

Michał Głuszkowski

Rural Sociology and 'Rural' Linguistics. The Biographical Method in the Study of Dialects and Languages in Contact

Abstract

In the year 2018, marking the anniversary of their original releases, the main of the article is to discuss the question concerning the applicability of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918) by William Isaac Thomas and Florian Znaniecki and *Młode pokolenie chłopów* [The Young Generation of Peasants] (1938) by Józef Chałasiński, two crucial works in rural and general sociology to other areas of humanistic disciplines, with examples drawn from linguistic research. Here, we both characterise and justify the historical and contemporary relationships between sociology and linguistics both on a general level and in their rural varieties. Cooperation between representatives of the given disciplines is possible on the ground of structuralism and, in fact, is being implemented in many joint research projects.

Rural sociology has established itself as a subdiscipline of sociology and has developed its specific thematic and methodological autonomy within the major scope of the field. The existence of 'rural' linguistics is not so obvious, but there are certain phenomena and processes observed in rural conditions which justify the use of such a term. However, it is not the officially accepted name of the subdiscipline which, in the present article, is defined as 'linguistic (and sociolinguistic) research in rural area' with constant references to dialectology.

Hence, methods such as the personal documents method and the biographical method are already present in linguistics and sociolinguistics, although direct references to sociological works (both in general and specifically to both

Thomas and Znaniecki's and Chałasiński's texts in detail) are rare. Still, some popular linguistic approaches – e.g. language biographies or the use of personal documents as a source of linguistic data – are very close to the ideas postulated by the precursors of rural sociology. There are also authors who have so far used Thomas and Znaniecki's as well as Chałasiński's theoretical achievements, while they refer consciously and directly to *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* and *The Young Generation of Peasants*.

Keywords: biographical method, field research in rural areas, sociological methodology in linguistics, dialectology, contact linguistics, sociolinguistics, sociology of language

Introduction

The significance of William Isaac Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's as well as Józef Chałasiński's works in sociology has been confirmed many times. The outcomes of their studies are valuable, not only from a historical point of view as both contemporary authors and historians of sociology, still refer to their publications. Every year, there appear new citations of and references to both *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (the year 2018 will mark 100 years since the original publication) and *Młode pokolenie chłopów* [The Young Generation of Peasants] (the year 2018 will mark 80 years since the original publication) – in bibliometric databases and indexes (see e.g. GS 2017a; GS 2017b; WoS 2017a; WoS 2017b).

Both Thomas and Znaniecki's and Chałasiński's methodological achievements have been applied not only in the latest publications and in various subfields of sociology (e.g. Hüchtker 2016; Nijhoff 2016; Kelle 2017), but also in other disciplines, for instance in psychology (see Boss et al. 2017) or philology (see Wilczyńska 2016). Some inspirations seem quite obvious: the methodology of qualitative research (Zaworska-Nikoniuk 2014), the sociology of rural areas (Halamska 2015), memory (Kończal, Wawrzyniak 2017), education (Cohen, Manion, Morrison 2013), immigration (Portes, Rumbaut 2006) or religious studies (Pasięka 2015). However, in other social sciences and humanities references to *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* and *The Young Generation of Peasants* are very rare, even if similar concepts and methods are employed in those fields of knowledge. The main aim of this article is to discuss and answer the question concerning

the applicability of the biographical method and the personal documents method in linguistics, as well as giving examples of a possible development of the methodology of its various subdisciplines with the help of Thomas and Znaniecki's as well as Chałasiński's theoretical contributions.

Obviously, one has to remember about broader significance of their work. Although both *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* and *The Young Generation of Peasants* refer to rural communities and peasants in various social conditions, it would be oversimplification to reduce them only to these questions, all the more so as neither the authors themselves, nor the historians of sociology, associated their names specifically with rural sociology (cf. Szacki 1981: 731–762; Winławski 1998: 73–76; Wieruszewska 2002: 318–322). Although we are not going to classify Thomas and Znaniecki's as well as Chałasiński as rural sociologists, their interest paid to rural communities and methodological solutions might be still inspiring and useful for linguists working in similar conditions.

Sociology and linguistics

Theoretical and historical premises for the application of sociological theories and methods in linguistics are strong. Their main source is the structuralist paradigm, whose most important assumptions are common in both disciplines and are still relevant. After the Neogrammarian School (Young Grammatics, Ger. *Junggrammatikers*), structuralism was a real revolution in linguistics. Nowadays, it not only remains one of the most important paradigms but has also been an inspiration for other mainstream approaches, including generative grammar (being, in fact, a special variety of structuralism) and cognitive linguistics, although representatives of the latter debated and revised many of the structural theses (Kardela 2011: 60).

Ferdinand de Saussure, whose *Cours de linguistique générale* [*Course in General Linguistics*] (1916) contains the terminology and concepts instrumental in linguistic structuralism, distinguished two research dimensions of language (*langage* in French): a) *langue* ('language') – an abstract system of rules and conventions independent of its individual manifestations and users, and b) *parole* ('speaking') – the use of language in concrete speech

¹ Compiled on the basis of the notes from his lectures (1906–11) by Charles Bally and Albert Schehaye.

situations and by concrete individual language speakers (de Saussure 1959: 13–14).

Émile Durkheim and his successors have not been forgotten in contemporary sociology, too, and a mutual influence of both scholars refers to their main theories and terminology. The definition of *langue* fits with the notion of the Durkheimian ‘social fact,’ which is ‘any way of acting, whether fixed or not, capable of exerting over the individual an external constraint; or: which is general over the whole of a given society whilst having an existence of its own, independent of its individual manifestations’ (Durkheim 1982: 59).

In fact, Saussure used this term literally: for him ‘language is a social fact’ (de Saussure 1959: 6). The French linguist formed his dual perspective of *‘langue: parole’* (language: speaking) on the basis of sociological opposition where ‘social action: individual behaviour’ (Polański 2003: 543). Durkheim’s *The Rules of Sociological Method* was actually released over a decade before de Saussure’s lectures and characterised the system of signs as one of the most important examples of social facts, which were the basis for his definition (Durkheim 1982: 51). Thus, the phenomenon of language and relationships between language community and their communicative tools, which ‘exist only insofar as they are spoken and understood by the people using them,’ were also applied by Znaniecki as an exemplification of the notion of humanistic coefficient (Znaniecki 1934: 36).

The range of mutual influence within the structuralist paradigm was wider and not limited to Durkheim’s and de Saussure’s ideas. By way of illustration, strong sociological and anthropological inspirations appeared in the theories by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, perceived as one of the most important precursors of linguistic structuralism (Głuszkowski 2011a: 124–127). Later, the structuralists interested in social sciences eagerly referred to linguistic structuralism.

One should first of all mention Claude Lévi-Strauss here, who frequently emphasised the meaning of structural analysis in anthropology and referred to analogies between linguistic and cultural systems; for instance, similarities of marriage rules in various societies coincided with the affiliation to the same language family (Lévi-Strauss 2000: 46–50; 72–76). He was also an advocate of methodological cooperation and joint research. Etymology is one case in point: linguists provide etymological data which help sociologists to find regularities and relationships otherwise invisible

to the social sciences, while sociologists or cultural anthropologists can provide them with a description of customs, norms, rules and injunctions explaining the sustainability or instability of certain language features (Lévi-Strauss 2000: 36).

In fact, Lévi-Strauss' postulates have been put into practice. For instance, the linguists from Perm State University working on dialectal dictionaries engage representatives of social sciences in their projects (see Rusinova 2011). Marcel Mauss went even further and claimed that the methodology of social sciences should be based on linguistics (Mauss 2001: 324). A clear illustration of such attempts is found in cultural landscape studies. Paul Claval claims that landscape forms – considered the result of human interests and activities – can be interpreted similarly to the study of language, i.e. choremes can fulfil the function of analytical units, and phonemes, morphemes and semes are used in linguistics in a comparable manner (Claval 2005: 15; 18).

Linguists, especially sociolinguists, have also been interested in the methodology of social sciences and claim that 'linguistic forms are cultural forms *par excellence*' (Bock 1968: 213). Such an approach bears fruit in the form of publications in which linguistics regularly meets sociology. This interaction is found, first of all, in journals like *Language in Society*, *Sociolinguistica* or *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. However, it also features in such linguistic periodicals as *Word* or *Language* (cf. e.g. Haller 1988; Tagliamonte, D'Arcy 2009). Thus, there is, without doubt, a lot of sociological interests in linguistics on a general level, where one may focus on more detailed questions, which are the main object of further considerations in this article, i.e. the application of Znaniecki's and Chałasiński's concepts and methods in the specific domains of linguistics.

Rural sociology and 'rural' linguistics

At the beginning of this section, a terminological inadequacy concerning rural sociology and 'rural' linguistics should be explained. The former appeared as the name of one of the courses offered at the University of Chicago in 1894 (Smith 2011: 6). In the 1930s, the number of institutions giving such lectures rose to over 500 (Smith 2011: 37) and despite the recently developed criticism of its present condition (Friedland 2010), rural sociology has firmly established itself as one of subdisciplines of sociology.

The latter does not exist in scientific discourse, although bibliographical databases (e.g. JSTOR or EBSCO) link the entry 'rural linguistics' to publications in the fields of linguistic geography, areal linguistics and, last but not least, dialectology.

The term 'rural linguistics' may also be understood as 'linguistics in rural areas.' Here, individual studies deal with such problems as language retention efforts of native nations in the USA, e.g. in the preschool education for Cherokee Indians (Deweese 2014: 480), or the processes of English language acquisition and acculturation of immigrant communities in rural areas (Crowley, Ebert 2014: 410).

The traditional scope of dialectology covers 'non-standardized varieties of national languages' (Lewicki 2003: 118–119) and 'the study of [their] geographical variation, especially in rural areas [...] among NORMs – non-mobile old rural men' (Britain 2010: 127). However, it is not limited to language communities of village dwellers, since there are also urban and social dialects which are used in town areas or by a certain social group (see, e.g., McDavid 1965; Kerswill 2001). In addition, the aim of the term 'urban dialectology' was to encapsulate approaches and methodologies which could be applied in various social conditions, independently of any specific area (Britain 2010: 128). Thus, 'rural' linguistics cannot be identified solely with dialectology. In the present article it will be understood as linguistic (and sociolinguistic) research in rural areas, although dialectology will still occupy an important place in the given field.

William Friedland characterised rural sociology in sub-disciplinary terms, as a part of general sociology within which it developed. At the same time, it manifested some autonomy, which was expressed (or potentially could be expressed) either by concentrating on the specificity of rural societies or tendencies in methodology and paradigms, e.g. empiricism vs. theorism and quantitative vs. qualitative analysis (cf. Friedland 2010: 75; 84). Analogically, 'rural' linguistics is still part of general linguistics and its existence can be justified with the occurrence of different language phenomena in the conditions of rural areas.

Many research reports revealing differences in the languages spoken by urban and rural dwellers, e.g. a different accent in farmers' speech even if they used a standard variety of the national language instead of a dialect (Claval 1988: 37). Living in a village can also affect the processes of linguistic change and language attrition. Andrée Tabouret-Keller investigated

the language situation of a rural minority community in France, whose members used both the local dialect and the standard variety. The scholar observed the correlation between a place of work and the domains of usage of each of the codes.

Members of the minority community working in town areas not only replaced their local dialect with standard French in the subsequent spheres but were also less efficient as regards the generational transmission of the vernacular code to their children. The quantitative analysis showed that the higher the percentage of people working outside the rural community was, the lower the level of competence of children and youth in the local dialect (Tabouret-Keller 1972: 374–375).

A special treatment of the widely understood language behaviour in rural areas also stems from differences between city and village communities. Various types of factors determine the distinction between rural and urban communities. They include demographical (e.g. population density, migrations), socio-economic (e.g. education level, average income) and cultural (e.g. value orientation, level of traditionalism, religiousness) features (cf. Styk 1999: 131–137; Huddart-Kennedy et al. 2009: 310), which result in a 'specific way of life of urban and rural society, as well as typical ways and forms of communication these societies practice', while at the same time being 'two ways of expressing the culture of [one] society' (Petković 2007: 28).

As a subdiscipline, rural sociology is based on the abovementioned differences and its aim is to characterise the social evolution of local communities, their economic dependence on agriculture, and the traditions and customs typical of single villages and regions. The following question thus arises: How can 'rural' linguistics take advantage of sociological experience?

The first field of cooperation is dialectology. Unlike corpus-based studies oriented at syntax, morphology, semantics or typologies of national literary languages, which belong to core linguistics and are free from sociological influences, dialectology is much closer related to social sciences. Even a cursory comparison of publications and conference papers in the given subdisciplines shows that the authors who address issues in semantics or syntax do not refer to social conditions of, for example, the idioms analysed. In contrast, studies on dialects, minority languages or language contact are supplemented with cultural, historical or, at least, sociolinguistic data (cf. ICML 2013; Gómez-Jiménez 2016). Einar Haugen

has named this additional information ‘language ecology,’ i.e. ‘language in relation to its human environment’ (Haugen 1987: 27).

Standardised literary languages can be investigated in both their spoken and written forms. Moreover, thanks to their established norms (lexis, grammar rules), they are ‘independent from their individual manifestations,’ all non-standardised and atypical codes exist in their variants. Moreover, due to lack of appropriate norms, the researcher who examines dialectological problems cannot omit this fact in his or her analysis. Thus, there is a need to explain what the reasons for variantisation are and, therefore, dialectologists as well as other scholars interested in language contacts pay so much attention to the idiolect, i.e. ‘the total set of speech habits of a single individual at a given time’ (Weinreich 1954: 389).

Whereas general linguistics can fully follow de Saussure’s postulates and entirely concentrate on the language as a system (*langue*) without taking into account the phenomena of speaking (*parole*) (cf. de Saussure 1959: 15), ‘rural’ linguistics are forced to include individual instances of language behaviour in its scope of research, which makes it possible to characterise regularities in language variety (cf. Oskaa 2000: 39; Nefedova 2002: 251). Another difference between general and ‘rural,’ or other non-standard linguistics, which should also be stressed, arises from the accessibility of language data, such as corpora. Those linguists who study literary languages can choose from among many databases and tools, while dialectologists have to collect research material on their own. Even if they obtain linguistic samples from other researchers, or they make use of one of a few dialectal corpora (if it refers specifically to the dialect examined by them), the data gathered should be supplemented with further research material. This is the reason for which almost all scholars investigating dialects and minority languages are field researchers (at least to some extent), while, in most cases, semanticists or typologists can examine linguistic phenomena within the walls of their study rooms.

The need for planning and conducting field research is an important feature of ‘rural’ linguistics. Dialectologists ‘exploit [their] methodological tools in the twin contexts of insights which derive from sociology via sociolinguistics’ and have to face the dilemma of finding ‘an inviolate line of demarcation between “dialectology” and “sociolinguistics”’ (Thomas 1988: V).

The methods derived from the works by Thomas and Znaniecki and by Chałasiński can be hence helpful in the process of gathering linguistic material. The basic form of data collection is interviewing informants. Here, questionnaires can achieve the standardisation of the given research, e.g. to gather lexis from a specific field: house building, names of trees, vocabulary connected with anthroponomy, and lexical items belonging to other categories.

However, such tools and the monotonous activity of asking successive questions make the conversation unnatural and tiring for both the informants and the researchers. Attempts to elicit the word or phrase required in the questionnaire often lead to anecdotic situations, e.g. the question 'What does a cow have at the back?' asked by a Russian dialectologist in order to check if the consonant cluster [hv] is contaminated with [f] in the dialect investigated (cf. Russian literary *hvost* 'tail' and Rus. dialectal *fost*) amused the informants who could not believe that well-educated people from university did not know the word 'tail'.

Therefore, such questionnaires should not be the only tools used in the dialectological research, being that the naturalness of conversational interaction should be taken into consideration as well. Natural interaction is important for yet another reason: if informants concentrated on the lexis from a domain specified by the dialectologist or on the particular parts of speech, e.g. pronouns, their language behaviour would be artificial.

In order to avoid a similar situation, William Labov applied the method of distracting the informants in one of the most influential research projects in the history of dialectology and sociolinguistics. His aim was to find social factors influencing phonetic phenomena, but he did not inform his interlocutors that he sought to elicit the pronunciation of centralised diphthongs /ai/ and /au/. Instead, he asked questions concerning the value judgments or social orientation of the informants. The enquiries were phrased in a way which made it possible for the speaker to unintentionally produce the sounds required (Labov 1963: 283).

The biographical method is useful for dialectologists in many areas. Questions about local history, childhood and important periods in one's life are frequent subjects of interviews and they efficiently divert the interlocutors' attention from the linguistic aspects. Sometimes, it is the only way to make informants take part in the research, since many members of minority groups and language communities using their own dialects do

not want to be perceived by others as strange because of their speech. If researchers leave them with the conviction that what is important is not only the manner in which they speak but also the content of their utterances, they would feel more comfortable and natural during the interview.

For elderly rural dwellers, who are the most important research group in traditional dialectology (cf. Britain 2010: 127–128), a dialectologist's visit is an opportunity to come into contact with someone willing to listen to them and, due to limited possibilities of spending their spare time in the village, they eagerly start giving accounts of their life and history (cf. Iwański 2007: 87; Kalniuk 2013: 133). Such attitudes were one of the main stimuli for carrying out 'Dialog pokoleń' [Dialogue of generations], a long-term and comprehensive research project initiated and supervised by Barbara Falińska. The main aim of this research endeavour is to gather linguistic material from various regions of Poland with the aid of biographic interviewing (important moments and periods in life, history, tradition, etc.) or from personal documents: first of all memoirs, but also correspondence.

The wide range of the project is the outcome of the involvement of non-academic researchers. The informants are usually interviewed either by members of their families, e.g. grandchildren, or by other people from their surroundings and facilitated by amateur regionalists with philological education, predominantly local teachers who coordinate survey teams consisting of mainly lower- and higher-secondary-school students (Kresa 2015: 13–16; Falińska 2017: 7–10). Academic dialectologists supervise the project and, together with less experienced university dialectologists (MA and PhD students), they take charge of transcriptions of the interviews, which, on the one hand, show Polish dialectal features, e.g. mazuration, as the replacement of retroflex fricatives and affricates *ś, ż, ć, ź* with alveolar consonants *s, z, c, ʒ*. On the other hand, they have to be 'readable' for non-linguists, since 'Dialogue of generations' is addressed to a wider range of recipients in an attempt to record and promote local dialects (cf. Kresa 2015: 14; Falińska 2017: 7).

The project also involves the publication of personal documents, i.e. memoirs accompanied by a linguistic and socio-cultural commentary (see Falińska, Grott, Baranowska 2007). Although the memoirs existed independently of the researcher's contribution, there are coincidental similarities to Chałasiński's *The Young Generation of Peasants* (cf. Chałasiński 1984: ix–xi). Yet there are no references to the biographical method and the

personal documents method used in sociology. They can be found neither in the monographs from the series 'Dialogue of Generations', nor on the project website (cf. Dialog 2017).

Falińska's project is only one of many examples of using memoirs and other personal documents as a source of linguistic data. Maciej Rak has recently taken into consideration the language in the Polish peasants' wills created between the 16th and the 18th centuries (Rak 2017). It should be stressed that Rak's research is an example of the situation of a linguist examining a published collection of personal documents from the past, collected and edited by a historian (Łosowski 2015).

Apart from the texts of wills, the edition contains basic sociolinguistic information, which makes this material useful for historical linguistics. It should be underlined that the memoirs found in *The Young Generation of Peasants* also constitute a valuable source for linguistic studies. The original orthography, lexis and syntax bear testimony to the features of the sociolect used by Polish peasants in the 1930s (see, e.g., Chałasiński 1984: 4–5; 205). With reference to the contribution by Thomas and Znaniecki, due to the process of edition, the letters published in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* may only be useful in pragmatic and stylistic research (Thomas, Znaniecki 1918: 303–309).

The research material collected through biographic interviews and excerpted from personal documents has a double value because it is not only the source for analysis of linguistic features, but also for cultural or social memory studies. They may also be additional outcomes of dialectological studies while, by way of illustration, long-term research in various regions of Russia has resulted in a several-hundred-page selection of dialectal texts on different topics and a specific self-portrait of Russian village dwellers (see Kasatkin 2009).

From a terminological point of view, the closest linguistic approach to the biographical method in sociology is the concept of 'language biography', which is widely used especially among German sociolinguists (e.g. Franceschini, Miecznikowski 2004; Busch 2011). A parallel example is provided by the use of the synonymous notion of 'language portrait' (Bellet 2016). The method of language biography is used in the conditions of bilingualism in order to characterise the relationship between the oral or written text and the experienter, and the role of emotions and attitudes towards one's languages.

The main sources consist of the informants' narratives and 'the triangulation between observer, observation and observed objects leads to an unstable, culturally sensitive constitution of shared interpretations which appear as "reality," "truth," "assumption of shared background," "discourse," "history," "autobiography," etc. – slightly different in every other moment. This is the basis for the non-repeatability of social events in their full complexity (Franceschini 2003: 2). Although Franceschini cites works from the field of sociology of knowledge only, Brigitte Busch refers directly to the sociological methods of biographical study and narrative interview (cf. Franceschini 2003: 17–19; Busch 2011: 10).

Language biography can also be understood as a special 'linguistic curriculum vitae.' Tadeusz Lewaszkiewicz used this concept in a comprehensive monograph on the language situation of a rural community repatriated from the former Polish Eastern Borderland, the surroundings of Navahrudak (Polish Nowogródek, nowadays in Belarus), to the territory that was incorporated by Poland after 1945 (Lewaszkiewicz 2017: 58–69). The language curricula vitae emerged on the basis of interviews and the participant observation method used by the author who was an insider in the group studied. Although both the method and the concept are well-known in sociology, Lewaszkiewicz does not refer to any works from the field of social sciences (cf. Lewaszkiewicz 2017: 464–474).

The biographical method has particular application in longitudinal sociolinguistic studies, both in micro- and macro-sociolinguistic perspectives (cf. Miodunka 2016). The former shows the evolution of an idiolect depending on the changing social conditions, while the latter is used to characterise language development on the level of entire generational groups (Głuszkowski 2011b: 114–250). The informants should be visited and interviewed at different moments of their lifespan. Thus, the researcher can observe not only changes in the language behaviour of the given group, but also the evolution of their attitudes towards tradition, norms and values.

The idiolect and language behaviour observed in each informant can be described on the basis of such criteria as language acquisition, the language used in childhood, school age and adult life. Hence, there are particular moments responsible for the whole future life, while their significance requires the researcher's special attention (Głuszkowski 2011b: 125–145).

The studies so far in the community of the descendants of Russian religious refugees from the 2nd half of the 17th century, an ethno-confes-

sional minority in North-East Poland, were conducted with the help of the biographical and other sociological methods. They were applied consciously both in the process of gathering linguistic material – biographical interviews, personal letters, private memoirs and amateur poetry, as well as in the analysis, e.g. evolution of language phenomena on the time continuum depending on changes in the informant's biography. Such approach made it possible to make comparisons, if phonetic interference in the recorded speech was reflected in specific orthography of the written texts (Pawlaczyk 2017).

It can be also argued that the group surveyed is differentiated both linguistically and socially. The most remarkable variety of idiolects and language biographies is noticed in the youngest generation. Biographically oriented interviews have shown that the influence of Polish surroundings, i.e. the majority society is stronger than in the older generations. Young members of the minority group discover conflicts between the values of their group and the ones shared by the majority. Although there are still young people living in the traditional rural community and trying to maintain their mother tongue and to follow local customs, the pursuit of social, cultural and economic advancement often means assimilation to the mainstream culture. The conscious use of sociological concepts and methodological tools in 'rural' linguistics and sociolinguistics facilitates the characterisation of the factors shaping such processes as language death and maintenance, which would be inaccessible at the level of purely linguistic analysis (Głuszkowski 2013: 278–280).

Despite the important role of cultural context in language studies, many researchers are still afraid to use sociological methods in linguistic analysis. It is difficult to explain this fact, since there is neither a rule nor a paradigm formally excluding other sciences from their interaction with language studies. Moreover, it might even be quite embarrassing for contemporary structuralists to ignore openly such assumptions expressed by de Saussure's as the ones found in the following quotations: 'we must put language into its social setting and frame the question just as we would for any other social institution' (de Saussure 1959: 72) and 'Speech has both an individual and a social side, and we cannot conceive of one without the other' (de Saussure 1959: 8).

The best concluding argument for the necessity of applying sociological methods in linguistics would probably be a further paragraph drawn from

Course in General Linguistics, in which de Saussure claims that ‘linguistics is very closely related to other sciences that sometimes borrow from its data, sometimes supply it with data,’ and it tries to find common grounds with sociology and social psychology (de Saussure 1959: 6). Developing the reciprocal exchange of data and methodology is exactly what ‘rural’ linguists and rural sociologists can do and, in some cases, this process has already begun.

References

- Bellet, S. 2016 ‘Sprachenportraits – ein introspektives Instrument für das eigene Spracherleben’ [‘Language-portrait – an introspective tool for one’s language biography’]. Available at: http://www.ph-vorarlberg.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/RED_zentrum/RED_forsch/docs/SBellet_Sprachenportraits.pdf
- Bock, P. 1968 (1964) ‘Social structure and language structure,’ in: J. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., pp. 212–222.
- Boss, P., Bryant, C.M., Mancini, J.A. 2017 *Family stress management: A contextual approach*. 3rd edition, Los Angeles–London–New Delhi–Singapore–Washington DC–Melbourne: SAGE.
- Britain, D. 2010 (1992) ‘Dialectology,’ in: K. Malmkjaer (ed.), *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. 3rd edition, London–New York: Routledge, pp. 127–133.
- Busch, B. 2011 ‘Biographisches Erzählen und Visualisieren in der sprachwissenschaftlichen Forschung’ [‘Biographical narrations in linguistic research’], *ÖDaF-Mitteilungen* 2/2011. Available at: https://heteroglossia.net/fileadmin/user_upload/busch_2011_ODaF.pdf
- Chłasiński, J., 1984 (1938) *Młode pokolenie chłopów* [The Young Generation of Peasants], vol. 1, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Kultury Wsi.
- Claval, P. 1988 *European Rural Societies and Landscapes, and the Challenge of Urbanization and Industrialization in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 70(1), *Landscape History* (1988) pp. 27–38.
- Claval, P. 2005 *Reading the rural landscapes*. *Landscape and Urban Planning* No. 70, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2003.10.014, pp. 9–19.
- Cohen, L. Manion. L. Morrison H., 2013 *Research Methods in Education*. 7th edition. London–New York: Routledge.

- Crowley, M., Ebert, K. 2014 'New Rural Immigrant Destinations: Research for the 2010s,' in: E. Ransom, L. Jensen, C. Bailey (eds.), *Rural America in a Globalizing World: Problems and Prospects for the 2010's*, Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, pp. 401–418.
- de Saussure, F. 1959 (1916) *Course in General Linguistics*, New York: Philosophical Library.
- Deweese, S. 2014 'Native Nations in a Changing Global Economy,' in: E. Ransom, L. Jensen, C. Bailey (eds.), *Rural America in a Globalizing World: Problems and Prospects for the 2010's*, Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, pp. 471–288.
- Dialog 2017 *Dialog pokoleń. Apel do młodych regionalistów* [Dialogue of generations. An appeal to young regionalists]. Available at: <https://dialogpokolen.uw.edu.pl/questionnaires>
- Durkheim É. 1982 (1895). *The Rules of Sociological Method*, S. Lukes (ed.). New York-London-Toronto-Sydney: The Free Press.
- Falińska, B., 2017 'Wprowadzenie' [Introduction], in: B. Falińska (ed.), *Dialog pokoleń. Suwalszczyzna. Powiat Sejny* [Dialogue of generations. Suwałki Region. The county of Sejny], Warszawa: Towarzystwo Kultury Języka & Wyższa Szkoła Menedżerska w Białymstoku & Starostwo Powiatowe i Urząd Miasta w Sejnach.
- Falińska, B., Grott, E., Baranowska, E. (eds.), 2007 *Suwalszczanie o swojej przeszłości. Wspomnienia i życiorysy* [The inhabitants of Suwałki Region expressing their past. Memories and curricula vitae], vol. 1, Warszawa: Wszechnica Mazurska & Towarzystwo Kultury Języka w Suwałkach.
- Franceschini, R., 2003 *Unfocussed Language Acquisition? The Presentation of Linguistic Situations in Biographical Narration*. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 4(3). Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/667/1443>
- Franceschini, R., Miecznikowski, J. (eds.) 2004 *Leben mit mehreren Sprachen: Sprachbiographien* [Living with many languages: Language biographies], Bern–Berlin–Bruxelles–Frankfurt am Main–New York–Oxford–Wien: Peter Lang.
- Friedland 2010 *Who Killed Rural Sociology? A Case Study in the Political Economy of Knowledge Production*. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture & Food* 17(1): 72–88. Available at: <http://www.ijisaf.org/archive/17/1/Friedland.pdf>

- Głuszkowski, M. 2011a 'Elementy socio- i psicholingwistiki v ucheniyakh I. A. Boduena de Kurtene' ['Elements of socio- and psycholinguistics in J. Baudouin de Courtenay's theories'], in: P. Głuszkowski, G. Myakgov, P. Cyunchuk (eds.), *POLONIA v Kazani i v Volgo-Urale v XIX–XX vv.* [Poles in Kazan and Volga-Uralic Region in 19th-20th centuries], Kazan: Kazanskiy Universitet, pp. 121–131.
- Głuszkowski, M. 2011b Socjologiczne i psychologiczne uwarunkowania dwujęzyczności staroobrzędowców regionu suwalsko-augustowskiego [Sociological and psychological conditions of the bilingualism of the Old Believers in Suwałki–Augustów Region], Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Głuszkowski, M., 2013. 'Asymilacja wyspy językowo-kulturowej. Przypadek młodego pokolenia polskich staroobrzędowców' ['Assimilation of a linguistic-cultural island. A case of the young generation of Polish Old Believers'], in: E. Nowicka, M. Głuszkowski (eds.), *Słowiańskie wyspy językowe i kulturowe* [Slavonic linguistic and cultural islands], Toruń: Eikon 2013, pp. 271–280.
- Gómez-Jiménez, E. (ed.) 2016 Book of abstracts of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, 31 August – 3 September 2016, University of Naples Federico II, Naples (Italy). Available at: http://sle2016.eu/downloads/BoA%20SLE%202016_final.pdf
- GS, 2017a Google Scholar Citations: Józef Chałasiński, Młode pokolenie chłopów, available at: https://scholar.google.pl/scholar?cites=15058148695575037111&as_sdt=2005&sciodt=0,5&hl=pl
- GS, 2017b Google Scholar Citations: Florian Znaniecki, William I. Thomas, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, available at: https://scholar.google.pl/scholar?cites=16753638361361137934&as_sdt=2005&sciodt=0,5&hl=pl
- Halamska, M. 2015 Specyfika rolnictwa rodzinnego w Polsce: ciężar przeszłości i obecne uwarunkowania' ['The specificity of family farming in Poland: the weight of past and present conditions']. *Wies i rolnictwo* [Village and Agriculture] No. 166, pp. 107–129.
- Haller, H. 1988 Ethnic-language mass media and language loyalty in the United States today: The case of French, German and Italian. *Word* 39(3). 187–200.
- Haugen, E. 1987 *Blessings of Babel: Bilingualism and Language Planning, Problems and Pleasures*, Berlin-New York-Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huddart-Kennedy, E. et al. 2009 Rural-Urban Differences in Environmental Concern in Canada. *Rural Sociology* 74(3): 309–329.
- Hüchtker, D. 2016 Gender, Politics, and Participation: Memoir Competitions in

- Poland. *European Journal of Life Writing* V: 45–66, doi: 10.5463/ejlw.5.125. Available at: <http://ejlw.eu/article/view/161/400>
- ICML, 2013 Book of abstracts of the 14th International Conference on Minority Languages, 11–14 September University of Graz, Austria. Available at: http://icml14.uni-graz.at/etc/upload/ICML_XIV_programme.pdf
- Iwański, R. 2007 Zrównoważony rozwój obszarów wiejskich a sytuacja osób starszych na wsi ['Sustainable development of rural areas and the social position of elderly people in the countryside'], *Folia Pomeranae Universitatis Technologiae Stettinensis* 2013, *Oeconomica* 299(70): 81–90.
- Kalniuk, T. 2013 Mocarstwo słabych – o wartości starców w kulturze ludowej ['The power of the weak: on worthiness of elders in folk culture']. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne* 5: 131–141.
- Kardela, H. 2011 Ile jest strukturalizmu w kognitywizmie lub czy istnieją rewolucje naukowe w językoznawstwie? ['How much "cognitivism" is there in structuralism, or do scientific revolutions really take place in linguistics?']. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* ['Bulletin of the Polish Linguistic Society'] 61: 51–70.
- Kasatkin, L. (ed.) 2009 *Russkaya derevnya v rasskazakh yeyo zhiteley* [Russian village in its inhabitants' narrations], Moscow: AST-PRESS.
- Kelle, U. 2017 'Die Integration qualitativer und quantitativer Forschung – theoretische Grundlagen von „Mixed Methods“' ['The integration of qualitative and quantitative research – theoretical foundations of "mixed methods"'], *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 69(Suppl 2): 39, doi: 10.1007/s11577-017-0451-4. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11577-017-0451-4>
- Kerswill, P. 2001 A dialect with 'great inner strength'? The perception of nativeness in the Bergen speech community. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 23–49. Available at: <http://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/appling/workingpapers/kerswill.pdf>
- Kończal, K., Wawrzyniak, J. 2017 Provincializing memory studies: Polish approaches in the past and present. *Memory Studies*, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698016688238>
- Kresa, M. 2015 'Wprowadzenie' [Introduction], in: M. Kresa (ed.), *Dialog pokoleń na Mazowszu Dalszym (Dąbrówka, Sadowne, Stoczek)* [Dialogue of generations in Mazovian Region (Dąbrówka, Sadowne, Stoczek)], Warszawa: BEL Studio, pp. 13–16.

- Labov, W. 1963 The Social Motivation of a Sound Change. *Word* 19(3): 273–309, doi: 10.1080/00437956.1963.11659799. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00437956.1963.11659799>
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 2000 (1958) *Antropologia strukturalna* [Structural anthropology], Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe KR.
- Lewaszkiewicz, T. 2017 *Język powojennych przesiedleńców z Nowogródka i okolicy* [The language of postwar repatriates from Nowogródek and its surroundings], Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Lewicki, A. 2003 'Dialektologia,' in: K. Polański (ed.), *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [Encyclopedia of general linguistics], Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, pp. 118–120.
- Łosowski, J. (coll. and ed.) 2015 *Testamenty chłopów polskich od drugiej połowy XVI do XVIII wieku* [Polish peasants' wills from the 2nd part of the 16th century till the 18th century], Lublin: Wydawnictwo Olech.
- Mauss, M. 2001 (1950) *Socjologia i antropologia* [Sociology and anthropology], Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe KR.
- McDavid, Jr., R. 1965 American Social Dialects. *College English* 26(4): 254–260.
- Miodunka, W. 2016 'Biografia językowa jako jedna z metod badania dwujęzyczności' ['Language biography as one of the methods in the research on bilingualism'], in: Dębski R., Miodunka W. (eds.), *Bilingwizm polsko-obcy dziś. Od teorii i metodologii badań do studiów przypadków* [Polish-foreign bilingualism today. From theory and methodology to case studies], Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, pp. 49–87.
- Nefedova, E. 2002 'Idiolekt kak istochnik dialektного varyirovaniya' ['Idiolect as a source of dialectal variety'], in: Kasatkin L. et al. (eds.), *Materialy i issledovaniya po russkoy dialektologii* [Materials and studies in Russian dialectology] vol. II (VIII). Moscow: Nauka, pp. 251–262.
- Nijhoff, K. 2016 Polish Migrants in The Hague: Stories of Integration and Attachment. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 18: 623–640, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-016-0491-z>
- Oskaar, E. 2000 Idiolekt als Grundlage der variationsorientierten Linguistik' ['Idiolect as the basis for variety-oriented research in linguistics']. *Sociolinguistica* 14: 37–41.
- Pasieka, A. 2015 *Hierarchy and Pluralism: Living Religious Difference in Catholic Poland*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Petković, J. 2007 Traditional values and modernization challenges in forming

- urban and rural culture. *Facta Universitatis. Series: Philosophy, Sociology and Psychology* 6(1): 23–39.
- Pawlaczyk, A. 2017 'Znaczenie metody biograficznej w badaniach gwary polskich staroobrzędowców' ['The role of the biographical method in the research on Polish Old Believers' dialect']. Paper at 75th meeting of Polish Linguistic Society, Łódź 18th–19th September 2017.
- Polański, K. 2003 'Socjologiczna szkoła w językoznawstwie' ['Sociological school in linguistics'], in: K. Polański (ed.) *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [Encyclopedia of general linguistics], Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, p. 543.
- Portes, A., Rumbaut, R. 2006 *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, 3rd edition, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press.
- Rak, M. 2017 'Testamenty chłopów polskich jako źródło badań dialektologicznych, historycznojęzykowych i etnolingwistycznych (uwagi wstępne)' ['Polish peasants' testaments as a source for dialectological, historical-linguistic and ethnolinguistic research']. Paper at 75th meeting of Polish Linguistic Society, Łódź 18th–19th September 2017.
- Rusinova, I. 2011 *Slovar' russkikh govorov severa Permskogo kraja* [The dictionary of Russian dialects in Perm Krai], Perm': Permskiy Universitet.
- Smith, S. 2011 *The Institutional and Intellectual Origins of Rural Sociology*. Paper prepared for Rural Sociological Society 74th Annual Meeting 28–31 July 2011 Boise, ID. Available at: <http://www.ag.auburn.edu/~bailerc/Smith.2011.pdf>
- Styk, J. 1999 *Chłopi i wieś polska w perspektywie socjologicznej i historycznej* [Peasants and Polish village in a sociological and historical perspective], Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Szacki, J. 1981 *Historia myśli socjologicznej. Część druga* [History of sociological thought. Part two], Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. 1972 (1964) 'A Contribution to the Sociological Study of Language Maintenance and Language Shift,' in: J. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, vol. 2, The Hague: Mouton, pp. 365–376.
- Tagliamonte, S., D'Arcy, A. 2009 Peaks Beyond Phonology: Adolescence, Incrementation, and Language Change. *Language* 85(1): 58–108.
- Thomas, A. 1988 'Preface,' in: A. Thomas (ed.), *Methods in Dialectology: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference Held at the University College of North Wales*, 3rd–7th August 1987, Clevedon–Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, p. V.

- Thomas, W.I., Znaniecki, F. 1918 *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Monograph of an Immigrant Group. Volume I. Primary Group Organization*, Boston: Richard G. Badger, Gorham Press.
- Weinreich, U. 1954 *Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?* *Word* 10(2–3): 388–400, doi: 10.1080/00437956.1954.11659535. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00437956.1954.11659535>
- Weinreich, U., 1963 (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Wieruszewska, M. 2002 'Wieś' ['Rural areas'], in: K. Frieske et al. (eds.) *Encyklopedia Socjologii* [The encyclopedia of sociology], vol. 4, Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, pp. 318–322.
- Wilczyńska, E. 2016 *Dzieciństwo i dziecko w narracjach pamiętnikarek chłopskich* ['Childhood and child in narratives of female peasants' memoirs']. *Litteraria Copernicana*, 3(23): 37–51. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/LC.2017.049>
- Winclawski, W. 1998 'Chałasiński Józef', in: A. Kojder et al. (eds.) *Encyklopedia Socjologii* [The encyclopedia of sociology], vol. 1, Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, pp. 73–76.
- Wos, 2017a Web of Science. Cited Reference Search: Józef Chałasiński, *Młode pokolenie chłopów*, available at: http://apps-1webofknowledge-1com-100bc2fk01adf.han3.uci.umk.pl/Search.do?product=WOS&SID=P1GKOK4LLp5k2eU9fZq&search_mode=CitedRefIndex&prID=6a88615b-360c-4f0a-960f-be39047bf591
- Wos, 2017b Web of Science. Cited Reference Search: Florian Znaniecki, William I. Thomas, *Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, available at: http://apps-1webofknowledge-1com-100bc2fk01adf.han3.uci.umk.pl/Search.do?product=WOS&SID=P1GKOK4LLp5k2eU9fZq&search_mode=CitedRefIndex&prID=b9f8186f-0e76-42eb-b78d-e6eacca22dd
- Znaniecki, F. 1934 *The Method of Sociology*, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc.
- Zorska-Nikoniuk, D. 2014 *Zastosowanie współczynnika humanistycznego w jakościowej orientacji badawczej. (Re)interpretacja teorii Floriana Znanieckiego* ['The application of humanistic coefficient within the qualitative research paradigm. (Re)interpretation of Florian Znaniecki's theory']. *Pedagogika Społeczna* [Social Pedagogy] 1(51): 33–44.