

Anglo-Croatian language contact in England: a case study

Goričan, Nikolina

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2019

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

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:058762>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-23**



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

Nikolina Goričan

ENGLESKO-HRVATSKI JEZIČNI KONTAKT
U ENGLESKOJ: STUDIJA SLUČAJA

Diplomski rad

Mentor: dr. sc. Anđel Starčević, docent

srpanj 2019.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of English

Nikolina Goričan

ANGLO-CROATIAN LANGUAGE CONTACT
IN ENGLAND: A CASE STUDY

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Anđel Starčević, Assistant Professor

July 2019

Contents

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Theoretical Framework 2
- 3. Methodology 7
- 4. The Respondent’s Profile 11
- 5. Results and the Analysis of the Interview 13
- 6. Conclusion..... 29
- 7. Abstract 31
- 8. Appendix 32
- 9. References 39

1. Introduction

The aim of this master's thesis is to explore and uncover different language-related and other processes which occur within an individual in a language contact situation. Language contact is a phenomenon explored within contact linguistics, a field of linguistics which "uses the methods of sociolinguistics" (Nelde 2000: 286). Sociolinguistics is a linguistic discipline which has been increasingly popular and important in recent decades. According to Trudgill, it is "that part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon" (2000: 21). Sociolinguistics is a fairly complex and comprehensive discipline as its scope expands well beyond the boundaries of language alone: "[i]t investigates the field of language and society and has close connections with the social sciences, especially social psychology, anthropology, human geography, and sociology" (*ibid.*). As such, it necessarily involves a range of varying field and research methods and studies, employed by numerous researchers to collect data and give a closer and more detailed look into the nature and relations between language and other disciplines that sociolinguistics involves. This master's thesis is based on a case study, which is "most appropriate where a given individual has some behaviour worth observing, but where the circumstances are so individual or rare that there would be no benefit in combining the results of observation of that person with those of others" (Wray and Bloomer, 2012: 181). Furthermore, conducting a case study is highly appropriate if the focus of the research is on discovering "how that particular individual manages the different processes" (*ibid.*), which is precisely our aim. One of the most important and most commonly used methods to collect data in a case study is the sociolinguistic interview. According to William Labov, one of the most significant individuals in the fields of linguistics and sociolinguistics, a sociolinguistic interview is "a well developed strategy," which as its result has a "recorded conversation with a member of the speech community" (1984: 32). Furthermore, "an 'interview' entails the researcher presenting the questions to the informant orally and recording the responses either in written notes or on an audio recording for later transcription and analysis" (Wray and Bloomer, 2012: 164). This master's thesis is based on a case study of language contact between English and Croatian and the data has been collected by means of a sociolinguistic interview.

2. Theoretical Framework

The aim of this master's thesis is to study language contact between Croatian and English. According to Weinreich (1953: 1), "two or more languages are said to be in contact if they are used alternately by the same person". The notion of language contact is inevitably connected with the phenomenon called 'bilingualism', which is explained as "the practice of alternately using two languages". Furthermore, "the persons involved", or in other words, persons using two languages alternately are thus called "bilingual" (*ibid.*). In his book *Studying bilinguals*, Grosjean (2008: 9) explains that there are two different views on bilingualism: the monolingual, and bilingual/wholistic view. He explains that the first term views bilinguals as two monolinguals in one person, e.g. that "the bilingual has (or should have) two separate and isolable language competencies" (*ibid.* 10). Furthermore, the monolingual view sees bilingual people as those who should be "equally and fully fluent in two languages" (*ibid.*). On the other hand, the bilingual view of bilingualism "proposes that the bilingual is an integrated whole which cannot easily be decomposed into two separate parts", and that "he or she has developed competencies (...) to the extent required by his or her needs" (*ibid.* 13-14). Bilingual people acquire different languages in many different ways and stages of life. According to Lightbown and Spada (2006: 25), "children who learn more than one language from earliest childhood are referred to as 'simultaneous bilinguals', whereas those who learn another language later may be called 'sequential bilinguals'". One of the possible problems that might arise in young children is what Lambert calls 'subtractive bilingualism', or in other words, "the loss of one language on the way to learning another" (*ibid.* 26). In order to prevent this from happening, Lightbown and Spada suggest striving for 'additive bilingualism', which refers to "the maintenance of the home language while the second language is being learned" (*ibid.*), which should enable a child to acquire a second language but remain proficient in their native language as well. The notion of home language is connected with the idea that different languages that an individual speaks have different roles: "ordinarily one language is the *home language*, while the other serves a wider range" (Bloomfield 1933: 56).

In language contact situations, the inability to express oneself or communicate with other people often leads to feelings of frustration: "anyone who has experienced intercultural conversation will recognize the frustration (...), having something to say but being unable to find a way to say it" (Tannen, 2012: 142). The feeling of frustration can then lead to other phenomena, for example, language conflict. When different languages, or rather speakers of

different languages, come into contact, it can sometimes lead to language conflict, or in other words, conflict between language speakers. (Nelde 2000). The reason why language conflicts happen is “the confrontation of differing standards, values, and attitude structures, and [it] strongly influences self-image, upbringing, education, and group consciousness” (*ibid.* 292).

However, contacts with people who speak a language different than one’s one do not necessarily end up in conflict. Speakers of a different language can also assume the role of a language-helper to help someone learn the language and facilitate the process of language acquisition (Crowley 2007: 85), and this is usually done by answering questions and explaining or translating unknown words or phrases.

Weinreich (1953: 76) mentions one additional feature of bilingualism; language dominance, based on which language is learned first:

[t]he distinction of having been learned first is so great that the first-learned language, the ‘mother-tongue’, is generally considered dominant by definition. In the initial stage of bilingualism, the mother-tongue is, indeed, at the same time the language of greatest proficiency; but later on, many bilinguals exceed their mother-tongue proficiency in the second language under certain circumstances”.

One’s native language is usually considered to be dominant solely because of the fact that it was one’s first language. However, it is not unusual that people become more proficient in their second language, which then becomes dominant regardless of the fact that it was learned later on. Furthermore, Weinreich brings bilingualism into close relationship with interference, which is defined as “[t]hose instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact” (*ibid.* 1). What interference, in fact, involves is “the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language”, which, among other things, includes vocabulary (*ibid.*).

In cases of bilingual people and communities, it is interesting to observe in what situations they speak which language and why. This phenomenon of using “two or more varieties, or codes, in an interaction” is called code-switching (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015: 400). Code-switching can be situational or metaphorical (*ibid.* 97). Situational code-switching “occurs when the languages used change according to the situations in which the speakers find themselves: they speak one language in one situation and another in a different one”, while metaphorical code-switching signifies that switching from one code to another, or from one language to another, carries some additional, “symbolic meaning” (*ibid.*).

In contact situations which involve different ethnic groups it is important to consider Giles's Communication Accommodation Theory, which "provides a wide-ranging framework aimed at predicting and explaining many of the adjustments individuals make to create, maintain, or decrease social distance in interaction" (2007: 293). Furthermore, it suggests that "individuals use communication, in part, in order to communicate their attitude towards each other" (*ibid.* 294). This is done by employing various communications strategies, most important of which are convergence and divergence (*ibid.*). Convergence is "a strategy whereby individuals adapt their communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic (...), paralinguistic (...), and nonverbal features (...) in such a way as to become more similar to their interlocutor's behaviour (*ibid.* 295). On the other hand, divergence is a strategy that "leads to an accentuation of speech and nonverbal differences between self and the other" (*ibid.*). Furthermore, both convergence and divergence can be upward or downward:

[u]pward convergence would be illustrated by an interviewee's adoption of the prestige patterns of an upper class interviewer. Upward divergence would be indicated by the adoption of a swifter speech rate and more cultured accent with someone nonstandard-sounding, whereas downward divergence could be seen in the emphasis of one's low-prestige minority heritage (*ibid.*).

During a bilingual's life, it's not unusual to experience a phenomenon called 'language forgetting', or also 'language loss' or language attrition' (Grosjean 2012: 11). This is how Grosjean describes it:

[d]uring language forgetting, the domains of use of the language are greatly reduced, or sometimes even disappear, and signs of loss appear over time: language production is filled with word finding problems and hesitations; the person's accent is influenced by the other, stronger, language(s), as is the syntax; the speaker calls on the other language(s) more and more for a word or a phrase, and so on. In addition, bilinguals become very unsure of themselves when they have to use the language and often state that they do not know it any more (*ibid.*).

The process of language forgetting is affected by many variables, some of which include "the age at which a language is acquired, how it is acquired (for example, in a natural setting or more formally such as in school, or a combination of the two), and the amount of use it is given over the years" (*ibid.*). Also, it is important to note that language attrition process can affect both one's native, as well as later-acquired languages (Grosjean, 2018: 15). In some immigrant communities, the attrition of one's native language can be lessened by attending Saturday schools where students learn and/or further develop their native language. This is found to be the case with e.g. Croatian immigrants in Canada (Starčević 2014: 113-

114), where Saturday schools were organised for children from different backgrounds (Croatian, Greek, Italian...).

The process of acquiring two (or more) languages in bilinguals can take many different forms. They can acquire their native language first, and then another language later in life through education, private lessons, immigration, etc., or they can acquire/learn both languages simultaneously since the moment they are born (Grosjean 2018: 14). In families where one parent is a native speaker of one language and another parent is a native speaker of another language, people sometimes decide that they will speak to their child (or children) in different languages each, which also results in the child becoming a more balanced bilingual (*ibid.*).

Second language acquisition is a process which has fascinated many linguists and researchers, mainly because there are numerous ways in which a second language can be learned and even more factors which affect the process of acquisition, and various levels of proficiency that the learners eventually reach. Inevitably, one's native language and second language(s) are always in some kind of correlation. Lightbown and Spada (2006: 30) accentuate that all second language learners have, by definition, "already acquired at least one language", which can have both positive and negative effects on the second language acquisition: "[t]his prior knowledge may be an advantage in the sense that they have an idea of how languages work. On the other hand, knowledge of other languages can lead learners to make incorrect guesses about how the second language works". Furthermore, there are many processes not directly linked to language, which nevertheless have a major impact on the process of acquisition, as well as the degree of proficiency an individual achieves. One of them is motivation, which is associated with "a willingness to keep learning" (*ibid.* 63). Lightbown and Spada further explain that "[i]f learners need to speak the second language in a wide range of social situations or to fulfil professional ambitions, they will perceive the communicative value of the second language and will therefore be motivated to acquire proficiency in it" (*ibid.*).

Another major discussion when it comes to learning languages develops around the correlation between language and age. The term 'critical period hypothesis' refers to the idea that "animals, including humans, are genetically programmed to acquire certain kinds of knowledge and skill at specific times in life" (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: 17). The term was originally introduced by Lenneberg, who claims the following:

The onset of language is regulated by states of maturation in the brain. Between the ages of two to ten or twelve, our brain is in an optimal condition for acquiring language. This facility

declines, and by the late teens something has occurred in the brain that makes it very difficult or impossible to acquire language if one hasn't learned to speak yet (1970: 71).

Although this theory originally referred to first language acquisition, “it has been hypothesized that there is a critical period for second language acquisition just as there is for first language acquisition” (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: 68). Lightbown and Spada additionally explain what this means for second language learners:

[d]evelopmental changes in the brain, it is argued, affect the nature of language acquisition, and language learning that occurs after the end of the critical period may not be based on the innate biological structures believed to contribute to first language acquisition or second language acquisition in early childhood. Rather, older learners may depend on more general learning abilities -- the same ones they might use to learn other kinds of skills or information. It is argued that these general learning abilities are not as effective for language learning as the more specific, innate capacities that are available to the young child (*ibid.*).

In other words, if a person starts learning a second language during the critical period, he/she might be able to reach a very high, possibly native-like level of proficiency in that language. Reciprocally, if a person starts learning a foreign language after the end of the critical period, he/she won't be able to achieve as high a level of proficiency, especially (although not exclusively) when it comes to accents (*ibid.* 69). Grosjean (2018: 18) calls the same phenomenon ‘a sensitive period for language acquisition’, and explains that “languages can be more easily and completely mastered when exposure begins early in life”.

When it comes to sociolinguistics, one important object of study are language ideologies. They are especially important in critical discourse analysis, within which “ideology has indeed been a very fertile topic of investigation” (Bloomaert 2005: 158). Critical discourse analysis is interested in analysing discourse because “discourse is seen as a means through which (and in which) ideologies are being reproduced” (Bloomaert 2005: 26). The term ‘ideology’ has been defined in numerous different ways, but for the purposes of this master's thesis I will use a definition by Verschueren, which goes as follows:

It is related to *ideas*, *beliefs*, and *opinions*, but this relationship is not a straightforward one. Ideas, beliefs, and opinions, as such, do not make ideology. Simplifying a bit, they are merely ‘contents of thinking,’ whereas *ideology* is associated with *underlying patterns of meaning, frames of interpretation, world views, or forms of everyday thinking and explanation*. Thus the ways in which beliefs, ideas, or opinions are discursively used, i.e. their *forms of expression* as well as the *rhetorical purposes* they serve, are just as important for ideology as the contents of thinking for which these three terms serve as labels (2012: 7).

There are many different types of ideologies and even more ways in which they can be manifested. The first ideology dealt with in this master's thesis will be the ideology of the standard language, which can be described as "a bias toward abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language" (Lippi-Green 1994: 166). According to Milroy (2001: 535), the ideology of the standard language arises from the belief that certain languages exist in standardized forms. Furthermore, it is this standardization that is behind speakers' "consciousness of a 'correct', or canonical, form of language", which is the basis for the standard language ideology. The ideology of the standard language can also be expressed in the belief of correctness; a belief which "takes the form that, when there are two or more variants of some word or construction, only one of them can be right" (*ibid.*).

The monoglossic ideology is defined by Wardhaugh and Fuller as a belief that "languages should be kept strictly separate" (2015: 90). Additionally, this ideology excludes mixing different languages or even different dialects or varieties of the same language. The opposite of the monoglossic ideology is the ability to mix languages and presenting this as a desirable way of speaking, which "show pluralist ideology, in which multiple ways of speaking and being are valued" (*ibid.*).

3. Methodology

The data for this master's thesis is collected by means of a sociolinguistic interview, which is described as "one of the most important tools for collecting data on language in its social setting" (Schilling 2013: 107). When preparing to conduct a sociolinguistic interview, there are several points that the researcher should keep in mind before, during and after the interview in order to obtain not only the required amount, but also the proper type of data.

Before anything else, the researcher has to decide who is going to be his/her respondent, having the aim of the research in mind. Furthermore, the respondent has to be willing to participate in the project, and their participation has to be ensured by signing a written consent form (Crowley, 2007: 28), which the researcher has to provide. As mentioned above, conducting a sociolinguistic interview involves constructing and organizing interview questions, which necessarily have to be aimed at obtaining the data that the researcher requires. Wray and Bloomer (2012: 167) emphasize the importance of question form, which

can be either open or closed: “[a]n open question offers the respondent a chance to talk or write at length, and that is often just what you want. (...) In an interview, open questions are the gateway to following up interesting issues”. On the other hand, “a closed question requires only a short answer, with no direct opportunity to expand” (*ibid*). The form of the questions directly affects the kind of responses an interviewer might get, which is further discussed later in the text. The form, although important, is not the only aspect to consider when it comes to interview questions. According to Edley and Litosseliti (2010: 158), the main methodological concern in studies based on either focus groups or interviews has been “ensuring the neutrality of the interviewer or ‘moderator’ - through the eradication of leading or ambiguous questions and through the standardization of their delivery”. This can be done by carrying out a structured interview, which consists of “prescribed questions”, where the answers of the respondent are “restricted” (*ibid.*). In a structured interview there is no possibility for improvisation and the respondents do not have the chance to expand their area of interest. Although structured interviews do, indeed, ensure neutrality and reduce the possibility of ambiguous questions, they do not provide the interviewer with all the necessary information for understanding the situation in the field which they are researching. According to Labov (1984: 38), “the sociolinguistic interview is considered a failure if the speaker does no more than answer questions”. Furthermore, “it is the additional material that the speaker provides, beyond the initial question, which provides the main substance of the interview” (*ibid.*). In other words, it is “naturalistic speech” from the respondent that the researcher should be aiming at during the sociolinguistic interview (Becker, 2018: 104). In his text *The anatomy of style-shifting*, Labov introduces the term “tangent”. The term refers to “an extended body of speech that deviates plainly from the last topic introduced by the interviewer, and represents the strong interest of the speaker” (2001: 92). Additionally, Labov explains that “[w]henver the interviewer recognizes that the speaker has moved in a different direction from the interview module, and has changed the subject, he or she pursues that topic without attempting to return to the previous one,” which is “perhaps the most basic guide for sociolinguistic interviewing” (*ibid*). These kinds of extended bodies of speech, which represent the true field of interest for the respondent, are what the interviewer has to aim at during the sociolinguistic interview. If the respondent feels the need to deviate from the subject, this means that the content introduced by him or her has great significance to them, which must be taken into consideration. That is why a structured interview would not provide sufficient data, and would not provide a chance to explore these fields of interest that the respondents might have. In order to access the previously mentioned naturalistic speech of the

respondent, it would be better to use “semi- or unstructured interviews”, with which “an interviewer/moderator may possess a set of guide questions, but they would not usually seek to impose them” (Edley, Litosseliti 2010: 158). The interviewer’s task is, therefore, to make questions less pointed and “designed to steer interviewees away from focusing on specific linguistic forms, toward producing connected speech about topics of interest” (Schilling 2013: 108).

The questions that the interviewer chooses to ask have to be aimed at prompting naturalistic speech from the respondent, which is best done by asking personal, intimate questions: “... a number of questions and topics (...) have been noted as successful in eliciting naturalistic speech, like personal narratives” (Becker 2013:104). Becker further explains that the practice of cataloging demographic information at the beginning of the interview serves, among other things, “to set the tone of the speech event as a casual conversation about the interviewee’s life, experiences, and opinions” (*ibid*). In other words, during the sociolinguistic interview the respondent is expected to share information about their private life, their family, memories, experiences, beliefs and opinions, all of which could potentially be sensitive areas. Therefore, it is important for the interviewer to “remain neutral during the data gathering process; to withhold their own opinions vis-à-vis the questions and to remain impassive in the face of the respondent’s answers” (Edley, Litosseliti 2010: 158). The interviewer must keep in mind that he or she is not conducting the interview to impose or judge their respondent’s experiences and opinion. Consequently, he/she must be aware of his/her facial expressions in order to avoid sending the wrong message, as well as any other form of behaviour that might be misinterpreted by the respondent. Furthermore, the interviewer must be aware of his/her answers and/or comments on what they hear. Showing approval or disapproval might make the respondent believe that their answers are somehow wrong or inadequate, which might lead to different kinds of deviations. Firstly, it might lead them to say what they believe the interviewer wants to hear. Secondly, the respondent might withhold some important information to avoid judgement, or, on the other hand, he/she might add some information which is ultimately not true. Finally, they might get uncomfortable and not want to answer any further questions at all.

It is important to appreciate the respondent and remember that he or she is devoting their free time to help collect necessary information for the interviewer, usually without any personal gain by the entire process. Therefore, the interviewer must show that he/she is interested in what the respondent has to say, not only the way in which he/she says it. Labov (1984: 40) claims that the interviewer’s “interest must not be a mechanical one, and he must

not be distracted from the content of what is being said by too much attention to the speaker's phonology or syntax". Since the respondent is bound to share his personal information, the interviewer should show an interest in their stories and their lives, not just their language.

When it comes to conducting any form of research, including the sociolinguistic interview, it is impossible not to come across a phenomenon called "the observer's paradox" (Labov 1984: 40). Wray and Bloomer (2012: 180) explain that the term refers to "the participants' awareness of an observer or of recording equipment", which consequently affects their behaviour. The observer's paradox cannot be completely avoided, but it can be lessened, which is connected with the relationship between the interviewer and the respondent. More precisely, it is connected with the fact that the interviewer is perceived as having the authority over the respondent: "[o]ne of the crucial elements that determine the course of a sociolinguistic interview and further contacts is the relative degree of authority of the interviewer and speaker" (Labov, 1984: 40). The interviewers have to be careful about how they present themselves to the speakers. According to Labov (1984: 40), "any identification of the interviewer as a teacher would stress the fact that he is a person that information flows from, not to". Furthermore, "[t]he basic counter-strategy of the sociolinguistic interview is to emphasize the position of the interviewer as a learner, in a position of lower authority than the person he is talking to" (*ibid.*). It is important to let the respondent know that he/she is the one sharing his knowledge with the interviewer, not that the interviewer has come to teach the respondent.

When it comes to technology, Wray and Blommer (2012: 174) state that the interviewer "should expect to audio- or video-record interviews", which means that he/she will require a recording device in order to capture the respondent's speech. Depending on the device, the interviewer has to make sure that there will be enough memory space to store all the data (De Decker, Nycz 2018: 130), considering that he/she will record "from one to two hours of speech" (Labov 1984: 32). Furthermore, the respondent's voice has to be clearly heard on the recording, but this cannot be achieved only by carefully choosing and preparing the technology: "[t]echnology alone cannot produce the optimal recording setup – it must be a mix between your equipment and where you do the recording" (Decker and Nycz 2018: 127). When arranging a place where the interview is going to be held, the interviewer has to make sure there will be no noises or disturbances which could spoil the recording. This is the area where the interviewer should not give up their authority, despite what has been said about the observer's paradox:

“In one respect, the interviewer should retain his authority: in his own area of expertise in making recordings. He should feel free to suggest where the others might sit so that he can get the best sound; if outdoors, to move out of the wind or away from the street; if indoors, to turn off the sound on the television set, turn off electric fans, or move away from a noisy motor” (1984: 40-41).

After the interviewer has chosen his respondent and the place where the interview will take place, they should make sure that the conditions are suitable for the cause.

Lastly, only conducting and recording the interview will not suffice, because „the corpus of texts that you have recorded are going to be useful to you only if they have been transcribed“, which might prove to be a slow and painful process (Crowley 2007: 137-138). However, for the purpose of this master’s thesis, it will be enough to transcribe only those segments which match our field of interest.

The interview that was carried out for the purposes of this master’s thesis was conducted on 23rd April, in the respondent’s apartment, as a place that is well-known to the respondent, allowing him to feel as comfortable and relaxed as possible. The interview lasted for one hour and forty-eight minutes. According to Wray and Bloomer (2012: 181), the researcher has to “demonstrate strict confidentiality”, so any information that could endanger the respondent’s anonymity is either going to be modified or removed from the analysis. Lastly, since the respondent’s mother tongue is Croatian, the interview was carried out in Croatian. In the interview, the questions and other utterances made by the interviewer are marked with and ‘I’ (interviewer), while the respondent’s answers are marked with and ‘R’ (respondent).

4. The Respondent’s Profile

The respondent is a forty-one-year-old man who was born in Croatia in 1978. He is a native speaker of Croatian and lived in Croatia for the first eight years of his life, first in Samobor, and then, from the moment he started primary school, in Zagreb. He finished his first two years of primary school in Zagreb. At the age of eight, he and his family moved to London, the United Kingdom, where they lived for six years. The respondent finished primary school education in London, after which he and his family returned to Croatia. At the moment of moving back to Croatia, he was fourteen years old. They lived in Croatia for four years, and then his family decided to move to London again. This time, however, the respondent decided to stay in Croatia in order to enrol at a college in Zagreb, while his parents and sister

moved back to London. The respondent is currently living in Zagreb, as well as his parents. His sister still lives in London and has her own family there. He had never been to any English-speaking countries before moving to London (he had only gone to visit his uncle in Germany once). While living in London, he and his family came to Croatia every summer, several times at Christmas and once at Easter. He has been living in Croatia continually for the past twenty-seven years.

This person has been chosen as the respondent for this case study because of his experience of moving to an English-speaking country at a young age. My focus is the process of adjusting to the life in a new country, not only in terms of society but also in terms of language, as well as on the process of acquiring English and how the circumstances affected the acquisition of English and what effect they had on the respondent's current knowledge of English. Furthermore, the case study is also aimed at exploring what happened with the respondent's knowledge of Croatian during the period spent in London and what were or are the consequences and effects of growing up in a country where one's native language is not spoken or is a minority language, as well as the consequences and effect of being part of a different educational system and then returning back to complete one's formal education in Croatia. Other than Croatian and English, he learned French for nine years (first in London for five years during primary school, and then in Croatia for four more years in high school) and German (for two years in London in primary school). The chart below shows his current perception of his own knowledge and competencies in all the languages he knows or has learned so far:

SKILL/LANGUAGE	Croatian	English	French	German
Speaking	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Listening	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Reading	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Writing	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Today, the respondent lives with his family in Zagreb. He has an MA degree in English but does not work in the profession. He has a wife who is Croatian and who has an MA degree in English and French. She works as an English teacher. They have a daughter who was born in 2018.

5. Results and the Analysis of the Interview

The story of the respondent in this interview is not a typical story about a family migrating to another country in search for better life opportunities. Before moving away to London, the respondent's mother worked as an architect, while his father worked in a company engaged in the woodworking industry. The company that the father worked for had branch offices all around the world and he was presented with the opportunity to work as their representative in London, which was the reason for the whole family to move there. The mandate was originally supposed to last for four years, but the family decided to prolong this period for two more years, resulting in six years of their lives spent living in London before moving back to Croatia (or, at that time, Yugoslavia). Since the reason for moving was business, the location was already decided on and in was not something that the family could have an effect on. Before the whole family moved to London, the father went there alone and spent six months preparing everything for the arrival of the rest of the family. During that period, the father had the help of the person who previously had the job of the representative. Other than that, the mother's cousin also lived in London at the same time, which means that they already had someone they knew there and who could help them adjust:

1. I: Je l' tamo već bio netko kog ste vi znali, neka obitelj, poznanici?

R: Hm... Bili su ovi iz predstavnštva koji su imali mandat prije oćevog. Tak da, ovaj, uvijek je taj neki overlap kad dođeš gore pa ti oni koji su već tamo pokažu gdje, šta, kako i onda je uvijek lakše ali otac je išo šest mjeseci prije nas gore, da pripremi isto teren. Onda smo mu se mi pridružili gore. Ali majka ima daljnju rodbinu, sestrićna jedna njezina daljnja je udata gore bila za Engleza pa onda je to isto pomoglo malo.

Since the respondent was eight years old at the time, he remembers the period before London only partially. The strongest memories that he has are that of his home town, Samobor, and the period when he started school. During his first and second grade in primary school, he and his family would spend their weekdays in Zagreb, and their weekends in Samobor:

2. I: Kolko se dobro sjećaeš tog perioda do svoje osme godine, do kad niste otišli?

R: Am... Ne baš. Najbolje se sjećam u Samoboru jer baka i dida su bili u Zagrebu, ja kad sam krenuo u osnovnu školu, u prva dva razreda onda smo iz Samobora došli sa bakom i didom živjeti u Zagreb. A vikende bi provodili u Samoboru. Tak da ja pamtim Samobor jako dobro ko klinac, i Zagreb stan od bake i dide isto jako dobro....ovaj...tak da, kaj ja znam. Al to je bilo više onako igranje s dečkima iz kvarta, dok si klinac...

He also recalls going to kindergarten for a period of time when his mother started working, but he does not remember how long this period was:

3. I: Jesi ti išo u vrtić?

R: Ja sam išo u vrtić al, da, išo sam u vrtić bome, kad je mama krenula radit. Bio je jedan u haustoru nasuprot ovog, botaničkog.

I: Se sjećaš kol'ko dugo?

R: Ne, kad je to bilo, nemam pojma (smijeh).

After kindergarten, the respondent started primary school. At the time of moving, the respondent was eight years old and he finished his second grade:

4. I: Znači, spomenuo si da si išo prvi i drugi razred tu u školu.

R: Mhm, u Gundulićevu.

I: Ok, znači prva dva razreda osnovne škole, to si tu završio?

R: Da.

When asked about the time when he found out about moving, the respondent recalls that it was a difficult period for him, not only because of moving to London, but also because his grandfather (with whom he was very close) had passed away:

5. I: Taj period kad ste se selili ustvari gore, znači imo si osam godina, kol'ko se dobro tog dijela sjećaš?

R: Jako dobro, jer hm, ja sam bio jako vezan za svog djeda. I on je taman umro kad sam imo osam godina, kad smo išli gore i ja sam tu godinu bio, onak, u komi. Ja sam... plako, ja mislim, dobrih šest mjeseci, ovaj, a i to je bilo onak promjena okoline, zemlje... Ja nisam zapravio ni htio ić, jer roditelji su me, ovaj, posjeli, pokušali mi objasniti da ćemo ić kao u Englesku, ja nisam to htio, napustiti prijatelje... tak standardno.

I: Ok, znači, kad si saznao da se selite, nije ti to baš sjelo?

R: Nije mi sjelo, ne. (...)

At the age of eight, the respondent was coping not only with his unwillingness to change the familiar scenery, his school and his friends, but also with the loss of a loved one. This made the move even more difficult and emotionally challenging. However, his unwillingness to leave his friends behind also signifies that he understood what it means to move away to London, and he also understood that in the new country people do not speak the same language as in Croatia. He was familiar with the English language because he had spent two years learning it in a foreign language school:

6. I: Kad ste se trebali preseliti, jesi znao da gore ljudi ne pričaju hrvatski?

R: Mmm... Ja sam ti ovdje išao u Varšavsku, znači kak sam išo u osnovnu školu dvije godine tak su me roditelji dali u Varšavsku na engleski.

I: Znači, Varšavska je trajala dvije godine?

R: Da.

I: To je ovo, u stilu, privatna škola stranih jezika?

R: Ma da, privatna škola engleskog jezika, s tim da sam uvijek am, bio nestašan što se tog tiče, kad sam bio klinac, ovaj, tak da, ja bi uvijek pričao sa drugima na nastavi, pola uha bi imo samo na profesoru i šta priča ali uvijek sam bio spreman s pravim odgovorom, kad sam bio mladi. Kad sam bio stariji sam izgubio tu, ovaj, sposobnost. Kad sam bio mladi sam mogo hvatat i to i to mi je baš majka pričala, to nije moja, ovaj, sjećanje, to mi je majka pričala.

Based on the accounts of his mother, the respondent admits that he did not take English lessons seriously. He also does not recall grades or any other means of assessing knowledge during that time. When it comes to learning language informally, the respondent denies having such opportunities:

7. I: Šta se tiče ovih nekih neformalnih načina, televizija, internet i slično?

R: Tad su bila dva samo programa na televiziji i to ti je sve bilo na hrvatskom, tak da na televiziji nije bilo engleskog tad, barem ja ne pamtim.

Amidst the conversation about the period before moving to London and his familiarity with the English language at the time, the respondent suddenly recalls his first memory after coming to London. It is the memory of his first day in school, when he and his sister were brought in front of the school and introduced to the other children:

R: E sad, prvi dan u Engleskoj, to se sjećam, to nikad ne bum zaboravio, am, blokada mozga. Prvi dan u školi, am, znači, oni imaju svako jutro assembly gdje se cijela škola nađe u velikoj dvorani i onda ti dođe, ovaj, profesor, headmaster il tko god, ravnatelj i onda ti priča plan za taj dan. I ak će se neka dogoditi onda ti prezentira svim učenicima škole da svi znaju o čemu se radi i tak dalje. I prvi dan u školi, kak smo došli, onda su ti mene i sestru dopeljali naprijed ispred cijele škole, mi nismo znali engleski apsolutno, i onda su nas predstavili cijeloj školi. I onda, kak je ona četiri godine mlada od mene bila, ona je bila taj neki vrtić-grupa, a ja sam već bio kao osnovna škola i onda su nas raspode... rasporedili po tim razredima di smo trebali bit i, prije nego što su mene stavili s ostatkom razreda me profesorica koja je vodila tu grupu, taj razred, me odpeljala u svoj kabinet i ja sjedim, čekam da vidim šta će bit i vidim olovku na njezinom stolu. I ja se sjetio kak se kaže pencil, pokažem prstom, kažem pencil. I to je onak, ostala, ovaj, sjećanje...

I: Je l' to bilo... bio trenutak sreće jer si se sjetio ili?

R: Pa, trenutak sreće, onak, dvije godine Varšavske – pencil (smijeh)!

Although he had spent two years learning English in a foreign language school, he was unable to use it upon arriving to London. After seeing a familiar object, a pencil, and remembering the English word for it, he felt relieved, because it was the only familiar thing in a situation where everything else was completely new and unknown to him. Based on his experience, he regards his knowledge of English language as almost non-existent at that point:

8. I: Mm, ako bi sad, ako bi te tražila da ocijeniš svoj engleski kad si otišo gore, nakon te dvije godine Varšavske, s kol'ko bi se ocijenio?

R: Pencil – jedan (smijeh). Ak ne i nulu (smijeh).

Other than not being able to speak, the respondent also negates being able to understand it. Therefore, his communication with other people was based on gestured, mimics, pointing and using pictures. In some cases, the respondent would remember that he learned some of the words before, in the foreign language school:

9. I: S obzirom na te dvije godine u Varšavskoj, jesi razumio šta su oni pričali?

R: Mislim da ne. Fakat ne. Kažem, i oni su s nama komunicirali sa pokazivanjem, sa slikicama, tak da...

I: Znači, prilagodili su se?

R: Da. Mislim, kad ti neko, znači, Englez mali oće nešto reć, ti ne kužiš pa ga pogledaš ko bedaka, onda ti on počne pričat šta hoće, recimo za ovu Hipp kaže jar. Jar. I onda bilo je situacija gdje smo mi učili vokabular taj u Varšavskoj, ja se nisam mogo prije toga toga sjetit ali ako bi on spomenuo i pokazo sa slikom, onda ok. I tak je to krenulo sve.

This account is also an example of convergence. The respondent recounts that his interlocutors adjusted their speech so that he would be able to understand them. In other words, they made an effort to make their language behaviour more similar to the respondent's. Furthermore, this is an example of downward (as opposed to upward) convergence, because the interlocutors would adopt less prestigious patterns of using language.

When it comes to his parents, he remembers that his father knew English well, while his mother had no knowledge of it and, therefore, attended English language courses in London. He does not remember how long his mother attended the language course, but states that she learned English enough to be able to communicate, as well as to attend other courses which were not related to language:

10. I: Kol'ko si upućen u to kol'ko su oni, znači tvoji roditelji, kol'ko su oni znali engleski? Prije nego što ste se preselili?

R: Majka ništa, majka je išla na tečajeve engleskog u Engleskoj a otac je znao engleski i, pa, zato je dobio, ovaj, poziciju u engleskoj poslovnicu.

I: Je l' znaš možda kol'ko je taj tečaj na koji je tvoja mama gore išla, jel znaš kolko dugo je to trajalo?

R: Ne znam. Al' znam da je uvijek išla na neki tečaj kad je završio taj tečaj sa jezikom je krenula na tečaj Autocada, za crtanje na kompjuteru, tak da... Uvijek je išla na neke tečajeve.

I: Dobro, onda pretpostavljam da je dobro savladala engleski ako je nakon jezičnog tečaja mogla dalje?

R: Da. Iako dan danas, kak smo sestra i ja naučili engleski, onda nekad znamo kolutat očima jer,

am, kod starijih ljudi ostane onaj naglasak pa ne... Ono, malo smo prekritični što se tiče roditelja u tom pogledu (smijeh).

I: Je l' to samo što se naglaska tiče ili ima i nekih gramatičkih...?

R: Am, pa fora je u tome što, kak imam dva strica u Njemačkoj, oni su se oženili za Njemice, i onda su roditelji dosta komunicirali na njemačkom, i onda mami se zna dogoditi da počne miješati njemački i engleski, da, tak da... Ima tih kombinacija raznih.

The respondent says that his mother's English was good enough to attend and successfully finish courses that were not related to language, but also admits that he and his sister criticized (and still criticize) her pronunciation. The respondent believes this is something that happens generally when people start learning foreign languages at an older age, and this can be brought into correlation with the critical period hypothesis. Furthermore, the respondent explains that, before learning English, his mother knew German and used it to communicate with her family in Germany. Mixing these two languages reported by the respondent is an example of language interference.

After the initial shock on the first day of school, the respondent was appointed a class and he started the process of adjusting to the new environment, as well as acquiring English. In the beginning, he was unable to participate in classroom activities as any other child, so he participated in those activities where it was possible for him to take part, and spent the rest of the time learning English through special notebooks and pictures:

11. I: S obzirom da si tu išo u drugi razred, di su oni tebe stavili?

R: Oni su mene stavili u normalni razred s Englezima, svojim vršnjacima...ali ja...

I: Isto stari?

R: Isti, isto stari i, am, za aktivnosti gdje sam mogao sudjelovati, tipa gdje se nešto moralo raditi tralala, oni nisu imali ko kod nas da te drilaju u školi nego bile su razne aktivnosti, onda, za te aktivnosti gdje sam mogao sudjelovati jesam, ali u principu ja bi dobivao, am, bilježnice, sa, am, nacrtanim kao sličicama i onda crta ispod i onda sam trebao napisati šta je to na slici i tak sam ja zapravo učio engleski kroz te, bilo je pet, šest ja mislim bilježnica.

I: Znači, bile su bilježnice sa sličicama i učio si riječi s...pomoću tih...?

R: Tako je, kad bi riješio to, onda sam imo još jednu baš teku u koju sam pisao riječi kad smo ih...kad sam ih učio i onda bi to drilao doma kao vokabular.

The process of acquiring English in this case was very interesting and somewhat atypical. The respondent was immersed in an all-English environment which inevitably had a significant impact on the process of learning the language, but at the same time he was learning it through formal education, using special notebooks to learn new words, and making list of words that he would later learn by heart. Furthermore, since his studying consisted of looking

at different pictures and/or writing down words, he recounts his difficulties with writing the word 'because':

R: Sjećam se, najviše problema sam imo sa riječi because, kak se piše. To je ostalo u sjećanju. I interesantno je, kad pišem na engleskom, onda si slovkam na hrvatskom. Znači ja neću, ammmm, spelat na engleskom nego ću na... razmišljam si b-e-c-a-u-s-e. I tak, ja sam tak učio jer sam znao hrvatski i učio sam engleski na taj način i tak mi je ostalo. Kad trebam spelat onda baš moram onak, ide mi sporo i onda moram razmišljat.

Having first learned Croatian, where words are written as they are pronounced, the respondent thought it illogical to pronounce a word in one way and then write it in another. Also, although the respondent mastered English in a short period (as it is going to be presented in the thesis later on), he never got used to spelling in English, but keeps spelling letters as one does in Croatian. During the initial period, when he was still unable to communicate in English, the respondent remembers other, non-verbal ways of communication that he used, but also mentions the feeling of frustration caused by his inability to express himself properly:

12. I: Tih prvih dana, kad je, kad je vokabular se tvoj svodio na pencil, kak je izgledala tvoja komunikacija s...s učiteljicom, sa ostalom djecom?

R: Mmmm, pokazivanje rukama. Dosta frustracije sigurno (smijeh). Am, navodno su mi roditelji bili pozvani u školu, am, zato što kako je bilo frustracija da se ne možemo sporazumijeti a ja sam bio mali nasilnik onda su roditelji bili pozvani u školu na razgovor i onda kad su završili taj razgovor su me posjeli za stol i rekli su mi da sramotim Hrvate i Hrvatsku (smijeh) i tak dalje, tak da, malo sam se skulirao poslje toga.

Although he does not remember specific occasions on which frustration led to conflicts between him and other children, he remembers that this was what caused his parents being called in for a conversation regarding his attitude. But regardless of the difficulties that he was faced with, he was able to acquire English enough to be able to communicate with other people in a very short time:

13. R: Pa meni nije dugo trebalo, kol'ko pamtim, da propričam, možda tri-četiri mjeseca. Jer jednostavno kad si među vršnjacima onda ti i oni isto pomažu. Onda oni isto ponavljaju, nije samo da ti sam radiš na nečemu nego te zapravo cijela okolina uvuče i pomaže. Mislim, da sad čovjek ode u njemačku sredinu, pokupio bi njemački. Samo ovisi koliko se zapravo krećeš u tom kolektivu koji komunicira na tom jeziku. Mislim, ak se ti odeš u Njemačku družiti sa Hrvatima, nećeš pokupiti engleski, ovaj, njemački. Ista stvar ovdje. Znači ja sam bio stavljen u sredinu gdje su bili samo, ovaj, ljudi koji pričaju engleski i pokupi se brzo. Još dok si klinac, na igralištu, brzo to ide.

The respondent firmly believes that being put in a situation where he was surrounded by English was one of the most important factors in his acquisition of the language. Furthermore, he believes that this is not the case only for him, but that it is a universal phenomenon. However, he states that if a person comes to a different country or a setting where a different language is spoken, the person won't learn the language if he/she doesn't communicate in that language. Moreover, the respondent believes that age was also a very important factor, which is in correlation with the critical period hypothesis. Being in an English-speaking community also provided the respondent with multiple sources of language-helpers -- his parents, teachers, and peers:

14. I: U ovom početnom periodu, kad si još učio engleski, kad nisi još skroz propričo engleski, jel bila neka specifična osoba koju si pito, koja ti je pomagala?

R: U školi bi pito profesoricu. Doma bi pito roditelje. Mislim, oni su isto imali rječnike tamo pa onda nije bio problem listat.

I: Ok, znači, učiteljica ti je u biti bila taj izvor?

R: Da. Na satu. Van sata sigurno vršnjaci.

The respondent's peers did not just help him by answering his questions, saying what is the proper word for something or explaining something he did not understand. They also helped by correcting his mistakes:

15. I: Jesu te drugi, recimo u školi, djeca, učiteljica, jesu te ispravljali kad si neš krivo reko?

R: Sigurno, sigurno. Sto posto. Ja se ne sjećam ali sto posto. Jer...ali...kažem, svi su bili vrlo dobronamjerni i onda te u pozitivnom smislu idu ispravljat, nije sad da ti se rugaju haha to si krivo reko nego onak ne kaže se tako, kaže se ovako. I ti, naravno, iz pristojnosti, iz pokušaja asimilacije ispraviš sam sebe, sljedeći put ne napraviš tu grešku.

The respondent does not have specific memories of situations when other people or children corrected him, but he does remember the overall positive atmosphere where people tried to help him by pointing to his mistakes, without making fun of his ignorance or mistakes he made.

Other than being immersed in the community and the age, the respondent also believes that one of the most important things that helped him learn English was reading:

16. R: (...) Zavolio sam čitat na engleskom kad su mi roditelji dali knjige Enid Blyton, The famous five, am, i još je bilo drugih, uglavnom, to su onak avanture klinaca i kroz te knjige sam ja učio pisati i čitat u slobodno vrijeme engleski, da. (...)

I: Ok, šta bi reko, od cijele situacije, šta ti je najviše pomoglo da to tak brzo sve lijepo savladaš?

R: Pa okolina, krasni ljudi, jako dobri prijatelji i to čitanje. Či...čitanje jako puno pomogne. Iiiii... znači mora bit volja ta. A u tim knjigama onak ko klinac baš hoćeš saznat šta se dogodi sljedeće u knjizi i onda imaš tu volju čitat.

I: To samo za čitanje, ta volja? Ili općenito za učenjem jezika?

R: Pa to kad čitaš, što se tiča knjiga onda samo za čitanje. A u komunikaciji, kad se igraš s nekim, onda pričaš kol'ko možeš pričat, a ako dođeš do nekog pojma koji ti je ne...nejasan, onda ti svakako druga strana isto pokuša objasniti što bolje, jer onda možeš nastaviti se igrati, tečnije se igraš i... Da.

The respondent highlights the importance of one's own willingness to achieve something, in this case to find out what happens next in the book or to continue playing with one's friends. In other words, he highlights the importance of motivation, which is in accordance with Lightbown and Spada (2006: 63).

Furthermore, the respondent believes that reading was especially helpful for the development of his vocabulary, and also says that reading dictionaries proved beneficial:

17. I: Jesu se znale desit opet situacije da ne znaš neku riječ, da baš ne znaš za neku stvar kak se to točno kaže na engleskom i to?

R: Ne zato što, ovaj, tad sam već čito ove knjige i ja sam kroz knjige jako, ovaj, vokabular pokupio. I kad smo se vratili ovdje u srednju školu sam imao naviku čitati dictionary. Znači ja sam iz gušta čito dictionary.

Having mastered the language, the respondent's everyday life changed. He began feeling as a part of the group and his frustration stopped. After acquiring the language, he was able to develop deeper relationships with people around him:

18. I: Nakon ta tri-četiri mjeseca kad si propričo engleski, jesi se osjećo, am, malo bolje integrirano?

R: Pa jesam, da da da, i integrirano i zadovoljniji je čovjek s tim naravno. Možeš onda razvijati i prijateljstva konkretna jer znaš jezik. Jer ti ne možeš razvit nekakvo prijateljstvo dok još gestikuliraš samo. Znači uz jezik ide sve. Baš normalizacija života.

19. I: Na koji način ti se u tom trenutku kad si mogo se svakodnevno izražavat na engleskom, kak ti se promijenila svakodnevica u školi?

R: Sve je bilo lakše, lakše sve možeš pratit, sudjelovat, normalni život se nastavlja. Znači, normalni život je bio pauziran dok se jezik ne pohvata. Čim pohvataš jezik, sve ide dalje svojim tokom.

I: Jesu tu one bilježnice nestale?

R: Da, da. Znači to, kad se to usavršilo onda je krenulo normalno praćenje nastave, sve ono što su drugi radili to sam i ja mogo radit i pratit.

He not only felt better integrated into the society, but also felt that he could then finally live a normal life. He considers learning a language as a prerequisite for being able to do anything

else, for example, develop relationships with other people, make friends, etc. Another major difference after he had learned the language was school, where he did not have to use special notebooks anymore, but instead did everything that other children in the classroom did as well.

The respondent acquired English, but he also continued to use and develop his Croatian in different situations. Formally, he attended a special school, which was organised every Saturday morning from 8 to 12 for all children from Yugoslavia, which still existed at that time:

20. I: Dok si bio gore, jel bilo nekakvog učenja hrvatskog?

R: (Smijeh) Čeko sam da me to pitaš. Znači kad dođeš gore, tad je još postojala Jugoslavija. Onda da bi ti pratio, am, razrede u Jugoslaviji, ti si se moro upisat u Jugoškolu. Jugoškola ti je bila svake subote, od osam do podne. I to ti je bilo, to je bilo...s obzirom da je to bila Engleska i s obzirom da je bilo više Srba u Engleskoj, onda ti je to bio srpsko-hrvatski, to nije bio hrvatski. Ovaj, i, am, i to ti je bilo, kol'ko, am, mislim od osam do negdje deset sati bi bio predavanja, onda bi bilo pola sata odmora i onda do dvanaest sati ponovno. I to je bilo baš praćenje programa hrvatske škole ali samo hrvatski jezik. To jest, jugoslavenski iliti srpsko-hrvatski, ali razlika je u tome što kod nas u tom periodu se ćirilica učila u trećem razredu. S obzirom da je gore više bilo Srba onda su oni zahtijevali da se zna ćirilica iz prvog razreda. Ja nisam imo pojma ćirilicu, ja dan danas, možda se sjetim napisat svoje ime na ćirilici, ali meni je mama u bilježnici pisala na latinici između redaka da mogu čitat i pratit nastavu, da varam.

I: Znači to je bilo obavezno?

R: To je bilo obavezno.

In contrast to Starčević 2014, Saturday school in London was not organized specifically for Croatian children, but for children from the whole of Yugoslavia. The language that the respondent learned was Serbo-Croatian, which reflected the higher number of Serbian children in London. Since Croatian and Serbian language have different scripts (Latin and Cyrillic), the respondent had trouble learning the Cyrillic script. Apart from Saturday school, the respondent's family was in contact with other Croatian families in London, and every Sunday they had the opportunity to attend Sunday masses in Croatian:

21. I: Jeste se gore, am, onak ko obitelj možda družili s nekom drugom obitelji koja isto se doselila?

R: Da, ovi Hrvati koji su došli u Jugoškolu, njihov otac je radio u (...), bio je predstavnik (...) i onda smo se s njima družili. Praktički svi ostali su bili ili Srbi ili Makedonci, a nismo imali baš previše kontakta s njima. I bilo je isto, ovaj, am, hrvatska misija. Znači, am, svake nedjelje bi bila misa na hrvatskom. Am, znači, bio je jedan svećenik, don Drago, on ti je imo svoju, ovaj, kuću

koju je rentao i onda bi u jednoj prostoriji držao mise svake nedjelje u centru Londona i onda bi svi Hrvati kao išli kod njega jer je to baš bilo za nas Hrvate.

Unlike Saturday school, Sunday masses were organized specifically for Croatian people living in London, and provided a chance to meet and communicate with other Croatian people there.

After the respondent acquired English enough for everyday communication, he was able to keep up with everything in school as any other English child. His knowledge of English was no longer being brought into question. However, the respondent feels that, because of the fact that he was an immigrant from another country, his mathematical skills were underestimated:

22. I: Dok si bio gore, je li se sjećao da je bila neka situacija čak i nakon što si pripričo da se tvoj znanje engleskog nije smatralo dovoljno dobrim jer su znali ljudi da nisi iz Engleske?

R: Ne, ne. Stvar engleskog - ne, stvar matematike – da. Am, jer tamo u školi u kojoj sam završio, išao sam tamo u tri škole. U ovoj zadnjoj u kojoj sam bio, oni su imali gradirane razrede znači, am, nije bio fiksni razred nego se, am, razred mijenjao ovisno o grupama i o predmetu koji se sluša. Znači, am, to su bile houses, bilo je am devet kao houses i onda bi rasporedili učenike po tim houses i, am, onda bi, am, djeca iz tih houses išli u razrede, ovaj, nevezano za te kuće u kojima su bili. Ali, opet, ti razredi bi se, am, dijelili po, recimo, predmetu ovisno o tome koliko se dobro čovjek snalazi, recimo, u matematici. I mene bi uvijek stavili u najnižu grupu, za najlošije matematičare i ja bi se uvijek morao izboriti za dalje. I onda bi ti oni pratili kako napreduješ i ovisno o tome ako su te stavili u lošiju grupu, ako pre, ovaj, brzo rješavaš probleme koje ti daju, zadaju, onda bi te, ovaj, stavljali u naprednije, sve naprednije grupe, tak da, bilo je dosta, ovaj, zbrke.

I: Znači automatski su te uvijek stavljali u najnižu?

R: U najnižu i onda bi se izborio do najviše ili druge najviše i tak.

I: Jel bilo neke...na koji način se ta selekcija vršila? U početku, na temelju čega su vas oni svrstali?

R: Ne znam, ja mislim da je to bilo proizvoljno na početku. Mislim da nismo rješavali nikakve testove prije da bi nas po tom testu, kao, išli svrstavati. Nego vjerojatno su rekli ovaj vjerojatno ne zna pa ćemo ga staviti a onda za dva tjedna ako vidimo da je predober u tome ćemo ga staviti u neku drugu grupu.

This extract also provides an insight into the English educational system, which is very different from Croatian. Apart from organizing classes differently, the way in which the material is learned is not the same as in Croatian, especially when it comes to languages. The respondent learned German and French as additional foreign languages during his life in London, but the difference between the educational systems affected every language, including Croatian, when he came back to Croatia:

23. I: A, am, gore si učio te strane jezike jer je to, to si htio, ili je to bilo obavezno?

R: Pa, Englezi, ovaj, am, vole učit francuski, jer im je to i povijesno, oni su jako povijesno povezani sa Francuskom i onda je to...i draži im je francuski nego njemački. Nisu baš ljubitelji Nijemaca, mislim, ne vole baš ni Francuze, ali (smijeh) ako moraju birati između Francuza i Njemaca, izabrat će Francuze. I tamo se drugačije uči jezik. Znači tamo učiš jezik po frazama. Znači ti dobiš fraze koje se koriste u određenoj situaciji i onda tako te drilaju. A kod nas je to totalno drugačije, kod nas te drilaju prvo gramatika, vokabular i sve odvojeno. Tak da sam pristup učenju jezika je kompletno drugačiji bio.

I: Je l' ti lakše bilo učit strane jezike gore ili tu?

R: Gore, jer učiš fraze. I, am, ja se nisam gore apsolutno susreto sa gramatikom. Am, kad smo se vratili, mene su roditelji upisali ovdje u prvi srednje, ovaj, u tu jezičnu gimnaziju di sam imo hrvatski, imo sam latinski, imo sam engleski, imo sam francuski. Četiri jezika, svi su zahtijevali da znam hrvatsku gramatiku, i sve ostale gramatike. Ja se nisam to tad susreto uopće sa gramatikom. Ja sam prve tri godine srednje škole išo intenzivno na instrukcije gramatike, dva put tjedno. Tak da sam prvi srednje završio latinski jedinica, francuski jedinica. Onda sam moro ići na popravni.

I: Sve zbog te razlike u pristupima?

R: Razlika u pristupima, količina gradiva, četrnaest predmeta razlika od šest, am, i, onak, dok se ne prilagodi čovjek, recimo drugi srednje sam završio samo sa jednom jedinicom ali iz matematike. Znači, znači već nakon te godine dana sam ja pohvatao, ovaj, manje-više se prilagodio. Treći i četvrti razred sam završio bez problema. Znači, to je baš bila ta prilagodba.

According to the respondent, the biggest difference when it comes to learning languages in Croatia and England is the way grammar is taught. In other words, in the Croatian educational system emphasis is put on grammar, while in the English educational system emphasis is put on vocabulary. Therefore, the respondent could not keep up with the other children when he came back to Croatia, and required additional classes which were specifically based on learning grammar. Additionally, his adjustment to school back in Croatia was also hindered by the number of school subjects, which was more than double compared to England.

During their life in London, the respondent and his family maintained the routine of speaking Croatian whenever they were together:

24. I: Jesi, kroz cijeli vaš boravak gore, jesi cijelo vrijeme sa svojim pričo na hrvatskom?

R: Da.

I: Jesi, kad si došo, kad si tek počeo to sve učit, jesi miješo hrvatski i engleski?

R: Mislim da ne. Jer sam doma pričao na hrvatskom, a vani, u svijetu na engleskom. I doma bi na engleskom se svado sa sestrom. Da. Ali inače sa roditeljima i unutar četiri zida, na hrvatskom.

The respondent and his family had a more or less clear separation of when to use which language. Their home language was Croatian, which is an example of additive bilingualism.

However, the respondent also mentions that he would fight with his sister in English and then further elaborates on this:

25. R: (...) mi kad se svađamo, mi se uvijek svađamo na engleskom.

I: I danas?

R: I danas, uvijek. Od tad.

Although the respondent is clear about using Croatian as a means of communication within his family throughout their stay in London, English was used in fights with his sister, which is an example of situation-specific code-switching. Code-switching would also happen in situations where other people (who were not speakers of Croatian) were present in their company, which is an example of situational code-switching:

26. I: Znači sa svojimima si koristio hrvatski, jeste uvijek pričali, recimo ako ste bili na nekom javnom mjestu, jeste svejedno između sebe pričali hrvatski?

R: Uvijek.

I: Je l' se znalo desiti da pričate hrvatski međusobno i kad ste bili u društvu Engleza ili nekih drugih stranaca?

R: Ne, to je nepristojno, to općenito, to je stvar kulture. Nećeš ti sad pričati... I jedino ako ne znaš nešto reći na engleskom, onda ćeš pričati sa roditeljima na materinjem jeziku i onda dok oni ne kažu ili ako oni tebe pitaju ako ti znaš bolje engleski od njih kako bi se nešto reklo onda ti samo kažeš na engleskom.

If someone else was present in their company, the respondent and his family switched to English because they believed it would be impolite to speak a language someone in their company cannot understand. Therefore, although they normally spoke Croatian to each other, they would switch to English if there was someone else present. When they moved back to Croatia, their routine of speaking Croatian to each other reversed; they started speaking to each other in English. This was the case with both his parents and his sister, regardless of there being a fight or not:

27. I: Kad ste se vratili, kažeš da misliš da ti je engleski bio tad bolji od hrvatskog. Jesi ga dalje ovdje nastavio koristiti svakodnevno?

R: Doma da. Jer ono što bi bila situacija u Engleskoj da smo pričali na hrvatskom, sad se promijenila situacija, znači, sad bi vani pričao na hrvatskom svugdje a doma na engleskom.

I: S kim?

R: Sa roditeljima i sa sestrom. Znači, neg...nismo se samo svađali na engleskom sad sestra i ja nego bi općenito, ovaj, komunicirali na engleskom. Jedino sa bakom i didom smo pričali na hrvatskom. To jest, sa bakom.

I: Je l' to bila stvar dogovora da vam ostane taj engleski ili je to bilo spontano?

R: Ne, to je bilo jednostavno spontano.

In the case of this family, the language they spoke to each other and language of the environment were in a complementary relationship. When the language of their environment was English, they spoke to each other in Croatian, but when the language of their environment became Croatian, they started speaking English to each other.

At the moment of moving back to Croatia, the respondent rates his proficiency in English as perfect, and, additionally, as better than in Croatian:

28. I: Kad si došo nazad u Hrvatsku, kol'ka bi sad tu bila ocjena za tvoj engleski?

R: Znači, to bi bilo...desetke sve. Ne pet, neg deset. Sad mi je pet, a onda sam puno bolje baratao.

I: Jesi bio bolji u engleskom ili u hrvatskom tad?

R: Engleskom. Daleko bolji u engleskom, i dan danas sam daleko bolji u engleskom.

Although the respondent has not reported having the feeling of losing his Croatian during his life in London, he reports having the feeling of losing English after moving back to Croatia:

29. I: Jesi imo kad dojam da si zaboravio malo hrvatski gore?

R: Ne, hrvatski ne ali imo sam užasan dojam da sam zaboravio engleski kad sam se vratio ovdje. I kroz srednju školu i na fakultetu. To sam imo...i dan danas mislim da sam bio puno tečniji na engleskom tad i to je, to sam izgubio kroz školovanje ovdje. Treba mi par dana onak prilagodbe kad odem recimo u Englesku da počnem ponovo tečno pričat.

As already mentioned, the respondent was fourteen years old when his family moved back to Croatia. Right after moving back, his parents enrolled him into a grammar school with a bilingual program. He made mistakes while speaking Croatian, but in contrast to the situation in London, his peers did not correct his mistakes, so he was often unaware of them:

30. I: A kad si došo u srednju?

R: Kad sam došo u srednju, ne pamtim takve stvari. To je više bilo ak sam nešto krivo reko da bi se svi grohotom nasmijali i idemo dalje, niko ne bi, ovaj, ispravio, da, nego haha nešto je smiješno reko i... Al to je opet, pubertetlije, drugi mentalitet i tak.

I: Dobro, je l' ti to smetalo ili, ono, je i tebi bilo smiješno?

R: Pa...ak bi ja nešto krivo reko i svi bi se nasmijali ja bi mislio da sam neš smiješno reko, ne bi ja mislio da sam krivo nešto rekao. I onda ni ne znaš da krivo kažeš, tak da...to onak ignorance is bliss (smijeh).

On the other hand, he used his knowledge of English to correct other people's English, especially his English teacher, who disliked such practices:

31. I: Am, je l' bilo nekih reakcija profesora na tu...na to tvoje tečnost kad koristiš engleski? Pozitivno, negativno?

R: Negativna. Profesorica engleskog nije voljela, ovaj, kad smo ju ispravljali. Znači nisam ja bio jedini koji se vratio iz...izvana, bili su ova dva frenda pa je bio jedan dečko koji je iz Amerike koji se vratio, bilo nas je više. I onda kad bi mi ispravljali profesoricu to njoj nikako dobro sjelo. (...)

I: Dobro, kako je izgledalo to vaše ispravljenje?

R: Pa, onak, pristojno, digli bi ruku i rekli bi.

Furthermore, although his proficiency in English was almost native-like at that time, he was unable to have an excellent grade in English during high school. According to the respondent, it was because of his inability to write fast enough and to successfully write a dictation:

R: Svaki ispit, am, iz gramatike, bi ja imao pet ali sporo sam pisao, i mene je diktat uvijek rušio. Ja bi uvijek u diktatu imao prvu rečenicu zapisanu i zadnju. Ovo između ne bi mogo pohvatat nikako. I diktat bi mi uvijek rušio ocjenu u engleskom, tak da ja nisam imo pet iz engleskom nikako. Zbog diktata. A to nije vezano za jezik nego za sposobnost pisanja, dal možeš brzo pisat.

When it comes to Croatian, the respondent believes that he has never perfected it, although it is his native language. Today, his wife is the one who most often points out his mistakes, which happen in both grammar and vocabulary:

32. I: Je l' misliš da, zbog toga jer si baš u tom periodu u kojem si bio živio u Velikoj Britaniji, da neke stvari u hrvatskom nisi onak, do kraja, usavršio?

R: Sigurno, sigurno.

I: Je l' to osjetiš, onak, na dnevnoj bazi?

R: Da, jer supruga mi stalno to, ovaj, spočitava neke stvari.

I: Je l' to više gramatika, vokabular?

R: Gramatika i vokabular jednako, s tim da supruga mi je grammar nazi tako da, onak, svaku sitnicu, ovaj, spominje.

Additionally, the respondent regularly switches between different codes, mainly in everyday conversations with his wife. They switch mainly between Croatian and English, but sometimes include French as well:

I: Kad pričaš s (...), pričate na hrvatskom, na engleskom?

R: Nekad na hrvatskom, nekad na engleskom, nekad na francuskom. Ovisno, al to bude onak po jedna rečen...francuski bude po jedna rečenica, ovaj, al pret...engleski i hrvatski...kad pričamo onda pričamo kompletno u tom jeziku, da. Znači ako imamo ovaj razgovor na engleskom onda ga vodimo na engleskom, nekad na hrvatskom, na hrvatskom a nekad se zna dogoditi da, kažem, pola rečenice bude na hrvatskom druga polovica na engleskom. Al to se i njoj događa, ne samo meni.

I: Je l' to, to prebacivanje, je l' to uvjetovano bilo čim, ili to jednostavno kak vam dođe?

R: Mmm, to kak nam dođe. Nem...nema nekog pravila tu. S tim da, kažem, ja sam odrasto gore, ona je cijeli život ovdje, tak da...kod nje je to, ne znam, drugačije.

In this case, code-switching is not conditioned by any specific factors. It happens spontaneously both to him and to his wife, although she has never lived abroad. However, the respondent singles out one specific situation in which he believes is crucial not to switch between languages, and that is a job interview:

33. I: Je l' ima nekih situacija da baš paziš da ne, da ne pomiješaš jezike?

R: Da! Tipa razgovor za posao. (smijeh) Tu je uvijek jako važno imati odvojeno. Da, pa tak je situacija, inače ne, jer svi razgovori su onak s prijateljima i to manje-više, am, razumijemo se, ne.

This is an example of symbolic code-switching, but also the monoglossic ideology. By maintaining a monoglossic conversation with a possible employer, one is more likely to appear more suitable for the job.

Croatian is the language used most on a daily basis by the respondent:

34. I: Koji jezik koristiš više na dnevnoj bazi?

R: Sad hrvatski. Ali kažem, još uvijek čitam knjige na engleskom, mislim, televizija se gleda na engleskom, internet opet engleski...

Today, the respondent uses Croatian more often than English, but emphasizes that English nonetheless surrounds him through reading and technology. When it comes to language dominance, the respondent says it is English:

I: Za koji bi reko, hrvatski ili engleski, da ti je dominantan?

R: Ja mislim da mi je engleski sad već postao... Jer kažem, am, imam veći vokabular engleskog neg hrvatskog. Lakše se izražavam na engleskom.

The respondent believes English is his dominant language because his vocabulary is more advanced in English than in Croatian, and he finds it easier to express himself in English. Furthermore, the respondent brings his proficiency in Croatian into correlation with coming across as intelligent:

R: Hrvatski, hm... Općenito, mm, kad pričam treba mi malo vremena da si posložim što hoću reći, nisam baš rječit kad pričam. Morao bi onak dobro pet minuta razmislit šta hoću reć da ispadnem donekle inteligentan (smijeh).

The respondent believes that, without focusing on what he is going to say, his Croatian is not good enough and he does not sound smart enough using it, which is again an example of the standard language ideology.

In everyday communication, the respondent spontaneously switches between English and Croatian, but believes that people should keep different languages separate:

35. I: U svakodnevnom govoru, ovak doma, na kavi, bilo di, je l' miješaš hrvatski i engleski?

R: Nekad da. Zna mi se dogodit da jednu cijelu rečenicu kažem na hrvatskom ali jednu riječ u toj rečenici onak na sredini ispalim na engleskom. I obrnuto.

I: To automatski?

R: Da, ne razmišljam o tome, to samo izleti.

I: Dobro, jel misliš da je to ok, to šta miješaš?

R: Pa ne baš (smijeh). Jer trebalo bi se imati odvojeno to, ovaj... I navodno djeca koja uče dva jezika od najranijih nogu ako recimo imaju dvoje roditelja, da je jedno recimo Hrvat drugo Englez, am, kad uče recimo sestra konkretno, ovaj, njezina djeca, ona isključivo priča na hrvatskom sa djecom a njezin muž isključivo na engleskom. I kažu da dijete kad navrší tri godine već mu se odvoje ta dva jezika i može tečno na jednom i na drugom ovaj, sam... bez miješanja pričat sa roditeljima, da. Al kažem, do treće godine, dok je to još izmiješano, ne funkcioniра.

As already mentioned, the respondent's family spent six years in London, then four years in Croatia, after which they decided to move to London again, but this time the respondent stayed behind to attend and finish college. His sister, however, went again to London, finished her education there, and then married and had children. When it comes to her children and languages, she decided that she would speak to them only in Croatian, while her partner speaks to them only in English. Based on the assumption that children can separate two different languages at the age of three, the respondent believes that people should not mix different languages in everyday communication, which is an example of the monoglossic ideology.

When it comes to other people's reactions to his language mixing, the respondent singles out his accent:

36. I: Uporaba tvog engleskog na svakodnevnoj bazi, je li izazivala nekakve reakcije kod drugih ljudi?

R: Neam pojma. Am, možda utoliko što kod nas više forsiraju američki naglasak a ja imam britanski. Kad ja pričam onda je to malo čudnije za čut nego...kad drugi pričaju.

This is an interesting result because teaching English in Croatia is based on British English. On the other hand, American English is much more present via television and the internet and people are much more used to hearing an American than a British accent. This area is underresearched in Croatia and provides an opportunity for further investigation.

Lastly, having mastered English, the respondent became a fluent speaker of two languages, Croatian and English, which he still is today. Based on Weinreich's definition, this classifies the respondent as a bilingual. However, the respondent himself is not convinced that he really is one:

37. I: Jel' bi za sebe reko da si bilingvalna osoba?

R: Kako koji dan. Hmm, s obzirom da sam ja išao u Englesku sa osam godina, a hrvatski mi je materinji, ja sam onaj ključni period kad zapravo se razvija vokabular u jeziku...meni je engleski nekad puno lakši nego hrvatski. I puno sam rječitiji na engleskom nego na hrvatskom. Možda bi

se...ne bi bilo, ovaj, točno reći da sam *bilingual* nego prije bi bilo da sam jači u engleskom nego u hrvatskom.

I: Mh, mh, znači engleski ipak malo prevladava?

R: Da, iako mi je materinji hrvatski, što je fascinantna situacija.

Although he is able to use, and uses, both of these two languages in everyday communication without any difficulties, he does not consider himself a bilingual. The reason for this is that he believes he is more fluent in English than he is in Croatian. This is an example of the monolingual view on bilingualism, where a bilingual is seen as two monolingual persons in one.

6. Conclusion

The respondent in this case study is a bilingual individual who started learning the second language at the age of eight, during the critical or sensitive period for second language acquisition. Having moved from Croatia to Great Britain without knowing how to speak English at that age, the respondent experienced feelings of confusion, fear and frustration until he mastered the language. His frustration, brought about by his inability to communicate in English, sometimes led to conflicts with members of the English-speaking community. This is an important result because it shows that conflicts between people can stem from issues related to language, such as one's level of proficiency, and it is also evidence of how closely intertwined language and society are. Since the respondent started learning English at a young age, he was able to acquire it fully and achieve a high level of proficiency. Other than age, motivation is shown to have a significant impact on the process of acquisition, especially in terms of society and developing (and maintaining) relationships with other people. In this case, this was most visible in the respondent's relationships with other children, with whom he found it difficult to connect without knowing the language. Furthermore, the results show that an encouraging and helpful community also plays an important role in acquiring a foreign language, but also in feeling accepted and integrated into the new community. Because the respondent's situation was unique, the process of learning English was somewhat atypical. He was immersed in an all-English community, which was very important for his acquisition, but he also had a special way of learning vocabulary in school; using pictures, writing down words and learning the words by heart at home. This provides us with an insight into the process of language acquisition and helps us understand the difficulties immigrant children go through in foreign schools and environments.

Additionally, the results show that, when moving from one country to another, different educational systems can either facilitate or hinder the process of adapting to the new situation. In the respondent's case, the difference between the number of school subjects and the way in which languages were learned made it more difficult to adjust once he came back to live in Croatia. While the respondent tried to learn English and adapt to life in London, he also further developed his Croatian by using it as the home language with his parents and by learning Serbo-Croatian in Saturday School. However, the respondent feels that his level of proficiency in Croatian is lower than in English, although Croatian is his mother tongue. Since he continued to use Croatian on a daily basis during his life in London, he did not feel that his Croatian deteriorated, but he felt that his English was getting worse after moving back to Croatia. Furthermore, the respondent does not consider himself to be bilingual because his level of proficiency in English is higher than in Croatian.

The results related to the process of acquiring English can be very useful for future teachers. It provides us with a possible way to deal with a child in our classroom who comes from another country and does not speak the language, but also gives us some insight into the processes and feelings that the child might experience and go through. Furthermore, the results might help teachers reflect on their practices and be more understanding in situations involving possible conflicts.

Although this study provides us with valuable information about the language learning process and bilingualism, there are some limitations that have to be taken into account. Since the respondent has been living in Croatia for the past twenty-seven years, there were some experiences and situations from the period spent in London which he does not remember anymore. In other words, some of the potentially useful data for this research is lost due to the lapse of time. Furthermore, a wider and more complete insight into the respondent's situation could be achieved by including the rest of his family in the study, especially his parent and his sister, who could provide additional information about the respondent, but also about themselves and their process of acquiring English and adjusting to life in an English-speaking country. Further research in this field could deal with interviewing whole families of larger groups of people who have experienced living in a different country, where a different language than one's native is spoken, and who then came back to live in their native country again. Additionally, based on the results obtained in the interview, further research could be done in the field of different English accents and how they are perceived by different societies and groups of speakers.

7. Abstract

This master's thesis is a case study focused on a specific language contact situation between Croatian and English. The data for the case study was collected by conducting a sociolinguistic interview with one respondent. The respondent is a forty-one-year-old male who moved to London with his family at the age of eight, right after finishing his second grade in primary school. He lived in London for six years and finished his primary school education there. At the moment of moving to London, the respondent had gone to a foreign language school and learned English for two years, but was unable to either use it or understand it. The thesis primarily deals with several processes and phenomena connected to bilingualism and the sociolinguistic conditions of second language acquisition. More specifically, the thesis deals with the ways and methods employed by the respondent in the process of acquiring English, as well as the process of integration in the new society and the interrelationship of the two developments. It explores the impact of the community on both languages, but also the impact of the different educational systems in Croatia and England. Additionally, the results show the respondent's present-day situation, e.g. the levels of proficiency in Croatian and English, his everyday use of both languages, situations in which code-switching occurs, etc. Lastly, the thesis deals with some of the most important language ideologies and the respondent's beliefs about language, on both the individual and the general level.

Key-words:

language contact, bilingualism, second language acquisition, code-switching, language ideology

8. Appendix

Interview questions:

1. LINGVISTIČKA BIOGRAFIJA

1. Koji ti je jezik materinji?
2. Koje sve jezike aktivno pričaš?
3. Jel' bi za sebe reko da si bilingvalan?
4. Koje si sve strane jezike učio i koliko dugo?
5. Kako bi ocijenio svoje znanje iz jezika koje pričaš?

2. PODRIJETLO

1. Di živiš?
2. Otkud su ti roditelji?
3. Di si živio prije nego što si krenuo u osnovnu školu?
4. Koliko si dugo živio u Velikoj Britaniji?
5. Koliko već dugo živiš u Hrvatskoj?

3. PRIJE PRESELJENJA

1. Jel' se sjećaš života u Hrvatskoj prije nego što ste se odselili?
2. Kojih uspomena se najbolje sjećaš?
3. Jesi išao u školu u Hrvatskoj prije preseljenja?
4. Jel' tvoja sestra išla ovdje u školu prije preseljenja?
5. Jesi ikad do tad bio u Velikoj Britaniji?

4. STAV PREMA PRESELJENJU

1. Koliko se dobro sjećaš perioda prije i tijekom preseljenja?
2. Jel se sjećaš odlaska?
3. Kako si se osjećao kad si saznao da ćete se preseliti u drugu državu?
4. Jel' te bilo strah otić živjet u drugu državu?
5. Kolko je tvoja sestra imala godina kad ste se preselili?
6. Kako je ona reagirala na preseljenje?

5. PRESELJENJE

1. Koliko si imao godina kad ste se preselili u Veliku Britaniju?
2. Jesi razumio što će se dogoditi?
3. Zbog čega ste se preselili u Veliku Britaniju?

4. U kojem si gradu živio u Velikoj Britaniji?
5. Jel' u gradu u kojem ste živjeli živio netko koga ste ti i tvoja obitelj već poznavali?
6. Jesi znao da ljudi tamo ne pričaju hrvatski?
7. Koja je prva uspomena koju imaš nakon dolaska u Veliku Britaniju?

6. JEZIČNO ZNANJE U TRENUTKU PRESELJENJA

1. Jesi učio engleski u školi ili na tečaju ili negdje prije nego što si se preselio?
2. A usput, preko televizije, interneta, pjesama, na neki drugi način?
3. Kako bi ocijenio svoje znanje engleskog u trenutku preseljenja?
4. Jesi učio neki drugi strani jezik u Hrvatskoj prije preseljenja?
5. Jel' hrvatski jezik bio jedini koji si tad pričao?
6. Što misliš, koliko je tvoja sestra tad znala engleski?
7. Jel' učila negdje engleski prije preseljenja?

7. RODITELJI

1. Kojim zanimanjima su se tvoji roditelji bavili prije preseljenja?
2. Koje poslove su radili u Velikoj Britaniji?
3. Jesu pričali engleski prije odlaska u Veliku Britaniju?
4. Što misliš, jel' se njima bilo lako prilagoditi na život u novoj državi?
5. Jesu imali ikakvih problema u komunikaciji s drugim ljudima na engleskom?
6. Jesu učili engleski u Britaniji, išli na neki tečaj ili slično?

8. ŠKOLA

1. Jesi odmah po dolasku u Veliku Britaniju krenuo tamo u školu?
2. S obzirom na razlike u obrazovnim sistemima, u koji razred si bio smješten?
3. Kako si se sporazumijevao s ostalom djecom i s učiteljicom?
4. Jesi mogao pričati s njima?
5. Kako si se osjećao okružen djecom koja ne govore hrvatski?

9. JEZIČNI KONFLIKT U ŠKOLI

1. Jesi se ikad našao u situaciji da želiš pričati s drugom djecom, ali ne znaš kako?
2. Što si radio u takvim situacijama?
3. Kako su druga djeca reagirala na to što ne znaš pričati engleski? Je li bilo nekih negativnih reakcija, ruganja, ismijavanja?
4. Jesi shvaćao zašto te druga djeca ne razumiju?

5. Jel' bilo situacija u kojima si ti pokušavao pričati s nekim koristeći hrvatski, a ta druga osoba je koristila engleski?

10. JEZIČNI KONFLIKT IZVAN ŠKOLE

1. Jesi imao poteškoća u sporazumijevanju s ljudima koji su govorili engleski izvan škole, npr u dućanu i slično?
2. Jesi imao nekog uz sebe tko bi ti pomagao u komunikaciji s drugim ljudima?
3. Kako su te ljudi doživljavali kad su shvatili da ne govoriš engleski (dobro)?
4. Jesi ikad bio u situaciji da je jezična barijera dovela do neke druge vrste konflikta, neke svađe ili nesuglasica s drugom djecom ili slično?
5. Jesi se osjećao manje vrijednim zbog toga što nisi govorio engleski?

11. PERCEPCIJA NE-IZVORNOG GOVORNIKA

1. Nakon koliko si vremena provedenog gore savladao engleski u dovoljnoj mjeri da ga koristiš u svakodnevnim situacijama?
2. Jel' se odnos drugih ljudi, druge djece u školi tad promijenio prema tebi?
3. Jesi ikad bio u situaciji da se tvoje znanje engleskog ipak ne smatra dovoljno dobrim jer nisi bio izvorni govornik?
4. Jel' misliš da ti je znanje engleskog omogućilo da se bolje prilagodiš u zajednicu?
5. Što si radio ako se nisi mogao sjetiti neke riječi na engleskom ili nisi znao kako se nešto kaže na engleskom?

12. JEZIČNI POMAGAČ/ODMAGAČ

1. Kad nisi znao kako se nešto kaže na engleskom, jesi imao nekoga kog si mogao pitati?
2. Jesi imao nekog tko bi ti prevodio ono što nisi znao?
3. Jesi u školi imao kakvu pomoć?
4. Jesu tvoji roditelji imali nekoga tko im je pomagao s jezikom?
5. Jeste ti ili tvoja obitelj ikad bili u situaciji da vam je netko želio pomoći u prijevodu a zapravo vam je odmogao?

13. SESTRINA ISKUSTVA

1. Kakva je situacija bila za tvoju sestru? Jeste išli u istu školu?
2. Kako se ona sporazumijevala s ostalom djecom?
3. Jel' znaš za neka negativna iskustva koja je doživjela?
4. Jel' ti ona pomagala u komunikaciji s drugima?
5. Tko je njoj pomogao?

6. Jel' misliš da je njoj bilo lakše snaći se u novoj državi?

14. OBRAZOVANJE

1. Jesi imao ikakvih problema u školi što se tiče ostalih predmeta?
2. Jesi mogao pratiti tempo drugih učenika?
3. Što misliš, kolika je u tome bila uloga jezične barijere?
4. Jesu ti druga djeca pomagala u učenju/jeziku?
5. Jesi počeo formalno učiti engleski jezik odmah kad si došao gore u školu?

15. UČENJE ENGLESKOG JEZIKA

1. Jel' se sjećaš kak je izgledalo tvoje učenje engleskog gore?
2. Jesi imao kakvih problema s usvajanjem engleskog, što ti je bilo najteže?
3. Jesi u početku miješao hrvatski i engleski?
4. Što misliš, što ti je najviše pomoglo u učenju engleskog?
5. Jesi tamo u školi učio još neki jezik osim engleskog?

16. KONTAKT S HRVATSKIM U ENGLESKOJ

1. Jesi ostao u kontaktu s prijateljima iz Hrvatske za to vrijeme dok si živio u Velikoj Britaniji?
2. Koliko si često dolazio u Hrvatsku?
3. Jesi u Britaniji učio hrvatski na bilo koji način?
4. Jel' se sjećaš koliko ti je vremena trebalo da naučiš engleski?
5. Kad si naučio engleski jezik, jesi pričao sa svojom obitelji na engleskom ili hrvatskom?
6. Jesi koristio hrvatski redovito tijekom cijelog boravka u Britaniji?
7. Jel' imaš dojam da si u nekom trenutku zaboravio nešto hrvatskog?
8. Jel' misliš da neke stvari u hrvatskom nisi nikad naučio jer u tom periodu nisi živio ovdje?

17. CODE-SWITCHING

1. Jeste ti i tvoja obitelj međusobno koristili hrvatski jezik kod kuće, na javnim mjestima ili uvijek?
2. Jeste međusobno koristili hrvatski jezik u situacijama kad su bile prisutne i osobe koje ne govore hrvatski jezik?
3. Kakve su bile reakcije tih osoba, s obzirom na to da vas nisu mogle razumjeti?

4. Jel' bilo situacija kad su drugi ljudi međusobno pričali engleski ili neki drugi strani jezik dok si ti bio prisutan, iako ih ti nisi mogao razumjeti?
5. Na koji način si to doživio?
6. Jeste u Britaniji bili u kontaktu s nekim drugim ljudima ili obiteljima koji su došli iz Hrvatske ili koji su govorili hrvatski jezik?
7. Na kojem jeziku si pričao s njima?

18. OSTALI STRANCI

1. Jel' tamo u školi bilo druge djece koja su došla iz neke druge države?
2. Jel' bilo takve djece u tvom razredu?
3. Ako da, kako su se oni prilagodili?
4. Jeste se kao obitelj družili ili upoznali s nekom drugom doseljeničkom obitelji?
5. Koliko su dobro oni pričali engleski?
6. Na kojem jeziku ste vi s njima pričali?

19. ŽIVOT U BRITANIJI

1. Dok si živio u Britaniji, jel' bilo nešto što ti se nije sviđelo?
2. Jeste se ti i tvoja obitelj osjećali prihvaćenima u društvu?
3. Jel' bilo nekih predrasuda prema vama zato što ste bili doseljenici?
4. Što misliš, koliko ljudi u Britaniji prihvaćaju strance?
5. Jeste se ti ili članovi tvoje obitelji ikad susreli s nekim problemima, teškoćama ili ograničenjima zato što ste doseljenici?

20. ISPRAVLJANJE

1. Tijekom učenja engleskog u Engleskoj, jesu te drugi ljudi ispravljali ako si nešto krivo rekao?
2. Koliko često ti se to događalo?
3. Na koji način su te drugi ispravljali?
4. Jel' to utjecalo na tvoje napredovanje u znanju engleskog?
5. Jesu drugi ljudi ikad kritizirali način na koji govoriš engleski?

21. POVRATAK U HRVATSKU

1. S koliko godina si se vratio u Hrvatsku?
2. Jel' ostanak gore ikad za tebe bio opcija?
3. Zašto si se vratio?
4. Jel' se cijela tvoja obitelj vratila?

5. Jesi ovdje išao u srednju školu?
6. Jesu te drugi doživljavali kao stranca kad si se vratio?

22. JEZIČNA PRODUKCIJA NAKON POVRATKA

1. Kako bi ocijenio svoje znanje engleskog nakon povratka u Hrvatsku?
2. Jel' misliš da si, kad si se vratio u Hrvatsku, bolje govorio engleski ili hrvatski?
3. Jesi osjećao nedostatak formalnog obrazovanja iz hrvatskog jezika kad si se vratio?
4. Jesi imao kakvih poteškoća u školi zbog toga?
5. Jesi zbog toga ikad doživio neke negativne situacije, ruganje, ismijavanje?
6. Kakve su bile reakcije drugih na to što si se vratio, odnosno što si živio u Velikoj Britaniji do tada?
7. Jesi tijekom srednje škole nastavio učiti engleski?

23. REAKCIJE PO POVRATKU

1. Kakve su bile reakcije tvojih profesora na tvoje znanje engleskog?
2. Jel' ti boravak u Engleskoj olakšao učenje jezika ovdje?
3. Jesi nastavio koristiti engleski jezik u svakodnevnom govoru?
4. Kako su drugi ljudi to doživljavali? Jel' bilo nekih negativnih reakcija?
5. Jesi ikad doživio neke negativne reakcije na to što si godinama živio u drugoj državi i što tečno govoriš neki strani jezik?
6. Jel' itko ikada dovodio u pitanje tvoju nacionalnost/nacionalnu lojalnost/pripadnost na temelju jezika?

24. NASTAVAK OBRAZOVANJA I ZAPOSLENJE

1. Što si studirao?
2. Zašto si se odlučio studirati engleski jezik?
3. Gdje trenutno radiš?
4. Koristiš engleski na poslu?
5. Koliko ti je boravak u Engleskoj pomogao pri zaposlenju?

25. SVAKODNEVNI GOVOR

1. Jel' misliš da bolje pričaš hrvatski ili engleski?
2. Koji jezik više koristiš na dnevnoj bazi?
3. Za koji jezik bi rekao da ti je dominantan?
4. Jel' ti ljepši engleski ili hrvatski?
5. Što misliš, koji je jezik lakše naučiti?

26. MIJEŠANJE JEZIKA

1. Jel miješaš hrvatski i engleski u svakodnevnom govoru?
2. Jel' misliš da je takvo miješanje različitih jezika ok?
3. Jel tvoje miješanje ta dva jezika izaziva ikakve reakcije kod drugih ljudi?
4. Jel' te itko ikad kritizirao jer koristiš engleske riječi u hrvatskom?
5. Jel' ima nekih situacija u kojima se suzdržavaš od miješanja više jezika?

27. KUĆNI JEZIK

1. Na kojem jeziku pričaš s Ivanom (suprugom)?
2. Tvoja sestra i dalje živi u Engleskoj?
3. Ona gore ima svoju obitelj?
4. Na kojem jeziku pričaš s njom?
5. A s nećacima?
6. Na kojem jeziku ćete Ivana i ti pričati sa Sonjom (kćeri)?
7. Jel biste htjeli da i ona govori oba jezika tečno?

9. References

1. Becker, K. (2018) The Sociolinguistic Interview. In Mallinson, C., B. Childs and G. Van Herk (eds) *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics: Methods and Applications*. London, New York: Routledge. 99-107.
2. Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Bloomfield, L. (1984) *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Crowley, T. (2007) *Field Linguistics: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. De Decker, P. and Nycz, J. (2018) The Technology of Conducting Sociolinguistic Interviews. In Mallinson, C., B. Childs and G. Van Herk (eds) *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics: Methods and Applications*. London, New York: Routledge. 123-130.
6. Edley, N. and L. Litosseliti (2010) Contemplating Interviews and Focus Groups. In Litosseliti, L. (ur.) *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London/New York: Continuum. 155-179.
7. Giles, H., & Ogay, T. (2007) Communication Accommodation Theory. In B. B. Whaley & M. Samter (eds), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp. 293-310). Mahwah, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
8. Grosjean, F. (2012) Bilingualism: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean & P. Li (eds), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism* (pp. 5–25). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
9. Grosjean, F. (2008) *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Grosjean, F., & Byers-Heinlein, K. (2018) Bilingual adults and children: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean & K. Byers-Heinlein (Eds.), *The listening bilingual: Speech perception, comprehension, and bilingualism* (pp. 4–24). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
11. Labov, W. (1984) Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In Baugh, J. and J. Sherzer (eds) *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 28–53.
12. Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006) *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Lippi-Green, R. (1994) Accent, Standard Language Ideology, and Discriminatory Pretext in the Courts. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168513>. In *Language in Society*, Vol. 23, No 2. (Jun., 1994), pp. 163-198. *JSTOR*. Sun, 27th of January, 2019.

14. Milroy, J. (2001) Language of Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. In *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5/4. 530-555.
15. Nelde, P. (2000) Language Conflict. In Coulmas, F. (ed.) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 285-300.
16. Schilling, N. (2013) Surveys and Interviews. In Podesva, R. J. and D. Sharma (eds) *Research Methods in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 96-115.
17. Starčević, A. (2014) *Hrvatski i engleski jezik u dodiru: hrvatska iseljenička obitelj u Kanadi: doktorski rad / Croatian and English in contact: a Croatian immigrant family in Canada: doctoral thesis*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet.
18. Tannen, D. (2012) Turn-taking and Intercultural Discourse and Communication. In Paulston, C. B., Kiesling, S. F. & Rangel, E. S. *The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
19. Verachueren, J. (2012) *Ideology of Language Use: Pragmatic Guidelines for Empirical Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
20. Wardhaugh, R. and Fuller, J.M. (2015) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
21. Weinreich, U. (1953) *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
22. Wray, A. and A. Bloomer (2012) *Projects in Linguistics and Language Studies. A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. Abingdon: Hodder Education.