An Empirical Investigation of the Theoretical Approaches to Code Switching: Petrčane as a Case Study

by

Mihaela Bogeljic

Submitted to Central European University

Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology

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

Supervisors: prof. Alexandra Kowalski

prof. Vlad Naumescu

Budapest

June, 2010

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisors, prof. Alexandra Kowalski and prof. Vlad Naumescu for their advice, support and encouragement. I also want to thank prof. Dan Rabinowitz for his helpful insights about my research.

I want to acknowledge all the people in Petrčane who helped me with data gathering, as without them this research would not be possible. Special thanks goes to my family, my mother, my sister, but especially my niece Imona and nephew René, who helped me immensely.

I am also grateful to all my friends and colleagues at CEU, for making this year a great experience.

I dedicate this thesis to my father.

Abstract

Code switching is a linguistic phenomenon that occurs in all languages. It can be employed when people use two or more languages to communicate, which is often the case in various immigrant communities, or when they use different varieties of a single language. Why do people change the way they speak in different social situations and in what ways do they do it? Is it beneficial to them to speak differently? Central to this proposed research, these questions will be applied to code switching practices in the village of Petrčane, located in the Croatian coastal region, Dalmatia. Croatia went through many changes recently, including the transition from communism to a war for independence to the establishment of an open market economy. All of these changes affected the way people use language all over Croatia. Such is the case in Petrčane, a small village with approximately 600 permanent residents and a booming tourism industry. In this research Petrčane is going to serve as a case study to test three theoretical approaches to code switching, namely the Markedness Model, Speech Accommodation Theory and Relevance Theory, in order to see if they are useful in explaining language practices in this community.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CEU eTD Collection

Introduction

Code switching is a linguistic phenomenon that occurs in all languages. It can be employed when people use two or more languages to communicate, which is often the case in various immigrant communities, or when they use different varieties of a single language. Why do people change the way they speak in different social situations and in what ways do they do it? Is it beneficial to them to speak differently? Central to this proposed research, these questions will be applied to code switching practices in the small village of Petrčane, located in the Croatian coastal region, Dalmatia. Croatia went through many changes recently, including the transition from communism to a war for independence to the establishment of an open market economy. All of these changes affected the way people use language all over Croatia. Such is the case in Petrčane, a small village with approximately 600 permanent residents and a booming tourism industry (Bilosnić 2009). In this research Petrčane is going to serve as a case study to test three theoretical approaches, namely the Markedness Model, Speech Accommodation Theory and Relevance Theory, in order to see if they are useful in explaining language practices in this community.

Code switching (CS) is a linguistic term that is studied through two approaches; one is structural and the other is sociolinguistic (Boztepe 2003). The structural approach deals with the grammatical issues in code switching. Sociolinguistic approach, which is the focus of this research, "sees CS primarily as a discourse phenomenon focusing its attention on questions such as how social meaning is created in CS and what specific discourse functions it serves" (Boztepe 2003:3). Some authors argue that sociolinguistic aspects of code switching can reflect on issues of domination and resistance in a society (e.g. Gal 1987; Heller 1995). Gal states that: "[p]atterns of choice among linguistic variants can be interpreted to reveal aspects of speakers' "consciousness": how they respond symbolically to class relations within the state, and how they understand their historic position and identity within regional economic

1

systems structured around dependency and unequal development" (1987:637). Heller sees the importance of studying code switching in a way that it can "reveal the micro-processes of symbolic domination - including the identification of interactional zones where individuals use language choices to exert, aggravate, or mitigate their power, to collude with or resist that exercise"(1995:374).

Petrčane was specifically chosen as a case study due to the various linguistic influences it is exposed to. First, there is code switching occurring between the Petrčane accent that is mostly heard among the older residents, and the variety of a language that younger people use. Furthermore, there is also the influence of the Zadar language variety - the closest city to Petrčane and the primary locus of economic and social interaction for surrounding villages. All of this has to be seen within the broader Dalmatian language variety and the standardized variety of the Croatian language. Linguistic practices of this village can also be applied to other villages in this region, as most of them have similar linguistic situation, which can shed some light on code switching strategies in a region as a whole. Additionally, as a native myself from Petrčane, this particular case arouse my interest in this topic, since code switching is something I learned how to utilize early on in my life. First four years of the elementary school I finished in Petrčane, where we did learn the standard Croatian language in school, but the village variety was still tolerated to some extent by our teacher, and used to a great extent in every day life. When I started going to school in Zadar in the 5th grade, as everyone else from the village, since the village school only provided first four years of education, the situation drastically changed. Me and my friends were ridiculed by the city children, and often called villagers because of the way we spoke. This came as a surprise to us, and soon we learned that we need to start switching to the city variety when in Zadar, to avoid being teased and to be able to converse with other children without interruptions and jokes about our language use. In school, we were required to use the

2

standard variety, while some influences from the Zadar variety were allowed, but not the village variety. When we went back to the village after school, however, we had to switch to the village variety, or people from the village would accuse us of wanting to be city kids which could easily lead to the feeling of exclusion from the village. I was personally very confused with this situation, and started feeling that the village variety that was part of my identity to a great extent is less worthy than the other varieties. First time I came across code switching as a linguistic concept, was in my college years when I took some classes in anthropological linguistics. I learned the difference between prescriptive and descriptive grammar which explained a lot of things I was wondering about for years. Prescriptive grammar, as the name implies, prescribes the right and wrong ways of speaking, and this is something I came across in my language use in Croatia, since I was constantly corrected or advised how to speak. Descriptive grammar, on the other hand, simply describes the different language varieties and values all language forms equally:

> The idea that one dialect of a language is intrinsically better than another is simply false; from a strictly linguistic point of view all dialects are equally good and equally valid. To look down on nonstandard dialects is to exercise a form of social and linguistic prejudice (Tserdanelis and Wong ed. 2001:13).

These notions explained a lot of things to me, and I was aware that the language issues I have been dealing with were socially and politically constructed. I became aware that the highest form of a language in my country, the standard Croatian, was simply one dialect of Croatian that was arbitrarily chosen as a standard, only because the dominant group in society that was in power was using this dialect. I realized that this situation is similar in any country, which drastically changed my attitudes toward my language use, and language in general.

This research will look at different code switching practices among the Petrčane residents. Why is it, that in such a small community, some people, spread across different generations, code switch and others do not? Some residents speak mostly the Petrčane variety; some speak the Zadar or more rarely, the standard variety, while some keep switching

3

between different varieties, depending on situation they are in. What are the reasons for differences in people's code switching practices? In attempting to answer these questions I will apply three code switching theories - the Markedness Model, which states that individuals code switch in order to negotiate their position within the society, Speech Accommodation Theory that explains code switching practices by the desire of the speaker to accommodate their speech toward their interlocutor, and Relevance Theory which explains code switching as an attempt to optimize the relevance of the message. I argue that none of these theories are sufficient on themselves to explain code switching practices, although they are useful in explaining some situations. In order to better explain code switching, it is important to take into account, following Bourdieu, issues of symbolic domination, prestige and imposition of the standard language, as well as interactions between the macro - national, and micro - local level of interaction. In the first chapter of my thesis, I will review relevant literature of sociolinguistics on code switching, language and social context, followed by an analysis of studies on creation of standard language and nationalism. In the second chapter, I will write about the creation of the Croatian state and the imposition of the standard language on the macro level. In the third chapter I will review my methodological approaches and subsequently move to the fourth chapter that is the theoretical and empirical part, where I will explore language patterns on a micro level. I will conclude that for a better understanding of code switching practices in Petrčane in relation to Croatian nation state building, an approach which combines the previously mentioned three theories with Bourdeian concept of symbolic domination would be more useful.

Short Overview of Petrčane and its Dialect

Petrčane is located in central Dalmatia, ten kilometers away from the city of Zadar (Gržan 1999). First time it was mentioned in the written records was in the year 1070. According to legend it got its name from the first inhabitants of the village, called Petar and Zane, and by the combination and some alternation of these names, the name Petrčane was created (Gržan 1999). Traditionally, the main industries in the village were agriculture and fishing, and in more recent times, tourism became one of the most important industries in the village (Gržan 1999).

The differences between the Petrčane language variety and the standard Croatian and the Zadar variety are seen in the vocabulary used in the village (see Table 1), but most differences are evident in the specific accent of the Petrčane variety. While standard Croatian language, as well as the Zadar variety, in many words place the accent on the first syllable, in Petrčane the accent is often put on the second syllable of the word. In the Petrčane variety, this accent will have a short falling tone, while the other varieties will have a short rising tone. This is the most easily identifiable difference between these varieties.

Table 1. Some differences between the standard and the Petrčane language variety. Source: Gržan, 1999.

English language	Standard Croatian	Petrčane variety
to complain	*prigovarati*	*bruntulati*
Shop	*Trgovina*	*butiga*
to loosen	*Popustiti*	*molati*
Jail	*Zatvor*	*pržun*
to slip	*skliznuti*	*popusti*
Cigarette	*cigareta*	*španjulet*
to sweat	*uznojiti se*	*uspotiti se*
Crazy	*ludo*	*manito*
to put	*stavljati*	*mećati*
to spend too much	*previše trošiti*	*arčiti*
walking stick	*štap za hodanje*	*bagulina*

Literature Review

The literature on code switching is extensive and it reflects some definitional differences among various authors. However, an analysis of code switching necessitates an examination of different issues connected to this topic within sociolinguistic studies.

"The Sociology of Language" by J.A. Fishman explains issues that descriptive sociolinguistics deals with. This discipline, Fishman argues, shows that people do not use the language always in the same way, and they also change attitudes toward language (in Giglioli ed.1990:47). The author gives few examples from different bilingual communities where all speakers utilize both languages to support this argument. Fishman states that:

> The task of descriptive sociology of language is to describe the general or normative patterns of language use within a speech network or speech community so as to show the *systematic nature* of the alterations between one variety and another among individuals who *share* a repertoire of varieties (in Giglioli ed.1990:48).

He also explains the concepts of situational shifting and metaphorical switching. Situational shifting refers to importance of situation when speakers shift from one language variety to another. Situation is defined as "co-occurrence of two (or more) interlocutors related to each other in a particular way, communicating about a particular topic, in a particular setting" (in Giglioli 1990:48). Metaphorical switching is employed "for purposes of emphasis or contrast" and it can be correctly used "by those that comfortably share not only the same *set* of situational norms but also *the same view as to their inviolability*" (in Giglioli 1990:50).

B. Bernstein in "Social Class, Language and Socialization" defines the term code in sociolinguistics as comprising of "social structuring of meanings *and* their diverse but *related* contextual linguistic realizations" (in Giglioli 1990:158). According to this author, there are two types of codes; restricted and elaborated. Restricted code is used when speakers have some mutual knowledge about the topic, and elaborated code is used when there is a need for deeper explanations of the topic (in Giglioli 1990:197). He argues that "restrictive code gives access to a vast potential of meanings, of delicacy, subtlety and diversity of cultural forms,"

6

while elaborated code "does not entail any specific value system" and it holds "the potential of alienation of feeling from thought, of self from other, of private belief *from role obligation*" (in Giglioli 1990:176).

"The Logic of Nonstandard English" written by W. Labov describes a relationship between the standard and nonstandard English on the example of treatment of African American children in American schools. This article is reviewing federally funded educational research that has been conducted at that time (the article was written in 1969) about the language usage of African American children in schools in impoverished neighborhoods. The conclusion of this research, which the author is challenging, is that these children suffer from "verbal deprivation" and are not able to express themselves (in Giglioli 1990:179). Labov states that this view is wrong, as "[t]he concept of verbal deprivation has no basis in social reality: in fact, Negro children in the urban ghettos receive a great deal of verbal stimulation…they have the same basic vocabulary, posses the same capacity for conceptual learning, and use the same logic as anyone else who learns and understands English" (in Giglioli 1990:179). The author is highly critical of the view that not only these children are deprived of language, but they "have no language at all" (in Giglioli 1990:183). This view is based on Bernstein's work in which "middle-class language is seen as superior in every respect" (in Giglioli 1990:183). Labov shows through his research that African-American language variety is well developed, logical and should not be seen as inferior in any sense, which is a very important conclusion for that time period, when African Americans in general were seen as an inferior group.

In the article "Diglossia" by C.A. Ferguson this concept is used the same way that code-switching is used in this research. It explains a situation in which "two or more varieties of the same language are used by some speakers under different conditions" (in Giglioli 1990: 232). Ferguson divides different language varieties used into "high" (H) and "low" (L) form,

7

in which the high form is usually the standard variety (in Giglioli 1990: 234). He stresses the importance of using the right variety in the right situation or otherwise the speaker might be ridiculed. Ferguson also touches upon the issue of prestige, since the high variety is usually seen as the superior one and at times "H alone is regarded as real and L is reported 'not to exist'" (in Giglioli 1990: 237). The author continues: " [e]ven where the feeling of the reality and superiority of H is not so strong, there is usually the belief that H is somehow more beautiful, more logical, better able to express important thoughts" (in Giglioli 1990: 237).

Ralph Fasold in his book *The Sociolinguistics of Society* provides an overview of definitions of major terms associated with language choice. The term 'code switching' is used when a speaker uses two or more languages to communicate (Fasold 1984:180). 'Code mixing' refers to using one language in which some words or phrases from another language are intertwined. The third term is what the author calls "variation within the same language" which is using two or more varieties of a single language (Fasold 1984:180). Although the last concept is the focus of this research, I am nevertheless going to use the term code switching. Fasold stresses that these three language choices are often hard to separate and should be seen as "a continuum from relatively large-scale to relatively small-scale choices" (1984:181). Other authors (Urcuioli 1995:528; Boztepe 2003:4) as well argue that it is hard to distinguish between these terms, and therefore for the purpose of this research I am going to refer to any switching between two language varieties (a neutral term that does not distinguish between dialects and languages) as code switching.

In the following section I am going to review works in the literature on Croatia that I found relevant for my research.

Krešimir Mićanović (2006) in "Mjesto standardologije u jezikoslovnoj kroatistici" discusses the relation of the standard Croatian language with three main dialects of Croatian; stokavian, kajkavian and chakavian. These three dialects are based on a different words for

the term "what", namely *što*, *kaj* and *ča*. Standard language is based on the stokavian dialect. The author discusses the claims that the speakers of all three dialects have to learn the standard language and this task is not any easier for the speakers of the stokavian dialects when compared to others. In regards to the Croatian standard, Mićanović argues, there is a possibility to complete separate it from the influence of the stokavian dialects. This would make it neutral and more autonomous on its own.

Mate Kapović (2005) in "Jezični utjecaj velikih gradova" writes about the linguistic influence of four large Croatian cities – Zagreb, Split, Rijeka and Osijek- on the surrounding areas. Kapović argues that people living in the vicinity of these cities switch to the language varieties of those cities in an attempt to adjust their speech to a more standard form of language. By switching from their local varieties to the city variety, he argues, they are often in some instances actually moving further away from the standard without realizing it. This is especially true for the speakers of the chakavian and kajkavian dialects, since merely switching to the stokavian dialect, on which the standard is based, appears to them to be more 'correct'. The author finds the reasons for this practice in the firm roots of the prescriptive standard in the Croatian education system and the discipline of linguistics.

Krešimir Mićanović (2005) in "Hrvatski sa naglaskom" discusses the issues of different accents in Croatian language and the standardization of the language. Standardization requires for one accent to be dominant and this creates problems, since speakers of different Croatian accents resist abandoning their accent completely. The author argues that if the chosen accent is not accepted by all the speakers, major modification has to be done to the standard, otherwise it is not functional. Another problem arises because the standard should be a neutral form of the language that everyone can use, but in reality the standard form is not neutral, as it reflects to some extent some regional affiliation.

9

Some of the theoretical approaches to code-switching practices, that were proven to be of most importance for my research, include Bourdieu's ideas of symbolic domination (Gal 1987). He suggests that through education, which is sponsored by the state, one dialect becomes dominant, and in turn it devaluates all other varieties (Gal 1987:638). By this process, a certain social group can exercise dominance over another, by imposing their cultural practices as a reality (Heller 1995:373). Susan Gal in her article "Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery" employs Bourdieu's ideas and connects them to code switching, on the example of three minorities, namely Italians in Germany, Hungarians in Austria and Germans in Romania (1987). Gal analyzes the differences in code switching in these three communities and connects them to various forms of resistance toward the symbolic domination of the dominant group (1987:637). These differences stem from the differing positions of the three minority groups within the world capitalist system (Gal 1987: 637). Heller writes about symbolic domination as well in "Language Choice, Social Institutions, and Symbolic Domination". She focuses on code switching practices between French, Somali and English languages in educational institutions in Ontario, Canada (1995). Heller argues that power relations in educational institutions are formed based on the support or resistance toward monolingualism in those institutions. Code switching is used accordingly, either to support or resist these practices (Heller 1995:373).

Lambert et. al. suggest that using a certain code, brings about stereotypes about the people using that code, which in turn affects their social behavior and positions them within a certain group (quoted in Urciuoli 1995:531). Similarly, Giles and associates examined people's accent and concluded that they are "perceived as aspects of persons", in other words, accents are seen as something internal and are used to make judgments on people's personalities (Urciuoli 1995: 532).

10

Don Kulick in his book *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction* describes the replacement in the New Guinean village Gapun in great detail. Tok Pisin is a sort of lingua franca in New Guinea, also termed as "Pidgin English, neo-Melanesian and New Guinea English" (Kulick 1992:4). The complete replacement of the local language is happening among the younger generations, which led to a language shift, or as it is sometimes known the language death, of a local language (Kulick 1992:6). Older people claim that children simply do not want to learn and speak the local language, but Kulick found the reasons for the shift in the practices of code switching among the older residents. Kulick's investigation demonstrates how unconscious choices of code switching practices can drastically influence the language of the next generation.

Carol Myers-Scotton in "Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching" stresses that code switching is always "socially motivated", as it serves as a negotiation tool in presenting oneself to the others (Myers-Scotton 1993:476). It also includes a great deal of creativity from a speaker, which is seen through the language choices he or she makes while conversing with others.

The book *Contested Tongues* by Laada Bilaniuk, explores the language patterns in post-Soviet Ukraine, with special regard to code switching between Russian, Ukrainian and *surzhyk,* a mixture between the two languages (Bilaniuk 2005). Russian used to be a dominant language in Soviet Ukraine and was seen as a "high" language, which was used in public life and academia. By contrast, Ukrainian was devaluated and considered as a "low" language, and people using this variety were seen as uneducated (Bilaniuk 2005:15). *Surzhyk* had, and still has a similar status (Bilaniuk 2005: 17). After the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukrainian became the official language. The author is, through her ethnographic work, exploring the power dynamics between these three varieties, and ways in which they are being used in

11

Ukraine. Bilaniuk describes in great detail the creation of the standard language as well, in the changing political and economic circumstances (Bilaniuk 2005).

Erving Goffman in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) analyzes social contacts through some interesting ideas that can be connected to code switching practices. His ideas about *front stage* and *back stage* can be associated with using the standard language and some other variety, respectively, depending on how the speaker wants to present him or herself (Boztepe 2003). Standard language would be used in official situations, while the dialect or some other variety would be used in an informal setting, within one's own group (Boztepe 2003). Goffman's book *Stigma* (1963) was also useful in exploring issues connected to the village identity and its devaluation of it coming from the urban areas.

In exploring the issues of creation of the standard language in Croatia and the creation of the nation-state, I found writings of Ernest Gellner and Anthony Giddens very useful.

Ernest Gellner (1981) in "Nationalism" argues about the importance of nationalism in the modern world. He states that nation-states put great effort in reinforcing their borders and in order to do that successfully, administration has to operate in one linguistic medium. This is why nation-states put such importance on creating and maintaining the standard language. It is exactly this kind of a strong centralized state that is characteristic for the modern world.

Anthony Giddens (1987) in *Nation-State and Violence* defines the nation-state as "set of institutional governance maintaining an administrative monopoly over a territory with demarcated boundaries (borders), its rule being sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence" (Giddens 1987:121). He argues that clear boundaries between the nation-states mark the most important distinction from the pre-modern states. This is why the protection of the borders becomes of crucial importance for the nation-state.

Below I am going to review the most important aspects of the three code switching theories that I will use in my research. I chose these three theories, among many that can be

applied to code switching, because they seemed to be the ones that could be the most applicable to the case study of Petrčane.

Markedness Model

According to this model, developed by Myers-Scotton, individuals code switch in order to negotiate their position with others within the society. Their primary goal is to determine rights and obligations between each other (Myers-Scotton 1993). In my research, this model may be employed when people in Petrčane use the Petrčane language variety among themselves to reinforce their duties to each other. According to the Markedness Model, speakers have the possibility of using more than one code, and they choose a certain code to show their preferences and desires about membership in a certain group (Myers-Scotton 1993: 478). Their ability to do this stems from the fact that speakers have a "negotiation principle" (Myers-Scotton 1993:478). The author stresses that this principle, although similar to Grice's cooperation principle, differs from it, namely because Grice states that speakers choose their maxims to create cooperation in conversation, while Myers-Scotton's negotiation principle, can result in cooperation or in conflict (Myers-Scotton 1993:478). Aside from negotiating their position with others using certain codes, Myers-Scotton argues that speakers are aware of the relative markedness of the codes. Marked codes are used to reaffirm rights and obligations, while unmarked choices serve some other uses (Myers-Scotton 1993:479).

Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT)

This theory, also known as Communication Accommodation Theory, explains code switching by the desire of the speaker to accommodate their speech in order to show their intentions or attitudes towards the person with which they are conversing (Chan 2005:18). It

has two aspects; convergence and divergence. Convergence is used when the speaker wants to accommodate their speech toward the speech of their interlocutor. Divergence is used when the speaker wants to stress the difference in speech with its interlocutor. Convergence is used to express solidarity, while divergence is used to express difference (Chan 2005:18). Speech Accommodation Theory can be used in this research in instances when people from Petrčane express their in-group solidarity when someone who is not from Petrčane is present.

Relevance Theory

Through this theory, code switching is used to optimize the relevance of the message (Chan 2005). The speaker uses "all available linguistic and communicative resources" to assist the listener in understanding the utterance (Chan 2005:7). This can be done consciously or unconsciously. According to this theory, code switching is used in a way that will transfer the message to the interlocutor in the fastest possible way. On the Petrčane example, this theory may be useful when people switch to another language variety in order to be better and easier understood.

Historical context: Dissolution of Serbo-Croatian language and creation of Croatian State

Croatia became an independent country in 1991 and since then standard Croatian language became very important in the state building process. This language variety has been promoted heavily through the education system and media. Petrčane residents usually use the standard variety in schools, often at jobs, and in any official situation they found themselves in, such as going to the courthouse or to the local municipality. Since Zadar variety is closer to the standard one than the Petrčane dialect, many residents of Petrčane will code switch to the Zadar variety instead of the standard, if the situation allows it. Through this process of imposition of the standard variety, it seems that the Petrčane variety is becoming less and less valued. Standard language serves to reinforce the homogeneity of the nation and it is connected to the nationalistic ideas that are often reproduced by the state and carried out through the education system (Gellner 1981). Therefore, in this research, I will draw on Anthony Giddens' writings on nation- state formation, which he sees as "a bordered power-container" (Giddens in Friedland, 1987), and on the emergence of nationalism. I will also use Gellner's ideas on nationalism, which he defines as "primarily a political principle that holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent" (Gellner, 1981). I will focus on the representations of the state through symbolic interaction, especially through linguistic aspects of this symbolic interaction. How is the state exercising symbolic power on a macro scale and in turn affecting the micro scale? What are the symbolic hierarchies in a territorial framework of contemporary nation-state? How does the structure of the state influence the production of the standard language and how does the state exercise dominance through the imposition of the standard language, especially through the education system?

Nation-states and borders

Modern nation-states are territorially bounded systems that are seen as political entities, in which the nation and the state coincide in space (Kossler 2002). Anthony Giddens argues that the nation can come to be only when the state has administrative control over its territory over which it enforces its sovereignty (1987:119). He defines the nation-state as a "set of institutional governance maintaining an administrative monopoly over a territory with demarcated boundaries (borders), its rule being sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence" (Giddens 1987:121). McCrone and Kiely (2000) argue that although most sociologist would find this definition somewhat problematic, since in sociology nation, state, and society as well, are seen as different entities that correspond to different spheres (cultural, political and social) they would nonetheless accept this definition. The reasons for this lay in the fact that in the reality of the modern world these three entities became interconnected and are very hard to distinguish from one another (McCrone and Kiely 2000). This suggest that the "key unit of modern life is the territorial entity in which social organization, political control and cultural identity coalesce" (McCrone and Kiely 2000). McCrone and Kiely however argue that it is important which term is used since nation, state and society are not in alignment in most cases. If nation-states are seen, they argue, "as the correspondence of a cultural grouping – a 'people' – with their actual self-government, then there are few genuine nation-states in the modern world" (2000:22). Croatia as well does not fit this description perfectly, because although the vast majority of people in Croatia are of Croatian descent, still considerable percentage of population belongs to some other ethnic groups. However, the Croatian government is nonetheless trying to present Croatia as a culturally and politically unified entity.

Anthony Giddens argues that the clear boundaries between nation-states are one of the most evident distinctions from the pre-modern states (1987). Within these boundaries, the

16

state exercises its power and carries out some basic functions, such as "the applicability of specific legal provisions and institutions, or control over the movement of people or the use of specific official and/or school languages" (Kossler 2002:27). Modern nation-states put great importance on enforcing their boundaries, and it rarely happens that they fail at this task, and if they do it is considered scandalous (Gellner 1981:771). To reinforce the borders, communication within administration and with the citizens must go smoothly. That is why administrations generally operate in one "linguistic medium" (Gellner 1981:771). This linguistic medium is implemented in educational systems, especially through primary education, which has to be universal in order to effectively reproduce that linguistic medium (Gellner 1981:771). It is in the interest of population to acquire this medium through education, in order to possibly secure a position within the administration. Within this train of thought, Gellner argues that "the essence of national sovereignty is not merely to have one's own rate of inflation, important though that is, but to have a national system of education diffusing a national medium of communication" (Gellner 1981:771). In Croatia, the national system of education is very important for the state and it is the main vehicle for reinforcing the standard Croatian language.

Language policies and education

In order for the state to become coterminous spatially with the nation, social interaction has to be set within these firm boundaries (Kossler 2002:27). With the aim of achieving this, the state imposes economic unity, administrative apparatus and cultural homogeneity. Shared culture and common language are very important aspects of cultural unity, and above all linguistic homogenization becomes crucial, which is "aimed both at securing the prerequisites for easy communication in the national market and the underpinnings of a symbolically represented national community" (Kossler 2002:27).

17

Language policies of the state have a goal of creating a uniform national language, which is primarily promoted through the education system.

With the establishment of the Croatian state in 1991, and the escalation of the war, Croatian state had to struggle to establish its borders, territorial and symbolic. Therefore, to establish symbolic boundaries of the state, language policies became extremely significant. Prior the Croatian independence from Yugoslavia, the official language was Serbo-Croatian and these two language varieties were officially considered to be one language (Jahn 1999: 330). Through the use of the Serbo-Croatian standard in Yugoslavia, to a certain extent the "Serbisation of the Croatian literary tradition" was carried out, since some Serbian words and expressions were more valued and often imposed rather than the Croatian ones (Jahn 1999:330). Language aspect of the national identity became very important for the Croatian state and differences with the Serbian variety were stressed out to a large degree. This was somewhat problematic, since linguistically it is hard to distinguish these two language varieties as two languages (Jahn 1999). In order to establish the Croatian language variety as a separate language, Croatia introduced new language policies. Any similarities with the Serbian variety were eradicated from the standard Croatian language after the creation of Croatian state. Purity of the language became a central issue as "morphosyntactic constructions which "sound" Serbian are no longer accepted in the official language […], "Serbian" words are dropped in favor of Croatian expressions or, if there was only one expression of both variants of Serbo-Croatian, an old word from the Croatian linguistic heritage is revived, often after having long been in disuse, or, if there were none, a new word has to be found" (Jahn 1999:330). The change in the linguistic convention became especially difficult for speakers of some of the many Croatian dialects, who may have been struggling with the old language standard as well (Jahn 1999:330). Many new words and phrases have been introduced to Croatian language in the 1990s and even many international words,

although commonly used so far, have been eradicated from the language because their usage was associated with the Serbian language. For dialect speakers this process makes language use even more difficult, since linguistic homogenization of the language is carried out in the official discourse, administration, and media but especially through the education system.

The linguistic homogenization became immensely important in the areas in Croatia where there are ethnically mixed populations, such as in the region Istria. The political movement from the multiethnic republic of Yugoslavia to the nation-state of Croatia, resulted in strong regionalist movements, especially in Istria, which has a largely mixed population and 16 percent of the population identifies themselves as Istrian, not Croatian (Jahn 1990). Jens-Eberhard Jahn, while conducting research about language practices in Istria, came to this conclusion: "the more one is attached to the state, the more one appreciates the 'warm sound" of the official national standard language" (1999: 339). The coastal region Dalmatia, where Petrčane is situated is not very ethnically mixed and the situation is very different from the Istrian case. However, the strong emphasis on the standard Croatian by the state and eradication of the regional language varieties plays and important role all over Croatia. It seems that any kind of regional identity is not favored by the Croatian state, perhaps exactly because of the possibility of the regionalist movements, which would weaken the Croatian nation-state. For such reasons, speakers of the Petrčane variety are often inclined to code switch between their variety, the standard and the regional dialect that often creates confusion in communication. The standard language in its pure form is rarely used in every-day life, although it is imposed in many ways. Petrčane dialect speakers are often more inclined to use the regional dialect, perhaps because it is closer to the standard variety than the village dialect. This results sometimes in the abandonment of the village variety, because it is marked as uneducated and even archaic.

Homogenization and Nationalism

Ernest Gellner argues that today's world is characterized by a strong centralized state that has a function of creating order, of maintaining a complex infrastructure and an elaborate education system (Gellner 1981:761). Internal homogenization becomes crucial for the centralized state, in order for it to justify its nation-state status. Language plays a role here as well, since one language variety sends a message of one unified people. Regional dialects, although not associated with some other ethnic group, still can be seen as having a separatist tendency. If homogenization is the goal of the nation-state than any internal differences are not desirable. The unitary cultural character of the nation becomes crucial and it is reinforced through education system. Education becomes universal as "it must be carried on in some linguistic and cultural medium" (Gellner 1981:761). This medium carries great importance in modern societies that are geographically and occupationally mobile, as it is "underscored by mobility, occupational and other, which makes genuine communication essential" (Gellner 1981:761). Communication in such society is contextual, in a sense that the things that are actually said form only a small segment of the meaning. What is equally important for the meaning of what is said is "how it is said, by whom to, when and in what circumstances" (Gellner 1981:761). Pierre Bourdieu (1991) argues in *Language and Symbolic Power* that words can mean something, while at the same time they don't have to refer to anything. He states:

> In other words, formal rigour can mask *semantic freewheeling*. All religious theologies and political theodicies have taken advantage of the fact that the generative capacities of language can surpass the limits of intuition or empirical verification and produce statements that are *formally* impeccable but semantically empty. Rituals are the limiting case of situations of *imposition* in which, through the exercise of a technical competence, which may be very imperfect, social competence is exercised – namely, that of the legitimate speaker, authorized to speak and to speak with authority (Bourdieu 1991: 44).

Authority in speaking comes from the standard language, which, according to Bourdieu, has a tendency to impose itself as the only legitimate language and it requires the linguistic market

20

to be united, which devalues all the dialects compared to the standard. Bourdieu continues about the ways in which the standard official language is implemented, reinforced and imposed:

> The official language is bound up with the state, both in its genesis and in its social uses. It is in the process of state formation that the conditions are created for the constitution of a unified linguistic market, dominated by the official language, Obligatory on official occasions and in official places (schools, public administrations, political institutions etc), this state language becomes the theoretical norm against which all linguistic practices are objectively measured. Ignorance is no excuse: this linguistic law has its body of jurist – the grammarians – and its agents of regulation and imposition – the teachers – who are empowered universally to subject the linguistic performance of speaking subjects to examination and to the legal sanction of academic qualification" (Bourdieu 1991: 45).

Language contributes to the creation of the "mobile anonymous and homogeneous society", and serves as a leveler within the society (Gellner 1981:762). Centralized state is created of mobile populations that are anonymous, in a sense that there is no group membership, and it has highly homogenous culture, which is transmitted through education. Education, in Gellner's opinion has two tasks, which are "to instill that culture, and to ensure an adequate standard of literacy and technical competence, adequate for employability and rapid redeployment of personnel" (Gellner 1981:762).

Nationalism is another leveler that makes the society homogeneous and it is carried out through the education system (Gellner 1981:762). Gellner states that "nationalism is essentially the transfer of the focus of man's identity to a culture which is mediated by literacy and an extensive, formal educational system. It is not the mother tongue that matters, but the language of the ecole maternele" (1981:762). This is how kinship and other ties become less important as identity markers in comparison to nationalism. For a nationalist, Gellner argues, language is "acquired with mother's milk", but in modern times it is not even acquired with the "bottle-fed milk" but with school books (1981:762). Folk culture is being eradicated through education and it becomes mystified exactly at the moment when it stops being a reality (Gellner 1981:762). Through this process, the local language varieties might be

21

eradicated as well, in favor of the standard official language. Petrčane variety seems to be going through this process, as it is becoming more and more a part of the 'folk' culture and less suitable for any kind of public conversation, outside the village itself. For Giddens, nationalism is "the existence of symbols and beliefs which are either propagated by elite groups, or held by many of the members of regional, ethnic, or linguistic categories of a population and which imply a community between them" (Giddens 1987:190-191). He argues that nationalism is a recent phenomenon that came about with the French revolution and the advent of capitalism (Giddens 1987). This explanation could be applied to Croatia, since secession from Yugoslavia, the beginnings of strong national sentiments and the introduction of the capitalist economy came at the same time. This was all accompanied by a sudden importance and imposition of the newly created standard Croatian language.

Croatia became a newly founded nation-state in 1991 after its secession from Yugoslavia. The consequence of this decision was a full-fledged war with the Yugoslav army. It became crucial for the Croatian state to firmly establish its borders and reinforce the cultural, national and political unity. In the 1990s nationalistic sentiments were encouraged and 'purified' Croatian culture was the only one that was valued. This was reflected in language policies of the Croatian state, that were closely tied to the creation of the nation-state and nationalism that went along with it. In order to make the Croatian language as different as possible from the Serbian variety, many changes were introduced. In the opinion of many Croatians, the language was 'butchered' and it became very difficult to use it in the new 'proper' way. This new language was enforced in schools, in the media and in any official discourse. Language homogenizing became crucial for the newly founded state, and using any words associated with the Serbian variety was undesirable. Language became the marker of Croatian identity and it became an important part of the nationalistic sentiments. This is how all language varieties in relation to the official standard language were devalued. One unified

22

linguistic and cultural identity was imposed on many levels. It seems that this policy affected Petrčane as well, as people tend to code switch more and more to the standard or to the variety closer to the standard than the Petrčane one. Many younger residents it seems completely abandoned the Petrčane variety in favor of the regional one, since it is seen as less cultured and not desirable, to say the least. The minority of the Petrčane residents, however, still use the local language variety in everyday life.

Methodology

Collecting data for this research was an interesting endeavor. Being from Petrčane myself influenced the ways I conducted the fieldwork in significant ways. I could not approach people in my village through the standard text-book rules of ethnographic research, since most of the people know me in the village and such method would not be useful at all. On the other hand, I had to find a way not to let my interviews become too informal and for conversation to stir to other directions.

As Val Colic-Peisker discusses in "Doing ethnography in one's own ethnic community", being an insider brings some benefits, such as knowing your informants and some rules of the community (2004). However, it brings some difficulties as well, because it becomes hard to distinguish private life from a professional one, especially since one's own community might have expectations about the ways they are going to be represented in the research (Colic-Peisker 2004: 84). I had similar experiences in my ethnographic work, as Colic-Peisker, and "[i]ntrospection…became an important part of my work, reflecting the apparent tension between roles of the detached observer and engaged participant" (2004:84). Colic-Peisker argues for the "insider anthropology" and reflexivity: "deconstructing the myth of the noninvolved objective observer is like shaking off a heavy burden: instead, our research now requires us to be conscious of the ways we are involved and engaged with our research participants, and to find strategies for ethically managing the engagement" (2004:85). I had to take all of these elements into account before starting my fieldwork and find a way to be aware of my own involvement in the community and incorporate it in my research in a transparent way.

I decided to conduct interviews with people of different ages, professions and life experiences and tried to get as many perspectives as I could on the code switching practices and the status of the village dialect compared to other language varieties. I recorded most of

the interviews, in order to be able to later analyze first hand my informants' language patterns. Few of the interviews I did not record, mostly because they happened spontaneously and I either didn't have a voice recorder with me, or I thought that recording some of these interviews would ruin the flow of the conversation and would not be beneficial for my research. Another method I used extensively was participant observation. Being from this village by itself made me a participant throughout my life. The observation part is something that I introduced during my research and it has proven to be very useful. It enabled me to step aside from being part of the village and carefully observe the language patterns of the people I talked to, or listen to, which is something I never consciously did before as a resident of this village.

I conducted around twenty interviews with the residents of the village. Most of the interviews were of combined type. Beginnings of interviews were always very structured, as I asked the same sets of questions to all my informants (see Table 2):

Table 2: Interview Questions

1. Do you speak in Petrčane dialect with your parents?
2. Are both of your parents from Petrčane?
3. Do they speak Petrčane dialect?
4. What language do you use when you go to school/work?
5. Has the teacher/boss ever corrected your language?
6. How do you speak with your friends in Petrčane when in the village?
7. What about when you go out to the city with them?
8. How do people in the city react when they hear the Petrčane accent?
9. What do you think about older people's way of speaking in Petrčane?
10. Can you understand everything when you talk to them?

I asked these ten preliminary questions in a form of a survey in order to get some background information and some basic language patterns from my informants which can be later easily compared. After these questions, the interviews became more unstructured and the questions were about more general attitudes about language. Questions were revolving about the Petrčane dialect, about the ways in which my informants perceive it, whether they think it is

25

changing and what is the status of this dialect compared to the other dialects and the standard Croatian language. I also inquired about their own language practices in relation to code switching, and tried to get their attitudes about the reasons and ways their utilize different language varieties. The age of my interviewees varied from a nine year old child to an 86 year old woman. Some of my informants lived in Petrčane their whole lives and some were returned emigrants or people that lived elsewhere in Croatia at some point of their lives. Many people from Petrčane emigrated to the United States, so some of my interviewees were representatives of that segment of the population. Some of the professions of the people interviewed include an agricultural self-employed worker, a journalist, an owner of a café, a mailman, a retired ship's captain, a student and a stay at home mom, just to mention a few. I tried to get as many different people as my informants in order to get a more of a holistic picture of the language patterns in this village. I was careful not to make a mistake of having a sample that will represent only one segment of the community and tried to include as many different opinions.

Participant observation was the most extensively used method in this research. As I mentioned before I have been a participant in this village life since birth, although I did live at different places within and outside Croatia, but even more valuable tool was the observation part. I spent one month in the village and tried to be a careful observer in any situation of my daily life. I was observing my own family and friends, but as well interactions in the local café, people talking on the street, after the church mass and so on. I always had my notebook with me and I tried to write down any significant observation connected to language use that I observed. On several occasions, I followed one informant as she went to the city Zadar and observed whether her language patterns changed in different settings. I was also very careful to notice phone conversation and observe if there was any code switching employed in that situation, depending on whether my informants talked to someone from the village or with an

outsider. I also had an opportunity to observe a 22 year old man from the village who was a contestant on a Croatian TV singing show "Hrvatska traži zvijezdu" similar to American Idol. I observed his language use on a national TV and found out through my interviews that he has received advice from some people in the village about which way he should speak in the show.

Theoretical Approaches and Analysis of Fieldwork Findings

In this chapter I will present and analyze the data I collected during the one month fieldwork conducted in April 2010 in Petrčane.

First thing I noticed after analyzing the research data was that most of my informants were not very aware of their language usage and most claimed they never switch their language to another dialect. After more questions however, they would say that they do change the way they speak, if the situation requires it, like going to some kind of an official institution. Many of the informants were aware of some issues concerning the Petrčane dialect and showed great interest in this topic. I got very different answers however to the question whether this local dialect is dying off or being revived. Some claimed it is dying off and young people do not use it anymore. Some claimed that it is still used to a great extent and it is not endangered.

It seems that people that are between 25 to 40 years of age code switch the most, meaning they utilize all three language varieties that were mentioned before and do not stick to one variety, which I observed more among other generations. People from 40 – 60 years of age mostly use the village dialect, switch to standard when they have to (in official situations) but resist the city dialect to a great extent. Senior residents mostly use only the language variety and do not feel comfortable using the standard or any other variety.

One of my main informants was R., a 36 –year old journalist, who lives in the village and works for national newspapers in the city of Zadar. She was raised in Petrčane and lived there until she moved to the capital city, Zagreb, at the age of 18, where she studied and graduated journalism. After her studies were completed, she worked in Zagreb for few years and than moved back to the village. When she reflected upon her language use, she explained

28

she started code switching when she started going to school in Zadar in the 5th grade, which is similar to my own experience:

> They looked at us, kids from Petrčane, as villagers, mostly because of the way we spoke. I was very surprised by this, because I didn't think I was a villager. I thought people from coastal villages are cool, and villagers are the ones coming from the non-coastal villages.

R. pinpointed this period of her life as beginning of code switching practice for her, which she still employs today:

> I am not at all aware when I start changing the way I speak. I have no control over it and it surprises me sometimes when I do it. If I'm in the village talking to people in Petrčane dialect, and someone from Zadar or Zagreb calls me on the phone, confusion is created in my head. I get lost sometimes and don't know how to talk. If I start mixing different dialects, I keep thinking how strange I must sound. I think people from Petrčane change the way they speak a lot. You can't use the Petrčane dialect in the city, people will interrupt you and laugh at you all the time. They mostly make fun of our accent, not so much of the words we use, unless it is a very archaic word. I think I switch between dialects mostly to save energy and get on with the conversation.

R.'s code switching practices, according to this example, could fit in the Speech Accommodation Theory, but not entirely. She is accommodating her speech to that of her interlocutor, which could be explained as a convergence aspect of SAT. However, convergence is mostly used to express solidarity, while R. is code switching to avoid being ridiculed. At some instances R.'s language patterns seem to fall under the Markedness Model: "At job or some official situation, I always speak the standard language or something close to the standard and don't have many problems with mixing dialects, while at home I use the Petrčane dialect". Markedness Model is suitable in this situation, since R. is negotiating her position in two settings; one professional and the other one private. At times, R.'s code switching can be explained by the Relevance Theory. For example, if she speaks with someone from Zagreb, she will do her best to use her language in a way that will assist her interlocutor in understanding her the most. On the example of R.'s language practices, it can be concluded that each of these models is useful in some situations, but none can be used on its own. What is even more important in her code switching practices are notions of shame, ridicule and symbolic dominance in Bourdeian sense, on the part of people from the city.

29

Symbolic dominance refers to imposing one group's norms and behavior on another, and presenting it as the only 'normal' way to do things. People in Zadar exercise this dominance over people in Petrčane by imposing their language usage as the norm, and by ridiculing people from the village because of their dialect. Since Zadar is the urban center and has more prestige, and its dialect is closer to the standard than the Petrčane one, people from Zadar feel they have the right to ridicule and correct the speech of people from rural areas. Symbolic dominance and issues of shame are probable reasons for R.'s code switching strategies. In any case, language choices are very complex and it is very hard to explain them with one all-encompassing theory.

Another informant who also demonstrates these complex language choices in an opposite way is I. He was one of my informants that represent the best a segment of population that does not code switch to a great extent, but always, in his words, speaks in Petrčane dialect. "How I speak is how I speak. I don't change it, I don't adjust. I don't care if I speak with the professor or a minister; it is always the same for me". I. is a 40-year old veteran of the 1991 war that lived most of his life in the village. I. was always involved in small coastal village life; he knows everybody in the village, loves to go fishing and tends to the family olive fields with great care. His experiences with using the village dialect are much different than R.'s. "I was never ridiculed in the city by the way I speak. I mean, they do tease me sometimes, but they never call me a villager. People are positive toward my speech in the city". The reasons for this may be because his whole image is that of a guy from a small coastal village, that lives that lifestyle fully, so the dialect 'suits' him. In R.'s case, who is a professional woman, village dialect is not tolerated, as it is not corresponding to her lifestyle, at least through the perception of the people from Zadar. I.'s language patterns could be explained by the Markedness Model, in a way that he is choosing to speak in the village dialect in order to show preference about belonging to a village as a community. However, he

30

is showing considerable levels of resistance through refusing to speak any other variety but the village one. The reasons for this might be in the fact that he knows that others are trying to exercise symbolic dominance over him, which also affects his language choices.

As opposed to I. who tries to resist the standard dialect, another informant G., complies with the imposition of the dominant dialect. He is a retired ship's captain that sailed in many places around the globe. In his retirement days he writes poems and articles for the local newspaper, and paints as well. "Autochthonous *Petrčanci*[1] are disappearing like Indians[2]", he states, "other traditions are being brought into village and no one accepts the village ways". G. tries to speak in the standard language, when he is with someone, he says "who really doesn't need to hear my Petrčane dialect", but still sometimes 'slips' into the village dialect. When he writes, he also uses the standard variety, although he thinks some words are much more beautiful in the dialect variety. G.'s language usage shows that he accepts the city or the standard dialects as the 'proper' ones, although he might not necessarily think they are better. In terms of compliance, Bourdieu states that:

> All symbolic dominance presupposes, on the part of those who submit to it, a form of complicity which is neither passive submission to external constraint nor a free adherence to values. The recognition of the legitimacy of the official language has nothing in common with an explicitly professed, deliberate and revocable belief, or with an intentional act of accepting a 'norm'. It is inscribed, in a practical state, in dispositions which are impalpably inculcated, through a long and slow process of acquisition, by the sanctions of the linguistic market (1991: 50).

Another significant aspect emerging from G.'s interview is the point where he seems to believe that people should make clearer choices in their language usage: "There are still some old ladies in the village that speak like people spoke a hundred years ago, although not many. But the young generation has everything mixed up in their heads, so they speak half standard, half Petrčane dialect". This point can also be interpreted as his confusion of the dialects he actually complies with depending on the context, whether he is in the city or in the village,

---

[1] People from Petrčane
[2] The Croatian word *Indijanci* which he used implies Native Americans, but for the sake of keeping the original quote, I translated in as Indians.

and his expectations from the people around him to make clear choices like him, especially the young generation.

When I talked to this 'younger generation", people that are between 17 and 23 years of age, this claim has proven to be true. Most of them told me they speak a mixture between the Zadar or standard variety and Petrčane variety and they only sometimes switch between varieties. They created their own linguistic 'mixture' that is accepted both in the village and in the city. They eradicated some accents and words that are obviously associated with the village, but kept some village words and expressions that are acceptable in the city. These language patterns could be explained by the Relevance Theory in some instances, in a way that they want to be easier understood in the city. However, it could also be argued that they are conforming to symbolic dominance of the city, while at the same time trying to keep ties to the village. There is another 'current' among this generation that speaks the village variety. R. told me her observation: "some younger people speak a really old school Petrčane dialect. They find some archaic words, their accent is very pronounced. They over do it, they sound like old grannies. I think they do it to become totally accepted in the village." Since they utilize their language usage to express solidarity and belonging to the group, their language patterns might be explained by the convergence aspect of Speech Accommodation Theory. However, many people in Petrčane find it annoying that they use a more archaic version of this dialect, so they might be doing it to resist the new ways and go back to what they see as 'real' Petrčane dialect.

As an example, L., a 22 year-old student at Zadar University, says he doesn't care for Petrčane or Zadar dialect and he speaks some kind of mix between the two. "M. and D.[3] [his friends] are really annoying with their Petrčane dialect. They use it all the time. I don't care for it". M. thinks that Petrčane variety is dying out, although he says some of the younger

---

[3] D. is actually Duje, a contestant in a TV show which will be discussed as a case in the next chapter.

people are trying to speak it. "People in Zadar don't make fun of me when I talk. At least not 'real' Zadrani[4], only vlasi[5] think it is funny" he says. Ma., a 22 year old student, thinks that Petrčane dialect is dying out and she is not using at all. "I think it is very important if your grandma was babysitting you when you were little. If yes, you will learn the Petrčane dialect. If no, you wont, that was my case. But even those that did have a grandma babysitter speak the dialect only until they are around 10 years of age and than lose it". Gi., a 23 year old says he speaks a new Petrčane dialect, as he calls it, which is a mixture between the village and city variety. He thinks that code switching is situational. "At work you shouldn't use the Petrčane variety. But than again, if someone is buying a boat, let's say, than it would be appropriate to speak in the dialect". According to these interviews, it seems that everyone has their own complex way of code switching and reasons to do that even in the same generation of a particular village, which makes it even more difficult to come up with on single approach for understanding code switching practices.

---

[4] People from Zadar

[5] Pejorative term for people from non coastal villages in the vicinity of Zadar

Story about Duje

While I was conducting research in my village during the month of April in 2010, Duje, a 22 year old man from Petrčane happened to be a contestant on a popular Croatian TV singing show, similar to American Idol, called "Hrvatska traži zvijezdu". This show was aired every Friday on national TV, alongside with a separate TV show that showed contestants throughout their days as they are preparing for their singing contest and interacting with each other in a house in the capital city, Zagreb, they all lived in. Contestants on this show are regular Croatians with aspirations for a singing career. Duje achieved considerable success at this competition, since among 5000 people auditioned for the show, he got to be among top three contestants, before he was voted out of the contest. Other than observing his language, I found out that some people in the village were discussing and advising him which language variety he should use on national TV, which makes this case useful in analyzing language usage in a public domain as well as attitudes toward different language varieties among this community.

Duje's image in this show was that of the typical Dalmatian. Dalmatia is a coastal region of Croatia where Petrčane is situated and it has its own characteristics which distinguish it from other regions in Croatia. Primarily Dalmatians are recognized by their dialect, which has some common attributes throughout this region, although it varies in some aspects in different towns and villages. Dalmatian dialect uses *ikavica* reflex[6]*,* while the standard and some other dialects use *ijekavica* reflex. Namely, this means that words will have *i* or *ije* in the middle, depending on which language variety is utilized (see table 3).

---

[6] A reflex is "an element in a language, as a sound, that has developed from a corresponding element in an earlier form of the language: The (ō) in "stone" is a reflex of Old English ā" (Dictionary.com).

Table 3. Differences between *ikavica* and *ijekavica*

English language	*Ikavica*	*Ijekavica*
white	*Bilo*	*bijelo*
pretty	*Lipo*	*lijepo*
rock	*stina*	*stijena*

Duje was using *ikavica* in his speech, which is also part of the Petrčane language variety. What distinguished him from other Dalmatians that were present at the beginning of the show, and that were using mostly urban Dalmatian dialect, is that he used Petrčane dialect, a village Dalmatian dialect. The show host and the members of the jury remarked upon this at several instances, by joking about his coastal village background.

His image as a Dalmatian also came from the songs he chose. Aside from being a contestant in this show, Duje has been singing in a *klapa* ensemble for a while. *Klapa* singing is a traditional Dalmatian *a capella* singing, with topics that typically revolve around love, Dalmatia, olive trees, sea and sun. This image worked very well for him, especially alongside his jokester personality, and soon he became a very recognizable contestant in the show. Every time he would come to the audition at the beginning of the contest, and later as he got to perform on live TV airings, the members of the jury would automatically recognize him as a jokester and anticipate his funny remarks. Backstage he would often crack jokes about his village background, for instance, once he called his family on the phone and asked "did you tie the donkey in the shade?" This was an obvious joke because he does not own a donkey, nor anyone else in the village, since people are mostly in tourism industry and it is rare that someone would have any type of animals anymore (although most people do still have olive groves or some other type of fields). This type of jokes might have been his way of dealing with the stigma that often surrounds people from rural areas. It seems he addressed this stigma

in a positive way because he could possibly anticipate that this is something that will be addressed by others sooner or later anyway. As Goffman states in *Stigma*:

> The special situation of the stigmatized is that society tells him he is a member of the wider group, which means he is a normal human being, but that he is also 'different' in some degree, and that it would be foolish to deny this difference" (1990:149).

At times, members of the jury in the show would joke around his village background as well. Once a member of the jury told him he is such a villager, and that he loves that. Although he was always addressed with a lot of sympathy, this could show some condescending attitudes toward people from small villages. In any case, his village Dalmatian image has proven to be very useful, since he got to be among three top contestants. A lot of his success in reversing the rural stigma for his benefit, comes from his open character and a decision to present himself as a proud member of the somewhat stigmatized group. Since he does have the right personality to take in all the jokes about his background, he adopted a complete "in-group alignment" in Goffman's sense (1990). "The stigmatized individual in mixed contacts will give praise to the assumed values and contributions of his kind. He may also flaunt some stereotypical attributes which he could easily cover" (Goffman 1990:138).

On the local level, while I was conducting interviews with people in the village, it was very interesting to find out that Duje talked to people in Petrčane, and was advised by them about which language variety he should use. J., a café owner in the village, told me that she advised him to stick to the village variety, and speak as he usually does. She explained this by saying that if he tried to use the standard language, he might make a mistake, and also she thought he should take pride in this language and just use it on national TV. J. was very insightful to recognize that hypercorrection of the language might not be useful for Duje. In Bourdieu's analysis of the petit-bourgeois language patterns, it is seen that this hypercorrection is not the best approach, and it actually differentiates the petit-bourgeois from 'real' bourgeois class even more (1990).

"The petit-bourgeois hypercorrection which seeks it models and instruments of correction from the most consecrated arbiters of legitimate usage – Academicians, grammarians, teachers – is defined in the subjective and objective relationship to popular 'vulgarity' and bourgeois 'distinction'" (Bourdieu 1990:63).

Duje took J.'s advice, which worked well for him. I did notice at few times, although determined to use the village variety that he unconsciously switched to the standard. This switching can be explained by the pressure a TV appearance can bring on someone, because TV is a public domain where one would expect to use a standard language.

Duje united the village with his TV appearance and his over the top image as a guy from Petrčane. Many people in the village voted for him regularly, commented about his performance and most people watched this contest, either at home or at the local cafe. His TV appearances had an impact on the village life, as everyone got involved in some way in this story. Most people supported him to the full extent, and voted for him passionately, while some watched the show regularly but did not put as much enthusiasm in helping him win. Only small segment of the village's population did not care for his success, and only few were annoyed by it. In any case, many people would get together to watch the show or comment about it later. His closest friends and relatives followed him to Zagreb and were his biggest fans. A bus was organized by the show to take fans to Zagreb every Friday to support him. When approached by TV cameras, fans usually stressed they came from Petrčane to support him. They also had a big picture of the village which they held while they were in the audience. Duje would get much support from the residents of the village anyway, but in my opinion they supported him to such great extent, because he represents the village as a whole through his image.

Conclusion

Linguistic situation in Croatia in general is a very interesting focus of study. The reasons for this lay in the diversity of dialects in this small country, but also in the language policies of the newly founded state. The imposition of the new Croatian standard language, the conscious eradication of the Serbian words and phrases from the language, as a part of state policies, all contribute to the complex linguistic practices of this country. The complexity of language choices are evident in the village Petrčane as well, since people often code switch between three language varieties, the village one, the Zadar variety and the standard Croatian language. Explaining the language strategies in Petrčane is not a simple task. The three theoretical approaches to code switching employed in this research, namely The Markedness Model, Speech Accommodation Theory and Relevance Theory showed to be useful in some instances, but they could not explain language patterns as a whole. Each of these approaches worked well in explaining some of the situations when code switching is employed, but none were sufficient to clarify all code switching practices.

Bourdieu's notion of symbolic domination worked well in explaining the linguistic pressures that the urban area, Zadar, is exercising over the rural area of Petrčane. Zadar variety is much closer to the standard Croatian, which is imposed on many levels to all citizens of Croatia, than the Petrčane one. This is why the Zadar variety holds much more prestige and therefore the speakers of the Zadar variety often look down on the village language variety and openly ridicule people from Petrčane. This certainly can have profound effect on code switching strategies of people from this village. Symbolic domination seems to work on many levels. The standard variety dominates the Zadar variety, and in turn the Zadar variety dominates the village variety. However, it can be seen from the insights of my informants R. and M., who mentioned the different attitudes toward people and language varieties of the non-coastal villages in comparison to the coastal villages, which demonstrates

the complexity of symbolic domination. It was difficult to bring any definite conclusions on the code switching practices in this village, since even people from the same generation, such as the ones from 17-25 years of age, have very different language patterns and attitudes toward language. Some comply with the symbolic dominance, some resist it, and some, such as Duje, manage to turn around the stigmatized village identity that is explicitly shown through the language, to their own advantage. Code switching is a complex phenomenon that deserves special attention and individual approach to every case. Applying one or more all-encompassing theories is not enough to explain it, since language usage reflects the complexity of social and political issues in a certain community, which are reflected through the symbolic domination that one group exercises over another.

Further research on the code switching practices stemming from the Petrčane case study could be useful in comparing the language patterns of the region of Dalmatia as a whole, in order to see if there are any similarities in language usage in other coastal villages. It would be also interesting to compare the code switching practices of the villages in the continental Croatia with those of the Dalmatian villages. Differences in lifestyle in these two regions could possibly reflect on different usages of code switching.

References

Bilaniuk, Laada. 2005. Contested Tongues. *Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine*. Cornell University, USA.

Bilosnić, Tomislav Marijan.2009. *Petrčane*. Biblioteka Povjesnice, Zadar.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.

Boztepe, Erman. 2003. "Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models". Teachers College, *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 3 (2).

(http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/viewPDFInterstitial/32/37)

Chan, Brian, Hok-Shing. 2005. Conversational code-switching and Relevance Theory. Paper presented at the *9th Conference of International Pragmatics Association* (IPrA9), held at Riva Del Garda, Italy, July 15, 2005.

Colic-Peisker, Val. 2004. Doing Ethnography in one's own community. In *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation* edited by Lynne Hume and Jane Mulcock.

Dictionary. Com. (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reflex.)
Accessed June 1st 2010.

Elster, Jon. 1994. "The Nature and Scope of Rational Choice Explanation". Chapter 20 in *The Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre, eds.,Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, A Bradford Book.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford, England; New York, NY, USA.

Friedland, Roger. 1987. "Giddens' Golden Gloves". *Contemporary Sociology*, 16(1):40-42.

Gal Susan. 1987. "Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery". *American Ethnologist* 14(4): 637-653.

Gellner, Ernest. 1981. "Nationalism". *Theory and Society*, 10(6): 753-776.

40

Giddens, Anthony. 1987. *The Nation State and Violence Volume Two of A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giglioli, Pier Paolo eds. 1990. *Language and Social Context.* Penguin Books, England.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books. Great Britain.

------. 1990. *Stigma*. Penguin Books,USA.

Gržan, Zvonimir. 1999. *Petrčki Baul*. Otokar Krešovani Rijeka.

Heller, Monica. 1995. "Language Choice, Social Institutions, and Symbolic Domination". *Language in Society* 24(3): 373-405.

Hrvatska Traži Zvijezdu. (http://www.htz.rtl.hr/). Retrieved April 10 2010.

Jahn, Jens-Eberhard. 1999. "New Croatian language planning and its concesquences for language attitudes and linguistic behavior – the Istrian case". *Language and Communication* 19.

Kapović , Mate. 2005. "Jezični utjecaj velikih gradova". *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje,* 30(1): 97-105.

Kossler, Reinhart. 2002. "The Modern Nation State and Regimes of Violence: Reflections on the Current Situation". *International Seminar: Violence, Media and Challenges of Modern Societies.*

Kulick, Don. 1992. *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.

Mićanović, Krešimir. 2006. "Mjesto standardologije u jezikoslovnoj kroatistici". *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću.* Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

------. 2005 . "Hrvatski s naglaskom". *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 30(1).

Myers-Scotton Carol. 1993. "Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural

Factors in Codeswitching". *Language in Society* 22(4): 475-503.

McCrone, Davis and Kiely, Richard. 2000. "Nationalism and Citizenship". *Sociology*
34(1):19–34.

Tserdanelis, George and Wong, Wai Yi Peggy. 2001. *Language Files*. The Ohio State
University. Editors. Ninth Edition.

Urciuoli Bonnie. 1995. "Language and Borders". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24(4): 525-
546.