

tries, which are under-represented in the higher education and political science literature. Given the complexity and diversity of their systems, the graphic representation of changes is particularly useful. I found the categorisation of higher education models and their operationalisation to be useful since it provides a more comprehensive view of the changes in higher education governance. At the same time, some points for improvement can be mentioned.

Although I found the story of convergence convincing, and the comparison of countries' higher education legacies and current developments useful, I would have liked the indicators regarding stakeholders and networks in the governance of higher education to have been more prominent. Dobbins' argument on the changing role of the state in higher education governance has been highlighted, but I am not sure that the different roles of the state have been given enough attention, such as state regulation versus state guidance. Finally, although managerial governance is noted in the operationalisation of the models—and attributed largely to the market-based ideal-type model—I wish it had been highlighted more, since institutional management can be important not only within institutions, but also at the policy level (e.g. via the Rectors' Conference) and international networks. As observed in different countries, the Rectors' Conferences may have a significant influence on governance changes or stability, even though their managerial guidance in the institution may be constrained by their powerful Senates.

The comparative political science lenses selected in order to understand the directions of change in higher education governance and the reasons behind it, with a special focus on the Bologna Process, successfully invigorate the debate on the dynamics of change in higher education governance and the institutionalisation of Europeanisation processes across countries, and, most importantly, they shed light on

these processes in the highly dynamic higher education systems of Central and Eastern Europe, which is seldom done.

Liudvika Leisyte

School of Government and  
Management, Twente University  
l.leisyte@utwente.nl

#### References

- Clark, B. 1983. *The Higher Education System*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- DiMaggio, P. and W. Powell. 1983. 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.' *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–160.
- Hall, P. and R. Taylor. 1996. 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms.' *Political Studies* 44 (1): 936–957.
- Holzinger, K. and C. Knill. 2007. 'Ursachen und Bedingungen internationaler Politikkonvergenz.' Pp. 85–106 in *Transfer Diffusion und Konvergenz von Politiken*, edited by K. Holzinger, H. Jörgens and C. Knill. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Leisyte, L. 2002. *Higher Education Governance in Post-Soviet Lithuania*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Institute for Educational Research.

**James Wilson: *Moravians in Prague. A Sociolinguistic Study of Dialect Contact in the Czech Republic***  
Frankfurt am Main 2009: Peter Lang,  
267 pp.

Variation sociolinguistics investigates correlations between linguistic elements and key social characteristics of a speaker, such as his or her age, sex, region of origin, socio-economic status, and education. It might sound somewhat paradoxical to state that Wilson's study is one of only a few works in variation sociolinguistics based on Czech and that it is actually the first study on such a comparatively large scale to investigate dialect contact between speakers of different varieties of Czech. The paradox follows from the fact that Czech linguists have been interested in the social

dimension of language and in the stratification of Czech into varieties for many decades, having started in the 1930s with the formulation of the 'theory of the cultivation of language' by the founders of the Prague Linguistic Circle. At that time they paid closest attention to the question of the literary or standard language and its codification. Later, since the beginning of the 1960s, the version of Czech used widely as a vernacular or interdialect, usually called Common (or Colloquial) Czech, its relation to Standard Czech and its territorial distribution have become central to linguists' discussions and even quite harsh polemics, which recommenced with new vigour after 1989. Nonetheless, the arguments used in these debates relied for the most part on linguistic introspection and the native-speaker intuition of their participants and on studies carried out by the methods of traditional dialectology. Only in recent years have some linguists started to refer to newly established linguistic corpora. It is therefore not so surprising that researchers who *cannot* rely on native-speaker intuition, i.e. foreign bohemists, predominate among authors of the few variationist or quantitative sociolinguistic studies on the Czech language situation. The book under review is a case in point.

The language situation addressed by Wilson's research is in some respects comparable with situations of dialect contact in various other language communities, but there are also some features unique to the Czech language situation, arising from the complicated historical development of Standard Czech. The current standard is considerably archaic as it does not include certain phonological and morphological changes which were already fully stabilised in the speech of Prague and Bohemia at the time when the modern standard was established at the beginning of the 19th century. These changes now represent features typical of Common Czech, the vernacular spoken throughout Bohemia, but

they did not reach eastern and northern Moravia (and the Czech-speaking part of Silesia). In central Moravia, these changes were received too, but here their development went further, resulting in the quite specific Central Moravian dialects. Today, Standard Czech is not acquired as a mother tongue by children of any social group or in any region in the Czech Republic; conversely, Common Czech is not socially restricted, but is limited territorially. Standard Czech has higher prestige in Moravia, and speakers of Moravian (inter)dialects have an innate sense that their language is 'purer' and closer to the Standard than Common Czech is. This seeming proximity may be questioned easily. There is actually plenty of agreement between Common and Standard Czech in such features as voice assimilation, most nominal declension, and certain syntactical constructions, which have different forms in Moravian dialects.

James Wilson studies dialect contact between Moravian students living at a Prague students' dormitory and their new—Common Czech-speaking—environment. One of the objectives of his research is to verify the contact hypothesis formulated by Petr Sgall, a renowned Czech linguist who has long advocated Common Czech as the majority vernacular. This hypothesis predicts that, having moved to live in Bohemia, speakers of Moravian dialects drop some features of their local vernaculars and assimilate features of Common Czech [Sgall and Hronek 1992: 90]. As vague as this contact hypothesis is formulated, it is quite banal and the result of its testing comes as no surprise either to Wilson or to anyone who has some knowledge of previous dialect contact researches wherever these have been conducted. Yes, Moravian migrants do assimilate Common Czech features after some period of residence in Prague. (Admittedly, the accommodation of the first migrant generation is usually never complete.) But what is really interesting and what Wilson actually investi-

gates are such questions as: By what route does the accommodation take place? Is there a sort of fixed route of linguistic accommodation as has been claimed by, among others, Peter Trudgill [1986]? What new forms are acquired more widely, earlier and with greater ease, which ones are picked up later or even never? Who are the people who accommodate early, easily, most new forms and who are those who are resistant to a new dialect longer? And how does this correlate with their social characteristics?

Wilson's informants are 18 men and 22 women, representing proportionally all three main Moravian dialect regions. Most of them were living at one student dormitory in Prague at the time of the research and were studying medicine. Students of some other subjects such as sports science were included too, but Wilson avoided humanities students, supposing that their language awareness is higher than is typical of the whole population. He investigates the correlation of their assimilation of Common Czech with four primary social parameters—gender, region of origin, network integration, and length of residence—and three other (secondary) social criteria—the informants' attitudes to Common Czech, the subject they were studying, and the method of their recruitment. Wilson analysed data elicited in interviews of two different formats. The first, sociolinguistic, interview consisted of a twenty-minute informal talk, which the author's collaborator, a native speaker of Common Czech and an insider in the community under scrutiny, conducted with each of the informants on everyday topics, none of them having been told of the exact aim of the research. The second interview, recorded on the same day and conducted by the author himself, had two parts. The first related to the informants' social life, enabling the author to ascertain their social network integration score (with such questions as 'Where does your room-mate come from?').

In the second part, the author asked direct questions about the interviewee's attitudes to language.

Wilson focused on three phonological and three grammatical variables whose usage could be considered a measure of accommodation to Common Czech. Phonological variables are the most studied in variation linguistics, as they are easy to elicit because of their high frequency in speech. This does not apply to the same extent to grammatical variables, as the author was also able to confirm, for out of the three chosen grammatical variables only one occurred in statistically relevant numbers. The author is precise and cautious in his analysis, having divided both the linguistic and independent variables into further sub-variables, selecting and further testing those correlations which turned out to be indeed statistically significant. Being properly circumspect about drawing conclusions, he also tests how the independent variables interact among themselves. For instance, at first glance women seemed to accommodate to Common Czech much more readily than men, exceeding them in the use of all but one of the variables being studied. But a deeper look into the relationship between accommodation and sex with a combination of other social factors revealed that the women in the study were also slightly more integrated in a social network than the men. Network integration finally turned out to be the most significant of all the social factors, being interconnected in various ways with some of the others. For example, the positive correlation between accommodation and language attitudes is supported by the fact that people with an open attitude to their new social environment integrate earlier and more deeply, and people who integrate well into a new community usually start to alter their previous attitudes. An informant's region of origin came out as the least important social factor. Wilson's expectation that speakers of the Central

Moravian dialect would use more Common Czech features was not confirmed.

Another issue which Wilson's research addresses is whether there is a hierarchy according to which some linguistic variables are assimilated better and sooner and others less and/or later, and what possible factors may be responsible. The research confirmed the author's prediction that the most territorially widespread and socially acceptable features are the most readily assimilated. Yet the interplay of social and intra-linguistic factors remains an area of speculation and ambiguity. Some researchers in dialect contact use the term 'salience' for the features that are accommodated better and quickly, but they have not arrived at an agreed definition. 'Salient' features are those which are the most frequent in a variety and/or are particularly well-known within a given community; the salient features of the old dialect are given up first and the salient features of the new one are accommodated first in any dialect contact situation. But the same forms could be socially stigmatised as well, which may bar them from being assimilated easily.

Wilson's monograph poses a kind of challenge to Czech sociolinguistics: it has filled, if only partially, a gap in our knowledge of the Czech sociolinguistic situation, but it raises even more questions. First, the second part of the contact hypothesis should be tested. That is, is it possible that native speakers of Common Czech, having moved to Moravia, do not behave as most migrants in dialect contact situations, that is, they do not assimilate local forms? Second, what differences in linguistic accommodation might there be between university students or graduates and blue-collar workers? And further, what role does a speaker's age play in dialect assimilation? Wilson could not address this question because all his informants are of the same age cohort. But might there not be something like a 'critical age' for the accommodation of a second dialect? What differences might

there be between the accommodation of Moravians who have moved to Prague already as university graduates or later in life, or are, say, married to another Moravian and so forth? Perhaps this, certainly only partial, list of further issues is evidence that the book under review provides ample food for thought, especially in the range of social parameters that might be examined next.

Kamila Mrázková,  
Institute of the Czech Language  
AS CR, Prague  
mrazkova@ujc.cas.cz

#### References

- Sgall, Petr and Jiří Hronek. 1992. *Čeština bez příkras*. (Czech Laid Bare) Prague: H&H.  
Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell.

**Luděk Sýkora (ed.): *Rezidenční segregace***  
Prague 2010: Univerzita Karlova, pp. 143

*Rezidenční segregace* (Residential Segregation) is a short book resulting from a number of research projects commissioned by the Czech government, including the Ministry for Regional Development, in order to provide an initial overview of the extent of residential segregation in the Czech Republic. The editor, an urban geographer, is also the author of most of the chapters, which consist of short overviews of the phenomenon of residential segregation in other countries, especially the United States, and equally short case studies from the Czech Republic. The booklet comes across as a cross-over between a commissioned report and a syllabus aimed at undergraduate students. It makes no contribution to theory, and its scholarly value is diminished by the absence of even a single reference to publications—Czech or foreign—about the phenomenon under investigation.