SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Odsjek za anglistiku

Tamara Bosnar-Musija

Jezične ideologije u poučavanju engleskog jezika

Diplomski rad

Mentor: dr. sc. Anđel Starčević, docent

svibanj 2019.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of English

Tamara Bosnar-Musija

Language Ideologies in English Language Teaching

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Anđel Starčević, Assistant Professor

May 2019

ABSTRACT

Ideologies can be defined as systems of common-sensical ideas and beliefs. They become common sense by being reproduced by institutions. The aim of this study is to identify and examine language ideologies found in English classrooms in Croatia, focusing particularly on the influence teachers have had on their students' later attitudes to the foreign language. The method that has been used to gain the data is the semi-structured interview. The participants' responses show that they have encountered and adopted three major types of language ideologies. The first is the ideology of the standard language. The participants find the standard to be a more prestigious variety. The second ideology is the ideology of the native speaker, which is reflected in the participants' view of the native speaker as an authority on language. The third group of ideologies on which the participants' answers have been collected are different ideologies concerning code-switching. The participants mostly favour the ideologies of monoglossia and monolingualism, that is, the exclusive use of English in the classroom. Moreover, they believe that their former teachers' attitudes, that is, displays of language ideologies, are pedagogically justified because they facilitate language progress.

KEY WORDS: language ideology, standard language, native speaker, code-switching, ELT

Table of contents:

1 INTRODUCTION

Language is used for much more than just exchanging information – people use it to say who they are and one can assume a lot about others just by hearing them speak, such as their social status or where they come from. Nowadays, English is the main means of communication, or in other words, it is a global language and its teaching has, thus, become essential. Its importance has been recognized in Croatia as well and is nowadays taught in primary and secondary schools, as well as many language schools. However, each teacher, while teaching the subject, may consciously or unconsciously transfer their beliefs about the language and, by extension, about the world to their students. The aim of this research paper is to examine English teachers' beliefs about language, that is, their language ideologies by interviewing former learners of English. Moreover, the aim is to see whether the respondents have adopted the language ideologies which they encountered during their formal education.

2 ENGLISH AS A GLOBAL LANGUAGE

English has indisputably become one of the most wide-spread languages and it is often defined as a global language meaning that it is "a contact language, or in other words, a vehicular language between speakers who do not share a first language" (Mauranen 2017:7) and that "it develops a special role that is recognized in every country" (Crystal 2003:3).

According to Kamwangamalu the status of English as the global language "is practically a mirror of major global events over the past 155 years and this ties practically all language teaching, including the choice of foreign languages, to large-scale, real-world, political events, and the world's traffic in goods, services, science and communication" (2010:164). Furthermore, Crystal presents two main reasons why English is a global language today – the first is the geo-historical one and the second one is the socio-cultural one (2003:29).

The geo-historical reason refers to British colonial power which began in the eighteenth century and spread to the Americas and Asia, as well as to the Africa and the South Pacific in the nineteenth century (Crystal 2003:29). Moreover, the English language became an official language in newly independent states during the twentieth century (ibid.). The fact that English was so wide-spread made it easy for it to become a global language. Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, Pincas (2003:1) claim that "as a mother tongue, it ranks second only to Chinese, [...] [o]n the other hand the 300 million native speakers of English are to be found in

every continent, and an equally widely distributed body of second language speakers, who use English for their day-to-day needs, totals over 250 million". However, having many speakers is not enough for a language to claim the status of a global language, which is evident from the example of the Chinese language. In Crystal's words, "[w]hy a language becomes a global [one] has little to do with the number of people who speak it. It is much more to do with who those speakers are" (Crystal 2003:7).

Moreover, Crystal states that there is another reason for English claiming the status of the global language – the socio-cultural one (2003:29). The author says that "the socio-cultural explanation looks at the way people from all over the world, in many walks of life, have come to depend on English" for various reasons some of which may be their economy, politics, communication, media, and finally, education (ibid.) which is the subject matter of this paper. Thus, if one wants to have a voice in today's globalized world, they need English which makes teaching English as a second or foreign language essential.

3 ENGLISH IN CROATIA

The importance of learning and teaching English is recognized in Croatia as well; however, it has not always had the status it has today, nor has its instruction been so pervasive. For a long time, Latin had primacy as a second language in schools (Vilke 2007:18). During the nineteenth century, "French and German joined Latin as part of the curriculum of every respectable secondary school in Croatia", while English appeared only sporadically (Vilke 2007:18). Filipović mentions that many people would take private tutors (1972:241). English gained popularity during the second part of the twentieth century while German, French, and Russian lost theirs (Vilke 2007:19). Nowadays, English language is taught in both primary and secondary schools as an obligatory subject, as well as in many foreign language schools. The Croatian National Education Standards for Foreign Languages (CNES) views knowledge of foreign languages as one of the key competences and clearly states that the educational system has to acknowledge the changes in modern society by providing their students with language and communication skills (2006:4-5). Furthermore, teachers of foreign languages thus have an integral role in the process of educating learners and helping them achieve these skills. However, each teacher has a different view of how and what to teach, as well as their own beliefs, not only about language, but also about the world, which they consciously or unconsciously transfer to their students – meaning that education cannot be neutral or value free. As Lo Bianco (2010:164) points out "teachers enact communicative, pedagogic and

ideological decisions which can entrench lifelong patterns of communication skill, identity and ability". The author elaborates further:

> "First, teacher classroom language implements norm choices, of code and register, made from those available to the participants in that setting, that is the learner and the teacher. Teachers' authoritative position as regulators and controllers of permitted language (topics and arguments, what can be said), and their role in 'policing' how things are said, constitutes the teacher as a LP authority. [...] Third, teacher classroom language contains moments of metalinguistic reflection, observation and analysis. These are occasions during which teachers might attach connotative meaning, that is, value, emotion or ideology, to linguistic form. Fourth, the literacy and literate practices of the teacher and what the teacher promotes and validates as acceptable literacy practice from the students, involve teachers implementing written language norms and standards in a similar way to those teachers implement for spoken language" (ibid. 166).

This means that teachers' reflection is essential. Johnson comments that "L2 teacher education programs have an obligation to inform L2 teachers of and provide them with the tools to actively and continually scrutinize the macro-structures that are ever present in the contexts in which they live, learn, and work" (2009:122). However, they should not only be able to scrutinize the world they live in, but consider how their beliefs about the world reflect in their teaching. Teachers need to be, according to Giroux and McLaren, transformative intellectuals, that is, "professionals who are able and willing to reflect upon the ideological principles that inform practice, who connect pedagogical theory and practice to wider social issues, and who work together to share ideas, and exercise power over the conditions of more humane life" (Giroux and McLaren 1989, cited in Johnson 2009:121).

4 IDEOLOGY

The term *ideology* was first coined by the eighteen-century French philosopher Destutt de Tracy who wished to create a science that would provide a rational foundation for the study and critique of knowledge and ideas (Kennedy 1979:355, Terrell 2009:1). The understanding of the notion changed over time and in the nineteenth century captured the interest of the social scientists. Ideology has been one of the central concepts within the Marxist theories, and later on, Neo-Marxist ones. Marxists believe that ideology refers to hidden systems of domination and control that support the interests of the ruling class emphasizing the element of unequal power relations (Elster 1986:168). This idea was later applied by the Neo-marxists to many areas of life. For example, Gramsci views the effects of ideology through education (Monasta 2002:79). Gramsci focuses on how the educational system spreads the dominant ideology thus

maintaining the position of the ruling class by perpetuating their ideas and values, making their world-view the accepted norm which is also known as cultural hegemony (Ritzer 1997:135).

However, according to Verschueren, ideology may be summarized and defined

> "as any constellation of fundamental or commonsensical, and often normative, beliefs and ideas related to some aspect(s) of (social) 'reality'. The commonsense nature of the beliefs and ideas is manifested in the fact that they are rarely questioned […] the beliefs and ideas in question are often […] carried along implicitly rather than to be formulated explicitly" (Verschueren 1999: 238).

In other words, ideologies are implicit and understood as commonsensical because they are deeply ingrained within a society, which means that they are understood as facts, and facts are rarely questioned. There are many different kinds of ideologies related to various aspects within every society, which means that no area of human activity is ideology-free and language is no exception.

Ideologies about language or *language ideologies* can be defined as "[s]ocially, culturally, and historically conditioned ideas, images, and perceptions about language and communication" (Blommaert 2005:253). Tollefson and Yamagami (2013:1) provide a two-fold definition of language ideology. The first part refers to "specific sets of ideas and beliefs that individuals and institutions articulate and promote", while the second one refers to "complex, often implicit cultural conceptions of language that are closely linked with social structure, social identity, and beliefs about what is "normal" and "natural" in human societies" (Tollefson and Yamagami 2013:1). Therefore, one's language ideologies are never only about the language itself and should not be viewed in isolation, but connected to the social circumstances of the speaker. If recognized and analysed, language ideologies can show how one's beliefs about language are connected to one's attitudes about the extralinguistic world, that is, about the social and cultural systems the speaker belongs to. Doerr states that "[l]anguage ideologies connect linguistic form and use with the very notion of the person and the social group, as they integrate language users and their politico-economic positions and interests" (2009:18). Milroy comments on the power language ideologies have by saying that:

> "Everybody is supposed to know [their language] – it is part of general knowledge to know it, […] it is believed to be open to everyone to learn what the correct forms are; therefore, it is thought to be quite proper to discriminate – in employment, for example – against people who

use non-standard forms. Although it is now unacceptable to discriminate openly against someone for reasons of ethnic group, social class, religion or gender, it is still acceptable to discriminate openly on linguistic grounds. Unfortunately, people do not usually realize that language stands proxy for these other social categories" (2007:135).

However, not everybody has equal opportunity to learn the 'correct', that is, standard forms. Use of non-standard forms is usually a basis for discrimination because non-standard forms are used by particular groups of people. Moreover, while it may be unacceptable to openly discriminate against somebody's ethnic background or social class, discriminating against somebody based on their language use is perfectly acceptable, even though it actually means discriminating against the group they belong to. Therefore, discrimination based on one's language use should be viewed as equally unacceptable as discrimination based on other social categories.

Blommaert (1999:6) thus advocates linguistic research done through an ideological perspective considering contributions it can make. The author argues that linguistics has traditionally focused mainly on language forms and functions while not examining certain aspects that ideological perspective can address (Blommaert 1999, cited in McGroarty 2010:4). Blommaert believes that language should be examined in the context in which it appeared, while taking into account the actors, their power relations, and, finally, looking into which linguistic ideologies are reproduced by institutions (ibid.). The author explains that the more linguistic ideologies are reproduced by institutions and everyday practices, the more likely they are to undergo normalization, which the author sees as a "hegemonic pattern in which the ideological claims are perceived as "normal" ways of thinking and acting" (Blommaert 1999:10).

One of such institutions in which language ideologies easily undergo normalization is school, more precisely the foreign language classroom. Thus, research informed by an ideological perspective based on learners' experiences from a language classroom may be quite beneficial in order "to uncover the hidden world of students and teachers to shed light on the fundamental forces that shape and give meaning to their actions and interactions" (Tollefson and Yamagami 2013:1) given that "[t]he activities of L2 teaching […] are not neutral but instead are embedded in and emerge out of the broader social, historical, political, and ideological practices that constitute L2 teachers' professional worlds" (Johnson 2009:93).

4.1 STANDARD LANGUAGE AND FORMS OF CAPITAL

According to Milroy, "[s]peakers are not usually conscious that they are conditioned by [certain] ideological positions: they usually believe their attitudes to language to be common sense and assume that virtually everyone agrees with them" (2007:133), even though there are many, often contradictory and conflicting language ideologies in every society. Nevertheless, many will agree that a uniform standard language has its advantages, the most prominent one being its function, meaning that "it can be used in a wide variety of different spheres of activity" (ibid. 134). Thus, one of the most widespread language ideologies is *the ideology of the standard language*, which is the belief that the standard dialect is better, more logical, precise, elegant, and the only legitimate variety of a given language (Milroy and Milroy 1999). Additionally, it is based on the common-sense belief that communication is more efficient if everyone speaks a uniform standard language (Milroy and Milroy 1999:19). Milroy suggests several interrelated and overlapping ideas behind the ideology of the standard language, which are: the relevance of prestige, the notion of correctness, the importance of authority, and the idea of legitimacy (2007:134).

The standard variety of any language enjoys "overt prestige, that is, positive value ascribed to language forms which is based on their value in the mainstream society" (Trudgill 1972, cited in Wolfram 2007:82). Furthermore, "it should be noted that prestige is not primarily a property of a linguistic form or variety – it is a property of speakers, or groups of speakers, some of whom are accorded higher social prestige than others, and this is very clearly related to varying social class or social status" (Milroy 2007:137). In other words, linguistic forms have no value on their own – their prestige is tied to the speakers. Therefore, the higher the social status of the speaker, the higher the social status of the associated linguistic variety.

Lippi-Green maintains that the ideology of the standard language is based on "a bias toward an abstract, idealized homogenous spoken language, which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class" (1997:64). Given that the standard language is drawn from the language of the upper social classes, it is regarded as superior to other varieties, because, again, the value of a linguistic variety is tied to the social status of its speakers. Furthermore, its status is maintained by the educational system by only permitting the use of standard language in the classroom, which may put those who do not speak it at a disadvantage. On the other hand, in a foreign language classroom, focusing only

on the standard variety is justified by the limited time in the weekly schedule students have to learn the foreign language, so non-standard forms are erased.

Given that standard forms are more overtly prestigious ones, they bear more of what Bourdieu calls *linguistic capital* (1991:18). According to Bourdieu, *capital* is an umbrella term defined as "accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its ″incorporated″, embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor" (1986:241). This means that capital may be understood as means which allow one to assume a certain position within the society and linguistic capital can be observed in the way one speaks and writes. Moreover, those who have more linguistic capital become more competitive in the linguistic market and enjoy more legitimacy or credibility; hence, they may build upon other forms of capital – economic and social (Thompson 1991:14). Milroy and Milroy give an example of

> "[a] person who speaks English perfectly effectively, but who has occasional usages that are said to be 'substandard' (e.g. omitting initial [h] in words like happy, hair, or using double negatives) may well find that his or her social mobility is blocked and may, for example, be refused access to certain types of employment without any official admission that the refusals depend partly or wholly on his or her use of language" (1999:2).

Therefore, "learners have powerful practical reasons for learning standard languages, based upon the fact that languages are pervasively used to channel individuals unequally into different occupational, social, and economic groups" (Tollefson 2000:50). This means that if one wants to be perceived positively, as smart, competent, or successful, one has to learn and use the standard; otherwise, the person's social mobility will be blocked. While prestige based on local values may be ascribed to forms and varieties, "[l]inguistic forms that are favoured by the lower social classes tend to be stigmatized in the wider community, and these are typically the forms that are rejected in the educational system" (Milroy 2007:137). In line with those claims, many people are aware of the prestige of the standard, and they are as equally aware that their production is not completely standard – this awareness as well as uncertainty which arises when using a language is called *schizoglossia*. It is defined as "a linguistic malady which may arise in speakers and writers who are exposed to more than one variety of their own language" (Haugen 1962:63) as well as a foreign language, which may be quite detrimental and demotivational in a language classroom.

Moreover, the standard language is sustained by the notion of correctness (Milroy 2007:134). In standard-language cultures, according to Milroy, almost "everyone subscribes to the idea of correctness" (ibid.) producing a polar and binary outlook on language. That means that while some forms are believed to be right and correct, others are perceived as wrong, and this is generally taken for granted as common sense – "correctness rules are thought to be rules of language (not of society), and no justification is needed for rejecting [incorrect forms]" (ibid. 135). Therefore, there is also no need to justify the rejection of *people* who use non-standard language. Milroy continues by saying that, "[a]lthough rules of correctness are actually superimposed upon the language from outside, they are considered by speakers to be rules inherent in the language itself" (ibid.). However, language rules are made by people, that is, by what Milroy calls *outside*, so these people decide which language forms can be considered correct and which cannot. In other words, rules of correctness aare not a spontaneous and necessary element in the language itself.

Rules of correctness are imposed by institutions, among which are schools, positioned as authorities on linguistic matters. Language thus becomes "the possession of only a few persons (usually not clearly specified) who have the authority to impose the rules of language on everyone else" (ibid.). Therefore, this ideology may often be found in a language classroom given that the maintenance of the standard language and preserving it from `corruption´ is expected of the educational system. Milroy claims that "it is believed that if these efforts at maintenance are neglected, the language will be subject to corruption and decay, and will ultimately disintegrate […] if it is not taken care of by privileged authorities, it will inevitably decline" (ibid. 139). Thus, it is the teachers' responsibility to pass on the `proper´ language by correcting any non-standard production. Teachers may also, depending on their corrective practices, become *language brokers* or *language breakers*. A language broker is a person who acts as an interpreter or mediator between speakers of different languages (Morales and Hanson 2005:472). Even though language brokers are usually children (ibid. 492), one may argue that teachers have the same role of interpreting and bringing two languages and cultures closer and guiding learners to become skilled users of another language. On the other hand, a language breaker is a person who demotivates another by criticizing their production (Starčević 2014:193). While a certain amount of correction is needed, it is also important how it is done. A teacher may become a language breaker by mainly focusing on students' mistakes and repeatedly correcting their production or even making fun of their sudents' mistakes to the point of them becoming demotivated and even

giving up. Tollefson remarks that "error correction in language teaching is probably the most striking manifestation of standard language ideology, along with the related belief that students' lack of motivation, their carelessness, and merely their failure to learn are the reasons for the non-standard linguistic forms that learners produce" (2000:44). Error correction is justified as being the only way to learn a `proper´, standard language. Given that non-standard forms are usually not found in course books, students are probably more motivated to learn a language if their production consists of, for example, occasional slang words. However, as I have mentioned before, teachers may be the ones to blame for their students' lack of motivation if they overly criticize their production.

The standard variety is codified, that is, standardized, in grammar books and dictionaries (Milroy 2007:136). Codification helps it become the legitimate variety, while simultaneously rendering other forms illegitimate. Moreover, teachers are helped in their efforts to legitimize the standard language by various clasroom tools (textbooks, grammar books, and dictionaries) which, Tollefson explains, "sustain the illusion of a uniform standard language (a 'target language')", "persuading English language teachers and learners against all evidence to the contrary that uniformity is normal and desirable" (Milroy and Milroy 1985, cited in Tollefson 2000:44).

Furthermore, Cameron claims that variation is believed to be deviant when it comes to the standard language and that "any residual variation in standard English must therefore be the contingent and deplorable result of some users' carelessness, idleness or incompetence" (Cameron 1995:39). Thus, "language learning is widely seen as the process of attempting to produce increasingly close approximations to standard English. The measure of a learner's success is his or her ability to approximate standard forms" (Tollefson 2000:45). Otherwise, the learner is seen as incompetent. Tollefson adds that:

> " [f]irst, standard languages are in fact idealized constructs; the speech of speakers of Standard English includes significant variation that is largely ignored within ELT theory and practice. Second, though standard languages are usually considered to be politically neutral, equally accessible to everyone, and inherently superior to other varieties, in fact they are based upon whatever variety is spoken by the upper middle class. Third, educational institutions play a crucial role in imposing the standard, through systematic sanctions against those who do not speak the standard, and rewards (e.g. good grades in school) for those who do" (2007:26).

Moreover, Cameron remarks on the lack of variation: "Expecting everyone to learn and use the same standard variety is no more realistic than requiring everyone to be the same height: despite the apparently commonsense advantages of uniformity, linguistic variation (like biological variation) is an essential characteristic of all human societies and impossible to eliminate" (Cameron 1995, cited in Tollefson and Yamagami 2013:4). In other words, variation is an essential part of any language, and it would be unrealistic to expect everyone to learn and use the standard; however, its exclusive use is insisted upon in many, if not most foreign language classrooms.

4.2 NATIVE SPEAKER

The belief that the native speaker is the one who knows their language best, that they are the "ultimate authority" (Aneja 2014:26) is rarely questioned; furthermore, it is often considered that native speakers of English make better English language teachers. According to Johnson, "the public discourse surrounding L2 teachers has operated under certain assumptions about the supremacy of the native speaker; that is, if you can speak the language, you can teach it. Thus, in part, knowledge about language has, at least in the public discourse, been defined as 'native speaker-ness'" (2009:41). Why the native speaker is considered the authority on language is also elaborated by Pennycook (1994:175-176), who states three ideologies which support the native speaker's position and authority in the eyes of non-linguists.

The first ideology is the idea implying that the native speaker has an innate competence in their language and that being a native speaker means having high levels of competence in all domains of their mother tongue (Pennycook 1994:175). However, this need not be true given that what is usually considered to be the best language is the standard, and not all speakers use the standard. According to Trudgill, native speakers are speakers of many diverse varieties, among which is the standard (1999:118). However, Doerr mentions Quirk's (Quirk 1985, cited in Doerr 2009:32) view of identifying only native speakers' speech as the standard and claiming that native speakers have complete competence in their first languages, and, consequently, viewing non-native speakers of English as deficient.

The second ideology Pennycook discusses is the idea that there is a close connection between being a citizen of a nation-state and being a native speaker of the state's national language (Pennycook 1994:176). Doerr further comments on this connection by saying that "a nation is imagined as a homogenous unit" (2009:20), thus, a language that is spoken within each

nation-state must, by extension, be homogenous. What is meant by homogenous is everybody learning and using the standard language; however, as I have mentioned before, linguistic uniformity and lack of variation are impossible. Therefore, a native speaker may not be a speaker of the standard language.

This premise leads to the third ideology Pennycook discusses, which is the belief that language is a *homogeneous and fixed system* with a homogeneous speech community, which allows "a rigid and clear distinction between being a native speaker and not being so" (Pennycook 1994:176). However, this view may be challenged by the notion of Bakhtin's heteroglossia (1981:428), which considers *linguistic variation* as normal and essential. Another concept too arises against the view of linguistic homogeneity, which is the notion of *orderly heterogeneity* by Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968:162). The authors claim that language is not fixed or homogenous and that it varies orderly because it serves a complex community (ibid. 101). If the community is complex and not homogenous, then not all native speakers are the same nor is their language, so the native speaker cannot be the ultimate authority on language; moreover, the concept of the native speaker cannot be understood as one-dimensional.

However, the ideology of the native speaker is still endorsed by both language teachers and learners, and thus plays an important role in language education. The question which arises most often is whether non-native speakers (NNS) are as good language teachers as their native-speaking (NS) counterparts. According to McKay, EIL (English as an International Language) discourse "often positions English learners and bilingual teachers as deficient in comparison to NS" while also idealizing the so-called NS (2010:107). Aneja further argues this belief saying that NNS teachers' professional, pedagogical skills are often overlooked and because "only native speakers can be legitimate teachers, developing language proficiency or professional skill sets is futile" (2014:27). The author continues by saying that: "Because native speakers were considered expert teachers by definition, even if a native and non-native teacher received the same professional training and had the same pedagogical expertise, the native speaker's language proficiency would be higher, making [them] the more expert teacher" (ibid. 33).

Some authors, such as Kubota 2009:234, Doerr and Kumagai 2009:301, agree on the reason why learners would prefer teachers who are NSs – their supposed proficiency of their native language, namely, the standard variety of their native language. Kubota claims that "the

native speakers teachers' linguistic expertise in so-called Standard English is equated with their teaching expertise. In other words, by virtue of being a native speaker of Standard English, a teacher is perceived as superior to experienced non-native teachers" (Kubota 2009:234). However, not all NSs are speakers of the standard variety. Aa I have mentioned before, the standard is considered to be the most prestigious variety of a given language (Milroy 2007:137), so Doerr and Kumagai comment on the learners' position by saying that to be a successful learner, "one must be able to use English to accomplish their academic, personal, and social goals with the same proficiency as native speakers of English" (2009:301). Therefore, it is believed that the way to accomplish the goal of coming as close to the ideal type native speaker as possible and belonging to the speech community of native speakers may be to have a NS as a teacher.

Nevertheless, there are advantages of having a NNS foreign language teacher. The NNS teacher has the upper hand because they may use both the learners' L1 and their L2. Macaro points out the following:

> "Yet, the match between the bilingual teacher's brain and that of the L2 learner is much closer than that of the monolingual teacher and the L2 learner. Consequently, the former teacher's understanding of the learner's interlanguage state is likely to be much richer than that of the native speaker teacher who will, by necessity, be forced to override interlanguage development being unable to detect a great deal of the systematicity in it. Moreover, the teacher who has learnt more than one language is able to demonstrate that learning and using a second language is achievable and useful both to themselves and to others" (2005:65).

Thus, by speaking both L1 and L2, the teacher can pinpoint the learners' needs and possible struggles in L2 learning which may yield faster progress. Furthermore, the NNS teachers have to go through linguistic as well as pedagogical education, neither of which is sometimes expected of NS teachers. Finally, Doerr and Kumagai emphasize the importance of raising the learner's awareness of linguistic reality:

> "The goal of second language education, then, needs to move away from guiding learners to join the "imagined" target community of native speakers. Instead, the goals can include encouraging learners to (1) become familiar with any linguistic varieties that are meaningful and relevant to them, regardless of the status of the linguistic varieties (i.e., standard, non-standard, "native," or "non-native" variety) and (2) understand power politics and implications involved in the uses of various language varieties including hybrid language" (2009:305).

4.3 CODE-SWITCHING

Code-switching, which is the use of more than one code at a time, is yet another disputed topic in language teaching. Kamwangamalu (2010:127) defines it as entailing "simultaneous use of two languages including a target language (L2) such as English and students' first language (L1), or of two varieties of the target language, one standard and one nonstandard, for classroom interaction and instructional exchanges". While some authors, such as Charpentier 1997, cited in Tollefson 2007: 25-26, Porter 1990:125, McKay 2010:112, Auerbach 2000, cited in Tollefson 2007:28, Kamwangamalu 2010:132, discuss whether or not to engage in code-switching between the target language (L2) and their first language (L1) in a language classroom, its advantages and disadvantages, this paper will also deal with code-switching between varieties of the target language, namely varieties of English.

For example, Charpentier, argues against bilingual language classroom saying that it "seems to lead to social, psychological, and pedagogical blockage" because students "cannot seem to figure out the respective roles and characteristics of the two codes" (Charpentier 1997, cited in Tollefson 2007:25-26). Moreover, Porter claims that time spent using the language is the most important in determining success in English language learning, which justifies exclusive use of English in the classroom (Porter 1990:125). However, other authors have found positive effects of code-switching in the language classroom. McKay says that:

> "encouraging code-switching in EIL classrooms is beneficial in that it will provide equal status to all of the languages learners speak and provide a context for students to investigate reasons for code-switching. And most importantly it allows for a discretionary use of the first language as a means of developing proficiency in English" (McKay 2010:112).

Furthermore, Auerbach lists several major advantages for using L1 in the classroom which can be summed up as being a learner-centered, more inclusive approach which promotes retention and language progress (Auerbach 2000, cited in Tollefson 2007:28). Kamwangamalu goes further by saying that "[r]equiring the students not to use their L1 in the classroom [...] can have a detrimental effect on the learners' academic development" (2010:132).

However, as I have mentioned, the question of code-switching does not only concern L1 and L2, but also whether it is acceptable to code-switch between the varieties of the target language. Teachers usually choose between standard British and standard American English

which may be due to "most textbooks assum[ing] that the target language is one of the major standardized varieties, usually American or British English" (Tollefson 2007:25). While some teachers acknowledge the use of the different varieties of the English language as perfectly acceptable, others see them as distinct and consider code-switching between them as not using *proper* language. Whatever one a teacher believes in is a reflection of a language ideology. Behind the question whether code-switching is acceptable or not are two opposing ideologies: *the heteroglossic ideology* and *the monoglossic ideology*.

The heteroglossic ideology is the belief which is based on the understanding that "at any given time, in any given place, there will be a set of conditions – social, historical, meteorological, physiological – that will insure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning different than it would have under any other conditions" (Bakhtin 1981:428), or in other words, that it is acceptable to use more than one code at the time, that is, that it is acceptable to code-switch (Gal 2007:156)

The heteroglossic ideology is linked to *the ideology of bilingualism* – an umbrella term used for various views on who a bilingual person is and what kind of bilingualism is acceptable. Cenoz mentions that Blackledge and Creese distinguish between *ideologies of separate* and *flexible bilingualism* (Blackledge and Creese 2009, cited in Cenoz 2013:4). Ideology of separate bilingualism is the idea that the languages a person speaks should be in separate containers and not mix (ibid.); therefore, a bilingual person is only a perfectly balanced individual who does not code-switch and knows when to use which language. Moreover, even though this view promotes bilingualism, it is often connected to not condoning usage of both codes in the classroom. The latter, the ideology of flexible bilingualism claims that "the speaker and not the language is the centre and language practices allow for combining different languages" (ibid.) which means that it allows code-switching and gives learners more time to learn a language without pushing them into a monolingual foreign language classroom where no other language is recognized as legitimate.

Opposed to the heteroglossic ideology is *the monoglossic ideology*, similar to the ideology of separate bilingualism, which emphasizes "the idea that languages are distinct entities and should be kept strictly separate in their use" (Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015:411), which again, may be used to promote other *extralinguistic ideas* and consequently allow discrimination against anybody who does mix codes. In the classroom, students switching between codes

may thus be seen as unsuccessful in learning the foreign language; this applies regardless of whether they use their native language or another variety of the target language.

Furthermore, the monoglossic ideology is similar to *the ideology of monolingualism,* which refers to the belief that for group communication, a single language is more efficient than multiple languages (Baker 2006, cited in Tollefson and Yamagami 2013:2). This ideology can easily be imposed in a foreign language classroom because it can be justified on pedagogical grounds as a prerequisite for successful language learning. In an English classroom this ideology would also be known as the *English-only approach* (Lee 2012:1, Enama 2016:21).

5 METHODOLOGY

One of the most widely used methods for gaining qualitative data on people's experiences and attitudes is the interview (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006:315) – in this research, the emphasis is on exploring and uncovering language ideologies speakers have adopted during their education. Even though the type of interview structure may vary, this interview follows a semi-structured format because it is more flexible than a structured one, and allows the researcher to obtain extended stretches of unscripted conversational speech (Milroy and Gordon 2003:58). The modules, which can be described as categories of questions, were formulated prior to the interviews (Labov 1984:33); however, additional questions were asked during interviews to clarify or further expand on a certain topic. The modules consist of a list of seven modules with several questions per module starting with broader ones and ending with more specific ones. To make the interview seem as close to natural-occurring conversation as possible, the modules were organized in a network (Labov 1984:37). Questions were simple and unambiguous, formulated to elicit as much information as possible. With some respondents some modules or questions were simply skipped due to them not having anything to say on the topic or because they had already answered the question while answering another one. The modules consist of open questions because these are the ones which may reveal something the researcher may not have anticipated (Wray and Bloomer 2012:167). Given that closed question limit the respondents' answers they were used only as sub-questions. The questions may also be direct or indirect (ibid. 155) – even though direct questions may provide honest answers, the respondent may also wish to deliberately mislead the researcher or give socially appropriate answers, that is, "answer questions in the way they feel will most please the interviewer" (Saville-Troike 2003:102). Moreover, the interviewee might assume that certain topics or attitudes are not appropriate resulting in the

observer's paradox, them being aware that they are being interviewed, and thus not reveling their true attitudes, but the ones they believe to be more socially acceptable ones (Labov 1984:40, Kolbe 2013:2). While it can never be completely solved, its effects can be lessened by the researcher (Langman and Sayer 2013:4). Indirect questions are a distracter and indirectly provide the researcher with the information they want – it has proven to be most effective to ask more indirect questions and several direct questions, in some cases maybe even no direct questions if the respondent is not used to talking about language (Wray and Bloomer 2012:167), which was the case with some of the respondents in this study. There are several interview techniques which were employed for prompting the respondent to elaborate without asking a straightforward question. These are *active listening*, *repetition feedback*, and the *uh-huh prompts* (DeWalt and DeWalt 2010:143-148). All of these show the respondent that the interviewer is listening and paying attention to them talk (ibid.). The length of each interview depends upon the respondent; however, Labov suggests that the interview should not be too long, and states that it should last for one to two hours (1984:37).

Another aspect that was decided upon prior to the interview is the *sampling technique*. When using an interview as a method, the sample is usually smaller (Wray and Bloomer 2012:154); therefore, in this research study a judgement sample was used which means the participants were chosen according to the preferred criteria (ibid. 166). In this case, the participants were chosen on the criteria that they were over 18 years old, no longer in primary or secondary education, and that they learnt at least English as a foreign language during their education. The participants were, therefore, seven people, three of whom female and four male, aged 23 to 59, presently living in Zagreb. Four of the participants have high-school education, while three of the participants have obtained their bachelor's degrees. Two of the participants are college students, three of the participants have administrative jobs, one of them works in a telecommunication company, and one works in a factory. All of the participants had studied English in a formal context. Each participant was given a general idea about the study and was given a consent form informing them that what they say was confidential. The date, time, and place of the interviews were set several days prior to the interview, so that the participants could be fully committed to the conversation and so that the interview would not be interrupted. The interviews were carried out in the respondents' homes and lasted from about half an hour to one and a half hours. The interviews were carried out in Croatian and the interviewees' names were altered for the sake of keeping them anonymous.

The next steps after the interview is over are transcription and data analysis. Transcription should be "detailed enough to retain enough information to conduct linguistic analyses in an efficient way and simple enough to be easily readable and relatively easily transcribed" (Tagliamonte 2006:54). Once the transcribed material was coded it was further analysed. In this study the focus is on language ideologies in language education; therefore, these have been sought for in the participants' reports, categorized, and analysed.

6 RESULTS

The respondents' statements point to three main types of ideologies they have encountered during their education – the ideology of the standard language, the ideology of the native speaker and different ideologies concerning code-switching. Thus, the results have been subdivided into these categories.

6.1 IDEOLOGY OF THE STANDARD LANGUAGE

The respondents were asked about their experiences in the educational system in order to find out whether their beliefs about language, and in this case, the standard variety stem from there. Based on the respondents' claims, their English teachers favoured the standard.

> I: Je li tvoj nastavnik inzistirao na upotrebi standardnog jezika?

>> R3: Jesu… pa zato što standardni jezik… nije da se bezveze zove standardni i normalno da se recimo to tako forsirao… nisu dozvoljavali… ni u pismenom ni u usmenom… dobro možda nekad u usmenom… ali u pismenom nisu dozvoljavali žargon i to baš zbog toga jer je red da naučiš jezik kakav je standardni i kakav je…isto ko i da ti dođeš negdje na primjer u Englesku i pričaš žargonom… ili netko ko je učio žargonski hrvatski ti tu dođe i priča… jel ti ljepše čut normalni standardni jezik ili onaj tvrdi… isto je i s drugim jezicima… malo bi mi bilo smiješno…

>> R1: Da… standardni jezik je… htjeli su nas naučiti jezik prvo… da se znamo izrazit ko pametni ljudi… da ne zvučimo ko redneckovi… postoji i mjesto i vrijeme za sve… i mislim da je znanje standardnog, književnog jezika bitnije za život... recimo ko ti zvuči pametnije… neko ko priča lijepi britanski književni ili neko ko priča ko… redneck..? Kužiš ako ja naučim standardni jezik… koji god… mogu pričati… sa svima…

>> R4: Da.

>> R5: Da.

>> R6: Da. Jako, uvijek.

Moreover, they understand that certain varieties bear more linguistic capital. The respondents perceive the standard to be the only legitimate variety of a language, and while prestige is not

necessarily a property of a linguistic variety (Milroy 2007:137) it is evident from these statements that the participants recognize the overt prestige of the standard language and its ties to the speakers of upper social classes. Thus, if one speaks the standard variety of a language, they may have more doors open for them. Furthermore, the respondents see those who speak the standard as intelligent and as good members of society, and those who do not speak the standard as less intelligent and less socialized.

Nevertheless, while the respondents acknowledge that they, as well as other learners, have had good practical reasons for learning the standard, most of the respondents believe that including non-standard forms, including slang, in a foreign language classroom might be beneficial for the learners; however, only with more proficient learners who are aware of the correct, that is, standard forms, and only in speaking tasks.

Što misliš o uključivanju žargona u nastavu jezika?

R1: To bi bilo jako korisno… jer ko priča Queen's English osim možda onaj na vijestima… Engleski za svakodnevne potrebe je drugačiji…

R2: Zašto ne… možda ne odmah… prvo nauči osnove jezika… ali tam negdje kasnije kad budeš već neki intermediate user, ovoga, onda da te nauči malo žargon i to jer a gle… a za kaj ti treba engleski najviše…? Da se sporazumiješ s nekim… nećeš učit engleski samo da bi čitao ne znam… treba ti za sporazumijevanje… televiziju… Internet… šta ja znam…

R3: Ja bi to možda da se spomene, ali ne bi se previše zadržavao na tome…

R4: Mislim da ovisi… uglavnom smo uvijek morali koristiti književni jezik… i neki od nas se ne bi ni usudili reći recimo ain't… meni bi to bilo zanimljivo… ali opet kad smo pričali… uglavnom u razgovoru… sad u pismu… za to baš i nisam… moraš naučit književni prvo… to je ipak prvo…

R5: Kao dodatno nešto... za nekog tko želi znati više... ali morali bi prvo imati osnove. Mislim da se time dobiva manje plastična slika o jeziku... daga koriste stvarni ljudi na drugom kraju Europe... ali mislim da se i dalje ne bi trebalo tolerirati kad usmeno ispituješ učenika.

R6: Ja sam za to da se prvo savlada književni pa ćemo onda dalje…

When asked about non-standard varieties of English, the respondents claim that they were allowed to use non-standard English, but only in conversations and never in written form, confirming that the standard language is an idealized variety based on the written language.

I: Jesi li ti, kao učenik, ikada koristio nestandardni jezik na satu jezika?

R2: Mogao si… ne bi te niko linčovao sad… ali znalo se kaj se preferira…

R3: Da… ali ne u pismenom… ono kad bi pisali zadaću ili sastavke… ne, to ne… standardni engleski je bio glavni…

18

R4: Da, često, jer mi je bilo fora… ali nije bilo baš ok koristiti ga… pogotovo u sastavcima. To ne.

R6: S obzirom da sam ja učila jezik prije interneta, onda žargon nije bio toliko dostupan pa ga nismo ni koristili… izvor engleskog nam je bio nastavnik koji je koristio isključivo standard… ali da smo negdje nešto vidjeli, pročitali… I onda to iskoristili… bili bi ispravljani odmah…

R7: Ne, sleng nije bio dopušten. Samo književni jezik. Britanski.

As Tollefson (2000:44) points out, teachers' corrective practices are one of the most striking manifestations of the standard language ideology. Milroy adds that it is believed to be the responsibility of teachers to preserve the language form corruption (2007:139). Furthermore, teachers' corrections of their learners' non-standard production are legitimized by the fact that the standard variety is codified in many course books, grammar books, and dictionaries. Thus, it is not surprising that in the following statements, the emphasis is on non-standard forms being looked down on and not permitted in the English-language classroom. As respondent 2, 5, and 7 agree, non-standard forms were considered to be a non-language, which led to their erasure. Even though respondent 4 experienced erasure of non-standard forms during their education, they believe that using non-standard language is an indicator of a learner's higher proficiency.

I: Kakva je bila reakcija nastavnika ako bi koristili žargon?

R2: Ako bi rekao recimo ain't onda bi ti profesorica ispravila… ak bi iskoristili tak neš… onda bi bilo: kak se zapravo kaže?... da znamo da to nije pravilno…

R4: Podsmjeh i odmah ispravljanje… nije tako nego je ovako… ja sam to znao, ali sam volio koristiti žargon… jer mi je to bilo zabavno… jezik je jezik, uvijek će imat više načina da se nešto kaže… i opet je da je to žargon i to se kao ne smije… ali i kroz to se obogaćuje rječnik… ako neko zna žargon… ta osoba zna više engleskog nego neka osoba koja ga zna skroz gramatički točno… ali nikad nam nisu objašnjavali kaj znači ako bi naišli na neku riječ koju nismo znali… ne znam… samo bi prešli preko toga… rekli to se ne koristi…

R5: Nismo ga smjeli koristiti... nema šanse da bi nam dopustili...

R7: Jednostavno bi nas ispravili. Morali smo govoriti pravilnim engleskim inače bi dobili jedinicu…

The teacher may either be a language broker or breaker depending on how they go about correcting their learners' errors. A teacher should be a language broker, but if a teacher is a language breaker, their learners may become insecure when using a language, and they may exhibit signs of schizoglossia. As can be seen, some of the respondents were corrected in such a way that they do not feel comfortable or confident in their language skills. Respondents 1 and 4 report similar experiences of feeling embarrassed by their teachers who would overly

and repeatedly criticize and correct them. Moreover, their teachers would make fun of them, which made them not only insecure, but also demotivated.

> I:Da li te nastavnik ikada ispravio tako da ti je bilo nelagodno?

>> R1: Uf često… nikad nam ne bi dala onak šansu da se sami ispravimo nego bi se nam rekla točan odgovor, kaj je ok i legit… ali onda bi slušala još petminutnu prodiku jer ne znam to nešto… u biti da… bilo me strah išta reć da me ne ispravi i osramoti tam pred svima pa sam radije šutjela… jer kao ne pratim… jel se baš moraš tolko fokusirat na moje greške… ok mi je da me ispraviš… konstruktivna kritika… ali imaš različite načine kak da to napraviš… ili bi nas samo odrezala…

>> R2: Uglavnom ne… išlo mi je…

>> R3: Da... sve po malo… uglavnom izgovor...

>> R4: Da… jer bi ispao neznalica u odnosu na druge… i ti si u centru pozornoti i 30 glava se okrene prema tebi i gledaju te ko lavovi zebru i ti moraš reć ne znam… i onda ona još drži monolog o tome kako nećeš uspjet u životu jer nisi naučio sve past simple… greške se trebaju ispravljati jer tako učiš, ali postoje različiti načini, dobro je da nisu samo slegnuli ramenima… drago mi je da su me ispravljali, samo, kažem, ovisi kako se to radi…

> I:Da li te način na koji te je nastavnik ispravljao učinio nesigurnim u tom jeziku?

>> R1: Pa da… treba ispravljati da naučiš… ali na kraju postaneš skroz nesiguran… dok sam i znala nisam nikad htjela reć…

>> R4: Pa više nisam, ali dugo vremena sam bio… znalo se dogodit da čak nešto i znam i neću dić ruku… ili recimo kad bi nam došla rodbina iz Amerike… ja nisam htio pričat s njima neko vrijeme jer kaj ak fulam… oni će znat…

Even though the respondents think that non-standard forms are a part of any language, they still ascribe overt prestige and a higher value to the standard variety – all of the participants show that they are aware of the connection between the language and how its speakers are perceived in the society. The respondents agree that learning a uniform standard foreign language has its advantages, namely, that it facilitates communication by allowing speakers from different backgrounds to understand each other. Furthermore, they also acknowledge that using a non-standard variety can be a basis for discrimination, thus, indicating that language cannot be viewed in isolation, but in relation to the extralinguistic world. Moreover, they conclude that the standard was the encouraged variety during their education, both in their L1 and L2. Thus, their beliefs about the standard variety can be related to their teachers' beliefs about language.

6.2 IDEOLOGY OF THE NATIVE SPEAKER

As aforementioned, the ideology of the native speaker is the belief that native speakers of a language are model speakers and by extension, very often considered as the best teachers of their language – high proficiency is often, thus, defined as nativeness. All of the participants in this research study show that they believe in the ideology of the native speaker by favouring native-speaking teachers over bilingual ones, or saying that the best way to learn a language is to go abroad to a country where the language is spoken. However, they do not see themselves as authorities on their own native language, Croatian, because they do not see themselves as highly proficient speakers. Again, high proficiency is equated with speaking the standard – the respondents show that while they condone the ideology of the native speaker when it comes to other languages, they are hesitant to give themselves the same status because they are aware that their production is not standard. This may be due to the respondents not being aware of many different varieties of English and how different they are from the standard, given that what is learnt in English classrooms in Croatia is the standard. Their attitudes point to the ideology of standard language, schizoglossia, and the awareness that being born into a particular group is not necessary for highly proficient language use.

> R1: ...sad sam se sjetila da ja baš ne znam hrvatski... znam ga, al ga ne znam... a priznam fali mi znanje hrvatskog… pričam par narječja i hrvatski hrvatski baš ni ne znam…

> R4: Svi mi govorimo hrvatski, ali ne onaj književni pa ne znam sad...

Nevertheless, when asked about the advantages and disadvantages of having a non-native or native speaker as a teacher, they almost unanimously agree that having a native-speaking teacher is better.

> I: Da li misliš da je bolje da nastavnik bude izvorni govornik tog jezika? Zašto?

> R1: Naravno. Oni ljepše pričaju… Uvijek ti svi kažu da ćeš najbolje naučiti od izvornog govornika.

> R2: Sigurno, ne može ti odmoći.

> R3: Da.

> R7: Pa ne mora biti ako jako dobro govori… ali bitno je da zvuči čim bliže izvornom govorniku… da imaš koga kopirati.

Respondents 4 and 6 also see the importance of not only having linguistic knowledge, but of having pedagogical knowledge as well. This means that being a native speaker does not mean that one is a qualified teacher, but that a certain level of teacher's education is a requirement.

Moreover, respondent 4 mentions the importance of the native speaker being bilingual, that is, speaking students' L1 in order to communicate more easily. However, what they are describing might be said to be quite similar to a highly proficient NNS teacher whose L1 is Croatian.

> R4: Pa ja mislim da da. Opet bitno je da ima i to neko pedagoško obrazovanje. Ako ima onda definitivno šiša sve neizvorne govornike. I da možda zna hrvatski… da definitivno da zna i hrvatski ako su učenici na nekoj nižoj razini...

> R6: Mora biti pedagoške struke, mora znati prenijeti znanje.

Respondent 5 recognizes that not all native speakers speak the standard variety of English, which they believe to be quite important for learning a language.

> R5: Sigurno da bi. Mislim da je kontakt s izvornim govornicima uvijek dobar. Uvijek je bolje da ti predaje izvorni govornik... ali... kod izvornog govornika se pojavljuje zamka da ne pričaju standardnu varijantu tog jezika... mislim da je kod djece najbitnije da čuju standardnu varijantu... kako je po pravilu... bolje je da čuju čisti jezik.

Participants were asked about their experience with native speakers. Only two of the participants have had native speakers of English as their teachers. Respondent 1 believes that having a native English speaker as their teacher aided their accent and that if it had not been for that teacher, they would sound less like a native speaker and their Croatian accent would be more noticeable. As I have mentioned before, given that the respondents believe that native speakers know their language best, it is not surprising that they want to come as close in their production to the ideal-type native speaker. However, respondent 6 presents a reason against having a native speaker as a teacher – because they (and the rest of their class) believed in the superiority of the native speaker and because they were insecure about their production, they were scared to communicate with the teacher, which means that, due to their perceived immaculate and frightening language competence, the native speaker was viewed as a language *breaker*. Therefore, they did not benefit from having a native speaker of English as their teacher. This means that a bilingual teacher may have an advantage over a teacher whose native language is English.

> I: Da li ti je koristilo to što si imala nastavnike koji su bili izvorni govornici?

> R1: Pa zapravo definitivno… mislim da sam više naučila... najbolje je zapravo otić tam u neku zemlju… bilo bi dobro da sam išla… možda bi mi i naglasak bio bolji… isplati se otići tak ili imati izvornog govornika.... Ali da, mislim da mi je naglasak bolji jer sam ih imala dok sam bila mala... Mislim da sam imala nekog ko je govorio balkanski engleski da bi i ja tak pričala...

R6: Bilo nas je strah progovoriti jer on će se nama smijati… bila je strašna trema u razredu. Možda zato jer nam je bilo predstavljeno sad će nam doći izvorni govornik… I nije mi baš koristilo, ne. Bio je ili Amerikanac ili Kanađanin.

The others see the benefits of having a teacher who is a native speaker, even though they have never had one. Moreover, they see non-native speakers of English as deficient in comparison to their native-speaker counterparts when it comes to teaching. Respondent 3 believes that having a native English speaker as a teacher is an advantage because bilingual teachers could never be at the same proficiency level as a native speaker. Moreover, respondent 4 agrees with respondent 3 and adds that native speakers must be better teachers because of an innate ability to understand their language better than speakers of other languages; therefore, they are the most competent teachers. However, it may be argued that just because one is a native speaker of any language does not mean that they understand how their language works, how to teach it, and what the needs of the learners are.

I: Smatraš li da bi ti koristilo da si imao prilike imati nastavnika koji je izvorni govornik?

R3: Definitivno da… Ti se ne možeš… ako nisi izvorni govornik… ti ne možeš sto posto ni izgovor ni sintaksu… ni bilo šta… ko izvorni govornik… neko može bit super profesor, ali ne može bit ko izvorni govornik

R4: Da. Zato što izvorni govornici smatram da stvarno mogu čak i bolje neke stvari približit pošto je to njihov materinji jezik djeci tj pošto je to njima materinji, a poučavaju ga kao strani… vjerojatno ga znaju približit… vjerojatno se sjećaju kako su oni učili svoj materinji jezik… sigurno ga mogu bolje prenijeti… osoba koja nije izvorni govornik… možda će neke stvari previdjeti… zaboraviti spomenuti… što su djeca mlađa tim je bolje da imaju izvornog govornika za nastavnika da im uđe u glavu pogotovo ako imaju malo predznanja… pogotovo njihov naglasak… izvorni govornici bar znaju približit to… bolje…

Lastly, the respondents were asked about their bilingual teacher sounding native-like. They see it as a prerequisite to be a teacher. As I have mentioned before, native speakers are perceived as the ones who know their language best, so if a teacher sounds native-like, it gives them more authority in the classroom – being a native speaker or being as close to a native speaker as possible is associated with other positive traits, such as intelligence. On the other hand, English with an audible foreign accent is associated with being less intelligent.

R1: Cilj mi je da zvučim čim bliže izvornom govorniku... pa nisam došla učiti engleski trećeg svijeta, nego engleski koji me nije sram koristiti u obrazovanom društvu... Ne mora imati prenaglašen naglasak ali rašn ingliš ne dolazi u obzir...

R4: Smatram da jest, jer ako već poučava prvi ili drugi strani jezik on je učenicima jezični uzor, a jedan od načina usvajanja jezičnog znanja je i slušanjem... meni iskreno nije bitno da zvučim ko native, samo mi je bitno da nemam onaj ruski naglasak i ja sam sretan.

R5: Da... Zato što mislim da ćeš tako bolje naučit jezik...

The answers that were collected on the topic confirm Pennycooks's (1994:175-176) description of how the native speaker is seen. The respondents see native speakers of English as having a better understanding of their own language, a type of innate competence which puts non-native speaking teachers in an unfavourable position. Thus, people who are native speakers are believed to be the best teachers. However, they also claim that they do not consider themselves as native speakers to be authorities on their own language because they do not speak the standard variety showing the ideology of the standard language and the awareness of diversity within a language group, which they neglect when it comes to English.

Moreover, all the respondents except Respondents 4 and 6 completely disregard the importance of the teacher having pedagogical knowledge, which the non-native speakers have to have in order to teach which means having a better understanding of the learning process. Furthermore, the respondents do not acknowledge the differences that exist among the native speakers, but see them as a homogeneous population that speaks one of a few major varieties of standard English even though native speakers are a highly diverse group. Their views can be traced back to the education system because some teachers emphasize the importance of sounding native-like, that is, British-like, which leads to the last part of the analysis – code-switching.

6.3 CODE-SWITCHING

The respondents were asked about their attitudes regarding code-switching as well. The aim was to examine their experiences in the foreign language classroom and their teachers' view of code-switching, both between their L1 and L2, as well as between the varieties of English. Moreover, while some researchers (Charpentier 1997:236, Porter 1990:125) say that time spent using L2 determines success and that use of two distinct codes may hinder progress, others (McKay 2010:112, Auerbach 2000, cited in Tollefson 2007:28) are in favour of using the students' L1 as a means of teaching L2 because it promotes retention and language progress. When asked about their experience of code-switching to their L1 in a foreign language classroom, the respondents almost unanimously said that it was not encouraged and agreed with the monolingual or English-only approach saying that they believe it has been beneficial to them. Respondents 2 and 4 believe that the English-only approach results in faster acquisition, while such an approach was frustrating for respondent 1.

I:Da li je profesor inzistirao na upotrebi samo stranog jezika u nastavi?

R1: Bilo mi je teško pratiti na nastavi… pričalo se uglavnom na engleskom… tu i tamo neko objašnjenje na engleskom… a i od nas se tražilo da cijelo vrijeme pričamo engleski… ak smo koristili hrvatski to isto nije bilo dobro… Uglavnom da… nakon nekog vremena se samo engleski pokušavao koristiti…

R2: Da… pričali smo isključivo samo na engleskom… mislim da je to dobro da potakneš ljude da se znaju… da znaju razgovarat na engleskom... džabe ti učiš i gramatiku i riječi i sve ak ne pričaš… a i bolje je da je sve na engleskom… prije propričaš… više naučiš…

R4: Jesu… zašto ne… korisnije ti je da koristiš samo strani… prije ćeš naučiti jezik… to ti je isto ko da odeš nekam… u Englesku i onda se moraš snać… prije ćeš propričat jer si tam jer ovisiš o sebi… i tom svom znanju. govoru čemu već… tak je i na nastavi… čim više stranog jezika koji god to bio tim bolje… jer ti imaš… kolko… dva tri sata tjedno da ti njih naučiš engleski… i onda pričat na hrvatskom nema baš smisla… bilo je ljudi koji nisu znali ili nisu mogli koristit engleski… i baš se sjećam… krene rečenicu na hrvatskom… i onda ga profesorica prekine i pita: How do we say this in English? I čeka dok ovaj ne kaže… mislim nije čekala vječno, pomogla bi mu naravno… ali satovi su bili samo na engleskom i meni je to dobro… da, jesu, inzistirali su na tome… ali znali su i s kim pričaju i pomagali su… ali opet, samo u usmenom… ali pisano nije bilo uopće riječi o tome da bi zamijenili neku riječ… Isto sjećam se kad bi neko digao ruku da pita neko pitanje i krene pitati: kako da ja napišem ovo-ono itd… pa bi mu odmah rekli… no… ask in English… how do I… znaš kroz to smo i mi ostali učili… to se nije toleriralo…

R6: Vrlo rano… naročito na engleskom izvan škole.

Respondent 3 is the only one with a different experience.

R3: Smjelo se… pogotovo ako su učenici bili slabiji i trebalo je kad su odgovarali objasnit uporabu… smjelo se… da… iako se to nije poticalo.

I: Je li te profesor ispravljao ako bi koristio hrvatski ili odbijao komunikaciju?

R1: Uvijek bi inzistirali na engleskom i onda ak bi nekaj i rekli na hrvatskom onda je bilo: Say it in English…

R2: Ak bi nekaj rekao na hrvatskom onda bi mu rekla: reci to na engleskom. Ako kažeš na engleskom onda dobro, ako ne onda… pomogla bi ti ona…

R3: Da… da… morali smo probat na engleskom i onda kad bi vidjeli da baš baš ne ide… nisu odbijali komunikaciju…

R4: Nisu, ali su nas pokušavali navest na to da uspijemo reć kaj hoćemo na engleskom… možda se dogodilo koji put… ne sjećam se. U svakom slučaju engleski je bio prvi… i hrvatski je trebao biti... trebalo ga se koristiti čim manje...

R6: Do srednje su nas puštali, a u srednjoj je najedamput bilo nema više… I onda je dolazio u obzir isključivo engleski.

Furthermore, teachers usually pick either British or American English as the one taught in their classroom. Some teachers, thus, monoglossically see them as distinct varieties that should not be mixed, while others do not. The respondents were then asked about their experiences concerning code-switching between the varieties of the foreign language, namely

English. They were asked which variety their teachers preferred, as well as whether it was acceptable to code-switch between the varieties. Respondents 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 say that British English was the preferred variety. Moreover, respondents 1, 2, and 4 say that their teachers insisted upon their using only British English, especially in writing, otherwise, they would lose points on tests. This means that their teachers believed in the monoglossic ideology. While other respondents do not agree with their teachers' beliefs about British and American English being two distinct varieties, respondent 3 says that they should not be mixed and that they are too different to be considered the same language, thus showing that they have adopted the monoglossic ideology.

I: Je li tvoj nastavnik otvoreno preferirao neku varijantu jezika?

R1: Uvijek smo učili British English… i u pisanju i to sve… onda sam ja znala imati problem s pisanjem jer bi recimo napisala color umjesto colour i onda bi to bila drama na testu… bila je greška i uzimali nam bodove… forsirali su ne nužno britanski naglasak, ali pismo je moralo bit British.

R2: Uglavnom je materijal za slušanje bio na britanskom… nije bilo bitno da ti se poklapa govor i pisanje…ajmo reć… za neke stvari koje su se razlikovale, oni bi ti rekli… ovo je sad američki, ovo je sad britanski način… u osnovnoj je pisanje trebalo bit britansko pa nam je to znala ispravit… recimo color ili coulour, znala nam je ispravit… jer kao više smo orijentirani prema Britancima… znali smo se žalit… jel engleski… je… kaj nam imaš oduzimat bodove… i onda još u srednjoj je profesorica pričala s nekim britanskim, i materijal i sve je bilo na britanskom… a i ona bi nas isto ispravljala i za pravopis i za to sve da bude na britanskom, al… opet… to je sve isti jezik meni i ne vidim čemu tolko tog…inzistiranja ovo ili ono…

R3: Jedna je govorila američki, druga britanski, treća isto američki… i sad nisu one to otvoreno preferirale… nikad to nije bio problem… niko nije zahtijevao od nas da govorimo jedno ili drugo… Ali meni su to dva jezika jer se previše razlikuju da bi ih više mogli svrstati pod jedan.

R4: Da. Uopće nam nije rekla unaprijed. Nego smo shvatili kad nam je počela uzimat nešto za grešku… tipa neka pravopisna greška… di uopće tekst ili odgovor ne gubi svoj smisao nego smo neki drugi izraz koristili ili smo nekak drukčije napisali riječ… onak kak nam je bliže… i to mi je bilo apsurdno… jezik se ne uči na jedan način… s razlogom ima više pristupa… profesorica je preferirala britanski i to smo saznali tek na testu…

R5: Uvijek British English... nema da mi dođeš tu s nekakvim američkim... jesi ti normalan... da, znali smo...

R6: Britanski.

I: Da li je te tvoj profesor ispravljao ako nisi koristio varijantu koju je on preferirao?

R1: Da…

R2: Uglavnom ne… ali znalo se da profesorica preferira britanski engleski… jedino u pisanju je tražila da pišemo… a znaš one razlike između britanskog i američkog…kaj ja znam… recimo nije o neg je ou… i tak neke stvari… ali u govoru, ak smo recimo koristili američke

riječi to je bilo ok… mogo si doć pričat ko prosječni balkanac… mogo si pričat kak si htio, nije bilo bitno, bilo je bitnije da znamo reć kaj hoćemo… da se znamo izrazit i sporazumjet…

R4: Da je, najčešće pisano… znala je nekad i u govoru… znala je poludit s nama jer smo mi svi govorili neku varijantu balkanskog američkog… znala nam je ponavljat da mi tu radimo samo i isključivo britanski engleski…

R5: Mislim da je... ali se ne mogu sjetiti specifične situacije... sjećam se da je bilo nešto sa lift i elevator... ali ne znam točno... je ispravljala me...

When asked about their attitudes to code-switching, and their own use of it, the respondents' answers are divided. Respondent 1 switches codes a lot. They grew up using two languages and considers switching codes to be a natural part of their language use. Respondent 2 code-switches because they cannot find the right meaning in Croatian and considers it useful. Both respondents 1 and 2 thus believe in the heteroglossic ideology and the ideology of flexible bilingualism. On the other hand, respondents 3 and 4 do not condone code-switching, especially in a foreign language classroom. Respondents 3 and 4 show that they believe in the ideology of separate bilingualism and the monoglossic ideology.

Što misliš o miješanju dva jezika u govoru?

R1: Ja sam odrasla s dva jezika… i nikad se nisam znala skroz izraziti ni na jednom jeziku… i miješati jezike… i neke stvari je lakše izraziti na drugom jeziku… ja znam da budu mene ljudi skužili… spontano mi dođe… meni to ima istu težinu jel ja kažem was i kaj i šta i what… to je dio mog govora…

R2: Dogodi se, sve je to jezik. Dok te drugi razumiju sve je to ok. A sad, ponekad… ako je… ak mi je lakše neš objasnit pomoću engleske riječi jer ima… da nešto što ne možeš tako precizno i dobro opisat na hrvatskom pa ubaciš tu englesku riječ na primjer svi znaju tu englesku riječ… aha da… a sad kad bi to išo na hrvatskom objašnjavat…

R3: generalno nije mi to baš neka ideja… pogotovo u učenju stranog jezika… bolje je da je nastava samo na tom stranom jeziku… klinci više dobiju od toga… bar ja tak mislim… bolje je kad si izložen tom stranom jeziku stalno… isto tu smo u Hrvatskoj i pričat ćemo hrvatski… ne vidim zašto bi miješali engleski ili bilo koji drugi jezik… Kad možemo koristit hrvatske riječi… ne vidim zašto bi… ne baš.

R4: Sve je to dio modernog načina života… ljudi vise na internetu cijele dane… ali ako već postoji izraz na tvom jeziku za to… koristi ga… kad si razmislim… glupo mi je sad da u nekoj tvrtci jednostavno oni sad rade neki event… smiješno je… ili idu na team building… imaš normalne hrvatske riječi… jer ljudi misle da zvuči bolje ako koriste englesku riječ… i dalje znači isto… meni se to ne sviđa… da zapravo mi to ide na živce… u školi… definitivno nema mjesta tome u školi… zašto bi neko govorio frend ako može reći prijatelj? Pogotovo jer se materinji uči paralelno s prvim stranim… jednostavno ako ćemo tako onda ćemo laganini izgubit svoj jezik… doći ćemo do te točke di ćemo u hrvatskom imat 1500 riječi koje se mogu koristit, a drugo će nam sve bit nekakve posuđenice, anglizmi… nisam za to niti u nastavi, niti u komunikaciji pogotovo službenoj…

Most of the respondents' teachers have favoured British English and encouraged the use of only one code at a time. Thus, it can be hypothesized that their ideologies influenced the

respondents' attitudes; they are more inclined to favouring the monoglossic ideology, as well as the ideology of separate bilingualism, and the ideology of monolingualism when it comes to the classroom. Moreover, some of the respondents' teachers have looked down on American English, while others prohibited its use. This may have led to some of the respondents perceiving the two major varieties of English as distinct languages that should not be mixed. However, some of them admit that they do switch codes and that they consider it perfectly acceptable, thus supporting the heteroglossic ideology and the ideology of flexible bilingualism. They recognize that different codes serve different purposes, but distinguish between what is acceptable in a foreign language classroom and in everyday life.

7 CONCLUSION

Ideologies easily undergo normalization in institutions, such as schools. In the educational system, language ideologies can be justified on pedagogical grounds as a prerequisite for successful language learning. Moreover, teachers are positioned as authorities, as regulators and controllers of classroom language – of what can be said and written. Interviewing the participants of this study about their experiences in the English classroom has pointed to participants adopting several ideologies, one of which is the ideology of the standard language.

The respondents say that the standard variety was the one favoured by their teachers, while any non-standard forms were not encouraged and immediately corrected, especially in writing. Moreover, the respondents say that they favour the standard because they associate it with people who have higher social status; thus, according to them, anyone learning a foreign language has a good practical reason for learning the standard variety. Nevertheless, while the standard variety was the encouraged variety during their education, some respondents believe that it may be useful to incorporate non-standard language into the classroom activities.

Furthermore, the respondents believe in the ideology of the native speaker. Most respondents see native speakers as a homogenenous group that speaks the standard. Moreover, the respondents see native speakers as authorities on their language, which makes them the best teachers. Nevertheless, one of the respondents did not benefit from having a native speaker of English as their teacher. While most respondents equate being a native speaker with having a high level of proficiency in language and being a competent teacher, others emphasize the importance of having pedagogical knowledge as well.

The respondents have also reported having different ideologies concerning code-switching; these are the monoglossic ideology, the ideology of separate bilingualism, and the ideology of monolingualism.The respondents' teachers encouraged the use of one code at a time, whether it was code-switching between Croatian and English, or between different varieties of English. Moreover, the teachers insisted upon the English-only approach, which most of the respondents believe to have been beneficial for them. However, the respondents switch codes in their everyday lives and consider code-switching acceptable outside of the foreign language classroom.

To conclude, these results show just how important the role of the teacher is. These ideologies are the ones that might have been supported by the respondents' former English teachers; therefore, the participants have been influenced by their former teachers' ideologies. The teacher may influence their students' attitudes and beliefs about language and, by extension, about the world. Given that ideologies can easily be used as basis for discrimination against anybody who speaks differently (and *lives* differently), teachers really have to be transformative intellectuals and be able to connect their pedagogical practice to the wider social issues (Giroux and McLaren 1989, cited in Johnson 2009:121). Future research may focus on doing a similar, but a more comprehensive study, with a bigger sample and other foreign languages that are taught in Croatia. Moreover, it can be used in a comparative study to see what language ideologies are promoted in other countries.

8 WORKS CITED

Aneja, G. (2014) Disinventing and reconstituting native speaker ideologies through the classroom experiences of international TESOL students. In *Working Papers in Educational Lingusitics*. 21/1, 23-39.

Auerbach, E. (2000) When pedagogy meets politics: Challenging English only in adult education. In Gonzales, R. D.and Melis, I. (eds.) *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, C. (2006) *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Blackledge, A., and Creese, A. (2009) *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Blommaert, J. (1999) The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-38.

Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In Richardson, J. G. (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood. 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P., Pincas, A. (2003) *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (1995) *Verbal hygiene*. London: Routledge.

Cenoz, J. (2013) Multilingualism. In Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 1-8.

Charpentier, J. M. (1997) Literacy in a pidgin vernacular. In Tabouret-Keller, A., Le Page, R. B., Gardner-Chloros, P., and Varro, G. (eds.) *Vernacular literacy: A reevaluation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 222-245.

Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press

DeWalt Musante, K., and DeWalt, B. R. (2010) *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers*. Rowman Altamira.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., and Crabtree, B. F. (2006) The qualitative research interview. In *Medical education*. 40/4, 314-321.

Doerr, N. M. (2009) Investigating ″native speaker ideologies″: Toward a new model of analyzing ″native speaker″ ideologies. In Doerr, N. M. (ed.) *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 15-46.

Doerr N. M., Kumagai Y. (2009) Towards a critical orientation in second language education. In Doerr, N. M. (ed.) *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 299-317.

Elster, J. (1986) *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enama, P. R. B. (2016) The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. In *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 7/1, 19-30.

Filipović, R. (1972) *Englesko-hrvatske književne veze*. Zagreb: Liber.

Gal, S. (2007) Multilingualism. In Llamas, C., Mullany, L., and Stockwell, P. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London/New York: Routledge. 149-156.

Giroux, H. and McLaren, P. (1989) *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Haugen, E. (1962) Schizoglossia and the Linguistic norm. In Woodworth, E. D. and Di Pietro, R. J. (eds.) *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 15, 63-69.

Johnson, K. E. (2009) *Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010) Multilingualism and Code-switching in Education. In Hornberger, N. H. and McKay, S. L. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 116-142.

Kennedy, E. (1979) ″Ideology″ from Destutt de Tracy to Marx. In *Journal of the History of Ideas*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press. 40/3, 353-368.

Kolbe, D. (2013) Corpus analysis in dialectology. In Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 1-8.

Kubota, R. (2009) Rethinking the superiority of the native speaker: Toward a relational understanding of power. In Doerr, N. M. (ed.) *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

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

Langman, J. and Sayer, P. (2013) Qualitative sociolinguistics research. In Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 1-6.

Lee, J. H. (2012) Reassessment of English-only approach in EFL context in view of young learners' attitudes, language proficiency, and vocabulary knowledge. In Kirkpatrick, A. (ed.) *Multilingual Education.* New York: Springer. 2/5, 4-11.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* London: Routledge.

Lo Bianco, J. (2010) Language Policy and Planning. In Hornberger, N. H. and McKay, S. L. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 143-174.

Macaro E. (2005) Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In Llurda, E. (ed.) *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession.* New York: Springer. 63-84.

Mauranen, A. (2017) Conceptualising ELF. In Jenkins, J., Baker, W., and Dewey M. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca.* New York: Routledge. 7-24.

McGroarty, M. (2010) Language and ideologies. In Hornberger, N. H. and McKay, S. L. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 3-39.

McKay, S. L. (2010) English as an International Language. In Hornberger, N. H. and McKay, S. L. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 89-115.

Milroy, J. (2007) The Ideology of Standard Language. In Llamas, C., Mullany, L., and Stockwell, P. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics.* London/New York: Routledge. 133-139.

Milroy, L. and M. Gordon (2003) *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Milroy, J. and Milroy L. (1985) *Authority in Language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Milroy, J. and Milroy L. (1999) *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English.* London: Routledge.

Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa. (2006) Hrvatski nacionalni obrazovni standard. Zagreb: Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa.

Monasta, A. (2002) Antonio Gramsci: The message and the images. In Borg, C., Buttigieg, J., and Mayo, P. (eds.) *Gramsci and education*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. 67-85.

Morales, A. and W. E. Hanson (2005) Language Brokering: An Integrative View of the Literature. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences. 27/4, 471-503.

Pennycook, A. (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.

Porter, R. P. (1990) *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education*. New York: Basic Books.

Quirk, R. (1985) The English language in a global context. In Quirk, R. and H. G. Widdowson (eds.) *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-6.

Ritzer, G. (1997) *Suvremena sociologijska teorija*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus

Saville-Troike, M. (2003) The ethnography of communication. Oxford: Blackwell.

Starčević, A. (2014) *Hrvatski i engleski jezik u dodiru: hrvatska iseljenička obitelj u Kanadi*. (Doctoral dissertation). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006) *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Terrell, T. D. (2009) The economics of Destutt de Tracy. In Destutt de Tracy, A. *A treatise on political economy*. Auburn: The Ludwig von Mises Institute. 1-14.

Thompson, J. B. (1991) Editor's introduction. In Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity press. 1-31.

Tollefson, J. W. (2000) Language ideology and language education. In Shaw, J., Lubelska, D., and Noullet M. (eds.) *Partnership and interaction: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language and Development*. Bangkok: Asian Institute of Technology. 43-52.

Tollefson J. W. (2007) Ideology, Language Varieties, and ELT. In Cummins J. and Davison C. (eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. New York: Springer. 25-36.

Tollefson, J. W. and Yamagami, M. (2013) Language Ideology in a Language Classroom. In Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 1-7.

Trudgill, P. (1972) Sex, covert prestige, and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. In *Language in Society,* 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 179-195.

Trudgill, P. (1999) Standard English: What it isn't. In Bex, T. and Watts, R. J. (eds.) *Standard English: The widening debate*. London: Routledge. 117-128.

Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Vilke, M. (2007) English in Croatia – a glimpse into past, present, and future. In *Metodika: časopis za teoriju i praksu metodikâ u predškolskom odgoju, školskoj i visokoškolskoj izobrazbi*. 8/1, 17-24.

Wardhaugh, R. and Fuller, J. M. (2015) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W., and Herzog, M. I. (1968) Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In Lehman, W. P., and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) *Directions for historical linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 95-195.

Wolfram, W. (2007) Ethnic varieties. Llamas, C., Mullany, L., and Stockwell, P. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London/New York: Routledge. 77-83.

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

9 APPENDIX

DEMOGRAFSKI PODACI

    Gdje si rođen?

    Koliko imaš godina?

    Koliko godina formalnog obrazovanja imaš?

    Jesi zaposlen? Studiraš?

OSNOVNO O JEZIKU

    Koje strane jezike si učio u životu?

    Kada si ih počeo učiti?

    Zašto si ih počeo učiti?

    Zašto si ih prestao učiti?

    Učiš li sada neki jezik?

    Kako ti je išlo učenje jezika?

    Kakva je bila atmosfera na satu jezika?

ŠKOLA

    Misliš da je važno da djeca u školi uče strane jezike? Zašto?

    Zašto misliš da se ljudi odlučuju učiti jezik/ upisati djecu na jezik?

    Smatraš li znanje jezika dijelom opće kulture?

NASTAVNIK 1

    Kakav ti je bio nastavnik jezika?

    Jesi li ikada imao nastavnika jezika koji je bio izvorni govornik?

        Ako da: Je li ti to koristilo?

        Ako ne: Smatraš li da bi ti koristilo da si imao prilike imati nastavnika koji je izvorni govornik?

    Da li misliš da je bolje da nastavnik bude izvorni govornik tog jezika?

NASTAVNIK 2

Je li tvoj nastavnik otvoreno preferirao neku varijantu jezika?

Koju varijantu ti preferiraš?

Da li je te tvoj profesor ispravljao ako nisi koristio varijantu koju je on preferirao?

Da li te nastavnik ikada ispravio tako da ti je bilo nelagodno?

Što ti je najčešće ispravljao?

Kako je ispravljao tvoje greške?

Da li te to učinilo nesigurnim u tom jeziku?

Postoje li greške u jeziku koje drugi rade, a tebi idu na živce?

NASTAVNIK 3

Je li tvoj nastavnik koristio žargon na satu?

Jesi li ti, kao učenik, ikada koristio nestandardni jezik na satu jezika?

Kakva je bila reakcija nastavnika?

Je li tvoj nastavnik inzistirao na upotrebi standardnog jezika?

Što misliš o uključivanju žargona u nastavu jezika?

MIJEŠANJE KODOVA

Da li je profesor inzistirao na upotrebi samo stranog jezika u nastavi?

Je li te profesor ispravljao ako bi koristio hrvatski ili odbijao komunikaciju?

Što misliš o miješanju dva jezika u govoru?

Da li ti miješaš jezike? Zašto, kada?

Kako na je na to reagirao tvoj nastavnik hrvatskog?