

more up-to-date curricula and teaching methods, students might be more likely to opt for Slovene language studies rather than, say, English or German: there are, for example, about four times as many applicants for the study of English than can be admitted.

This spring, incidentally, a craze for playing marbles in Koper has shown in young children a unique ability—when given free rein—for innovative word formation in Slovene: they invented more than 20 new names for marbles. Thus, according to the material they are made from: *navadenka*, *steklenka*, *porcelanka*, *lesenka*, *železenka*, *papirka*, *plastična*; according to their designs: *marsovka*, *enoperesna*, *dvoperesna*, even *petdesetperesna*, and *kačarka*, *italijanska kačarka*, *superka*; according to their colors: *belka*, *rumenka*, *rdečka*, *zelenka*, *nevidenka*, *kokakolka*. Also, size-distinctions gave rise to marbles ranging from *batko*, the largest, through *polbatko* to *amerikanka*, *cicibanka* and so on. The hypernym for "marble" was not *frnikola* but the word used for decades in Koprščina, *ščinka*.

We have to admit a considerable influence of the Italian language upon the Slovene of Koprščina, but one cannot deny a certain amount of reverse influence, that of Slovene upon the Italian in Trieste and its environs. One excellent example is the use of the second person plural personal pronoun *voi* as the pronoun of address, which contrasts with the normal Italian use of the third person singular form *lei*. In Trieste the use of *voi* is increasing, and this is most probably under the influence of the Slovene usage of *vi*.

A lack of interest in studying Slovene in the towns on the Italian side of the border is a serious obstacle to closer co-operation. There is however one really outstanding institution which cultivates the use on a high cultural level of the Slovene language for the general public, the *Stalno slovensko gledali šče v Trstu*, which has put great efforts into preserving our language and heritage. With a carefully-chosen repertoire and by appointing the best Slovene performers, year after year it attracts the attention of theatre-goers in Trieste as well as from the Slovene Littoral. This spring they staged a brilliant performance of Tennessee Williams' *Rose Tattoo*, thus succeeding in combining a modern American text in a Slovene-language version upon Italian territory.

Notwithstanding all the pressures exerted upon the Slovene language in Koprščina and the broader Primorsko region, it has persisted and developed, and now, with the growing self-awareness of the Slovenes, has a firm basis to grow as a constituent of the whole.

### 3: THE CASE OF THE SLOVENE MINORITY IN ITALY

Emidij Susič, Università degli studie di Trieste

#### 1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present some data concerning the dimensions of our round table topic as they relate to the Slovene minority in Italy. These data, which relate to linguistic attitudes and to language use, were collected in several empirical investigations over the last twelve years.

These investigations dealt with only some of the segments of the Slovene ethnic community in Italy which lives in the Italy/Yugoslavia border area. The data and the commentary on them that are provided here are intended to provide only a hint—we may say, a glimmer—of the phenomena that interest us.

Let us first consider some general features of the Slovene ethnic or national community. In addition to Standard Slovene, other local varieties are widespread among the members of the community. One very important linguistic fact is that all the Slovenes in Italy are bilingual, since they know and use, in a more or less balanced way, at least one variety of Italian and one variety of Slovene. Bilingualism or plurilingualism involving the languages of these communities is not widespread among members of the majority group. Finally, at a social level, a diglossic—or, more precisely, a bi-diglossic—situation is present, involving the relationship between Standard Italian and Standard Slovene on the one hand, and on the other hand the relationship between two or more varieties of each of these two codes.

## 2. Language Attitudes

The linguistic preference of the Slovene minority group is of primary importance in a study of language attitudes. A 1977-78 survey including 378 adults from Udine Province showed that 43% of the respondents indicated a preference for the mother tongue and almost as many, 41%, for the Italian language (De Marchi 1982: 195).

TABLE I: EXPRESSED LINGUISTIC PREFERENCES OF SLOVENES, BY REGION							
preference	UDINE 1	GORIZIA-TRIESTE 2				GORIZIA 3	total
		TRIESTE		GORIZIA			
		URBAN	RURAL	URBAN	RURAL		
SLOVENE LV	43.0	76.4	90.4	67.5	87.2	83.0	80.0
ITALIAN LV	41.0	20.8	8.8	32.5	12.8	15.9	12.7
OTHER LV	16.0	2.8	0.8	---	---	1.1	7.3
N =	378	72	124	40	47	283	150

LV = language varieties. Figures are percentages.  
 1 = Udine 1977-78 (De Marchi 1982); 2 = Gorizia & Trieste 1980-81 (Štrukelj & Sussi 1983); 3 = Gorizia 1990 (Arko 1990)

We have more recent data for the provinces of Gorizia and Trieste. During the school year 1980-81 research was conducted into the motivation for learning and into the use of Slovene and Italian among Slovene senior high-school students. In this investigation, data were also collected on the language preference of 283 students. TABLE I shows a significantly high percentage preference for Slovene language varieties, 83%. This is understandable when one considers the characteristics of the respondents, while (as the table shows) the differences between urban and rural setting

must be emphasized (Štrukelj & Sussi 1983). The same question was asked of a group of 150 Slovene students attending a Slovene senior high school in Gorica/Gorizia in 1990. The responses were similar: 80% of the respondents preferred a variety of Slovene and 12.7% preferred a variety of Italian (Arko 1990).

The findings of research into inter-ethnic marriage partners living in the Trieste and Gorizia provinces are also very interesting (Štrukelj & Sussi 1989). The language preference of the 139 Slovene respondents, as shown on TABLE II, is similar to that described from the above-mentioned surveys. According to the students' parents, however, a significant drop in Slovene language preference has been noted among the first-born. This finding should not come as a surprise, since we were looking at families with mixed ethnic origins; there is, consequently, an almost equal distribution between the two principal linguistic codes. The language preference for Slovene was slightly higher for the second-born. We were not however able to make any firm conclusions, because the group of interviewees was too small.

**TABLE II: EXPRESSED LINGUISTIC PREFERENCES OF SLOVENES, BY GENERATION**

preferences	INTERVIEWEE	FIRST CHILD	SECOND CHILD
SLOVENE LV	81.0	45.3	54.6
ITALIAN LV	13.9	41.4	31.8
OTHER LV	5.1	13.3	13.6
N =	137	128	66
LV = language varieties. Figures are percentages (Štrukelj & Sussi 1989)			

Let us look briefly at some other aspects of linguistic attitudes. In an essay presenting the results of research conducted in the province of Udine during 1977 and 1978, De Marchi made the following statement: "the feeling that local varieties are less and less spoken by parents to their children is widespread..." [my translations here and below, ES]. The results demonstrate that 54% of the respondents were "favorable" to local code usage (i.e., the use of Slovene) with their children, while 41% were "unfavorable." "Utility" was the most frequent reason given by the first group, while up to 18% of the second group cited "low prestige" and/or "low utility" as the most frequent motivation for their choice (De Marchi 1982: 199-201).

In the above-mentioned interviews with 383 students living in the provinces of Gorizia and Trieste, they were asked to evaluate the most important and the least important factors which influence the learning and the use of the Slovene and Italian languages. TABLE III shows the results of the Multi-response Analysis on 792 responses. There are two "expressive" factors at the top of the scale. These two factors show, for the Slovene language, a definite link between language and ethnicity—even

though the item "Knowledge of Slovene is necessary in order for [people] to identify themselves with being Slovene" was ranked only in fifth position. In contrast, for the Italian language explicit reference was made to its importance for collaboration between and integration of the two ethnic groups living together in the region. The maintenance of the minority group and interethnic cooperation are to be perceived as high-priority needs.

It is also worth our while to look briefly at the data from two studies that have tried to explain other aspects or dimensions of language attitudes, such as loyalty, vitality and prestige. In both studies, the same method, that of "Semantic Differential," was used; this is considered by many social scientists as the most suitable instrument for the indirect measurement of attitudes. Let us consider the average scores, which give us an initial profile to individual languages.

**TABLE III: MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS AFFECTING LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE**

FACTORS	RANK	%
<b>KNOWLEDGE OF SLOVENE:</b>		
is a necessary condition for the existence of the Slovene national community	1	18.9
is useful for those who are looking for an occupation	2	12.2
makes it possible to become acquainted with Slovene culture and civilization	3	11.2
<b>KNOWLEDGE OF ITALIAN:</b>		
contributes to co-operation between the two peoples	1	12.7
is required for all kinds of occupation	2	12.4
is useful for those who are looking for an occupation	3	12.3
Figures are percentages of subjects (Slovenes) choosing given factor (Štrukelj & Sussi 1983)		

In the first investigation, twelve seven-point scales were presented to students enrolled in the senior high schools in Gorizia and Trieste. The concept stimuli were in Slovene and Italian. Generally, the two languages were rated positively; as could be foreseen, however, there was a preferential score for Slovene. The fact that the respondents perceived Slovene as more "difficult" and as more "complicated" than Italian means that it may be possible to hypothesize that the respondents allotted a higher value to Slovene on the power dimension in spite of the actual status of that

language within the dominant society, and hence with reference to their own in-group. The reasons for perceiving Slovene as "slow" and "dull" may be attributed to an evaluation of lesser vitality within the dominant society (Štrukelj & Sussi 1983: 167).

The second investigation dealt with ten ethnic and linguistic minorities in Italy. Sixty interviews were carried out in each community. The Slovene subjects in the study were interviewed in the provinces of Trieste (average age: 21 years) and the Nadiža/Natisone valley in the province of Udine (average age 25.3 years). Thirty scales were used, with concept stimuli concerning varieties of language. We are not interested here in comparing the average scores—see TABLE IV for the results from the Slovene group in the Trieste Province—which give us a general profile of attitudes toward Slovene and Italian.

**TABLE IV: LANGUAGE ASSESSMENTS BY SLOVENES IN TRIESTE**

	SLOVENE	ITALIAN
bright : dark	2.67	2.35
not loved : loved	5.67	5.38
beautiful : ugly	1.97	2.07
difficult : easy	2.32	4.05
useful : useless	2.32	2.07
weak : strong	4.72	4.52
dynamic : static	3.25	2.42
compulsory : voluntary	4.05	3.25
hot : cold	2.70	2.52
unfamiliar : familiar	6.22	5.17
light : heavy	5.38	2.97
superficial : deep	5.47	4.90
active : passive	2.55	2.67
prestigious : not prestigious	2.52	2.57
superior : inferior	3.70	3.50
refused : accepted	4.13	4.92
original : commonplace	2.52	3.25
influential : not influential	3.67	2.80
good : bad	2.27	2.65
hazy : clear	5.40	4.75
sad : happy	4.17	5.38
spontaneous : imposed	3.15	4.17
exact : inexact	2.63	3.22
nasty : nice	5.72	5.27
public : private	3.35	2.75
not melodious : melodious	4.77	6.13
ours : theirs	1.55	4.17
far : near	6.17	4.72
pleasant : unpleasant	2.40	2.40
false : sincere	5.55	4.67

Figures are mean scores on scale 0.00 [first indicator] - 7.00 [second indicator] (Tessarolo 1990)

Our major interest and concern is in the further statistical analysis of the data, as carried out by the investigator. The study is based on the hypothesis "that . . . the image of the language offers a certain number of dimensions . . . and that among them there are two principal ones, namely, identification and prestige. . . The unifying and the separating functions of language are part of identification" (Tessarolo 1990: 82). These are the integrative functions which support group identity. Prestige is a ". . . functional criterion related to the social distribution of the linguistic varieties. . ." (Tessarolo 1990: 82-83.) How much, and in what way, are these two dimensions linked to power, vitality, linguistic loyalty and pride? This question cannot be answered at this point in time. It must be emphasized that some other factors (labeled "familiarity," "vitality and simplicity," and "liking") have emerged from factor analysis.

A remarkable identification with the Slovene language emerges from the composite factor scores of the Slovene group in Trieste (see TABLE V). In relation to the Italian language, it has a slightly lower score on the *prestige* dimension. Italian, on the other hand, is noticeably superior on the *simplicity* dimension, as distinguished by "happiness" and "lightheartedness." The group of Slovenes from the Natisone Valley appeared to score Slovene as closer to Italian: see the higher score for *identification*, and note that the scores relating to the dimensions of *prestige* and *simplicity* are much superior for the same language.

**TABLE V: COMPOSITE FACTORS SCORES FOR SLOVENE RESPONDENTS**

comp. factors	TRST 1		NADIŽA		TRST 2	
	SLN	ITA	SLN	ITA	SLN	ITA
IDENTIFICATION	2.10	0.60	1.13	1.91	2.43	0.15
PRESTIGE	1.21	1.33	0.72	1.93	2.17	1.72
SIMPLICITY	0.22	1.45	0.55	1.30	0.82	0.81

TRIESTE 1: mean age 21 years; TRIESTE 2: aged 45-50.  
 NADIŽA = Nadiža/Natisone Valley, Udine Province.  
 SLN = Slovene; ITA = Italian (Tessarolo 1990)

To evaluate the influence of age on attitudes, the above-mentioned thirty scales were presented to another group from the Slovene community in Trieste, aged between 45 and 50. If we compare the results for the two groups ("TRST 1" and "TRST 2" on TABLE V) we notice small differences between the composite factor scores, while the different rank-order of extracted factors shows that the older respondents allot major importance to *prestige* rather than to *identification*.

### 3. Language Use

Language use, particularly in the household—in the family—has been studied in many of the investigations we have referred to. The research conducted in Udine Province in 1977-78 (TABLE VI) showed that, generally, "the use of local linguistic varieties decreases considerably in a time-span of two generations" (De Marchi 1982: 191). Data from another investigation conducted in the same region in 1985 supports this conclusion; and language loss is even more widespread among people living in the Plain of Friuli, outside of the territory of their origin (TABLE VI; Beltram, Ruttar & Susič 1988).

**TABLE VI: USE OF SLOVENE IN FAMILY INTERACTION, UDINE PROVINCE**

	1	-----2-----			-----3-----		
		fm	f	m	fm	f	m
Subject's parents, with each other	75						
Subject, with spouse	52	45			34		
Subject, with children	29		27	42		4	8
Subject's children, with each other	19	27			5		

Figures show percentage of respondents reporting use of Slovene.  
 1 = Udine Province, 1977-78 [N = 378] (de Marchi 1982)  
 2, 3 = Udine Province, 1985; 2 = Nadiža Valley [N = 100]; 3 = Plain of Friuli [N = 100]; f = female; m = male (Beltram, Ruttar & Susič 1988)

During interviews with Slovene students in the Gorizia and Trieste Provinces (TABLES VII and VIII) they were asked about language use, involving a series of different interlocutors, in three different situations: at home, at school, and in public places. Apart from at school, where Slovene is the dominant language, it can be stated that, generally—although the two cases differ from each other—to a certain extent language shift toward Italian occurs very frequently in various public situations. This fact obviously affects the linguistic situation of the minority group.

As far as these two cases are concerned, no information was available on the ethnic composition of the interviewees' families. In contrast, research into mixed marriages provides useful information about language use in families of this kind (Štrukelj & Sussi 1989). It must however be pointed out that the respondents in this study defined themselves as Slovene and, in many cases, showed that they have a strong ethnic consciousness. In our opinion, the data that we are very briefly reporting in this paper (see TABLE IX) are particularly relevant with respect to the language used when talking to children. However over-emphatic and over-used this assertion may be, let

us say that children are the future of ethnic groups, and particularly of minority ones. Both in ethnically homogeneous and ethnically mixed families, the linguistic socialization of the descendants is, in our opinion, a key factor for the persistence of the ethnic groups.

**TABLE VII: USE OF SLOVENE AND ITALIAN ACCORDING TO DOMAIN (I)**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>1. IN PRIVATE</b>						
with father	7.1	7.1	3.2	11.0	66.4	5.2
with mother	7.4	3.2	2.8	15.9	67.1	3.5
with sisters	3.5	2.5	3.5	8.1	39.2	43.1
with brothers	2.5	3.5	3.2	8.8	41.0	41.0
with grandparen	4.2	3.2	3.5	7.8	64.3	17.0
with friends	1.8	6.4	24.4	42.0	21.9	3.5
<b>2. IN PUBLIC</b>						
in store, with clerk	23.3	21.2	26.1	17.7	9.2	2.5
in government office	50.2	21.9	13.4	8.1	2.8	3.5
in post office	51.2	17.0	12.4	3.5	6.0	3.9
in bank, with teller	43.1	16.6	15.5	8.5	11.0	5.3
in bar or restaurant	29.0	21.2	22.6	16.3	6.7	4.2

Figures, which are percentages, refer to Slovenes in Gorizia and Trieste in 1980-81 (N = 283 students). 1 = Italian only, 2 = mainly Italian but also Slovene, 3 = both Italian and Slovene, 4 = mainly Slovene but also Italian, 5 = Slovene only, 6 = no response (Štrukelj & Sussi 1983)

**TABLE VIII: USE OF SLOVENE AND ITALIAN ACCORDING TO DOMAIN (II)**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>1. IN PRIVATE</b>						
with father	11.3	4.0	2.7	9.3	66.0	6.7
with mother	7.3	3.3	1.3	8.0	80.0	—
with sisters	3.3	3.3	2.0	4.0	40.7	46.7
with brothers	2.0	3.3	2.0	5.3	42.0	45.3
with grandparent	2.0	2.7	5.3	6.0	70.7	13.3
with friends	2.7	6.0	27.3	38.0	25.3	0.7
<b>2. IN PUBLIC</b>						
in store, with clerk	18.0	34.7	24.7	14.7	7.3	0.7
in government office	69.3	13.3	6.0	3.3	3.3	4.6
in post office	79.3	8.7	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.0
in bank, with teller	34.7	16.7	12.0	10.0	24.0	2.7
in pizzeria	66.7	18.0	6.0	3.3	4.0	2.0

Figures, which are percentages, refer to Slovenes in Gorizia in 1990 (N = 150 students). 1 = Italian only, 2 = mainly Italian but also Slovene, 3 = both Italian and Slovene, 4 = mainly Slovene but also Italian, 5 = Slovene only (Arko 1990).



**TABLE IX: USE OF SLOVENE AND ITALIAN IN FAMILY INTERACTION**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Subject, with children	11.1	11.1	23.0	5.9	48.9	(N = 135)
Subject's spouse, with children	75.8	10.4	8.1	—	3.7	(N = 135)
Subject's children, with each other	21.9	11.0	19.2	8.2	39.7	(N = 73)

Figures show percentage of respondents reporting use of Slovene and Italian.  
1 = Italian only, 2 = mainly Italian, 3 = both Italian and Slovene, 4 = mainly Slovene, 5 = Slovene only (Štrukelj & Sussi 1989)

#### 4. Conclusion

Finally, one more point about the relationship between language use and language attitudes. The gap, as far as the two aspects are concerned, that is demonstrated by the results of the investigations conducted in Udine gives support to De Marchi's finding (1982: 204):

"... language use and language attitudes are indeed two separate dimensions, not always parallel, and sometimes contradictory. Although a connection between the two undoubtedly exists, the latter cannot be taken as a valid predictor of the former."

The data from the investigations conducted in Gorizia and Trieste seem to suggest that there exists a greater homogeneity between language use and language attitudes. This finding cannot however be considered generally valid, since it is the result of investigations carried out among particular segments of the minority population. The above-mentioned gap may be even greater in other, larger strata of the Slovene ethnic community.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbreviations: SLORI = Slovenski raziskovalni inštitut; INV = Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja.
- Arko, A. 1990-91. *Jezikovni položaj Slovencev na Goriškem* (začasni naslov). Diplomski naloga, Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Beltram, P., P. Ruttar & E. Susič. 1988. *Množični mediji in narodnostne manjšine*. Trst: SLORI & Ljubljana: INV.
- De Marchi, B. 1980. *Indagine campionaria sulla condizione linguistica nel Friuli Venezia-Giulia*. Gorizia: Istituto di Sociologia Internazionale di Gorizia.
- 1982. "A sociology of language research in Friuli-Venetia Julia, a multilingual border area," 183-210 in B. De Marchi & A.M. Boileau, eds., *Boundaries and Minorities in Western Europe*. Milano: Angeli.
- Francescato, G. & M. Ivašič Kodrič. 1978. "La comunità slovena in Italia: aspetti di una situazione bilingue," *Quaderni per la Promozione del Bilinguismo* 21/22: 1-38.
- Nečak-Lük, A. & I. Štrukelj, eds. 1984. *Dvojezičnost. Individualne in družbene razsežnosti*. Ljubljana: Društvo za uporabno jezikoslovje SR Slovenije.
- Sedmak, D. & E. Susič. 1983. *Tiha asimilacija. Psihološki vidiki nacionalnega odtujevanja*. Trst: Založništvo tržaškega tiska.

- Štranj, P. 1989. *La comunità sommersa. Gli Sloveni in Italia dalla A alla Z*. Trieste: Editoriale Stampa Triestina.
- Štrukelj, I. & E. Sussi. 1983. *Motivacija in stališča do učenja in rabe L1 in L2 pri slovenski srednješolski mladini v Italiji*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za sociologijo.
- & ----- . 1989. *Podatki o raziskavi: Mešani zakoni med Slovenci v Italiji*. Ljubljana: ISU & Trst: SLORI.
- . 1989. "Nekatere razsežnosti etnolingvistične vitalnosti," 719-27 in I. Štrukelj, ed., *Uporabno jezikoslovje*. Ljubljana: Zveza društev za uporabno jezikoslovje.
- Tessarolo, M. 1990. *Minoranze linguistiche e immagini della lingua*. Milano: Angeli.

#### 4: THE CASE OF THE SLOVENE MINORITY IN AUSTRIA Tom M.S. Priestly, University of Alberta

##### 1. Introduction

Rather than try to describe at any length the linguistic situation in the bilingual area of Austrian Carinthia, I have chosen today to dwell on some questions about ethnicity in that province which I consider enormously important and for which I can offer no simple answers. Before I get to these questions, however, I shall first suggest a historical cause of some of the prevalent Carinthian language attitudes, and then explain why it is so difficult to give you a simple description of the Carinthian sociolinguistic situation.

##### 2. The legacy of the Habsburgs

Though not a historian, I understand that much of the background to the 'language question' in Carinthia can be traced to the policies of the Habsburgs of the 19th century, and in particular the governmental attempts to solve the problems posed by the ethnic heterogeneity of the Empire. In Carinthia, as in other Austrian provinces, these policies and tactics resulted in language (which, as elsewhere in Europe, was by now the manifest symbol of ethnicity) becoming—potentially, at least—both *politicized* and *intellectualized*. Given this state of affairs, it only took a historically very short period for this potential to be realized: namely, from the last year of what had hitherto been a relatively uneventful World War I up till the 1920 plebiscite. I suggest that these developments explain the speed with which the Germanophone intellectuals and quasi-intellectuals so quickly perfected the irrational *Windischentheorie*.<sup>1</sup> The results, seventy years later, are striking; many of the basic tenets of the *Windischentheorie* are now—unwittingly, in most cases—accepted as facts by the Slovene minority (cf. Priestly 1990a); and the average Slovenophone forester or farmer or shopkeeper or artisan, who has no intellectual pretensions and who tends to vote along party-political lines (in a place where all the major parties are distinctly Germanophone), is normally quite uninterested either by academic or by political appeals for Slovene language-support. The average Slovene-speaker, rather, is only swayed by emotional appeals; and, as I shall shortly

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that similar developments seem to have taken place in the Slovene minority area of Hungary, where official statements about the ethnic identity of that minority had remarkable similarities to Carinthian German pronouncements deriving from the *Windischentheorie* (see Fujs 1990). A contrastive study would be of great interest.