Language Ideologies and Correction Practices in Formal Education

Božinović, Barbara

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

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

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:135010

Rights / Prava: In copyright/Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-05-12**

University of Zagreb

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Master's thesis

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND CORRECTION PRACTICES IN FORMAL EDUCATION

Student: Barbara Božinović

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Anđel Starčević, PhD

Academic Year 2023/2024

Zagreb, November 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses how teachers' discourse and attitudes affect students, by focusing on linguistic and extralinguistic ideologies present in the educational context. The study shows how teachers affect students through discourse and when their discourse is considered as a tool for motivation, and when it is not, as well as how discourse is used to establish authority. The data was collected through sociolinguistic interviews. Ten participants were asked to take part in this research and had to answer thirty-two questions regarding their high-school experience. The questions were divided into seven modules, with four modules investigating specific subjects: Maths, Croatian, English and Second Foreign Language. The participants stated their opinions on the use of the standard and nonstandard varieties in formal education. Even though all the participants shared the same opinion when asked about the use of the standard variety in formal education, some expressed that they did not mind the occasions when their teachers would use the nonstandard variety, e.g. the Kaykavian dialect. The study also found some extralinguistic ideologies, e.g. the ideology of male supremacy, the ideology of superiority, as well as the ideology of equality in the classroom. The results show that, in terms of creating a more inclusive environment, teachers could introduce more discussions in class in order to help the students state their opinions, as well as learn how to accept other people's views. Through discussions and dialogues, teachers can gain insight into their students' attitudes towards their classes and how well they are acquiring knowledge.

Keywords: language ideologies – critical discourse analysis – sociolinguistic interview – standard language – correction practices

1. INTRODUCTION

This graduate paper is dedicated to the research of language use and correction practices in formal education, specifically, in high school education. It is quite obvious that using the standard language in everyday speech is difficult and, to some point, even impossible. We as speakers were all born in different speaking areas and use different varieties in everyday situations. However, we are interested in the use of the varieties in spaces such as formal education. For the purpose of this graduate paper, sociolinguistic interviews had been conducted to investigate the importance and perceptions of standard language use in formal education. Another topic of this graduate paper is the effect of correction practices in formal education. More specifically, this graduate paper focuses on the ways teachers communicate with their students and how their language use and/or claims about language use can affect the students. In addition to that, this paper will investigate the ways teachers correct their students and how these correction practices can affect the students' overall motivation.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Teun A. van Dijk in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2015) describes critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a

> "type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (van Dijk, 2015: 466).

For example, politicians use their speech as a weapon that helps them establish their power and dominance in society. They represent themselves through their speech and that affects the way they are perceived and accepted by the society. Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen further explain:

> "CDA states that discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned. Furthermore, discourse is an opaque power object in modern societies and CDA aims to make it more visible and transparent." (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000: 448).

In other words, discourse is created by society and speakers are expected to use discourse in a way that was recognised and approved by the said society (e.g., using the standard variety

in formal situations). However, the social world is also established through discourse. Blommaert and Bulcaen explain discourse as a social weapon that allows one group to impose their power on others. However, CDA aspires to clarify how one can project power through speech.

When discussing CDA, van Dijk elaborates that it should be understood as a different approach to theorising in discourse studies (van Dijk, 2015: 466). Since discourses differ one from another, their analyses will differ as well:

> "Critical analysis of conversation is very different from an analysis of news report in the press or lessons and teaching in school. […] As suggested, most kinds of CDA will ask questions about the way specific discourse structures are deployed in the reproduction of social dominance, whether they are part of a conversation or a news report or other genres of context." (van Dijk, 2015: 468).

Rebecca Rogers, referring to van Dijk, explains that what makes CDA *critical* is its association with studying power within the society (Rogers, 2004: 3). Rogers adds that CDA attempts to "describe, interpret, and explain the relationship between the form and function of language" (ibid. 4). Form of language includes grammar, morphology, semantics, syntax, and pragmatics, while function of language implies the use of language in everyday use. (ibid.). Regarding CDA's association with power, it is important to note that power and dominance also differ in society. Not all dominant groups will establish the same level of dominance within the society. Politicians can directly affect and control a great number of people at once, while parents establish authority on their children. Also, violent people use force to establish their power, while teachers use their position and knowledge to assert their dominance in the classroom. Language is a powerful tool that helps powerful groups establish their status in the society.

When it comes to discourse in general, it plays an important role in education as it allows teachers to establish authority. In addition, through discourse students are able to acquire knowledge on how to read, write, communicate, and voice their own opinions and ideas regarding social relations. Going back to CDA, as Blommaert and Bulcaen point out, CDA is connected to education as "education is seen as a major area of the reproduction of social relations, including representation and identity formation, but also for possibilities of change." (2000: 451). Discourse can also affect how students perceive their teachers and vice versa. Teachers' use of language in the classroom can (in)directly affect students' motivation for the

class and their subject in general, as well as create a negative (or positive) perception of the teacher.

2.2. LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

When discussing the term 'language ideologies', Susan U. Philips defines the said term as "people's ideas about language and speech" (Philips, 2015: 557). Further, Philips explains that language ideologies can be defined as ideologies that "concern both what language is like and what it should be like" (ibid.). In addition, Philips explains that when talking about language ideologies, the term 'ideology' is used for a specific reason:

> "The use of the term ideologies, rather than more neutral terms such as culture, beliefs, attitudes, or interpretive frameworks, points to a theoretical commitment to the idea that people's views about language are shaped by political and economic interests, and by relations of domination and subordination…" (ibid.).

Language ideologies are often shared by larger groups of people. Ingrid Piller explains the notion of language ideologies by comparing different varieties of English: "American English sounds professional and competent, while African American English sounds streetwise and cool and Indian English sounds nerdy and funny." (2015: 1). Stating that one variety of a language is more acceptable than others or stating beliefs about a language are also examples of language ideologies.

Regarding this paper, the main focus will be on *the ideology of the standard language*, but other ideologies will be mentioned and pointed out throughout the results. Other ideologies of importance are *the monoglossic ideology, the heteroglossic ideology, the ideology of assimilation*.

As their names state, the monoglossic and the heteroglossic ideologies appear in opposition. According to Josep M. Cots et al. (2022:1), the monoglossic ideology advocates that languages, e.g., Croatian and English, should not mix, while the heteroglossic ideology welcomes the said notion. With English being one of the most widespread languages in the world, it is almost impossible to avoid mixing between two or more languages. Many new technologies derive their terms from English, even though experts try to come up with adequate substitutions (e.g., *computer, kompjuter, računalo*). The heteroglossic ideology considers mixing between languages as an important phenomenon that allows speakers to express themselves through other languages and enrich their vocabulary.

The ideology of assimilation, explained by Raj Narayan Yadav, believes that "everyone, regardless of origin, should learn the dominant language of the nation" (Yadav, 2013: 200). For example, if a foreigner decides to migrate to Croatia, they will probably be expected to learn Croatian. The said ideology is applicable to different speech areas within one nation. To explain, if one was born in the Chakavian-speaking area in Croatia and moves to live in the Kaykavian-speaking area, they are sometimes expected to learn and acquire the local variety as well.

2.3.　IDEOLOGY OF THE STANDARD LANGUAGE

Regarding language ideologies, in his work *The Consequences of Standardisation in Descriptive Linguistics* (1999), James Milroy focuses on explaining the process of standardisation, as well as one of the language ideologies – the ideology of the standard language. Firstly, let us take a look at Croatian. Amongst Croatian speakers, the term "standard Croatian" can frequently be heard. It refers to a variety of Croatian that is expected and proposed to be used in institutions such as the parliament, court, school etc, and it also the variety taught to all Croatian speakers. When talking about the Shtokavian dialect, Croatian speakers often identify it as the standard variety. Croatian has three dialects: Shtokavian, Kaykavian and Chakavian, but only Shtokavian is often equated with the standard variety and is considered as the prestige dialect amongst Croatian speakers. In other words, if you speak Shtokavian on a day-to-day basis, many might consider you as more educated, eloquent, holding a higher place in the social hierarchy. James Milroy makes an interesting remark regarding peoples' beliefs on the use of the nonstandard varieties:

> "The general public tends to accept the authority of many prescriptive pronouncements. Most people claim to believe that there are correct and incorrect ways of speaking and may well accept, quite wrongly, that their own speech – to the extent that it is non-standard – is 'ungrammatical'. Very approximately, the forms that they *believe* are 'correct' are roughly equivalent to 'standard', careful or literary forms." (Milroy, 1999: 22).

Milroy further explains that most speakers, if not all, do not use the standard variety in everyday speech and conversations (ibid.). However, Milroy states that speakers "are often keenly aware that to use non-standard forms is undesirable for broadly social reasons, and they want their children to be taught 'correct' English." (ibid.).

Regarding the connection between education and the standard language, Jeff Siegel explains the following:

> "Common educational language policy is to use only the so-called standard, that is, the varieties of language found in written texts and the mass media – the kinds of language needed to get a college education or a high-paying job." (Siegel, 1999: 701).

In other words, in his explanation there is a sense of association between the standard language and prestige. Standard language leads to a high-paying job, and that kind of a job could be considered as a prestigious one. Siegel argues that the general public typically considers the standard variety as "more logical, more precise, and even more beautiful than other varieties" (ibid.). He explains that other "nonstandard varieties are stigmatized as corrupted forms of the standard and kept out of the classroom" (ibid.). When it comes to Croatian, even though the standard is based on the Shtokavian dialect, the other two dialects are not excluded from the classroom. Students are introduced to them through literary texts and poems but are typically expected to use standard Croatian during class, just as the teachers.

2.4. CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

Muhammad Sharif Uddin describes critical pedagogy as "an effective strategy to enhance the critical thinking capability of students and to generate positive behavioral change in students' lives" (Uddin, 2019: 111). Further, Uddin explains that through critical pedagogy students develop their consciousness, judgement and understanding of the world around them, as well as allowing them to speak their mind in and outside the classroom (ibid.). Using this approach, teachers should prepare their students for real-life situations and how to cope for what is to come. The educational system should not solely focus on students studying from books and materials and teachers' main goals should not only be excellent grades achieved by their students. Classes should be organised in a way that benefits the students and their cognitive skills (Uddin, 2019: 115). This includes regular dialogues and discussions between the teacher and the students as well as tasks that require them to find solutions on their own. Classes that are based solely on the teacher speaking and the students listening and copying or writing everything that is said do not help improve the students' critical thinking. Critical pedagogy thrives to change the educational system and is of great importance in modern education. Its goal is to introduce the idea of democracy and help students to be able to voice their opinions. However, teachers need to keep in mind that students have been raised in different backgrounds and could have different opinions on matters discussed in class. Critical pedagogy implies that

teacher should accept students' different views and try to refrain from imposing their views and what is written in the curriculum. (Uddin, 2019: 113)

In his book *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (2005) Paulo Freire emphasises the importance of dialogue-based class organisation and how dialogues affect students' critical thinking:

> "Only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education. Education which is able to resolve the contradiction between teacher and student takes place in a situation in which both address their act of cognition to the object by which they are mediated." (Freire, 2005: 92-93).

Further, Uddin explains that the dialogues held between the teacher and the students "break the silent nature of the students and the monologue of the teacher" (Uddin, 2019: 113). However, creating dialogue-based class could be challenging for a majority of teachers. A teacher's task is to create a classroom environment in which students will feel free to express their opinions and discuss what is being taught. Through dialogues students critically think about different subjects and topics, develop their understanding of the world. Uddin explains the following:

> "The teacher must have a positive mentality and show this to the students. […] Secondly, the teacher should not think of himself or herself as above the students. Teacher and student must consider themselves as equal partners in dialogue. Finally, the teacher should have faith in the students that they are not empty vessels; instead, they have some knowledge. Through using this knowledge, the student can engage himself or herself in dialogue and can achieve more knowledge." (ibid.).

Teachers should have a positive mindset regarding their students, but the same should be applied to the subject being taught and their profession in general. A major factor that affects the classroom's environment is the teacher's attitude. If the teacher shows openness to discussions in classroom that are not specified in the curriculum but are proven to be interesting and beneficial to students, that kind of attitude could be considered motivational for students. Motivated students could lead to greater achievements and overall better learning outcomes. Teacher should take into consideration that their attitude in classroom could affect their students and how they perform in class. If their approach to their students is negative, they could receive negative attitude back from their students. Hakkı Kahveci explains:

"A number of studies have demonstrated a strong relationship between a student's academic, personal, and social development and the attitudes and behaviors of those around him or her. At this point, the teacher has a great deal of influence." (Kahveci, 2023: 292).

One of the questions regarding this paper will be the impact of teachers' attitudes on students.

Critical pedagogy has set its goal to help educators understand and teach equality amongst students. All students and their ideas should be taken into consideration and there should not be any discrimination between them just because they have different backgrounds or upbringings.

3. METHODOLOGY

This paper is based on sociolinguistic research. The research was carried out through sociolinguistic interviews that helped the researcher gather the desired information. Regarding the broad definition of a sociolinguistic interview, Kara Backer explains that it is "a controlled speech event designed to elicit a wide range of contextual styles from an individual speaker" (2018: 99). Further, in order to explain what type of information can be collected through a sociolinguistic interview, Kara Becker states the following:

" [...] the sociolinguistic interview serves as the primary data in the investigation of sociolinguistic variation and change because the interview, and the individual speaker represented by that interview, never stands alone. Instead, it forms part of a set of comparable interviews gathered from a sampling of some speech community." (Becker, 2018: 100).

In this paper the aim of the sociolinguistic interviews is to compare and examine participants' attitudes towards correction practices used in formal education, as well as how they perceive and recall the use of language during their formal education.

In this sociolinguistic study, ten participants were chosen to take part. The participants had to satisfy certain requirements in order to participate in the interview. Firstly, they all had to have finished secondary education in the form of a general-program secondary school (Cro. *gimnazija*). Secondly, the participants had to have learned two foreign languages during their secondary education, with one of the two foreign languages being English. Lastly, they had to be either in their mid-twenties or late-twenties to early thirties. The participants' sex did not play a significant role for this project. The participants were not limited to a certain geographical

point, for example, they did not have to be exclusively from the Zagreb metropolitan area, but from any place in Croatia.

When it comes to the statistics of the participants, eight participants were female (80%) and two were male (20%). One participant was born in 1991 (10%), one in 1995 (10%), two participants were born in 1996 (20%), five were born in 1997 (50%) and one participant was born in the year 2000 (10%). However, the participant born in 2000 enrolled in primary education with their peers born in 1999.

The researcher had prepared thirty-two questions regarding the participants' experience during their secondary education and their opinions on language ideologies in education. All of the questions were conducted in a way that gave the participants a chance to speak their mind resulting in a discussion between the participant and the researcher. These types of questions, according to Alison Wray and Aileen Bloomer, are referred to as open type questions (2012: 167). Because of this, the interview did not feel like an interview, but rather as a conversation between the researcher and the participant with a natural flow. This also gives the researcher a chance to ask additional questions in order to obtain needed information or omit some questions if they have been answered through prior questions. However, the researcher needs to keep in mind that the interview can easily take a different turn if it has not been planned properly. Digression is always welcome, but the researcher needs to have ways and options prepared to divert the discussion back to its main topic, the interview. According to Charles L. Briggs, these types of interviews could be described as informal interviews: "Informal interviews are often conducted by researchers themselves. While lists of questions are often prepared in advance, exact wordings and the order of presentation emerge in the course of the interview..." (2005: 1053).

During a sociolinguistic interview, the researcher should make the environment comfortable and informal for the participant. If the researcher approaches the interview in a formal manner, the participant could try to give answers they believe the researcher is looking for, leading to false results and the disturbance of the overall research:

> "Sociolinguistic interviewers must continually monitor their behavior for any signs of this authority. They must review their lexical and grammatical choices to remove any evidence of bookishness or influence of literary language, and ruthlessly plane away all remains of conspicuous ostentation to achieve a plain, unvarnished style." (Labov, 1984: 40).

To achieve the informal environment of the interview, the researcher should opt for informal language, casual clothing and a relaxed approach. Therefore, the researcher of this graduate paper opted to use the Kaykavian dialect (vernacular) in order to appear less intimidating for the interviewed participants. Anđel Starčević (2016:10) describes that a researcher can give the feeling of authority and power through the way they have dressed for the interview. Due to this, the researcher of this paper decided to dress more casually in order to achieve the desired comfortable environment. Along with that, all interviews took place in locations that the participants are familiar with, be it their own home or a local coffee shop they enjoy. Even though coffee shops cannot be considered as the most appropriate locations to carry out an interview as they are often loud and crowded, sometimes, as Crawford Feagin states, "fieldworkers must sacrifice sound quality in favor of enhanced interactional quality when quiet locations that are comfortable to interviewees are not available" (2013: 23).

The researcher recorded all the interviews using her mobile phone. In my opinion, taking notes during a sociolinguistic interview is almost impossible and could affect the quality of the interview. The researcher could not be able to keep up with the participant resulting in loss of important information. Therefore, audio recording is advised and should be done in a subtle manner. The researcher held ten interviews and listened and took notes afterwards.

All the participants were informed prior to the interview that they would be recorded and that their answers would be used as results. They had all signed written consent forms. All the participants were made aware that they could refuse to take part in the research project, or, if they had agreed to take part, change their mind and leave the research without having to explain their decision. (Wray and Bloomer, 2012: 184).

The participants had to answer thirty-two questions divided into seven modules. Labov describes the module as "a group of questions focusing on a particular topic" (1984: 33). Creating these modules helps the researcher organise their questions so they achieve a natural flow of communication during the interview. Finally, all the modules together create a network of the sociolinguistic interview:

> "The modules are combined into a conversational network by the interviewer. […] …modules are connected at transitional points through close associations. Most modules begin and end with transitional questions which permit links to many other networks." (Labov, 1984: 34).

Participants were questioned on their general perception of education and how they perceived their teachers' attitudes during the four years. Participants were also asked to share their subjective opinions on four subjects: Maths, English, Croatian and Second Foreign Language (SFL), specifically how they had been taught these four subjects, what the teachers' approach had been, and what had affected and formed their opinions regarding those subjects. They had to recall how their teachers had used language during class, what type of feedback they had been given by their teachers and how they perceived the role of the standard language in an institution such as high school.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned in the previous paragraphs, participants were asked to recall how their teachers had used language in the classroom and they had to explain how they perceived classes for four specific subjects: Maths, Croatian, English and SFL. The second foreign language differs between the participants; some learned German, and others learned Italian as the second foreign language. Participants also had to recall the type of feedback they had received from their teachers and what type of correction practices had been used in class. Therefore, results will be divided in sections regarding the subjects, as well as language ideologies. In conclusion, the focus will be on the participants' general perception and opinions on secondary education, on their teachers' attitudes and how it affected them as students.

4.1. LANGUAGE USE IN THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

At the beginning of the interviews, the participants were asked to recall their teachers' use of language. The researcher wanted to investigate whether they remembered their teachers using the standard or the nonstandard variety. Further, the participants were asked to share their opinions about whether the teachers should use the standard or nonstandard language during class, as well as whether the students were allowed to use nonstandard varieties in class. In this section, the participants' answers and results have been divided according to the language ideology present in the answers. The ideologies analysed in this section are the ideology of the standard language, the ideology of assimilation and the monoglossic ideology.

a) Ideology of the standard language

Many agree that using the standard variety gives an impression of professionalism that teachers should have:

"…*mislim kad gledaš, okej. Mislim kad gledaš profesora, s profesorske strane možda bi trebala biti doza profesionalnosti, ali kad gledaš sa strane učenika, nama je bilo super kad se spustila na našu razinu, bila je zezancija, nije nam bilo dosadno na satu…*". (P1)

Participant One recalls that as students they welcomed occurrences when the teacher would use the nonstandard variety as they felt closer to their teacher. The participant explains that, since the teacher was from the Zagreb metropolitan area, it was understandable that some words associated with the Zagreb variety would come out during class:

"…*ona je iz Zagreba, pričala je zagrebački, nije nekim teškim narječjem pričala…*". (P1)

Participant Two explains a similar situation:

"…*dobro, ajde pobjegne neki kaj, kao kaj ste rekli. Ajde, dobro, zagrebačko područje, nemreš iz čovjeka skroz izbrisat taj kaj.* (P2)

Participant Three, when asked about the general use of the standard variety in educational settings, explains that teachers represent their schools and should opt for the standard variety when speaking:

"…*kad smo na radnom mjestu, odnosno, kad smo bili u školi, onda da. Daje dojam neprofesionalnosti jer svi smo mi s ovog područja, svi mi govorimo kaj, ovo, ono… Ali nismo mi svi profesori. Znači, možemo mi na hodniku se bilo kak razgovarat, ali smatram da jednostavno kad si na tom satu, zapravo kad si u toj ustanovi općenito, mislim da je jako bitno da se izražavaš standardnim jezikom. Profesor si, predstavljaš sve to, i dok si u školi, trebaš se koristiti standardnim jezikom.*". (P3)

When asked about general language use in their school, Participant Four recalls that their teachers did not generally care about their language use and that it was something that Participant Four found especially off-putting:

"…*pa uglavnom su pričali k'o da su vani s nama na placu. Uglavnom su se razgovarali tako, do te mjere da je to bilo neprofesionalno… Mislim da nitko u službenoj ustanovi, dakle školskoj, ne bi se smio razgovarati onako kako se razgovara doma. Ne bi se trebalo bazirati da se svi koriste svojim narječjem jer i učenici i profesori dolaze iz raznih podneblja, u raznim kućanstvima su odrasli, imaju različite korijene, dakle moramo neku standardiziranost zadržati…*". (P4)

Unlike Participants One and Two, Participant Four did not welcome those occurrences when their teachers would use another nonstandard variety in class. Participant Four explains that, when those situations did occur, the class would negatively react with the impression of

unprofessionalism on the teacher's part, especially because the teachers would often correct their use of language in class:

"…*u tak nekoj ustanovi to treba očekivati. Da profesori koriste malo jedno, malo drugo, i onda još ne vole kad to rade učenici i pogotovo kad im učenici i prigovaraju zbog toga. Onda nastane kaos. To odbija učenike. Stavlja im se da nekako moraju pričati, a sami profesori to ne rade. Njima se nameće standardni jezik i dobiju po nosu ako ga ne koriste, a ti koji ga nameću ga sami ne koriste… Jako je licemjerno i nedosljedno… Profesori trebaju motivirati svoje učenike da koriste standardni jezik, pogotovo jednog dana u poslu…*". (P4)

Participant Five, when asked about their teachers' use of standard Croatian, quickly and without hesitation answered that their teachers mostly used the nonstandard variety when explaining something during class or just having a conversation with the students:

"… *možda nekad da kad su predavali, ali znam da kad smo ovak s njima neš razgovarali pod nastavom ili čak kad su nam objašnjavali neke stvari, onda ne, ono, po dijalektima su pričali. Nije sad to ništa strašno, to je bilo* kaj *umjesto* što *i tak nekaj.*". (P5)

Participant Six shared the same opinion regarding the use of the standard variety in the educational environment and explained that teachers would often opt for nonstandard varieties but would almost always correct their students when using a nonstandard variety:

"…*mislim da kad god bi netko rekao* kaj*, oni bi ispravili sa* molim. *Često su koristili narječja, al' su nas uvijek ispravljali, pogotovo za taj* kaj…". (P6)

Unlike Participant Six, Participant Seven shared that they did not encounter disagreement from their teachers when it came to using nonstandard varieties during class. They recalled that many teachers used nonstandard varieties as they were teaching but did not correct the students' use of language as well:

"…*naprimjer,* kaj *neće ispravit', al' baš da sad kažeš cijelu rečenicu na nekom narječju, mislim i razred bi se počeo smijati na to pa bi opomenuli da se koristimo lijepim hrvatskim…*". (P7)

In their answer, Participant Seven refers to the standard language as 'beautiful'. Interestingly, when talking about the ideology of the standard language, the standard variety is usually described as 'beautiful' and 'correct', giving the impression of professionalism and the speaker being well-educated. In this example, the teacher portrays standard Croatian as 'beautiful', insinuating that other Croatian dialects are not as beautiful as the standard.

Nonstandard varieties are often related to speakers being uneducated and unprofessional and are not welcome in formal situations.

Participant Eight compared how older teachers did not care about their language use, while some younger teachers sometimes tried to use the standard variety:

"*...ne, pogotovo stariji. Možda su se mlađi još i trudili, ali generalno nisu pazili. Pogotovo bi im naglasak pobjegao jer nemamo mi tako standardni naglasak kao Slavonci. Ali, nisu ni nas ispravljali. Mislim da ih iskreno nije bilo ni tol'ko briga. Većina ih je odavde otkud smo i mi i kužili smo se i nije im to tol'ko smetalo.*". (P8)

Participant Ten made an interesting comparison between the use of standard Croatian and the age of their teachers. They experienced that older teachers were more careful about how they used language in class and spoke using the standard variety of Croatian, while younger teachers often opted for the nonstandard variety.

"*To ti točno vidiš po godinama profesora. Što su stariji, to više paze na jezik, mislim da se to prije puno više pazilo nego što se pazi sad, po mom mišljenju. Što se tiče izražavanja, to ti je bilo tako, stariji su pazili.*". (P10)

b) Ideology of assimilation

Even though most participants recalled their teachers being from the same speaking area as them, two participants mentioned that they had teachers that spoke in a different dialect. They explained that those teachers tried to learn their dialect and learn words that are considered specific for their dialect giving us examples of ideology of assimilation.

"*Da, treba koristiti standardni jezik u nastavi, kol'ko god je to moguće. Znam da će ljudima pobjeći, pobjegne i meni, ali ne bi trebalo koristiti teška narječja i forme karakteristične za neko narječje, to što se govori treba svima biti jasno. Mislim da nije u redu reći* 'pjat' *umjesto* 'tanjur' *tipa ako si u kajkavskom govornom području jer tko zna hoće li te sva djeca razumijeti...*". (P8)

Participant Eight explained that they had a teacher that was from the Chakavian speaking area, but worked in a school in which all students were from the Kaykavian speaking region. They explained that the teacher would often correct themselves as they would use Chakavian words. They had to assimilate themselves to the region they worked in and acquire the vocabulary. This situation could also be perceived as an example of the ideology of assimilation. The teacher had to learn words specific for the said area in order to be understood

and even perceived as a teacher. Participant Eight also explained that the teacher was not taken seriously from the very beginning due to their accent and use of vocabulary.

Participant One also mentioned another example that could represent the ideology of assimilation. Their Physics teacher was from a different speaking area but tried to assimilate by learning words from the students' dialect or using the standard variety. If the teacher were to speak in their dialect, they would perhaps be misunderstood by the students:

"*...imali smo jednog profesora iz fizike i tipa, nekad se moglo skužiti da nije odavde, ali se uvijek trudio govoriti standardnim jezikom ili barem koristiti naš žargon.*". (P1)

c) The monoglossic ideology

Participant Three shared how some of their teachers, especially their Physics teacher, were not fond of language mixing and would often point out that the students should use 'Croatian' words:

"*...bila je ta profesorica iz fizike koja je uvijek ispravljala i naglašavala hrvatske riječi. Netko je jednom na satu rekao* hiljadu *umjesto* tisuću *i to je nastao cijeli kaos. Mislim, svi znamo kaj hiljadu znači, ali ona je uporno naglašavala da koristimo hrvatske inačice. Jao, jednom je netko rekao da ne vidi na ploču od monitora, ona se samo okrenula i rekla da je to zaslon, a ne monitor. K'o da je ne znam kaj rekao, dobro da mu jedan nije dala.*". (P3)

In this example, the teacher corrects the students when using words from languages other than Croatian. The word 'hiljada' is typically perceived as Serbian, while the word 'monitor' is derived from English. Even though 'hiljada' can be substituted by 'tisuću' and 'monitor' can also be expressed as 'zaslon', both of those words are familiar to most Croatian speakers and are quite frequent in everyday speech. However, in this example, the teacher expresses their dissatisfaction with language mixing and points out the 'more Croatian' varieties of the said words.

During the interviews, it was evident that the participants mostly share the same opinion on the use of the standard language, in this case standard Croatian, in class. Even though all agree that using the standard language does make the teacher and the class appear more professional, some expressed that they did not mind if their teachers were to use the nonstandard variety, explaining that it made their teachers appear closer and friendlier, the class more laid-back and not as strict as expected.

4.2. MATHS CLASS

Participants were asked to share how they remember Maths class in their high school. The majority of the participants pointed out that they were not fond of Maths. While some explained that it was because they simply did not understand or find it interesting, others did mention that their teacher's attitude did play a role in that. In this section we will analyse how teachers' discourse can affect their students and their attitude towards learning and school in general.

a) Discourse as a tool for demotivation

Participant Six explained that, even though they were very fond of Maths and were generally really good with excellent grades, they believe that the teacher was not keen on helping those students that would often face difficulties understanding the lesson. They expressed that often they would feel uncomfortable as other students needed help and proper tutoring, but the teacher would blindly follow the lesson plan and push other students to keep up in order to complete all the tasks. Participant Six described that their teacher was older and probably "tired of teaching", but that it is still no excuse for their attitude towards other students. Further, Participant Six says that the teacher did exclude some students from others by treating them differently, showing clear favouritism towards them:

"*Realno, ti učenici na koje se oni fokusiraju su učenici koji su sposobni sami učiti, kojima onak, ne treba pomoć i sposobni su to sami naučiti bez profesora. Puno bi se više trebali angažirat na one učenike kojima ide teže. Sjećam se da kad bi netko rekao* meni to nije jasno*, profesori bi to samo ponovili identičnim riječima i nadodali* ma budete si to naučili. *Ali im zato nije bio problem odvojiti cijeli sat za ove kad su se pripremali za natjecanja. S njima je mogla cijeli sat prolaziti isto.*". (P6)

Participant Six then added:

"*Profa nije baš imala razumijevanja za one koji su trebali pomoć oko učenja. Puno je lakše pukla i jednostavno ona bi to rekla kaj učimo, mi bi riješili jedan primjer, ona je dala drugi primjer i bilo bi* kako to ne znaš riješiti sad, di ti gledaš...". (P6)

This example presents how teacher's discourse can be perceived as demotivational. Firstly, the teacher had a different approach to those students that were better in Maths and had excellent grades than to those that struggled. As previously mentioned, critical pedagogy advocates that all students should be treated equally, as well as that teachers should help their students develop their cognitive thinking. However, the teacher from the example, as stated by Participant Six,

was mostly focused on doing the required tasks and completing everything from the lesson plan. The teacher was not fond of additional explaining and helping those that had problems understanding but would find the time for those that were excellent in Maths. The teacher discriminated those who struggled and that was shown through their discourse. Saying '*ma budete to naučili*' without actually explaining and helping can negatively affect the students and their motivation for further learning.

Participant Nine did not have positive experiences with learning Maths. They recalled how their teacher had a tendency to humiliate their students if they did not study or understand the lesson:

"*...zna da ti ne znaš zadatak, prozove te na ploču, drži te na ploči petnaest minuta i tu baca neke fore, šprda se. I ti tu stojiš, ne znaš to riješit' i gledaš može li ti netko iz razreda pomoć, a profesor baca fore i zabavlja se.*". (P9)

They added:

"*Njegov pristup, da, kako to objasniti? Ajmo reći da nam je znao i psovati na satu ako nismo znali. Pa sad ti budi motiviran da učiš. On je možda mislio da nas tako motivira, ali to je bilo nešto skroz drugo...*". (P9)

In the former examples, the teacher uses their power and sets their authority by humiliating students, as well as using foul language as 'a motivational tool'. This should not be an acceptable practice as these kinds of situations can leave a mark on the student resulting in them completely alienating themselves from the subject in general. In addition, this teacher's discourse can only be described as demotivational, as stated by Participant Nine.

Participant Four recalled on their experience with Maths:

"*...nakon šest, sedam godina ja se i dalje sjećam kako je izgledao sat matematike. I atmosfere, i učionice, i kako se profesorica držala. Zamrzila sam matematiku, mrzila sam sat matematike, ali sam zamrzila zbog toga i matematiku kao predmet, iako do srednje nisam uopće imala problema s predmetom.*". (P4)

Further, Participant Four says that they often felt demotivated to learn because of their teacher's words:

"*...uvijek je bilo* pa pitajte, što vam nije jasno*, i onda kad bi pitali bi odgovor bio tipa* pa šta vam tu nema biti jasno, sve je jasno kao dan*, i onda jednostavno ne znaš na čemu si...Ono, na satu ti govori da*

pitaš i onda skužiš da bezveze pitaš jer ti ionak neće odgovoriti. U nekom trenu smo svi postali totalno demotivirani i nitko više nije ni pitao ni ništa.". (P4)

This example shows another use of discourse as a tool for demotivation. The participant explained that their teacher would encourage the students to ask if something is left misunderstood and unclear. However, when the students would ask for additional explanations, the teacher would simply state that everything had been explained and that everything is more than clear, refusing to explain again.

Participant Two explained their relationship with Maths in high school:

"...*profa nije bila, kako reći, motivacijski nastrojena. Ne znam, nije znala kako me potaknuti da učim matematiku. Bilo je bitno da se sve napravi, a ne jel' nama to jasno il' nije. Mislim, mene matematika nikad nije zanimala, ali me njen pristup na nastavi dodatno demotivirao. Nije joj se dalo, nije objašnjavala ako nam nije jasno, obično bi rekla da bi nam trebalo sve biti jasno i da ne razumije kako nam nije jasno. Ako nismo nešto znali, osjetila bi se ta frustracija od profe jer bi morala dodatno objašnjavati...*"

This result and the previous results show how discourse can affect the students' motivation and general attitude towards a certain subject and learning. It is important to realise that discourse is a powerful tool, and one word is more than enough to make a difference. Using phrases such as '*ma budete to naučili*' and '*što vam tu nema biti jasno*' when the students ask for help is not a motivational approach. In addition, in terms of critical pedagogy, teachers' main goal should be to help their students understand what they are taught and make learning easier and more approachable, especially when it comes to Maths, which many find rather difficult.

4.3.   CROATIAN CLASS

Regarding Croatian classes, all participants agreed on one thing – using the standard language was not an option, but a must. Since in Croatian classes students are taught rules regarding the Croatian language and the standard variety, teachers are expected to use the standard language and they expect the same from their students. In this section, we will analyse the participants answers regarding Croatian classes.

a) Ideology of the standard language

"Pa smatram da bi profesor hrvatskog trebao pričati standardnim jer ti si to završila i to si sve naučila, ti si zapravo profa koja bi nama trebala pokazat' kako se zapravo treba pričat'.". (P1)

Participant One explained that they expected from their Croatian teacher to use the standard variety. They explained that their Croatian teacher studied the standard variety in college, so they should teach their students the rules of the standard language.

b) Ideology of superiority

Participant Four recalled that one of their Croatian teachers did not leave a great impression on them regarding their behaviour:

"Svakak se odnosila prema učenicima i razgovarala. Jel, imala je miljenike, ove druge koje nije voljela, poput mene, baš je ono šikanirala, u smislu obraćanja. Nekad neke nije htjela prozvati da odgovore ako su jedini znali, nije htjela uključiti druge u razgovor i odredila ih kao nesposobne, koristila je pogrdne riječi kad se obraćala onima koji ne znaju.". (P4)

In addition to that, Participant Four explained that their other Croatian teacher had double standards. During class they spoke using the nonstandard variety and their own dialect, but they expected their students to speak using the standard language:

"Ona je smjela uvijek pričat na koji god način je htjela, dok je druge učenike upozoravala i ispravljala kao kaj, kaj kaj, dat' ću ja tebi kaj, nema kaj *i tak je neke fore bacala i tak se razgovarala Ocjenjivala je po tome tko joj je kakav, kak se taj dan obukao. U principu, ona je pravdala to svoje* kaj *kao očuvanje tradicije jer je bila iz Slavonije, ali drugima to nije smjelo ni past na pamet."*. (P4)

They added:

"Znala se podsmjehivati učenicima u stilu ajde obriši ploču pa ti možda dam dva, i tak si nesposoban za hrvatski *i takve neke izjave. Meni je to bilo grozno, katastrofa."*. (P4)

Regarding Participant Four's example, there are several things to analyse. Firstly, we can state that the teacher discriminated some students and treated them differently in a way that they did not let them provide the answer if they knew it. Secondly, the teacher did not always use the standard variety during class, but expected the students to use it and would oftentimes comment on their language use, in line with the ideology of the standard language. Through these actions, the teacher shows their superiority and authority, showing that rules do not apply to them, but that they can set rules and expectations for their students. Thirdly, the teacher has

a completely demotivating approach that is set to affect the students and their attitude towards learning Croatian, as Participant Four stated:

"*Doslovno odlazak na hrvatski mi je, ne znam, nije bila neka aritmija ili nešto, ali sam osjećala užasan grč, odlaziš sa grčem na nastavu gdje znaš da će te netko maltretirat'...*". (P4)

c) Ideology of equality

Unlike Participant Four, Participant Seven explained that their teacher treated them with respect, which was evident through their discourse:

"*Sa* vi *nam se, ja mislim, čak obraćao. Bio je, ono, ultra onako* nisam ja iznad vas, na nekoj stepenici više*, bio je takav da je bio jednak s nama i uvijek je naglašavao da smo, ono, svi mi tu isti. Mislim, mogao je on nama i na* ti*, ne bi me to uvrijedilo, al' vidjelo se da nas poštuje na način kako nam se obraćao.*". (P7)

Their teacher showed respect for the students through their discourse. This was shown through their use of personal pronouns in Croatian. Pronoun 'Vi', when denoting a single person, differs from pronoun 'ti' (both meaning 'you' in English) and is perceived as showing respect for the addressee.

d) Monoglossic and heteroglossic ideologies

Unlike Participant Four, Participant Two recalled that their Croatian teacher was more than professional. Their teacher insisted on the use of the standard language but did not always correct the students if they used a nonstandard dialect in class:

"*Profesor je težio k tome da pričamo standardnim jezikom, ali nije nas napadao ako bi rekli* kaj *ili* nikaj*. I on bi se nekad tako počeo zezat s nama i učio nas je raznim riječima drugih dijalekata. Bio je opušten, ali je pričao uvijek standardnim, kod njega se to baš čulo.*". (P2)

This example describes the heteroglossic ideology that allows different varieties within a single language. Croatian has many different dialects and speeches, but teachers usually request from their students to use the standard variety in class. However, this Croatian teacher would allow their students to use nonstandard words in order to show diversity within a single language, while using the standard variety himself.

Participant Three mentioned how their Croatian teacher was lenient towards language mixing but would oftentimes warn the students about the use of Croatian synonyms:

"*Tipa, mi bi rekli kompjuter, a on bi rekao računalo. Kao, nije on sad nama uzeo za zlo to što smo rekli kompjuter, ali bi nas s vremena na vrijeme ispravio i rekao da postoje i hrvatske varijante riječi. Tipa, umjesto šarafciger da kažemo odvijač, ili da umjesto avion koristimo zrakoplov u rečenicama i tak. Nije bio sad naporan oko toga, al' je znao to nekad spomenut'.*". (P3)

This example presents the monoglossic ideology. The teacher taught their students to use standard Croatian words if possible. They were not strict about it but would correct the students and point out the need to use Croatian variants.

4.4. ENGLISH CLASS

When questioned about English classes, almost all participants shared positive experiences and were not able to find flaws regarding their teachers. One participant, however, did mention that their teacher believed male students were better than female students, while another participant pointed out feeling demotivated by their teacher, which will be shown in the following results.

a) Discourse as a demotivational tool

Participant One explained that their teacher would often interrupt them in order to correct their answers, leading to the students' confusion and demotivation:

"*Ma je, sve nas je ispravljala. I kad smo imali usmene, i kad nas je digla pred ploču, sve živo bi ispravljala. I tražila bi nas da to ponovimo da to, kako bi ona rekla, uđe u naše moždane vijuge.*". (P1)

They explained that these types of corrections would often result in students feeling demotivated. Participant One explained that their teacher was oftentimes harsh with their feedback and corrections, but that she never had bad intentions. She did interrupt with her corrections, but only to help the students. However, some students did not find them that helpful.

b) Ideology of male supremacy

Participant Four said that their English teacher discriminated between male and female students:

"*Bilo je rodnih razlika, što se tiče dečki-cure. Za dečke je govorio da uvijek sve znaju, a cure nije htio ni poslušati. I onda kada je jedna cura rekla nešto što je bilo točno, onda joj je odgovorio u stilu*

Isuse pa ti znaš engleski, neka cura zna engleski *što mi je bilo užasno. Mi cure smo super znale engleski, ali nikada nismo mogle doći do riječi*.". (P4)

This example could be labelled as the ideology of male supremacy. The teacher believes that male students are smarter and better than their female colleagues without any evidence, solely based on their gender. This type of belief is unacceptable from a teacher as teachers should not make any assumptions regarding one's gender, background, social status, etc. All students should be respected and treated equally, and one gender should not be perceived as superior to the other.

c) Discourse as a tool for motivation

The following examples show how the teacher's attitude positively affects the students and their motivation.

Participant Three had nothing but praise for their English teacher and was very fond of them.

"*Jako puno nas je stvarno mogla natjerat' da sudjelujemo u nastavi. Koliko god je ona nekad bila popustljiva, ona je imala svoj sistem da nas sve uključi u nastavu i da svatko dobije svoju priliku za razgovor. Bila je jako motivirajuća, uvijek je bilo* ma sigurno to znaš, možeš se ti toga sjetiti *i navodila nas je na odgovore. Znala je da svi znamo, ali da nam ponekad treba malo guranja i motivacije.*". (P3)

Participant Three explained that their English teacher was "a mixture of strict and nice". They knew when to be a bit harsher and when it was time to give the students a break. Their teacher always tried to motivate their students and took into consideration that some students had problems with foreign languages. Participant Three pointed out that all their classmates only had words of praise for the said teacher.

Participant Six shared a similar experience to Participant Three. They expressed their satisfaction with their English teacher and recalled their English teacher being one of the best in their school:

"*Ma ona je stvarno bila super. Prihvaćala je sve odgovore, ako se baš nisi mogao sjetit' točne riječi, prihvaćala je i ono što znaš. Bilo joj je bitno da se znaš koristiti engleskim. Naravno da je htjela da učimo nove riječi, ali nije nas zbog toga rušila s ocjenama ili tako nešto. Trudila se, vidjelo se da voli što radi.*" (P6)

Similarly, Participant Seven recalled their teacher being innovative and thinking out-of-the-box. Just as advocated by critical pedagogy, their teacher focused more on teaching and helping the students learn, not so much on what is proposed by lesson plans:

"*Uvijek je našla vremena izać' izvan kutije i napravit' nešto posebno. Slušala je naše želje i što nas zanima u engleskom i trudila se objasnit' nam sve to, našla je vremena za sve što smo htjeli, nije bilo ono* idemo napravit' sve što moramo*, ne. Bilo joj je bitno da naučimo nešto*.". (P7)

4.5.   SECOND FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASS

When it comes to learning a second foreign language, high school students can often choose between several options. Out of ten participants that took part in this research, six had studied German, while four had chosen Italian as their second foreign language. In this section, we will analyse their experiences learning a SFL and how they perceived their teachers.

a) Ideology of equality

Participant Six studied German as their second foreign language and praised their teacher for their behaviour and how they treated the students. Their teacher respected those who were ready to work and learn, regardless of their results. They took into consideration that some students needed more time than others, but if they showed improvement, that was more than enough.

"*Jedan dečko je odgovarao i požalio se kako nije dobio višu ocjenu od cure koja je odgovarala prije njega, a bolje je znao. Profa je znala da je on čak živio u Njemačkoj i naravno da je sve znao pravilno reći, ali je ona kroz odgovaranje skužila da on nije ni otvorio knjigu i da je išao na blef. Profa je u tom trenu više cijenila što se curka prije potrudila i učila i vidjela je motivaciju te osobe i zbog toga joj je dala bolju ocjenu, bez obzira što nije bolje znala.*". (P6)

In this example, the teacher treats all students equally and motivates other students to study and try their best. The teacher respects those who work and take their time to learn what they were taught in class. By giving a better grade, the teacher shows that they treat their students based on their efforts.

b) Discourse as a tool for demotivation

 Participant Five studied Italian and has great respect for their teacher but admitted that their teacher was a bit cynical and oftentimes quite rude to students.

22

"*Kad ti ideš odgovarat' i svjestan si da nisi naučio, jedna stvar je imat' profesora koji ti kaže* okej, vidim da se nisi pripremio, hajde to nauči pa se javi i ispravi, znam da možeš, *a drugo je kada ti profa iz talijanskog kaže* haha a kaj ćeš, znaš da ti je to jedinica, tko ti je kriv. *Znaš, to ti je baš ono odvratno i demotivirajuće.*". (P5)

Participant Five explained that their Italian teacher oftentimes demotivated them and deterred them from learning Italian. Even though students are required to study and prepare for each class, sometimes, due to unknown reasons, they do not and get a bad grade. Getting a bad grade is enough of a punishment and the teacher should be the one to motivate them and let them know that they can correct it. Getting a demotivational comment from the teacher only adds to the student's negative attitude towards the subject.

c) Discourse as a tool for motivation

Participant Nine, just as Participant Six, studied German. Most participants expressed how they opted for German because they had studied it in elementary school and felt it was easier to continue learning it, instead of taking on a new language. Participant Nine shared their experience with their German teacher:

"*Vidjela je da znam, ali da mi se ne da raditi. I svaki put kad je bio test, ja bi dobila tri jer mi se nije učila gramatika. I profa je znala da znam, i svaki put bi me pitala jel trebam neku pomoć oko učenja, trudila se oko mene. Ali eto, period života kad ti se ne da, ali veliko hvala toj profi. Trudila se, bila je ljuta kad je vidjela da griješim na nekim osnovama jer je znala moj potencijal i gurala je da radim.*". (P9)

"*Poticala te maksimalno da se ni ti ne osjećaš loše i sve. Nekad bi ti bilo neugodno što nešto nisi naučio jer je ona bila tako dobra. Bila je prepredraga, Prihvaćala je sve odgovore. Nije sad bilo baš da ništa nisi trebao znati, ali ako je vidjela da se mučiš sjetiti neke riječi, dopustila bi da kažeš i neku drugu sličnu riječ, samo da, kao, preneseš misao.*". (P10)

Unlike Participant Five, Participants Nine and Ten shared their experiences and described their teachers as motivational. Their teachers would motivate them to try harder, to give their best and this affected the participants positively. Their teachers' approach, attitude and discourse were welcomed and accepted by the participants. This shows that teachers can motivate their students by using the right techniques and discourse, not just by insulting and belittling the students.

5. CONCLUSION

When it comes to the participants' general opinion on high school, many agreed that they were generally satisfied, but that there were some teachers that left a negative impression on them. When asked about the influence of the teacher's behaviour on the students' perception of the subject, some mentioned that it did affect their attitude towards the subject. One participant explained that they were really fond of Maths as a subject, but because of their teacher's behaviour and attitude towards teaching, they started giving up and receiving lower grades.

Regarding the four subjects the participants were questioned on, English had the most positive comments and feedback from the participants. However, most participants negatively remember Maths classes, describing them as boring and unproductive, with teachers only writing on the board and students copying what was being written. It is important for teachers to understand that their main goal should be to motivate their students and that their attitude in class could transfer to their students' attitude towards the subject. If the students realise that their teacher does not care about teaching, they will also not care about learning. In addition, teachers should be aware of their language use and how they address their students as discourse plays an important role in students' perception of the teacher and the subject.

In conclusion, the participants mostly shared the same opinions regarding the use of the standard language in educational institutions, as well as the importance of the teacher's attitude in class. All participants were satisfied with the interview and expressed their desire to participate in similar interviews in the future. Some of the results from the interview were as expected, e.g., regarding the participants' opinions on standard language use. However, some of the other answers were quite shocking. There were many results in which teachers' discourse was described as demotivational. Many participants used the word 'demotivational' when describing teachers that they were not fond of and, in the end, the subject they did not like. In addition, there were examples that showed how teachers can establish inequality (or equality) amongst students through discourse by stating e.g., that male students are better than female students, etc. Thankfully, there were many results that described teachers as motivational as they had had a positive impact on their students.

This research was based on analysing different ideologies present in high school. Apart from the ideology of the standard language that was expected to be mentioned, other language ideologies were the ideology of assimilation, as well as the monoglossic and heteroglossic

ideologies. Regarding extralinguistic ideologies, we encountered the ideology of male supremacy, ideology of equality, in which everyone is considered equal and deserving of respect despite their age or gender, ideology of superiority, in which the teacher established rules that do not apply to them since they hold authority over their students, etc.

When discussing the limitations of this study, it is important to mention the number of participants. Not many generalisations can be made on this sample of ten participants. Further, some participants had problems recalling some of the things they had experienced in high school and needed some additional time to recall, resulting in longer interviews.

Since this study was based on investigating the participants' high school experience, it could be followed up by a study on their university experience, since all participants enrolled in college after high school.

6. REFERENCES

Becker, K. (2018). The Sociolinguistic Interview. In Mallinson, C., Childs, B. and Van Herk, G. (eds) *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics*. Routledge. 99-107.

Blommaert, J. and C. Bulcaen (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 29*. Annual Reviews. 447-466.

Briggs, C. L. (2005). Sociolinguistic Interviews. In Von Ulrich Ammon, H., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. J. and Trudgill, P. (eds) *Sociolinguistics, An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. 1052-1062.

Cots, J. M. et al. (2022). *Promoting translanguaging (or not) in the ESP classroom: An analysis of monoglossic and heteroglossic practices and discourses*. Elsevier Ltd.

Dijk, T. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E. and Schiffrin D. (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Wiley Blackwell. 466-485.

Feagin, C. (2013). Entering the community. In Chambers, J.K. and Schilling, N. (eds) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 17-37.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Kahveci, H. (2023). The positive and negative effects of teacher attitudes and behaviors on student progress. In *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 7(1), 290-306.

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.

Milroy, J. (1999). The consequences of standardisation in descriptive linguistics. In Bex, T. and Watts, R. J. (eds) *Standard English*. Routledge. 16-39.

Philips, S. U. (2015). Language Ideologies. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E. and Schiffrin D. (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Wiley Blackwell. 557-575.

Piller, I. (2015). Language Ideologies. In Tracy, K (ed) *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1-10.

Rogers, R. (ed) (2004). *An Introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Starčević, A. (2016). Trenirka, diktafon i "iskrivljen hrvatski": metodološki izazovi sociolingvističkog intervjua i sudioničkog promatranja. In Kovačević, K.C. and Udier S.L. (eds) *Metodologija i primjena lingvističkih istraživanja*. Srednja Europa. 3-17.

Uddin, M. S. (2019). Critical Pedagogy and its Implication in the Classroom. In *Journal of Underrepresented and Minority Progress*, 3(2), 109-119.

Wray, A. and A. Bloomer (2012). *Projects in Linguistics and Language Studies. A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. Abingdon: Hodder Education.

Yadav, R. N. (2013). Language planning and language ideology: the majority and minority dichotomy in Nepal. In *Tribhuvan University Journal*, *Vol. 28*. 197-202

7. APPENDIX

Općenito o školovanju

1. Kakvo je tvoje sjećanje na srednjoškolske dane?
2. Jesi li volio/voljela ići u srednju školu?
3. Kakvi su ti bili profesori u srednjoj školi?

Jezik u nastavi

1. Sjećaš li se kak su te profesori ispravljali na nastavi kad bi neš krivo rekao/rekla?
2. Jesu li profesori htjeli da uvijek govoriš standardnim jezikom?
3. Kak su se profesori ponašali kad bi nešto rekao/rekla „nestandardnim" hrvatskim?

Nastava matematike

1. Kakva je bila nastava iz matematike? Kakva je bila atmosfera na nastavi?
2. Sjećaš li se kako je tvoj/tvoja profesor/profesorica iz matematike govorio/govorila na nastavi? Je li se uvijek koristio/koristila standardnim hrvatskim jezikom?
3. Na koji način te profesor/profesorica matematike ispravljao/ispravljala kada bi nešto krivo rekao/rekla? Je li te pokušavao/pokušavala navesti na točan odgovor, je li te možda ponižavao/ponižavala kad bi nešto krivo rekao i sl.?
4. Je li način na koji ti se profesor/profesorica iz matematike obraćao/obraćala ostavio i danas utjecaja na tebe?
5. Jesi li možda zbog profesora/profesorice zamrzio/zamrzila matematiku?

Nastava hrvatskog jezika

1. Kakva je bila nastava iz hrvatskog jezika? Kakva je bila atmosfera na nastavi?
2. Sjećaš li se kako je tvoj/tvoja profesor/profesorica iz hrvatskog govorio/govorila na nastavi? Je li se uvijek koristio/koristila standardnim hrvatskim jezikom?
3. Na koji način te profesor/profesorica hrvatskog ispravljao/ispravljala kada bi nešto krivo rekao/rekla? Je li te pokušavao/pokušavala navesti na točan odgovor, je li te možda ponižavao/ponižavala kad bi nešto krivo rekao i sl.?
4. Je li način na koji ti se profesor/profesorica iz hrvatskog obraćao/obraćala ostavio i danas utjecaja na tebe?
5. Jesi li možda zbog profesora/profesorice zamrzio/zamrzila hrvatski?

Nastava engleskog jezika

1. Kakva je bila nastava engleskog jezika? Kakva je bila atmosfera na nastavi?
2. Kako te profesor/profesorica engleskog jezika ispravljao/ispravljala na nastavi?
3. Je li profesor/profesorica engleskog jezika u provjerama znanja/ispitivanjima tražio/tražila točno one riječi i izraze koje ste učili na nastavi ili je dopuštao/dopuštala uporabu sličnih riječi koje si naučio/naučila van nastave?
4. Je li profesor/profesorica engleskog jezika ikada ismijavao/ismijavala učenike zbog naglaska i načina na koji izgovaraju riječi na engleskom jeziku?
5. Je li način na koji ti se profesor/profesorica iz engleskog jezika obraćao/obraćala i danas ostavio utjecaja na tebe?
6. Jesi li možda zbog profesora/profesorice iz engleskog zamrzio engleski jezik?

Nastava drugog stranog jezika

1. Koji si još strani jezik učio/učila u srednjoj školi?
2. Kakva je bila nastava tog jezika? Kakva je bila atmosfera na nastavi?
3. Kako te profesor/profesorica ispravljao/ispravljala na nastavi? Je li te pokušao/pokušala navesti na točan odgovor, je li te možda ponižavao/ponižavala?
4. Je li način na koji ti se profesor/profesorica obraćao/obraćala i danas ostavilo utjecaja na tebe?
5. Jesi li možda zamrzio/zamrzila taj jezik zbog profesora/profesorice?
6. Koristiš li se i dalje tim jezikom, sjećaš li se možda još nekih fraza ili si ga u potpunosti zaboravio/zaboravila?
7. Misliš li da si trebao/trebala izabrati neki drugi strani jezik umjesto tog koji si učio/učila?

Odnos nastavnika prema učenicima

1. Jesi li možda zavolio/zavoljela neki predmet zbog načina na koji se profesor/profesorica obraćao/obraćala i odnosio/odnosila prema učenicima?
2. Kako su se profesori općenito odnosili prema učenicima u srednjoj školi? Jesu li imali razumijevanja i strpljenja za učeničke pogreške i poteškoće ili su ponižavali učenike zbog istog?
3. Smatraš li da način na koji se profesori obraćaju učenicima ostavlja utjecaja na njih i da može utjecati na njihovo znanje iz određenog predmeta?