THE ATTITUDE OF SPEAKERS TO «LVIV REGIONAL DIALECT» (THE MATCHED GUISE TECHNIQUE)

Olesya Palinska

National University «Lvivska Politechnika»
vul. Bandery, 32d, Lviv, 79013, Ukraine
palinska_o@yahoo.com

The author of the article analyses language attitudes to the «Lviv dialect» using the matched guise technique. The author finds out language attitudes of speakers to idiom according to a status scale and a solidarity scale.

Key words: «Lviv dialect», the matched guise technique, language attitude, a status scale, a solidarity scale.

Language attitudes are a linguistic problem, which has begun to discuss in the Ukrainian sociolinguistics [1: 49], although researchers are studying the sociolinguistic problems, especially pay attention to the language policy, bilingualism, mixing languages (doublespeak) and other tangential issues (see [2]), practically without resorting to the analysis of the subjective perception of the speakers of their native language or other various idioms used in certain situations.

Instead, the language attitude in the global study of sociolinguistics relation has a long linguistic tradition. This term typically has got two slightly different concepts: the relation to the actual language (e.g. David Crystal's determination "Language attitudes - attitude that people have in their own language or in other languages" [3: 22]) or attitude towards people who speak a particular language, through their language (see [4: 87]). There may be other areas of research of the problem, such as: relationship to language in general, the motivation for the study of L1 and L2; language status or the status of its speakers, or some form of status (non-standard, high variant) language, its use in a specific (new, unconventional) sphere, in relation to language change (within the same community or in general) on the support of their own language, the attitude of the minority to its own non-standard dialect or language [5]. These problems in the studies tend to be closely linked, and as a subject of study is not objective, and often associated with affective assessments, respondents often actualize even those aspects which the researcher had not intention to learn.

Since the study of language attitudes on Ukrainian language material, as already noted, has not been performed, but the problem seems to be very interesting especially in traditionally multiethnic and multilingual regions, such as Western Ukraine, the article is devoted to the study of the attitude of citizens of Lviv to the traditional idioms that emerged in the city (and neighboring regions) compared with the attitude of the literary Ukrainian language. The purpose of the article is to identify language attitudes regarding "Lviv dialect" and standard Ukrainian language. To achieve this goal, the following objectives were set: using the matched guise technique relation to the citizens of Lviv to "Lviv idiom", match results affective and status characteristics, to compare the data with an open survey conducted in 2010 to identify differences in stereotypical and real attitudes of Lviv citizens to the regional dialect.

The matched guise technique is one of the indirect methods of sociolinguistic research, developed in the 1960s by Wallace Lambert based on the works of American psychologist Charles Osgood (literature review see particular [4, p. 86-110; 5]. This technique was developed to study interethnic attitudes using how other people form an

image based on listening their speech. Lambert suggested that the data obtained from respondents by public research methods do not allow sufficiently explore attitudes to people through the language (attitudes). Therefore, he proposed a new technique which is able to explore the unconscious factors that influence people's perceptions of each other. The main feature of this method is an enabling the researcher to eliminate the influence of the speaker's voice and the content of the text he reads, leaving only the effect of controlled language. To this end, the voices of people who are bilingual or speakers of two variants of one language, reading the same text or text versions in different languages are recorded. Then voices are placed in the order that the respondents will not be able to guess that some of the voices belong to the same person. Thus, the respondents believe that they hear twice as many votes as they are actually offered. During data analyses the researcher captures whether there is any difference in the assessment of the same person depending on the language he reads the text. If differences are found, the researcher can make a conclusion about the influence of language on the evaluation of the speaker.

At present the matched guise technique in its classical form or numerous modifications is considered to be a traditional tool for the study of language attitudes. Despite its great popularity, the method often has been criticized, particularly by the lack of validity, which is caused by the complexity of the synthesis of the data and application them to real life situations.

The working hypothesis of the research

In 2010, a research of media representations of Lviv Ukrainian language idioms, including attitudes towards speakers of language education [8]. The pilot survey carried out among the different regions of Ukraine found that respondents are not only persuaded in existence of specific "Lviv regional dialect", but say that they can identify it by ear by certain markers. In addition, all respondents gave a positive or at least neutral assessment to regional dialect; none chose option "speak only as ignorant people" or "a "rustic" dialect". Despite this, there is a reason to believe that respondents actually evaluated not real speech but mythologized idea of "Lviv" speech, as proved by responses to other questions, including linguistic unit. Therefore, this is the reason to believe that the real "Lviv" speech does not receive such high marks from respondents declared will not be confirmed experimentally. We assume that the idiom get a high score on a scale of solidarity and a low one on a status scale during the survey among responders from Lviv and Western Ukraine.

Experiment description

To determine the relation of language attitudes to "Lviv regional dialect" four texts were recorded. In contrast to the classical version of the matched guise technique, it was not the same text but a variation in tangential topics (common theme – radio calls), that variable "theme" could partly influence the experiment. To avoid this, the experiment respondents were asked to pay no attention to what people say but how they say it, because radio calls are a specific genre, where people can hide their true profession or social status, but cannot obscure manner of speaking. Texts were voiced by two speakers - a man and a woman each used two masks: Lviv resident and non-resident of the city. Tracks were arranged in the way that students could not guess that there were only two speakers: 1 - LM, 2 - UF, 3 - UM, 4 - LF (L – "Lviv" mask, U – "Ukrainian standard" mask, F – female voice, M – male voice).

Texts read by speakers, we submit with marked phonetic features "Lviv" speech (text LM and LF) or some non-normative elements uncharacteristic of Western Ukraine. For the transliteration, we use the international standard ISO 9, especially a version of ISO / R 9:1968 for the Ukrainian language.

(LM) [pro^{u}błéma tepłopo^{u}stačán' :a // to je taka pro^{u}błéma / šo sto^{u}sýjet' s' a do^u koždoho // to^{u}hó šo koly piv-místa ne máje ho^{u}rjáčoji vo^{u}dy cíłe líto // nu to/ znájete // i

tohó my płanujem toho róku zo^ubovjazáty vsi słýžby / jaki za to vidpovidájut / podaváty šomis' ac' a tki zvíty / šó zróbłeno / ko^uły / a jakšo ne zróbłeno // to xtó za to máje vidpovidáty // i tak ja dumaju zmóžemo navésty po^urjádok]

(UF) [u méne til' ky vynykáje zapytán' :a // kudy dyvyc' :a mis' ka vláda / kudy dyvyc' :a mer? // ce prósto xaos / povne bezhluzd' a i nevíhlastvo // nu i šč' e také // vidkryly telefón:u har□áč' y líniju mis' kóji rády // ja jakós' namahálas' a tudy zatelefonuváty // ce prósto neréal' no // dzvon□ú, dzvon□ú cilyj dén□ // telefón abo ne vidpovidáje / abo jakis' divč□átka / nič□óho ne znájut' / ni na šč□ó ne móžut' vidpovisty // ce vže prósto / bezvidpovidál' níst' ja v:ažáju]

(UM) [jak ce ne dyvno zvučyt' / ale u nas je velyka probléma z provéden' :am víl' noho čásu // my prósto ne vmíjemo vidpočyváty // ne znájemo / kudy sebe podíty // ce nasprávdi probléma / bez žártiv // nu móžna pity z pódruhoju v kafé / vypyty čášku kávy / nu móžna pogul' áty / v kinó sxodyty // ničóho bil' š cikávoho nam ne spadáje na hádku // take vrážen' :a / ščo l' údy zazvyčáj navmysno zavantážujut' sebe robótoju / prac' újučy dopizná / bo ne znájut' / jak oblaštuváty dozvíl' :a]

(LF) [znájete to tak jé / šo my vže tepér ne duže xóčem braty účast' v jakyxos' tkyx patriotyčnyx záxodax // to takóho jak to búlo v devjanóstyx vže teper nemá / šo divčáta xo^udyly u vyšyvánkax / na pásku kolo cérkvy kis□ zabávy ro^ubyly // to vs' o vže po^utróxu vidijšló / teper my skórše des□ pídem z koližankámy na kávu / i to ne v strójax a v jakyxos□ spídnyčkax i v méštax na obcásax /// to je vže tke po^ukolín' :a / to je tkyj čás]

To mark the speech as "Lviv regiolect" markers certified pilot corpus of texts that we collected in 2007 through interviews with residents of the city, whose family live in the city at least since 1938 were used [7]. This includes the following features:

- phonetic: bilabial [l] ([ł]), hard [p] in the position the soft ([po^urjadok]); "ukannya" (pronounce [o] like [u]) ([to^ubi]), west-Ukrainian accents ([róbl' u]);
- morphological: quasi-articles (**kis'** zabavy, **taki** zvity), **to**, **toj** 'that' in the sense **ce**, **cej** 'this';
- syntax: copula at the present tense (to **je** takyj čas);
- lexical: specific vocabulary (**koližanka** 'girlfriend', **mešty** 'shoes', **obcasy** 'heels', etc.), according to text corpus this vocabulary has a minimum frequency and a limited area of use, although respondents in the 2010 survey [8] consider them to be the most characteristic marker called "Lviv" speech.

As markers of "standard" (not "Lviv") speech were used literary structure, uncharacteristic for conversational speech (such as "l' údy zazvyčáj navmysno zavantážujut' sebe robótoju / prac' újučy dopizná / bo ne znájut' / jak oblaštuváty dozvíl' :a" 'people usually intentionally burden themselves with work, working late, because they do not know how to arrange leisure'), as well as some non-normative features, including the usage of soft [č'] and hypercorrect pronunciation.

Respondents were offered to listen to the texts and evaluate the speech according to certain characteristics that were divided into status (high vs. low status of the speaker) and affective (own vs. stranger). On a status scale the speaker was evaluated as a person who seems: intelligent, educated, opinion leader, successful, confident, leader. On a solidarity scale the speaker was evaluated as a person: sociable, sympathetic, the one you can trust, funny, the one who has a sense of humor, the one who might live next door.

In addition, respondents were offered to answer the following questions:
• In your opinion, what is this person?
• In your opinion, where does this person come from (region, urban / rural)?

Respondents listened to each interview, and then filled in a questionnaire about each speaker – put scores from 1 (not completely) to 7 (completely true), modeled on the semantic differential method. Additional questions provided an open answer option.

The results of the experiment

This was a pilot study, because there was no aim to interview the entire set of speakers or make a reliable general sample of the population, but only to check the validity of the methodology to address specific linguistic problems.

During the experiment 65 questionnaires were received with 18 male respondents and 47 female ones. The variables "age" and "education" were not included because the study was conducted only among students. Geography of participants is limited to the western region of Ukraine: Lviv – 25, Lviv region – 28, other – 12 (Volyn – 1, Transcarpathia – 1, Ivano-Frankivsk – 6, Rivne – 2, Ternopil – 1, Khmelnytsky – 1).

For each parameter survey results a mean was calculated, and they were compared in pairs L / U (male and female voice).

On a scale status the experimental results confirmed the working hypothesis: the speakers with "standard" speech were rated higher, and for male voice, these results even doubled (see Table 1).

Table 1. Results on a scale status (matching L / U)

	M	F
reasonable	3,42 / 6,05	3,7 / 3,76
educated	3,4 / 6,03	3,61 / 3,95
opinion leader	3,31 / 5,58	3,28 / 3,46
successful	3,14 / 5,57	3,6 / 4,11
confident	3,6 / 5,84	4,95 / 5,54
leader	2,91 / 5,49	3,6 / 4,12

Moreover, for female voice there was little difference in status for "Lviv" speech for speakers' roles (and by subject, and speaking rate, and the manner of expression "Lviv" speech sounded more authoritative than the "standard"), but all respondents still rated "standard" speech above status characteristics. Instead, the results for men's voices were significantly higher for UM, though the role of the speaker in the LM was higher. These data make it possible to state unequivocally that there is a relationship between the choice of language (in this case – the version of the language) and the attitude to the speaker.

On a solidarity scale, the results were far from straightforward (see Table 2): when for the female voice we can see at least a slight predominance of values of L over U, as it was assumed at the beginning of the experiment, for male voices, this advantage is seen only for option 'funny'. The marked values in the table indicate data that don't meet the working hypothesis.

Table 2. Results on a scale solidarity (matching L / U)

	M	F
friendly	**4,37 / 5,58**	5,95 / 4,14
cute	**3,17 / 5,12**	**4,4 / 4,85**
the one you can trust	**3,26 / 5,75**	3,95 / 3,11
fun	4,58 / 3,46	5,11 / 4,95
has a sense of humor	**3,94 / 4**	5,05 / 4,22
can live next door	**3,8 / 4,12**	**4,28 / 4,35**

It is significant that the most "clean" option of solidarity – "can live next door" – respondents preferred a "standard" speech, which means that "Lviv" speech seemed to

them not "own". This can partly be explained by the experiment manner: we should have separated interviews of people from Lviv and from other regions (even the Lviv region), and then compare them based on this variable. Although, in general, it is possible to state that a "Lviv" speech doesn't get good results from the inhabitants of Western Ukraine by affective characteristics (scale of solidarity). It should be noted that these results surprising to researchers is often the case: the same situation was in a study of d'Andleyan and Tucker attitude to the Canadian and European versions of French language in the Currants and Ryan Assessment of English and Spanish – English-Americans and Mexican-Americans, as well as in relation to studies of "white" and "black" versions of English in the United States (El-Dash , Tucker) and in three languages – English, Afrikaans and South African Xhosa (de Clerk, Bosch) (review problems in [4: 95 - 96]).

The answers of respondents to additional questions also confirm the assumption of low status idiom. Thus, according to the results of the experiment, the speaker LM has unprestigious profession: rural council employee, tractor driver, agronomist, coachman, guard, salesman. Only 7 participants in the experiment suggested that the speaker has a prestigious job (deputy of Lviv City Council, officer, entrepreneur). Instead the UM speaker was perceived by the respondents as a person of prestigious profession (priest, psychologist, teacher, director, politician, analyst). The case with a female voice was very much the same: many respondents identified in both cases the speaker's profession as a housewife, the seller (including the market), or a teacher, but when different versions of the "neutral" mask featuring such profession as a journalist, deputy city council, artist or a "high position" was inserted, the profession of "Lviv" mask was defined as worker in a country club, cooker, post officer. It should be noted that such occupations weren't imposed by the theme of the texts; therefore, the respondents evaluated only the manner of speaking.

A respondents' location (home) also shows a clear differentiation of speakers in the manner of expression. According to the respondents' answers one can trace a clear division "Lviv" votes as mostly "rural" (LM - village (27), town (3) small town (2) city (5); LF - village (16) urban village (2) town (2) city (16)), while a "standard" speech perceived solely as urban residents, including large ones.

According to the respondents, the geography of speakers' residence is quite broad. The location of "Lviv" speech carriers the respondents mainly define as Western Ukraine, sometimes specifying: Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Transcarpathian, Ternopil region, Galicia. Individual respondents identified the residence as announcers Central and Eastern regions of Ukraine (Dnipropetrovsk, Cherkasy region). Instead residence carriers "standard" speech referred to as Lviv as well as Galicia and other regions - Volyn, Poltava, Rivne region, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil, Khmelnitsky and Kharkiv and Donetsk. One of the respondents described a female speaker as a person who is a Lviv resident but moved to from the East.

In general it can be noted that the respondents, despite the certified not so high linguistic training and linguistic sense, gave unanimous assessment of the speaks according to the manner of their speech. In particular, the majority of respondents indicated geographic belonging to "the West" and "non- Western" Ukraine, as well as professional and social characteristics of the speaker, which confirm the low status "Lviv" idiom compared with standard Ukrainian broadcasting.

Conclusions

• The experiment showed that the respondents (mostly Inhabitants and residents of Western Ukraine) Lviv evaluate speech idioms as low status.

• The "Lviv" speakers uniquely obtained lower scores on a scale status.

• The research on a solidarity scale does not provide unambiguous results.

The analysis of broader linguistic data, including comparison attitudes on "Lviv" speech in Lviv residents and non-residents of Lviv, regional spread stereotypes of "Lviv"

(first language) identity and comparative analysis of subjective and objective data of Lviv residents' speech in different parts of Ukraine are the perspectives of future research.

1. Мацюк Г. Прикладна соціолінгвістика. Питання мовної політики : навч. посіб. / Г. Мацюк. – Львів : Видавничий центр Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2009. – 212 с.
2. Соціолінгвістичні студії / За заг. ред. Л. О. Ставицької. – К. : Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2010. – 288 с.
3. Crystal D. An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages / David Crystal. – Oxford : Blackwell, 1992. – 438 p. – P. 22
4. Вахтин Н.Б., Головко Е.В. Социолингвистика и социология языка. – СПб. : ИЦ «Гуманитарная академия»; Изд-во Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2004. – 336 с.
5. Schiffman H. F. The Study of Language Attitudes / Harold F. Schiffman // http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/attitudes/attitude.html
6. Saidat A. M. Language Attitude: The Case of Jordan / Ahmad Mahmoud Saidat // International Journal of Academic Research. – Vol. 2. – No. 6. – November, 2010, Part I. – P. 235 – 243.
7. Палінська О. Регіолект сучасного Львова: контактно-мовні процеси // Магістр гри слова. Філологічні дослідження, присвячені 60-річчю проф. Ф.С.Бацевича / Уклали О. Ясіновська, Л. Сваричевська / Львівський національний університет ім. І. Франка. – Луцьк : ПВД «Твердиня», 2009. – 470 с. – С. 294-305.
8. Палінська О. Класичний львівський регіолект і його сучасні інтерпретації // Мова і суспільство. – Львів : Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, 2011. – Вип. 1. – 234 с. – С. 174 – 180.