Language Attitudes of a Multilingual Speaker

Abramušić, Andrej

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2021

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **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:131:993342

Rights / Prava: In copyright/Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-08-10**

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Odsjek za anglistiku

Andrej Abramušić

JEZIČNI STAVOVI VIŠEJEZIČNOG GOVORNIKA

Diplomski rad

Mentor: dr. sc. Anđel Starčević, docent

Komentor: dr. sc. Damir Kalogjera, professor emeritus

prosinac 2021.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of English

Andrej Abramušić

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF A MULTILINGUAL SPEAKER

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Anđel Starčević, Assistant Professor

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Damir Kalogjera, Professor Emeritus

December 2021

Sažetak:

Jedan od značajnijih ishoda globalizacije porast je višejezičnosti i važnosti engleskog jezika u zemljama gdje engleski nije materinski jezik, posebice u poslovnom području. Sociolingvistička istraživanja bilingvalnih govornika pokazala su kako čimbenici kao što su obrazovanje, migracija, mediji, itd. mogu oblikovati jezične stavove govornika i ustanovila su oprečne jezične ideologije koje mogu utjecati na te stavove. U fokusu ovog rada nalazi se utjecaj konteksta usvajanja i uporabe jezika na jezične stavove. Istraživanje se temelji na pretpostavci da višejezični govornik može imati oprečne stavove prema različitim jezicima koje govori zbog različitog konteksta u kojem je svaki od jezika usvojio/la te u kojem ih koristi. Da bi se dokazala navedena pretpostavka provedeno je kvalitativno istraživanje na uzorku višejezičnog govornika iz Slovačke. Istraživanje je strukturirano u obliku dva sociolingvistička intervjua s ispitanikom te kroz analizu pisane komunikacije između ispitanika i istraživača. Rezultati su pokazali da ispitanik ima pozitivniji stav prema jezičnoj raznolikosti u kontekstu srpskog, hrvatskog, i bosanskog jezika nego što je to slučaj s engleskim jezikom. Osim toga, pokazalo se da ispitanikov govor ne odražava uvijek njegove vlastite stavove prema jeziku. Rezultati ukazuju na to da ispitanik ima oprečne jezične stavove prema različitim jezicima koje govori zbog različitog konteksta u kojem je svaki od tih jezika usvojio i u kojem ih danas koristi.

Ključne riječi: učenici inog jezika, dvojezičnost, višejezičnost, jezične ideologije, jezični stavovi, jezični purizam

Abstract:

One of the prominent results of globalization is the rise of multilingualism and the importance of English in countries where English is not a native language, particularly in the work sphere. Sociolinguistic research on SLLs shows how factors such as education, migration, media, etc. shape people's attitudes towards language and identifies the opposing language ideologies that can influence these attitudes. The focus of this paper is the influence of language learning and usage context on attitudes towards language. The research is based on the premise that a multilingual speaker can have opposing views of different languages that he/she speaks due to the different learning and usage contexts with respect to each language. The premise was examined through qualitative research on the sample of a multilingual speaker from Slovakia. The research was conducted in the form of two sociolinguistic interviews with the participant, as well as through an analysis of written communication between the participant and the researcher. The results have shown that the participant views language variation more favorably in the context of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian, than in the context of English. Additionally, it was shown that the participant's speech production does not always reflect his own attitudes towards language. The results imply that the difference in the participant's attitudes towards different languages is influenced by the different learning and usage contexts in connection with each language.

Key words: SLLs, bilingualism, multilingualism, language ideologies, language attitudes, linguistic purism

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

People in various societies both closer and further removed from the direct political and cultural influence of Anglophone countries and cultures increasingly find themselves having to learn and use English as a second language for various reasons, especially when related to employment prospects. As a result of this, the study of second language learners (SLLs) and language acquisition in general is proving to be an ever more interesting research field due to the constant 'push and pull' tendencies that arise from people having more and more access to different language varieties through the Internet and other media, and the need for standardization promoted by ideological ideas, which in turn both have influence on people's attitudes towards their own language and culture. The main developments in this area concern the rise of multiculturalism and multilingualism due to the effects of globalization throughout the world. The participant in this study is a multilingual who lives in the Czech Republic but speaks English on a daily basis. He learned English primarily in school and now in his adult years finds himself having to use the language as his main means of communication and as a platform to learn new skills and make progress at his workplace, although he does not show or profess to have a lot of personal interest in the language or associated cultures. At the same time, he considers his knowledge of other languages he speaks, namely Croatian and Serbian, as a very important part of his linguistic make-up, since he studied these languages at university and continuously invests a lot of his time and energy into learning more about the languages and the related cultures.

Considering the extent to which his attitudes towards these different languages diverge, this paper will argue that reasons for learning a language, learning environment, and usage context influence attitudes towards language and learning motivation in SLLs. Language ideologies that most speakers commonly subscribe to usually either support puristic ideas about language as a single national standard or conversely embrace the idea of language heterogeneity. This paper will argue that both stances can co-exist in one multilingual speaker. Additionally, the paper will attempt to prove that the attitudes towards language that a speaker professes to have may not always reflect the reality of their language production. The focus will be on language variation in the participant's written and speech production in all the above-mentioned languages, including the participant's mother tongue Slovakian and his primary second language, Czech, and the language ideologies that arguably influence the participant's attitudes towards the languages. The language ideologies discussed

will be addressed in view of the associated national identities, namely the opposing sentiments between Czech-Slovakian and Serbian-Croatian. The study is based on qualitative research conducted through the analysis of data gathered from written sources and interviews.

The paper is divided into three main sections, the first of which will introduce the terminology and ideological frameworks used in the research. The second section will explain the reasons for which the participant was chosen for the research and describe the research methodology. The last section is divided into two sub-sections, the first of which will present and analyze the linguistic results of the research and the second of which will attempt to draw conclusions about the participant's attitudes towards different languages based on the results collected in the linguistic interview.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Transference; Code-switching and Borrowing

The ideas that will be explored in the paper rely on research frameworks and models introduced by leading researchers in the field of sociolinguistics. When considering issues of language choice in a conversation, Clyne (2003: 42) cites the "markedness" framework introduced by Myers-Scotton (1993, 1998) according to which speakers make use of *code-switching* due to a "rights and obligations set." In other words, speakers choose to use different linguistic codes (languages or language varieties) in a given interaction according to the interlocutor and the situation and the advantages or disadvantages of the chosen code in the given interaction. The terms *marked* and *unmarked* usually refer to contrasting pairs of words, one of which possesses a special 'mark,' and the other one of which is considered to be neutral. For example, the pair *play/played* is differentiated by the marked inflection *-ed*, while in the pair *cow/bull*, *bull* is marked for maleness. (McArthur 1992: 645) In this paper the term *markedness* will be used in its broader sense, "to distinguish between normal (unmarked) behaviour and a less common variant." (ibid.) In the context of code-switching, not only single words borrowed from another variety or language, but also whole varieties and languages used in specific situations can be considered marked, as opposed to the more neutral/expected word, variety, or language that a person would use in other situations. Code-switching in these marked situations, in addition to providing clarity of meaning, can provide levels of intimacy, distance, irony and hostility. (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998; cited in Clyne 2003: 42)

With respect to marked language choice, Clyne (2003: 45) acknowledges two different motivational sets: "communicative functions and intentions" and "the symbolic significance of language choice." The first one can refer to, for example, use of swear words exclusively in one language, usually the native language, and the second one to use of language to express solidarity with members of a group or exclude members of another group. These correspond to what Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015: 98), following Blom and Gumperz (1972), refer to as *situational* and *metaphorical code-switching*. In situational code-switching a speaker uses one language variety in a certain set of situations and another variety in a different set. This should be distinguished from *diglossia*, in which "the choice is much more rigidly defined by the particular activity and by the relationship between the participants." Metaphorical code-switching refers to the choice of language to fit a particular

message where the language carries symbolical meaning, such as speaking Italian in order to express love. (ibid.)

It is important to recognize the complexity and disagreement in the terminology used when talking about linguistic interferences in multilingual speech production. The main distinction that most scholars agree on is between *code-switching* and *borrowing*, and while the terms are not clearly divided but rather form a continuum, borrowing denotes "a high[er] degree of acceptance into the recipient language." (ibid. 70-72) Another difference between the two is that code-switching is used to mean transfers of both single-word and multi-word elements, while borrowing only covers the former, in addition to phonological and morphological transfers from one language into another. (ibid. 71) Code-switching analysis often differentiates between inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching, and the examples in this paper will all be of the latter, that is switching codes within a single sentence. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 97) The language that foreign lexical items are taken from will be referred to as the *donor* or *source language*, while the one that the items are transferred into and in which most of the discourse is carried out will be referred to as the *recipient language*. (Poplack 2018: 6) All the above-mentioned interferences can be grouped under the umbrella term *transference*, "where the form, feature or construction has been taken over by the speaker from another language, whatever the motives or explanation for this." (Clyne 2003: 76) A product of transference is called a *transfer*. (ibid.) Moreover, transference can facilitate *transversion*, where the speaker "[crosses] over into the other language rather than transferring something, a lexical item or unit, from one language to another." (ibid. 75)

2.2. Maintenance; Convergence and Divergence

Another type of linguistic behavior that often informs a person's speech production shows relations between groups and individuals and is described by the *Speech Accommodation Theory*. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 98) By accommodating his/her speech to the expectations of a collocutor, a person can try to reduce the differences between them in order to gain social approval, for example. This kind of behavior is called *convergence* and a person can be doing it unconsciously, as well as deliberately. On the other hand, a person may try to distance himself/herself from the person he/she is speaking to, for example when teenagers use slang and non-standard speech in order to dissociate from their parents. This kind behavior is called *divergence*. (ibid.) Le Page (1997: 28) further emphasizes the significance of this kind of behavior on identity-building, as the speaker does not only adapt to their collocutor, but also to their own image of himself/herself when engaging in this type

of behavior. (cited in Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 99) In connection to this identity-building function, divergence is sometimes a tool for *vernacular maintenance*, i.e. a conscious effort on the part of a speaker to use his/her own vernacular in order to preserve its existence in a multilingual environment. (Milroy 1980: 43, cited in Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 186)

2.3. Language Ideologies

Ideologies are beliefs, ideas and opinions used as frameworks for the interpretation of everyday thinking and therefore whole worldviews. (Verschueren 2012: 7) The power of ideology lies in its tendency to frame relations between groups of people as 'normal,' based on the idea of commonsensicality. (ibid. 8) For this reason, it is virtually impossible to be completely free of ideology as these frameworks are necessary for survival in human societies. (Irvine and Gal 2019: 12) It is, however, possible to shift one's ideological views based one's experience through life and contact with other, different worldviews. According to Verschueren (2012: 17), language is "(one of) the most visible manifestation(s) of ideology […], which may reflect, construct, and/or maintain ideological patterns." In this paper, several of these language-based ideologies will be examined and compared based on the example of the participant's speech production in different languages.

2.3.1. Ideology of the Standard Language

Proponents of the *ideology of the standard language* believe that the language they speak exists in a standardized form and this affects how they think of other languages and language in general. (Milroy 2001: 530) Cultures these speakers live in, including many native English-speaking cultures, are called *standard language cultures*. Milroy warns that many linguistic theories may be influenced by this ideology as well, since the perceived standard variety is often taken as the 'neutral' version of the language being discussed. (ibid.) Lippi-Green (2012: 57) draws attention to the contradictory nature of many definitions of the standard language. The standard language is usually described as the variety of the educated, but this definition keeps this main criterion vague without further explaining who precisely makes up this category. As this definition fails to include various regional differences and excludes almost all social variation in favor of 'the educated,' the standard variety is also often described as the variety "acceptable wherever English is spoken and understood." (Merriam-Webster's Dictionary 2009, quoted in ibid.) This focus on the educational, as well as the widespread, common character of the standard language shows that the primary function of the standardization is to make a variety as universal as possible in order to ease

communication between various groups. For this reason, the standard variety is prevalent in all formal contexts, including education, administration, and the media. Because of these social contexts, the standard is often perceived as the most prestigious variety. However, the process of standardization necessarily imposes *uniformity* on language and fails to represent the reality of real-life language use in all its diversity. (Milroy 2001: 531) That is why many speakers believe that the standard variety that they were taught in school is the only 'correct' way of speaking and perceive other varieties as 'wrong' or of lesser value. Speakers who perceive language in this way subscribe to the ideology of the standard language. (ibid) Coupled with what Lyons (1981: 24) calls the *fiction of homogeneity*, or the belief that "all members of the same language-community speak exactly the same language," the ideology of the standard language can offer quite a distorted view of all socially imagined languages, including widely used languages such as English.

2.3.2. Monoglossia and Linguistic Purism

When it comes to both monolinguals and multilinguals, many speakers believe that it is somehow wrong to mix different languages and that this implies laziness or ignorance on the part of the speaker. The belief that different languages should be used strictly separately is called *the monoglossic ideology*. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 90) In this view, code-switching and borrowing is improper language use and should be avoided in favor of the use of a single variety. People who believe in the ideology of the standard language can, therefore, build upon the idea that any intrusion of foreign elements into the standard is incorrect and start viewing these conversational strategies as 'wrong' in themselves. (ibid.)

This is closely related to the idea of linguistic purism, which Brunstad (2003: 52) defines as "a language planning ideology involving resistance to foreign elements." The notion of a 'pure' language is a mental construct brought about by the imposition of normativity that is part of the standardization process of a standard language. (ibid) In this way, foreign linguistic elements may be perceived as 'dangerous' in their capacity to 'corrupt' the 'correct' standard language by changing its uniform structure.

2.3.3. Diglossia and Multilingual Discourse

On the other hand, some language communities promote a *pluralist ideology*, where the ability to mix linguistic codes is a source of pride, as it enables speakers to show familiarity or solidarity through their use of language. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 90) There are two terms that are useful in this context, which refer to similar but distinct

linguistic phenomena. *Diglossia* is "a situation in which there are two distinct codes with clear functional separation; that is, one code is employed in one set of circumstances and the other in an entirely different set." (ibid.) Functional separation in this sense stands for the separation between primary dialects of a language, and a highly codified superposed variety, usually based on a body of literature, which nonetheless both coexist in a relatively stable language relationship. (Ferguson 1959: 336, quoted in Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 90) An example of this is the Czech diglossia that consists of *Standard Czech* (*spisovná čeština*), which is based on the humanist linguistic norm of the 16th and early 17th centuries that was revived in the time of the Czech National Revival in the 18th and 19th centuries, and *Common Czech* (*obecná čeština*), which reflects the organic changes Czech language underwent throughout its history and which were not taken into account during the revival. (Vuković 2013: 18) When comparing this to the other Slavic languages the participant speaks, there is no equivalent linguistic dichotomy today in Slovakian, Croatian, or Serbian.

As opposed to diglossia, where the functional role of the varieties dictates usage, such as the use of Standard Czech in all formal contexts and of Common Czech in everyday speech, the notion of *multilingual discourse* refers to a linguistic setting where the use of multiple languages or varieties is not considered improper but where it is common for speakers to freely mix codes and make use of conversational strategies such as code-switching and borrowing with no social stigma. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 96)

2.3.4. Ideology of the Native Speaker

One of the defining characteristics of second or foreign language teaching today is the use of the notion of the 'native speaker' as "a model, norm, and a goal […in] language and educational policies," both implicitly and explicitly. (Doerr 2009: 15) The use of this notion sets up a dichotomy between 'native' and 'non-native' production in which they are equated with the perceived 'correct' and 'incorrect' production. (ibid.) Considering the difficulties which many people can have with achieving a native-like production, it can be argued that this norm sets up unrealistic expectations for SLLs, which can often have detrimental influence on their perception of their own production. This disparity between the expectations and the reality of learning a foreign language can create confusion and further impede the learning process. Doerr defines this norm common in foreign language teaching as the ideology of the native speaker. (ibid.) Language experts, however, "contest the view that 'non-native speakers' are deficient language speakers in relation to the 'native speaker' and suggest alternative ways to judge the proficiency of language learners." (ibid) For example,

since SLLs are usually taught the standard variety, Seidlhofer (2001: 138) argues that the norm for SLLs should be the notion of English as *lingua franca* as opposed to 'the native speaker,' as this variety is a language "developed independently, with a great deal of variation but enough stability to be viable for lingua franca communication." (quoted in Doerr 2009: 4) In other words, it is a distinct variety used as a means of communication across national and linguistic boundaries. (ibid.)

3. Methodology

3.1. Participant

The participant in this study is a multilingual male adult from Slovakia who has lived in the Czech Republic for the last 12 years. He is a native speaker of Slovakian and he also speaks English, Czech, Croatian, and Serbian. In addition to this he is familiar with Bulgarian through his university studies. The participant was chosen as the subject of the study for several reasons. Firstly, his linguistic makeup with respect to English written and speech production is fairly influenced by the necessity to use the language in a professional environment in addition to him being a second language learner (SSL) who primarily learned English through the traditional educational system. In other words, he did not have much conversational experience in using English in real-life informal and professional situations prior to starting a job in IT but has recently found himself in an environment where using English is a daily requirement. This new experience has not only challenged his knowledge of English but has arguably also changed his attitudes towards the English language and culture.

Secondly, the participant is a Slovak living in the Czech Republic, where, due to the specific linguistic environment in the two countries which previously constituted one country, Czechoslovakia, he continues speaking Slovakian in his daily life, although his Slovakian production is somewhat influenced by Czech due to his daily contact with Czech speakers for a number of years. Moreover, the participant studied Croatian and Serbian languages and literature at university, has many friends from the Balkans with whom he communicates regularly and frequently travels to different countries in the Balkan region where he is exposed to different language varieties. The participant's speech production in both Croatian and Serbian is influenced by the other language, and, in this respect, he

arguably uses a mixture of the two languages with some transfers and borrowings from Slovakian and Czech.

Finally, the participant is currently working in IT customer service in a company with over 350,000 employees where his knowledge of languages is one of the main skills he uses in his daily work. The participant works in a small team where he resolves IT issues for Czech and Croatian customers. In this job role, he is often required to adjust his speech production in both Slovakian, where he sometimes switches to Czech completely, and Croatian, where he tries to avoid influences from Serbian and Slovakian. This is sometimes due to the specific terminology used and ease of communication, and sometimes due to the customers' expectations. In addition to this, he is regularly required to speak English with people from different parts of the world, whose own native accents and linguistic patterns influence the participant's production and attitudes towards English. An additional reason for choosing the participant is that he is a close friend and work colleague of the researcher, so he was available for additional follow-up questions. For anonymity reasons, the participant will not be referred to by his name.

The participant was born in Prešov, Slovakia in 1986, where he graduated from elementary and high school. In 2008 he moved to Brno, Czech Republic in order to study at the Masaryk University and has stayed there to date pursuing a career in IT. Economic migration of Slovak people into the Czech Republic, especially the eastern region of Moravia, has been a fairly constant occurrence throughout the last century and still occurs today. Due to the common history that both peoples share as members of one former state, Czechoslovakia, Czech people have historically seen Slovak immigrants not as a minority but as members of the same people. (Ligocký 2015: 37) Accordingly, the participant, as most Slovak people in the Czech Republic do, uses the Slovakian language in his daily communication but understands Czech and can use it as the main language of communication when necessary.

Brno is a multicultural city where a number of mostly Slavic people live together with the Czech majority and it a necessity for most immigrants to learn and speak Czech in order to communicate with the locals, as only around 27% Czechs speak English to some level, as reported by the European Commission. (2012: 21) Slovaks are arguably an exception to this rule. According to a 2011 census (Czech Statistical Office), Slovaks comprise only 1.5% of Brno's population (although 23.7% of inhabitants did not define their nationality in the survey). However, the majority of foreign university students in the Czech Republic come from Slovakia (Czech Universities 2019), which is especially the case in Brno due to its

proximity to the neighboring country. (Povolný 2019) Up until now, Slovak students in the Czech Republic were allowed to use Slovakian as the official language during their university studies based on the agreement between the Czech and Slovakian governments, which meant that they could take written and oral exams in Slovakian, but the official administrative language for all students was still Czech. (Klimentová 2014: 41-42) Students of other nationalities had to learn Czech in order to undertake their studies, although in some cases English was provided as the optional language. This implies an aspiration on the part of Slovak people in the Czech Republic towards vernacular maintenance through political means.

The linguistic and cultural tensions between the two peoples is visible from the developments in this area that started in 2019, when the agreement about the official language at Czech universities between the two governments expired. After the expiration of the agreement, some Czech universities started demanding that Slovak students use Czech as the official language during their studies, while others were more lenient and kept the same arrangement as before. According to some predictions, Slovak students will most likely use English as the official language during their studies in the future, rather than Czech. (Čermáková 2019) This paper will, among other issues, explore the participant's attitudes to and divergence from the perceived status and maintenance of Slovakian in the Czech linguistic environment.

3.2. Procedure

The research for this study was carried out by gathering two types of data. Firstly, a sociolinguistic interview with the participant was conducted in two sessions, the first of which lasted approximately two hours, where the participant was questioned in English and was asked to answer in English. The second session lasted approximately an hour and a half and was conducted in Croatian, but the participant was told to feel free to answer the questions in the language of his choice. The recorded interview was then analyzed, with the focus given to the participant's pronunciation and elements of linguistic interference. The two interview sessions were conducted with a time difference of approximately a year, but the research did not detect much change in the participant's written or speech production or attitudes, so this time difference will be disregarded. Secondly, the researcher gathered examples of online written communication between himself and the participant in two different channels: a chat application on an online social network and an online tool used by the researcher and the participant as the main channel of communication at their workplace.

The conversations in both channels were carried out without any premeditation on the researcher's part during the period of approximately a year and reflect a natural exchange between the participant and the researcher in personal and professional contexts. The type of data acquired in the research is conducive to a qualitative study which is best suited to assess the linguistic behavior and identity of an individual in a confined setting, such as the workplace. (Llamas 2007: 13)

The sociolinguistic interview is a research strategy devised by Labov, based on field research of several prominent sociolinguists. The goal of the interview is to record between one and two hours of speech which will provide sufficient data, obtain demographic information, elicit accounts of personal experience, focus on topics of greatest interest to the speaker, which will allow him/her to influence the topical direction of the conversation and to obtain a report of attitudes towards language, linguistic features, and stereotypes, among others. (Labov 1984: 32-33) This kind of strategy allows the researcher to make the speaker relaxed and shift his/her speech towards the vernacular, which somewhat lowers the mental barrier the participant might have due to the unnatural conversational environment he/she is subjected to during the interview and makes the speech more 'natural,' that is, containing linguistic patterns the participant might use when he/she knows that they are not being observed by a linguist. (ibid.) The interview was organized to be semi-structured, using the conversational modules suggested by Labov (ibid. 33-34) as a starting point and then allowing the speaker to change the direction of the conversation. Labov's Q-GEN-II modules are sets of questions which focus on a specific topic and are devised in order to help the interviewer start the conversation focusing on more general themes and then gradually narrow down the conversational topics according to the interviewee's points of interest. Following Labov's form, the researcher used the same twenty conversational modules in the first session but adjusted them to the interviewee's cultural context and adopted a looser interview structure in the second session conducted in Serbian/Croatian, which focused on questions about language.

Some common mistakes Labov warns about which the researcher tried to avoid are making the questions too long, not allowing the interviewee to contribute to the topics of the conversation through tangential shifting of topics initiated by the interviewer and influencing the interviewee's production by drawing attention to himself/herself as a linguistic authority figure through the use of a scholarly style. (ibid. 33-40) The interviewer used follow-up questions and verbal nods in order to encourage the participant in the first part of the conversation. Another strategy used by the interviewer in order to avoid what Labov calls the

observer's paradox is the use of an informal style and avoidance of scholarly terms. (ibid. 40) In addition to this, the interviewer connected certain topics to memories and experiences that both the participant and the interviewer shared in order to make the transitions between different modules less prominent and make the interview feel more similar to a casual conversation the two would usually have in an informal context.

Both interview sessions were done in person in the participant's home, with the aim of creating a calm and private atmosphere and making the participant feel comfortable. The interview was recorded on a mobile phone which was placed at a speaking distance between the participant and the interviewer (the researcher), in order to help the participant feel less conscious of the fact he was being recorded and allow him to speak at a normal volume. No time limit was set so the conversation progressed at a natural pace, did not feel rushed and ended when all the question modules were explored, without straining the participant's attention span.

The written language examples taken from online channels are twofold. The examples taken from the social network demonstrate informal and friendly exchange between the participant and the researcher. On the other hand, the researcher was until recently in a position of authority at the workplace where the participant and the researcher work together, so the examples taken from the workplace channel illustrate a more formal, and consequently a more tense, exchange between the two. The written examples will be copied word for word, including the misspellings, and will not include the diacritical marks when the participant or the researcher did not use them. All names of real people will be replaced by substitute names and the name of a company that is often mentioned in the examples will be replaced by the substitute name *Corp*, in order to ensure maximum legibility of the examples.

4. Results

4.1. Linguistic Preferences and Transference

Due to the specific meaning of the term Serbo-Croatian, namely the language used by four South Slavic nations (Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, and Muslims) in the former Yugoslavia (Brozović & Ivić 1988: 3), the participant's production in these languages will be described as Serbian/Croatian. The participant learned both languages separately in his studies at university and in conversation with other people often consciously resorts to situational code-switching between the two, but in most situations his written and speech

production is a synchronous combination of both languages. In addition to this, the participant claims to be actively trying to speak Bosnian, rather than either of the two languages, as a kind of a linguistic compromise. This is arguably more a matter of linguistic attitude than a realistic assessment of the participant's production, as the examples in the following sub-chapters will show. Similarly, the participant's production in his mother tongue, Slovakian, is fairly influenced by Czech when speaking with other Czech speakers, which is something the participant is aware of. The blend between the two languages in the participant's production, however, is not as consistent as in his Serbian/Croatian production. Therefore, it will be described as Slovakian. The reasons for the participant's code-switching, borrowings and transversions will be explained in the chapter "Attitudes towards Language."

4.1.1. Slovakian Production

The interview sessions were conducted mainly in English and Serbian/Croatian, with only occasional code-switching, borrowings and transversions into Czech/Slovakian on the part of the participant. I (the interviewer/researcher) speak Czech, but not Slovakian, although I have some passive knowledge of and can mostly understand written and spoken Slovakian. Still, the participant often uses transfers, i.e. intra-sentential code-switching and borrowings from Czech into a predominantly Slovakian production, when speaking with me, which was the case during the interview too. As the researcher does not speak Slovakian, all comparisons between Czech and Slovakian were done by consulting the online dictionary *dict.com* and Jozef Mistrík's 1988 *A Grammar of Contemporary Slovak*. The participant's usage of intra-sentential code-switching can be seen in the following written example:

> P: "Nee. Ovo vec mora da je neka sabotaz. I Corp radi? nisu se objesili zenske – Ana, Eliska, itd?"
> I: "da, mozda stvarno neko zeza […] Jana je na urovni zenskych v Corp tak si asi dobre rozumi"
> P: "u nas este ani jeden tiket od rana nedosiel, asi tiez prekalili vikend, inzenyri v Rakusku a Svajciarsku"
> P: "e koji datum da ti pisem tamo na taj ppair [sic]?"[1]

---

[1] P: "Noo. This must be some kind of joke. [The people in] Corp are able to work? the girls did not commit suicide yet – Ana, Eliška, etc?"
I: "yeah, maybe somebody is having a laugh […] Jana is on the same level as the girls in Corp so they probably understand each other"
P: "we haven't received a single ticket since the morning, they probably got drunk over the weekend, engineers in Austria and Switzerland"
P: "btw, which date should I put on the paper?"

In the first sentence, the participant transfers the Slovakian word *sabotáž [sabotaz]* into a Serbian/Croatian structure (*Ovo vec mora da je neka sabotaz*), using it instead of the Serbian/Croatian word *sabotaža* and then continues writing in Serbian/Croatian. I reply in Croatian, but then switch to Czech in the next sentence, which triggers the participant's switch to Slovakian. The sentence that follows is mainly written in Slovakian – the main markers of this are lexical items, since the word order would be the same if the lexical items were in Czech. For example, the words *ešte, nedošiel, tiež, Rakúsku, Švajčiarsku* [*este, nedosiel, tiez, Rakusku, Sajciarsku*] are all Slovakian, while the rest of the lexical and grammatical items are common to both Czech and Slovakian. For comparison, the Czech equivalents to the above-mentioned words are: *ještě, nedošel, také, Rakousku, Švýcarsku*. In the same sentence, the participant uses the English word *ticket*, an expression specific to his job in IT, and adjusts it to the Czech/Slovakian spelling (*tiket)*, which is an example of borrowing as defined by Poplack (2018: 6). In addition to this, he also uses the Czech word *inženýr* instead of the Slovakian word *inžinier*. The participant then continues the conversation in Serbian/Croatian, which is probably triggered by the language which the document he is talking about is written in (*e koji datum da ti pisem tamo na taj [papir]?*). This kind of code-switching in both the participant's and the interviewer's case can be described as situational, as both speakers connect the shift in the conversation topic to Czech people that they work with and hence both find it more suitable to continue the conversation in this language.

The participant's Slovakian speech production is also characterized by occasional borrowings from Czech, although these do not appear to be motivated by convergence, which can be heard in the participant's production in the other languages, but rather by repeated usage due to long-term exposure to Czech. The fact that these intra-sentential single-word borrowings are not motivated by convergence is clear from their sparseness:

> "Môžeš ísť priamo do technického tímu a začať **prostě** technicky, ale tam furt je **zájem** o tých squad **lídrů**, **manažerů** a tam můžeš využít ten svůj leadership za půl roka."[2]

For example, he softens the Slovakian adverb *proste* by palatalizing the consonant *t* (spelled as *prostě*), which is specific to Czech pronunciation. In addition to this phonological borrowing, the Slovakian nouns *záujem*, *predák* and *manažér* are replaced by Czech nouns

---

[2] "You can go straight to a technical team and start doing technical stuff, but they're always looking for those squad leaders, managers and there you can start using your leadership [skills] in half a year."

zájem, *lídr* and *manažer*. In contrast to these borrowings, where the equivalent words from the two languages mostly sound quite similar, there is a more pronounced transfer on the morphological level. When borrowing the Czech word *lídr*, the participant also transfers the Czech morphological ending *-ů* (*lídrů, manažerů*), whereas the Slovakian ending for the equivalent words in the genitive case would be *-ov* (*predákov, manažérov*).

The participant's speech production in Slovakian is fairly informal with occasional use of discourse markers and the participant does not refrain from using swearwords. In the example below, the participant uses the Czech discourse marker *ty vole*, which is today considered not to be a swear word in most contexts, despite its etymology. Although Slovakian does not use the vocative case, this Czech expression, where the noun *vůl* is in the vocative case, is a natural part of the participant's predominantly Slovakian speech production:

> "Značí to je výhra, **ty vole**, **to** budeš mať ešte viac práce […] **ako víš**, co je pointa manažera, ta práca ti má akoby ubúdať, ta exekutívna a mal by si proste ručiť a byť zodpovedný za nejaké veci a delegovat **všecko** na ostatní a ne, že ti budou pridávať **prostě chujoviny**."[3]

Similarly, expressions *víš* and *všecko* (Slovakian: *vieš, všetko*) are transferred from Czech, while the rest of the example is in Slovakian, including the Slovakian swear word *chujoviny*. Other discourse markers in this example are the particle *to* before the verb *budeš mať,* which here stresses the verb, and the adverb *ako*, which serves a similar function to the English adverb *like* used in informal speech (an example from Oxford Learner's Dictionaries: *It's really hard. Like I have no time for my own work*.).

There were no examples of dialectal traits typical of East-Slovakian dialects, such as a complete lack of quantity and the characteristic declension and conjugation (Mistrík 1988: 147-8), in the participant's production observed in the interview and written communication, although the participant claims his speech reflects his native dialect much more when he is speaking with people from his home region in Slovakia. The reasons for this convergence in all other contexts are purely practical, in the participant's opinion. Considering his own dialect is fairly different from the codified standard Slovakian, he modifies his speech in order to make it easier for other people to understand him, which is an example of behavior known as Speech Accommodation Theory (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 98):

---

[3] "So that's your reward, shit, you only get more work to do […] like, you know what's the point of being a manager, the amount of work should decrease, that executive [sic] and you should just guarantee and be responsible for some things and delegate everything to others and not keep getting new crap to do."

P: "Zapadnoslovački, to je dosta blizu srednjoslovački. Srednjoslovački je taj čisti jezik. Istočnoslovački, tamo je puno razlike među srednjoslovački, ali zapadno i srednjo nije toliko razlike. Možda bi som reko da šezdeset, sedumdeset posto je među srednjoj i istočnoj, a među srednjoj i zapadnoj deset, dvadeset procent."

I: "Zbog čega je čist taj jezik?"

P: "Zbog kodifikacije. […] Tako se naviklo, svaki to smatra, i zapad i istok to reko da, oni se dogovorili, ne kao u Bugarskoj, tamo sto kodifikatora se svađaju do danas […] je to bolje za tu cijelu zemlju, za taj cijeli region da se uzalud ne svađaju ti ljudi kao u toj Bugarskoj, znaš. Kad je jedan jezik, okej. Zašto ne. […] Mislim da je bolje kad je jedan jezik koji je respektiran ostalima, ali ostali isto može da koriste svoj dijalekt, zašto ne."

I: "Jel misliš da dijalekt nekad može bit neprimjeren?"

P: "Iz praktičnih razloga, nije to fer kad tamo u šalteru neka ženska i sad počnem na nju istočnoslovački […] neka te shvati u ti komunikaciji, to je zmisao jezika, da ti pričaš neka te neko razume."

I: "Je 'l ti smeta kad neko drugi priča dijalektom u takvim situacijama?"

P: "Kad bi som bio na šalteru tamo bi mi to smetalo, znaš, ali inače mi to ne smeta. Ja na primjer imam pet prijatelja iz regiona koji se zove Valašsko i oni imaju svoj naglasak, svoj malo drugi dijalekt, al to ne smeta, meni je to bolje, zato što malo te to obogati, nešto novo, znaš."

Considering the participant's collocutor speaks Czech and the participant's speech is very much characterized by convergence when speaking other languages (Serbian and Croatian), it is visible that this tendency is mostly conscious and premeditated in the participant's production in all languages:

"Da, to je to. Zbog toga koristim te čehizme znaš ili neke češke riječi, zato što ne ja bih hteo da pričam češki. Ja hoću da pričam slovački, ale vremenima sam naučio da je bole kad koristim neku češku riječ nego koristim slovačku zato što kad koristim slovačku uvek me pitaju ljudi što, šta, ne razumem i posle moraš da objasnivaš i zbog toga sam počeo neke riječi izmijeniti za tu češku riječ i za komunikaciju to je bole za mene, ali trudim se generalno slovački."

4.1.2. English Production

The first interview session was conducted in English upon the researcher's request as English is not the default mode of communication between the participant and the researcher in other contexts, such as when socializing or at work. Even in the work environment the communication between the two is usually conducted in English only in situations when other work colleagues who do not speak Czech are present, while the choice of the language (Serbian/Croatian or Czech/Slovakian) is normally dictated by whoever starts the conversation. The interviewee's replies in the first session were noticeably short, and in many

places there was an apparent lack of tangential shifts on his part. The session conducted in Serbian/Croatian contained many more topical shifts and the interviewee was willing and able to express his thoughts on language much more clearly than in the other session, mostly because the participant's language knowledge level is much higher in Serbian/Croatian than in English.

In addition to linguistic competence, SLLs need to acquire a set of other related skills called *pragmatic competence* in order to be able to communicate successfully. (Foster-Cohen 2011: 643) This involves a variety of communicative acts, such as directness, politeness and informativeness, but also the ability to construct linguistic units larger than an utterance. (ibid.) Based on the examples from the interview, this last point seems to be what the participant is mostly struggling with in his English production. He seems to have acquired enough vocabulary and grammatical structures in order to convey his thoughts, but due to his limited experience in conversation with other speakers as well as his apparent lack of interest in the language his production mostly consists of short utterances.

The participant's English speech production was characterized by a slow and thoughtful delivery, as for the most part he tried not to use other languages and he resorted to Slovakian or Czech only when missing a specific word which was necessary to complete his thought. For example, transfers in the participant's English production are mainly in the form of sporadic Slovakian words in the nominative case that he tentatively communicates to his collocutor in order to ask for help with finding the right English equivalent. This might be motivated by the fact the participant is being interviewed by a linguist, however, it also seems to be a strategy which gives the participant more time to think and find the right word:

> "[My parents] are from **dělnická třída**, middle class, they are workers, my dad is **údržba**, maintenance employee and mother is arranger, mmm difficult for explain, it's… in my language it's **aranžérka**. **Aranžérka** meaning is if you have some **výklad, výloha**, […] in a shop window and she arranged this… it's old profession, which is not now normally, but in communist part of our history she was […]. My mother last work was **obchodní zástupce**, she selling in the shop for example and father working in hospital in the maintenance."

Because the Slovakian words are used in the nominative case, it can be argued that this is not a form of borrowing, since these words do not play a functional role in the sentence structure, but rather an example of what Clyne (2003: 75) calls transversion, as Slovakian words intrude upon what is generally an English sentence structure. In most cases, the interviewer did not attempt to help the participant find the English equivalent, but rather let the

participant find a solution and complete sentences on his own. When comparing examples from the interview to the written communication between the participant and the researcher, it seems that the participant made an effort to remove as many words foreign to English as possible due to having been asked to answer the questions in English. The choice between a more or less relaxed attitude towards code-switching in the participant's English production seems to be influenced by the environment and the collocutor. For instance, in the written production in the workplace environment the participant avoids code-switching even when directly addressing a Czech-speaking colleague that he usually speaks to in Slovakian because he is writing in a channel used by a team of coworkers, most of whom do not speak Czech or Slovakian:

> "I have problem with my IVR recording, cannot reach a record sequence, @jan.novak can u record it pls?"

On the other hand, when it comes to the communication in a channel used only by Czech-speaking colleagues, intra-sentential borrowing and code-switching is a prominent characteristic of the participant's Slovakian production:

> Example 1: "**skontrolujem** SNC v SRP, toto co si dal **screen** nevim o co **go**"
> Example 2: "Nováková tam je, ale nejde to, lebo jej niekto hrabal na SRP nastaveni nefunguje to a druha, Slováková, tam na **exception liste** neni pre istotu vobec."
> Example 3: "oni si musia uvdomit, ze budu mat aj po **namapovani access** len tam, kam maju prava, nedostanu sa vsade na legacy"

Words which are transferred by code-switching (*screen, go, exception, access*) or borrowed (*skontrolujem, [exception] liste, namapovani*) from English all have their Czech or Slovakian equivalents (*obrazovka, ísť, výnimka, prístup, overiť, zoznam, uložení*), but the participant nonetheless switches between codes when speaking with his colleagues in a predominantly Czech/Slovakian linguistic context. As these expressions come from the IT domain and are specific to the daily work done by the participant, the motivation for code-switching is most probably a need for practicality and simplicity in communication. However, code-switching in this context is inconsistent as the participant in other places uses Czech or Slovakian equivalents for the same expressions, for instance:

> Example 1: "cerna **obrazovka**, … je v kanclu a asi to bude pre dcs ale musime spravit trblsht a az pak obkecany tiket na DCS" (*obrazovka* instead of *screen*)

Example 2: "SW centrum, ale su **vynimky**, napr.obycajne PBI, alebo neiktore PDF viewri" (*vynimky* instead of *exceptions)*

Example 3: "treba zistit ci je niekde aj tiket na RMT, potrebuje **pristup** aj tam" (*pristup* instead of *access)*

From these examples it can be concluded that the participant has a more relaxed attitude towards code-switching when communicating in Slovakian compared to his English production. Similarly, transversion occurs very rarely in his production – mostly in the form of sporadic Slovakian nouns in the nominative case serving as placeholders that give the participant time to search for English equivalents. The motivation for this difference in linguistic behavior in Slovakian and English production is arguably convergence – the attempt on behalf of the participant to make his production more similar to that of his collocutor when speaking a foreign language, as well as his belief in the ideology of the standard language in the context of English.

Some non-standard characteristics of the participant's English production is the omission of articles, which are not used in Slovakian, usage of adverbs instead of adjectives, use of non-standard prepositional phrases, omission of the possessive *'s*, usage of the *-ing* ending as a replacement for other verbal endings and usage of a possessive form without *'s* instead of an of-structure when describing relations. For instance, the participant uses phrases such as *my dad is […] maintenance employee and mother is arranger* and *it's old profession* omitting the indefinite article when using a singular noun phrase as complement to describe something. In the sentence *it's old profession, which is not now normally,* the participant uses the adverb *normally* in the function of an adjective in the predicative position to describe the preceding noun phrase. There are two possible interpretations of this usage: the participant might have wanted to follow up the adverb with a verb (e.g. *it's old profession, which is not now normally found),* but did not complete his thought. More probably, the participant wanted to express the meaning of the adjective *common*, but used the adverb *normally* instead (e.g. *it's old profession, which is not […] common [any more]*). In the phrase *difficult for explain* the participant uses a prepositional phrase after an adjective (more precisely, a combination of a preposition and a verb, instead of a preposition and a noun), rather than the standard adjective + to-infinitive clause. Moreover, he simplifies certain phrases, such as the noun phrase *my mother last work* by omitting the possessive *'s* and uses the ing-form as a generic verb form to replace other verb forms, irrespective of the tense: *she selling in the shop for example and father working in hospital in the maintenance*. Finally, the phrase

aranžérka meaning (i.e. *the meaning of [the word] aranžérka*) resembles a possessive form used instead of an of-structure, however, the possessive *'s* is again missing.

In the example below, the participant uses the verb *to mean* in the sense *to think*. Although at first sight it looks as if the verb is used in one of its standard senses, i.e. "intend as meaning," the participant is not clarifying a previous utterance by explaining his real intention, but merely answering the question by describing his opinion in a sense which is expressed by the verb *to think* in the standard variety. A possible interpretation of this usage is the following: the Slovakian word which expresses both meanings (*think* and *mean*) is *myslieť*, so the participant treats the two English words as synonyms and uses both for all associated meanings, transferring the lexical meaning from Slovakian to English:

> I: "How would you describe your knowledge of English in conversation?"
> P: "I **mean** my English is good for normal communication with some people without some difficult topics. […] **It's depend** from accent, if it's totally British English, normally, maybe seven. But if it's American English or some other shit, I don't know, Gaelic or Scottish, it's maybe five."

The participant uses contracted forms such as *it's* (*it is*), *don't* (*do not*) and *I'm* (*I am*) and often transfers these forms to other clause structures creating non-standard grammatical structures such as *it's depend* (standard: *it depends*) and *I'm live in the Prešov and I'm move to Brno* (standard: *I lived in Prešov and I moved to Brno*). In the first example, the participant inserts the verb *to be* in a clause that already contains a main verb and uses *to be* as the main verb, while treating the verb *to depend* as an adjective. In order to understand this structure, it is best to take a look at the second example: *I'm live in the Prešov and I'm move to Brno*. The participant here transfers the Slovakian clause structure which consists of the main verb *žiť*, the auxiliary verb *byť* and the adverbial *v Prešove* (*žil som v Prešove*)[4] into English, whereas the standard English form of the past tense does not use the auxiliary verb *to be*, but instead uses a single-word form (*I lived in Prešov and I moved to Brno*). In the clause *it's depend*, the participant does not transfer the grammatical structure in the same way, since the tenses differ and the Slovakian equivalent of this expression does not contain the auxiliary verb, but only the main verb and a prepositional phrase in a subject-less clause (*záležať na kom/čom*). Instead, it seems the participant either copies the same structure from the previous example or is so used to the contracted verb form *it's* that he uses it in other contexts irrespective of the grammatical rules of standard English.

---

[4] The standard Slovakian structure omits the subject *ja* (*ja som žil v Prešove*).

There are other examples of similar non-standard verb forms in the participant's production, listed below together with a standard variety approximation:

Example 1: "Maybe in Scottish, in my job, there… I **must speaking** there English […]"
Standard: "Maybe when I was working in Scotland, I **had to speak** English there […]"

Example 2: "I have problem **to understood** Spanish English… if some Spanish person **speaking** English."
Standard: "I have problems **understanding** Spanish English… if a Spanish person **is speaking** English."

Example 3: "Ok, just inform John somebody, for not stepping tomorrow morning there, i cannot reach him on chat. And in monday **opening** restaurants and "restaurants" also, so **its will** good for plan B, if wheater again **gonna** wrong."
Standard: "Ok, somebody inform John not to go there tomorrow morning, I cannot reach him on chat. And restaurants **will open** on Monday so we **have** a plan B if the weather **goes** bad again."

Example 4: "hello, just lit question - **have** somebody experience with **buy** your laptop from Corp? **Is** it after 4 years possible and **counting** from CAP date? I have Cap Date : 2017-03-26, so **must wait** till 2021?"
Standard: "Hello, just a small question – does somebody have experience with buying a laptop from Corp? Is that possible after 4 years and does it count from the CAP date? I have a Cap Date : 2017-03-26, so **do I have to wait** until 2021?""

A general characteristic of verb structures in the participant's production is the absence of any differentiation between past and present tenses. The participant instead relies on the context and adverbial phrases in order to convey the time of the event he is describing, but often fails to convey that the event happened in the past. For instance, in the sentence *Maybe in Scottish, in my job, there… I must speaking there English* it is not clear whether he has worked in Scotland in the past or if he is still working there. Past simple and past participle occasionally do occur in the participant's production, but are mostly used randomly and do not suggest past tense: *I have problem to understood Spanish English*. Although the ing-form is prevalent in the participant's production, nonetheless, he does not seem to use the form as a gerund, but only as an active participle – compare *I must speaking there English* and *in monday opening restaurants* where the ing-form is used as an active participle to *I have problem to understood Spanish English* and *have somebody experience with buy your laptop* where non-standard forms of the to-infinitive stand in place of what would usually be expressed by the gerund. The future tense is expressed either by *will* or *be going to*, but here too there are non-standard forms: in *its will good for plan B* the copula *be* is inserted into the

standard structure and in *if wheater again gonna wrong* the participant simplifies the clause by omitting the auxiliary verb *to be* and the main verb *go*, leaving only *gonna,* the informal way of saying *going to*. The question form in *have somebody experience with buy your laptop from Corp?* is a transfer from Slovakian, where questions are formed by an inversion of the subject and the main verb, while in English the auxiliary verb *do* is used in simple tenses (e.g. *Does anybody have experience with buying their laptop from Corp?*).

On the morphological level, the participant generally omits articles, especially indefinite articles, although he will sometimes add the definite article to a noun phrase, seemingly with no specific reason. For example, in the sentence *I have not the very good vocabulary* the definite article replaces the indefinite article, which is used for describing in the standard variety, when in front of a noun phrase with an adjective. Instead, it seems the determiner *some* is often used in the participant's production to serve the same function as the indefinite article:

> **Example 1**: "*If I'm go to the some pub and speaking with people about some complex topic […]*" (**standard**: *If I go to a pub and I speak with people about a complex topic*)
> **Example 2**: "*I don't feel some improve*" (**standard**: *I don't feel an improvement*)
> **Example 3**: "*I have no money for some private school*" (**standard**: *I don't have money for a private school*)

It seems the participant feels the need for an indefinite meaning in *If I'm go to the some pub*, so even after starting the noun phrase with a definite article, he follows it up with the determiner *some*. *Some* is used with plural and uncountable nouns in the standard variety, while the indefinite article is used with singular nouns. The reason for this usage is probably a transfer from Czech or Slovak, where the word nějaký/nejaký (Eng. *some*) features prominently in spoken language (Czech National Corpus). He also often uses the definite article in front of names (*the Prešov*).

There are transfers from Slovakian on the syntactical level too. For example, while the standard English short answer is in the form subject + auxiliary verb of the question (e.g. Q: *Do you want to get better at English?* A: *Yes, I do*.), the participant answers questions by using the main verb of the question (A: *Yes, I want*.), as is typical in Slovakian. The word order in Slovakian is governed by factors such as functional sentence perspective (the rheme and the theme), grammatical and rhythmical factors (Mistrík 1988: 132), but is still relatively free since the inflection makes grammatical roles easy to identify (Kösegiová 2014: 3-4). Therefore, in the sentence *I must speaking there English* the participant transfers the word

order from Slovakian, placing the adverbial *there* between the verb and the object, whereas in the standard variety the adverbial is usually placed after the object of the verb (e.g. *I had to speak English there*).

The participant does not feel his English has improved much after first learning it in high school. The differences between Slavic languages and English seem to him too big to overcome and this influences his attitude towards the language:

> I: "Where did you learn English?"
> P: "I'm study in kindergarten. But some, only simple things. […] in university I'm get the exam from university English, academic English. I don't know why, how, but I have it."
> I: "Do you remember the first time you had a conversation in English?"
> P: "Maybe in Scottish, in my job, there… **I must speaking there English** because they cannot…
> I: "Was that difficult for you?"
> P: "Not in **this simple things**, but if I'm go **to the some pub** and speaking with people about some complex topic, it was difficult. Because they have **other accent**, **this is problem** and I have not **the very good vocabulary**, I have some holes there."
> I: "Have you tried speaking with Scottish people in the pub? How did that go?"
> P: "After three or four beers okay. But before it was not good."
> I: "And now? Has your English improved?"
> P: "I don't know. Not very good. **I don't feel some improve** from my high school years."
> I: "Do you want to get better at English?"
> P: "**Yes, I want**, but I have no money for some private school or something."
> I: "What do you think about English? Do you like the language?"
> P: "It's not my favorite language. It's my language which is necessary for all the world. But **language like language** is not very good for me. […] I'm Slavic and I mean English have other specifics for everything, for **grammatics**, for etymology, for syntax. Everything is **other like our languages**. So it's difficult for me."

On the lexical level, in the example above there are transfers from Slovakian into English in expressions *other accent, language like language,* and *other like our languages*. For instance, when explaining the difficulty of understanding Scottish people, the participant said *they have other accent,* using the adjective *other* instead of the word *different* (i.e. *they have a different accent*), again transferring meaning from the Slovakian adjective *iný* which carries both senses (i.e. *other* and *difficult*). The expression *language like language* is a literal translation of the Slovakian construction *jazyk ako jazyk*, which in standard variety would not be expressed by using the comparative preposition *like*, but rather by adding a prepositional phrase to the noun or a reflexive/emphatic pronoun (*language per se* or *language itself*). Similarly, in the expression *other like our languages*, the participant again uses the adjective *other* in the sense of the adjective *different* and then uses the preposition *like* which signifies

similarity instead of one of the prepositions, such as *than, from* or *to,* which are used with *different* and express contrast in the standard variety. This is once more a direct translation of the Slovakian phrase *iný ako,* where the word *ako* can express both similarity and contrast, while in English the two possible translations differ. Another interesting example on the lexical level is the word *grammatics*, which the participant created on the spot not knowing or being able to retrieve the word *grammar,* perhaps motivated by the Slovakian word *lingvistika*. Namely, the Slovakian word for *grammar* is *gramatika*, so it can be conluded that he formed the new word based on the analogy with the English translation of the word *lingvistika* (*lingvistika > linguistics*; *gramatika > grammatics*).

When asked to assess his understanding of different English accents, the participant rated British English as the easiest to understand, due to his elementary and high school education, where he learned the most about the language. The preferred variety in the educational system was British English and any deviation from this standard reportedly creates difficulties for the participant in having a conversation:

I: "How would you describe your knowledge of English in conversation?"
P: "I mean my English is good for normal communication with some people without some difficult topics. […] It's depend from accent, if it's totally British English, normally, maybe seven. But if it's American English or some other shit, I don't know, Gaelic or Scottish, it's maybe five."
I: "Which accent is the least understandable for you?"
P: "Indian English. Or some foreign people have some weird English. I have problem to understood Spanish English… if some Spanish person speaking English."
I: "Which accent is the easiest to understand?"
P: "British."

With respect to the participant's claim that he speaks the British variety of English, which he considers to be the standard, there are no hints of this on the lexical or phonological level. The participant, for instance, uses words such as *apartment* and *vacation*, rather than their British English equivalents, *flat* and *holiday*. The participant's pronunciation is heavily influenced by the Slovakian phonological system and his interpretation of written English words (so the pronunciation of the word *class* [klaːs] might be explained as a phonetic interpretation rather than as an example of an RP accent that the participant was presumably taught in school). The participant's pronunciation seems to rely heavily on his memory of written English as the vowels are often pronounced as they would be in a written Slavic word. For example, the participant does not pronounce the voiced dental fricative *th* [ð] in *other* [ˈʌðə(r)] but replaces it with the voiceless alveolar plosive [ˈɔtɛr]. Another

phonological transfer from Slovakian is the pronunciation of *window* [ˈwɪndəʊ], which the participant pronounces as [ˈvɪndɔf] due to the assimilation that affects all voiced consonants at the end of the word in Czech and Slovakian. In addition to assimilation, the initial *w* is pronounced as the voiced labiodental fricative [v], since the voiced labial-velar approximant [w] does not exist in Slovakian or Czech. Similarly, the initial [w] sound in *one* [wʌn] is pronounced as [v], which shows that the participant does not base his pronunciation merely on the phonological approximation of the written word but adjusts what he hears others say to the Slovakian phonological system. In the same way, English vowels are replaced by Slovakian vowels and schwa [ə] is missing, so *dad* [dæd] and *arranger* [əˈreɪndʒə(r)] are pronounced as [dɛd] and [ˈaranʑɛːr]. A prominent phonological feature is the way the participant pronounces verbs ending in *-ed*, where the past simple ending is not weakened/reduced, for instance in the word *divorced*, pronounced as [dɪˈvɔːrsɛd] as opposed to the standard [dɪˈvɔːrst].

4.1.3. Serbian/Croatian Production

The language variety that the participant used in the second interview session has elements of both Croatian and Serbian, therefore it will be referred to as Serbian/Croatian. The participant studied the two languages at university, where he was taught the standard variety of both Serbian and Croatian, so his production is a combination of the Serbian Ekavian Shtokavian variety and the Croatian Jekavian Shtokavian variety. (Brozović & Ivić 1988: 56-8) He switches between the two varieties freely and code-switching in his production is sometimes intentional and sometimes accidental or unconscious:

> "Pa normalno pričam srpski, bosanski, hrvatski zato što svaki taj jezik ima svoj oficijalni znaš kod u lingvistici ili u, znaš šta mislim, oficijalni je to jezik, dakle pričam, crnogorski to ne pričam, *ale* tako pričam, hrvatski, srpski, bosanski, zato što svaki *jazyk* ima svoje *specifikum*, neke riječi druge i tako dalje, to znam, te razlike. Ja sam i hrvatski i srpski studirao u tom vremenu, te *štyri*, prvo sam imao jednu lektoricu hrvatskog dva godine i posle dva godine srpski sa drugim lektorom i tamo ozbiljno morao sam, ne *môžem* da kažem tisuća, *ale* hiljada i tako dalje. Morao sam da se bijem sa tim interferencijama, znaš, *ale* ide. Ja sam imao samo hrvatski, ali posle bilo dosta na gramatiku ta lektorica i ja sam posle dosta putovao u Srpsku, u Srbiju, i tako dalje i više sam hteo da učim po srpski. Srpski lektor više ima *důraz* za vokabular, za praktični jezik, tamo više bilo o tom da pričaš, da znaš koji *syntax* koristiti. […] u tom hrvatskom bilo više *drezúra*, znaš."

For example, code-switching between the Jekavian and Ekavian varieties can be seen most clearly on the phonological level, where it occurs fairly inconsistently:

"svaki jazik ima svoje specifikum, neke **riječi** druge i tako dalje"

"ja sam **posle** dosta putovao u Srpsku, u Srbiju, i tako dalje i više sam **hteo** da učim po srpski"

Similarly, there are elements of both varieties on the syntactical level. For instance, the participant uses both the infinitive structure typical of standard Croatian (*tamo više bilo o tom [...] da znaš koji syntax koristiti*) and the combination of the conjunction *da* + present typical of standard Serbian (*[ja] sam hteo da učim po srpski*). The participant sometimes has difficulties with Serbian/Croatian syntax, especially when using cases: *prvo sam imao jednu lektoricu hrvatskog dva godine i posle dva godine srpski sa drugim lektorom.* The reason he uses an incorrect case for the numeral *dva* is a transfer from Slovakian, where the word meaning 'calendar year,' *rok*, is masculine, whereas the Serbian/Croatian noun *godina* is feminine, so he transfers the Slovakian case for the noun modifier. Another syntactical transfer from Slovakian is the construction *mi s tobom*, which is typical of all Slavic languages, except for Serbian and Croatian, where the same meaning is expressed by the construction *ja i ti.* (Brozović & Ivić 1988: 2)

On the morphological level, he transfers the 1st person singular form of the Slovakian verb *môcť*, using it instead of the Serbian/Croatian form (*ne môžem da kažem tisuća*), but generally uses the standard forms for other verbs. This particular transfer is probably motivated by the similarity between the 1st person sg. of the Slovakian verb (*môžem*) and the 1st person pl. of the Serbian/Croatian verb (*možemo*). Moreover, he often transfers prefixes from Czech and Slovakian, either directly by connecting them to a Serbian/Croatian verb or by adjusting them to the target language. For instance, the verb *izriješiti* is a combination of a translation of the Slovakian prefix *vy-* (*vyriešiť*) and the Croatian word *riješiti*. Both Croatian and Slovakian verbs differentiate between two grammatical aspects (perfective and imperfective), but in the context of this specific example, the Croatian aspects have different stems, while the Slovakian aspects differ by adding a prefix. Therefore, the participant adds a translation of a Slovakian prefix to a Croatian verb which is already in its perfective form, creating the non-standard form *izriješiti*.

There are numerous transfers on the lexical level too, which the participant probably resorts to due to the similarity between the Serbian/Croatian and Czech/Slovakian words. These are marked in italics in the conversation snippet above. For instance, the noun *specifikum* is taken from Czech. Although the noun *specifikum* exists in Croatian, the possessive determiner *svoje* is neuter, while the Croatian noun is masculine. This leads to the

conclusion that the noun too was transferred from Czech (for comparison, the Slovakian word is the feminine *špecifikácia*). Similarly, the participant inserts Czech (*důraz, drezúra*) and Slovakian (*jazyk, štyri, syntax*) words into a Serbian/Croatian sentence and adjusts the determiners accordingly, while still keeping the syntactical structure of the Serbian/Croatian sentence. When there are synonymous pairs of words, such as *vrtić* and *obdanište*, used in Croatian and Serbian, respectively, the participant often uses both words, as a form of clarification: *Engleski učim od vrtića, od obdaništa*. The participant claims that the choice between different varieties is contextual and usually depends on his collocutor. When he is unsure of which variety an expression belongs to, he might use both as a way of clarification:

> P: "Ja opće ne koristim te hrvatske neke riječi kao te zrakoplov, one […] tisuća, hiljada, na primer to dosta mešavam, nije bitno, […] kad sam u Srbiji na primer trudim se da bude hiljada"
> I: "Kad pričaš sa mnom koji ti je draži izraz, hrvatski ili srpski?"
> P: "Samo to što mi prvo padne na pamet, to koristim. Ne razmišljam o tom."

In addition to the two languages that the participant studied at university, he claims to speak Bosnian too. He explains that he understands the differences between the three languages and can use the vocabulary from all three. However, there were no grammatical or lexical elements specific to either standard Bosnian as codified in *Pravopis bosanskoga jezika* (Halilović 2004) or colloquial Bosnian as described in *Govor grada Sarajeva i razgovorni bosanski jezik* (Halilović et al. 2009) observed during the interview or in online communication. The reasons for this claim on the part of the participant will be explained in the next section.

4.2. Attitudes towards Language

4.2.1. Attitudes towards Language Proficiency and Variation in Serbian/Croatian

In order to understand the participant's self-assessment of his proficiency in Serbian and Croatian, it might be best to first see them in relation to his mother tongue and the closely related Czech. The participant claims that his knowledge of Czech is almost at the same level as his knowledge of his mother tongue, Slovakian. He evaluates his level of Czech to be at C1 according to CEFR, stating that only native speakers can reach the C2 level in their own language. This leads to the conclusion that the participant subscribes to the ideology of the native speaker, although his following elaboration implies a more tentative attitude towards

this belief. The main parameter he uses to assess knowledge of languages is whether or not a person is able to carry a conversation with a native speaker. In this regard, he thinks he has a sufficient knowledge of English, Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. When asked which languages he would claim to speak in his CV, he listed these four, in addition to Czech and Slovakian. The best way to learn a language, in the participant's opinion, is to live in a country where the language is spoken by the native people and because he has lived in the Czech Republic for a number of years, he thinks that he can use Czech at a high level in most situations. He is confident that he would be able to master other Slavic languages if he went to live in the Balkans:

> "Kad ja bi som na primjer živeo deset godina u Bosni pa znao bi som perfektno, ali time da nisam tamo pa ne možem, znaš, al ovde u Češkoj živim dugo, dakle već znam sve te stvari koje trebam."

When asked to define which of the languages spoken in the Balkans he speaks, he claims to be able to use Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian:

> "Pa normalno pričam srpski, bosanski, hrvatski zato što svaki taj jezik ima svoj oficijalni, znaš, kod u lingvistici ili u, znaš šta mislim, oficijalni je to jezik, dakle pričam, crnogorski, to ne pričam, ale tako pričam, hrvatski, srpski, bosanski, zato što svaki jazyk ima svoje specifikum, neke riječi druge i tako dalje, to znam, te razlike. Ja sam i hrvatski i srpski studirao u tom vremenu, te štyri, prvo sam imao jednu lektoricu hrvatskog dva godine i posle dva godine srpski sa drugim lektorom i tamo ozbiljno morao sam, ne možem da kažem tisuća, ale hiljada i tako dalje. Morao sam da se bijem sa tim interferencijama, znaš, ale ide. Ja sam imao samo hrvatski, ali posle bilo dosta na gramatiku ta lektorica i ja sam posle dosta putovao u Srpsku, u Srbiju, i tako dalje i više sam hteo da učim po srpski. Srpski lektor više ima důraz za vokabular, za praktični jezik, tamo više bilo o tom da pričaš, da znaš koji syntax koristiti. […] u tom hrvatskom bilo više drezúra, znaš."

He studied Croatian and Serbian at university, first focusing on Croatian for two years and then switching to Serbian for two more years. The main reason for the change was his dissatisfaction with the Croatian teacher and her focus on grammar. As there are parallels between Serbian/Croatian and Czech/Slovakian grammars, he felt that a more important aspect for him was the vocabulary, which he was able to learn more of with the professor of Serbian. The professors were not tolerant of language variation, promoting linguistic purism instead, which was one of the more difficult aspects during his studies. Namely, he was required to keep the two languages separate in accordance with the idea of monoglossia. Code-switching was looked down upon in the academic environment and the importance of

keeping the languages 'pure' was further strengthened in his mind after his experiences in the Balkans:

> "Imo sam u Srbiji, na primjer, neke situacije, gde sam sreto sa nekim mladićem […] Kad sam reko tisuća, nemoj da pričaš tisuća, moraš da hiljada ili tako nešto. Ili reko sam zrakoplov, a ne, kako je, vazduhoplov ili… bilo je takvih situacija."

The participant recognizes that all three languages (Croatian, Serbian, and Bosnian) are codified and have their respective standard varieties based on specific linguistic rules and characteristics. He also gives examples of personal experience with native speakers who emphasized the importance of differences between the languages in real-life communication. Proficiency in these languages, therefore, seems to be closely connected to the idea of linguistic purism in the participant's mind. In practice, this means that knowing the differences between the languages is important if one is to claim to have mastered them. The participant also mentions that he struggled with interferences from one language into another, but frames this in a way that suggests this was imposed upon him by the professors and the examples in what follows will show that he does not strictly separate between the languages in his speech today.

When describing his own production, the participant expresses puristic tendencies as proposed by the monoglossic ideology, which is evident in his personal and academic experience, the significance he gives to the notion of language codification and his awareness of linguistic interferences in his speech. However, the participant's speech production in Serbian/Croatian as observed in the interview and other sources analyzed here show a different reality than the participant's attitudes would suggest. There are signs of this not only in the participant's production, but this is also hinted at in the participant's description of his adopted variety. When asked to give more details about his knowledge of Bosnian, the participant admits that he does not know too much about the language, but that his decision to claim to speak Bosnian is more ideological. In neutral contexts, such as when speaking with the researcher, he is aware his production is a combination of Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian, and in situations where he recognizes linguistic purism is important to his collocutor, he temporarily adopts the collocutor's variety:

> "Ja mislim da kod mene je to adaptivniji način, zavisi sa kim pričam, da li sa Bosancem, da li sa Hrvatem, moj mozak automatski se, nešto se tamo uradi i pričam na taj način, ale reko bi som da mješavina, da. Nisam nekako ozbiljno za neki jezik, za mene je to jedan bosanski."

This is an example of convergence, as the participant adapts his production to the situation and in this way brings himself closer to his collocutor. Nonetheless, he still calls the language he speaks in all contexts Bosnian. He thinks that most language varieties spoken in the Balkans are part of one language and that there must be some twenty dialects spoken in Croatia, Serbia, and Bosnia. This is a clear rejection of the notion of language homogeneity on the part of the participant, since he recognizes the plurality of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian, not only as opposed to each other, but also internally. He explains that he likes the fact that there was an attempt to group all these varieties into one common language, Serbo-Croatian, in the former Yugoslavia, because this made it easier for people from similar societies to communicate between each other and helped to bridge cultural differences between these societies:

> "Zadnjih dva godina pričam da bosanski, zato što to sam se odlučil da to je dobar put, ale ispred sam rekao uvek srpsko-hrvatski, zato što ja sam to učio, meni se sviđalo u bivšoj Jugoslaviji da to dali pod jedno i trudili se da ima neki jedan smer, znaš. I to bi bilo najjednostavnije, kad bi sme mogli tako pričat, ali srpsko-hrvatski tamo nemate Bosnu, znaš, to nije toliko fer."

The participant recognizes and advocates the practical reasons for the existence and systematic development of a standard variety but rejects the ideology of the standard language according to which a single prestigious variety has greater intrinsic value compared to other varieties. He does not think that any of the numerous dialects of the language he calls Serbo-Croatian are of any lesser value or that they are 'wrong' or 'incorrect.' What is more, he argues that the standard language in the Balkan region should include other, smaller, and less codified varieties, i.e. the Bosnian variety.

The participant's argument in support of the standard language is that thoroughly thought-out standardization gives societies a common goal to pursue and simplifies national identities in favor of a common ideology. The downside of this kind of grouping under a common name based on the most dominant ideologies in the former Yugoslavia was that smaller cultures were left out, namely the Bosnian national identity was not recognized in the name and the concept of *Serbo-Croatian*. The participant has close friends from Bosnia and, between the three countries, he spent the most time there. He recognizes that people from Bosnia speak in a variety that differs from Croatian and Serbian in meaningful ways and have a distinct national identity that emerges in part from the linguistic identity. Still, when

studying Balkan languages at university, he was not able to learn more about or focus on Bosnian, but still had to choose one of the dominant varieties. Moreover, his choice had to be made to the detriment of the other variety, due to the monoglossic ideology promoted by both sides. In other words, code-switching, borrowing and other kinds of interferences between Serbian and Croatian were looked down on, not to mention any such interferences from Bosnian.

During his studies, he described the language he spoke as Serbo-Croatian, but after learning more about Bosnia and spending time with people from the country, he decided to start calling his own language variety Bosnian. This is a useful form of cultural and linguistic support to the people of Bosnia, in the participant's opinion. When asked by people in the Czech Republic and Slovakia to explain which foreign language he speaks, he practically promotes the culture and language that has been unfairly neglected by the dominant ideologies for the most part of its history. Since it shares many common traits with Serbian and Croatian, which he studied in more detail in an academic environment, Bosnian serves as a kind of a surrogate term for Serbo-Croatian, which does not exist in reality anymore, and at the same time still accounts for all the different varieties spoken in the present-day Bosnia, i.e. different dialects of Croatian, Serbian, and Bosnian.

When asked to evaluate the closeness of his Bosnian speech production to the standard variety or any of the regional varieties, the participant dismisses the importance of this in his own speech and explains that the most important aspect of his production in any of the three languages is his ability to use any of the varieties as a means to show respect and appreciation to the culture and language of his interlocutor:

> I: "Je li ti bitno da tvoj jezik bude što bliže bosanskom kako se priča, na primjer, u Bihaću ili ti je svejedno?"
> P: "Je mi svejedno, ali je potrebno ili ja to smatram da bih hteo da pričam sa svakim tim čovekom, Srbija, Hrvatska, Bosna, na njegov način kad sa njim pričam. To je nešto kao poštovanje tog čoveka i ja bih hteo da pričam sve te jazyke, koristim samo taj koji možem u tom trenutku, ali ne koristim jedan generalno uvek."

In his opinion, his claim to language proficiency in Serbian/Croatian is precisely the fact that he can easily switch codes and speak in different codes with people from different countries. The fact that he has to choose a label for the language he speaks is purely ideological and has political connotations, namely his support for the sometimes-disputed Bosnian, but the unique positive trait of these languages is the fact that they can be labelled under one name

and still possess a richness of variety. He claims to be able to recognize different dialectal traits in Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian and approximates his own production to be closest to the "eastern variety of Bosnian" as he spent the most of his time in the Balkans in the city of Bihać. Bihać is situated at the far north-west of Bosnia and Herzegovina, so this is probably a slip of the tongue on the part of the participant, and he actually meant the "western variety of Bosnian:"

> I: "Jel poznaješ dijalekte ili varijante bosanskog? Odakle je koji bosanski? Ili srpskog ili hrvatskog?"
> P: "U Hrvatskoj dosta se pozna, znaš, tamo imaš, u Istri je čakavski, ne, i tako dalje, tamo čuješ više te… poznajem ko je iz Istrije, poznajem ko je iz Slavonije i ko je iz Zagrebu. U Bosni... […] U Srbiji znam da tamo se vidi ko je iz Vojvodine, ko je iz Nišu, zato što to je na jugu… to čujem, da. Ali ne baš nekako detailno, znam ove velike rozdíly, víš, glavne razlike čuje se."
> I: "A u Bosni jel prepoznaješ razlike?"
> P: "Mislim da bi som poznao ko je iz Velike Kladuše, ko je iz Bihaću i ko je iz Sarajeva, zato što je to malo drugačije."
> I: "A šta bi ti reko koji ti pričaš od svih tih bosanskih dijelekata?"
> P: "Možda taj istočno-bosanski neki način tamo iz Bihaća, tamo sam najviše proveo, tamo znam i najviše tih ljudi, dakle tamo naslušao nešto i podvědomě znaš, pričam tejch načine."

The participant's awareness of the plurality of varieties spoken in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia, his willingness to learn and use bits of any variety he comes across in his production, the spontaneity and unselfconscious openness with which he mixed codes in the interview suggest that he subscribes to a pluralist ideology, "in which multiple ways of speaking and being are valued," as opposed to the monoglossic ideology. (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 90) Even though the conversation from which these examples and attitudes were taken from was conducted in the form of a sociolinguistic interview where the participant was aware that he was being interviewed by a linguist, he showed a much more relaxed attitude towards code-mixing than it was suggested in his recollections of encounters with speakers from different regions in the Balkans. In this sense, the interview session conducted in Serbian/Croatian was a successful one, as it very much resembled the usual informal conversation between the participant and the researcher. The participant was relaxed, his speech had elements of the vernacular and he freely mixed different codes. As Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian are secondary languages for the participant, puristic and monoglossic tendencies seem to be a result of convergence, rather than part of his belief system. On the other hand, it needs to be considered that the participant's declaration of monoglossic belief might be a direct

consequence of the *observer's paradox* at least to some extent, due to the context of the conversation. What certainly comes across in the participant's speech is his love of the languages spoken in the Balkan region and the richness of their varieties.

4.2.2. Attitudes towards Language Variation in English

In contrast to Serbian/Croatian, the participant claims to have been learning English for the longest time of all the foreign languages he speaks, but the language still feels distant and foreign to him. He has been in contact with English probably since the same time as when he first encountered Czech, since he learned both languages primarily from watching the television as a child, in addition to having been taught English in kindergarten:

> "Engleski učim od vrtića, od obdaništa, znaš, nije to jezik koji bi mi bio blizu, ali zbog toga da to učim toliko strašno dugo pa znam, ali teži je za mene nego bosanski nekako."

He explains that the main reason for this is probably the fact that English is a part of a different language family and that he has a natural capacity and propensity for learning Slavic languages, which is not the case for languages from other languages families. Overall, he evaluates his knowledge of English at 5 on a scale from 1 to 10:

> I: "How would you rate your knowledge of English on a scale of 1 to 10?"
> P: "I mean my English is good for normal communication with some people without some difficult topics but from 1 to 10 maybe 5."
> I: "How good are you at reading and understanding generally?"
> P: "Reading and understanding maybe 8.
> I: "And listening?"
> P: "Listening… it's depend from accent, if it's totally British English, normally, maybe 7. But if it's American English or some other shit, I don't know, Gaelic, Scottish it's maybe 5. Speaking maybe 5 and writing maybe 4."
> I: "Which accent is the least understandable to you?"
> P: "Indian English, Indian or some foreign people have some weird English."

To contrast this with his production in Serbian/Croatian, the participant evaluates his knowledge there at 8 on the same scale. Similar to his perception of Serbian/Croatian, he sees English as an umbrella term for all the different varieties that can be described as English, such as British, American and Indian English, but also including Scots and Scottish Gaelic, for example (Gaelic languages are actually part of the Celtic language family and are not related to modern English, while Scots is). This leads to the conclusion that in English too, similarly to his attitudes towards Serbian/Croatian, the participant rejects the ideology of

language homogeneity, or the belief that all speakers within a language community speak in the same way. An interesting dichotomy between the participant's attitudes towards English on the one hand and Serbian/Croatian on the other can be seen from his attitudes towards the standard language.

The participant's openness to language variation in Serbian/Croatian sharply contrasts with his attitudes towards linguistic variation in English. Even though his academic studies have been characterized by monoglossic tendencies promoted by the academic establishment and his personal experience with native speakers has shown him the extent of the ideological differences that cross-influence language varieties spoken in the Balkans, the participant still renounces the monoglossic pressures in his production by cultivating a pluralistic attitude towards Serbian/Croatian. What's more, he actively supports an arguably less dominant linguistic ideology as exemplified in his decision to identify his production as Bosnian. Nonetheless, in the English linguistic context his views seem to be influenced by the ideology of the standard language:

> I: "What kind of English should a person learn? Which dialect, for example?"
> P: "British English is only one, good. Because British English is clear and American English, Australian, New Zealand English, my sister living in New Zealand, so I know something about that. This English have some influences from many sides and British English is only one pure and clear for me. It's my opinion."
> I: "It's easier to understand? That's why?"
> P: "Exactly, yeah. If I'm watching series I can understood everything in British."
> I: "And what about American English?"
> P: "I don't see any reason why American English will be better like British. Do you know something? […] British English is like a glass of clean and pure water and American English is like water with some garbage there […] have influence from all countries, all of this colonies, and big history and everything. It's other."

According to the ideology of the standard language, a defining characteristic of a given language is its uniformity or invariance of structure. An examination of this view by some linguists argues that this uniformity is imposed on a structure which is by its nature always variable. (Milroy 2001: 531) The participant, for example, views British English as defined by its perceived lack of outside influences, which supposedly gives it certain qualities such as clarity and makes it more understandable. As was seen in the discussion of Serbian/Croatian varieties, the feature of being understandable due to codification is highly rated by the participant, so it follows that in the plurality of different varieties in a language as widely used as English, the variety perceived as having the longest historical tradition will carry the

most value. The language variety with the longest tradition in this sense is perceived as 'pure' and any addition that might complicate or inhibit understanding is viewed as 'littering.' In other words, the codification and tradition standardized this one variety up to the point where it is the easiest to use and understand, and most suitable in most contexts, so any non-structured and haphazard addition of foreign elements that occurred in recent times can only lead to deterioration of clarity and limitation of social contexts in which it is possible to use the variety.

Milroy (2001: 532-33) warns about the importance of being careful not to equate structural language uniformity with the idea of language prestige, which has inadvertently influenced some linguistic studies. This is because prestige is not an intrinsic property of a variety but is often attributed to a variety that plays a role in social life of certain groups of speakers. (ibid.) Following this argument, the participant in his views does not imply that the British variety is 'better' due to its social prestige, but rather that its value lies in the perceived lack of heterogeneity and its codification. An example of an often-mentioned prestige variety is British RP. It can be argued that the participant equates British English with the RP variety often used to teach English to foreigners and considers it to have the highest value not because of its social prestige but because it seems to be the standard variety with the longest tradition. This tradition ensures maximum clarity and accessibility to foreigners, whether or not this has any impact on how the participant perceives his own production or how others perceive it. Although the participant rejects the idea of language homogeneity, when it comes to English, he seems to disregard the plurality of different varieties in favor of the perceived standard, which takes the form of an 'imagined' model. The model is imagined, because his English production suggests a different linguistic reality with regard to his production than his attitudes do. Reasons for this belief are arguably practical – the participant does not profess to have much interest in English for its aesthetic or social-bonding values. Rather, he learned English at school because it was an obligatory subject. Today, he is using it only as a necessary means of communication at his workplace, and when possible, he would always switch to any other language that he shares with his collocutor.

An important clarification to be pointed out here is the definition of British English, as opposed to the internationally used *Standard English*. Standard English is the most commonly used variety of English throughout the world. It is the language of books, newspapers, magazines, and other media in English-speaking countries and therefore the variety most SLLs are familiar with. Although Standard English was historically *selected* and

developed from a mostly London-based dialect that was used by the upper classes throughout most of its history, and most native speakers learn to read and write it, not more than 15 percent of the population of today's England actually speak this variety, which makes Standard English a social rather than a geographical dialect. (Trudgill and Hannah 2017: 1-2) In addition to selection, the standardization process that Standard English went through involves *codification* and *stabilization*. Codification refers to the fact that Standard English usage norms are "widely considered to be 'correct' and constituting 'good usage,'" while stabilization refers to the variety's relatively stable form and uniformity. However, since there are many different versions of Standard English with noticeable differences throughout the English-speaking world, this notion of uniformity is only relative. (ibid.)

The term British English, on the other hand, "has a monolithic quality, as if it were a homogeneous variety and a straightforward fact of life," while in fact there are many different interpretations and controversies surrounding the term. (McArthur 1992: 156) McArthur argues that British English can be interpreted in a broader sense as the English language spoken in Great Britain or the United Kingdom, encompassing all standard and non-standard varieties, in all regions, and at all social levels. In a narrower sense, British English often refers to the variety used by middle and upper classes in the south-east of England and is often associated with RP. This is the variety most commonly used as a model when teaching English to foreigners and presented in dictionaries and textbooks. (ibid.) Likewise, Trudgill (1984, cited in McArthur 1992: 156) differentiates between *English English* and British English, and argues that the latter term is usually used in order to differentiate it from the other dominant variety, American English, and in the context of teaching English as a foreign language. There were no noticeable expressions specific to British varieties, Americanisms, or other regionalisms in the participant's production during the interview, except for the minor ones mentioned in section 4.1.2. His production and attitudes do not seem to cover the heterogeneous nature of the broader definition of British English, and neither do they have much in common with the RP accent and usage, except for the fact that British English was the term used in the classroom when the participant studied English. Therefore, the participant's variety can be most accurately described by the generic term Standard English, as it is spoken in "Expanding Circle" nations, where English is a foreign language (Trudgill and Hannah 2017: 4), rather than the vaguer term British English.

A clear distinction can be made between Serbian/Croatian and English, with respect to the participant's learning motivation, learning environment, and usage contexts. He first started learning Serbian and Croatian on his own out of curiosity and later decided to enroll

into university in order to study these languages in a more systematic way. During and after his studies, most of the learning process continued through contact with native speakers in their native countries. Even though in his workplace today Croatian plays a very small role and does not increase his employment prospects by much, he still continues to use it actively and tries to improve his production. English, on the other hand, has very little importance in his life outside work, where it is mostly the language he reads and writes in:

"Engleski je za mene taj službeni jazyk."

The learning process with respect to English was very different than with the other languages he speaks. Namely, he never studied it by choice, but rather because it was an obligatory subject, and still today he uses it mostly when he has to, but not in any context that he could gain pleasure and entertainment from. Therefore, one of the main reasons for this dichotomy is a lack of linguistic contact. The influence of the ideology of standard language seems to be stronger in the language that the participant has had less contact with and the barriers against acceptance of plurality seem to break down in the languages that the participant had more contact with.

The results of this are visible both in his production, as was seen in previous chapters, as well as his attitudes towards English. For example, the participant describes linguistic variation in English, such as American or Indian English, only in negative terms, as degradation of the standard variety modelled on British English. With regard to the languages spoken in the Balkans, conversely, the participant finds different values and functions to be inherent in different varieties due to various degrees of codification. This would suggest that the participant views the linguistic situation in the Balkans as a kind of diglossia (or multiglossia), considering the fact he assigns different functions to different varieties:

I: "If British English is 'the glass of pure water,' what's the glass of pure water in the Balkans?"
P: "I must say that Serbian. Croatian and Serbian are codificated languages. Vuk Karadžić, Ljudevit Gaj. But [in Croatian] Ante Pavelić made some mess, but in Serbian I don't see this mess. There were only Vuk Karadžić, gotovo je. I don't see somebody make some changing in language. So for this reason I must say that Serbian is the most pure from them."
I: "And Bosnian?"
P: "Bosnian have many influences. I have some friends, which… my friend, he speak Bosnian and I cannot understood two words in one sentence, because he's from Tuzla and have some words which are very, very foreign for me. I never heard it. […] Bosnian is more colored language."

I: "Is that a good thing?"
P: "Yes, exactly. It's very good for artists, for poetry, for everything."
I: "Which one do you prefer, Serbian or Bosnian?"
P: "For practics, communication, Serbian. But for literatury, for art, it's better Bosnian."

No similar values and functions in varieties of English were identified in the participant's attitudes towards English. Moreover, his preference for British English as the standard variety extends further to encompass questions concerning English as a *lingua franca*. When asked what he thought about the idea that one day most smaller languages will disappear and that English will replace them, he stated the following:

P: "Podržavam to da engleski je prvi. Ne sviđa mi se na primjer da Francuzi žele njihov jazyk… ili njemački. Zašto to? Priča malo ljudi francuski i njemački. Većina priča engleski… tako išlo čas, tako išlo vreme, zašto ne."
I: "Jel možeš zamislit da engleski nekad postane službeni jezik u Slovačkoj ili Češkoj?"
P: "Da, kao službeni da. To bi se mi sviđalo. Da se dogovoriš svuda jednim jazyk, to bi bilo super kad bi to bio obavezni jazyk. Ali ne sviđa mi se da bi ostali jazyky umrli zbog toga."

In conclusion, the attitudes the participant expressed suggest that he subscribes to the ideology of the standard language with respect to English, as he considers British English to be the 'correct' version of English or 'better' than other varieties. Similarly, the fact that he sees the introduction of foreign elements into British English as exemplified by various other varieties, such as American and Indian English, as a form of language degradation suggests that he subscribes to the monoglossic ideology and has certain puristic beliefs. On the other hand, the participant resists the pressures of the monoglossic ideology in the context of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian, which is suggested by his production where he frequently mixes different codes. The fact that the participant mixes codes, calls his own variety Bosnian, rather than Serbian or Croatian, and attempts to resolve the discordance between Serbian as the 'most codified' variety and Bosnian as a 'less codified' variety by assigning functional values to the varieties lead to the conclusion that he does not agree with the ideology of the standard language with respect to Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. The reason for this disagreement between attitudes is arguably the learning motivation, learning environment, and usage contexts which differ with regard to English and Serbian/Croatian. What's more, the participant's perception of his English production does not seem to correspond to his actual production but is rather an ideal that he is aspiring to. This too is arguably a result of a lack of contact with different English varieties that could give him a more holistic overview of the possible usages.

4.2.3. Attitudes towards the Mother Tongue

When asked about his opinion about switching between Serbian/Croatian and Czech/Slovakian in conversation with the researcher and other colleagues at work, the participant expressed favorable opinion of switching codes:

> "Za mene je to idealno, zato što i ja i ti vežbamo naše tuđe jazyke. Dakle kad bi mi smo pričali samo hrvatski ili samo češki, slovački, pa bilo bi ne baš bolje, zato što taj drugi jazyk ide u zadu i malo zaboraviš. Prebacivanje je ok, da. To je sve samo o tome da na slovačkom bolje se mi priča da znam sve riječi."

This suggests that the participant uses convergence in order to promote a balanced linguistic situation when there are multiple choices between languages that he and his collocutor speak, as well as in order to use the opportunity to practice the language. From what was observed both during the interview and in informal everyday communication between the researcher and the participant, convergence is a fairly common strategy for the participant. However, there are examples of the contrary too.

The participant showed signs of divergence in several different situations. Firstly, in the example above the participant explains that he will sometimes start the conversation in Serbian/Croatian but then switch to Slovakian if he starts feeling hesitant about his production because he cannot remember how to say something. Secondly, it was observed that the participant would sometimes switch back to Slovakian in stressful situations. It was mentioned before that the participant and the researcher are co-workers, and that the researcher is in a position of authority at the workplace with regard to the participant, due to job roles that the two occupy. As convergence is a fairly frequent behavior for both the participant and the researcher in their discourse, that is we both switch back and forth between Czech/Slovakian and Serbian/Croatian due to a variety of triggers, behavior that diverges from this tends to be easily noticeable. For example, the conversation would often start in Croatian – the greeting and the topic of the conversation would have a light-hearted tone, and the conversation would continue in Croatian for some time – however, after the tone is shifted by the researcher, by giving instructions for a task that needs to be done, for example, the participant might switch to Slovakian. Below is an excerpt from an online written conversation at the workplace between the two. This is a good example of how the conversation develops and the language changes based on the topic and tone of the conversation:

I: "cao / kako ide danas?"
P: "cao, ok / Jana vec nece biti u SME, bice Natalia, sstavim na trello kad to dobijem oficialno"
I: "uu / steta / on je bas bio dobar / Natalia i Tetiana?"
P: "da / ali cekam jo da dodje neki mail / on je sad delivery manager, diriguje WWTS, CTS i IMAC"
I: "lijepo"
P: "nema vreme da odgovara, pa sad ja Marku radim tikete, heh"
I: "ej jel mozes vidjet molim te taj mail u followup sto stoji od petka / jel trebas pomoc s tim?"
P: "pozrem / pisem do poznamky ked je kokotina / zapinam vdi teprv - je tam nieco v poznamke?"
I: "prema logu izgleda da joj je rijeseno, zalila bi se inace do sad"
P: "no ona ma hlavne iny tiket na to / a danov tam dali asi IAM, to oni zvyknu tak, ze streli nahodne SD / mam ju v plane volat"

This suggests that the participant uses convergence as a defense strategy when there is a shift in tone of the conversation – a shift from a purely friendly, informal tone to a more tense one – and when he feels that he is facing pressure regarding work performance from his collocutor. The participant in this case seems to be more comfortable speaking his mother tongue which arguably puts him on an equal footing as his collocutor, if not at an advantage, if his collocutor were to adapt to the new code.

Finally, the participant's attitudes towards the tensions between Czech and Slovakian in the context of a bilingual environment, such as the city of Brno, imply that he might use divergence as a strategy for vernacular maintenance. In chapter 3.1, where the participant was introduced, there was a description of the linguistic and political tensions between the two languages in the academia in the Czech Republic. Namely, Slovakian had long been one of the official languages at Czech universities, but this arrangement was recently strained due to the expiry of a legal agreement between the countries. When asked what his reaction would be if he was given a choice between studying either in Czech or English, but not in Slovakian, his response showed signs of vernacular maintenance:

"Sto posto na engleski… a među Češkoj i Slovačkoj to bi som morao da razmišljam da li mi stoji za to. To studiranje, znaš, ale nije bi mi bilo prijatno. Za moje vrijeme super bilo, sve je bilo tolerancija. Ale je to logično da ide tim smerom. Razumem tome, ale mi nismo imali tih problema."

Nonetheless, this attitude seems to be motivated mostly by political factors, and the participant's attitudes to mixing codes in the context of Czech and Slovakian seem as relaxed as it is in Serbian/Croatian:

"Da, ja miješam češki i slovački, nisam toliko narodno mišljenje, znaš kako neki Slovaci koji uvek moraju sve slovački, iako žive ovde dugo. Meni je to svejedno, ja se kontam ko Europan."

Still, the participant seems to be somewhat indecisive about his attitudes towards linguistic purism. In a different part of the interview, the participant seems to have implied the opposite:

"Kad pričam sa Čehom, možem da miješam slovački i češki, ale trudim se da pričam slovački, neka je čisto. Ali to ne smeta nikome, slovački i češki je toliko blizu i svi razumeju, znaš. Mislim tamo stariji ljudi, trideset i više. Kad bi som pričao sa mladima pa moram neke riječi prebaciti na češki zato što ne razume. Bolje, da ne pitaju šta, šta."

This suggests that his beliefs are still influenced by the monoglossic ideology to some extent, similarly to his attitudes towards English and Serbian/Croatian. His production, however, suggests that he subscribes to a pluralist ideology instead.

With regard to the question of the standard language ideology, the participant seems to embrace the different dialects in Czech and Slovakian:

"Kad bi som bio na šalteru tamo bi mi to smetalo, znaš, ali inače mi to ne smeta. Ja na primjer imam pet prijatelja iz regiona koji se zove Valašsko i oni imaju svoj naglasak, svoj malo drugi dijalekt, al to ne smeta, meni je to bolje, zato što malo te to obogati, nešto novo, znaš."

However, he still points out his preference for the practicality of a standard variety:

"Ima nekih tih dijalekata koji imaju manje ljudi koji pričaju sa tim i zbog toga ja bih… ja volim više kad se izabere taj dijalekat ili taj način koji ima najvišu množinu ljudi koji sa tim pričaju. Zato što je to najjednostavniji put kako ići sa tim jezikom, najmanje to boli, znaš."

5. Conclusion

The aim of this research was to elicit information about language attitudes from a multilingual speaker who emigrated to a neighboring country where he uses several second languages in contexts of varying formality on a daily basis. The participant was chosen as the subject of the research not only because he is a native Slovakian speaker in a multilingual environment dominated by the closely related Czech language, but also for the presumed difference between the learning contexts and usage of his secondary languages, English and Serbian/Croatian. Namely, the participant studied English exclusively in the context of elementary and high school education, speaks it mostly in work-related situations, where this usage is fairly limited in a contextual sense, and does not profess much interest in the language itself. A prominent feature of this kind of linguistic exposure is presumably the influence of the ideology of the standard language as part of the study of English as a second language. Conversely, one of his main personal interests is the study of languages spoken in the Balkan region, specifically Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. The participant studied these languages in an academic environment, but also actively uses them in conversation with native speakers and continues to invest time and energy into learning more about the languages and related cultures. An additional interest posed by the participant's linguistic make-up was the conflicting nature of the codified varieties of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian.

The proposition suggested by the confluence of these different linguistic and social factors is that the difference in learning motivation, context, and usage with regard to these different languages will influence the participant's attitudes towards the specific languages in different ways. The results of this research have suggested that the participant's attitudes in all of the languages are influenced by the ideology of the standard language and monoglossic beliefs. The participant has clearly expressed his preference for the standard variety of English, which he described as British English. However, his English speech production as analyzed in this paper has shown a fair amount of deviation from the standard variety, which is mostly due to influences from Czech and Slovakian. In addition to this, he has expressed a belief that this standard variety is in certain ways superior to other varieties of English, mostly due to perceived clarity and lack of outside influences.

Similarly, the participant has shown signs of convergence when it comes to keeping the languages spoken in the Balkans separate when speaking with people from Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia. However, his speech production, as well as certain attitudes, shown in

the interview and in written examples imply that he instead subscribes to a more pluralistic attitude towards code-mixing and rejects the monoglossic pressures coming both from his academic and personal experience. His preference for the standard variety also seems to be challenged by his embrace of a range of different varieties of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian. The results, therefore, lead to a conclusion that the proposition is correct and that the participant views these languages in different ways and is influenced by the ideologies of the standard language and monoglossia to varying degrees with respect to different languages.

6. Appendix: Question Modules

1. DEMOGRAPHY

– What do your mother and father do?

– What kind of school did they go to?

– What kind of school did you go to?

– Your first job? How long did you do it?

– Where were you born?

– Where was the first place that you lived?

– Did you move? Where/why?

– Where did you live during university? Can you describe it?

– Where was your family born/raised?

– Did you ever speak any language besides English and Slovakian?

– When? With whom? How long did you study it?

2. GAMES

– Can you remember the time when you were 9-12 years old? What were some of the games that you played after school? On the street?

– How do you play that there? What do you call it? What are the rules?

– Hide and seek? Tag?

– How did you decide who was IT? Who would find the others?

– Is there any game you used to play at night?

– Is there any game you played with a ball on the streets, or in a yard?

– Can you give me an idea how you played?

– What about video games?

– Music?

3. SPORTS

– What sports do you play?

– When did you start playing it? How long did you train?

– Can you describe the game to me? The rules?

– Why do you like it? Is there anything you dislike about it?

– What other sports have you played?

– What about your mother, father?

– Did you ever get into an argument/a fight with your teammates? What happened?

– What pisses you off the most during the games? How do you react?

4. FIGHTS

– Did you ever get into a fight with somebody bigger than you?

– How did it start?

– What was the best (the worst) fight you remember?

– What was the most important fight you were ever in?

5. DANGER OF DEATH

– Have you ever been in a situation where you were in serious danger of getting killed?

– What happened?

– Some people say in a situation like that, "Whatever is going to happen is going to happen." What do you think?

– Was there ever anything that happened when you were growing up that you couldn't explain?

– Were there any spooky places you wouldn't go at night?

– Does it bother you when people talk about ghosts?

– Have you ever been somewhere new and knew that you've been there before?

6. FEAR

– Have you ever known what it was to be really afraid?

– How was that? What happened?

– Did you ever dream about something that happened to you before, like that?

7. DREAMS

– Did you ever have a dream that really scared you?

– Do you remember your dreams?

– Do you dream in color?

– What language do you dream in?

–   Do dreams ever come true?

–   Do you ever tell people about your dreams?

–   Some people say if you do, they will come true.

–   Can you wake up if you don't like a dream?

–   Was there ever a dream, where you just didn't want to wake up?

–   Do you ever actually know you're dreaming?

–   Do dreams mean anything?

–   Did you ever have a dream that you thought meant something?

–   Do you ever have trouble going to sleep?

–   What do you do?

8. COMMON SENSE

–   What is common sense? In your opinion?

–   Do most people have it?

–   Do you get more as you get older?

–   Could you say about someone, "He's very intelligent, but he has no common sense?"

9. FAMILY

–   Getting back to your family, when you were a kid (say 12), did you have any rules about when you had to be in at night?

–   What happened when you stayed out late?

–   Did you ever get caught sneaking out?

–   Did your parents ever punish you? How? Was there ever physical punishment?

–   Did you ever get blamed for something you didn't do?

–   Could you talk to your parents?

–   When you got into trouble?

–   About sex?

–   About your friends?

–   Did your parents have any ideas about what they wanted you to be?

10. RELIGION

–   Is anyone in your family religious?

- What's your experience with religion?

- When you're young they teach you that if you're good, you're going to heaven, and if you're bad, you're going to hell. Do you think that's true?

- What do you think happens to you after you die?

11. PEER GROUP

- Who are your closest friends?

- Do you feel you can tell them everything?

- Is there a leader in your group of friends?

- Where do you usually go out with your friends? What do you do together?

- How are your friends in Slovakia different from your friends in the Czech Republic?

12. RACE AND NATIONALITY

- When you were a kid, who were all the kinds of people that lived in your neighborhood? How did they get along? Do you have many friends who were of other races/nationalities?

- Were there any fights where it was one group against the other?

13. CRIME IN THE STREETS

- Do you know anyone who was mugged?

- Are the streets safe around there during the daytime? At night? Can you walk around by yourself?

- How do the policemen behave? Is there any place that they just won't go? Do they treat everyone the same?

- What about protests?

14. CITY SERVICES

- Would you say that life is better in Czech Republic than it was in Slovakia?

- Does Brno feel like a big city compared to Prešov?

- Have you lived in any other city?

- What are the advantages of a bigger city when it comes to city services?

- How would you describe the city infrastructure of Brno?

- Why did you decide to stay in Brno?

- Does your family ever complain about city infrastructure in Slovakia?

- Does it bother you when you go to visit them?

- How often do you go to visit?

- How long do you stay?

15. SCHOOL

- Did you go to a neighborhood school? How far was it from your house?

- Did you have any teachers that were really tough? What was the worst thing you saw a teacher do to a kid? A kid to a teacher?

- Did you ever get blamed for something you didn't do?

- Did you have a teacher that you really liked?

- What kinds of groups did they have in your school?

- Did this change at university?

16. MARRIAGE

- Jesi trenutno u vezi?

- Šta smatraš receptom za uspješnu dugoročnu vezu?

- Kakav je odnos prema gay zajednicama u Češkoj?

- Kakav je odnos prema njima na Balkanu?

- Poznaješ li nekoga tko je u takvoj zajednici?

- Koji izrazi se obično koriste za homoseksualne žene ili muškarce?

- Postoje li neki kolokvijalni izrazi koji su ti poznati (u Češkoj/Slovačkoj, ali i u BiH/Srbiji/Hrvatskoj)?

17. GOALS

- Jel bi rekao da si ostvario svoje glavne ciljeve u životu?

- Šta si htio postat kad si bio dijete?

- Jesu li se tvoji snovi promijenili kada si došao u Češku?

- Zbog čega?

- Jel misliš da te to iskustvo dovelo bliže ispunjenju tvojih ciljeva?

- Jesi imao namjeru ostat u Češkoj?

- Dal bi volio živjet negdje drugo?

- Jel misliš da ciljeve treba jasno definirat i zašto?

18. SLOVAKIA, THE CZECH REPUBLIC, AND THE BALKANS

- Po čemu su Slovaci i Balkanci slični, a po čemu različiti?
- Kako bi ti definirao balkanski identitet?
- Jel ti se to sviđa ili ne sviđa?
- Ima li šta loše u tome?
- Jel misliš da bi se ti ponašao slično kad bi živio tamo?
- Smeta li ti šta u ponašanju kod Čeha? A kod Slovaka?
- Jel se osjećaš drugačije kad si na Balkanu?

19. WORK

- Kada si dobio prvi posao?
- Kakve si sve vrste poslova radio?
- Kakvo je bilo radno iskustvo u Škotskoj?
- Jesi li oduvijek znao čime se želiš baviti u životu?
- Smatraš li da bi svoje poslovne ciljeve mogao ostvariti u jednakoj mjeri u Slovačkoj? Na Balkanu?
- Jesi li ikada razmišljao o tome da se vratiš?
- Zašto (ne)?
- Kako se sad osjećaš na poslu?
- Šta bi moglo bit bolje na poslu?

20. LANGUAGE

- Koje jezike govoriš?
- Što podrazumijevaš pod izrazom "znam određeni jezik"?
- Koristiš li ga i za koje bi jezike rekao da ih "znaš?"
- Kako, kada i gdje si naučio te jezike?
- Predstavlja li ti učenje stranog jezika problem?
- Smatraš li da postoje ljudi koji su skloniji usvajanju novih jezika?
- U kojoj su oni prednosti u odnosu na ostale?
- Kada bi rekao da si naučio hrvatski/srpski/bosanski? A engleski?
- Što smatraš najboljim receptom za učenje jezika?

- Kojom varijantom ili dijalektom srpsko-hrvatskog bi rekao da govoriš?

- Vidiš li ti to i dalje kao jedan ili 4 različita jezika?

- Smatraš li da je ijedna varijanata superiornija u odnosu na drugu i u kojoj situaciji?

- Kad te pitaju u Slovačkoj/Češkoj koji od ta tri jezika pričaš, šta odgovoriš?

- Kad te to pitaju u Bosni, Srbiji ili Hrvatskoj šta im kažeš?

- Jesi li se ikada osjećao neugodno kad si koristio svoj dijalekt? A šta kad si pričao bosanski?

- Kako bi ocijenio razinu svog znanja u jezicima koje govoriš?

- Kako si učio jezik?

- Učiš li i danas aktivno jezik?

- Jel ti poznavanje ili nepoznavanje jezika ikada dalo prednost ili nedostatak u traženju posla?

- Kako si se u početku snalazio na poslu?

- Padaju li ti na pamet neke interesantne anegdote u vezi s jezičnim zabunama?

- Kako si se osjećao kada nisi dovoljno vladao određenim jezikom?

- Jesu li ti izvorni govornici na Balkanu stvarali probleme ili su ti pomagali s jezikom i kada?

- Prepoznaju li ljudi tvoj akcent?

- Smeta li ti to?

- Smatraš li "dobar" akcent važnim?

- Kojim jezikom se koristiš na poslu/kod kuće?

- Poznaješ li ljude s različitim akcentima engleskog? Smeta li ti to?

- Pada li ti teško razgovarati na engleskom jeziku na sastancima na poslu?

- Kojim jezikom razgovaraš s prijateljima?

- U kojim prilikama se koristiš kojim jezikom?

- Postoje li teme u kojima preferiraš neki drugi jezik u odnosu na slovački?

- Razgovaraš li nekada o jeziku sa svojom obitelji ili prijateljima?

- Paziš li nekada na način na koji se izražavaš?

- Kada i gdje?

- Jel ti poznat izraz "code-switching"? Radiš li to ponekada? Kada i gdje?

- Smeta li ti ako to netko drugi radi? Zašto?

- Kakav je tvoj stav o psovkama? Koristiš li ih?

- Jesu li psovke tabu u slovačkom/češkom/engleskom/srpsko-hrvatskom?

- Koristiš li neke poštapalice?

- Preferiraš li nekada češke izraze nad slovačkim?

- Radiš li to svjesno ili nesvjesno?

- Mijenjaš li ili prilagođavaš li svoju jezičnu produkciju nekada i gdje (npr s ljudima manjeg vokabulara, drugog dijalekta, strancima)?

- Što podrazumijevaš dijalektom?

- Koji dijalekti postoje u tvom jeziku?

- Koji dijalekti postoje u engleskom? U srpsko-hrvatskom?

- Pada li ti teško razumjeti različite dijalekte? Zbog čega misliš da je to tako?

- Je li ti važno govoriš li standardnom ili dijalektalnom varijantom?

- Smatraš li dijalekt nekada neprimjerenim? Kada, gdje i zašto?

- Smeta li ti ako netko ne govori standardnim jezikom?

- Smatraš li to odrazom obrazovanosti ili društvenim statusom?

- Na kojem jeziku razmišljaš ili sanjaš?

- Prevodiš li iz jednog u drugi jezik kada pričaš?

- Ponašaš li se drugačije kada se koristiš drugim jezikom?

- Smatraš li da si „pristojniji" na engleskom u odnosu na svoj maternji?

- Jel misliš da se na bosanskom više viče? Šta misliš o tome?

- Smatraš li engleski bogatijim u odnosu na neki od drugih jezika?

- Što misliš o teoriji da će engleski postati jednim jezikom i da će ostali jezici iščeznuti?

- Koliko važnim smatraš jezik za identifikaciju i nacionalnu pripadnost?

- Koliko je tebi to osobno važno?

- Koju muziku slušaš? Zašto?

- Primijetiš li razliku između svoje jezične produkcije sada i prije?

- Jesi li primijetio da je nečiji tuđi dijalekt ili jezik utjecao na tebe?

- Kako se osjećaš zbog toga?

- Postoji li neki dijalekt ili jezik koji ti je smiješan ili koji povezuješ s humorom?

- Npr u Zagrebu je bosanski smiješan, u Hercegovini je srpski, u Dalmaciji je zagorski i sl.

7. References

Brno (district Brno-město). Census 2011. Czech Statistical Office. Accessed September 9, 2021. https://vdb.czso.cz/vdbvo2/faces/en/index.jsf?page=profil-uzemi&uzemiprofil=31288&u=__VUZEMI__43__582786#

Brozović, D. and Pavle Ivić. (1988). *Jezik srpskohrvatski/ hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod "Miroslav Krleža."

Brunstad, Endre (2003). Standard language and linguistic purism. *Sociolinguistica*, 17 (1), 52–70, doi: 10.1515/9783110245226.52.

Clyne, Michael. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Czech National Corpus, s.v. "nějaký." Accessed September 9, 2021. https://www.korpus.cz/slovo-v-kostce/search/cs/n%C4%9Bjak%C3%BD?pos=P&lemma=n%C4%9Bjak%C3%BD

Čermáková, Viktorie. (2019). *Slovenští studenti budou muset psát v čestine. Slovenština již není považovaná za jazyk rovnoprávný s češtinou*. Stisk. http://www.munimedia.cz/prispevek/slovensti-studenti-budou-muset-psat-v-cestine-slovenstina-jiz-neni-povazovana-za-jazyk-rovnopravny-s-cestinou-15143/

Doerr, N. Musha. (2009). *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Europeans and their Languages. Report. (2012). Special Eurobarometer 386. https://op.europa.eu/es/publication-detail/-/publication/f551bd64-8615-4781-9be1-c592217dad83

Foster-Cohen, Susan. (2011). Pragmatic Competence, Acquisition of. In Hogan, C. Patrick (Ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gal, S., and Judith T. Irvine. (2019). *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Halilović, Senahid. (2004). *Pravopis bosanskoga jezika*. Zenica.

Halilović, Senahid, Ilijas Tanović, and Amela Šehović. (2009). *Govor grada Sarajeva i razgovorni bosanski jezik*. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet.

Klimentová, Lucie. (2014). *Foreign students on the Czech public universities*. Master's Thesis, Masaryk University: Faculty of Economics and Administration. https://is.muni.cz/th/q38ld/diplomova_prace.pdf?so=nx

Kösegiová, Katarína. (2014). *Slovosled v chorvátčine v porovnaní so slovenčinou*. Bachelor's Thesis, Masaryk University: Faculty of Arts. https://is.muni.cz/th/pa5vy/Bakalarska_praca_KATARINA_KOSEGIOVA_2014.pdf

Labov, W. (1984). Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In J. Baugh & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Language in Use: Reading in Sociolinguistics*, 28-53. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ligocký, Jan. (2015). *Imigrace do ČR jako společenský fenomén.* Master's Thesis, Masaryk University: Pedagogical Faculty. https://is.muni.cz/th/hg9ed/Zaverecna_prace_text_2_final.pdf

Lippi-Green, Rosina. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

Llamas, Carmen. (2007). Field Methods. In: Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, 12-18, London: Routledge.

Lyons, John. (1981). *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. England: Cambridge University.

McArthur, Tom. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milroy, James. (2001). Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5 (4), 530 – 555.

Mistrík, Jozef. (1988). *A Grammar of Contemporary Slovak*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, s.v. "like." Accessed September 9, 2021. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/like_7

Poplack, Shana. (2018). *Borrowing: Loanwords in the Speech Community and in the Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Povolný, David. (2019). *Students claim Brno is one of the best cities in the world*. MUNI: Student. Accessed September 9, 2021. https://www.em.muni.cz/en/student/11952-students-claim-brno-is-one-of-the-best-cities-in-the-world

Record number of foreigners studying at Czech universities. (2019). Czech Universities. Accessed September 9, 2021. https://www.czechuniversities.com/article/record-number-of-foreigners-studying-at-czech-universities

Trudgill, Peter, and Jean Hannah. (2017). *International English: A Guide to Varieties of English Around the World*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Verschueren, Jef. (2012). *Ideology in Language Use.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Vuković, Petar. (2013). *Uvod u jezikoslovnu bohemistiku*. Zagreb: FF-press.

Wardhaugh, R. and Janet M. Fuller. (2015). *An introduction to Sociolinguistics.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.