

CENTRUM FÜR INFORMATIONS- UND SPRACHVERARBEITUNG STUDIENGANG COMPUTERLINGUISTIK



Pravi Purgeri - Different language attitudes within the Kajkavian dialect family

Barbara Kovačić, Computational Linguistics at Ludwig-Maximilian-University Munich

The Croatian language, belonging to the BCMS language family, comprises three dialect families: Štokavian, Čakavian, and Kajkavian. These dialects differ in how they ask "what," using "što" for Štokavian, "kaj" for Kajkavian, and "ča" for Čakavian. The Štokavian dialect forms the basis of the Standard language, revitalized after the Yugoslavian war in the 1990s. Subsequently, Croatia has implemented an extensive language policy [1].

While this "puristic movement" led to a decrease of dialect speakers for both, Čakavian and Kajkavian, it seems that the Kajkavian speakers inhabiting the City of Zagreb, capital of Croatia, are resistant towards this trend. Looking at previous research [2][3][4], it looks like the speakers of Zagreb Kajkavian, which are often referred to as "Purger" (coming from the German word "Bürger", meaning "citizen" [5]), always had a very special language attitude towards their variety [6].

The concept of language attitude refers to individuals' reactions toward language varieties and their users, shaped by psychological and sociocultural factors. Consisting of an interplay of cognitive elements involving beliefs and stereotypes, affective aspects that pertain to evaluations, and behavioral dimensions that reflect observable actions and responses [7], several methods have been developed to research language attitudes such as the societal treatment approach, the direct approach and the indirect approach [8]. By doing so, the aim is to document and explain language attitudes as well as to understand the consequences of language attitude towards Non-Standard speakers and to find measures to reduce negative bias [9].

Therefore, this presentation aims to first analyze the characteristics of Zagreb Kajkavian and compare these to other Kajkavian dialects such as Međimurski Kajkavian and Zagorijan Kajkavian. Secondly, it summarizes previous research of language attitude of different Kajkavian communities, concluding in a research proposal to study the language attitude from both, Zagreb and other Kajkavian speakers, towards their dialect and the Standard language nowadays.

References

- [1] Mønnesland, S. (1997, October). Emerging literary standards and nationalism. The disintegration of Serbo-Croatian. In Actas do I Simposio Internacional sobre o Bilingüismo (pp. 1103-1113).
- [2] Šimičić, L., & Sujoldžić, A. (2004). Cultural implications of attitudes and evaluative reactions toward dialect variation in Croatian youth. *Collegium antropologicum*, *28*(1), 97-107.
- [3] Kalogjera, D. (2001). On attitudes toward Croatian dialects and on their changing status. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2001(147), 91-100. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.009
- [4] Škifić, S. (2011). (Re) creation of positive dialect appraisal and consequential dialect ideology: a study of overt attitudes towards Croatian Standard and dialect varieties. *LINGUISTICA E FILOLOGIA*, *31*, 65-91.
- [5] Neusius, B. (2008). *Sprache und Sprachbewusstsein in Kroatien: empirische Untersuchungen zum heutigen Kroatischen in Zagreb* (Doctoral dissertation, München, Univ., Diss., 2008).
- [6] Šimičić, L., & Sujoldžić, A. (2004). Cultural implications of attitudes and evaluative reactions toward dialect variation in Croatian youth. *Collegium antropologicum*, *28*(1), 97-107.
- [7] Garrett, P. (2006). Language attitudes. In *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics* (pp. 136-141). Routledge.
- [8] Kircher, R., & Zipp, L. (2022). An Introduction to Language Attitudes Research. In R. Kircher & L. Zipp (Eds.), *Research Methods in Language Attitudes* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108867788.002
- [9] Dragojevic, M., Fasoli, F., Cramer, J., & Rakić, T. (2021). Toward a Century of Language Attitudes Research: Looking Back and Moving Forward. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 40(1), 60–79.