

New International Dictionary was published in 1909. The second edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary* (1934) was the ultimate authority on meaning and usage and it dominated the market for unabridged dictionaries until the 1960s (Morton 1994: 2; 39). In 1961, the third edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary* came out, which was descriptive, reflecting the view of its editor Philip B. Gove (1967: 7), who pointed out that "Lexicography should have no traffic with guesswork, prejudice, or bias, or with artificial notions of correctness and superiority. It must be descriptive and not prescriptive." The descriptive approach of the dictionary was not well accepted by those who believe that a dictionary should serve as a standard of correctness, thus being prescriptive (Morton 1994: 7; Béjoint 2010: 134). In 1966, *The Random House Dictionary* was published which was intended to be fully descriptive and saw a revised edition in 1987 (Morton 1994: 284). The publication of the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* in 1969 should be understood as a reaction against the descriptive approach of *Webster's Third* (Adams 2015: 17), being self-described as more prescriptive than its competitors (Morton 1994: 285). In the *Introduction to the American Heritage Dictionary*, the editor-in-chief, William Morris states that the dictionary "would faithfully record our language, the duty of any lexicographer", but he adds that the dictionary "would add the essential dimension of guidance, that sensible guidance toward grace and precision of the American public" (Morris 1969: vi). However, the first edition also included elements that pointed towards a more descriptive direction. Successive editions (1982, 1992, 2000 and 2011) qualified the dictionary's prescriptive tendencies, yet, in the course of time, the dictionary changed in ways that reflect the descriptive approach (Adams 2015: 17-18; 25; 32). Despite a growing trend toward description, all five editions of the *American Heritage Dictionary* are still regarded as normative (Adams 2015: 41).

It can be said that the prominence of linguistic prescriptivism in English was set at the level considerably lower than in numerous other European languages very early on. One can trace this attitude to the following statement in Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary*:

[...] academies have been instituted, to guard the avenues of their languages, to retain fugitives, and repulse intruders; but their vigilance and activity have hitherto been vain; sounds are too volatile and subtile for legal restraints; to enchain syllables, and to lash the wind, are equally the undertakings of pride, unwilling to measure its desires by its strength. The French language has visibly changed under the inspection of the academy; the stile of Amelot's translation of Father Paul is observed, by Le Courayer to be un peu passé; and no Italian will maintain that the diction of any modern writer is not perceptibly different from that of Boccace, Machiavel, or Caro. (Johnson 1755: Preface: 10)

As we could see from the above overview, prescriptivism is present in the cultures and linguistic traditions of the English-speaking world in the Northern Hemisphere. The authority for prescriptive usage in English is not very clear, the reason being the absence of normatively inclined institutions like language

academies, and there are various and changing referents like the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the *American Heritage Dictionary*, and the like (Balteiro 2011: 285). British dictionaries have been more descriptive than prescriptive, which is due to the influence of Johnson's *Dictionary* and OED (Béjoint 2010: 154). America might be expected to be particularly open to lexicographic description, but surprisingly, Americans have long embraced prescriptive attitude toward language. Prescriptivism is no longer a hot issue in America and the late twentieth century American lexicography is characterized by the descriptive approach (Béjoint 2010: 155; Adams 2015: 18–20).

2.3 Prescriptivism and descriptivism in the lexicographic tradition of the Slovene language

As stated in Section 2.1, Slavonic languages are characterized by a reference book trio: a dictionary, along with a grammar book and a manual of orthography. A look into the history of linguistic development in Slovenia shows that the first reference books go back to the 16th century, to the works of the Protestant writers who were strongly influenced by the German Protestant Reformation movement. The most notable Slovene Protestant Primož Trubar is regarded as the key figure of Slovene cultural history who is also notable for consolidating the Slovene language. The first proper dictionaries were published at the end of the 16th century by the German lexicographer named Hieronymus Megiser. These dictionaries were multilingual, Slovene being one among many target languages. The multilingual dictionaries formed a basis for the development of bilingual dictionaries that followed, whereas monolingual lexicography in Slovenia developed relatively late.

The first Slovene monolingual dictionary was compiled by Joža Glonar and came out as late as 1936. Glonar adopted a more prescriptive approach as he tried to follow linguistic rules when describing the language (Dobrovoljc 2004: 65–66). The compilation of the first institutional monolingual Slovene dictionary began in the 1950s. The Dictionary of Standard Slovene (DSS) appeared in five volumes and the final, fifth, volume came out in 1991. The second edition with minor changes and corrections was published in 2014. These two editions are characterized by strict adherence to normativity and prescriptivism. In 2016, work on an entirely new dictionary of standard Slovene began (*eSSKJ: Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika — e-Dictionary of Standard Slovene*). The first and the second editions of the DSS claim to include a variety of variant forms and language peculiarities. The lexicographers admit openly that their approach is normative, but at the same time they strive towards objectivity to the greatest possible degree. The compilers of the eDSS, however, moved away from prescriptivism to language description, but partly they retain the normative role typical of manuals of orthography. For more information on the inclusion of normative information in the DSS and eDSS, see Šipka et al. 2020.

Compared to monolingual dictionaries, grammar books of Slovene can be traced back to the end of the 16th century. The first grammar book was published in 1584 by Adam Bohorič and was didactically oriented (meant to serve moral teaching as well). Numerous other grammar books were published in the centuries that followed, some didactic, some didactic with normative tendencies and others with pure normative orientation. The most influential grammar book was published in 1976 by Jože Toporišič. It is considered the highest authority in the field of grammar and is currently the single most quoted grammar book in Slovenia (Marušič and Žaucer 2015).

The reference book that has been of the utmost importance in setting the norm for the Slovene standard language has been the manual of orthography. Many different manuals of Slovene orthography typically consist of two parts: the first part contains theoretical rules relating to orthography, pronunciation, inflectional paradigms, syntactic rules and style; the second part is the dictionary part that exhibits the rules explained in the first part. The first manual of orthography was published in the second half of the 19th century by Fran Levec and was didactic in nature; this is why it was used as a school textbook (Dobrovoljc 2015a). The 20th century saw the publication of numerous other manuals of orthography that were first published by individual scholars and were characterized by a strong normative note. The first manual of orthography to be published under the auspices of an institution (the Orthographic Committee of the Scholarly Society in Ljubljana) was authored by Anton Breznik and Fran Ramovš. It came out in 1935, and it is descriptive in nature, meaning that it allows the users to make a choice about the variants included in the manual (Dobrovoljc 2015b). In 2001, a completely new *Manual of Slovene Orthography* was published. It was edited by the grammarian Jože Toporišič and others. This *Manual* is based on Toporišič's (1976) grammar book and follows the tradition of normative manuals of orthography (Dobrovoljc 2015c).

Bearing all these historical developments in mind, the study into the effect of normative labels in contemporary dictionaries on their users was conducted. The findings of this study are presented and discussed in the following sections.

3. Research design

The study was carried out with Slovene and American students who are likely to use monolingual dictionaries in general (e.g., in writing their assignments). We wanted to get an insight into how native speakers of Slovene and American English interpret select normative labels in monolingual general dictionaries. For this purpose, we prepared a questionnaire, which was distributed in early November 2019 to the undergraduate students of economics and English at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. The US survey was conducted in late January 2020 with the students of English and International Letters and Cultures at Arizona State University. A total of 105 students provided their responses to all

questions in the Slovene survey, while 112 participants provided their responses to all questions in the US survey³.

The questionnaire was developed with the aim of eliciting monolingual dictionary users' attitudes toward normative labels and the effects the labels have on dictionary users. The Slovene questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1. The US questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2. The questionnaire consists of three parts based on the type of information we wanted to obtain. The first part (Question 1) includes the labels *colloquial*, *dialectal*, *incorrect*, and *obsolete* belonging to primary exclusion labels. The purpose of primary exclusion labels is to exclude a word or its meaning from the contemporary standard language. The four primary exclusion labels are mixed with four secondary exclusion labels (*expressive*, *facetious*, *ironic*, *vulgar*) whose primary purpose differs from that of primary exclusion labels. Secondary exclusion labels can still be interpreted as excluding a lemma or one of its senses from contemporary standard language. Our respondents were asked how often a lemma or one of its senses marked with one of the aforementioned labels is used in the contemporary standard language (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never). Question 1 aims at discerning how our respondents interpret these labels as such, i.e., in isolation from the words that are labeled. The second part, which comprises of three questions, inquiries about whether these labels are useful (Question 2), whether respondents pay attention to them (Question 3), and whether a more precise division within the field of colloquialism would be useful (Question 4). The purpose of these questions was to gather information about users' general attitudes toward this type of labels. The final part of the questionnaire (Question 5) asks if the selected words are used in the standard language (using a Likert scale: strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree). There are four pairs of words. In each pair, the words share a common characteristic, e.g., both words in a pair are colloquial but just one of them is labeled *colloquial*, whereas the other one does not have any label. The purpose of Question 5 was to see whether the labels have any effect on dictionary users.

4. Results

As indicated in Section 1, the present research was meant to provide answers to the following questions, comparing Slovene and US data:

- a. How does a type of normative labels influence the level of acceptability of labeled words in the standard language variety?
- b. What are the users' attitudes toward normative dictionary labels?
- c. How does the fact that a lemma or one of its senses marked with a normative label affect the level of acceptability of labeled words in the standard language variety?

The results relating from these three questions will be discussed in turn below.

4.1 Primary vs secondary exclusion labels

For both, the Slovene and the US surveys, an independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the levels of the standard language usage of primary and secondary exclusion labels (Question 1). In the Slovene survey, there was no significant difference in the level of standard language use for primary labels (M=2.60, SD=1.21) and secondary levels (M=2.75, SD=1.12); $t(838) = -1.84$, $p = .067$. As can be seen, primary exclusion labels have a somewhat lower degree of standard language use, but the difference is not statistically significant, although it is very close to that status. In the US survey, however, there was a significant difference in the level of standard language use for primary exclusion labels (M=2.97, SD=1.19) and secondary exclusion labels (M=3.26, SD=1.21); $t(894) = -3.65$, $p = .000$. As can be seen, primary exclusion labels have a lower degree of standard language use. The standard language use of individual labels is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Standard language use of individual labels

	Slovene			US		
	Type	N	Mean	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
colloquial	primary	105	3.03	112	3.34	1.03
dialectal	primary	105	2.39	112	3.19	.87
incorrect	primary	105	2.37	112	2.65	1.45
obsolete	primary	105	2.61	112	2.70	1.20
expressive	secondary	105	3.12	112	3.85	.95
facetious	secondary	105	2.79	112	2.92	1.03
ironic	secondary	105	3.10	112	3.45	1.11
vulgar	secondary	105	1.97	112	2.83	1.42

In the Slovene study, the results show that the main contributor to the exclusion among secondary labels is the label *vulgar*. Also, given that Slovene dic-

tionaries contain both *colloquial* and *lower colloquial*, the primary label *colloquial* is considerably less exclusive than other primary labels. This points to the fact that the difference between primary and secondary colloquial labels could be even higher with other labels in lieu of the aforementioned two. The US data show that the main contributors to the exclusion among secondary labels are the labels *vulgar* and *facetious*. Among primary labels, *colloquial* and *dialectal* are considerably less exclusive than other primary labels.

What is most remarkable in comparison of the two datasets is a higher level of acceptance for the use of labeled dictionary entries in the standard language variety in US respondents across the board. The average value for acceptance is 2.67 for Slovene respondents and 3.12 for US respondents.

4.2 Usefulness and use of labels

The data obtained from the responses to Questions 2, 3 and 4 (Table 2) show that there is a difference between the cognitive component of the attitude about usage labels (there is a relatively high acceptance for the idea that they are generally useful) and the behavioral component of that attitude (the respondents use them at a lower degree). One can also see that the belief that the division inside the label *colloquial* (*standard colloquial* vs *non-standard colloquial*) is useful only slightly above the neutral point (with three being the mid-point of the 1–5 scale).

Table 2: Usefulness and use of labels

	Slovene			US		
	Useful	I use them	Higher vs lower colloquial useful	Useful	I use them	Higher vs lower colloquial useful
N	105	105	105	112	112	112
Mean	4.10	3.22	3.24	3.92	3.12	3.24
SD	.843	1.18	.90	.818	3.38	.942

The Slovene and US data are remarkably similar, the only difference being a higher positive attitude of the Slovene respondents about the usefulness of the labels.

4.3 Labeled vs unlabeled entries

For both groups of respondents, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the level of acceptance for the use in the standard language variety in labeled and unlabeled entries (Question 5). In the Slovene dataset, there was a significant difference in the level of acceptability for labeled entries ($M=2.58$, $SD=1.28$) and non-labeled entries ($M=2.94$, $S=1.30$); $t(838) = -4.05$, $p=.000$. As can be seen, labeled entries have a lower degree of acceptability. The acceptability of individual entries is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Acceptability of individual entries in the Slovene study

	1ybaksis	1nsekirati	2ydeci	2ndeka	3ydeka	3nhohštapler	4ncoprnik	4yfajfa
N	105	105	105	105	105	105	105	1.05
Mean	1.77	3.30	3.27	3.51	2.92	1.88	3.06	2.34
SD	.80	1.38	1.37	1.11	1.28	.90	1.11	1.06

Heading codes: 1,2,3,4 – the number of the pair of labeled and unlabeled entries, y – label present, n – label absent. The remainder is the name of the entry.

There is a weak, yet not statistically significant, positive correlation between the self-assessment of using the labels and the effect they have (the label use question versus the difference in acceptability between labeled and unlabeled entries [$R = .12$, $p = .22$, $N=105$]).

In the US dataset, there was a significant difference in the level of acceptability for labeled entries ($M=3.04$, $SD=1.34$) and non-labeled entries ($M=3.67$, $S=1.21$); $t(894) = 7.38$, $p=.00$. As can be seen, labeled entries have a lower degree of acceptability. The acceptability of individual entries is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Acceptability of individual entries in the US study

	1ncram	1ychill_out	2yscrewed	2ybamboozle	3yprick	3nhang_out	4nknocked-up	4njerk
N	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
Mean	4.04	3.35	3.11	3.03	2.69	4.08	3.04	3.53
SD	.95	1.33	1.31	1.32	1.34	1	1.29	1.27

Heading codes: 1,2,3,4 – the number of the pair of labeled and unlabeled entries, y – label present, n – label absent. The remainder is the name of the entry.

There is a weak, yet not statistically significant, positive correlation between the self-assessment of using the labels and the effect they have (the label use

question versus the difference in acceptability between labeled and unlabeled entries [$R = .18$, $p = .063$]).

What is most remarkable in a comparison between the Slovene and US data is a considerably lower level of acceptance among Slovene students for labeled and unlabeled entries alike. On a scale from 1 (least acceptable) to 5 (most acceptable), the average among Slovene students was 2.76 (2.58 for unlabeled entries and 2.94 for labeled entries) as opposed to the score obtained from the US students of 3.36 (3.04 for unlabeled entries and 3.67 for labeled entries).

5. Discussion and conclusion

Dictionaries are often thought of as a record of language. However, dictionaries — even if they claim to be only descriptive or only prescriptive — mostly combine both descriptive and prescriptive approaches. This is pointed out by Svensén (2009: 24), who says that "... most general-purpose dictionaries should be characterized as partly normative because, in one way or other, a large portion of what they describe is actually made up of linguistic norms already in existence"; this is also in line with Cameron (1995: 5), who considers this absolute binary distinction between descriptivism and prescriptivism a mistake. An important point that should be emphasized is that in the dictionary, the public often seeks answers to questions about the spelling, pronunciation and the correct usage of words, which means that the public expects at least a certain degree of normativity (Adams 2015: 25). Compilers of a general-purpose monolingual dictionary should therefore always try to find a balance between descriptive and prescriptive approaches, since both of them affect the users (Adams 2015: 43).

The results obtained in the present research point to the following hypotheses that are consistent with the aforementioned claim about the relation between descriptivism and prescriptivism.

First, in both observed samples, the type of normative labels matters. Primary normative labels are associated with a lower acceptance for the use in the standard language variety than their secondary counterparts. In this survey, primary labels showed a lower level of acceptability (2.60 in the Slovene and 2.97 in the US survey) than their secondary counterparts (2.75 in the Slovene and 3.26 in the US survey). The fact that their effect seems to be stronger in the Slovene sample could be related to a higher degree of prescriptivism in the mainstream Slovene linguistic culture as opposed to a more descriptive approach in the American linguistic culture.

Second, in both samples, there is a disconnect between the cognitive component of attitude toward normative labels and its behavioral component. The approval for the claim that these labels are useful (4.10 in the Slovene and 3.92 in the US survey) is considerably higher than the value for the statement that the respondent uses the labels (3.22 in the Slovene and 3.12 in the US survey). A higher approval for the claim about usefulness of the labels in the Slovene

sample may be another consequence of a higher level of prescriptivism in that linguistic culture.

Third, the presence of the label makes a difference in terms of the level of acceptance for standard language use in both observed samples. Consequently, labeled entries have a lower level of acceptability (2.58 in the Slovene and 3.04 in the US survey) than their unlabeled counterparts (2.94 in the Slovene and 3.67 in the US survey). A considerably lower general level of acceptance for standard language use among Slovene students (2.76 versus 3.36 in their US counterparts) may, yet again, be related to a higher prominence of prescriptivism in that linguistic culture.

Among the limitations of the study whose results are presented in this paper, we should mention that the study was carried out in the environment of only two languages, i.e., Slovene and American English. Apart from that, the number of respondents and their background (they were all students) was also part of a fairly limited sample, which means that the two gathered were not representative. Consequently, the results should be understood as hypotheses which should be examined in more detail in further studies.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the project, The Practice of Normative Labeling in Slovene and American Lexicography (grant number: BI-US/18-20-036), which was financially supported by the Slovene Research Agency. They also acknowledge the approval of the Arizona State University (ASU) Institutional Review Board. Our gratitude goes to Elly van Gelderen, Mariana Bahtchevanova, and Anne Walton-Ramirez for their help with organizing the survey of US students. The authors are also very grateful to the study participants from the undergraduate programs in the School of Economics and Business and the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ljubljana as well as to the students of English and International Letters and Cultures at Arizona State University.

Danko Šipka would also like to thank the ASU Melikian Center and the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research for their financial support of his trip to Slovenia.

Endnotes

1. In discussing the complexity of the relation between standard and non-standard language forms, a study carried out by Smakman (2012) is of a particular importance. He surveyed over one thousand non-linguists from England, Flanders (a part of Belgium, France and the Netherlands), Japan, as well as other parts of the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland and the United States and concluded that although the ideas about the standard language have very little in common, one can recognize a socially distinctive (exclusive) notion of the standard language and socially cohesive (integrative) one. The former notion points to the fact that the language form is only used in formal communication (such as the news, official documents, etc.).

2. This is very much in line with Scherba (1974: 276; cited in Grigoryan 2007: 4–5), who stated: "From a purely linguistic point of view only normative or academic type of dictionaries must be considered scholarly since their subject matter is linguistic reality — i.e. the lexical system of the language in its totality and complexity."
3. IRB approval was secured at Arizona State University in early April 2019 (IRB ID: STUDY00010014).

References

- Adams, Michael.** 2015. Language Ideologies and *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*: Evidence from Motive, Structure, and Design. *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 36: 17-46.
- Ahačič, Kozma (Ed.).** 2015. *Slovenske slovnice in pravopisi: spletišče slovenskih slovnice in pravopisov od 1584 do danes*. Version 1.0. Accessed on 14 May 2020:
<https://fran.si/slovnice-in-pravopisi/>
- Armstrong, Nigel R. and Ian Mackenzie.** 2015. On Prescriptivism and Ideology. *Representaciones. Revista de Estudios sobre Representación en Arte, Ciencia y Filosofía* 11(2): 27-58.
- Balteiro, Isabela.** 2011. Prescriptivism and Descriptivism in the Treatment of Anglicisms in a Series of Bilingual Spanish–English Dictionaries. *International Journal of Lexicography* 24(3): 277-305.
- Béjoint, Henri.** 2010. *The Lexicography of English: From Origins to Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brewer, Charlotte.** 2010. Prescriptivism and Descriptivism in the First, Second and Third Editions of *OED*. *English Today* 26(2): 24-33.
- Cameron, Deborah.** 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Dobrovoljc, Helena.** 2004. *Pravopisje na Slovenskem*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- Dobrovoljc, Helena.** 2015a. Fran Levec. *Slovenski pravopis*. Ahačič, Kozma (Ed.). 2015. Accessed on 14 May 2020:
<https://fran.si/slovnice-in-pravopisi/34/1899-levec>
- Dobrovoljc, Helena.** 2015b. Anton Breznik, Fran Ramovš. *Slovenski pravopis*. Ahačič, Kozma (Ed.). 2015. Accessed on 14 May 2020:
<https://fran.si/slovnice-in-pravopisi/39/1935-breznik-ramovs>
- Dobrovoljc, Helena.** 2015c. Toporišič, Jože (Ed.). [Pravila:] Franc Jakopin, Janko Moder, Janez Dular, Stane Suhadolnik, Janez Menart, Breda Pogorelec, Kajetan Gantar, Martin Ahlin. [Slovar:] Franc Jakopin, Janko Moder, Janez Dular, Milena Hajnšek-Holz. *Slovenski pravopis*. Ahačič, Kozma (Ed.). 2015. Accessed on 14 May 2020.
<https://fran.si/slovnice-in-pravopisi/50/2001-skupinski-toporisicev>
- Finegan, Edward.** 2003. Linguistic Prescription: Familiar Practices and New Perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 23: 213-224.
- Finegan, Edward.** 2020. *What Is 'Correct' Language?*
<https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/what-correct-language>

- Gliha Komac, Nataša, Nataša Jakop, Janoš Ježovnik, Simona Klemenčič, Domen Krvina, Nina Ledinek, Tanja Mirtič, Andrej Perdih, Špela Petric, Marko Snoj and Andreja Žele (Eds.).** 2015. *Koncept novega razlagalnega slovarja slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU. Accessed on 14 February 2020:
https://fran.si/179/novi-slovar-slovenskega-knjiznega-jezika/datoteke/Potrjeni_koncept_NoviSSKJ.pdf
- Gove, Philip B. (Ed.).** 1967. *The Role of the Dictionary*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Gove, Philip B.** 1967. The Dictionary's Function. Gove, Philip B. (Ed.). 1967: 5-8.
- Grigoryan, Ashot A.** 2007. On Gender Aspect in Lexicography. Karpova, Olga and Faina Kartashkova (Eds.). 2007: 2-10.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef.** 1989. Die Markierung im allgemeinen einsprachigen Wörterbuch: eine Übersicht. Hausmann, Franz Joseph, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand and Ladislav Zgusta (Eds.). 1989: 649-657.
- Hausmann, Franz Joseph, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Ernst Wiegand and Ladislav Zgusta (Eds.)** 1989. *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Vol. 1*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hitchings, Henry.** 2005. *Dr Johnson's Dictionary*. London: John Murray.
- Jarošová, Alexandra and Vladimír Benko.** 2012. The Dictionary of the Contemporary Slovak Language: A Product of Tradition and Innovation. Vatvedt Fjeld, Ruth and Julie Matilde Torjusén (Eds.). 2012: 257-261.
- Johnson, Samuel.** 1755. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. London: W. Strahan, for J. & P. Knapton.
- Karpova, Olga and Faina Kartashkova (Eds.).** 2007. *Essays on Lexicon, Lexicography, Terminography in Russian, American and Other Cultures*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Laird, Charlton Grant.** 1970. *Language in America*. New York: World Publishing Company.
- Landau, Sidney I.** 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, Jack (Ed.).** 2003. *Samuel Johnson's Dictionary*. New York: Walker & Co.
- Lynch, Jack.** 2003. Introduction to this Edition. Lynch, Jack (Ed.). 2003: 1-21.
- Martin, Peter.** 2019. Peter Martin on *The Dictionary Wars*. Interview on August 26, 2019. Accessed on 16 April 2020:
<https://press.princeton.edu/ideas/peter-martin-on-the-dictionary-wars>.
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer.** 2015. Jože Toporišič. *Slovenska slovnica*. Ahačič, Kozma (Ed.). 2015. Accessed on 14 May 2020:
<https://fran.si/slovnice-in-pravopisi/46/1976-toporisc>
- Miłkowski, Marcin.** 2013. On the Social Nature of Linguistic Prescriptions. *Psychology of Language and Communication* 17(2): 175-187.
- Morris, William (Ed.)** 1969. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Morton, Herbert C.** 1994. *The Story of Webster's Third: Philip Gove's Controversial Dictionary and Its Critics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scherba, Lev V.** 1974. Opit obschei teorii leksikografii (Experience of General Theory of Lexicography). *Jazykovaja sistema i rečevaja dejatel'nost'* (Language System and Speech Activity): 265-304.
- Schulman, Arthur and Jill Lepore.** 2008. *Websterisms: A Collection of Words and Definitions Set Forth by the Founding Father of American English*. New York: Free Press.

- Smakman, Dick.** 2012. The Definition of the Standard Language: A Survey in Seven Countries. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 218: 25-58.
- Svensén, Bo.** 2009. *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Šipka, Danko, Alenka Vrbinc and Marjeta Vrbinc.** 2020 (in press). Normative Labels in Slovene Dictionaries: Users' and Lexicographers' Perspectives. *International Journal of Lexicography* 33(4).
- Vatvedt Fjeld, Ruth and Julie Matilde Torjusen (Eds.).** 2012. *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress, 7-11 August 2012, Oslo*. Oslo: Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo.
- Vrbinc, Alenka, Donna M.T.Cr. Farina and Marjeta Vrbinc.** 2018. Objectivity, Prescription, Harmlessness, and Drudgery: Reflections of Lexicographers in Slovenia. *Lexikos* 28: 361-383.
- Yong, Heming and Jing Peng.** 2007. *Bilingual Lexicography from a Communicative Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zgusta, Ladislav.** 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Prague: Academia / The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Appendix 1: Slovene Questionnaire

1. The following dictionary label means that the word or its meaning is used in standard language (such as news read by TV anchors, or court decisions). Select one option for each label.

colloquial	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
dialectal	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
expressive	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
facetious	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
incorrect	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
ironic	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
obsolete	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
vulgar	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never

2. Labels (for example, coll – colloquial, vulg – vulgar) are a useful part of the dictionary.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

3. When I use dictionaries I pay attention to the labels (for example, coll – colloquial, vulg – vulgar).

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

4. Is the difference between colloquial and lower colloquial useful?

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

5. The word in bold are used in standard language

báksiš -a m pog. *napitina, podkupnina*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

čóprnik -a m *čarovnik*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

déci m neskl. pog. *deciliter*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

fájfa -e ž pog. *priprava za kajenje, ki se napolni s tobakom; pipa*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

sekírati -am nedov. *s pretiranimi zahtevami povzročati komu neprijetnosti, slabo voljo*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

déka² -e ž pog. *(volnena) odeja*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

hóhštápler -ja m *domišljav človek, gizdalin*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

déka¹ -e ž *dekagram*

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

Appendix 2: US Questionnaire

1. When we look a word up in a dictionary, we sometimes find a label on it like these listed below. Does that mean that we can always use such words in standard English (such as news read by TV anchors, or court decisions) or never, or somewhere in between? Select one option for each label.

colloquial	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
dialectal	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
expressive	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
facetious	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
incorrect	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
ironic	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
obsolete	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never
vulgar	<input type="checkbox"/> always	<input type="checkbox"/> often	<input type="checkbox"/> sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/> rarely	<input type="checkbox"/> never

2. Labels (for example, coll – colloquial, vulg – vulgar) are a useful part of the dictionary.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

3. When I use dictionaries I pay attention to the labels (for example, coll – colloquial, vulg – vulgar).

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

4. It would be useful if dictionaries would differentiate between colloquial and lower colloquial.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

5. Is the word in bold used in standard English (such as news read by TV anchors, or court decisions)?

cram v to study for an examination by memorizing facts at the last minute

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

chill out v *slang* to calm down; to relax

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

screwed adj *slang* bilked; cheated

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

bamboozle v *informal* to practice trickery, deception, cozenage, or the like

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

prick n *slang* an obnoxious or contemptible person

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

hang out v to loiter in public places

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

knocked-up adj made pregnant

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

jerk n a contemptibly naive, fatuous, foolish, or inconsequential person.

strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree