjsko 5.32, Dolenjsko 4.97, Primorsko 4.7, Koroško 4.11, Prekmursko 2.68 (105). The question in the earlier survey is not exactly the same as the current question. In the earlier survey people were asked to rate their own and other dialects rather than being asked to put themselves in the place of outsiders to make an intelligibility judgment. Nonetheless, the comparison is interesting as a point of reference. People from Haloze believe their dialect is difficult for outsiders to understand. They believe that they must alter their speech to be understood.

It stands out that respondents from Zavrč believed their dialect to be significantly more difficult to understand. Only 26% of those from Zavrč claimed the dialect is dying. This is also the group that claimed the highest percentage of youth, 80%, who primarily speak the dialect. This appears to be a group more devoted to dialect maintenance.

Figure 36: Outsiders' View of Comprehensibility

A person not from Haloze probably thinks that the Haloze dialect is incomprehensible-comprehensible		Mean
1 2 3 4 5 6 7.		
Overall:		3.87
By Gender:	male	3.68
	female	3.96
By Age:	15–30	4.00
	31–40	3.76
	41–50	3.78
	51–73	3.61
By Education:	voc	3.80
	coll prep	3.88
	post sec	3.61
By Region:	(low) Zavrč	3.45 (Turkey, 1 from 4: .027)
	Cirkulane	3.85
	Leskovec	3.62
	(high) Podlehnik	4.30 (ANOVA .024)
By Birth:	in Haloze	3.92
	not in H	3.63

4.9 INFLUENCE OF OTHER VARIETIES OF SLOVENE

The second part of our discussion of the survey will focus on the remaining three questions. They deal with respondents' attitudes toward surrounding dialects and other more distant varieties of Slovene. They also tell us which varieties of Slovene have the most direct influence on the local dialect.

Figure 37: Most Beautiful Slovene

Where in Slovenia is the most beautiful Slovene spoken?		<u>Lj</u>	<u>CS</u>	<u>Ptuj</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Celje</u>
Overall:		6	15	33	26	20
By Gender:	male	7	15	30	22	26
	female	6	15	34	28	17
By Age:	15–30	7	17	33	23	20
	31–40	4	10	38	28	20
	41–50	0	24	31	29	16
	51–73	22	20	17	12	29 (.001)
By Education:	voc	7	12	29	24	28
	coll prep	6	16	31	30	17
	post sec	0	21	42	11	26
By Region:	Zavrč	6	9	42	28	15
	Cirkulane	6	14	34	19	27
	Leskovec	10	19	18	32	21
	Podlehnik	5	15	36	30	14
By Birth:	in Haloze	6	15	33	28	18
	not in H	10	13	30	19	28

For this first question about the place where the most beautiful Slovene is spoken, the answers were: in Ljubljana, in Central Slovenia, in Ptuj and its surroundings, in Maribor and its surroundings, in Celje and its surroundings. Overall ordering by this group of Haloze residents and dialect

speakers is interesting. 33% said that the most beautiful Slovene is spoken in and around Ptuj. For these respondents that could include their own dialect. It is surprising to find Ptuj at that top of a list of dialects considered to be beautiful. It is unlikely that people from outside of this area would consider the dialect spoken in and around Ptuj as beautiful. This judgment most likely represents a judgment of intelligibility and similarity to the respondents' own speech. It is not surprising to see Maribor, 26%, near the top as the city is commonly connected to the northeastern variant of the colloquial standard language. Celje, 20%, along with Central Slovenia, 15%, is widely considered a model of good Slovene (Lundberg 2010: 52). Ljubljana, 6%, has been rated low in aesthetic judgments in other surveys.⁴⁰ There is a statistically significant difference in the answer to this question when categorized by age. Only the oldest respondents, those over 50, did not rank Ptuj first (chi-square .001). For this group the highest areas are all in the center of the country: Celje 29%, Ljubljana 22%, Central Slovenia 20%, Ptuj 17%, Maribor 12%. We will return to this point later.

The next question is about the amount of contact speakers have with other varieties of Slovene. The possible answers to this question were the same as those for the previous question except that Ljubljana was replaced by the colloquial standard language, defined as the way people speak on TV.

The overall results are clear. 71% of respondents said that they had the most contact with the dialect spoken in and around Ptuj. It is interesting that the literary standard is in second place with 14% followed by Maribor, 8%, Central Slovene, 6%, Celje, 1%. In all categories Ptuj was in first position, but respondents over 40 claimed significantly more contact with the literary standard and the variety of Slovene spoken in Central Slovenia (chi-square .007). That may help explain why older respondents to the question about the most beautiful Slovene thought the varieties of Slovene spoken the center of the country were more beautiful. They have more contact and familiarity with those varieties of the language.

⁴⁰ In two previous surveys of Slovenes from across the entire country respondents rated Pannonian (or Prekmurje) and the speech of Ljubljana as the ugliest varieties of Slovene (Lundberg 2007 and Lundberg 2010).

Figure 38: *Contact with Varieties of Slovene*

Besides your local dialect, with what variety of Slovene do you have the most contact?		<u>Lit</u>	<u>CS</u>	<u>Ptuj</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Celje</u>
Overall:		14	6	71	8	1
By Gender:	male	13	10	66	12	0
	female	15	5	72	6	2
By Age:	15–30	7	0	77	13	3
	31–40	8	3	82	7	0
	41–50	20	14	58	6	2
	51–73	20	10	58	7	5 (.007)
By Education:	voc	12	4	77	6	1
	coll prep	16	7	66	9	2
	post sec	16	5	68	11	0
By Region:	Zavrč	11	6	81	2	0
	Cirkulane	16	8	65	10	1
	Leskovec	14	12	63	7	4
	Podlehnik	14	1	75	9	1
By Birth:	in Haloze	14	6	73	5	2
	not in H	17	7	55	21	0 (.004)

The final question in this section is a follow up to a question about the future of the local dialect. People were asked if the local dialect were dying. If they answered that it was, they were asked what variety of the Slovene

language was replacing it. The possible answers were the same as for the question about contact with other dialects.

Figure 39: Dialect Attrition

What variety of Slovene is replacing the local dialect?		<u>Lit</u>	<u>CS</u>	<u>Ptuj</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Celje</u>
Overall:		17	13	62	5	3
By Gender:	male	18	17	52	8	5
	female	16	11	67	3	3
By Age:	15–30	0	14	72	14	0
	31–40	16	5	70	3	6
	41–50	23	16	52	6	3
	51–73	24	13	50	10	3
By Education:	voc	23	9	60	6	2
	coll prep	15	15	66	3	1
	post sec	17	16	50	17	0
By Region:	Zavrč	12	23	65	0	0
	Cirkulane	17	15	56	8	4
	Leskovec	23	8	54	10	5
	Podlehnik	15	8	75	0	2
By Birth:	in Haloze	16	11	63	6	4
	not in H	21	21	54	4	0

There were no statistically significant differences between any to the categories. The overall ranking is very similar to the ordering for the question about the dialect with which people have the most contact (figure 38). For this question respondents said that the dialect spoken in and around Ptuj, 62%, is replacing the local dialect. Ptuj was followed by the literary standard, 17%, Central Slovene, 13%, Maribor, 5%, and Celje, 3%.

People from Haloze claim high levels of command of the local dialect with 87% of respondents to this survey claiming to both speak and understand the dialect. The number goes up to 98% if we include those who claim adequate command of the dialect. They also have a relatively positive aesthetic judgment of the local dialect. When asked to indicate if the dialect were ugly or beautiful on a scale from 1 to 7, respondents averaged 5.69. In Cirkulane respondents averaged 6.21. It is also striking that 63% of respondents claimed that youth from Haloze speak primarily in the local dialect. In Zavrč 80% claimed that the youth speak primarily in the local dialect. 50% of those under 30 claimed that the younger generation primarily speaks dialect.

Not all of the attitudes expressed in the results of this survey are positive for dialect maintenance. Half of all respondents to this questionnaire said that the local dialect is dying. Increases in age and education level seem to make a person more likely to think that the dialect is dying. When people from Haloze were asked to indicate how they are viewed by outsiders, they judged the dialect to be much lower in terms of beauty, 3.86, and comprehensibility, 3.87. They see their dialect as strange and difficult to understand for outsiders. They believe that they need to modify their speech in order for others to understand them.

In the first footnote of this chapter, a 2009 survey of 239 Haloze-dialect speakers was mentioned. As part of that survey on dialect attitudes and usage, people were asked to indicate if and how much they change the way they speak based on social contexts. See figure 40 below.

Figure 40: *Dialect and Social Context*

In the following situations, on a scale from 1 to 7, do you speak in dialect or in the literary language, for example, the way they speak on the TV news? (1) would be most like the local dialect, and (7) would be most like the literary language.

At home	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At work	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
With friends	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
Shopping	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
On the street or transport	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At the doctor	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
Athletic event	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At the theater or a concert	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At a movie	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At school or university	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At a community gathering	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
In Government offices	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
At Church	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
On the internet	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
If I travel to Ljubljana	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
Outside my home area	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language
Formal presentation	Local dialect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Literary language

Figure 41 displays the results to this question. The social contexts are listed in order of usage from most like the local dialect to most like the standard language.

Figure 41: Order from Local to Public

<u>Context</u>	<u>Mean</u>
home	1.98
friends	2.34
sports	3.44
local gathering	4.1
internet	4.14
not local	4.43
movie	4.52
shopping	4.59
church	4.62
work	4.73
public transport	4.83
theater	5.29
ljubljana	5.3
school	5.68
doctor	5.77
gov. office	5.92
speech	6.21

It is interesting that outside of interactions at home and with friends almost everything that people from Haloze do requires them to speak in a way that is closer to the literary standard than the local dialect. They see a large gap between their local dialect and the standard language. This is a larger gap than other dialect speakers have reported between their local dialect and the standard language, with the possible exception of dialect speakers from Prekmurje (Lundberg 2010: 56).

In this same 2009 survey of Haloze-dialect speakers, people were asked, if they did change the way they spoke based on a social context, what did they change and why. 66% said that they changed pronunciation features, and 71% said that they changed the words they used. When asked why they changed the way they spoke, they gave a variety of answers. Some said that dialect was not suitable or polite in some circumstances. Some changed out of embarrassment or because the dialect did not sound cultured. Some said that they simply did not know some words in dialect. One answer was repeated more than any other. 69% of respondents claimed that they changed the way they spoke in some social contexts in order to be understood. They believe that outsiders cannot understand their dialect, and figure 41 above shows that they change in small ways locally and in larger ways in other contexts. This tendency to change the way one speaks in order to be understood matches well with the attitudes toward other varieties of Slovene discussed earlier. When asked what variety of Slovene is the most beautiful (Ptuj 33%), with what variety of Slovene do you have the most contact (Ptuj 71%) and what variety of Slovene is replacing the local dialect (Ptuj 62%), Ptuj was the top choice for Haloze dialect speakers. This is additional support for the claim that the local Haloze dialect is being leveled toward the regional speech of Ptuj.

4.10 DIALECT LEVELING IN HALOZE

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, loss of marked or salient features and significant stylistic variation in the dialect are signs of dialect leveling. My own descriptive fieldwork over the course of more than a decade indicates that both of these are widespread in Haloze. The leveling of sa-

lient features in Haloze includes the abandoning of exclusive lexical items (*zɔ'bačə* for *grablje* 'rake') and grammatical structures such as male verb agreement for females (*bɔ:un šɔ:u* for *bom šla* 'I will go') and local forms of the dual (*mija sma* for *midva sva* 'we two will...'). Younger people and also those with regular contact with other dialects often do not use some of the most striking pronunciation features such as diphthongal pronunciation of vowels (*z'vä:izdə* for *z've:zdə* 'star' and *'dɔ:ubili* for *'dɔ:bili* 'received'), fronted *u* (*krüş* for *kruh* 'bread') and epenthetic *v* before *u* (*'vürə* for *'ura* 'hour'). All of these are archaic features, but they are used or not used by individuals based on social factors like education level, profession and contact with people from outside of the dialect region. These things point to dialect leveling.⁴¹

Dialect is valued in Slovenia as an important part of local identity, but it is not easily defined as a uniform code because speakers have such varied exposure to and proficiency in different varieties of the language. The type and number of archaisms and innovations in the speech of individuals may vary. One of the reasons that people claim high dialect use, even as many distinctive local features are being leveled, may be that people identify the regional koine and the partially-leveled local dialect as one and the same. The non-linguist may not clearly differentiate between the local and the regional dialect, especially if they are growing more alike. It is almost always difficult to draw distinct lines between closely related varieties of a language (Werlen 96). It is also true that there is significant variation in the level of awareness of the standard language and other varieties among non-linguists (Priestly 25). This may help to explain why people claim to be speaking dialect even though they have accommodated in significant ways to the regional dialect forms.

⁴¹ Additional research is needed to document the rate of leveling of different types of features in Slovene dialects. This would likely be a fruitful direction for inquiry in dialects across the Slovene speech territory.