

Language Biography of a Bilingual Australian Family

Vasić, Ivana

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

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

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:131:092339>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-17**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

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



SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Odsjek za anglistiku

Ivana Vasić

JEZIČNA BIOGRAFIJA
DVOJEZIČNE OBITELJI IZ AUSTRALIJE

Diplomski rad

Mentor: dr. sc. Anđel Starčević, docent

Komentor: dr. sc. Damir Kalogjera, professor emeritus

rujan 2020.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Department of English

Ivana Vasić

LANGUAGE BIOGRAPHY OF
A BILINGUAL AUSTRALIAN FAMILY

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Anđel Starčević, Assistant Professor
Co-Supervisor: Dr. Damir Kalogjera, Professor Emeritus

September 2020

Sažetak:

Znanstvenici koji se bave istraživanjem identiteta kod bilingvalnih osoba došli su do zaključka, kako se kategorije koje tvore identitet kao što rod, nacionalna pripadnost, jezik i sl. nalaze u procesu konstantne transformacije. Usvajanjem znanja i stjecanjem iskustva ljudi mijenjaju svoje stavove i posljedično transformiraju svoj identitet. U fokusu ovog rada nalazi se promjena stavova prema jeziku. Istraživanje se temelji na pretpostavci da usvajanje drugog jezika i multikulturalno okruženje mogu utjecati na stavove prema jeziku. Provedeno je kvalitativno istraživanje na uzorku bilingvalne obitelji iz Australije kako bi se dokazala navedena premisa. Istraživanje je strukturirano u obliku četiri zasebna socio-lingvistička intervjua sa članovima obitelji. Rezultati su pokazali da Sin i Kćer imaju znatno pozitivniji stav od njihovih roditelja po pitanju jezične raznolikosti. Osim toga, pokazalo se da Majka i Otac imaju različite kriterije za pojedinačne jezike. Rezultati mogu ukazivati na to da su razlike u stavovima povezane s promjenom okruženja i usvajanjem drugog jezika.

Ključne riječi: dvojezičnost, jezične ideologije, bilingvalne osobe, stavovi o jeziku, dvojezičnost u doseljeničkom kontekstu

Abstract:

Scientists studying identity in SLLs (Second Language Learners) have concluded that categories which shape a person's identity such as gender, nationality, language etc. are constantly in a process of transformation. By acquiring knowledge and experience people change their attitudes and consequently re-shape their identity. The focus of this thesis is the change in attitudes towards language. The research is based on the premise that the acquisition of another language and a multicultural environment can influence a person's attitudes towards language. The premise was examined through qualitative research on the sample of a bilingual family from Australia. The research was conducted in the form of four separate sociolinguistic interviews with the family members. The results have shown that Son and Daughter exhibit a more favourable outlook on language variation than their parents. Additionally, it was found that Mother and Father express different criteria for the two languages. The results might imply that their dissimilar attitudes stand in correlation to the change in the environment and the type of second language acquisition.

Key words: bilingualism, language ideologies, SLL, language attitudes, bilingualism in immigrant settings

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Theoretical Background | 3 |
| • Transfers, borrowings and transversions..... | 3 |
| • Intra-sentential, situational and metaphorical code-switching..... | 3 |
| • Divergence, convergence, maintenance | 4 |
| • Language ideologies..... | 4 |
| 3. Methodology | 7 |
| • Participants | 7 |
| • Procedure..... | 10 |
| 4. Results | 12 |
| • Linguistic preferences, code-switching and transfers | 12 |
| • Attitudes towards language | 19 |
| • Attitudes to Australia and biculturalism..... | 28 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 33 |
| 6. Appendix | 35 |
| 7. References | 43 |

1. Introduction

People learn languages for a variety of reasons. Some people learn them for migration reasons, others for better employment opportunities and some as a way of learning about the world. The number of people learning a second language is constantly on the rise. Therefore the process of acquiring a second language has been an inexhaustible field of research and still is today. Bonny Norton has made a large impact on the research of SLLs (Second Language Learners) (Block 2007: 46). She recognised the need for an extensive theory that would consider different learners found in specific learning contexts (ibid.). This idea derived from her study of identity in SLL. Scientists studying identity in second language learners have encountered a new challenge in this regard (ibid. 47). Delanty (2003:135) accurately described the problem by stating that the invention of self and shaping of an identity has become a dynamic process guided by the individual themselves as opposed to being constricted by rigid structures (qtd. in Block 2007:11). Gender, nationality, ethnicity and other aspects of identity are perceived as fluid categories that are prone to change during the course of one's life. The changes occur through the shift in a person's attitudes. Attitudes can be defined as personal beliefs that are shaped by the environment, society and context a person lives in. Changing any of those circumstances can result in a modification of a person's attitudes. Therefore attitudes can be seen as the building blocks of identity.

A big part of identity that influences the way people categorise or perceive themselves is language. Attitudes about language are moulded by education and society in general. Since language has political value and serves as a means of constructing national identity, oftentimes those beliefs i.e. *ideologies* are part of dogmatic ideas promoted within a community. Therefore language attitudes strongly reflect other facets of a person's identity.

Through contact with other cultures, traditions and ideologies people can change those beliefs. For example, a study by van Compernelle (2017:320) suggests that acquiring another language can influence a shift in attitudes. The study shows that people who speak more than one language and who have lived abroad for an extended period of time show a more positive attitude towards linguistic variation.

This study will examine attitudes about language found within a bilingual family in Australia. The goal is to examine how a change in social context and the acquisition of a foreign language have influenced their attitudes about language. Special focus will be given to attitudes about linguistic variation, code-switching and linguistic purism. The research is

based on data collected through a series of semi-structured individual sociolinguistic interviews with the family members...

The second section of this paper will provide the theoretical background concerning research into attitudes amongst SLLs. It will define attitudes and outline some of the most common ideas about language *i.e. ideologies*, which will be examined with the participants. The next section of the paper provides a description of the methodological approach used to elicit the data. The results of the research will be presented and discussed in the fourth section. The final part of the paper contains a brief reflection on the research and the conclusion.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. *Transfers, borrowing and transversions*

When it comes to the use of multiple languages it is highly common for specific linguistic interferences to occur. Linguistic concepts from one language consciously or unconsciously slip into the spectrum of another language. Clyne (2003:76) calls these influences of one language on another *transfers*. He defines *transfers* as a result of *transference*, i.e. the process of taking over “form, feature or construction” from another language, regardless of the motivation (ibid.).

If the speaker, however, takes a lexical item and adapts the item to the recipient language we can also talk about *borrowing* (Poplack 2018:6). In terms of borrowing Poplack makes a distinction between the *donor language* (language the item gets borrowed from) and *recipient language* (language that “borrows” the item) (ibid.).

Another common way of mixing languages are *transversions*. These are instances where a speaker completely shifts from one language to another (Clyne 2003:75). As opposed to the aforementioned phenomena, which imply a certain result of a mixture of two codes, transversions refer to occasions of tapping into one code and then tapping back into the other.

2.2. *Intra-sentential, situational and metaphorical code-switching*

Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015: 97) labelled transfers and borrowings that happen within a sentence as intra-sentential code-switching. Another distinction they make is connected to the intention of code-switching, where they distinguish between *situational* and *metaphorical code-switching* (ibid. 98).

Situational code switching refers to the alternate use of more languages that is dictated by a specific situational context. (ibid.) For example, the speaker uses a certain language on specific occasions because e.g. the interlocutors do not understand a different language.

Metaphorical code-switching is the practice of ascribing a specific meaning to a language. The speaker chooses to speak one code in a specific situation because of a certain metaphorical quality they believe the language to have. (ibid.) For example, they feel that Italian is a language for poetry or German is the language one uses to scold their children etc.

2.3. *Divergence, convergence, maintenance*

The Speech Accommodation Theory refers to a type of behaviour where speakers tend to modify their production in order to fulfil the expectations of their collocutor (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 98). Speakers intentionally or unconsciously try to adapt or *accommodate* their speech in a way to either resemble or differentiate from the person they are talking to. If a speaker tries to modify their speech by trying to bring it closer to the production of their collocutor it is called *convergence*. If the speaker tries to modify their speech with the intention to create a distance from the other person, then that is called *divergence*. Divergence can be motivated by negative feelings associated with the language the speakers are trying to distance themselves from. (ibid.) However, it may also be connected to another phenomenon, which Milroy (1980:43) calls *vernacular maintenance* (qtd. in Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015:186). This refers to the conscious effort of speakers to use and maintain their own vernacular, mostly within a multicultural setting (ibid.)

2.4. Language ideologies

People create an understanding of the world through specific concepts. Those concepts serve as guidelines for all of their life choices and at the same time give meaning to them. Irvine and Gal (2000:35) call these conceptual schemes *ideologies*. Even though these ideologies may shift during the course of a person's life, people never become completely ideology-free. According to Irvine and Gal (2000:36) it is impossible to enter a state with no ideological views. They suggest that people do not simply dismiss an ideology, as much as they substitute one idea for another. (ibid.) In this paper I am particularly interested in *language ideologies*, which Irvine and Gal (2000:35) define as “ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events and activities that are significant to them”.

A study conducted by van Compernelle (2017:325) found a correlation between tendencies in language formality and attitudes towards language variation. The study showed that those speakers who exhibit more positive attitudes towards language variation also tend to prefer less formal language (ibid.). Therefore this thesis will predominantly focus on ideologies concerning language formality, variation and purism. In the following section I will introduce the ideologies that will be examined in the speakers' production.

A) The ideology of the standard language

In order to achieve uniformity in language teaching, educational institutions need to achieve a consensus about the language variety taught in schools, typically referred to as the *standard*

language or the *standard variety*. That variety is present in all formal contexts, in education, newspapers, business etc. The term *standard* denotes the fact that it represents a form of “imposed uniformity”, rather than the way speakers of the language usually communicate (Milroy 2001: 531). The standard variety is a tool used for the purpose of achieving easier communication between speakers in a language community.

The misinterpretation of the idea of standardization leads many speakers of those languages to believe that there is only one legitimate form of their language (Milroy 2001: 530). They perceive the standard form to be “THE correct form” and any other variety to be wrong or of lesser quality (ibid.). The standard variety is therefore often perceived as the most prestigious variety. Milroy (ibid.) calls this perception of language “the ideology of the standard language”.

B) Homogeneity

Closely related to the previous ideology is the ideology of *language homogeneity*. Proponents of this ideology share the belief that all speakers within a language-community speak in the same way (Lyons 1981: 24). This needs to be distinguished from the monoglossic ideology.

C) Monoglossia and linguistic purism

Monoglossia is the belief that speakers should attempt to keep languages strictly separate, regardless if they are monolinguals or multilinguals (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015: 90). Supporters of this idea believe that code-switching is an improper use of language(s) and that bilinguals/multilinguals should always use only one language or language variety at a time. (ibid.) Advocates of the monoglossic ideology display puristic ideas about languages. Brunstad (2003: 52) defines *linguistic purism* as “a language planning ideology involving resistance to foreign elements”. Purists believe that the key for language conservation is ensuring the language is not corrupted by language contact. They are often supporters of the standard language ideology, believing that anything that differs from the standard form is impure and therefore signifies an improper use of language.

D) The ideology of the native speaker

The final ideology is a very common idea spread among bilinguals and especially among adult SLLs. It is the belief that only native speakers can achieve the highest level of language proficiency and therefore their production becomes the role model. Foreign language teachers especially are held to this unrealistic standard and their non-native status can become an obstacle in their employment opportunities (Faez 2011:231). However, this non-native status is determined in an improper manner, as the study by Kelch and Santana-Williamson suggests (Hu and Lindemann 2009:255). In the study non-native speakers were supposed to rate the production of native and non-native speakers. The study found that they rated the production of people they perceived as native speakers more positively than those of people they perceived as non-native simply based on their accent (ibid.). The problem was that often they were not capable of recognising the native speaker if they spoke in an informal way or used dialect. This led to the conclusion that the most desired production amongst SLLs is the use of the standard variety with a native-like accent (ibid.), the type of production many learners believe a non-native speaker is incapable of achieving. Hu and Lindemann (ibid.) mention a number of studies that have shown that non-native speakers commonly share a large bias against non-native accents. However, considering that they are not always able to recognise a native accent, this view has to be taken with a pinch of salt.

Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that the attitudes about language that people have are not necessarily a true representation of the way they speak. They have to be understood as a person's general approach to language, i.e. the way they perceive or evaluate it, rather than a sentiment of their own production. A person's production is always susceptible to change depending on different situations and therefore van Compernelle (2017:320) describes language attitudes as being "variable across communicative contexts".

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The participants in this study are members of a bilingual immigrant family from Australia. Four participants were included in this study. All of them are adults, but do not belong to the same generation. According to the classification suggested by Haugen (1953:334), Father and Mother belong to generation 1A (having left the old country as adults) and Son and Daughter to generation 1B (having left the old country as children). The family was chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, the fact that they do not belong to the same generation is important because they acquired the language in different social contexts. The parents studied in a context that promoted monoglossic and puristic tendencies while the children grew up in a multicultural and multilingual environment. Secondly, they are war immigrants who were forced to leave their homeland. Therefore, their motivation and attitudes toward language may differ from those of voluntary immigrants. Thirdly, the language that they considered as their mother tongue formally does not exist anymore. This can also influence their perception of language. Lastly, accessibility provided an additional reason, since the participants are close friends of the researcher's and were available for additional follow-up questions.

The participants will be introduced in the order in which they were interviewed. For anonymity reasons, their real names will not be disclosed. They will be referred to as Father, Mother, Daughter and Son.

Father was born in Lipnica (Bosnia and Herzegovina) in 1963, where he finished elementary school. He then moved to Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) when he was fifteen years old and graduated from high school. Afterwards he moved to Belgrade (Serbia), where he spent twelve years. He met his wife in Belgrade, got married and had two children. In the midst of the war in Yugoslavia, in 1993 he moved with his family to Dortmund (Germany), where they lived until 1999. They initially did not intend to stay in Germany for so long, since it was supposed to be a temporary solution on their way to Australia. Australia was his first choice, partly because of the language, since he had learnt English in elementary school as well as in high school, and partly because of the family he had in Perth. Nevertheless, since they did stay in Germany for a longer period, Father enrolled in a German course, where he achieved a B2 level certificate. In June 1999 he moved to Perth (Australia), where he still lives with his family today. Upon their arrival they had to attend a government-sponsored language course for immigrants. After that he continued learning English mainly through practice during his

work and everyday life. His production in English is at an upper-intermediate-to-advanced level. His pronunciation is leaning toward British English combined with a Slavic accent. He uses English at work and with some friends. He states that he uses his mother tongue on a regular basis as well, mainly with his family and friends in Perth. He considers the standard variety of what was formerly known as Serbo-Croatian to be his mother tongue. According to the classification by Brozović and Ivić (1988:70), Father is a speaker of the Eastern Bosnian Jekavian Shtokavian dialect. In school he was taught the Serbo-Croatian language. Therefore he can fluently read and write in both the Latin and the Cyrillic alphabets. He actively practices his writing skills by regularly writing e-mails to his family and friends in Europe. He also regularly sings and listens to music in his mother tongue.

Mother was born in Novi Pazar (Serbia) in 1962. When she was eighteen, she moved to Belgrade (Serbia) to attend university. Together with her husband she moved to Germany in 1993. She too attended a German course and reached a B2 level in German. Previously she had not learnt German, but she had been learning English throughout her entire education, including university. However, she claims that she felt the biggest progress with her English once she completed the mandatory English course upon their arrival in Australia. Since then she has been using English on a daily basis, mainly at work and partly with her family. Their children's spouses are native English speakers, which is why they now mostly talk to their children in English. However, she and her husband live alone and they communicate exclusively in their mother tongue. Even though her variety of Serbo-Croatian is not the same as her husband's, they each use their respective variety in their everyday communication. According to the classification by Ivić, her dialect would be the Zeta-South Sandžak Ekavian Shtokavian (Brozović&Ivić 1988:70). Her English production is at an advanced level. She uses the standard variety of British English with a predominantly Australian accent. She has regular contact with her family in Serbia, which gives her the additional opportunity to practice her mother tongue. She too is fluent in reading and writing in both the Latin and the Cyrillic alphabets. She reads books and listens to music in her native tongue. Mother and Father visit their homelands on occasion, but not as frequently as they would want to.

Daughter was born in Belgrade (Serbia) in 1988. She started kindergarten there and when she was five years old, she moved with her family to Germany. There she continued kindergarten and afterwards attended school for five years. Even though at home they spoke exclusively in their mother tongue, in time she became more fluent in German. She spoke to her brother and friends in German. She started learning English while they were living in Germany. By the

time they moved to Perth, she had been learning English for one year. However, she claims that she learned more English in one week living in Australia than during the whole year learning it at school in Germany. When they moved to Australia, their parents insisted on speaking English at home, so that they could learn it faster. After their first year, they switched to Serbo-Croatian again and she talked to her parents exclusively in their mother tongue. She would speak to her brother in English if they were alone or amongst friends, but in the presence of their parents they would all speak in their mother tongue. Her production in English is at a proficiency level. She has a distinct Australian accent. In Serbo-Croatian she uses a mixture of her mother's and her father's dialects and estimates her production to be at an A2 level. Since she moved away from her parents she only uses her mother tongue when talking to them on the phone. She talks to her partner in English. Most of her friends are from a mixed cultural background so she talks to them in English. She occasionally writes letters or listens to music in her native tongue. She has visited her homeland on a few occasions, but felt more comfortable using English whenever she had the opportunity.

Son was born in Belgrade (Serbia) in 1984. He started school there and continued elementary school in Germany. Although he had not learnt German previous to their migration, he claims that he had no problems adjusting to the new language and environment. At home they would speak in their native tongue, but at school and with his sister he would speak German. When he was five years old he started learning English through cartoons. Later he continued learning it at school, so he was already at an intermediate level of English upon their arrival in Australia. When they arrived in Perth he had to attend an English language course for six months, after which he was able to continue regular education and enrol in high school. For the first year he would speak to his sister in German and to his parents in English or his native tongue. He had many friends from the former Yugoslavia, so they would alternate between English and their mother tongue. His production in English is at a proficiency level with an RP-like pronunciation. His production in his mother tongue is at an upper-intermediate-to-advanced level. He alternates between the Ekavian and Jekavian Shtokavian dialect, leaning more towards the former. He claims that in recent years he has not had the opportunity to use his mother tongue regularly. His spouse is Australian and he does not live with his parents anymore and therefore he has no regular contact with speakers who share his mother tongue. He can read and write in his mother tongue, but only in Latin script. He says that he can read Cyrillic in print, but not in handwritten form. Son occasionally watches movies or plays games with German subtitles, but does not feel that he could speak or write in German.

3.2. Procedure

According to Llamas (2006:12), the three most important decisions when conducting a research project are the type of study, the speaker and the data that are required. For this particular topic of interest, the researcher found the sociolinguistic interview to be the most suitable method. A qualitative type of study is more appropriate for studying linguistic behaviour and identity. Furthermore, the specific construction of modules and questions allows the researcher to elicit a sufficient amount of specific/individual data.

The research was organised in four semi-structured individual interviews. The interviews with Father and Mother were conducted in July 2017, while the interviews with Daughter and Son were conducted in April 2019. The interview with Son was carried out via video chat, while the rest of the interviews were done in person. Clark (1971:55) suggests using a unidirectional microphone, because it creates fewer distractions for the interviewee than a lavalier microphone. Therefore I used the audio recorder on my mobile device to record the dialogues. During the fourth session Son was asked to record the interview as well, in order to ensure impeccable sound on both sides. The speech on the recordings proved to be sufficiently clear and comprehensible. All of the interviews were carried out in a comfortable and quiet place in order to prevent any outside noise, to ensure privacy and to create a calm atmosphere, so that any uneasiness among the participants could be avoided. The microphone was at speaking distance, so that the speakers could talk at normal volume and pace. There was no time limit on the part the participants so that there was no pressure caused by the duration of the interview. All of the interviews lasted between one and a little over two hours, in line with previous research (Labov 1984: 32). This time frame creates a sufficient period to obtain all the necessary data, while still respecting the interviewee's attention span. The duration of the interviews was as follows:

Father: 2:06:24

Mother: 2:03:06

Daughter: 1:12:16

Son: 1:39:36

The questions were organised into twenty modules (Labov 1984: 35). Each module consists of a number of questions with the same topic. The order of topics follows the Q-GEN-II form, which allows a natural conversation flow with logical topic transitions (ibid. 33). The

questions are organised to build up from more personal to more general ones. The researcher tailored the questions to the participants, respecting the principles of colloquial format, shortening and feedback (ibid.). The interviewer also used colloquial speech in order to motivate the speakers to use their vernacular. Secondly, the questions were reduced to a limit of five seconds, in order to remain clear and precise. Thirdly, the interviewer accommodated to the responses of the interviewees to provide a natural dialogue flow. Some questions were altered during the interview, some were connected to a different topic than planned and some were omitted completely. Some of the questions were addressed by the interviewees themselves during tangential topic shifts or longer uninterrupted speech sequences (ibid. 38).

The level of familiarity the interviewees shared with the interviewer ensured a greater level of trust and made them more relaxed. The interviewees felt comfortable using their vernacular without the need to accommodate to the observer (ibid. 29). However, in order to avoid the uneasiness that occurs when participants are overly aware and concerned about being observed, the phenomenon known as the “observer’s paradox”, the interviewer spoke to them in a rather informal style using her dialect (Labov 1984:40). The interviewer avoided using scholarly terms and occasionally added to the conversations with responses or brief anecdotes, to make the interview seem like a casual dialogue. Apart from the observer’s paradox, another pitfall to avoid when conducting the interview is the “acquiescence bias” (Garrett 2007: 117). Garrett describes this as a form of behaviour where the participants give responses that they perceive as desirable, rather than answering the questions honestly (ibid.). The researcher aimed to prevent this behaviour by avoiding giving the interviewees the questions beforehand. Furthermore, the interviewees were not even completely familiar with the specific focus of the study. Consequently, the interviewer was able to record a fair amount of vernacular speech, which provided sufficient data for the research.

4. Results

4.1. Linguistic preferences, code-switching and transfers

A) Father

The interview questions were asked in Croatian. The participants could choose to give answers in whichever language they preferred. Father chose to use his mother tongue. Being aware of the purpose of the interview, he claims that he feels more comfortable using his mother tongue.

The language variety in his native tongue that Father uses is very close to the standard form of what was formerly known as Serbo-Croatian. His production is very formal, regardless of who his collocutor is. He does not use slang. He claims the following:

F: “Ja govorim književni srpsko-hrvatski, kako su nas učili u školi. Bitno mi je kako se izražavam. Jako mi je bitno. Pokušavam uvijek da gramatički pravilno konstruišem rečenicu.”

The occasional use of informal discourse markers such as *ovaj*, *ustvari*, *onaj*, *recimo* was observed during the interview. Even though he does not seem to be aware of this pattern, he claims that he is not bothered by this.

I: “Koristiš li nekad poštapalice?”

F: Ne znam. Slušala si me zadnjih dva sata. Koristim li? hehehe Možda. Ljudi obično nisu svjesni poštapalica. Ali i da koristim, ne mislim da bih se trudio da promijenim svoj govor. “

He refrains from using swear words.

F: “Psovke, po mom mišljenju ne bi trebalo da budu stalno prisutne ni u kom jeziku.”

A dialectal trait found in his speech is the omission of the final vowel in infinitive forms like *generalisat*, *organizovat*, *nazvat* etc., and shortening of words like *imo*, *trebo* etc. This characteristic is shared by speakers of his local dialect in informal communication. However, this is not a regular pattern and it occurred at more frequent intervals as the interview progressed. This leads to the conclusion that these “dialectal slips” occur due to his lack of concentration and reduced control over his production. However, another rather prominent dialectal marker is the stress shift from nouns to prepositions as in the following examples:

“Često kad bih išao **od kuće**...”

“Kod nas se **u Tuzli** nikada nije govorilo kruh.”

Instead of stressing the lexical words/nouns ([kùćē] or [Tùzli], he stresses the preposition ([òdkùćē] and [ùtùzli]).

When it comes to the use of foreign elements in his speech, he seems to make a conscious effort to avoid code-switching and if he does resort to it, it is mostly followed by a clarification. This behaviour can be observed in the following excerpts:

Example 1: “U mom gradu nije bilo **igrališta, špilplaca ili što bi rekli playground**”

Example 2: “I onda opet što u Engleskom kažu „**bullying** “. Kako se kaže „**bullying** “na našem jeziku? Jer tu riječ mi nismo upotrebljavali.”

Example 3: “Oni neće što se u engleskom kaže „**commitment** “, oni neće da se „**commit**“, neće da se, kako bi se to reklo na našem jeziku, neće da se posvete nečemu bezrezervno.”

He reports that he does not pick up the speech of his collocutor, regardless of their production. However, the researcher observed occasional transfers from English, as well as from his wife’s variety during the interview. An example of this would be the following statement:

F: “Ima **broj ljudi** koji nam dolazi redovno.”

This is a literal translation of the commonly used phrase “a number of” referring to *several of a particular type of thing*, like in the following example: “I decided not to go, for a number of reasons” (Cambridge Dictionary). In Serbo-Croatian this phrase would need an additional adjective to convey the same meaning like *izvjestan*, *stanovit* or *određen* (Hrvatski jezični portal). So the original sentence would be e.g. *Ima određen broj ljudi koji nam dolazi redovno*.

Therefore this can be labelled as a transfer from English.

As previously mentioned Father speaks a different variety from Mother, but some transfers from Serbian Ekavian Shtokavian were noticeable during the interview (Brozović&Ivić 1988:70). Those transfers were mostly noticed on the phonological level, like in the following examples:

“Oni su u Njemačkoj posle 3 **meseca** počeli jedno sa drugim da pričaju na Njemačkom”

“Kod nas je sistem bio takav. Barem, koliko sam ja mogao da **primetim**.”

Here the interviewee used the Ekavian as opposed to the Jekavian variant like *mjeseca* and *primijetim*.

Father mentions that their home is designated to be a “native language area”. He states that Mother and he always speak to their children in their mother tongue. This is a form of

situational code-switching with the intention of language maintenance. Father clarifies this with the following statement:

F:” Smatram bitnim da oni zadrže vezu s našim jezikom. Jer da smo se i mi prešaltali, mi ne bi zaboravili naš jezik, ali oni bi ga definitivno zaboravili.”

B) Mother

Mother also opted for using her mothertongue during the interview. Her production does not contain any slang or curse words, she speaks slowly and in full sentences, clearly enunciates the words and rarely uses fillers. Therefore her production is also very formal. Occasional discourse markers such as *ovaj*, *ustvari* and *recimo* were noticed during the interview.

She uses the Ekavian variant of standard Serbo-Croatian. Some occasional dialectal traits can be noticed on the phonological level. For example, she stresses the middle syllable, as opposed to the first syllable in words like [ōtīcī], [nāvīklā] or [pārtnéra], which is characteristic for the Zeta-South Sandžak Ekavian Shtokavian variant (Brozović&Ivić 1988:70).

During the interview Mother mostly used one code. The researcher observed occasional intra-sentential code-switching and borrowing. However, she resorts to code-switching highly consciously and she does so mostly in two situations. Firstly, she uses another code when she wants to convey a specific meaning, i.e. to make a cultural distinction. For example, she uses the word *party* to refer to a specific kind of gathering, as opposed to the word *druženje*.

M:”Pa imaju i oni te *parties* jel kao i mi naša druženja. Što se razlikuje je da kod nas domaćin priprema sve, a kod Australaca je to tako da oni dele te obaveze.”

At other times she resorts to code-switching or borrowing when she does not know a certain expression in the other language, as can be seen in the following situations:

Example 1:” Desi se da neke stvari ne znam da objasnim na našem, jer sam ih naučila na engleskom jeziku. Zanimanje kojim se bavim se zove *purchasing officer* i ja ne znam kako bih to prevela na naš jezik. Neko ko radi nabavku, ali kako se to baš zove kao zanimanje, to ne znam, pa onda i kažem na engleskom, jer mi je lakše.”

Example 2: „ Pa eto, obično pričas o svom *backgroundu* i odakle si došao naprimer.

Lexical transfers from English can oftentimes be noticed in Mother’s production. For example:

“Njih država podržava i više možda nego *bele ljude*.”

Here Mother literally translated the term *white people* to refer to European Australians of white skin colour. However, the corresponding lexical term in her mother tongue would be *belac* or *belokožac* or *čovjek bele rase* (Pavle Ćosić 2008:50). Therefore these literal translations are a clear indicator of the influence of English.

Curiously, no transfers from Father's production were established in her speech. Mother reports that she does not accommodate to her collocutor, as long as this does not create any misunderstandings in the communication. She claims the following:

“Ja ne prilagođavam svoj jezik ni u Bosni, ni u Hrvatskoj. Ne mogu ja da pričam hrvatski, jer nisam nikad živela tamo. Pričam onako kako pričam, pa sad, ako me ljudi razumeju. Da li je sad *kesica* ili *vrećica*, nebitno.”

She exerts a form of maintenance, which was also observed during the interview. When the interviewer asked the questions in Croatian she would consistently reply in her own vernacular, like in the following example;

I: „ Je li te strah nečega, možda **morskih pasa** i slično? “

M: „ Nisam se okupala u okeanu od dve hiljadite zbog straha od **ajkula**. “

C) Daughter

The interviewer asked questions in Croatian while Daughter used a mixed code. She tried answering as many of the questions in her native tongue as she could, but often relied on English to get her message across.

Daughter states that she alters her production in English based on the situation, but that in her native tongue she always speaks the same. When asked how she modifies her production to make it less formal she gave the following response:

D: “There’s a lot that can be said, for example, the pitch of my voice is different. It is lower. In Australian I have more of a drool, words are more blend together. Where if I am trying to be more formal, I will speak more staccato, like a machine gun to pronounce it correctly. And also simply the words you use that would be considered unprofessional.”

Her style in the interview was mostly formal. She spoke slowly, clearly enunciating the words. Some informal discourse markers like *pa*, *ovo*, *recimo*, *znaš* were noticeable in her native tongue, but this can be interpreted as a compensation strategy to make up for the lack of vocabulary. In English she often used *yeah* or *right* and contracted forms such as *they've* (*they have*) or *we'll* (*we will*) or *I'ma* (*I am going to*) etc. Another informal marker was the use

of non-rhotic and more fronted word endings, like in the words *together* /tə'geðΛ/ instead of /tə'geðə/ or *better* /'bedΛ/ instead of ['betə] (Macquarie Dictionary).

Transfers from English are a regular occurrence in her production. Phonological transfers commonly happen with the pronunciation of [r] as in the word *greška*, which she pronounces as /g.rəʃka/ using the postalveolar glide instead of /grêʃka/ using the alveolar vibrant (Ščukanec 2008: 70, 73). Additionally, she pronounces words of Greek origin like the word *hemija* or *tehnologija* with a /k/ instead of a /x/ as *kemija* and *teknologija*, which is a transfer from the English words *chemistry* /'kem.i.sti/ and *technology* /tek'nɒlədʒi/.

Apart from phonological transfers and missing vocabulary, Daughter often experiences difficulties with syntax, especially when using cases:

Example 1: “Ja imam **jedan drug**, znaš, koji mi je baš kao best friend.“

Example 2: “Ja se sjećam, kad smo mi tek došli u Australiju **bili su neke dece**, što su me zezali kako ja pričam engleski“

Sometimes she would simply mimic the structure of an English sentence like in the next examples:

Example 1: “Eh, da, da. U Australiji je sve malo više lagano. I nemaju disciplinu **kao mi imamo**, recimo. Less respect for parents, I think.”

Example 2: “Ali u Australiji kad pričam na engleskom onda sam **više slobodnija** i ja mislim da se to osjeti.”

Daughter freely switches between languages. During the interview this was mostly as a compensation strategy, when she inserted English where she lacked words in her native language. In topics concerning family, friends and everyday life she mostly used her native tongue and resorted to intra-sentential code-switching if necessary.

Example 1: “Mama je iz Srbije and Tata **grew up** in Lipnica, in Tuzla.

Example 2: # Ja imam jedan drug, znaš, koji mi je baš kao best friend i nekoliko nas, mi idemo kao na piće zajedno, ali možda, **maybe six of us that are very close**, ali, **I keep my circle small**.“

In questions about her opinions, emotions, memories etc., which required more abstract vocabulary, she switched to English. She would either attempt to answer in her mother tongue and then have a longer transversion in English,

D: “Ponekad, ali ponekad je **the opposite**. Zato što za mene, ja slabo pričam naš jezik. Tako da kad dođem ovdje, ja sam malo više, **I am more shy and when I notice that someone is**

from our country I think they are gonna think I sound stupid and that actually makes me feel more nervous and I think you can feel it between me and the other person“

or she immediately answered the question in English:

I: “Kakav je odnos prema drugim rasama u Australiji?”

D: **“Whenever there is some kind of influx of immigrants we have some sort of push-back. If there’s a wave of Yugoslavs than suddenly that’s problematic, if there’s a wave of Asians than there’s a problem. At the moment there’s a lot of racism towards the people from the Middle East, especially Muslims.”**

When asked about it she confirmed that she is very conscious when using and switching between languages.

I: “Jesi li primijetila da biraš druge teme kada razgovaraš s nekim na drugom jeziku?”

D: “Yeah, sto posto. Ja recimo ne znam na našem jeziku da se svađam. **I dont have the vocabulary for arguing, debating or philosophising. I have roughly the vocabulary of a five-year old. Like I am not gonna say oh let’s talk about taxes. I would never pick that topic of conversation, because I have no idea how to talk about it, I can have that conversation in English, 'cause I have the vocabulary in those more adult topics. In our language I try to choose topics that I can contribute in.”**

D) Son

Son chose to have the interview in his native language. His vernacular can be described as a mixture of his parents’ respective varieties. He switches between the Ekavian and Jekavian varieties in an inconsistent manner, as can be seen in the following examples:

Example 1: „Ja sam došao sa znanjem engleskog i opet se **osećam** ko da mi je trebalo 4 ili 5 godina da baš dobro **razumem**, a ne da pričam, nego da **razumijem** “

Example 2: „Kod mene je to sve **miješano**. Ja malo pričam ekavicu, malo ijekavicu, malo ovo, malo ono. To je sve **pomešano**. “

He shows some dialectal traits of his Father's vernacular. For example, he omits vowels in verbs in the Present tense in 1.Ps.Sg. like *došo*, *reko*, *pokazo* or in verb endings i.e. *prepoznat*, *napraviti* etc. He shares some dialectal traits with Mother as well. For instance, he stresses words on the second syllable e.g. [přiměťim] as opposed to the standard variety, which requires stressing the first syllable [priměťim] (Pavle Ćosić 2008:502).

His style of speech is informal. He uses dialectal forms, shortens words and uses informal discourse markers like *znaš*, *ovaj*, *i tako*, *ustvari*. Another indicator of an informal style is the

omission of the vowel *a* in the conjunction *kao*, which he pronounces as [ko]. He also uses the colloquial word *skontati* instead of the standard form *shvatiti*.

When asked about his language preferences, he states that he prefers to use his native tongue, whenever he has the chance. He confirmed that at home they mostly use their mother tongue.

S:” *Default language* u kući je naš. Eh sad, ja ponekad miješam. Ako ne znam neku riječ ubacim englesku. Ja sam često pokušavao s roditeljima da pričam na engleskom, ali oni mi nisu dali. Oni su hteli da se ja potrudim.”

Son mostly uses one code with occasional code-switching. He does not hesitate to use English, but only for a specific purpose. Sometimes when he cannot remember a word, he will use English as a compensation strategy in order to achieve fluency.

S:”Ja sam jedini naš u mom **department** na poslu.”

S: “Nekako sam počeo izbegavati naše ljude u Australiji, mislim, jedini **exception** su mi prijatelji od mojih roditelja. “

On other occasions he uses the English word if he does not know the translation or a literal translation does not exist, but then the word is followed by a clarification.

S:”Eh, sad. Mi imamo one, ne znam kako bih to opisao, u Australiji mi to zovemo **bogans** ili u Engleskoj **chavs**. To su ti oni **lower-income**, znaš, **less-educated** tipovi. “

Apart from these instances of intra-sentential code-switching he also switched when quoting his or somebody else’s words. At times this lead to transversions, but only for the purpose of quoting somebody who was speaking English.

S: „Ja kažem `I am from former Yugoslavia. I used to live in Serbia, in Belgrade. ` Nijemci su me često pitali odakle sam i pitaju me pitanja o mojoj kulturi i jeziku, a Australci, njih to toliko ne interesuje, oni samo kažu `Ah, Serbia, no worries, Đoković! ` ”

When he quotes someone who speaks his native tongue, he still quotes the person in the native tongue.

S: “Moj éale kad vidi nekog našeg, odmah krene da priča sa njim. Oni pitaju `Koje ti je prezime? ` i onda `Uuu možda znam odakle si! ` ili `Znam nekoga ko zna tvoju familiju! ` ”

It was also observed that he used English more frequently if the interviewer used English when asking the questions.

I: “Koji je tvoj uobičajeni pozdrav, neki **default greeting** na poslu? “

S: “Moj **default greeting** je `Hello, Sir’ “

This is a form of convergence, because he mimics the production and/or style of his collocutor.

The interviewer observed some transfers from English. Phonological transfers were not as frequent as lexical transfers. An example for phonological transfers would be the pronunciation of [r] when it is preceded by another consonant like in the word *srpska* [sřpska:], which Son pronounces as [sɜ:pska:], or in the word *pričati* [pri:třati], which he pronounces as [p.i:třati].

Transfers on the lexical level were more prominent.

S:” Osećam kao da pričam sa osobom i *studiram je*.”

The word *study* in English has the meaning *carefully examining something or somebody* and can collocate with the nouns *person* or *people* (Cambridge Dictionary). But the verb *studirati* in Serbian means *istraživati* (*investigate*) or *učiti* (*learn*) and does not usually collocate with the noun *osoba* (Payle Ćosić 2008:592). A more monolingual choice of words in this context would be *proučavati osobu*.

4.2. Attitudes towards language

A) Attitudes to language proficiency

Father claims that out of the three languages he speaks, he is most proficient in his mother tongue. When asked about the parameters he uses to evaluate his production, he mentions grammatical correctness and a native-like accent as most important. He is very aware and very critical of his own production.

F: “Ja govorim književni srpsko-hrvatski, kako su nas učili u školi. Bitno mi je kako se izražavam. Jako mi je bitno. Pokušavam uvijek da gramatički pravilno konstruišem rečenicu.”

F:” Produkciju u svom maternjem jeziku na skali od 1 do 5 ocijenio bih sa 4.5. Ja mislim da sebi može dati 5 samo profesor književnog jezika, neko ko razumije gramatiku totalno. Ja sam već zaboravio šta je pluskvamperfekt ili aorist. Ja mogu da ih koristim, ali ne znam objasniti i zato ne mogu da sebi dam 5.”

As can be seen from this example, Father stresses the importance of “correct” language as well as an understanding of grammatical rules. He claims that he prefers German over English because of a clearer grammatical structure.

F: “Ja i sad više volim njemački, nego engleski, zato što je gramatički mnogo jednostavniji, zato što je izgovaranje riječi propisano određenim jezičnim zakonom, koji je uvijek takav kakav je. Toga u engleskom nema. U njemačkom imaju pravila, al ta su pravila striktna i ako se njih pridržavaš, ne možeš pogriješiti. “

In addition to that, Father is not a proponent of code-switching. In his words:

F: “Nisam nikad čuo za code-switching, ali mislim da kad pričaš, treba da pričaš jedan jezik. Ja se trudim da ne upotrebljavam ni engleski ni njemački u mom govoru kada pričam srpsko-hrvatski jezik. Jer mislim da kad neko miješa svoj jezik sa stranim jezikom, da on ne zna da priča ni jedan ni drugi kako treba. Manji je problem kad sad neko priča naš jezik i upotrijebi neku englesku riječ, to se desi svakome. Ali je problem kad ljudi počnu zaboravljat svoj jezik i počnu koristiti engleske riječi, a mijenjaju ih po padežima kao u našem jeziku. Recimo, neko ti kaže da je on nešto **kukovo (cook-ovo)**. Ili moj brat koji meni kaže naprimjer *On je mene putovo daun (put-ovo down)*.”

Therefore, it can be concluded that Father feels that the use of foreign elements, or more precisely borrowing, contributes to “forgetting” one's language and “ruins” the production of the speaker. These monoglossic ideas and the striving for language accuracy lead to the conclusion that Father is a supporter of the ideology of the standard language. Apart from that it may also be a strategy for language maintenance, since the negative outcome he seems to be most worried about is “forgetting” his mother tongue.

Mother also evaluates her own production in a very strict manner, claiming the following:

M: “Produkciju u engleskom bih ocenila sa 3, možda 4.

I:” A koji bi bio tvoj najbolji jezik? Onaj kojim najbolje vladaš?

M:” Ne znam. Nisam profesor ni engleskog, ni srpsko-hrvatskog jezika, ali znam ga dovoljno da se mogu sporazumeti.”

As can be seen from this example, Mother is reluctant to claim to *know* a language, since she does not consider herself to be an authority on language. Like Father, she also feels that only obtaining metalinguistic skills makes you proficient in a language.

M:” Meni je za poznavanje jezika najvažnija gramatika, ali sigurno i izgovor. Bilo bi idealno kada bi se sve to spojilo.”

She explains that her intention was to learn a formal and standard form of English, but that once she has achieved that her next goal became slang.

M:” Kada sam učila engleski bilo mi je važno da naučim taj školski engleski. Mada, eto, uz posao naučiš neke izraze koje nisi nikad našao u školskim knjigama.”

She adds that she still works on her English by listening and talking to native speakers, predominantly her colleagues, to achieve a “smoother” accent and learn more slang. This is a clear indicator of the ideology of the standard language and the ideology of the native speaker.

M:” Najefektnije za učenje jezika za mene je da slušam, ovaj, eto to mi je, mada i pisanje je isto tako jako bitno, bilo mi je bitno da znam izraze, u engleskom recimo sada „slang“, nešto što ne možeš naći su svakom rečniku.”

M:” Ja imam kolegu koji je Anglo-Indian i njegov engleski je recimo perfektan. Pričajući s njim to je meni učenje. On je meni puno pomogao na poslu, da se oslobodim, da pohvatam termine stručne prirode, pomogao u pisanju i to mi je došlo kao nadogradnja u poslu.”

When asked about her opinion on code-switching she claims the following:

M: “Trudim se da ne radim taj code-switching. Pokušavam uvek da odvojim oba jezika kad pričam. Nama to **izgleda smešno i ne izgleda baš lepo** pa pokušavam to da eliminišem.”

Clearly the “we” Mother is referring to is her and her spouse. They share these monoglossic ideas about language. Furthermore, this example indicates that Mother is very conscious about her production and makes an effort to avoid foreign elements, because she wants to speak “nicely” and “correctly”. Father and she both share these attitudes.

Interestingly, when asked about their production in English, they both accentuate that their main goal is to speak in a way that they are understood. So, since English is a foreign language to them, their main focus is on functionality. In addition to that, Mother feels that knowing slang is a highly desirable virtue, while simultaneously avoiding slang in her own mother tongue. Their desire to achieve an “unblemished” and “proper” production in their mother tongue indicates that they attach a meaning idea of superiority to this kind of production. This could be due to the society and schooling system that they both were brought up in, since this is the environment in which they learned the language. The fact that they acquired English in a multicultural environment may have influenced their different attitudes towards the language.

The children show a completely different understanding of language. Daughter mentions that occasionally she catches herself expressing purist ideas about language, especially when she evaluates her own production. This may be an influence of her parents and their ideas about language, since she holds completely different parameters for “knowing a language”, as can be seen in the following statements:

D: “Sometimes I can get a little bit like grammar police, but in most situations I understand that language is a skill like any other and that people make mistakes and it's fine. I am hard on myself but not hard on other people, when they make mistakes.”

I:” Što za tebe znači znati jezik?

D:” When I’ve mastered a language. That means that you are able to create a written or oral piece of work without errors. I can say that English is the only language that I’ve ever mastered, because I’ve written my thesis in English.”

Daughter is a proponent of the native speaker ideology. She believes that people have a native inclination towards their mother tongue.

D:” Serbo-Croatian is my mother tongue so I think I have a kind of natural bond. For example, my partner is English and when I see him learning our language, I think he could spend twenty years learning our language and he could never speak it as well as I do, because it is not the first language he learned. So I have that kind of connection to Serbo-Croatian, but that does not mean that it’s the best language for me.”

In addition to that she believes that knowing the slang of a language can be regarded as the highest level of language acquisition. This can be seen as an extension of the aforementioned ideology, since the production of the native speaker is considered as superior.

D: “I think that people often, when English is not their first language, they are too formal, because they have learned the language properly and sometimes I think that I speak too proper, because I do not know the slang well enough. Sometimes I think that speaking a language well means using slang and speaking incorrectly almost. “

Daughter believes that language is an individual choice and that it is susceptible to change and therefore does not support the ideology of the standard language.

D: “I think that language is like cooking. It is something that travels and changes and morphs and it belongs to people and not to academics. I don’t think it’s up to the elites to tell others in terms of language where you are at, the correctness of the language. “

Son shares similar views to Daughter. He does not see the standard form as superior, but simply as a tool for effortless communication. He recognises the benefits of using the standard variety, but does not necessarily insist on speaking “properly”. He claims that he adapts his level of formality to the situation, like for example at work.

S:”Pa sa prijateljima puno više govorim slang i psujem, a na poslu onda imam svoju verziju official language, jer sad imam senior position.”

Son adds that this does not apply to his mother tongue, since he is not proficient enough to adapt his production.

S: ”Ja kad pričam na našem, ja ne znam da li je to proper ili nije. Ja znam samo jednu verziju i to je to šta pričam s roditeljima.”

S: “Većina naših kad priča je opuštena, pa i nije bitno da je sad proper govor. Znam jedog našeg, on je hirurg, pa je malo više korektan kad priča. Meni to nekad zvuči malo čudno.”

Son states that his parameter for language proficiency is a complete comprehension of all accents and dialects. He adds that obtaining a native accent is the final state of language acquisition and that by that definition Daughter is the most proficient in English of all of them.

I:” Kada si naučio jezik?

S:” Moje znanje engleskog je bilo super od početka, ali možda još nekih 5 godina od dolaska onako malo po malo, gradual learning, jer zavisi od kojeg si grada, imaju ljudi sa drugim accents, tako da ljudi iz Queenslanda, njih je mnogo teže razumeti. Kad sam osetio OK sad mogu da razumijem sve bez problema, onda sam ja znao jezik.”

S:” Naprimjer, ja imam par kolega, jedan je iz Kine, jedan iz Koreje i oni odlično pričaju engleski. Njihovo znanje i gramatika i sve je perfektno, ali akcenat je tako, kako se kaže, *thick*, da baš moraš da *pay attention*. Tako da akcenat ima ulogu u znanju jezika.”

I:” Šta bi rekao, ko od vas ima najbolji engleski?

S:” Pa [Daughter], sigurno. Ona baš zvuči ko Australac i kod nje se uopšte ne čuje da je *immigrant*.”

Son reports that he does not mind code-switching and that he occasionally uses this strategy.

S: “*Default language* u kući je naš. Eh, sad, ja nekad miješam, pa ako ne znam neku riječ ubacim englesku.”

He claims that he finds it exhausting to speak Serbo-Croatian in situations where he cannot resort to code-switching as a compensational method.

S:” Ako pričam sa roditeljima ili njihovim prijateljima, to je prilično opušteno i ja nisam nikad umoran, ali kad pričam sa pacijentkinjom od 90 godina i ja znam da ona ne razume ni jednu reč engleskog i onda baš moram da se skoncentrišem i da se trudim.”

B) Attitudes to linguistic variation

Personally Father does not mind if people speak with an accent. He does not feel that it impacts language proficiency as long as it does not hinder comprehension.

F: “Meni nikad nije bilo bitno kojim akcentom netko govori, meni je uvijek bilo bitno da se prenesu poruka, da razumijem ono što neko hoće da mi kaže. “

F: “Imam na poslu puno kolega iz Indije, koji pričaju sa jakim indijskim akcentom, ali imaju dobar engleski.”

However, he states that people with an accent are oftentimes faced with prejudice and social rejection.

F:” Ljudi nisu sposobni da prodru kroz boju tvog akcenta i da vide tebe. Jezik je prva stvar. Ljudi te slušaju i čim čuje akcent, ja vjerujem odmah u intervjuu da te prekriži ili čak da te ne pozove na intervju jer vidi da si došao odnekle koje nije englesko govorno područje. Ja mislim da neko ko ima akcent u Australiji, da mu treba više sreće i napora da bi došao do radnog mjesta.”

This is why Father often feels the need to justify his production. He claims the following:

F: “Kad ljude upoznam u Australiji, ja ih upozorim da moj engleski nije **suptilan**. Moj engleski ima naš akcent, akcent ljudi sa Balkana i **grub je**, ja znam da ljudi, nekad kad im se obratim, ja ne želim da zvučim ili izgledam grubo, ali vidim na njihovim licima da su uplašeni. Onda ja ljude upozorim da je moj engleski takav zato što ja ne mogu da formulišem moju rečenicu vrlo **suptilno i senzitivno dovoljno** da bi ja prenio ono što hoću da kažem na način koji bi njima odgovarao.”

Father does not display any negative attitudes towards dialectal speech. He claims that in English he often uses dialectal or non-standard forms of words out of convenience.

F:” Evo recimo, riječ *through*. Amerikanci pišu *thru* u onda ja koristim tu varijantu, jer mi je jednostavno lakše.”

In his mother tongue he displays a behaviour that can be labelled as maintenance. He calls this behaviour *lingvistička tvrdoglavost* (linguistic stubbornness).

F:” Ja sam živio u Beogradu 15 godina i nisam nikad ekavicom izgovorio neku riječ. To ja zovem lingvistička tvrdoglavost.”

F:” Znam da u Dalmaciji kažu *pomidor*, ali ne bih došao u Dalmaciju i tražio *pomidora*. Tražio bih *paradajz* ili *hljeb*. Nisam nikad imao problema.”

As was mentioned before, Mother displays the same form of maintenance as Father. Correspondingly, she is very open to different dialects.

M:” Ja ne mislim da bi ljudi trebali da menjaju svoj govor. Treba da zadrže svoj govor i da pričaju kako su uvek pričali.”

M:” U Australiji se ne nameće taj standardni jezik. Svi dijalekti su prihvaćeni.”

In addition to that, Mother states that she is very welcoming towards other accents, claiming the following:

M:” Pa svi akcenti u jeziku su prepoznatljivi, ali su prihvatljivi. To bi već bio rasizam da kažemo da to nije prihvatljivo.”

Contradictory to that, she claims that she still works on achieving a more natural accent as a means of assimilation.

M:” Svi mi težimo da se asimiliramo, da pričamo tako da te svi razumeju i da budeš prihvaćen.”

This statement can be linked to Father's experience of prejudice against foreign accents. Therefore, it can be argued that Mother's personal views support linguistic diversity, but that in her opinion their environment favours the idea of homogeneity within society.

Daughter has a favourable outlook on linguistic variation. She explains that in her opinion accents are a personal choice and that she does not link accent to nationality.

I: "Postoji li *accent* koji ti je neugodan za slušati, neki *that makes you cringe*?"

D:" No, but I think that is because I am not officially Australian. I don't have an affinity to a certain accent, like Australian or American or British, I say what I prefer. So my partner is British, so he thinks it's correct to speak the way British people do, but I don't care. For example, British people or Australian people say Caribbean /kə'ri:biən/, Americans say Caribbean /ker.ɪ'bi:.ən/. I prefer /ker.ɪ'bi:.ən/, so I say /ker.ɪ'bi:.ən/. I don't think like 'I am from this part of the world so I have to speak a certain way'. I am a person of the world and I can speak however I prefer. "

She states that her environment is extremely multi-cultural and therefore less rigid concerning linguistic variation. However, this statements needs to be taken with a pinch of salt, considering that Daughter has no foreign traces in her production and therefore may not have had the same experience as her family members.

As mentioned before, Son attaches great importance to acquiring a native accent when learning a language. He seems to be bothered by the fact that people can recognise he is not a native Australian.

I:" Jesi se trudio imitirati njihov akcent? Jel ti bilo to bitno?

S:" Jeste, meni je to bilo bitno, ali je bilo teško. I sad ja nemam australski akcent, nikako. Ljudi koji sa mnom pričaju i ne znaju me pitaju me '*Are you from South-Africa?*'. Ima malo njemačkog, malo našeg, malo engleskog. Tako da, ja sam se baš trudio i ja mislim, prvo sam pričao kao British English i nakon tri-četiri godine ja sam mislio ok, ja sad zvučim kao Australac, a ustvari ja ne zvučim kao Australac uopšte, ja zvučim ko da sam iz Južne Afrike."

Firstly, this indicates that he is a supporter of the ideology of the native speaker, which influences his perception of his own production. Secondly, this may be interpreted as a desire for assimilation and acceptance within the community. As previously established, this behaviour was observed with his parents as well.

Son claims that he personally does not attach any extra-linguistic meaning to people with different accents, but that sometimes he prefers a standard pronunciation, because it is more comprehensible to him. He especially mentions the Bogan slang in Australia.

S:” Meni je nekad lakše slušati ljude koji imaju baš engleski akcent. Mislom razumem ja i druge, ali neke je stvarno teško razumeti. Eh sad, mi imamo one, ne znam kako bih to opisao, u Australiji mi to zovemo Bogans ili u Engleskoj chavs. To su ti oni lower-income, znaš, less-educated tipovi. To je meni teže za slušati, znaš. Oni imaju nešto što mi zovemo twang. Onda sam ja više za proper English. Meni je lakše komunicirati, a i lakše mi je slušati ljude koji pričaju tako. “

Son reports that his production is liable to change depending on his collocutor. He states that he has noticed this behaviour with all three languages.

S:” Ja sam primetio da moj akcent mutira, menja se, zavisi s kim sam prošli put pričao.”

S:” Ja se osjećam ko da menjam svoj akcent da budem malo sličnije ljudima s kojim komuniciram.”

This behaviour is classified as convergence. It can also be speculated that this strategy is in connection with his wish for assimilation. On the other hand, it may be an unconscious pattern and simply a result of his affinity towards languages.

C) Attitudes to mother tongue

The participants were asked about their perception of Serbo-Croatian as a language, given the changes it has endured due to the political changes in their former homeland of Yugoslavia.

Mother and Father both still refer to their mother tongue as Serbo-Croatian. They claim the following:

F:” Meni je srpsko-hrvatski i dalje jedan jezik. To što ja razumijem i istočnu i zapadnu varijantu svog jezika samo govori koliko ja dobro znam svoj jezik, a ja govorim isto kao što sam govorio i prije. Iako sam, recimo, hrvatske nacionalnosti, ja govorim *hljeb*, a ne *kruh*, jer u Tuzli niko nije govorio *kruh*. Sad se govori nakon ovog rata, ali pošto sam ja otišao prije rata, ja nisam mogao da se prešaltam na *općinu* ili *plaću*.”

F:” Nazivanje tih varijanti drugim jezikom meni ima jaku političku konotaciju, a ne lingvističku. To je definitivno jedan jezik, a ti ga možeš nazivati sad ovako ili onako. Pa ljudi u Dalmaciji po meni i dalje pričaju srpsko-hrvatski sa puno primjesa talijanskog.”

M:” Moj maternji jezik je srpsko-hrvatski. Meni je to i dalje kao jedan jezik sa dijalektima, kao što je i britanski, američki, južnoafrički engleski. Nazovi ih kako god, ali ljudi se sporazumevaju i nemaju problema sa *moj* i *tvoj*. Zašto i mi ne bi mogli tako?”

As previously mentioned, Mother and Father both exert a behaviour labelled as maintenance. They pay attention to nurturing their vernacular. Additionally, they both give importance to speaking “properly” and “correctly” in their mother tongue. Classifying Serbo-Croatian as one language allows them to maintain their vernacular. Since they have not familiarised

themselves with specific changes the individual languages from former Yugoslavia have gone through, they may not feel confident enough to claim to speak any of those languages.

F:” Ja govorim književni srpsko-hrvatski, kako su nas učili u školi.”

M:” Ja pričam srpsko-hrvatski. To je jezik koji smo učili u školi i koji su moji roditelji govorili.”

M:” Ja ne prilagođavam svoj jezik ni u Bosni, ni u Hrvatskoj. Ne mogu ja da pričam hrvatski, jer nisam nikad živela tamo. Pričam onako kako pričam, pa sad, ako me ljudi razumeju. Da li je sad *kesica* ili *vrećica*, nebitno.”

In addition to that, both Mother and Father refer to their language as *naš jezik*. They have many friends, who are from different regions of former Yugoslavia and all of them speak a different dialect/language, but they refer to all of those varieties as one language, as *naš jezik*.

Daughter reports facing difficulties or misunderstandings with people when referring to their mother tongue as *our* language or as Serbo-Croatian.

I:” Kako zoveš jezik kojim govoriš?”

D:” Well, to my friends I do not say “our language”, because that means nothing to them. Then I refer to it as Serbo-Croatian. My brother often says Slavic, which to me is a strange expression, it's like saying `I speak Celtic because I am Irish. ’”

I:” Smatraš li to onda sve jednim jezikom?”

D:” I think I've had this conversation many times with my parents, because my dad says `It's Serbo-Croatian! That's what we were taught in school, that's what it's called! So that's what I say to people. But I have had the experience of saying that to people in former Yugoslavia now and they look at me a bit funny. Like if I say that in Bosnia, they say `why don't you say *bosanski* or *hrvatski* or whatever'. So I think `How can I avoid saying the name of the language altogether? But I find it interesting, usually my parents would say *naš jezik*, that's the expression they use and sometimes I have used that expression and people think `Well, which language? ’”

Son, on the other hand, shares his parents' attitude. He refers to the language as one language and modifies his labelling according to context in order to avoid misunderstandings.

S:” Kad sam tek došo u Australiju ja sam reko Serbo-Croatian, to je tada bilo korektno. Ja ne znam kako se to sada kaže uopšte. Ne znam dal' se to uopšte koristi. Sad je srpski, hrvatski, bosanski, al to je ustvari isto. To se ja sjećam kad smo prošli put bili kod vas i ja kupio cigare, a na pakovanju piše “pušenje ubija“na srpskom, hrvatskom i na bosanskom, a ono ista stvar. To je meni smiješno.

S:” Ja se osećam ko da vrlo često kažem Serbian, jer mi je to najlakše. Ponekad kažem Croatian, jer ponekad kad kažem Australcima Serbian oni pitaju `Šta je to? ' i ja kažem `Same as Croatian' i onda oni `Ah,ok,no worries.’”

It can be assumed that the terms *naš jezik* and *Serbo-Croatian* have a unifying purpose. It creates a common ground and consequently a sense of imminent closeness with people from former Yugoslavia. Furthermore, it establishes an opposition of *us* (people from former Yugoslavia) and *them* (people from other countries). This can be seen in the following excerpts from the interview with Father:

I:” Mijenja li se odgovor na pitanje ‘Odakle si?’ ovisno o državi u kojoj se nalaziš?”

F:” Pa naravno, ako sam u stranoj državi, mnogi nisu čuli ni za Tuzlu, tako da kažem da sam iz bivše Jugoslavije, ovaj, a ako hoću malo određenije da kažem, da sam rođen u Bosni.

I: “Šta podrazumijevaš pod stranom državom? “

F: “Pa zemlje koje nisu, recimo, iz bivše Jugoslavije.“

Daughter states that language plays an important role in creating a feeling of exclusion. This explains the reason behind the need to differentiate between *our* language and *other* languages. It relates to the inherent desire for socialisation and, by an extension, for belonging and acceptance. Being an immigrant generates a feeling of being the *outsider* in a society, which is especially accentuated by not knowing the language or not knowing it well enough. Daughter formulates her observation to this problem in the following way:

D:” Yeah, to je interesantno pitanje. Ja mislim kad smo mi, I think if you are the different one, you don’t see the diversity, if you know what I mean. You just think *me* and *them*. Probably there were a lot of children at the school I went to, who were from different cultures, but in my mind I was new and my English was the worst so I think I thought of myself as the *other*, the different one.”

4.3. Attitudes to Australia and biculturalism

Father states that he has assimilated to life in Australia and that he sees Australia as home now.

I:” Gdje je za tebe sada tvoj dom? Gdje si *kod kuće*?

F:” Kad kažem *idem kući* znači da idem u Pert. Bilo gdje da odeš, uvijek poželiš da se vratiš kući.”

I:” Što ti smatraš domom?”

F:” Meni dom čine porodica, kuća i okruženje, koje smo napravili da izgleda kako mi volimo.”

Continuing on the premise that language is an important part of assimilation, Father shares his observation of people who were unwilling to learn the language upon their arrival. He reports that those people often develop an aversion to Australia and everything connected to it.

F:” Najvažnije je da naučiš novi jezik kada dođeš u novu zajednicu, kako bi se asimilirao. Postoje ljudi, baš sa Balkana, koji su tvrdoglavo odbijali da se naviknu na bilo šta novo i njima nije dobro. To su ljudi koji su prvo pružali otpor učenju jezika, a onda kad su zaključili da su svi iz njegove generacije naučili taj jezik i počeli da rade, e onda dođe do mentalnih poremećaja, do depresije i slično. Da bi valjda opravdao svoj stav prema tom jeziku, onda počne još ružnije da priča o Australiji i sve mu smeta. Znači on je odbio da prihvati asimilaciju i sam sebi napravio takvu situaciju.”

He reports several occasions upon their immigration to Australia which depict the cultural differences they have got accustomed to:

F:” U Pertu sam se jednom osjećao nesigurno kad smo tek došli zbog naše percepcije centra grada. Kad smo pošli u kino nas četvero u centar grada, što oni zovu CBD (Central Business District), mi smo mislili `To je centar, to bruji od ljudi`. Kad smo u jedanaest izašli iz kina ono mrtvo more. Tad sam se osjećao malo i nesigurno.”

F:” Danas silom prilika slavimo i religiozne praznike, jer su oni ujedno i državni praznici. Prije se to nije obilježavalo u toj mjeri.”

F:” Australci se definitivno druže drugačije, oni kad naprave party, ti i ne znaš da imaju party. Oni samo ćaskaju, pričaju, pijuckaju, a kod nas kad imaš party to cijelo selo zna.”

When asked about traditions and virtues that his family maintains from their culture and that differ from the Australian ways Father named the following:

F:” Australija daje osobi pravo čim navršši 16 godina da uzima novac od socijalnih ustanova, koji se obično odnosi na školovanje. A ako neko počne da radi u tim godinama onda dobija novac i pomoć u pronalasku posla, tako da mnoge mlade osobe odu od kuće i roditelji ih ne zadržavaju, a kod nas to nije tako. Mi smo ponijeli iz naše kulture to da djecu držimo u kući dokle god ih ne osposobimo za život i da odu onda kada oni požele da odu, a ne da ih mi guramo.”

He gave a negative response to the question whether they have the intention or wish to ever move back to their homeland. As the main reasons he names their acquired property and job security.

Mother states that they would not have left Belgrade if it had not been for the war. However, today she sees Perth as her home. Like Father, she has no wish to move back to her homeland. She mentions a higher standard of living and a feeling of safety as most prominent criteria.

M:” U Australiji je sigurno veći životni standard nego u Srbiji danas. U Australiji su ti s tvojom prosečnom plaćom stvari mnogo dostupnije nego u Srbiji danas.”

M:” Bilo je malo i straha kad smo zadnji puta bili u Srbiji. Pazar je pre bio mala, tradicionalna sredina, a sada se sve to promenilo. Puno je droge, kriminala, ima i jedan bordel i tako. Zato se sada osećam sigurnije u Pertu.”

Apart from that, she lists a number of cultural differences she would not be willing to get used to again.

M:” Ima puno stvari kojih smo se odvikli, možda i nesvesno, kao što je, recimo, pušenje na javnim mestima.”

M:” Lepši mi je i taj malo formalniji pristup u javnim službama. Lepše se osećaš, a i posao se obavi brže. Kod nas nekad imaš osećaj da te baš sve ispitaju, pa ta prisnost ode malo predaleko.”

Although both Mother and Father have got accustomed to the Australian way of life and reportedly completely blended in the society, they are still hesitant to claim that they are bicultural. Similarly to the way they refer to Serbo-Croatian as *naš jezik*, they refer to people from countries belonging to former Yugoslavia as *naši ljudi*. When asked about cultural differences they draw a distinction between *kod nas*, referring thereby to all the regions that were part of the former country and *kod njih*, meaning Australians. This implies that they have not accepted Australian-ness as part of their identity, but rather Australia as a place of residence. One reason could be the fact that they moved to Australia as adults. Another reason can be linked to the feeling of displacement, since their parents and close relatives do not reside in the same place as they do. In addition to that, Mother mentions the language barrier.

I:” Osjećaš li se bliskije s ljudima sa svog govornog područja?”

M:” Pa to uvek ostaje, da su naši ljudi nama bliži po svemu. Možda zato što je lakše izraziti se na našem jeziku nego na engleskom.”

Daughter, on the other hand, does not see language proficiency as the main denominator of biculturalism. She believes that due to the multicultural demographic profile of Australia a migration background is a vital part of an Australian national identity.

I:” Percipiraš li ljude kao *less Australian* ako imaju strani akcent?”

D:” Ne, ne. Tu ja mislim da je Australija malo, again, it’s a multicultural country, so I consider my parents Australians, not just because they have a passport. I think part of Australian identity is being a migrant, in my opinion.”

She perceives Perth as her hometown and names a feeling of safety and familiarity as most important factor.

I:”Gdje je za tebe dom?”

D:”Ja bih rekla Pert. Samo zato što je tu I feel most comfortable in Perth. I understand, you know, the law and where I am and the language best. That’s where I feel safest.”

However, contrary to her parents, she does see herself as bicultural. She describes it as a feeling of simultaneously belonging to both places and neither of them.

D:” Ja volim kad mi, recimo, idemo u Beograd. Ne znam, there’s a certain feeling that I have of being at home. Well, I think that a lot of Yugoslavs, when they go Australia, well, a lot of immigrants feel that they don’t belong at home, but don’t belong at the new country either completely. I feel a bit like that.”

When asked about a cultural trait that she has inherited from her parents that is typical of people from former Yugoslavia she names family bonds as the most prominent feature.

D:” Family is everything to me. It’s very important to me. I think it’s part of our culture, more so than Australians. I have friends who see their parents once a year and they live in the same town as them. But my mother, if I don’t see her for a week, she’ll be upset with me. Nije mi normalno da ih ne vidim a longer period of time.”

Like her parents, Daughter responded negatively to the idea of moving back to her homeland.

I:” Je li bi se mogla zamisliti da živiš negdje u Bosni ili Srbiji?”

D:” Ne.”

I:” Na što misliš da se ne bi mogla naviknuti?”

D:” Ja volim ovdje doć. Ja volim kulturu, hranu i muziku and just the people. It’s such an interesting country and history. But what I find infuriating is that many things are not done properly. Like, driving or walking through Sarajevo there is not a single smooth path, there’s holes in any pavement that you could lose a dog in. It’s such a small thing, people are not dying because of potholes, but it makes me think ‘What else is not done properly? What is the legal system like here? Can I trust the police?’ I don’t know. I know it sounds very judgemental, but in Australia I just feel much safer.”

Like Daughter, Son reports that he has not considered moving back to his homeland. He states that due to multiple changes in environment he has no interest to adapt to a new place of residence, a new language or culture again.

S:” Kad sam došo u Pert i naučio kulturu i sve, znam da sam samo hteo da ostanem na jednom mjestu. Nisam više hteo da menjam. Treba mi neka stabilnost.”

When asked about his perception of *home* and his feeling of belonging Son responded in the following way:

I:” Gdje je za tebe dom?”

S:” To je malo komplikovano. Ja se osjećam kao da nikad baš nisam imao taj home. Meni je Njemačka bila home kad smo tamo živili i onda smo došli u Australiju i kad smo tek došli bilo je baš teško jedno prve tri-četiri godine, to je onaj, kako se kaže, fitting in, drugi jezik, druga kultura, prijatelji. Mislim da je tamo u Warwicku, gde mama i tata žive, to je meni sada home.”

This initial feeling of displacement translates to his perception of his bicultural identity. He claims that in the beginning he felt almost as having no culture due to multiple migrations at an early age. Similarly to his parents, he stresses language as the main part of acquiring a bicultural identity.

S:” Ja sam sebi govorio u vezi kulture kako kažu na engleskom I am neither here nor there, nisam ni naš a ni Australac, nego sam između, znaš.

I:” Misliš li da je to imalo veze sa jezikom?”

S:” Moj engleski je bio jako dobar kad smo došli u Australiju, eh sad, kultura i akcent, to je druga stvar.

I:” Kad si bio spreman reći za sebe `Aha, e sad sam naučio engleski. `?”

S:” Ja bi reko, jedno možda godinu dana nakon što smo došli u Pert. Kad smo tek došli u Pert, malo sam izbjegavao Australce, malo sam se njih bojio i bilo je puno naših ljudi i to je meni bilo lakše tako da sam uglavnom bio sa našima.”

It is noticeable that he uses the same label like his parents *naši ljudi* to refer to people immigrated from countries belonging to former Yugoslavia. As can be extrapolated from his statement, Son used to feel closer to people from his homeland. However, he states that he has noticed a shift in this regard. He claims that on one hand he still feels an immediate connection to people from former Yugoslavia, but on the other hand he feels very different and therefore he deliberately dissociates himself from them.

I:” Osjećaš li se bliskije s našim ljudima?”

S:” Nekako sam počeo i izbegavati naše ljude u Australiji. Mislim, jedini exception su mi prijatelji od mojih roditelja. Blisko mi je biti s našim ljudima ali onda primetim *nešto nije u redu tu*. Sa mlađim ljudima sam jako pažljiv jel moram da skontam da li će tu biti problema u vezi sa politikom i to.”

S:” Ja se sad družim s našima samo ako su ovako kao ja – malo više multicultural, malo više Australian. Ali imaš isto tako ljudi koji se družu samo s našima, slušaju samo našu muziku i oni su malo drugačiji, malo više i old-fashioned.”

When asked whether he feels bicultural today, Son responded affirmatively. He adds that he feels fully assimilated into Australian culture and feels more comfortable there now, but at the same time feels as “naš” (referring to the cultural background of his parents).

S:” Ja kad dođem gore kod vas ili se družim s našim ljudima, osjećam se kao naš ali australska kultura je za mene postalo nešto normalno i sad se osećam više kao Australac. Osećam se ko da sm 15 godina pokušavao da se uklopim i sad sam se uklopio. Ovdje se osjećam nekako više home.”

5. Conclusion

The researcher has encountered a number of problems during the research. Firstly, the familiarity level shared with the participants influenced the formulation of the questions. As the researcher already knew the answers to most of the questions, she failed to include some specific questions regarding the core problem of this research, which lead to the need for follow-up questions. In addition to that, some of the questions were too general, which influenced the relaxed flow of conversation during the interview and made the interviewees more aware of the observer's paradox. Lastly, the interviews with Mother and Father were too extensive and therefore exhausting for the interviewees, which influenced their concentration and consequently, their production. However, these problems did not hinder the researcher in achieving her goals set at the beginning of this research.

The aim of this research was to elicit information about language attitudes shared by a bilingual family from Australia. More precisely, to examine their perception of linguistic variation and to establish whether and how their attitudes towards language have changed. The family that was chosen is especially interesting because they were all at a different stage in their lives when they started learning languages, which consequently influenced their perception of it and competence in it.

The results have shown that the family members share some common ideas about language, but also hold opposite views when it comes to linguistic variation. All of them attach great importance to language proficiency, but they disagree on the parameters for defining it. Son sees slang and a native-like accent as the most superior. Daughter feels that language proficiency is an individual estimation and that everybody should establish their personal criteria. Mother and Father hold different parameters for different languages. In English they both see a native-like production as most prestigious. They feel that obtaining slang and a native-like accent are indicators of supreme linguistic competence. However, in their native tongue Mother and Father are very conscious of maintaining a proper and formal production. It can be linked to the fact that this was a highly admirable quality in the society they grew up in. A proper monoglossic non-dialectal production implied further virtues like being well-mannered, disciplined or being an intellectual. Since Australia is a highly multicultural society and people are constantly immigrating from all around the world, a standard production is not viewed as an especially prestigious quality. It can be hypothesized that this has impacted their different attitudes to the different languages.

Daughter and Son, in contrast, favour linguistic variation. Their age and the multicultural environment they grew up in could be responsible for forming their dissimilar perception.

All family members exert highly favourable convictions towards Australia, the language, and the society. This implies that they have completely adapted to life in Australia. While Daughter and Son both perceive themselves as belonging equally to two different cultures, Mother and Father display a certain reluctance to call themselves bicultural. One reason for that can be that they believe that language proficiency is the essential element in establishing a bicultural identity. On the other hand this can also be a result of the fact that they immigrated to Australia as adults and therefore their assimilation was a conscious decision and effort on their part and not a naturally occurring process.

All four of them state that they have no intentions of emigrating from their current place of residence. Safety and familiarity with the system and the environment were mentioned as the most important reasons.

6. Appendix

1. Demography

- Predstavi se
- Koje kategorije smatraš da te određuju najviše kao pojedinca (npr posao, obitelj, nacionalnost, rasa, dobna skupina)
- Gdje si rođen/-a i kada? Čime se baviš? Imaš li djece, braće i/ili sestara? Odakle si?
- Mijenja li se odgovor na to pitanje ovisno o kontekstu u kojem se nalaziš?
- Gdje trenutno živiš i koliko dugo?
- Gdje si do sada sve živio/-la, kada i s kim?
- Koje mjesto smatraš "domom"?

2. Family

- Riječ "family" - što podrazumijeva za tebe i kako bi je preveo/-la na "naš"?
- Tko se ubraja u tvoju užu, a tko u širu obitelj?
- Gdje žive članovi tvoje obitelji?
- Koji značaj za tebe ima obitelj u tvom životu?
- Je li to uvijek bilo tako?
- Smatraš li da je to uvjetovano tvojim podrijetlom?
- Vidiš li neke razlike između tvog odnosa prema obitelji i "australskog" poimanja obitelji?
- Jel Australcima nekada bio čudan taj odnos sa užom ili širom obitelji?
- Kakav je odnos prema odgoju djece u Australiji i u Bosni/Srbiji?
- Koji životni stil je za tebe privlačniji i zašto?

Friends

- Je li bi rekao/-la za sebe da imaš puno prijatelja?
- Na koji način se družiš s ljudima?
- Ima li za tebe razlike između izraza "prijatelj" i "drug"?
- Postoji li u Australiji razlika između tih izraza?
- Druži li se s Australcima ili Bosancima/Srbijancima?
- Kakav je tvoj stav bio prema izboru društva priikom doseljenja u Australiju?
- Osjećaš li se bliskije ljudima iz tvog govornog područja?
- Što misliš, zbog čega?

3. Hobbies and free time

- Imaš li puno slobodnog vremena?
- Je li ti to važno i zašto?

- Što radiš u slobodno vrijeme?
- Imaš li neke hobije?
- Bave li se ljudi u Australiji općenito hobijima?
- Kakav je odnos prema slobodnom vremenu u Australiji, i u Bosni/Srbiji?
- Kako ga ljudi provode u Australiji, a kako u Bosni/Srbiji?

4. Games

- Jesi li se volio/-la igrati kao mali/-a?
- Što si se igrao?
- Jesi se često igrao s drugom djecom?
- Jel ti bilo teško uspostavljati komunikaciju s drugom djecom, dok si bio u Bosni?
- Na koji način se igraju djeca u Australiji?
- Kako se to razlikuje u odnosu na tvoju djecu ili djecu danas?

5. Fights

- Jesi li se ikada potukao/-la?
- Kakvo je tvoje mišljenje o tučama?
- Jel bi se ikada potukao/-la za prijatelja?
- Jel bilo uobičajeno potući se među tvojim vršnjacima? U kojem uzrastu?
- Smatraš li da se to razlikuje u Australiji?
- Jesu li skloniji neverbalnim okršajima?
- Jesi li se osjećao/-la nekada nesigurno po tom pitanju? Kada i gdje?

6. Fear

- Imaš li često neke strahove?
- Kako se nosiš s njima?
- Koje strahove si imao/-la prilikom preseljenja u drugu zemlju?
- Jesi li nekada imao strahove u vezi jezika ili novog okruženja?
- Kada si osjećao/-la najveću nesigurnost?

7. Danger of Death

- Jesi li se ikada plašio/-la za život svojih bližnjih?
- Što podrazumijevaš pod izrazom „near death experience“?
- Jesi li imao/-la takvo iskustvo?
- Jel ti neko iskustvo promijenilo pogled na život i smrt?

8. Fate

- Šta za tebe znači “sudbina”?
- Jel vjeuješ u sudbinu?
- Smatraš li da su neki događaji u tvom životu bili djelom sudbine?
- Povezuješ li “sudbinu” s religijom?

9. Religion

- Smatraš li se religioznim?
- Kakvu ulogu religija ima u tvom životu?
- Jel neko iskustvo u tvom životu promijenilo tvoje viđenje religije?
- Kakvu važnost religija ima u vašoj domovini?
- Kakva je situacija u Australiji?
- Govori li se u Australiji često o religiji?
- Smatraš li religiju nečim što povezuje ili razdvaja ljude?

10. Race

- Kada je bio tvoj prvi susret s osobom druge rase?
- Kako si se osjećao kad si došao u mjesto veće kulturološke i nacionalne raznolikosti?
- Imaš li puno prijatelja/poznanika druge rase?
- Primjećuješ li neke razlike u suradnji ili druženju s njima?
- Jesu li ljudi ikada za tebe mislili da si iz neke druge države, a ne Bosne?
- Koje je tvoje mišljenje o rasnim razlikama u odnosu na nacionalne razlike?
- Kakav je odnos prema drugim rasama u Australiji?
- Jesi li primijetio/-la neke specifičnosti u jezičnoj produkciji ljudi drugih rasa?
- Misliš li da rasa uvjetuje mogućnost svladavanja određenog jezika?
- Kako je riješeno pitanje rasne jednakosti u tvojoj domovini?

11. Dating

- Kakav je tvoj stav o vezama među pripadnicima drugih rasa?
- Što je , po tvom mišljenju, uvjetovalo taj stav?
- Kako se gleda na brakove mješovite nacionalnosti u tvojoj domovini?
- Jesi li nekada savjetovao/-la djecu pri izboru njihovog partnera?
- Što si im savjetovao/-la?
- Na koje prepreke mogu naići parovi mješovite nacionalnosti u Bosni?
- Na koje prepreke mogu naići brakovi mješovite rase u Australiji?
- Smatraš li da jezik može biti prepreka i u kojem smislu?

12. Marriage (+ Homosexual Community)

- Jesi li ti trenutno u braku ili vezi?
- Je li ti to prvi brak?
- Gdje i kada si upoznao/-la svoju suprugu/ svog supruga?
- Primjećuješ li neke generacijski uvjetovane razlike u partnerskim odnosima danas i prije?
- Razlikuju li se partnerski odnosi u Bosni, Njemačkoj, Australiji i na koji način?
- Što smatraš receptom za uspješan dugoročan brak/vezu?
- Danas postoje različiti termini za različite odnose, npr „open marriage“, „civil union“, „domestic relationship“ – je li ti to poznato?
- Kakav je tvoj stav o tome?
- Smatraš li da drugim „nazivom“ nečega ono mijenja značaj ili oblik?
- Kakav je odnos prema gay zajednicama u Australiji?
- Kakav je odnos prema njima u Bosni i/ili Srbiji?
- 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 Australiji, ali i u BiH/Srbiji/Hrvatskoj)?
-

13. Goals

- Jel bi rekao da si ostvario/-la svoje glavne ciljeve u životu?
- Što si htio/-la postati kad si bio/-la dijete ?
- Jesu li se tvoji snovi promijenili kada si došao u Srbiju, Njemačku ili Australiju?
- Zbog čega?
- Smatraš li da te to iskustvo dovelo bliže ispunjenju tvojih ciljeva?
- Jesi li imao/-la namjeru ostati u Njemačkoj?
- Jesi li oduvijek želio/-la otići u Australiju?
- Zašto i kada si odlučio/-la ostati u Australiji?
- Što si učio/-la djecu o postavljanju osobnih ciljeva u životu?
- Smatraš li da ciljeve treba jasno definirati i verbalizirati i zašto?

14. School

- Koliko ti je bilo važno obrazovanje u životu?
- Koju školu/ fakultet si završio/-la?
- Je li to bio tvoj osobni izbor?
- Jesi li htio/-la ići na fakultet kada si bio teenager?
- Koju razinu obrazovanja su tvoji roditelji imali?
- Kakav je odnos prema fakultetskom obrazovanju u Bosni/Srbiji?
- Kako to izgleda u Australiji?

- Gdje su se školovala tvoja djeca?
- Možeš li povući neke paralele između obrazovanja tada i sada?
- Možeš li povući neke paralele između obrazovnog sustava u Bosni/Srbiji/Njemačkoj/Australiji?
- Koju vrstu prednosti pruža fakultetsko obrazovanje u Australiji?
- Što si savjetovao/-la svojoj djeci u vezi obrazovanja?
- Kakav je odnos prema cjeloživotnom obrazovanju u Australiji?
- Jesi li ikada razmišljao/-la o nekoj daljnoj edukaciji, ili u mirovini?

15. City services

- U globalu, jel bi rekao/-la da je život u Australiji bolji nego život u Bosni i zašto?
- Živiš li sada u velikom ili malom gradu?
- U kojim si gradovima sve živio/-la do sada?
- Jesi li ikada živio/-la u manjem gradu?
- Koje su prednosti u većem gradu po pitanju gradskih službi?
- Kako je riješena infrastruktura u Perthu?
- Iz kojeg si razloga odlučio/-la živjeti u većem gradu u Australiji?
- Dolaziš li iz velikog grada u Bosni/Srbiji?
- Kako bi usporedio/-la gradske službe u Bosni/Srbiji i u Australiji?
- Ima li tvoja obitelj koja živi u Bosni/Srbiji često pritužbe na uređenje države ili gradskih službi?
- Na što se uglavnom žale?
- Smeta li tebi to kada odeš u posjetu?
- Koliko često posjećuješ tu regiju?
- Gdje uglavnom odlaziš i na koliko dugo?

16. Street Crime

- Osjećaš li se sigurno u Perthu?
- Kolika je razina kriminala u mjestu u kojem sada živiš?
- Jesu li ulice sigurne?
- Je li to bio jedan o razloga zbog kojeg si se odlučio živjeti u tom mjestu?
- Jesi li ikada svjedočio/-la nekoj kriminalnoj radnji i gdje?
- Kako si se ponašao/-la u toj situaciji?
- Jel te to navelo da razmišljaš o promjeni mjesta življenja?
- Osjećaš li se sigurno kada dođeš u Europu?
- Koji su glavni problemi s kriminalom u Australiji?
- Kakav je odnos prema kriminalu u Bosni/Srbiji u odnosu na Australiju?

17. Income, rent and house value

- Kakav je životni standard u Australiji?
- Što za tebe određuje životni standard?
- Imaš li australsko državljanstvo?
- Kako Australija podržava svoje građane?
- Nudi li Perth bolji standard u odnosu na druga mjesta u Australiji?
- Možeš li povući paralelu sa standardom u BiH/Srbiji i Australiji?
- Kakvo je stanje s posjedovanjem privatne imovine u Australiji?
- Kupuju li ljudi češće kuće ili stanove? Zašto?
- Kupuju li ljudi češće nekretnine u Bosni ili u Australiji?
- Kakav je tvoj odnos prema osobnoj imovini?
- Ima li razlike između tog odnosa kod Australaca i "Balkanaca"?

18. Dreams

- Sanjaš li često?
- Smatraš li da ti snovi imaju neko značenje?
- Smatraš li da snovi nekada mogu predvidjeti neke situacije?
- Jesi imao ikada problem sa spavanjem?
- Što misliš do čega je to?
- Razmišljaš li o snovima i njihovom značenju?
- U kojim situacijama?
- Je li to uvijek bilo tako?
- Misliš li da je to uvjetovano zajednicom?

19. Common sense

- Ljudi često govore o zdravom razumu. Šta ti podrazumijevaš pod tim?
- Je li to objektivna činjenica ili je uvjetovana nečim drugim?
- Smatraš li da ga većina ljudi ima?
- Jel razlikuješ inteligenciju od zdravog razuma?
- U kojem kontekstu se susrećeš s tim izrazom?
- U kojem kontekstu ga ti koristiš?

20. Work

- Kada si dobio/-la prvi posao?
- Što je bio tvoj prvi posao?
- Kakve vrste poslova si sve radio/-la?
- Jesi li oduvijek znao/-la čime se želiš baviti u životu?
- Smatraš li da bi svoje poslovne ciljeve mogao ostvariti u jednakoj mjeri u Bosni/Srbiji? Zašto?
- Jesi li ikada razmišljao/-la o tome da se vratiš?
- Zašto (ne)?

21. Language

- Koje jezike govoriš?
- Kojim se jezicima služiš?
- Što podrazumijevaš pod izrazom “znam određeni jezik”?
- Koristiš li ga i za koje bi jezike rekao/-la da ih “znaš?”
- Kako, kada i gdje si naučio/-la 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/-la da si naučio/-la srpski/bosanski?
- Što smatraš najboljim receptom za učenje jezika?
- Što smatraš svojim maternjim jezikom?
- Kojom varijantom ili dijalektom srpsko-hrvatskog bi rekao/-la 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 kojim jezikom govoriš u Australiji, što odgovoriš?
- Kad te to pitaju u Bosni, Srbiji ili Hrvatskoj što im kažeš?
- Jesi li se ikada osjećao/-la neugodno koristiti se svojim dijalektom?
- Kako bi ocijenio/-la svoju produkciju u jezicima koje govoriš?
- Jesi li znao/-la njemački/engleski po dolasku u Njemačku/Australiju?
- Kako si učio/-la jezik?
- Učiš li i danas aktivno jezik?
- Je li ti poznavanje ili nepoznavanje jezika ikada dalo prednost ili nedostatak u traženju posla?
- Kako si se snalazio/- la na poslu?
- Padaju li ti na pamet neke interesantne anegdote u vezi s jezičnim zabunama?
- Kako si se osjećao/-la kada nisi dovoljno vladao/-la određenim jezikom?
- Jesu li ti izvorni govornici u Njemačkoj ili Australiji stvarali probleme ili su ti pomagali s jezikom i kada?
- Prepoznaju li ljudi tvoj akcent?
- Smeta li ti to?
- Smatraš li „dobar “akcent važnim?
- Poznaješ li ljude s različitim akcentima engleskog? Smeta li ti to?
- Pada li ti teško razgovarati konstantno na engleskom jeziku?
- Kojim jezikom se koristiš na poslu/ kod kuće?
- Kojim jezikom razgovaraš s prijateljima?
- U kojim prilikama se koristiš kojim jezikom?
- Postoje li teme u kojima preferiraš engleski u odnosu na „naš “?
- Kako je to kod tvoje djece?
- Razgovarate li nekada o jeziku?
- Na koji način si učio/-la svoju djecu jeziku?

- Jesi li pomagao/-la djeci kod učenja njemačkog i engleskog i na koji način?
- Je li ti bilo važno na koji način se izražavaju tvoja djeca?
- Zašto?
- 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 psovka? Koristiš li ih?
- Jesu li psovke tabu u engleskom/srpsko-hrvatskom?
- Koristiš li ili si koristio neke poštapalice?
- Preferiraš li nekada srpske nad hrvatskim izrazima?
- 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?
- 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/-a“ na engleskom u odnosu na „naš“?
- Je li ti nedostajalo „vikanje“ na našem jeziku? Kako si ga nadomjestio/-la?
- Smatra li engleski bogatijim u odnosu na „naš“?
- 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/-La 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.

References

- Brozović, Dalibor 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
- Clark, Thomas L. (1971). Elicitation in Linguistic Fieldwork. *American Speech* 46 (1/2), 52 -57, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3087987>
- Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ćosić, Pavle et.al. (2008). *Rečnik sinonima*. Beograd: KORNET
- Faez, Farahnaz. (2011). Reconceptualizing the Native/Nonnative Speaker Dichotomy, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 10 (4), 231-249, doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.598127
- Garrett, Peter (2007). Language attitudes. In: Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, 116-121, London: Routledge
- Grosjean, François. (2015). Bicultural bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 19 (5), 572- 586
- Haney, Peter. (2003). Bilingual Humor, Verbal Hygiene, and the Gendered Contradictions of Cultural Citizenship in Early Mexican American Comedy. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 13(2), 163-188
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior. Vol. I: The bilingual community; Vol. II. The American dialects of Norwegian*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hu, Guiling and Stephanie Lindemann (2009). Stereotypes of Cantonese English, apparent native/non-native status, and their effect on non-native English speakers' perception. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30 (3), 253-269, doi:10.1080/01434630802651677
- 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.
- 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

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

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

Ščukanec, Aleksandra. (2008). Glas *r* u hrvatskome, njemačkome i engleskome jeziku. *Lahor: časopis za hrvatski kao materinski, drugi i strani jezik*, 1:5, 66-79

Van Compernelle, Rémi A. (2017). Preferences for (in)formal language: correlations with attitudes toward linguistic variation, multilingualism, tolerance of ambiguity, and residence abroad. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14:4, 317-331, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2016.1165229

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