

# Anglo-Croatian language and culture contact: a case study

---

Karem, Dunja

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:711949>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-04-19**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Academic year: 2020/2021

Anglo-Croatian language and culture contact: a case study  
(diploma thesis)

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Anđel Starčević, PhD

Student: Dunja Karem

Zagreb, 2020

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Akadska godina: 2020/2021

Englesko-hrvatski jezični i kulturološki kontakt: studija slučaja  
(diplomski rad)

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Anđel Starčević

Student: Dunja Karem

Zagreb, 2020.



## Table of contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Theoretical background.....	1
3. Methodology .....	2
3.1. Modules and questions.....	3
3.2. Challenges .....	4
3.3. Post-interview phase .....	6
4. The respondent's profile .....	7
5. Results .....	11
5.1. Sociolinguistic results .....	11
5.1.1. Bilingualism.....	11
5.1.2. Biculturalism.....	12
5.1.3. Speech accommodation theory .....	13
5.1.4. Ideologies.....	14
5.1.4.1. Dialect ideology.....	15
5.1.4.2. Standard language ideology.....	16
5.1.4.3. Purism.....	18
5.1.5. Language anxiety .....	20
5.1.6. Language and identity.....	21
5.1.7. Code-switching .....	22
5.1.8. Language thinking and processing.....	23
5.2. Linguistic results.....	24
5.2.1. Gender-marking .....	24
5.2.2. Personal pronouns.....	24
5.2.3. Code-switching .....	24
5.2.4. Hedges.....	25
5.2.5. Croatian verb conjugation.....	25
5.2.6. Literal translation .....	26
5.2.7. Using the correct case .....	26
5.2.8. Phonological results .....	27
5.2.8.1. Rhotics .....	27

5.2.8.2.	Aspiration .....	27
5.2.8.3.	Place of articulation of the alveolar plosive [d].....	28
6.	Discussion .....	29
6.1.	Self-reflection .....	31
7.	Conclusion.....	33
8.	References .....	35

## 1. Introduction

This paper is a sociolinguistic study based on an interview with a 40-year-old female immigrant from Australia to Croatia. The respondent's mother tongue is English, and her second language is Croatian, which she started to learn at the age of 20. The aim of this case study is to create a profile of an Anglo-Croatian bilingual, and to investigate Anglo-Croatian language and culture contact. Also, the aim of the interview is to find interesting linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomena in the respondent's speech and analyze how cultural transition, second language acquisition, and bilingualism have affected the respondent's language and views on both language and culture. One part of the research results will be presented in relation to previous sociolinguistic research and relatable data describing similar phenomena dealing with language use, perceptions, evaluations, attitudes, etc. while the other part will look more into crosslinguistic Anglo-Croatian influence.

## 2. Theoretical background

Before the interview, it was necessary to consult existing guides for conducting a sociolinguistic interview. Extensive instructions on conducting sociolinguistic research can be found in *Projects in Linguistics and Language Studies, A Practical Guide to Researching Language* by Wray A. and Bloomer, A. It contains useful data on how to conduct a case study, which is precisely what was needed for this paper and this type of research. Another useful source to read before conducting research is Labov's *Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation* from 1984. While analyzing our data, I consulted previous research and the contemporary theory of sociolinguistics. Definitions and discussions of various sociolinguistic phenomena, such as bilingualism, bidialectalism, and speech accommodation theory were found in *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics* by Llamas, Mullany, and Stockwell from 2007. Grosjean's *Studying bilinguals* from 2008 offered a helpful theoretical framework for gathering data on bilingualism, studying bilingualism, analyzing data found about bilinguals, and sorting out linguistic phenomena typical of bilinguals. Holmes' *Introduction to Sociolinguistics* also has helpful material to compare your findings to, especially in defining convergence and how and why it occurs in communication. Another *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, by Wardhaugh and Fuller

from 2015 provided us with the theory and discussions, which I used in our analysis of the dialect ideology, standard dialect ideology, biculturalism, diglossia, speech accommodation theory and it was useful for comparisons of our results with results from previous research regarding many areas of investigating sociolinguistic phenomena. To determine purist tendencies in the respondent's answers, I consulted *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* by Hernández and Conde from 2012, where I found a text by Langer and Nesse on *Linguistic purism*. For the Croatian part of the interview, a Croatian grammar *Hrvatska Gramatika* by Barić, Lončarić, Malić, Pavešić, Peti, Zečević, Znika was used as a yardstick against which the respondent's proficiency in Croatian and Croatian speech production were analyzed.

### **3. Methodology**

In the following paragraphs, it will be discussed how the research was conducted and what was considered important to bear in mind before and during the research. Sociolinguistics offers a wide range of possible research topics, and with all the existing research, there are many aspects of this scientific area that leave dilemmas, unanswered and challenging questions. This research is a case study, as defined in Wray and Bloomer, in which a given individual or phenomenon are being observed, with the aim of collecting “a variety of different kinds of data in order to gain a full picture, with the interest lying in how that particular individual manages the different processes” (2012: 181). This paper aims to, by means of a sociolinguistic interview, create a profile of an individual's competence in various aspects of language(s), more specifically English and Croatian. In this particular study, the interview was based on an “interactional sociolinguistics approach” (Wardhough, Fuller 2015: 293), which is by default primarily qualitative and which “draws on data about a wider context in which the conversation takes place” (ibid.), while the researcher has to interpret specific utterance meaning regarding cultural norms, previous research and existing data. In order to provide this area of research with new, interesting, relevant, and useful findings, a clever choice of a respondent must be made to ensure “a reliable and representative sample” (Wray, Bloomer 2012: 166). For this research, in particular, the respondent's cultural and linguistic background seemed to offer a fertile area for investigating Anglo-Croatian culture and crosslinguistic influence. Since both the interviewer and the interviewee are speakers of both English and Croatian, the interview was conducted in both



languages. For ideologies, attitudes and other social aspects of sociolinguistics the interview was in English. The other, shorter part of the interview, where I was looking more into the respondent's Croatian language production and crosslinguistic influence, was held in Croatian.

### **3.1. Modules and questions**

The choice of the respondent consequently affects the choice of the interviewer's questions and the topics of the research as well. On one hand, the English part of the interview included obtaining the respondent's personal information, establishing a general linguistic biography, and arranging sociolinguistic modules on various ideologies and phenomena that may be interesting for the research. The part of the interview in which the respondent's personal information was gathered was based on the "explicit approach" (Wray, Bloomer 2012: 167), which means direct questions were used to gather information. This was necessary to "minimize the risk of being misunderstood" (ibid.) and to guarantee the interviewer is dealing with precise and correct information. For example, some of the direct questions used in this part of the interview were: "Where were you born?", "How old were you when you moved to Croatia?", "Did you study Croatian formally or informally?", etc. After obtaining this type of information, the interview questions became more and more indirect and the approach more "inexplicit" (ibid.), because this approach makes the respondent's responses more reliable (ibid). At the same time, the questions were formulated in a rather open way, beginning with "What do you think about...", "Can you tell me about...", all with the aim to "offer the respondent a chance to talk at length", which eventually might "reveal things you did not know were even there to ask about" (ibid.). Labov explains this saying that "the sociolinguistic interview is considered a failure if the speaker does no more than answer questions" (1984: 38). Having this in mind, the researcher intended to follow a more traditional sociolinguistic approach, which involves a casual interview, "which ideally resembles a conversation more than a formal question and answer session" (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 158), and which is more likely to result in useful tangential data. Tangential data are data arising from the respondent's interest in a certain topic, and "whenever the interviewer recognizes that the speaker has moved in a different direction from the interview module, and has changed the subject, he or she pursues that topic without attempting to return to the previous one" (Labov 2001:92), because this kind of interest in particular topics can be a fertile area for interesting results. Wray

and Bloomer (2012: 174) explain the same problem by saying that even though the researcher has to prepare the questions in advance, they should be ready to adapt to the interviewee, respond according to their interests, and “plan out a series of potential pathways through the list of questions, according to how the interview is developing”. Luckily, the respondent’s interest in the questions seemed high and her answers to the questions were wide, extensive, and full of tangents, a tangent being an “extended body of speech that deviates plainly from the last topic introduced by the interviewer, and represents the strong interest of the speaker” (Labov *ibid.*), which eventually led us to interesting findings.

On the other hand, the Croatian part of the interview focused more on form, rather than content, which is why the interviewer had to make sure the respondent did not explicitly recognize a transition between questions in English and questions in Croatian, as it is not desirable for the respondent to feel the interviewer is analyzing their speech production.

The questions in our interview were divided into modules, each of which aimed for a specific sociolinguistic result. Overall, the interview consisted of 25 modules, with about 150 questions. In choosing the modules and questions, it was important to make sure the research remained within ethical guidelines. In this case, in particular, the respondent’s moving to Croatia and learning of Croatian followed the death of her grandfather. This means that learning the new language could be a sensitive and a very intimate topic for the respondent, which is why “in seeking personal information a balance needs to be found between getting what you need and being intrusive, or costing people time or extra work” (Wray, Bloomer 2012: 166). Having this in mind, the respondent was reminded several times that she was free to choose whether or not she wanted to answer some of the questions.

### **3.2. Challenges**

Wray and Bloomer, as well as Labov, point to possible problems during the interview. One of them is the observer’s paradox, i.e. the possibility that the respondent will change their linguistic behavior knowing that they are being interviewed. Labov explains that this phenomenon can result from the asymmetrical power relationship between the researcher and the respondent, as the researcher may come across as an “outside observer in a dominating class” (1984: 40). Hence, it is quite a challenge trying to make sure “data you have collected are uncontaminated by the process

of investigation itself” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 157). For this and other such reasons, the researcher has to “be scrupulous in the preparation and sensitive and professional in the approach” and has to “ensure that the participant really does not mind being observed or tested and really understands what’s involved” (Wray, Bloomer 2012: 182). Secondly, to solve this impression of the dominant party, Labov suggests “the basic strategy of sociolinguistics interview, which is to emphasize the position of the interviewer as a learner, in a position of lower authority than the person he is talking to” (1984: 40). In this particular research, the interviewer and the respondent are not in a close relationship. The relationship resembles the one between co-workers, with the respondent being a kind of a mentor to the interviewer. This may be a mitigating circumstance as the power relationship between the two of them is in fact reversed. Also, the respondent is significantly older than the interviewer, which also may help reduce the observer’s paradox. In addition to that, both parties agreed before the interview that they both wished for it to be more of a conversation rather than a formal interview. It is very important to keep in mind that, during the interview, the respondent’s vernacular might be affected, which is a problem because the vernacular is most commonly the researcher’s target, as “the vernacular, in which the minimum attention is paid to speech, provides the most systematic data for linguistic analysis” (Labov 1984: 29). The challenge here was in the fact that the respondent speaks in the Australian variety of English, which, if it is very fast, the interviewer sometimes finds hard to understand. Having faced such problems in previous interaction with the respondent, the interviewer had to make sure to catch everything the respondent was saying. The vernacular was important, but not to the extent that it had to be the most natural speech production, because for the English part of the interview, our interest was not linguistic as much as sociolinguistic. Although risking losing the vernacular, this was mentioned to the respondent, in a way that she was told that the interviewer might not catch everything, and if that was the case, she would be asked for repetition, which she gladly agreed to. Labov also claims that the researcher cannot expect to find “the vernacular used in the main body of a first face-to-face interview, no matter how casual or friendly the speaker may appear to be” (ibid.), which is why it may be useful to have several interviews, leading up to establishing a closer relationship with the respondent and, hence, getting the respondent’s vernacular, and more useful data. When it comes to the vernacular, the respondent’s English seemed natural and spontaneous, while her Croatian was significantly slower and controlled.

An unexpected circumstance, to be specific – the COVID-19 epidemic was also a challenge. Because of the epidemic and because the interview was conducted during summer holidays, we decided to have an online interview. The restraints and challenges of online interviews are numerous. For instance, it is of great importance to have good equipment so that the conversation runs smoothly and so that the examiner and the respondent hear and understand each other well. From a phonological point of view, the recording equipment must provide clear sound, or else it would be difficult to observe the details of pronunciation and speech in general. One of the advantages of the online interview was the fact that we were both at home at the time of the interview, in a relaxed atmosphere, and everything looked like a regular, casual conversation. However, making sure that internet connection was perfect on both sides, making sure that audio material was audible enough, and that the respondent was not feeling like she is in a meeting was a challenge I most certainly tried to eliminate as much as possible.

### **3.3. Post-interview phase**

After the interview, I saved the data, gathered the results, and then analyzed them. The analysis contains a comparison with previous similar research results, followed by a discussion. At this point, one of the major concerns is the importance of reliability and validity of the data and the results. Firstly, validity implies that, as said by Lepper “the researcher must show that what is being described is accurately ‘named’ – that is, that the research process has accurately represented a phenomenon which is recognizable to the scientific community being addressed” (2000: 173). Secondly, reliability has to do with “how objective and consistent the measurements of the actual linguistic data are” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 162). To ensure that the results are both valid and reliable, each result discussion was supported by the existing literature and data on sociolinguistic research and phenomena.

Another important note in the post-interview phase is, as Wray and Bloomer say, the fact that the researcher has to “be prepared to evaluate their work critically and state how it could have been improved” (2012: 13), which is important for the purposes of future research and for validating the obtained results. The evaluation of the research will be discussed later in the paper.

#### 4. The respondent's profile

The respondent is a 40-year-old early childhood teacher from Sydney, Australia. She currently lives in Velika Gorica (Croatia) in a family of four. The respondent is a late bilingual, her second language is Croatian, which she started to learn at the age of 20 when she moved to Croatia. Up until that point, her knowledge of Croatian was passive, as she was exposed to it by hearing it in her family, more specifically, her grandparents, who continued speaking in Croatian regardless of having moved to Australia. However, she never used it on her own, in speech. Her knowledge and understanding of Croatian was mostly based on the Chakavian dialect of Croatian, as her grandparents were from Lika, where this variety of Croatian is spoken. Furthermore, once she moved to Croatia, she started learning Croatian informally, as she explains it – *on the street*. She lived in a small town near Opatija with her grandparents and was again exposed mostly to the Chakavian dialect of Croatian. However, when she moved to Velika Gorica as she got married, her Croatian started shifting more to a non-localized variety of Croatian. Her Croatian has been changing ever since under the influence of the variety of Croatian spoken by her husband, who is originally from Tomislavgrad, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and by her children, who were born and raised in Velika Gorica. At the same time, the respondent normally used her mother tongue (English) with her family back in Australia and the one she raised herself. In other words, ever since moving to Croatia, the respondent has been in a “language maintenance” mode, which means both languages continued to be spoken (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 83). In order to get a wider picture on circumstances leading up to the respondent's moving to Croatia, information was gathered on anything in that sense that could have been relevant in the research. Finally, the reason to move and to stay in Croatia was the respondent's engagement. Starting a family in Croatia meant starting to learn a new language, in a culture very different from the one in Australia. Some major differences, as she says, were those regarding the war, the economy, multiculturalism and the education system. However, the respondent emphasizes how all of this has changed over the past 20 years, most things for the better, and some things *not for the better*; and how Croatia is one of the fastest-changing countries, culturally and economically. Generally, the respondent sees people in Croatia *warmer* and Croatia being *safer* than Australia. She sees Croatia as a great place to raise a child, as she sees children walking to school on their own at the age of 6 or 7. When asked about whether she had ever considered moving back to Australia, she affirmatively confirmed that she

had, multiple times, but currently this is not an option for her family, and it would mean sacrificing her *children's freedom*, another thing Croatia has and Australia does not.

The respondent does not show a particular affinity for learning foreign languages, but is generally a very talkative person. The interviewee emphasizes her writing skills are *terrible*, both in English and in Croatian, because she is a *terrible speller*. However, her speaking skills, as she explains it, are at a high level. The table below shows how the respondent sees her English and Croatian language skills.

Table 1. The respondent's self-evaluation of the four skills in Croatian and English

SKILL/LANGUAGE	Croatian	English
<i>Speaking</i>	1 2 3 <b>4</b> 5	1 2 3 4 <b>5</b>
<i>Listening</i>	1 2 <b>3</b> 4 5	1 2 3 4 <b>5</b>
<i>Reading</i>	1 <b>2 - 3</b> 4 5	1 2 3 4 <b>5</b>
<i>Writing</i>	1 <b>2 - 3</b> 4 5	1 2 3 <b>4</b> 5

As it is shown in the table, English is a much stronger language for the respondent. It is the respondent's mother tongue and the language she generally considers more *natural* to use in communication. Her writing skill is somewhat weaker in English, and this is also the case in Croatian. Speaking about her knowledge of Croatian, she openly speaks about her inability to differentiate or define linguistic terminology (in Croatian), and the reason for that is partly in the fact that she learned Croatian only informally, which is also an explanation for why "her grammar is always her English grammar" and why she rarely thinks in terms of Croatian grammar. Also, she enumerates some of her biggest struggles with the Croatian language, some of which have to do with the pronunciation, such as the pronunciation of the r-sound, which she learned at the age of 30 (10 years into learning the language), and generally *swallowing* many sounds or pronouncing them softly. This, however, has changed over time and the respondent managed to overcome these problems to a certain extent. Another problem with Croatian that the respondent mentions is determining the gender of nouns, at which she is most frequently corrected. Although she placed her Croatian skills at a medium level, during the interview she confidently reveals that she is more than satisfied with her Croatian and that her knowledge of the language "meets even more than

her needs”, which points to the fact that the respondent is very confident about her language skills in general. However, she admits that she still has some difficulties speaking Croatian, but she does not generally think her Croatian is insufficient, because she can use it normally and without a problem. She uses Croatian in everyday situations and with her family, which depends on whether she talks only to her children or her husband is involved in the conversation too. The language they speak in the family also depends on the topic and on whether they are alone or other people are participating in the conversation. All in all, English is her mother tongue and hence, the dominant language. Although in her family she can speak both languages, English is the preferred one if she wants to express herself precisely, articulate her emotions or if she wants to sound professional.

The respondent switches from one language to the other on a daily basis. The charts below show the language usage ratio of the respondent, which, on a wider scale, changes depending on the time of the year.




Chart 1. The respondent's language usage ratio during school year




Chart 2. The respondent's language usage ratio during holidays

The charts show the respondent's assessment of her usage of the two languages and the general fluctuations between them, depending on the period. On a smaller scale, switching takes place on daily basis. During the school year, which is 10 months per year, the usage of English is dominant because it is the language the respondent uses in her workplace and, additionally to that, she uses

it with her family. During holidays, which is 2 months per year, she uses Croatian 90% of the time, because, as she explains, most of her holidays she spends with her relatives who speak and understand only Croatian. The charts show a significant transition in language usage that the respondent has to make when she transitions from one part of the year to another and precisely this time can be the time where interesting linguistic and sociolinguistic data can be found.

Generally speaking, the respondent was very interested to participate in the research; she is a very talkative person and has a solid opinion on most topics and issues, which was beneficial for the interview and yielded interesting sociolinguistic results.



## **5. Results**

### **5.1. Sociolinguistic results**

#### **5.1.1. Bilingualism**

The respondent considers herself and anyone who is “very fluent in at least two languages” bilingual. According to the respondent, another thing that makes a person a bilingual is the fact that this person “doesn’t have a problem to transition and have a healthy conversation about a different variety of topics with another person.” Although the respondent openly says she is aware of her Croatian not being grammatically perfect, and sloppy at times, she undoubtedly considers herself a bilingual. Interestingly enough, Grosjean claims “bilinguals rarely evaluate their language competencies as adequate” (as a result of the monolingual view of bilingualism) (2008: 13), which is not the case with our respondent, who is very satisfied with her Croatian competencies and will proudly identify as a bilingual. Our respondent is indeed a bilingual, according to Grosjean’s wholistic view of bilingualism, where he explains “the bilingual uses the two languages — separately or together — for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people” (2008: 14). The fluency of the two languages does not have to be equal for the person to be a bilingual, as Grosjean explains, “because the needs and uses of the two languages are usually quite different, the bilingual is rarely equally or completely fluent in the two languages” (ibid.). Regardless of the fact that the respondent herself rated her language competencies and skills as unequal, she shows understanding of this not being decisive of her status as a bilingual.

Bilinguals can also be categorized into early and late bilinguals, and balanced and dominant bilinguals; the former depending on “the age of exposure to two (or more) languages”, and the latter depending on “the proficiency and fluency of the respective languages” (Moradi 2014: 148). According to the age categorization, our respondent belongs to the category of late bilingualism, which is defined as “the acquisition of one language before and the other language after the age of 8 years” (ibid.). In the case of our respondent, L2 (Croatian) was actively learned after the acquisition of L1 (English) in adulthood, at the age of 20 (earlier she was only passively exposed to it). According to the proficiency and fluency categorization, our respondent belongs to the category of a “dominant bilingual” (2014: 149), being a bilingual whose proficiency is significantly higher in one language than in the other.

Being asked whether she thinks bilingualism can occur within a single language, she acts surprised: “Definitely, yes!” She explains this using her own experience as a proof of bilingualism within a single language: “The first Croatian I learned was ‘čakavski’. And I thought that was Croatian. I had no idea I wasn’t speaking Croatian.” Separating the Chakavian dialect from *real* Croatian and calling it a separate language, the respondent shows awareness that bilingualism can in fact occur within a single language, but the reason for this is the fact that people speaking in these two dialects will most probably be unable to understand each other. Therefore, if a person speaks both the Chakavian dialect and the standard dialect, according to our respondent, they must be bilingual.

When it comes to processing language and using systems and various mechanisms to communicate in English in Croatian, the respondent’s explanation points to having one system in her mind, as she never learned Croatian grammar, so her grammar is “always her English grammar”, and she always uses what feels *natural* to her. This indicates that her English grammar is the dominant pattern for her production in both languages, but at the same time the two language systems co-exist and interact in the respondent’s mind, which “produces a different but complete language system” (Grosjean 2008: 13). The co-existence and constant interaction between the two languages are realized in the respondent’s everyday communicative practice, as she explains “If I get stuck expressing myself in Croatian, I translate from English what I have in my head and then I say it.” In other words, the respondent blends the aspects of the two languages, creating an indivisible and unique language configuration in her mind.

### **5.1.2. Biculturalism**

According to Grosjean, a bicultural person is characterized by at least three traits: “They take part, to varying degrees, in the life of two or more cultures”, “They adapt, at least in part, their attitudes, behaviors, values, languages, etc., to these cultures”, “They combine and blend aspects of the cultures involved” (2008: 214). The interview conducted for this sociolinguistic research showed the respondent is a bicultural person, as she takes part in Croatian, Australian, and American culture, the first being the one she lives in, the second one the one she grew up in, and the third one being the one she is exposed to at work. Hence, the respondent continually compares these cultures and people during the interview: “Croatians have a better sense of humor, they are more easy-going; tolerant, in a way they make fun of each other, and laugh things off a lot more.”,

on the other hand in Australia people would be a lot more offended than what Croatians seem to be. Furthermore, the respondent has been exposed to both cultures and has combined both cultures, living in a family of Croatians on the Australian ground. As she herself explains, this exposure has affected her attitudes, behavior, values, etc. and that is quite noticeable during the interview. For example, although being successfully adapted to Croatian culture, the respondent shows a strong repulsion for swearwords in Croatian. She culturally compares the practice of swearing, emphasizing that swearing is much more explicit, vulgar and common with Croatians, which is something she cannot get used to. According to the respondent's tendency to respond to certain sociological and linguistic problems by comparing the two cultures, it can be concluded that through such comparisons the respondent's biculturalism is reaffirmed.

### **5.1.3. Speech accommodation theory**

It is a well-known sociolinguistic phenomenon that speakers, in various linguistic environments, try to accommodate their language to the expectations that their addressees may have of them. They may do this either "consciously and deliberately or be quite unaware of what they are doing" (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 98). Similarly, our respondent claims her Croatian can change depending on her addressees, meaning that her Croatian sounds as the Chakavian variety of Croatian when she spends some time on the coast, and it sounds different again when she spends time with her family in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In other words, the respondent tends to shift to the style of speech of her addressees, which, according to the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT), is called *convergence* (Auer 2007: 109). This, as the respondent claims, happens subconsciously and her friends are the ones bringing it to her attention. Although the respondent claims this happens subconsciously, Holmes points to this phenomenon stating that: "Converging towards the speech of another person is usually considered a polite speech strategy. It implies that the addressee's speech is acceptable and worth imitating" (Llamas, Mullany, Stockwell 2007: 245). Another external influence for this phenomenon may be in the fact that some of the people who the respondent switches with are her husband's family, her in-laws, which can point to the reason why this happens, as "it is also a personal act in that it helps create the identity one wishes to be seen as having in a particular set of circumstances" (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 99). On the other hand, the respondent does not change her English, ever, as she explains her "English always stays Australian", although she speaks English to speakers coming from different English-

speaking countries. She explains this by saying she thinks her mother tongue stays “stuck” as it is and the second, later-acquired language changes depending on the addressee and the environment. The ability to preserve one’s language production entirely from any changes is debatable, but if we did accept this as true to some extent, we could classify this phenomenon as a result of “language maintenance efforts” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 99).

#### **5.1.4. Ideologies**

With the respondent having a rich experience of two languages and two cultures, being exposed to many other languages and cultures while working in a multicultural school, and being an educator, it was our interest to look more into any of the respondent’s sets of beliefs regarding language and society, language and culture, and language and the world. These sets of beliefs, in sociolinguistics, are oftentimes called ‘ideologies’. Errington describes the study of language ideologies as “a rubric for dealing with ideas about language structure and use relative to social contexts” (2000, 115). Particularly interesting for our research are ideologies that privilege one way of speaking over other ways of speaking. Wardhaugh and Fuller explain this into more detail:

“There are certain hegemonic ideologies about different ways of speaking that dominate in a society and are widely accepted, even by speakers of the varieties which are judged as deficient. These ideologies dictate that certain ways of speaking are indicative of undesirable social traits, for example, poverty or lack of education, or personal characteristics, for example, laziness. Other ways of speaking are associated with more desirable social groups and it is assumed that everyone should want to aspire to speak in these latter ways” (2015: 75).

Ideologies can be economically, socially, or linguistically based and are most commonly subjective, stereotypical, and sometimes negative towards non-standard language varieties and speakers of those varieties. Through various questions in the interview, the interviewer attempted to track any such tendencies in the respondent’s attitudes towards language. The results of this part of the research are discussed below.

#### 5.1.4.1. Dialect ideology

The respondent shows affiliation towards dialects, seeing them as language treasure that has to be cherished and nurtured. She also shows amazement with Croatia being such a small country and yet so rich in dialects, as she explains: “I think it’s hilarious that I live in Velika Gorica, and I go with my car 3 km into Turopolje<sup>1</sup>, and I have no idea what the people are going on about. Absolutely love it!” Also, she feels the necessity to cherish, nurture and preserve the dialects of Croatian and she commends some schools where, as she has heard, “when you enroll your child to school, you can actually enroll them into *čakavski* class, and I think that’s wonderful.” The respondent is very emotional about this, about Chakavian in particular, probably because it was the first variety of Croatian she learned and it is a strong part of her family’s identity. She further articulates her views on this: “It’s a whole another language, a third language”, “It enriches language and culture”, “I’m all for honouring that!” Comparing this to the Australian language and culture, she mentions Aborigines, who have *thousands* of their dialects and they should be *nurtured*. Here, the respondent shows awareness of the problem Trudgill also points to in 2000, that is, that in Australia there used to be about 200 Aboriginal languages, “fifty of which are already dead, and another hundred are very close to extinction” (192). As Trudgill anticipated: “Perhaps as few as 30 will make it into the twenty-first century” (ibid.).

Commenting on Australian dialects, the respondent claims there are not as many dialects as accents in the Australian variety of English. When discussing dialects in Australia, she refers to Aborigines and thousands of different dialects of theirs. When it comes to accents, she points to accents being a matter of racial issues, as it is a common practice to correlate accents with ethnic groups, as in: “Asians sound like this”, “Arabs sound like this”, etc. This is rather a social differentiation, as Trudgill explains: “Ethnic-group differentiation in a mixed community, then, is a particular type of social differentiation and, as such, will often have linguistic differentiation associated with it”, more specifically, “the separate identity of ethnic groups is signalled, not by different languages, but by different varieties of the same language” (2000: 45). However, stating that ethnicity determines somebody’s language production is highly stereotypical and discriminatory, because “labelling and describing a particular way of speaking as an ethnic dialect

---

<sup>1</sup> Turopolje is a region in Croatia situated between the capital city Zagreb and Sisak. It is popular for its unique and rare variety of kajkavian Croatian.

implies a certain homogeneity about the variety and its speakers, and it inevitably also places the dialect and the group who speaks it outside the mainstream” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 46). Also, this tendency is not scientifically based, as previous research has proven that there is no connection between language and race (Trudgill 2000: 43). This is an ongoing issue and a lot has to be looked into, which is why sociolinguists investigate ethnolects. Up until now, it is considered that “the connection between race, ethnicity and nationality and linguistic variety is one that is entirely socially constructed, it is in no way linked to any inherent attributes of a particular group” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 45).

To sum up, the respondent shows strong tendencies for dialect ideology, showing appreciation of the dialectal diversity of Croatian. In comparison to Croatia, according to the respondent, Australia is known for its diversity of Aboriginal languages as well as various other ethnolects..

#### **5.1.4.2. Standard language ideology**

In sociolinguistics, the standard language ideology is an ideology proposing that “there is one dialect which is superior to others, and that this is a ‘natural’ order of things” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 418). This common attitude can be seen in the respondent’s approach to language as well. When she is with her family, the respondent says: “My Australian becomes very messy. It’s very poor English. It’s very slang-based, the words become very sloppy.” The slang-based non-standard dialect that the respondent calls *poor English* is so different that she says nobody from work would probably understand what she is talking about, because “Australians abbreviate everything a lot.” Wardhaugh and Fuller argue that it is a popular opinion about non-standard social dialects, that they are “lazy, sloppy, and degenerate” (2015: 44). In other words, the respondent indicates that there has to be one dialect to represent formality and higher social status, as she says: “I would never think that’s the language we should speak while presenting ourselves to others, in a school, in a company, in a job interview.” Trudgill explains why this is so: “Because language as a social phenomenon is closely tied up with the social structure and value systems of society, different dialects and accents are evaluated in different ways” (2000: 8). As we could see in this example, a certain degree of the ideological way of thinking is present in the respondent’s description of the language she uses in everyday family conversations. The respondent gives an impression of suggesting this language is bad, of less value, and not something anyone could be

proud of. Also, she makes it clear that she does not find it acceptable to use slang or any other substandard variety in formal situations.

The example mentioned in the previous paragraph is an example of the speaker's movement on a social variety continuum, and this phenomenon is called diglossia. The movement "varies from community to community", but typically, "the high variety is used in sermons, formal letters, political speeches, university lectures, news broadcasts, newspaper editorials, and 'high' poetry. The low variety, on the other hand, is used in conversation with family and friends, radio serials, political and academic discussions, political cartoons, and 'folk' literature" (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 95). As Wardhaugh and Fuller state: "Linguistically speaking, the differences between the high and low varieties in the diglossic situation may be considerable. Many of the differences are vocabulary differences. Many pairs of words may occur, referring to common objects or concepts, where the meaning is roughly the same, but where the usage of one item rather than another immediately indicates high or low variety" (2015: 96).

In addition to that, the respondent makes a clear statement indicating that the standard dialect is the only one acceptable in formal situations, because otherwise "we wouldn't be able to understand each other". However, she says it is not the same if somebody with a Dalmatian accent<sup>2</sup> speaks their mother dialect in formal situations and somebody from Vis or Komiža<sup>3</sup>, because Dalmatians "have a different accent and not different words". On the other hand, people coming from Vis and Komiža have an entirely different vocabulary, which is why they cannot be understood by most Croatians." Discussing this, the respondent does not take into consideration the dialect continuum and is governed solely by the principle of 'mutual intelligibility', which is not an objectively determined fact (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 29), and this is because, as Wardhaugh and Fuller state, "your ability to understand someone who speaks differently from you may vary according to your experience with different ways of speaking" (ibid.). Overall, the respondent's stance about this issue is indicating the standard dialect being the only one acceptable in formal situations, with the exception of dialects that are understood by *everyone*, such as that of speakers from Dalmatia.

---

<sup>2</sup> A regional dialect spoken in Dalmatia, Croatia.

<sup>3</sup> Komiža is a town on the island of Vis, which is located in the Adriatic Sea.

The respondent further confirms this ideological claim by saying that one cannot sound educated or professional if “everybody can’t understand you” indicating that some ‘more understandable’ dialects are privileged to sound more academic than other ‘less understandable’ dialects. This is another common tendency mentioned by Trudgill, and it concerns associating substandard dialects with “speakers from under-privileged, low-status groups” (2002: 9). Wardhaugh and Fuller also note that previous sociolinguistic research has shown that “the term ‘dialect’ often implies nonstandard or even substandard, when such terms are applied to language, and can connote various degrees of inferiority, with that connotation of inferiority carried over to those who speak a dialect” (2015: 29), and hence it is concluded, “this is part of what we call the standard language ideology” (ibid.).

There is a point in the interview when the respondent is asked about whether bilingualism can occur within a single language where she affirmatively responds saying that the first Croatian she learned was the Chakavian dialect (a regional dialect in Croatia), and when she spoke in the dialect, she says that she thought she was speaking Croatian, as if she in fact was not: “I had no idea I wasn’t speaking Croatian.” It is a perception of a dialect being separated from the language, which points to the perception of the standard dialect being the only true language, the ‘real’ Croatian language. As Wardhaugh and Fuller explain this, “ordinary people use these terms quite freely in speech, for them a dialect is almost certainly no more than a local non-prestigious (therefore powerless) variety of a ‘real’ language” (2015: 28). At some different points during the interview, this statement may be enhanced as the respondent continued separating the dialect from the Croatian language, saying, “it’s a whole another language”, “a third language”, but at the same time showing much respect for it, “I’m all for honouring that.”

#### **5.1.4.3. Purism**

As Langer and Nesse (2012: 607) explain, purism is discussed by many linguists as either “an attempt to rid a language of any undesirable elements or an attempt to rid a language of only foreign elements” (2012: 607). In this interview, the respondent shows a purist tendency to rid the language of foreign elements of any kind, being it elements coming from the English language, Serbian, Turkish, etc. More specifically, the respondent sees English as a kind of a threat to Croatian, as Croatian is oftentimes being replaced by English in many areas of life. She explains why she thinks this type of contact is wrong: “I’m a strong believer in language and culture” and



“I think a language is something that should be cherished and kept and nurtured.” To illustrate this, the respondent gives an example of the Eurovision Song Contest. In the past few years, the traditional practice that every country’s participant sings in their own language has been more and more replaced by singing in English. She sees this as an unnecessary practice, explaining that everyone should sing in their mother tongue, not only because languages need to be nurtured, but also because “when you translate a song, the depth is not the same, it can’t be as beautiful.” She adds, “I can’t imagine a *klapa* in English”. Another example of hers that triggers the purist tendency is in her stance that Pula Film Festival should be called Pulski filmski festival, which is a more natural title for a festival in Croatia. This should be the case unless “it aims for it to be international”. If not, “the language should stay true to the hosting country.” Trask explains this phenomenon stating that: “linguistic conservatives sometimes object to the presence in their language of large numbers of loan words,” in this case it is because the respondent thinks the Croatian language is self-sufficient and does not require foreign elements, which is why she agitates for “purification of the language by replacing foreign loans with genuine native words” (1999: 96).

Another point where the purist tendency was evident was in discussing dialects. A dialect she does not like in particular is the Slavonian one, which is called the Shtokavian dialect in Croatia. The respondent does not particularly like this dialect, because “they speak *ekavica*<sup>4</sup> too much.” She explains this by stating “it is too Serbian for me”, and makes sure she is not gotten wrong: “I have a Serbian brother-in-law, so I’m not saying this as a war-racial-cultural thing, I just think it’s too much of a different country and I think they should change that.” The influence of Serbian lies in the fact that Serbs and Croats used to live together in what was once called Yugoslavia and their language was Serbo-Croatian. Today, these are two different countries, divided by the instruments of ethnicity, language, and religion, with racial issues still being present. Geographically speaking, the Shtokavian dialect that the respondent is referring to is spoken in the eastern part of Croatia, on the border with Serbia.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is not entirely clear what the respondent is referring to here, since the 'ekavian' speech in Croatia is typical of the Chakavian dialect (Barić et al. 2005: 608), and not the Shtokavian one. The respondent probably equates *ekavica* with Serbian or “Serbian” loanwords. Also, according to the respondent's explanation, it could be assumed that the respondent dislikes the Shtokavian dialect because of the influence of the Serbian language.

Apart from this dialect, she says she does not like, as she calls it, *Bosnian Croatian*, which is very Turkish. In other words, the respondent shows the tendency to preserve language from foreign influence, in terms of language borrowing. Bosnian Croatian is rich with borrowed linguistic items from Turkish and this can, in some societies, be “socially, even politically, stigmatized” and can be seen as “degradation of the language” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 198), and Bosnia and Herzegovina are no exception. Based on the examples listed above, it can be concluded that such desires to free the language from foreign elements show the respondent’s strong purist tendency.

In addition to the respondent’s purist tendency, the respondent is very vocal about how swearing is a very bad side of the Croatian language, as “Croatian swears are really vulgar and really bad.” Culturally speaking, they are common and are already blended into Croatian culture and every-day language, which is why the respondent claims Croatians have started to take for granted what the swears actually mean. She explains, “If you said something like that in English you would be in a lot of trouble.” Comparing Croatians and *Aussies*, the respondent says the difference is in the vulgarity, Croatian swear words being more vulgar, and in the fact that even kids use them. In Australia, on the other hand, people will swear a lot, but you will not hear it in an everyday conversation. This leads us to another suggestion that the respondent shows tendencies to rid Croatian of undesirable elements, such as swearwords.

#### **5.1.5. Language anxiety**

By definition, language anxiety is “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (MacIntyre, Gardner 1994: 284). Interestingly enough, the respondent shows little potential and experience of language anxiety, regardless of the fact that she started to learn the second language as an adult. The respondent explains her willingness to speak and have a conversation was always stronger than the fear of being laughed at: “I always kept going for it.” When her language knowledge was not wide enough to meet her needs, she did not even bother to use her hands and body to convey her message. She laughs telling a story when in a store she needed chicken breasts and she *quacked* and pointed to her breasts to get what she needed.

However, there were particular situations where language anxiety was triggered and when she did avoid speaking, such as at parent-teacher meetings where she did not feel “as confident to state her mind”, because she felt like she would not express herself properly and she feared ending up sounding arrogant or stupid. As her language experience expanded, she got better at that, and so the anxiety level decreased, as she says: “When my kids started school, I would be a quiet parent in the room in order not to sound either arrogant or incompetent, but now I’m pretty much an advocate.” As her language skills improved, she became more and more confident to speak her mind, especially if she was very passionate about something: “even if I felt I would come off, I don’t know, rude or arrogant, or just stupid, I went for it because I’ve always been an advocate for people who can’t advocate for themselves.” She finally states that the closer you are to people around you, the lesser are the insecurities about your language.

Her Croatian is obviously not perfect, which is why she gets corrected sometimes. Her emotions on this are divided, as well. When her kids correct her, “that’s annoying”, she says laughing with it, but “when other people, hm...I don’t know, I feel it can maybe hurt your confidence a little bit, when you’re corrected, but if it’s through a caring conversation or if it is through my own inquiry then I think it’s actually really positive.” All in all, her confidence and satisfaction with her Croatian is big according to her reaction to this question, and she says her knowledge of Croatian “meets way more than her needs.”

Being laughed at for her Croatian has also not been a problem for the respondent, nor has it elicited possible language anxiety: “I’ve never taken offence of it, I kinda just laugh with it”, “I’m all right, I don’t get offended very easily.” She makes a comment that “Croats find hearing people practicing Croatian quite humorous...quite often”, but one must not get discouraged by that, as she says some of her friends, who would worry a lot about being laughed at, ended up speaking Croatian less fluently and less successfully.

#### **5.1.6. Language and identity**

Speaking Croatian for about 20 years now, the respondent has become fluent and finds it easy to communicate in Croatian. However, English still feels like a more natural means of communication and is a strong part of her identity, as Trask explains: “an individual’s way of speaking constitutes an important part of his or her identity within the community” (1999: 206).

The respondent claims she does not feel like she loses her identity when she switches from English to Croatian, but when she has a deep emotion to share, she fears being “misread or misunderstood”, which is why she would opt for English as a much safer option. She also feels like she is more authentic, funny, and humorous when she speaks English. Apart from this, the strong bond she has with her mother tongue is visible in the fact that in public she immediately *picks up* the English language, and if she hears the accent is Australian, then she will most certainly go up to the person, say hello and start a conversation. She says: “I’ve met some friends that live in Velika Gorica randomly that way”, and she admits that “there’s a little *tinkle* in your belly when you hear it”. Another thing that points to strong identity bonds with the Australian accent is the fear of losing her genuine accent. For example, when she got a job where most people speak English, but the vast majority of them speak in an accent of English different from hers, she felt like: “Oh my God, I’m gonna start sounding American because I work in an American school.” As she claims, that did not happen and she stayed true to her accent, which makes her happy because: “I like to be known as Australian accent”, and “I don’t want it to go away.”

The respondent says it is important to her that her children and grandchildren speak English too, not only because it is a part of her family’s identity, but also because she thinks it is for their benefit to be able to speak a foreign language, whatever the language is. As she says, “it wouldn’t be a problem if they spoke in American accent.” Hence, she taught her children English and they are bilingual as well, and most of the time she speaks English to them. She prefers English because, as she says, then she is “more nurturing, mothering” and their conversations are *richer*. This points to the fact that her identity as a mother is more complete when she speaks English than when she speaks Croatian. On the other hand, their conversations in Croatian are the simple ones, the casual ones, *day by day* conversations, about what is going on and similar topics.

#### **5.1.7. Code-switching**

Code-switching is listed by Grosjean (2008: 18) as one of the communicative strategies deployed by bilingual speakers when in a “bilingual mode”, i.e. in situations when more than one of the speaker’s languages is active, one of them being the “base language”. In his view, to code-switch is “to shift completely to the other language for a word, a phrase, a sentence” (ibid.). The respondent says she code-switches mostly with her family, her children in particular, using English as her “matrix language frame” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 97), and bringing in Croatian if

necessary. Although many of her co-workers speak Croatian, the respondent never speaks Croatian to them, not even in informal situations or out of the workplace. Code-switching occurred on several occasions during the interview and it was “intrasentential code-switching” (ibid.). According to the respondent’s self-reflection, in multilingual discourse she automatically switches to another language depending on the situation and her addressees, which is called “situational code-switching” (2015: 98). Examples of the respondent’s code-switching points will be listed in the section with linguistic results below.

#### **5.1.8. Language thinking and processing**

The respondent without a doubt thinks in her mother tongue. Earlier in the paper it was mentioned how she claims her grammar is always her English grammar, which points to the possibility that she applies English grammar rules to the Croatian language. This could be concluded on the basis of her statement that in situations when she has a deep conversation in Croatian and she thinks about how to answer, she oftentimes translates her English sentence in her mind and then says it out loud in Croatian. Speaking Croatian can be tiring for the respondent, which is why she says she feels tired after an entire day spent speaking Croatian; she explains this by saying: “I have to work a lot harder in Croatian than in English.”

As far as cognitive processes are concerned, it was found during the interview that the respondent occasionally does ‘in-mind’ translations to get her way out of a tricky conversational situation, as she explains: “If I get stuck expressing myself in Croatian, I translate from English what I have in my head and then I say it” In theory, this bilingual tendency is called “natural translation”, “it refers to cognitive skills involved, not to translation situation,” and “it is produced by a child or an adult who has received no formal training in translation and is relying on a set of natural linguistic skills” (Malakoff, Hakuta 1991: 144). This type of translation stands in opposition to professional translation, as it based on *what feels natural*, rather than on translation theory and practice. Most probably, the final product of the translation will be linguistically poor and unsophisticated, especially if it is a word-for-word translation, with translations of individual words that constitute phrases and sentences.

## 5.2. Linguistic results

### 5.2.1. Gender-marking

While self-reflecting and self-evaluating her Croatian skills, the respondent mentions several times that one of her biggest struggles in Croatian is gender-marking, e.g. determining the gender of nouns. Grosjean notes that this occurrence is a common phenomenon in late bilinguals: “Second language acquisition research seems to show that early bilinguals (i.e. those who acquired and used their gender-marking language regularly before adolescence) make no, or very few, gender-production errors, whereas late bilinguals (i.e. those who acquired their other language during adolescence or as adults) make a substantial number of gender errors” (2008: 142), some of which were noticed during the interview, such as “Išli su **jedan godina** prije škole.”

### 5.2.2. Personal pronouns

In Croatian, there is a distinction between the familiar second-person pronoun and the polite/distant one: *ti* (second person singular) marking closeness and familiarity, and *Vi* (second-person plural) being used as the polite form and when addressing someone with respect. This can confuse speakers of languages, which do not make such distinctions, e.g. English. The respondent mentions this problem saying that she is not always certain which form to use. The origin of this distinction is mentioned by Trudgill, who explains that the choice of the pronoun was determined by the power relationship between speakers (2000: 91). However, “the solidarity factor has now won out over the power factor, so that pronoun usage is nearly always reciprocal” (2000: 91) and this change has become noticeable in Croatian as well.

### 5.2.3. Code-switching

As it was mentioned earlier, the respondent, being in a bilingual speech mode and being aware of the fact that her addressee is a speaker of both English and Croatian, tends to switch codes and bring in Croatian to fill in where English is insufficient or unsuitable. Here are several examples: “I can’t imagine a *klapa*<sup>5</sup> in English”, “The first Croatian I learned was *čakavski*<sup>6</sup>” “That’s like a *roditeljski*<sup>7</sup>”. However, during the Croatian part of the interview, where Croatian

---

<sup>5</sup> A *klapa* is a group of 5 to 8 singers, who are known for *a capella* singing. In Croatian *klapas* are characteristic of Dalmatia and the Croatian coast and are closely associated with the Dalmatian dialect.

<sup>6</sup> One of the three regional dialects of Croatian.

<sup>7</sup> Meaning in Croatian: *parent-teacher meeting*

was the base language, the respondent switched to English for the word *content*, meaning ‘gradivo’ in Croatian. Heltai and Lenstyák (2018: 5) emphasize that although a popular perception of code-switching is frequently that it is “a result of deficits in linguistic competence”, they follow Poplack (1980: 240, cited in Heltai and Lenstyák *ibid.*) in her view that code-switching is “a verbal skill requiring a large degree of linguistic competence in more than one language, rather than a defect arising from insufficient knowledge of one or the other”. Also, citing works by Scotton 1988 and Auer 1995, they suggest that code-switching, “especially in the case of fluent bilinguals, is deliberately employed to convey socio-pragmatic meanings that cannot be expressed with the words of the other language” (Heltai, Lenstyák 2018: 5). This was also confirmed in our analysis of the respondent’s production. It was noticed that the respondent code-switches either when she cannot remember the word/term in Croatian (L2), or when she has to use a culturally-specific item, the translation of which would be imprecise. For example, during the interview we can hear the respondent say: “Puno manje *content* se mora naučiti.” In this particular case of code-switching to English for one word, the respondent took some time to think about the word in Croatian, and when she could not think of it, she brought in the English word. This occurrence may be the result of incomplete acquisition of L2 or the predominant usage of L1. An example of code-switching for culturally-specific items can be heard in the example: “I can’t imagine a *klapa* in English.” Using the term *klapa*, in this case, is understandable and logical, as the translation for this word does not exist in English and the respondent opted for the original term, rather than using a descriptive one.

#### **5.2.4. Hedges**

By definition, hedging is “a mechanism used to manage the tone, attitude, and information within spoken or written discourse” (Wardhaugh, Fuller 2015: 281). It involves “the qualification and toning down of utterances or statements” (*ibid.*). Over the course of the interview, it can be heard at many points that the respondent uses hedges, words and expressions such as *well*, *like*, *maybe*, *but*, *sort of*, *you know*, *I guess*, and so on.

#### **5.2.5. Croatian verb conjugation**

The present form of verbs in third person plural in standard Croatian can have three different suffixes: *-u*, *-ju* and *-e* (Barić et al. 2005: 236). The respondent repeatedly uses non-standard forms which employ the suffix *-u* in the third person plural present verb form in Croatian

where the suffix *-e* should be applied. So, instead of saying *vole, nauče, iznenade, postoje, žele...* the respondent says *volu, nauču, iznenadu, postoju, želu...*, which might be an example of crossdialectal influence from Chakavian/regional dialects. However, when she should use the suffix *-u*, she uses *-e* instead: “Moja djeca *ide...*” As far as verb conjugation is concerned, the respondent also uses the first person plural verb form *upućivamo*, rather than *upućujemo*, which is the ‘correct’ form according to *Hrvatski jezični portal*.

#### 5.2.6. Literal translation

While speaking Croatian, the respondent uses the expression *napraviti prijatelje*, which is a literal translation from the English expression ‘to make friends’, which does not work in monolingual Croatian. A more monolingual equivalent would be *steći prijatelje* or simply *sprijateljiti se*. Another example of literal translation of lexical collocations can be heard when the respondent says *imati razgovor*, which can work in monolingual Croatian and is not impossible, but in conversation *razgovarati* is more frequently used. Hence, based on the respondent’s tendency to produce literal translations of lexical collocations, it can be concluded that this is another such case.

Similarly, the respondent says: *tako su oni više volili*, which is a translation influenced by the English ‘They liked it better that way.’ The usage of directly translated formulations, or, simply, word-for-word translations in bilinguals is called ‘translational bilingual communication’, the product of which “shows signs of influence from the other language (contact effects, interference), leading to the development of new language varieties (bilingual language varieties, translated language)” (Heltai, Lenstyák 2018: 4).

#### 5.2.7. Using the correct case

The nominative case in Croatian is used for naming in narration or in descriptions (Barić et al. 2005: 236). It was noticed during the interview that the respondent tends to use the nominative case even in cases where a different case should be applied. This was noticed in the following examples: “Oni mogu razgovarati o svemu u vezi *likovni* ili *povijest*” (the genitive case should be used), “Sad pričam od *moj pos’o*” (the locative case should be used), “Kada ja budem s njima u *kafić*”, (the locative case should be used) “Moj muž je uvijek bio na *jedno mjesto*” (the



locative case should be used). Since the forms of these nouns are similar in the nominative and the accusative case, it is not certain which form the respondent refers to.

There are numerous other examples in which the respondent uses the wrong case, such as in examples: “To mene nije *u školu* zanimalo”, “...soram različitih *jezike*...”, “Morali su više vremena posvetiti *učenjem*.” It is difficult to track why, how and in which particular cases the respondent makes the wrong choice of a case, because the erroneous usage seems to be inconsistent and random. For more relevant results on case usage in the respondent’s speech a more extensive interview in Croatian should be conducted.

### **5.2.8. Phonological results**

#### **5.2.8.1. Rhotics**

Speaking about the process of acquiring Croatian, the respondent mentions difficulties she encountered trying to pronounce some Croatian phonemes, especially the r-sound, which she eventually managed to pronounce 10 years after she first started learning Croatian. The reason for the difficulty of pronouncing the r-sound may be in the fact that the Croatian variant of the r-sound is not used in her native variety of English. In addition, the Australian variety of English is a non-rhotic variety of English (Trudgill, Gordon 2006: 236). However, the rhotic phoneme in English “has a rather wide range of distinct phonetic realisations” (Josipović 1999: 54). In Croatian, those realizations are either alveolar trills, as in *trg*, or flaps, as in *ruka* (ibid.). Although the respondent says she did learn how to pronounce the r-sound in Croatian, a certain level of bilingual production was noticed in words such as *prekrasno*, *drugoga*, etc.

#### **5.2.8.2. Aspiration**

In words beginning with [t], there is a certain degree of aspiration of [t] heard in the respondent’s pronunciation, such as in words *tema*, *tada*, *tako*. As Josipović explains, /t/ is an alveolar plosive that is typically produced at the alveolar ridge, as in the word ‘tip’ (1999: 35). This type of aspiration in producing this plosive is a typical realization of the English phoneme /t/. However, this plosive is not normally aspirated in Croatian, so this manner of articulation indicates what could be called an English accent in Croatian.

### **5.2.8.3. Place of articulation of the alveolar plosive [d]**

During the interview, it was noticed that the respondent had a special place of articulation of the Croatian phoneme [d] when it was used in the middle of the word and surrounded by vowels. As Josipović explains, this alveolar plosive is produced “by a closure created by bringing the tip of the tongue tightly together with alveolar ridge” (ibid.). However, instead of producing the phoneme at the alveolar ridge, the respondent’s tongue is placed behind the alveolar ridge, at the hard palate and the result is that the phoneme is pronounced with almost no contact between the tongue and the ridge. This can be heard in words such as *nikada*, *nekada*.

## 6. Discussion

Based on the analysis of the results of this sociolinguistic research, it was determined that our respondent is a bilingual person, more specifically a late bilingual with a daily use of English (L1) and Croatian (L2). The respondent uses both languages in daily interactions: L2 is employed in most public interactions, while L1 is employed at work, in certain public interactions, and with her family. Although the respondent lives in an L2-based community, the dominance of the mother tongue, English, is present. Therefore, we can place the respondent in the category of a dominant bilingual, as shown in the graph below:




Chart 3. The bilingual profile of the respondent<sup>8</sup>

The graph shows the degrees of bilingualism. The vertical axis indicates English monolingualism, the horizontal axis indicates Croatian monolingualism, and the central diagonal line indicates balanced bilingualism. The lines between these three main lines indicate dominant bilingualism, depending on the level of knowledge of English (left of the diagonal) and the level of knowledge of Croatian (right of the diagonal). Based on the L2 language acquisition process, language usage

<sup>8</sup> The graph is based on E. S. Kester's 2018 article *Do I Need to Test Bilingual Children in Both Languages*, in which she uses a similar representation to demonstrate proficiency in bilinguals.

ratio (Chart 1. and Chart 2.), language dominance, language proficiency and fluency, language performance, and the respondent's self-assessment (Table 1.), the respondent was placed in the E<sub>c</sub> category as marked in the graph. This is an estimation and it is not a fixed point on the graph. Instead, it covers a wider area of the graph due to the possibility of movement along the language continuum. The transition from one point on the continuum to the other depends on how long the learning of the L2 has been taking place, on the time of year (depending on the time of year, the respondent increases or decreases the language usage ratio), and on some other micro-factors, such as addressees, situations etc.

According to the information obtained regarding different attitudes and opinions about language and the culture of communication, our respondent showed certain ideological thinking tendencies that could be categorized under the term 'linguistic conservatism' (Trask 1999: 96). This was evident in the respondent's stance on the standard language, which she considers to be more or less the only acceptable form of language in formal situations, regardless of the language. Another indication for an ideological way of thinking lies in the fact that the respondent has a strong sense of national identity, and is very vocal about the necessity to preserve traditional ways of speaking and regional dialects, to nurture the language as a part of a family's identity and to keep it from contamination from foreign influences. There are different points in the interview suggesting a rather purist tendency to rid the Croatian language of foreign linguistic influences and elements coming from Serbian, Turkish or English. Undesirable elements that the language should get rid of can be found in the language itself – it is also swearwords that the respondent sees as overly vulgar, inappropriate and bad for the language. On the one hand, there are numerous examples of ideological thinking in the analysis of the respondent's attitudes and we can see how the respondent will openly stand up for her beliefs and values, but on the other hand, the respondent shows non-stereotypical ways of thinking, and she does not make harmful generalizations about certain groups of people, language communities, etc. What is more, she shows openness and acceptance of multiculturalism, different cultures, peoples, and languages. The emotional approach to keeping and cherishing languages is present for both English and Croatian, and there is no apparent resistance to L2 influence, but a rather equal appreciation of both languages. Prior to the interview, the respondent had to assess her skills in L1 and L2, and she explained her Croatian language competence is not at a very high level, partly because she never learned it formally in school and partly because she predominantly uses English for her communicative

purposes. However, she explains, her L2 competence is more than sufficient for her needs and it seems that her prime concern is effective communication, and that she is not overly anxious about the ‘purity’ and ‘correctness’ of her L2.

The linguistic profile of the respondent is typical of a late bilingual. It is seen in the example of gender-marking problems the respondent keeps facing regardless of the years spent speaking L2. Also, the dominance of L1 is evident in the confidence, speed, fluency and the relaxed stance while speaking in it. The language performance in Croatian was significantly slower, more controlled, and it was noticed that the respondent takes more time to think in order to formulate meaningful sentences. Other typical bilingual traits are noticed in code-switching. The code-switching happens both when L1 is the base language and when L2 is the base language. Crosslinguistic influence is also present and it is manifested in bilingual case forms, gender usage, and in literal translation. As Grosjean explains, interference most commonly occurs under the influence of L2 (the respondent’s weaker, non-native language), but may appear at all levels (2010: 69), which was confirmed during the interview.

Certain prosodic features of the respondent’s Croatian speech production suggest that the respondent has ‘the English accent in Croatian’, which is especially visible in the pronunciation of r-sounds and in the aspiration of the phoneme /t/, as was explained in the results section.

### **6.1. Self-reflection**

This sociolinguistic interview offered a variety of useful data and insights into the methodology of conducting interviews and will be of great use for conducting future interviews. The research was conducted in accordance with the researcher’s expectations. The results presented in this paper represent a concise set of results obtained and could be extended for more detailed research.

The course of the research was carried out according to plan, and most of the set goals were achieved. A mitigating circumstance for this research was the friendly relationship between the respondent and the researcher, which was helped by previous cooperation. I am particularly pleased with the choice of the respondent for this research, as the respondent has varied and firm attitudes and thus the range of results was more extensive and interesting.

Several conclusions on the modules and question issues were made after the interview, and they will be listed below.

The aim of the interviewer is always to pose open questions in order to get spontaneous and lengthy responds from the respondent, because these questions may lead us to unexpected but useful results, as Labov explains: “the sociolinguistic interview is considered a failure if the speaker does no more than answer questions” (1984: 38). However, some of the questions had to be closed as their focus is on obtaining concrete information. The chart below shows the ratio of the type of questions used with the respondent.




Chart 4. The ratio of open and closed questions in the interview

As shown in the chart, the percentage of open questions in the interview was large, 71% in particular, while 29% of the questions were closed. The closed questions mostly focused on information about the personal and linguistic profile of the respondent. Nevertheless, some of the closed questions turned out to be open because the respondent offered answers from which other open questions arose. On the other hand, although most of the open questions resulted in extensive and useful answers and results, the respondent offered short and closed answers to some open questions. The analysis of the questions may have shown the reason why this was so. During the analysis, it was noticed that some questions were leading questions because they indicated the answer that the researcher may have expected from the respondent. For example, the question: “Do you think the standard language is the only one acceptable in formal situations?” may seem

open, but it is indeed a yes/no question, which indirectly suggests that the claim in the question is correct. This may significantly affect the respondent's response. For the respondent to give a completely non-biased answer, it would be desirable to formulate the question differently, for example: "What do you think about the standard dialect in formal situations?" Another example to illustrate the suggestiveness of questions is in questions where the respondent is given options to choose from, as in: "Does swearing depend on the person or the culture?" In this case as well, the respondent should be allowed the opportunity to come up with an answer on his own without suggestions. A better solution for this question would be: "What do you think swearing depends on?" because it would offer the respondent more time to think about possible answers and the answer itself would possibly result in more varied data.

The questions analysis brought new insights into my methodology of formulating questions. It can be concluded that, in order for the research results to be reliable and valid, the respondent must have a certain level of independence in the answers, and questions can have a great influence on that.

## **7. Conclusion**

This sociolinguistic research is a case study, the aim of which was to investigate the Anglo-Croatian interlinguistic and intercultural reality of a bilingual individual. The results obtained in the research have been analyzed from a sociolinguistic and linguistic perspective. They were obtained on the basis of one interview with the respondent, a late bilingual whose mother tongue is English and the second language is Croatian. Based on the sociolinguistic modules and questions asked in the interview, a sociolinguistic profile of the respondents was created, and it was divided into sociolinguistic and linguistic results. The obtained results are based on the respondent's self-assessment and the researcher's analysis of the respondent's answers. The analysis has shown that the respondent is a late, English dominant bilingual whose characteristics, attitudes, ideologies, and language production coincide with previous relevant research. The analysis of the linguistic results confirmed that the dominance of the respondent's L1 has significant influence on the respondent's production of L2.

However, the research and the results were taken as one separate sample, based on which no general conclusions can be drawn. For more detailed and extensive research and concrete and more generalizable results, more detailed research would be needed, which would include either more interviews, additional respondents with a similar language/culture background, or other variables.



## 8. References

- Auer, P. (2007) Mobility, contact and accommodation. In Llamas, C. Mullany, L. Stockwell, P. (2007) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge
- Barić, E. Lončarić, M. Malić, D. Pavešić, S. Peti, M. Zečević, V. Znika, M. (1997) *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Errington, J. (2000) Ideology. *Journal of Linguistics Anthropology*. 9 (1–2): 115–17.
- Grosjean, F. (2008) *Studying bilinguals*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2010): *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Heltai, P. Lanstyák, I. (2018) Translation and Bilingual Language Use: Two Subtypes of Bilingual Communication. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324573287\\_Translation\\_and\\_Bilingual\\_Language\\_Use\\_Two\\_Subtypes\\_of\\_Bilingual\\_Communication](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324573287_Translation_and_Bilingual_Language_Use_Two_Subtypes_of_Bilingual_Communication) [accessed Sep 12 2020].
- Holmes, J. (2013) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Hrvatski jezični portal*: [hjp.znanje.hr](http://hjp.znanje.hr)
- Josipović, V. (1999) *Phonetics and Phonology for Students of English*. Zagreb: Targa.
- Labov, W. (1984) Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In Baugh, J. and J. Sherzer (eds) *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 28-53.
- Labov, W. (2001) The anatomy of style-shifting. In Eckert & P. Rickford, J. R. (2001) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 85 – 108
- Langer, N. Nesse, A. (2012) Linguistic Purism. In Campoy, H. J. M. Conde Silvestre, J. C. *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Willey-Blackwell/John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 607-625.

- Llamas, C. Mullany, L. Stockwell, P. (2007) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Lepper, G. (2000). *Categories in Text and Talk: A Practical Introduction to Categorization Analysis*. London: Sage.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39, 251–275.
- Malakoff, M. Hakuta, K. (1991) Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In Bialystok, M. (ed.) *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. 141-166.
- Moradi, H. (2014) An Investigation through Different Types of Bilinguals and Bilingualism. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies*. Page No. 147-154
- Poplack, S. (1980) *Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español*: Toward a typology of Codeswitching. *Linguistics*. 18: 581-618.
- Trudgill, P. (2000) *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. London: Penguin Books.
- Trudgill, P. Gordon, E. (2006) Predicting the past: Dialect archaeology and Australian English rhoticity. *English World-Wide* 27:3. Université de Fribourg: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 235-246
- Wardhaugh, R. Fuller, J. M. (2015) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wray, A. and A. Bloomer (2012) *Projects in Linguistics and Language Studies. A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. Abingdon: Hodder Education.

## Abstract

This paper is a sociolinguistic research project, i.e. a case study of an Anglo-Croatian bilingual person from Australia, who has lived in Croatia for the last 20 years. The research was based on one interview, based on which a profile of the bilingual person was created with references to previous research on bilingual people. The interview results were divided into the sociolinguistic and the linguistic results. The sociolinguistic results include the respondent's experiences, opinions, attitudes, and ideologies, while the linguistic results follow the characteristic features in the production of the respondent's second language. The results show that the respondent is a late, English dominant bilingual. They also show ideological thinking tendencies in the respondent, such as standard language ideology and dialect ideology. Linguistic results show that the dominance of the respondent's L1 has significant influence on the respondent's production of L2, which is seen in code-switching and case usage. The results obtained can be used for comparative analyses with similar research topics, and they can also be used for extending this research into a wider and more representative study.

Keywords: sociolinguistic interview, Anglo-Croatian bilingualism, language ideologies, Australian Croats

## Zahvala

Na kraju svog fakultetskog obrazovanja, prije svega želim zahvaliti svojim roditeljima koji su mi tijekom cijelog života pa tako i studija omogućili miran i sretan život te poticajnu okolinu za učenje. Veliku zahvalu dugujem i svojoj sestri i bratu koji nisu bili ništa manje poticajni, dapače, uvijek puni podrške i ljubavi. Sve što sam postala postala sam zbog svoje obitelji u kojoj sam imala priliku rasti i razvijati se kao osoba i kao intelektualka, a gorivo za dalje uvijek sam crpila iz ljubavi, podrške i glasnog smijeha u našoj obitelji. Za to ne postoji dovoljno velika hvala.

Vrlo vjerojatno bih do ovog diplomskog rada došla puno teže da nije bilo svih mojih najboljih prijatelja, mojih cimerica, domaća i svih ostalih uz čiju pomoć sam uspjela laugh my way through all sorts of difficulties. I njima velika hvala.

I last but not least, prepunim srcem zahvaljujem Gospodinu na svim blagoslovima, na meni zaista ne štedi. Samo što sam pred Tobom i pred Tvojim imenom, samo tolika sam i ništa više.