

## QUALITY RESEARCH METHOD INTO RURAL SPEECH

V prispevku so predstavljena najpomembnejša načela metode fokusne skupine. Prikazana je metoda, uporabljena v raziskavi ruralnega jezika s posebnim poudarkom na spolu in jeziku (prim. Grochola Szczepanek 2006). Metoda fokusnih skupin (poleg osebnega intervjuja) je med najbolj priljubljenimi kvalitativnimi metodami, ki se uporabljajo na področju trženja, v sociologiji in psihologiji. To metodo lahko uporabimo tudi v jezikoslovju, zlasti v sociolingvističnih in etnolingvističnih raziskavah, še posebej takrat, ko tradicionalni jezikoslovni opis s pomočjo ankete ali vprašalnika ne zadostuje. V času globalnih kulturnih sprememb je možno raziskovati spremembe v jeziku samo v povezavi s socialnimi in kulturnimi dejavniki.

intervju fokusne skupine, ruralni govor, spol

The paper presents the most important principles of the focus group method and shows how it is used in a study of rural language with a special emphasis on gender in language (cf. Grochola Szczepanek 2006). The focus method (alongside the personal interview) is one of the most popular qualitative methods used in marketing, sociology and psychology. This method can also be used in linguistics, particularly in socio-linguistic and ethno-linguistic studies. It can be applied when traditional linguistic description with the help of a survey or questionnaire methods is not sufficient. At a time of global cultural change, an examination of changes in language is possible only with reference to social and cultural factors.

focus group interview, rural speech, gender

### 1 History of Focus Research

The term »focus method« comes from the English expression »focus group interview (FGI)« or »focus group discussion (FGD)«, or »focus group« for short. A Polish equivalent of these terms is »zogniskowany wywiad grupowy« (focused group interview). This is a kind of group discussion, controlled by a moderator, which follows a pre-prepared scenario. The word »focus« refers to concentrating on just one topic or one topical thread during the interview. The focus method was developed in the 1930s by two American sociologists: Robert Merton and Paul Lazarsfeld, who were among the first to describe the method and call it »the focused interview« (Merton 1946). Focused interviews conducted jointly by Merton and Lazarsfeld were used to evaluate radio programmes and, after the war, to test

military instructional and propaganda materials. The first book devoted to the method, *The Focused Interview* by Merton, Fiske and Kendall (1990), was published in 1956. The authors used the term »focus group« in relation to surveys based on both personal and group interviews, thus stressing »focus« as a specific feature of this method.

In the 1970s the focus method became especially popular in market research. In academic sociological research interest in the focus method goes back to the 1980s. Floch Lyon and colleagues published the results of using focus groups combined with a survey to study knowledge and social practices connected with family planning in Mexico (Floch Lyon, de la Macorra, Schearer 1981). These researchers differentiated membership of focus groups with regard to social and demographic factors, such as age, gender or education level. In 1988 the first editions of books by Krueger (1994)<sup>1</sup> and Morgan (1997) were published, which evoked interest in the focus method as a tool in evaluation studies. The method was introduced in the curriculum in many schools and higher education institutions in the 1980s. The English researchers Livingstone and Lunt used group interviews in their studies of the influence of televised information on viewers (Lunt, Livingstone 1996). Since the 1980s the focus method has been extremely popular as a method of gathering quality data. In Poland the method was first used by Radio Free Europe in 1989. Further development of the focus method was unstoppable. In a relatively short time commercial firms specialising in conducting quality tests started offering this method. The »method became one of the predominant ways of gathering quality data in marketing research. The focused interview has aroused interest in academic circles and is now part of the curriculum.« (Lisek-Michalska, Daniłowicz 2004: 13.)

After almost seventy years, the method has undergone many changes and modifications. Some of the original recommendations by Merton and Lazarsfeld have been considerably modified and some have been abandoned altogether. There are many publications in English about the focus method<sup>2</sup> and in Polish the book *Zogniskowane wywiady grupowe. Jakościowa metoda badań marketingowych* (Focused Group Interviews. Quality Method of Market Research, 2001) by Dominika Maison is worth mentioning. The author of this monograph, using English sources, arranges and systematises knowledge in the field of quality research. Maison discusses the use of the focus method, the principles of application, the stages of research and supporting techniques. Jolanta Lisek-Michalska and Paweł Daniłowicz edited *Zogniskowany wywiad grupowy. Studia nad metodą* (Focused Group Interview. Studies of Method, 2004). This is a collection of papers by different authors focusing on analysis of the method and the issues connected with it, such as aculturation of the interview, communication and group dynamics. The collection is based on the results of studies by authors who used the focus method in Poland.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lisek-Michalska, Daniłowicz 2004: 14.

<sup>2</sup> Detailed literature can be found in Maison 2001 and Lisek-Michalska, Daniłowicz 2004.

## 2 The main principles of the method

The general principles are as follows:

- 1) a focus group discussion is a method of obtaining quality data,
- 2) a survey is conducted in a carefully selected group,
- 3) data is generated in a group discussion and the discussion focuses on a specific topic,
- 4) the discussion is led by a moderator who, following the discussion outline prepared in advance, tries to encourage group members to respond,
- 5) the purpose of the focus group is to register all aspects of behaviour which are in any way connected with the topic under research.

In the majority of definitions attention is drawn mostly to the fact that a focus group is a discussion. According to P. Daniłowicz and J. Lisek-Michalska identifying the focus method with a discussion is wrong: it is a certain type of conversation, an exchange of opinions on a given topic, mutual reflection on an issue. However, in the focus method discussion is liable to certain limitations. It has to follow an outline specified and prepared in advance. The authors say that »focus is a discussion controlled by a scenario including, among other things, a set of questions which the moderator asks all participants of the meeting« (Lisek-Michalska, Daniłowicz 2004: 15). The focus method cannot be examined from the perspective of discussion alone. A group interview requires a number of things prior to the survey, and following it. The stages of a focus survey can be shown as follows:

- 1) specifying the problem (defining what the moderator wants to learn from the planned survey, what information is needed from the informants),
- 2) defining the survey group (number of participants, age, gender and venue),
- 3) writing a scenario for the discussion,
- 4) a group discussion on a given subject,
- 5) analysis and interpretation of the survey results,
- 6) preparing a report.

An advantage of the group interview is the possibility of making use of the qualities of a social group and effects connected with it, such as security effect, spontaneity effect, stimulation effect. The basic attribute of the group interview method is a phenomenon called group dynamics, understood as an interaction between the participants and the moderator. Group members discuss, come to mutual agreement and sometimes also quarrel. It seems that such a situation is closer to the reality of social life: most of our beliefs are liable to dynamics and are engendered in interaction with other people. Far less frequently opinions are arrived at in isolation and do not undergo change. A factor favouring the greater popularity of group interviews over personal ones is an increasing interest in specific effects stimulated by the group. It has been noticed that different reactions and emotions come to the surface when people are in a group than when they are examined alone.

### 3 Using focus groups in studies of rural language

The output of Polish dialectology includes many atlases, dictionaries and monographs; these are predominantly works based on studies conducted many years ago.<sup>3</sup> The need to study the present state of dialects and gather rural vocabulary has been emphasised in recent years (see, e.g. Kaś 2001). Attention is drawn to the fact that rural language is socially conditioned by such factors as age, education, profession, gender, the situation in which a speech utterance takes place and the relation between general language and dialect.<sup>4</sup> Traditional dialectological studies were aimed at registering and describing the oldest layer of a dialect in a possibly purest form. »The aims of sociologically and linguistically oriented research are different; its role is to show language diversity in a certain environment, which is conditioned by various social and situational factors« (Dunaj 1987: 30). These external conditions are called »the social variations of language« (Lubaś 1982, 1994).

In order to examine the process of change and transformation in language, the cultural and social context of a given village or region should be taken into account in linguistic studies. The traditional linguistic description should be enriched by the cultural and social sphere of rural speakers since some contemporary language changes can be discussed only against the background of cultural changes. In the light of this, the quantity methods of gathering data which have been popular up until recently are not the right methodological solution. Rural language should be treated as a dynamic phenomenon and not as a static, monolithic creation. In research into rural speech, attention should be focused mainly on the diversity of linguistic phenomena, and not on the frequency of their occurrence. Studies should provide an answer to the question »why« and not »how many«. Employing quality research methods, such as the personal interview or the focused group interview thus seems well-grounded. Survey or questionnaire methods can only be used as a certain completion or a supplement to the studies. They should not be used as the only and main research methods in the dialectical vocabulary.

Dealing with an issue of gender as a factor which differentiates the structure of rural language, as well as a way of communication which results from different social roles operating partly in a different »space«, I have been conducting personal and group interviews among the inhabitants of the Polish Spisz.<sup>5</sup> The general aim of my research is to describe the functioning of gender in rural language.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Karłowicz 1900–1911, *Mały atlas gwar polskich* (Small Atlas of Polish Dialects), 1957–1970, *Słownik gwar polskich* (Dictionary of Polish Dialects), 1977–2006.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g. Kucała 1960, Białokórska 1987, Zagórski 1991, Cygan 1993, Pelcowa 2001, Kaś 1994.

<sup>5</sup> Spisz is a historic, geographic and ethnographic region in the Western Carpathians, in the upper Poprad and upper Hornad valleys and in part of the Danube basin. To the north and west it adjoins Podhale, to the east it borders on Szarysz, to the south Abow and Gemer, while Liptów is to the south-west. The majority of Spisz now belongs to Slovakia. Poland has 14 local areas: Czarna Góra, Dursztyn, Falsztyn, Frydman, Jurgów, Kacwin, Krempachy, Łapszanka, Łapsze Niżne, Łapsze Wyżne, Niedzica, Nowa Biała, Rzepiska and Trybsz. The research is being carried out in basically two separate locations – Niedzica and Rzepiska – and sporadically in others.

When I began my field research I designed the following schema for personal talks with rural inhabitants:

- 1) general data about the interlocutor,
- 2) the village, region and inhabitants,
- 3) school or work,
- 4) home, family, marriage and lifestyle,
- 5) tradition, customs, belief and rites,
- 6) contemporariness, modernity,
- 7) men and women.

Each topic encompasses a number of issues and questions. My intention was to conduct personal talks with men and women of various ages according to one schema. During one of the first interviews it turned out that apart from the person I was to interview there was another householder who listened to the talk, added something from time to time or reminded the interlocutor about something. This situation made me think of conducting such discussions in a wider group. Multi-generation families that live under one roof or close to each other are not infrequent in the country. I shared my idea of interviewing several persons at the same time with Renata Siemieńska, sociology professor at Warsaw University, who among other things teaches *gender studies*. She suggested using a method employed in social studies, namely, the focus group. Having read literature on the subject of the focused group interview, I started conducting group interviews (besides individual interviews). The method adapted from the social to the linguistic studies had to undergo certain modifications.

A survey is conducted in the country environment, where the inhabitants know one another. The principle that the participants of the focus session cannot know one another cannot be applied in the study of a country community. Besides, in my opinion, the fact that in a small place inhabitants know one another is an asset in dialect studies conducted with the help of this method. Unfamiliarity with the rest of the participants of a survey, and so the lack of knowledge about their language (dialect), would cause certain inhibitions resulting from apprehension about acceptance of a slightly different speech and culture. Differences in speech appear even between neighbouring places. Inhabitants evaluate the speech of a given place as better or worse than their own. If the survey participants were representatives of several places from the region who did not know each other, then there would be a danger of the interview group being dominated by the »better« dialect speakers. Interviews in groups of participants who know one another create a natural environment for family or neighbours to talk. The choice of participants is not accidental. A family has to be at least a two-generations (parents and children above 16) to qualify. The second kind of focus interviews are single gender groups of men or women of the same age or groups representing two generations (e.g. mothers and

daughters). Good results in the studies of gender in rural language are achieved in interviews conducted with a pair of participants, a man and a woman.

I also had to limit the number of persons in the focus group. According to researchers' recommendations the group should consist of 6 to 12 participants. An average number of participants in my research is 4 to 6 participants, and the largest group is 8 persons. A smaller group enables the researcher to learn the opinions of each participant and is easier to moderate. The interviews are tape recorded. With fewer participants it is easier to recognise and identify the utterances of specific individuals while listening to the recording.

An important link in personal and group dialect interviews is the moderator. The best solution is when the person who conducts the interview is not a stranger to the interlocutor and when he or she knows the dialect and culture of the given region (see Kaś 2001). This is important for the survey for two basic reasons. In the first place, an unknown researcher who is a representative of a different, urban culture and a different language does not evoke trust in interlocutors. In this situation they try to switch off their dialect code and assume the code of the moderator, which has a negative influence on the survey results. Secondly, the unfamiliarity with the dialect and culture of a given region on the part of the moderator can lead to some linguistic misunderstanding, or even incorrect interpretation of certain linguistic and cultural facts. The fact that I can speak the Spisz dialect is advantageous for my research. Discussions are as a rule spontaneous; there are no barriers or inhibitions in the talks. The participants know me (in my home village) or are recommended by my family or acquaintances (in other villages), which is another advantage. As a result the interlocutor does not feel a stranger to the moderator, who is treated as a person from the same background.

A focus interview lasts on average an hour and a half. All discussions are conducted according to one schema. Sporadically, there occur certain changes and departures from the scenario. Sometimes, new thoughts or questions appear. There can also be exceptional interlocutors (especially among older people), who are willing to share their life experience. The moderator then abandons further questions for some time to listen to a story or a discussion among the participants. It can also happen that no answers are given to the questions asked: the participants cannot or do not want to give their own opinion on a given subject. This may result from ignorance of a given subject or because of embarrassment caused by the issue. The oldest generation (60+) generally does not understand much about issues connected with modern life and modern technology. Even if certain words or phrases are familiar to them from television, they are not able to say anything on the subject. The youngest generation (16–30) does not always understand traditional customs and tasks. »Difficult« interlocutors, who distance themselves from all aspects of country life, tradition and dialect, can be encountered within this young group. They do not play an active part in the discussion, saying that these issues concern only their grandparents or parents. Sometimes, in the family focus group,

the young people in the presence of their parents, or parents in the presence of their children do not want to talk about certain topics or use certain expressions or phrases. In such cases the moderator abandons certain questions or even threads during the group interview and tries to return to them during personal interviews with the same individuals. The reverse also happens when the interviewee is not very talkative during the personal interview, but becomes so during the group interview. Moreover, in a group a participant may change the opinions he or she has expressed during the personal interview.

I would now like to present excerpts from various interviews. Selected examples relate to the last part of the above mentioned schema: »men and women« and present opinions on the following three questions: 1) what words are used to refer to a spinster and a bachelor, and to a married man and woman, 2) which duties and household chores are men's and which are women's, 3) who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

### 3.1 Extract from the family focus group

The interview involves 5 people: parents Maria (1950)<sup>6</sup> and Wojciech (1946); sons Stanisław (1977) and Józef (1983); and daughter-in-law Elżbieta (1981).

EX<sup>7</sup>: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

W: *było godane dziywka i to przede wszystkim, no teraz panna pospolicie sie to nazywo, ale my starzy godóme dziywki abo dziywcynta.*<sup>8</sup>

E: *przeważnie dziywka tu sie godo.*

W: *parobek, parobcy – to przeważnie sie nazywali. Teraz to juz chłopcy, kawalerzy.*

J: *jo nie godóm parobek, ale parobcy to sie godo.*

S: *parobcy tyz uzywóm, ale dziywka to niy, bo to moze być obraźliwe.*

M: *teroz juz godo sie panny, dziywcynta.*

W: *baba no to juz jes cyjasi, chłopa baba, bo u nos nie godo sie żóna.*

M: *baba np. Jónkowa, Frankowa.*

J: *cyjasi, niy?*

M: *hej!*

W: *tam idzie Wojtkowa baba. Nie mówi sie małżónka, cy kobytka. Jo godóm tam casym małżónka, abo ślubno, ale to tak w żartak.*

W: *chłop tak samo.*

M: *jak nieznany, no to sie godo »cyj to jes tyn chłop«?*

EX: *Can we say about a married man, e.g. chłop Marynin?*

W: *to sie nie godo tak, ze chłop Marynin, abo Katrynin, ino Józek od Mazurka, Franek od Solusa. Na chłopa to juz sie nie godo tak, godo sie ze idzie Bartek, Józek, cy fto tam ...*

<sup>6</sup> The date of the interlocutor's birth is placed in the bracket.

<sup>7</sup> The abbreviation EX is the researcher.

<sup>8</sup> As phonetic features are not important here the author makes use of general spelling.

EX: Which duties, farm work and housework are carried out by women and which by men?

W: baba jes na codziyń w chałupie z dziećiami. Jo idym dzie, to mnie ni ma casym cały dziyń. Matka jes bardzi zzyto z dziećiami, z rodzinóm. Telo ze teroz jest tak, ze baby fcóm mieć równouprawniynie, zeby óna miała takie prawa jak i ón. Ale przewaźnie óna jes tóm kuróm dómowóm, ze siedzi w dóma i wychowuje dzieci.

S: my móme taki sóm układ dnia, idyme do pracy, zajmujyme sie dzieckiyem na zmianie.

E: jak jo robiym obiod, to S. idzie dzieckiyem na spacer, zaś niekiedy ón myje gorki, a jo usypióm małóm. Ni ma takiego podziału, ze dziecko abo kuchnia nolezy do jednyj osoby.

M: ku dziećiom bardzi baba.

S: kobieta mo wiyncy ciyrpliwości, spokoju, bardzi umie przekozać wiedze, bardzi do opieki nad dziećiami sie nadaje i tymu bardzi pasuje do takik zawodów jak nauczycielka, pielyngniarka.

W: do chałupy, do gotuwania, do obrzónku takiego po chałupie to baba. Sóm takie baby, ze nie jes powiedziane, ze óna se nie poradzi w chłopskij robocie. Potrafi i kosić i orać i jechać.

M: a chłop se tyz poradzi.

W: chłop se tyz poradzi. Bo jo piyrwi, to nie było kucharki, jagek był sóm z ojcyem nieboscykiym. Jagek uwarzól obiod, przisła siostra ze Slónska, to sie dziuwali, ze nie kozdo baba by tak uwarzyla, jak jo uwarzól. Dziś nie uwarzym, bo móm babe. To tak, ze to ni mozna ... Do cego cłowieka biyda zmusi, to toto musi zrobić. Jo se i wyproł, zmarasóny nie chodzól, mnie nie trza było godać co dzie jes, a dziś syn idzie do kościoła, to pyto sie matki: »naryftowaliście mi kosule«. Jo se i dziś naryftujym odziynie.

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

W: chyba chłop. Wiynksy powiniyn mieć refleks chłop, ale moze jes baba pewniyso pod wzglyndym pijatyki. Chłop siado pijany za kierownice i toto mnie nie pasuje.

M: a nas (here: son) jak jadzie, a jadzie fto przódzy nos pomału, to godo tak: »pewnie baba jadzie«, bo sie ni moze wyrobić.

W: toto dobrze godo, bo tyz zaros juz poznos, jak baba jadzie. Baby sóm, co jezdżóm po pierónie, jezdżóm duzo lepi niz chłop, ale wiyncy jeżdzi pomału.

J: chłopi zachowujum zinnóm krew.

E: wydaje mi sie, ze kobieta jes chyba spokojniyso, ze potrafi sie bardzi skupić.

S: mi sie wydaje, ze kobiety jak jezdżóm, to bardzi sie bojóm pewnyk, trudnyk miyjsc. Nie jezdżóm tak odważnie. Jak jadóm do Zokopanego, to juz w dóma myślóm, ze trzeba przejechać w Poróninie to trudne skrzizowanie. Tam trza skryncić w lewo, a strażnie duzo aut jedzie. Facet tego ni mo, bo ón myśli dopiyro, jak tam stoi. Ón sie martwi dopiyro jak jadzie, a nie martwi sie juz w dóma, jak ón tak pojadzie. Ale tak w ogóle myślym, ze ni ma reguły.



### 3.2 Extract from the focus group with women of the same age

The interview involves 4 women: Stefania (1932), Maria B. (1934), Zofia (1935), Maria Sz. (1936).

EX: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

MSz: *godo sie różnie. Przeważnie na takie niewydane no to sie godo dziywki. A zaś jak nieozyniony to parobek, parobcy.*

S: *dziywka, dziywcyzna, dziywce, a zaś tyn to parobek, parobeczek.*

MSz: *teroz to colkiym inne jes to dziywcyznie i parobcyznie, jak wtedy kie my były dziywkami. To było wesołe zycie. Pasłymy krowy w gojniku, śpiwały ... a dziś ta gowiydź ani gymby nie umie ozewrzyć.*

MB: *ni majóm muzyki, ino na tyk dyskotekak pohipcóm, pohipcóm w tym durku i juz.*

MSz: *dzie tam o śpiwaniu, ani mowy.*

Z: *młodzi to godajóm dziywcyzna, chłopak.*

S: *abo panna i kawalyr.*

MB: *no a wydano to zaś juz baba, a ozyniony to chłop.*

Z: *chłop i baba, to jes małżyństwo.*

S: *nie godo sie tak małżyństwo, ino chłop i baba, ociec, matka, abo ojcowie.*

EX: Which duties, farm work and housework are carried out by women and which by men?

S: *kobieta jest w domu, sobie tam patrzy porzóndku, gotuwanie, to jes jyj obowiónzek. No i te dzieci, zeby wyziyrały, były cyste, bo jak brudne, obdarte dzieci, to tyz godane jes na kobiecie, ze jes niedbało.*

Z: *na babie jes obowiónzek, musi dzieci chować, pociórzi ucyć, do skoły posłać, dyscypliny pilnuwać, musi ugotuwać, posprzónać. Wiyncy matka z dzieciami urzynduje jak ociec. Mo wiyńksóm odpowiedzialność o dzieci. Ón idzie do roboty, do pola, co ón wiy, co sie w izbie robi. Chłopa to telo obowiónzuje, jak przidzie z roboty: dzieci policyc, zygor nakryncić i taki jes obowiónzek chłopski ... (laugh).*

MB: *baba jes do sićkiego, i w dóma i w sokie.*

MSz: *chłopskóm robote by tyz robiyla.*

MB: *nie tak, ze by robiyla, bo przeciez robi! Pomogo i w chłopskij robocie i w dóma, jak baba jes pracowito. Jak jes do nicego, to i w swojij robocie se nie do rady. To zolezy, jako ftoro jes.*

MJ: *wedla rodziny to moze i baba wiyncy wortno, wedla roboty to zaś chłop. Chłop, cy w lesie, cy kosić, cy wozic, to baba tego nie robi. Wedla dómu, to zaś wiyncy baba mo obowiónzku. No bo cy prac, cy gotuwać, cy ucyć dzieci, to co tyn chłop robi, jak go cały dziyń ni ma. Jego obowiónzek jes cinyzysy w robocie.*

S: *chłop, kie mo kónia piykneho, wycycónego. Godajóm, kie gazda mo kónia i kota fajnego, to jes gazda porzónny. A jak jes kón chudy, kot ladacy, to widno, ze gazda do nicego. No to tyz jes obowiónzek jego, ze mo sie interesuwać*

gowiedzióm i zeby była fajno, wyziórno. Jes tyz choćtorn mraga taki, co jak moze tak robi, a idzie do karcmy, opije sie, to taki chłop to do nicego. To ta baba jes biydno w tym dóma.

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

S: *mnie sie widzi, ze tak chłop no to moze ..., ale dy ji baba przecie tyz jes moze jesce ostroźnijso, niy?*

MSz: *niy! Edy to zaś juz chłop do tego ...*

MJ: *jo myślým, ze moze chłop, nedy baby tyz jeżdżóm, ale to juz moze tak wiyncy chłopsko robota. Tako wiynkso odpowiedzialność.*

S: *ale to juz zalezy ji od baby ji od chłop, bo tam przecie jak jedyn tak ji drugi chyba, jak zdali egzamin jedyn cy drugi dobrze. Ale jak jes jakie niescyńsie, to cy chłop cy baba, to sie moze tyz zdarzić. Jak baba jeździ juz długo to tyz jes dobrze.*

MB: *ale baba moze jes lepsy, bo nie pije?*

MSz: *ale óna tu sie boji jechać, tam sie boji ...*

MB: *ale nie wypije, a chłop pijany jadzie i bylejak.*

MJ: *tak mi sie widzi, ze chłop wiyncy do takik sprawók sie nadaje.*

MSz: *mój zyińć z miasta, kie baba jadzie przódzy niego, to ón juz telo ugodo, ze źle jadzie, hamuje, nie umie skryncić, ze pomalu ...*

MB: *nas Tadek tyz nie fce widzieć babe za kierowce.*

MJ: *nasa (here: daughter in law) ni mo prawo jazdy, nie wiym kiedy bedzie robić.*

S: *jo kie tak na razie do Krakowa jeździylak z mojóm (here: daughter), no to tak se myslalak, jak to bedzie, no Jezu Kochany, no to jak to pojadyne, wołoby zyińć jechać. Nale óna jeździ juz długo i dobrze jeździ. Ale coz to toto znacy, cy baba, cy chłop. Baba kie jeździ, to dobrze jes.*

### 3.3 Extract from the mixed group with regard to age and sex

The interview involves 6 people. The parent's generation: Maria (1948), Anna (1952), Józef (1951); the children's generation: Halina (1969), Edward (1973), Kamil (1980).

EX: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

E: *jo godóm, ze panna, a óni (parents) uzywajóm jesce, ze dziywka.*

M: *my dziywka.*

J: *zaniko ta nasa gwara pomalutku i te nazwy tyz.*

A: *za dziywke to sie by gninywali, tu sie przestaje dziywka godać, jacy panna.*

H: *rzeczywiście ta dziywka to nie jes fajnie, panna jest ładni ...*

M: *a zaś na kawalyra godo sie parobek.*

E: *to juz tyz wychodzi, bo parobek to był sluzóncy.*

J: *my tu nalezyne do takiego regionu, co sóm ludzie z całyj Polski. W Polsce wołajóm na parobka kawaler, a u nos wołali parobek. To jes zaś abo z*

wyngierskiego, abo ze słowińskiego, bo tam dali jes parobek. A parobek po polsku to jes służóncy na gospodarstwie rolnym.

E: to tak samo było tu, bo było dużo dzieci w rodzinie, była biyda, no to seł u kogosi wyrobiół, to był parobek.

J: ale nie godali na niego parobek!

E: niy?

J: niy! Nie godali parobek! Godali sługa!

M: parobek toś już był furt.

J: parobek to był tak jak kawaler i dziywka, a sługa to był sługa.

K: mnie sie widzi, ze to starsi już ino używajóm, jo godóm dziewczyna i chłopok.

J: godo sie nawet dziywcy sie i parobcy sie, to sie godo.

A: jesce skoły nie wysła, a już dziywcy sie.

M: o jako dziywecka.

EX: Which duties, farm work and housework are carried out by women and which by men?

J: sóm chłopcy, co sóm i kucharze dobrzy i kelnerzy, krawcy.

M: ale nie godojze jak tam dziesi jes, ino jak u nos. Ftoryn to taki dobry kuchorz, abo kelner jest w dóma? Bo jo nie znóm tu chłopca, co by tak kelneruwoł koło baby?

J: e jes, jes.

H: na pewno sóm takie zawody, co widzím tylko kobiety, np. do przedszkola, do dzieci, do opieki, do starszych osób, pielęgniarka, bo te inne zawody to tak pół na pół.

EX: but speak about the village, not about the city!

M: do lasa, chłop sie bardzi nadaje, do oranio.

E: na gazdówce, w polu, do lasa.

K: to już chyba tako natura jes, ze chłop do takif technicznych spraw, do ciynzyjszych na gospodarstwie, baby zaś bardzi w dóma.

A: baba nie bedzie orać, sioć, kosić, młócić. Nie robióm to baby.

K: sóm i takie, co robióm wiyncy niz chłopci.

M: baba tyz idzie do lasa z chłopym, ale go słucho, jak mo być, bo ino ón jes móndry na to.

A: baba w dóma doi krowy, rajbanie, sprzóntanie, warzynie. To baba robi, w ogródku plewi i grzóndki plewi.

H: na pewno w dómu musi być kobieta, bo to jes zupełnie inny dóm. Choćby tyn chłop jak by sie starół, to jes zupełnie co innego. Chłop nie radzi sobie z pewnymi sprawami dómowymi, tak samo, jak i baba nie radzi sobie dobrze sama z gospodarkóm.

J: baba mo delikatniyjse rynki do dziecka.

M: koło chłopca tyz trza delikatnie, by sie mu nadać ... (laugh).

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

M: *no chłopi.*

J: *ni ma reguły, bo sóm i baby dobrzy kierowcy.*

M: *sóm baby dobre, ale mało.*

A: *Maryś nie sprycoj sie, bo teraz mało ftoro juz nie jeździ.*

M; *ale w tyf ciynskif autaf baba nie wiedzialaby jechać!*

J: *o sóm, sóm takie.*

E: *autobusym widzialef babe kiedysi jechać. Jest w Zokopany m taki przewoźnik, co dwie baby jeżdżóm autobusami.*

M: *to chyba teraz?*

K: *chłopi sóm bardzi nerwowi. Sie godo, ze kobiety, no dy baby to nie umiejóm jeździć, ale to jest szowinizm. Nie ładne powiedzynie, bo mi sie wydaje, ze baby jak juz jeżdżóm duzo autym, to lepi jeżdżóm, ostrożni, nie tak dziko.*

H: *mężczyźni myślóm sobie, że to óni sie nadajóm. Ale kobieta lepi wychodzi na tym, bo jest lepsza, opanowana, rozsądna. Statystyki mówią o tym.*

J: *jak my byli w Nymcaf, było małżyństwo, co mieli swoje gruszki do betónu. Baba jeździyla i chłop, to baba lepi jeździyla, lepi wycofała, była lepszym kierowcóm od niego.*

M: *no jo jescef baby nie widziála, ale moze wyjónki sóm.*

H: *chłop poza tym mo dume w sobie, nie wie gdzie jedzie, ale jedzie. Nie lubiy m błóndzić, wołym sie dwaścia razy zatrzymać i zapytać.*

### 3.4 Extract from the interview with a couple

The interview involves the married couple Zofia (1947) and Franciszek (1944).

EX: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

Z: *to sie godo dziywka, parobek.*

F: *no tak sie godo. A zaś baba wydano, ne to baba i juz.*

Z: *u nos sie nazywo baba i chłop, jak juz pozyniyni. Nie godo sie mónż i żóna ino chłop i baba. Godo sie tyz tak, ze tam Frankowa baba, abo Maryna Jadamowa ...*

EX: Which duties, farm work and housework are carried out by women and which by men?

Z: *warzynie, pranie, sprzónianie to juz babsko robota, chłopi sie do tego nie miysajóm. Chłop przidzie z roboty, to do sopy musi iś. A jak zaś trza to i do lasa, i z gnojym, i byleco trza naprawić. To juz chłop sie za to biere.*

F: *chłopy majóm inkse roboty, ciynskie roboty, kosynie, do lasa po drzewo.*

Z: *z dzieciami to juz ino baba sie zajmuje.*

F: *ni majóm ludzie casu dziś. Młode ludzie, chłop idzie do roboty, baba do roboty. Bez zorobku jest dziś biydnie, bo sóm oplaty na sićko, próndy, telefóny.*

Z: *dziś ino w pośpiechu, w pośpiechu, niby wygody i na wygody trza robić i kazdy zdenerwuany, bo na nic ni mo casu. Baby wsyndy by sie juz pchały, nale*

*mnie sie wydaje, ze chłopcy powinni i rżóndzić i ciynzko pracuwać. Baba to nie jes tako za bardzo odpowiedzialno wsyndzie. Chłop jes stanowczy i bardzi mo słowo kónkretne.*

*F: juz downo godali starzi ludzie, ze baby by ni miały być na wyzsyk stanowiskak. Baba jes wiyncy jakośi tako zdradliwso. Podczas wojnók, biydók chłop jes wytrzymalsy, a baba piyrwi moze zdradzić. Piyrwi by sie jóm dało przekupić. Nale jes i baba móndro i zaradno, noji trzimie sie swojego rozumu, ale jo wiyem?*

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

*Z: dobrze baby jeżdżóm, ale chłopci sóm bardzi tacy odporniyjsi, ino tak ze tyn alkohol ik niscy. Jeżdżóm pijani.*

*F: chłop kie nie pije, jes wytrzymalsy. Chłop jes praktycny i stworzóny do ciynzkik robót.*

### 3.5 Extracts from the individual interviews

The interlocutor Dorota (1989).

EX: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

*D: no to jest panna, dziywcyzna, starsi godajóm dziywka, ale to chyba nieładnie. Zaś chłopok to kawalyr. Wydano to chyba mężatka. Niy? A chłop to nie wiyem?*

EX: what duties, farm and homework belong to women, and to men?

*D: baba non stop musi siedzieć w kuchni i gotuwać, a jak chłopca w dóma ni ma, to juz wsyndy trzeba iś. W chałupie to baba do prasowania, a chłop tego nie robi, jo co tu widzyc, to nie wiyem, bo jo kozym prasować, ale zodyn nie chce.*

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

*D: chłop sie lepi nadaje do jeżdżynio, bo sama próbujym jeździć samochodym, ale mi to jakosi nie wychodzi. Chłop od razu wsiednie i jedzie, a baba musi sie namyśleć i nauczyć, zeby pojechała.*

The interlocutor Józef (1936).

EX: How do you refer to an unmarried woman and man, and a married woman and married man?

*J: jak nie pozynióne to parobcy i dziywki, zaś pozynióne to baba i chłop.*

EX: Which duties, farm work and housework are carried out by women and which by men?

*J: jo by powiedziól, ze baba mo wiyncyl zajyńcio w dóma. Chłop jak idzie do roboty, to robi jednóm robote. Baba zostaje w tym dómie, to dzieci na jyj głowie, i wyprać, i ugotuwać, jesce jak na gospodarstwie trza iś do stajnie, i to i to, i do sklepu. Baba sie lepi nadaje do kuchni, wyprać, sprzónać, zeby cysto było. Do pola tyz musi iś grobać. Musi umieć krowy wydoić. Chłopi tyz*

*dojóm, ale przeważnie baby. Chłopi robióm cinyzkóm robote. Juz z masinami, traktorami, to juz ino chłop.*

EX: Who is better suited to driving a car, a man or a woman?

*J: za kierownice lepi nadaje sie chłop. To jest mężczyzna. Jest to chłop mocniejszy. Jak ef zauwozył baby nie jeźdzóm tak ostroźnie jak chłop. Baba jedzie lepi otwarcie jak chłop. Jak jedzies drógóm z kóniym, to óna jedzie co ino tak gwizdnie, nie zwazo na to, ze to bydle, ze moze skoczyć.*

In studying dialect vocabulary in the context of social and cultural changes both personal and group interviews are very useful methods. A personal interview ensures better results with embarrassing issues, ones that are difficult to open in a group. It is also a method that is technically easier to carry out and to interpret data from the recording (utterances of one interlocutor). This method enables the researcher to identify the opinions, associations and utterances of one interlocutor. A focus group, on the other hand, allows a lot of data to be gathered in a relatively short time. Material gathered in this way is rich and diverse. The researcher has a chance to get to know people's opinions and language in more natural circumstances. From the utterances of several participants it is possible to get to know different aspects, as well as the multi-dimensional character of the problem under discussion. Comparing the usefulness of employing a personal interview with a group interview, the latter brings better results. Discussions in groups encourage greater effort and facilitate the appearance of various thoughts, associations and expressions, providing richer material. However, with the group interview method it should be remembered that it more difficult to conduct the discussion, and to reconstruct and interpret the results.

## Bibliography

- BIAŁOSKÓRSKA, Mirosława, 1987: *Integracja języka mieszkańców pięciu wsi gminy Golezowo w województwie szczecińskim na przykładzie słownictwa* (Integration of Language of Five Villages in the Szczecin Province. A Vocabulary Study). Szczecin.
- CYGAN, Stanisław, 1993: *Różnice w mowie pokoleń na Kielecczyźnie* (Differences in Speech of Different Generations in the Area of Kielce). *Polszczyzna Mazowska i Podlasia. Różnice w nowie pokoleń* (Polish Language of Mazovia and Podlasie Regions. Differences in Speech of Generations). Łomża, Warszawa. 93–104.
- DUNAJ, Bogusław, 1987: *O kilku problemach metodologicznych socjologicznych badań języka mówionego (w świetle dotychczasowych doświadczeń)* (A Few Methodological Problems of Sociological Studies of Spoken Language (in the light of hitherto research)). *Socjolingwistyka* (Socio-linguistics) 6. 29–37.
- FLOCH LYON, Evelyn, DE LA MACORRA, Luis, SCHEARER, S. Bruce, 1981: *Focus Group and Survey Research on Family Planning in Mexico*. *Studies in Family Planning* 12. 409–432.
- GROCHOLA SZCZEPANEK, Helena, 2006: *Badania fokusowe mowy mieszkańców wsi (Focused Group Interviews in Dialect)*. *Socjolingwistyka* (Socio-linguistics) 20. 19–35.

- KARŁOWICZ, Jan, 1900–1911: *Słownik gwar polskich* (Dictionary of Polish Dialects) 1–6. Kraków.
- KAŚ, Józef, 1994: *Interferencja leksykalna słownictwa gwarowego i ogólnopolskiego (na przykładzie gwar orawskich)* (Lexical Interference of Dialectal and All-Polish Vocabulary) (as seen in dialects of Orava). Kraków.
- KAŚ, Józef, 2001: Metodologia badań leksyki gwarowej w kontekście współczesnych przemian kulturowych i społecznych (Methodology of Dialectal Lexis in the Context of Contemporary Cultural and Social Changes). *Gwary dziś. 1. Metodologia badań* (Dialects today. 1. Methodology of Studies). Ed. J. Sierociuk. Poznań. 197–198.
- KRUEGER, Richard, 1994: *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks.
- KUCAŁA, Marian, 1960: O słownictwie ludzi wyzbywających się gwary (On Vocabulary of People who Abandon Dialect). *Biuletyn PTJ* (Newsletter of Polish Linguistic Association) 19. 141–156.
- LISEK-MICHALSKA, Jolanta, DANIŁOWICZ, Paweł (ed.), 2004: *Zogniskowany wywiad grupowy. Studia nad metodą* (Focused Group Interview. Studies of Method). Łódź.
- LUBAŚ, Wiesław, 1982: Types of Linguistic Variants in Contemporary Polish. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 35–36. 247–251.
- LUBAŚ, Wiesław, 1994: O polskim zarysie socjolingwistyki. Plan metodologiczny (On Polish Outline of Socio-Linguistics. Methodological Plan). *Socjolingwistyka* (Socio-Linguistics) 14. 7–17.
- LUNT, Peter, LIVINGSTONE, Sonia, 1996: Rethinking Focus Groups in Media and Communication. *Journal of Communication* 46. 79–98.
- MAISON, Dominika, 2001: *Zogniskowane wywiady grupowe. Jakościowa metoda badań marketingowych* (Focused Group Interviews. Quality Method of Marketing Research). Warszawa.
- Mały atlas gwar polskich opracowany przez zespół Pracowni Atlasu i Słownika gwar polskich, 1957–1970* (Small Atlas of Polish Dialects edited by Section of Atlas and Dictionary of Polish Dialects). Ed. K. Nitsch (vol. 1–3), M. Karaś (vol. 3–12). Wrocław.
- MERTON, Robert, 1946: The Focused Interview. *American Journal of Sociology* 51. 541–557.
- MERTON, Robert, FISKE, Marjorie, KENDALL, Patricia, 1990: *The Focused Interview*. New York.
- MORGAN, David, 1997: *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park.
- PELCOWA, Halina, 2001: Metodologia badań leksyki gwarowej u schyłku XX wieku (Methodology of Studies of Dialect Lexis at the End of 20<sup>th</sup> Century). *Gwary dziś. 1. Metodologia badań* (Dialects Today. 1. Methodology of Studies). Ed. J. Sierociuk. Poznań. 183–189.
- Słownik gwar polskich, 1977–2006* (Dictionary of Polish Dialects, 1977–2006). Ed. by Section of Dialectology at Polish Academy of Sciences, Źródła (Sources), vol. 1 ed. by Mieczysław Karaś, vol. 2–5 ed. by Jerzy Reichan and Stanisław Urbańczyk, vol. 6 ed. by Joanna Okoniowa and Jerzy Reichan. Wrocław, Kraków .
- ZAGÓRSKI, Zygmunt, 1991: *O mowie mieszkańców kilkunastu wsi wokół Konina* (On Language of Inhabitants of Villages in Konin Area). Wrocław.

