



Indrė Nugaraitė

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND ITS INFLUENCE ON LITHUANIAN MIGRANTS. SAMOGITIANS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THEIR LANGUAGE VARIETY

Summary. The study tries to bridge the gap between research on how the Lithuanian language and its varieties are spoken and maintained by migrants and on how the standard language ideology affects the speakers of regional varieties in Lithuania. The paper investigates Lithuanian Samogitian migrants' attitudes towards their regional variety, the main factors that might influence their beliefs and whether the standard language ideology is one of these factors. The in-depth analysis of 10 audio-recorded and coded interview responses has shown that in migration, similarly as in Lithuania, people's attitudes towards Samogitian and the usage of it are governed by the three main factors, namely education, Soviet language policy and the linguistic pressure from society. Even though migrants do not feel intense pressure to speak the "right" language and feel much freer to use the variety of their choice when talking to other migrants, they still believe that it is common sense to use the standard in official gatherings, for public speeches or for official events.

Keywords: linguistic attitudes; language ideology; dialect; migration.

Introduction

The standard Lithuanian language ideology almost undoubtedly affects speakers' attitudes towards regional varieties in Lithuania. As current studies suggest, even though consciously people express positive attitudes towards their own or other regional varieties, the subconscious attitudes show significantly worse social value of dialects. Standard language ideology affects people without their actual realisation. This is achieved through radio, television, other media, and, most importantly, at school (Vaicekauskienė, 2013, p. 10).

However, speakers who are not directly exposed to such ideological influences, for example, those living in countries other than Lithuania, might express different attitudes. Considering this, the question arises whether Lithuanian migrants are influenced by the standard language ideology even though they are not affected by it daily? Therefore, this research is driven by the interest in what Samogitian migrants' attitudes towards their regional language

variety are, what key features play a role in shaping them, and whether the standard Lithuanian language ideology is one of those features.

Methodology and Data Collection

This study embraces three major categories in which studies on language attitudes usually fall, as described by Agheysi and Fishman (consider Agheysi & Fishman, 1970, p. 140). It foregrounds respondents' attitudes and, usually stereotypic, impressions towards Samogitian, its usage and speakers.

The results of the study rely on the in-depth analysis of the data elicited from semi-structured interviews with Samogitians currently living in Germany and short observation of their linguistic behaviour. In total, 10 respondents from various places in Germany, namely Berlin, Hamburg, Hesse, and Rhineland-Palatinate have been interviewed which allows to see the main tendencies among different regions in Germany.

Why Samogitia?

Samogitia (Lith. Žemaitija) is one of the five historical geographic and ethnographic regions in Lithuania, currently resided by Samogitians (Butrimas, 2001, p. 3, Zinkevičius, 1994, p. 25). The main language variety spoken in the region is Samogitian or Žemaitian. It is one of the most widely spoken language varieties in Lithuania, the other one being Aukštaitian. Samogitian is considered to be much more modern than Aukštaitian, as it is more distinct from the original Proto-Baltic (SIL 2016). It is, in fact, so distinct from Aukštaitian that it is sometimes considered as a separate language (Ivinskis, 2004, p. 32, Kulevičius, 2012, p. 230, Kubiliūtė, 2011, p. 3).

Existing literature on Lithuanian migrants has shown that they maintain close relations with their home country (Bagdonavičienė et. al., 2013, p. 35, Sinickaitė and Labanauskas 2006 qtd. in Paužienė, 2011, p. 6, International Organisation for Migrants 2017). It is believed that for Samogitians these relations are even stronger as they are widely known for their strong positive feelings towards their region and language (variety) and their stubbornness. For

this reason, namely Samogitian has been chosen as the main object for this study.

Language Attitudes and the Standard Language Ideology

Attitudes towards language is a complex phenomenon which is currently widely investigated among scholars. The focus of such analyses is the influence of speakers' linguistic beliefs and opinions on the relations between different speech communities, language maintenance, policy of intercultural communication (Saville-Troike, 1990, p. 181–182, Brown, 2006, p. 329–330), family members, friends, community, media (Baker, 1992), and particular situations where the certain language variety is used (Garrett, 2010, p. 110). Attitudes are associated with feelings and have to do with speakers' behaviour towards language or language variety (Giles & Coupland, 1991, p. 12, Brown, 2006, p. 329–330, Agheyisi & Fishman 1970, p. 138).

Kristiansen distinguishes three attitudinal groups, those being official, conscious, and subconscious attitudes (2004, 2009, 2011). While official and consciously expressed attitudes are similar most of the time, the subconscious one might strike a difference (Kristiansen, 2004, p. 100). Therefore, if language users officially express that some language variety is "better" than the other but in practice they continue using the second one, it might be that their decision is governed by the subconscious attitudes and that is what is taken into consideration. Some researchers suggest that usually the way how attitudes are expressed in a conversation, which also includes a sociolinguistic interview, is driven by basic rules of communication (Maass et al., 1989); therefore, it is important to go beyond the declarative attitudes to understand how prejudice and stereotypes are unconsciously implicit in self-declarations of the interviewees (Gawronski and Payne, 2010). It is important to analyse "deeper" layers of respondents' attitudes to understand whether and why people do (or don't do) things that they say they do. Kristiansen also notes that "subconsciously offered attitudes influence language use in a way that consciously offered attitudes do not" (2004, p. 102).

The standard language ideology is defined differently among scholars, for example, Rumsey describes it as "shared bodies of common-sense notions about the nature of language in the world" (1990, p. 346). Heath narrows the broad Rumsey's definition by emphasising the social point of the standard language ideology and characterising it as "self-evident ideas of members as they contribute to the expression of the group" (1989, p. 53), whereas, Silverstein puts more emphasis on the activist nature of the standard language ideology, saying that it is a "set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structures and use (1979, p. 193).

Language users are usually not aware that their attitudes have been conditioned by such ideological influences (Milroy, 2001, p. 535). On the contrary, they tend to see it as common sense that some forms are better than the others and believe that similar opinions are shared among virtually everyone. Although, it is, indeed, the ideologies that is the main drive for public opinions, people who hold such attitudes believe that their beliefs are driven by purely linguistic judgements, not an ideological influence (Milroy, 2001, p. 535, 2006, p. 133).

As Milroy points out, it is now unacceptable to openly express discrimination towards people based on race, ethnic group, social class or similar. However, it seems that inequity towards language is still widely accepted. The choice of one language variety over another is usually influenced by factors that are outside the boundaries of simply standardisation process per se and that is what constitutes the standard language ideology (Milroy, 2006, p. 135).

The standard language ideology is a mental phenomenon (Woolard, 1998, p. 5–7), closely related to the prescription and the prestige of language (Milroy & Milroy, 1999, p. 10). It affects speakers' beliefs and attitudes even though they are not usually aware of that, judging their attitudes to be common sense (Milroy and Milroy, 1999, p. 346). Even though the open discrimination is reprehensible, the distinguishing between "right" and "wrong" language varieties is still widely acceptable. This is the consequence of the process of standardisation which also constitutes the standard language ideology (Milroy and Milroy, 1999, p. 11, Armstrong & Mackenzie, 2013, p. 5).

In Lithuania, the standard language and its influence on speakers is a rather concerning issue. The State Language Policy Guidelines declare

the standard Lithuanian language as the main variety in the daily life of the country which should be maintained. The maintenance of the standard variety is understood as continual codification of phonetical and grammatical forms of the language as well as the control of the public use of it (2003, p. 2). The standard variety is considered to be the absolute which is used in any spheres of life whereas other varieties of the Lithuanian language are given rather low prestige in everyday life (Raila & Subačius, 2012, p. 25).

Several researches on the attitudes towards regional varieties of Lithuanian (consider those by Ramonienė (2006) or Vaicekauskienė (2013)) show that they are sometimes rather negative (Ramonienė, 2006, p. 142–143). Negative attitudes towards regional language varieties might also be a heritage that is still traced since the Soviet times when dialects have been viewed as hindrance in communication or an indication of a poor education (Girdenis, 1981, p. 13).

On the other hand, in the present day, the regional varieties in Lithuania are acquiring higher prestige than in the past. The conscious attitudes expressed by school students in various regions in Lithuania show that they tend to put their own regional variety on the higher position than the standard (Vaicekauskienė, 2013, p. 16). However, when investigating the subconscious attitudes of the same learners, it is revealed that subconsciously they still think that the standard variety of Lithuanian is better than their own dialect (Ramonienė, 2006, p. 143). The analysis of the subconscious attitudes of school students towards their regional varieties shows that the dialect usage is associated with qualities as being “from a village”, “old-fashioned”, “poor-educated” but is considered to be “friendly”, “warm”, “fun” person. At the same time, the speaker of standard Lithuanian is seen as “well-educated”, “clever”, but “cold”, and “serious” (Vaicekauskienė, 2013, p. 18).

As current studies show, even though the situation of the dialects in Lithuania is improving, speakers’ attitudes towards their regional varieties are still rather negative. This might be due to the standard language ideology which has widely spread through various media throughout the country. The question arises whether speakers of Lithuanian dialects who live in foreign countries are also influenced by standard Lithuanian language ideology and whether they share similar attitudes towards their language varieties as those who live in Lithuania.

Use of Samogitian Before and In Migration

The analysis of the responses of the interviewees has revealed that when living in Lithuania, most of the interviewees spoke Samogitian only in their own region or when they talked to a person that they knew. Consider the following example:

(1)R5: *Samogitian? Well no... well how to put it... If you go somewhere often, if you know the person then you speak Samogitian with them. But if you speak with a stranger then Lithuanian. Or if you go to Kaunas or the capital then you speak the standard (male, 60–69).*

Such behaviour can be understood as a “safe zone” of a person. If others speak this way there is no danger to appear as a worse person than them by using a dialect. In comparable situation are those interviewees who speak Samogitian only with the people that they know. If a person knows that the communication partner speaks the dialect, there is no risk to be judged as being “from a village” or accorded low prestige. At the same time, if not sure whether the partner of a conversation speaks dialect or not, it is safe to use the standard to appear smart or as having high prestige.

Subconsciously associating the standard with high prestige, speakers choose to use it even in Samogitia because they are afraid of being judged for using regional variety. The dialect is understood as “wrong” while the standard is ascribed to the “correct” way of speaking with non-familiar people and is a means to avoid being judged as less competent or less educated than a communication partner.

Subconscious attitudes of the respondents are expressed here to some extent. Even though some of them declare that they use Samogitian most of the time, the reality is different. Most of them do not use it if they are not sure that the other person speaks Samogitian as well. The desire not to show themselves as worse than the others is present and subconsciously they still associate Samogitian with a dialect with lower prestige than the standard.

The in-depth content analysis has shown that even after migration Samogitian remains the primary choice in the family for communication with their parents and their spouses, if they are both Samogitians. This applies to the first-generation migrants (Geel and Veder, 2009, p. 187) who have migrated to

Germany after graduating school in Lithuania. However, the situation of the family language policy regarding children tends to be rather different. Only three respondents are teaching or planning to teach their children Samogitian together with the standard Lithuanian. Some of them have a very strong opinion about the matter:

(2)I: And which language will your future children speak?

R6: *Well, they will have to know Samogitian, there is no other way... Well... well and German, of course, because, well... because we live in Germany* [laughing] (male, 40–49).

However, the majority, that is, five respondents express that they want their children to speak Lithuanian and not Samogitian and one is speaking half-Samogitian to her grandchild, that is, she is maintaining some features of the variety but not the most distinguished ones. Consider the following example:

(3)R4: *Well, [child] is, like, half and half of both. We don't really use mainly Samogitian words, use Aukštaitian instead, well, for example, when we speak Samogitian at home, we don't say to the child "išgerk **peina**" [Sam. drink the milk], we say "a **nenuori pieno?**" [Lit. don't you want some milk?]. Or **dounos** [Sam. bread], we say "valgyk [vaikė] **duona**" [Lit. eat the bread]* (female, 60–69).

As can be seen, when the respondent or other family members talk to the child, they still use Samogitian. However, they tend to reduce the strongest features of the variety, such as diphthongs (*ei*, *ou*) and use the standard form.

Although teaching their children the standard, parents, nevertheless, speak Samogitian to them. This suggests that the family language policy strongly affects the language choice of a speaker. Samogitian is associated with communication within family, and children are family; therefore, even though parents try to speak the standard, they proceed speaking the dialect. Subconsciously knowing that Samogitian is supposed to be used in the family they apply this knowledge to communication with their children as well.

Many respondents have stated that Samogitian is the language variety which is closer to heart or "feels like home"; therefore, it is understood that parents use this variety to express love towards their children which they might not be able to do with the standard. Standard is only the second language variety

that a dialect speaker learns, whereas the dialect can be equated to the mother-tongue variety. The mother-tongue usually is the variety that allows a speaker to express their feelings in the most convenient way. Therefore, even though teaching their children the standard because it will be more useful in the future than Samogitian, parents nevertheless choose to communicate with them in Samogitian, as this variety is close to their heart and helps them to express strong feelings towards their children.

Besides being a private language variety in families, Samogitian is also used for communication with other Samogitians that live in Germany. When asked where they use the variety, almost all respondents replied that they speak it with their friends. Furthermore, to the question whether there would be any situation in which the respondents would never speak the standard, almost all stated that they would never choose it when speaking with their Samogitian friends who also live in Germany.

(4)I: Would there ever be a situation where you would never choose to speak the standard? Where you think only Samogitian would be appropriate?

R1: *For me, it would be, I think [laughing]. Possible. If there are any other Samogitians... well I wouldn't use the standard with, for example, [a friend] (male, 40-49)*

Even though in migration, Samogitian remains the main choice in communication with parents and spouses, if they are Samogitian, the situation with children is already different. Most migrants choose the standard Lithuanian as variety to teach their children. The main reasons for such choice are the following: parents are anxious that learning three languages will be too difficult for a child and believe that the standard will be more useful in the future. However, even though teaching their children the standard, some parents still tend to use Samogitian with them, sometimes even without realising that. Moreover, the interviewees tend to use more Samogitian in public communication in Germany than they did in Lithuania.

Both in Lithuania and Germany, Samogitian has been the main variety of communication in the family. However, when talking about its usage in public sphere, the situation is rather different. In Lithuania, the interviewees were carefully choosing the variety in which to speak in a public discourse, whereas in

migration they speak their variety rather freely without a fear to be judged. Even though migrants want their children to speak the standard Lithuanian, most of them still use Samogitian in the family communication, usually without even realising that.

Migrants' Attitudes Towards Samogitian

Studies on speakers' attitudes towards their regional varieties in a country have been already published and have shown that people tend to express positive attitudes towards their regional variety, whereas subconsciously they still believe their variety to have lower prestige than the standard (Kristiansen, 2004; Vaicekauskienė, 2013). For this study, it is important to see whether the situation in migration is similar, as migrants are affected by different external and internal factors which have influence on their attitudes towards their heritage variety than those living in Lithuania.

At this point, it is already quite clear that Samogitian is widely used among migrants in Germany, even without being sure what the attitudes of migrants towards it are, both conscious and, to some extent, subconscious. To understand respondents' conscious attitudes, they were asked whether the feeling of being Samogitian decreased after migration or, on the contrary, became greater. The interviewees were not asked directly what they think about their language variety as the majority of them clearly expressed their attitudes when answering other questions.

The subconscious attitudes were examined by analysing the answers that were given to the questions about public use of Samogitian and situations where the interviewees think Samogitian would be inappropriate.

As expected, none of the interviewees expressed negative attitudes towards their regional variety. However, not all have shown completely positive opinions either. Half of the people expressed neutral attitudes towards Samogitian, that is, they are neither very positive nor very negative towards the variety. They say that they are Samogitians and speak Samogitian and it is just the way it is. Consider the following examples:

- (5)R2: ... *well for me there's no "to be proud or not to be". It's just how it is... if you are from Telšiai, then you are from Telšiai* (female, 30–39)
- (6)R5: *I don't feel very special that I'm Samogitian in either country [Lithuania and Germany]. Only human. Everyone is from somewhere, so you are who you are* (male, 60–69)

However, the other half of the respondents claimed that they have strong positive feelings towards their regional variety. Moreover, these feelings became even stronger after they had migrated:

- (7)R8: *I think of myself as Samogitian even more when I'm abroad...* (male, 40–49)
- (8)R10: *Therefore, I'm not hiding that I am Samogitian. On the contrary, I'm like: "I also know Samogitian, not only Lithuanian, like most of you"* (female, 30–39)

It is quite clear that conscious attitudes of migrants even though are not exactly as expected, do not strike very unexpected results. Many respondents are thinking positively about their regional variety, whereas other express neutrality towards it.

However, even though all respondents speak positively about Samogitian and its usage, the short observation of their linguistic behaviour and deeper analysis of their answers to particular questions, have shown that subconsciously they might have rather different attitudes from what they officially declare. First, analysis has been performed on what respondents answered to the question: *Did you speak Samogitian in public places in Lithuania? For example, in a shop, library, medical institution, etc?* While the majority of answers support the expressed positive attitudes of migrants towards their regional variety, two responses contradict them to some extent. In the following examples, the two answers can be seen:

- (9)I: How were you speaking in public discourse in Lithuania? Let's say while shopping, with your doctor, in a library?
- R4: *Well... no... not Samogitian...* (female, 60–69)
- R2: *Well let's say like this: we tried not to speak Samogitian, tried to speak standard but still it was there, Samogitian* (female, 30–39)

These two respondents chose the standard over Samogitian even when still living in Lithuania, Samogitia. Even though they both express rather neutral conscious attitudes towards the variety, they still choose not to use it in any kind of public discourse.

The following response by the interviewee R7 seems to be rather similar to the latter ones:

(10) R7: *I want my children to know at least Lithuanian. Well they speak German of course, with their father and at school. And I only speak Lithuanian to them... well but not Samogitian, no... I don't speak Samogitian at all, only Lithuanian.* [Nuoriu, kad vaikai bent jau lietuviškai mokėtų. Nu **anie**, aišku, vokiškai šnek_ su tėvu **i** mokykloj_, nu bet aš tai tik lietuviškai su **anais**... nuu bet ne žemaitiškai, ne... nebešneku aš jau žemaitė, tik lietuviškai.]

The respondent claims that she does not use Samogitian and speaks only what she considers to be a standard. However, the short linguistic observation has shown that the main language variety that she uses to speak with her children is Samogitian. In the original transcript, the most key features of Samogitian are found in the respondent's speech. She uses the Samogitian diphthongs *uo* instead of the vowel *o* which would normally be used in the standard. In her speech, there are also other features that are common to Samogitian such as dropping of endings as well as particular lexis.

The most interesting observation is that the husband of the respondent, who is German but has learned what he thinks to be standard Lithuanian, is also speaking the mixture of the standard and Samogitian. It might be understood that the respondent herself does not realise that she uses Samogitian. Consciously she thinks that she speaks the standard; however, subconsciously, she still chooses to speak Samogitian.

The examples presented above signalise that even though declaring rather neutral attitudes towards Samogitian, the respondents still choose to preserve their variety to private communication only. This might be because subconsciously they might have positive attitudes towards the variety per se but rather negative attitudes towards the *usage* of it, especially in the public discourse.

When talking about attitudes towards the usage of the variety, quite different tendencies can be seen among respondents. Vast majority of the respondents would not choose Samogitian for public speaking in front of the audience or for communication in official settings. This suggests that even though respondents think positively about their variety, their attitudes towards the usage of it in official settings are rather negative. The interviewees indicate the two main reasons why they think Samogitian is not a suitable variety for public speaking. First, because other people might not understand what they are saying and second, "it is the way it is, the standard has to be used in official communication". In other words, the second reason might be understood as the common sense. The respondents tend to see it as common sense that the standard is more suitable for official communication than Samogitian and believe that similar beliefs are shared among everyone. However, it may be argued that, in this case, the ideology of the standard is the main drive for such attitudes.

While the first reason would seem rather logical because it is impossible to deliver a speech in language that the audience does not understand and to expect to be understood, one respondent makes a good remark. Consider the following excerpt from the group interview:

(11) I: Would there be any situation where you would never use Samogitian? Only the standard would be appropriate?

R1: *There wouldn't. Well, sometime happens, that people from Aukštaitija don't understand... then I would speak the standard.*

R2: *Well, let's say in some kind of gatherings, meetings... well, we have here our local Lithuanian community and if there is any kind of public speech, I never... I would never use Samogitian... if I had to give a public speech. And even you don't speak Samogitian, don't deny. [addresses R1].*

R1: *For understanding... not because I'm embarrassed by Samogitian or something. Only because I want other people to understand.*

R2: *I don't think it's because of that. Because I know many people here who only speak Samogitian, in any situation, and others understand them very well.*

This discussion between the respondents R1 and R2 illustrates very well that conscious and subconscious attitudes are sometimes very different. The respondent R1 states that he uses the standard in public only because he wants other people to understand. However, R2 claims that she knows people who

always use Samogitian in all the communication and are always understood, resulting that the R1's reasoning about wanting to be understood is actually not a reason at all. In fact, one interviewee stated that he uses Samogitian for all the communication, including public speeches and other official settings:

(12) I: Would there ever be a situation where you would never use Samogitian?

R6: *Never? No, there wouldn't be such situation [laughing]. Well, if it's my language then why not speaking it? I always use Samogitian.*

I: Even if you have to deliver a public speech or speak in an official setting?

R6: *Well yes... well maybe I change the hardest, strongest Samogitian words... don't use them... but still I only speak Samogitian.*

I: And if people don't understand?

R6: *Never happened before [laughing] They always understand (male, 40-49).*

This interview with the respondent R6 shows clearly that Samogitian is understood among the audiences and actually cause few or no problems for Samogitian speakers. Therefore, the argument that one should speak standard in the official environments in order to be understood becomes not valid.

With the argument of understanding becoming not a valid reason for using the standard instead of Samogitian in public, two other possible reasons emerge. First, respondents assume that it is common sense to think that one should use standard to be understood. Therefore, the only reason why the respondents choose standard over Samogitian for official communication is common sense. Such choice of variety is imposed on the speakers "from above", creating a gap between "correct" and "incorrect" language, that is the "right" language variety suitable for public speaking and the "wrong" one which is to be left for private communication. Although speakers believe their attitudes to be common sense (one must speak standard for public communication because it is acceptable) and driven by purely linguistic judgements, what they do not realise that they are, in fact, affected by the ideology of the standard language (Milroy, 2001, p. 535, 2006, p. 133).

Second reason why some respondents choose to use the standard for public speaking is that standard is automatically associated with power and

authority. It is commonly assumed that those who speak the standard have more power than dialect speakers. Therefore, when delivering a public speech, a person tries to achieve superiority over others by using the standard. Even though the respondent R1 declares very positive conscious attitudes towards Samogitian, subconsciously he still associates it with low prestige and does not want to be seen as powerless. The usage of standard allows him to seem powerful and authoritative and to leave a significant impact on the audience.

When talking about maintaining authority, the ideology should be mentioned as well. It has been already discussed in the earlier chapters, the term ideology refers to ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power (Woolard, 1998, p. 7). As the standard helps the speaker to maintain power over the audience, it might be concluded that the ideology of the standard language, indeed, has an influence on the speakers and their attitudes towards the usage of Samogitian.

Even though Samogitians themselves do not agree on whether Samogitian is a separate language or a dialect, the study reveals that the majority of them still think of Samogitian as a dialect. Even though their opinions on this matter differ, their attitudes towards it are not unexpected: they vary from strongly positive to neutral. However, an in-depth analysis of the interviews has shown that even though respondents officially declare strong positive attitudes toward Samogitian itself, subconsciously they tend to associate the language variety with low prestige and powerlessness. The usage of the standard in official occasions suggests that the (sub)conscious attitudes of migrants towards the usage of Samogitian in public are rather negative.

Main Factors That Influence Migrants' Attitudes

After being able to understand the patterns of usage of Samogitian among migrants and their attitudes towards it, it is important to determine the most principal factors which influence the migrants' attitudes towards their regional language variety.

The in-depth analysis of the interviews has shown that in migration, similarly as in Lithuania, migrants' attitudes towards Samogitian and the usage of it are governed by the three main factors:

Education: School is the first place where learners are introduced to the standard as the main variety of official communication leaving dialect to the private sphere, that is, as a variety to be spoken with family and friends. The influence of school has been already noted by researches performed earlier and this study has confirmed the results by previous investigations. However, the current investigation has revealed new findings that have not been discussed by other researches. The analysis has shown that university, in fact, plays more significant role in shaping speakers' attitudes towards regional varieties than school. Consider the following example:

(13) R7: *When I was studying... well it happened, I was just accidentally using Samogitian... but later there was no such thing anymore, I managed not to do it accidentally anymore...* (female, 40–49).

University expands the usage of the standard beyond the boundaries of public communication, becoming not only the variety of official discourse but also adopting some of the private environment, as friends of dialect speakers might usually not understand the dialect.

Soviet language policy: Has strong influence on those who had attended school during the period of Soviet occupation. Such respondents tend to express stronger negative attitudes towards the usage of dialect in public environments, some even express an opinion that Soviet language policy changed the way Samogitians speak and that the nowadays Samogitian is not the "pure" Samogitian due to this policy:

(14) R3: *We, who went to school at earlier times... they were trying to diminish the Samogitian dialect, so our language is already not pure Samogitian, it is already strongly adapted, not real Samogitian* (male, 60–69).

It should be noted, however, that this factor mostly influences senior respondents, those who had attended school under the Soviet regime.

Society: One of the crucial factors that influences speakers' attitudes towards their language variety and the usage of it. The analysis has shown that the pressure of the society to speak the "right" way has a strong influence on respondents when choosing which variety to use in public communication.

- (15) I: How do you think, what are the attitudes of people in Lithuania towards people who speak dialect?
R4: *Earlier, they used to laugh even... when I came to study to Šiauliai, I said something wrong, oh how much laughter there was. (female, 60–69)*
R2: *Of course. When I came to gymnasium, I would say something, and everyone would laugh. I remember I said "einu į trobą" [Sam. I'm going into a room] instead of "einu į kambarį" [Lit. I'm going into a room]. Well and later said "guzikai" [Sam. buttons], everyone was collapsing of laughter (female, 30–39)*
- (16) R2: *Well let's put it like that. In Lithuania, the attitude towards dialects was negative. If you go to Kaunas or something and tell them that you are from Telšiai, then they think that you are... well... like, lower... well, like from a village. And here, I don't have such feeling that someone would think that we're worse than them because we are from a region (female, 30–39)*

However, interviewees claim that in migration they do not feel such intense pressure from society to speak the "right" variety as in Lithuania. While in the latter country, dialect speakers prefer to stay in the "safe-zone" by speaking the standard in unfamiliar occasions, they have no fear to use their regional variety with a person whom they do not know in migration. Therefore, many respondents stated that they use more Samogitian in public while in migration than they did in Lithuania.

Conclusion

Features such as the pressure to speak the "right" way, the decision to use one variety over the other because of common sense or thinking that the "wrong" variety is of low prestige and those who speak it are poor-educated, lead to what is referred to as the ideology of the standard language.

Many scholars believe that this phenomenon influences speakers' attitudes towards dialects and the usage of them. It was important for this study to understand whether the ideology of the standard also influences migrants as they are not usually directly exposed to it. The analysis has shown that migrants do not feel intense pressure to speak the "right" language and feel much freer to use the variety of their choice when talking to other migrants. No negative attitudes were expressed towards those who speak dialect in migration. On the other hand, interviewees still believe that it is common sense to use the standard in official gatherings, for public speeches or for official events. Therefore, even

though migrants' attitudes towards their regional language variety are still influenced by the standard Lithuanian language ideology, the influence is, for sure, lesser than on those who live in Lithuania.

The study reveals that the development of positivity towards regional varieties in Lithuania is rather stagnated. The main factor for it is the outdated educational system regarding dialects as well as deeply rooted negative attitudes towards regional variety speakers and the usage of dialects. To improve the current situation, first, the educational system should be modernised by removing the still existing Soviet language policy model and replacing it with a new dialect-positive schooling pattern. This would help to raise a new generation of dialect speakers who would share positive attitudes towards dialects and their usage and would not be influenced by the standard language ideology.

References

- Agheyisi, R. & Fishman, J. A. (1970). Language Attitude Studies: A Brief Survey of Methodological Approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12, 137–157.
- Armstrong, N., & Mackenzie, I. (2013). *Standardization, Ideology and Linguistics*. Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Languages*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Bagdonavičienė, Vida et al. (2013). Integruotas modelis, skirtas užsienyje gyvenantiems bei iš užsienio atvykusių lietuvių ir kitų šalių vaikų lituanistiniam ugdymui bei su jais dirbančių pedagogų ir kitų specialistų kvalifikacijos tobulinimui. *Lituanistinis modelis*. Kaunas.
- Brown, K. (Ed.) (2006). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 6. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Butrimas, A. (2001). Žemaičių istorijos ir kultūros ypatumai. *Žemaičių žemė*, 1, 2–4.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gawronski, B. & Keith P. (2010). A History of Implicit Social Cognition: Where Is It Coming From? Where Is It Now? Where Is It Going? In B. Gawronski & P. Keith (Eds.). *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement, Theory, and Applications*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Geel, M. & Vedder, P. (2009). The Role of Family Obligations and School Adjustment in Explaining the Immigrant Paradox. *Empirical Research*, 40, 187–196.
- Giles, Howard, & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: contexts and consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Girdenis, A. (1981). Tarmės ir mokykla. *Mūsų kalba*, 3, 12–16.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivinskis, A. (2004). Žemaičių klausimas ir nūdienos politiniai vėjai. *Naujasis židinys – Aidai*, 1, 32–36.
- Kristiansen, T. (2004). Social Meaning and Norm-ideals for Speech in a Danish Community. Jaworski, Coupland (eds.) *Sociolinguistics. A Reader and a Course book*. 100–162.
- Kristiansen, T. (2009). The macro-level social meanings of late-modern Danish accents. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 41, p. 167–192.
- Kristiansen, T. (2010). *Investigating language in space: Experimental techniques*. In: A. Peter and E. S. Jürgen (Eds.). *Language and Space. An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation. Volume 1: Theories and Methods*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 528–549.
- Kristiansen, T. (2011) *Attitudes, ideology and awareness*. In: R. Wodak, B. Johnstone & P. Kerswill (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics*, pp. 265–279.
- Kulevičius, S. (2012) "Žemaičių tapatumo vingiai XXIa.: savo praeities ir paveldo paieškos". *Acta humanitarica universitatis Saulencis*, 14, 224–245.
- Kubiliūtė, G. (2011). Žemaičių užsispyrimas dėl tautybės neblėsta. *15 min*, 26, p. 3.
- Maass, A., Salvi, D., Arcuri, L. & Semin, G. (1989). Language use in intergroup contexts: The linguistic intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57/6, 981–993.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English*. London: Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 530–555.

- Milroy, J. (2006). The Ideology of the Standard Language. In C. Llamas, L. Mullany & P. Stockwell (Eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, p. 133–139. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Paužienė, E. (2011). Metodinė priemonė „atvira visuomenė – lietuvis ateities sąlyga“ skirta darbui pagal mentorystės veiklų mokymo programą. Europos fondo trečiųjų šalių piliečių integracijai Lietuvoje metinė (2010 m.) programa.
- Raila, E., & Subačius P. (2012). Language Standardization and Forms of Ideological Education. *Lituanus. The Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 58, 18–30.
- Ramonienė, M. (2006). Nuostatos dėl bendrinės kalbos ir tarmės: Joniškėlio atvejis. *Kalbos kultūra*, 79, 137–148.
- Ramonienė, M. (2013). *Emigrantų kalba*. Vilniaus universitetas.
- Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist*. 92(2), 346–361.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1990). *The Ethnography of Communication. An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- SIL International. 2016. *ISO 639 Code Tables*. Retrieved from <http://www-01.sil.org/iso639-3/codes.asp>.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks & C. Hofbauer (eds.). *The Elements: A parasection on Linguistic Elements and Levels*, p. 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Tarptautinė migracijos organizacija (2017). Lietuvių bendruomenės užsienyje. Retrieved from <https://renkuosilietuva.lt/lietuviu-bendruomenes-uzsienyje/>.
- Vaicekauskienė, L. (2013). *Lietuvių kalba: idealai, ideologijos ir tapatybės lūžiai, 2010-2013*, projekto baigiamoji ataskaita.
- Valstybinės kalbos politikos 2009–2013 m. gairės (2008). Valstybinė lietuvių kalbos komisija. Vilnius.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1994). *Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija*. Vilnius: Šviesa.
- Woolard, K. (1998) "Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry". In S. Bambi, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, p. 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.

Indrė Nugaraite

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Lietuva; indre.nugaraite@gmail.com

STANDARTINĖS LIETUVIŲ KALBOS IDEOLOGIJA IR JOS ĮTAKA LIETUVOS MIGRANTAMS. ŽEMAIČIŲ POŽIŪRIS Į SAVO TARMĘ

Santrauka. Šiuo tyrimu siekiama sumažinti atskirtį tarp sociolingvistinių tyrimų apie lietuvių kalbos išlaikymą migracijoje ir bendrinės lietuvių kalbos ideologijos įtaką kalbos vartotojams. Straipsnyje analizuojamas žemaičių migrantų požiūris į žemaičių tarmę, pagrindiniai įtakos turintys faktoriai, žiūrima, ar bendrinės lietuvių kalbos ideologiją galima laikyti vienu iš šių faktorių. Giluminė dešimties sociolingvistinių interviu analizė atskleidė, jog, panašiai kaip ir Lietuvoje, migracijoje kalbos vartotojų požiūriui įtakos turi trys pagrindiniai veiksniai: išsilavinimas, sovietmečiu vykdyta kalbos politika ir visuomenės spaudimas. Nors migracijoje spaudimas kalbėti „teisingai“ yra kur kas silpnesnis nei Lietuvoje, daugelis užsienyje gyvenančių žemaičių renkasi bendrinę lietuvių kalbą, o ne dialektą, ypač oficialių renginių metu.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: kalbos požiūriai; kalbos ideologija; dialektas; migracija.