

University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English
Department of Pedagogy

**LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF MULTILINGUALISM
IN THE BORDER AREA OF MEĐIMURJE**

Master's Thesis

Monika Krumpić

Mentor: dr.sc. Stela Letica Krevelj, postdoc.
Co-mentor: prof.dr.sc. Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš

Zagreb, 2017

Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Odsjek za pedagogiju

**LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF MULTILINGUALISM
IN THE BORDER AREA OF MEĐIMURJE**

Diplomski rad

Monika Krumpič

Mentorica: dr.sc. Stela Letica Krevelj, poslijedoktorandica

Komentorica: prof.dr.sc. Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš

Zagreb, 2017.

Examining committee:

dr. sc. Renata Geld, docent

prof.dr.sc. Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš

dr.sc. Stela Letica Krevelj, poslijedoktorandica

Contents

Abstract.....	4
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Croatian context	3
2. Theoretical background.....	5
2.1. Intercultural education	5
2.2. Multilingualism.....	9
2.3. Transfer	14
2.4. Code-switching and translanguaging	15
3. Study.....	18
3.1. Sociolinguistic context.....	18
3.2. Aims	21
3.3. Participants.....	22
3.4. Methods, instruments and procedure	24
3.5. Results.....	25
3.6. Discussion	36
4. Conclusion.....	38
5. Reference list.....	40
6. Appendix 1	47
7. Appendix 2	51
Sažetak.....	55
Acknowledgement	56

Abstract

In today's globalized world the benefits of multilingualism are often emphasized. The European Commission promotes language learning and advises that every European student should learn two foreign languages besides their mother language. As a result of learning more languages, multilinguals approach languages differently than mono- and bilinguals. Dialect should also be considered as separate languages in this context. This paper examined the situation in a specific border area where students are highly dialectal. The paper tried to assess language teachers' perception of multilingualism and their attitudes towards the dialect. The study showed that language teachers are aware of the potential benefits of the dialect and its potential for transfer. They demonstrated positive example of multilingual pedagogy. Even more, language teachers' collaboration with local community resulted in establishing the Dialectal group in school and working on dialectal dictionary. What is more, the Croatian Ministry of Culture recognized the dialect spoken in this border area of Međimurje and protects it as part of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Even though the example at hand is praiseworthy, there is still no systematic approach to teachers' education on multilingualism and intercultural education.

Key words: multilingualism, language teachers, dialect, transfer

1. Introduction

Multilingualism has recently been a much debated subject. It is defined as the ability to speak and several languages, irrespective of the level of proficiency and whether the use of languages is active (speaking, writing) or passive (listening, reading) (Griva & Chostelidou, 2012). Multilingualism is promoted by the European Union (EU), which currently has 24 official languages. The European Commission has recognized the importance of the issue of multilingualism. In 2002, the Heads of State or Government of the European Union meeting in Barcelona called for at least two foreign languages to be taught from a very early age (Barcelona European Council, 2002). This meeting preceded the release of *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism* in 2005 and the reviewed version in 2008.

The most important notions of the Strategy are:

- emphasising the important role that languages have in the European economy
- motivating citizens to speak and learn more languages, thus improving mutual communication
- ensuring that all EU citizens have all the necessary information available in their own language.

The Commission's Strategy is in line with the 2003 Action Plan *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity*. Every EU citizen is urged to learn at least two foreign languages, alongside their mother tongue, in order to create a multilingual society and in that way to facilitate not just mutual understanding, but also to accept language diversity, create a language-friendly society and to improve the language-learning process.

In the *Europeans and their Languages* 2012 report attitudes toward languages and language learning were examined. Since the study was conducted in 2012, a year before Croatia joined the EU, Croats did not participate in the study. However, the results are still relevant for understanding language attitudes of the majority of Europeans.

The results of the study showed that just over half of Europeans (54%) are able to hold a conversation in at least one language other than mother tongue, a quarter (25%) are able

to speak at least two additional languages and one in ten (10%) are conversant in at least three (The European Commission, 2012). When looking at the answers of our neighbouring countries, Slovenians have a percentage as high as 92% of people that are able to communicate in at least one foreign language aside from their mother tongue, whereas in Austria 78% of people speak at least one foreign language and in Hungary the percentage is 35%. The data on Italy is surprising. On one hand, 22% of Italians are able to speak at least two foreign languages, but at the same time, 62% of respondents from Italy are not able to speak any foreign language. All in all, the five most widely spoken foreign languages in Europe are English (38%), French (12%), German (11%), Spanish (7%), and Russian (5%). English is the most widely spoken foreign language in 19 of the then 25 Member States, excluding the UK and Ireland. English is also the most widely understood foreign language, with a quarter (25%) of Europeans able to follow radio or television news in that language. French and German are mentioned by 7% of respondents each, followed by Spanish (5%), Russian (3%) and Italian (2%). Two thirds of respondents (67%) believe that English is the most useful foreign language to be learnt, followed by German (17%), French (16%), Spanish (14%) and Chinese (6%). It is evident that the languages perceived as being useful are official languages of predominantly Western countries, and all of the mentioned languages are official languages of major economic powers.

When it comes to the reasons for learning a foreign language, most participants consider it an advantage when seeking a job abroad (61%). Similarly, 53% claimed it was useful in their work (including travelling for work). It is also perceived that knowing a language enhances possibility to study abroad (46%) and makes communication easier when on holiday outside native country (47%). This is in direct contrast with 2014 Eurobarometer data which states that more than half the EU population believe that migration is a negative phenomenon (Bartulović & Kušević, 2016). Positive views on learning and speaking foreign languages are in diametrical opposition with the negative attitude towards migration.

Although the European Commission promotes language learning and intercultural dialogue, there is still no common strategy among EU members which would go beyond

promoting good practice projects. In the future, European, national and local authorities could join forces and follow a four-step approach:

- mapping roads – identify exclusion and discriminating practices
- breaking down walls – work towards removing barriers, discriminations, stereotypes, prejudice and racism by introducing incentives to increase the presence of individuals
- building bridges – develop intercultural skills and competences through educational, artistic and media programmes
- sharing space – create space where interactive communication can flow freely, which would preferably result in a deeper understanding of different views and practices. (European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research, 2008)

1.1. Croatian context

As a member of the European Union, Croatia ought to adhere to the regulations and policies of the EU and European Commission, among which is the recommendation that every EU citizen should, besides its mother tongue, speak at least two foreign languages. The tradition of teaching foreign languages in Croatian primary schools has been present since 1930s, and since 2003 it has been made compulsory in the first grade (Mihaljević Djigunović, 2013). Throughout history, Croatia has been part of various kingdoms, empires and unions with other countries, which consequently influenced the choice of the official languages, as well as the choice of languages learnt at school. Geographic location has also contributed to linguistic diversity: having many neighbouring countries and being on the crossroads of many paths, Croats have learnt the benefits of acquiring languages that may come useful in communication with different people. Moreover, there is the factor of being a ‘small country’ with adjacent countries such as Italy and Austria whose official languages are major world languages. As a result, Croats have recognized the necessity to conform in order to be competitive on the market. Galtung (1971) (as cited in Cook, 1996) introduces the concept of Centre and Peripheral countries, which inevitably have to communicate when doing business

together. Accordingly, Peripheral countries are guided by the rules and the language of the 'superior' Centre country. This theory could be taken into consideration when thinking of Croatia as a primarily touristic country that has to accommodate tourists from other countries who normally do not speak Croatian but languages of Centre countries.

What is more, Croatia has a longstanding tradition of learning Latin in high school, a pretty unique tradition in contemporary world. This might be a distinguishing characteristic of the country and it could contribute to higher language awareness of Croatian language learners. However, it should be kept in mind that the choice of foreign language(s) taught in school is neither random nor coincidental. Naturally, the choice is politically, culturally and financially influenced by the effects it has on the people living in a country where a certain language is taught, as well as on the target language country. The choice of a foreign language taught in a country has repercussions on book sales, textbooks (often designed and published by the native speakers) and other media of language instructions. Likewise, the choice of language taught in school potentially affects the choice of travel destination (assuming that language learners are more likely to choose visiting a country whose official language they speak, as opposite to opt for a destination whose language and culture they are not familiar with). It is generally assumed that when it comes to work and student mobility, one will be more comfortable moving into a country whose language and culture they know. As it might be assumed, languages spoken in neighbouring countries and countries which are connected via politics, commerce, trade, tourism, industry, education etc. are more like to be appreciated and considered valuable. Phillipson (1992) (according to Cook, 1996) calls these economic effects of a language choice 'linguistic imperialism.'

Ilišin and Spajić-Vrkaš (2015) studied how young people in Croatia assess their language knowledge of the following six European languages: English, French, German, Russian, Spanish and Italian. Results showed that 90% were able to communicate in English. When asked to assess their knowledge according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001), just over one fifth assessed to be B1 level, almost two fifths assessed to be B2 level, while almost every third participant estimated to be C1/C2 level. German was the

second most spoken language. One third of respondents estimated to be between B1 and C2 level. 20% of all German-speaking respondents assessed to be B1 level. Interestingly, most German-speaking participants lived in the Northern Croatia, while the number of those living in Central Croatian and Dalmatia halved. Being between B1 and C2 level assessed 19% of Italian-speaking and 8% of Spanish-speaking participants. When it comes to French (4%) and Russian (2%), the percentage of participants who assessed to be between B1 and C2 level was very low. Around 6% of participants added additional 13 languages that they spoke (Slovenian, Latin, Czech, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Turkish, Portuguese, Albanian, Swedish, Esperanto, Serbian and Slovak). Only 3% reported not speaking any language besides their mother tongue. 48% communicated more or less only in one foreign language (B1 to C2 level), 32% spoke 2 foreign languages, 9% three, and 2% spoke between four and six foreign languages (Ilišin & Spaji-Vrkaš, 2015).

The choice of language(s) taught in school also depends on the preferences of students and their parents, especially in a school culture that values partnership between the institution and the parents. Based on a study conducted in the urban area of Zagreb, Medved Krajnović and Letica (2009) concluded that parents were aware of the importance of learning foreign languages and they encouraged it.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Intercultural education

Often, when one talks about learning a language, first thing that might come to one's mind is grammar and vocabulary as the prototypical image of acquiring a foreign language. In 1960s language tests assessed grammar and vocabulary in isolation and without context (Sercu, 2004). However, language is so much more than solely syntax and lexicon. Without semantics, orthography, phonetic and phonology, as well as pragmatics and sociolinguistics, to name just a few branches of linguistics which deal

with language, one cannot say that language has been fully acquired. Precisely the latter, sociolinguistic, is perhaps the key to understand a language in a native-like manner.

Understanding one's language is a step towards dialogue, an "interactive communication between individuals, groups or larger communities, [which] can involve a wide range of actors from international organisations to governmental bodies, arts and media organisations or networks" (European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research, 2008, p.10). Dialogue is the essence of *interculturalism*, which promotes genuine interaction between various cultural groups in order to result in new terms of engagements. Interculturalism requires "equality of opportunity in order to flourish and the confidence of all to step out of prescribed cultural boundaries, superceding the given barriers of origin and nationality to create new syntheses" (European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research, 2008, p.10). The term interculturalism emerged in European countries, while the term *multiculturalism* is predominantly used in English speaking countries, especially in the United States of America. The two terms should not be used interchangeably. While multiculturalism refers to the state where cultural pluralism exists, it does not assume any contact or interaction, while interaction is the key of interculturalism. Interculturalism also implies a dynamic and qualitative approach, as opposed to a static and quantitative approach that multiculturalism stands for (Spajić-Vrkaš, Kukoč & Bašić, 2001).

Cultural context, norms, expectations and way of living reflects the language, and vice versa. Michael Byram (1997) therefore advocates for developing intercultural communicative competence. To implement intercultural competence, it is not enough to solely have information about a certain culture and to speak the language, the aim is to get people to respect and value other cultures and for that one has to have certain attitudes, knowledge and skills.

- Attitudes are comprised of curiosity, openness, readiness to see cultures and its people without judgement, empathy, tolerance and respect.
- Knowledge refers to awareness of people and their products and practices as well as their communicative style.
- Skills are understood as the ability to interpret, discover, interact and relate to somebody, and to develop critical cultural awareness. (Byram, 1997)

Textbooks are generally abundant with cultural knowledge of the target language (such as traditions, festivities, and references to authentic films, literature and music). However, culture goes beyond pure facts. It also includes beliefs, values, attitudes, communication style, and so much more. Hofstede (1991) claims that culture is “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (as cited in Lázár, 2007, p. 7).

Intercultural education works “to achieve a developing and sustainable way of living together in multicultural societies through the creation of *understanding* of, *respect* for and *dialogue* between the different cultural groups.” (UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education, 2006, p. 18) Intercultural education is meant for every person, not just (foreign) students or migrants. It deals with an issue that goes further than the notions of state, nation or nationality (Piršl, 2016).

National Curriculum Framework for Pre-school Education and General Compulsory and Secondary Education (2010) states that the Republic of Croatia has adopted eight key competences for lifelong learning, proposed by the European Union. Among these eight competences are also: *communication in the mother tongue*, *communication in foreign languages* (where it is emphasised that “a significant part of achieving this ability is developing skills of intercultural understanding”, *social and civic competences*, which “involve abilities in the areas of inter-personal and intercultural cooperation.”, and *cultural awareness and expression*, which include “knowledge and awareness of local, national and European cultural heritage, and of the place of such cultural heritage in the world.” (National Curriculum Framework, 2010, p.12) In this process it is essential that students are trained to understand and defend cultural and linguistic diversity in Europe and the world, and to be aware of the importance of aesthetical factors in everyday life” (ibid.). *Interculturalism*, defined as “understanding and embracing cultural differences in order to reduce inequality and prejudice against members of other cultures” (National Curriculum Framework, 2010, p.16), is listed as one of the principles that constitute the basis of the national curriculum. Moreover, in the curricula of the mother tongue, foreign languages, and classical languages, intercultural activities are positioned as the fifth skill, alongside listening, speaking, reading and writing. The choice of implementation of intercultural education into language subjects is in line with Sercu’s (2004) stance that “‘intercultural competence’

¹always implies ‘communicative competence’, and therefore always also has a linguistic, sociolinguistic and discourse component” (Sercu, 2004, p.75).

It is evident that intercultural education, and hence intercultural competence, is promoted in the document. However, when it comes to developing intercultural competence, there is no systematic implementation of any activities required by the curricula which would instigate developing this competence, leaving the matter dependent solely on the teachers themselves (Bilić-Štefan, 2006; Piršl, 2016). Considering that interculturalism is not an obligatory school subject, it is advisable to incorporate intercultural content in teaching practices of not only language classes, but interdisciplinary in all subjects and in education in general. Interculturalism could also be introduced as an elective course, as part of civic education, or extracurricular projects. Consequently, the question of assessment is raised. Since the implementation is not systematic, it is problematic to assess whether, and to what degree, students have benefited from a certain model of intercultural education. Likewise, teachers have no (direct) way of receiving a feedback on their performance or knowing if their students met the educational goals set in the curricula. Sercu (2004) proposes that some teaching techniques (cultural mini dramas, critical incidents, culture assimilators, simulation games and documents originating from a foreign culture) could be used for assessment purposes, alongside self-assessment and peer assessment.

Previous studies on Croatian teachers and their attitudes towards intercultural competence have demonstrated that generally teachers have positive attitudes (Cvikić & Novak Milić, 2015; Piršl, E., Benjak, M., Diković, M., Jelača, M. & Matošević, A., 2016). Cvikić and Novak Milić (2015) studied future teachers’ attitudes towards intercultural competence in students at the Faculty of Teacher Education and students of Croatian language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, both from the University of Zagreb. Results showed that future students believe intercultural competence to be of great importance, but, when it comes to incorporating it into the classroom they are not so unified in their answers. The authors suggested that the doubts concerning how to present intercultural competence to students could be assuaged if

¹ “The construct of intercultural competence, too, has undergone changes, which have been reflected in the terminology used. The aim of culture teaching changed from ‘familiarity with the foreign culture’ over ‘cultural awareness’ to ‘intercultural communicative competence’. Whereas cultural awareness already refers to cultural insight, attitude and identity development, intercultural competence, in addition, emphasizes performance and behavioural aspects.” (Sercu 2004:76)

intercultural competence was given more emphasis in teacher training curricula. Novak-Milić and Gulešić-Machata (2006) claim that majority of teachers who teach Croatian as L2 know little about intercultural competence and what cultural knowledge their students should have upon finishing the course. Piršl et al. (2016) compared how intercultural and civic themes were implemented in undergraduate and graduate teacher training programmes at Croatian universities. The study showed discrepancies and inconsistencies among the universities. For one, the level of the study programmes at which such courses were offered differed from undergraduate to graduate and post-graduate. The status of the courses varies (obligatory/elective), as well as the ECTS points awarded (supposed indicator of the course's working load), and anticipated outcomes. The results of the empirical study suggested that more than 300 students and 400 secondary school teachers possessed fundamental knowledge of the essential characteristics of intercultural education (Piršl et al., 2016).

Bartulović and Kušević believe that the essence of intercultural education is the understanding of culture; being critical of both one's own culture, as well as others. The key is in the awareness that one should not see their culture as something that is given, but rather to have the courage to explore it, explore other cultures and ultimately their interaction (Bartulović & Kušević, 2016). The underlying emphasis is on the fact that intercultural education is meant to incorporate all students, not only those that are culturally different. In language context, this shows that the practice to validate minority languages should be expanded. Needless to say, minority languages should be respected and given proper attention. In 2011 census, 95,6% of people living in Croatia stated their mother tongue to be Croatian (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2011). Still, Croatian language should not be perceived as a unique, universal and homogeneous concept. Cultural diversity within one country must be honoured. The appreciation of dialects, which is the subject of this paper, is just one fragment of it.

2.2. Multilingualism

It was not always considered that speaking more than one language was an advantage. Quite the contrary, it was thought that, especially having in mind simultaneous early bilingualism, acquiring two languages at an early age would hinder children's mental

and language-developing processes, a person's second language (L2) would have demerits on the first language (L1), thus making bilingual children lag behind monolingual children. However, extensive research into bilingualism and multilingualism has reached a consensus that there are many benefits of being bi- and multilingual. To name just a few: multilingual people are better at problem-solving, they are more able to distinguish form from meaning, learning L2 provides insight into their mother tongue and their culture (Cook, 1996). Furthermore, it has been observed that multilinguals "demonstrate superior metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities, such as the ability to draw comparisons between different languages and to reflect on and employ appropriate learning strategies" (Haukås, 2016; but see also De Angelis, 2011; Medved Krajnović & Letica, 2009). In addition, it has been observed that multilinguals are better at picking up the grammar of another language (Kemp, 2007). Bilingualism is "positively associated with third language learning and the development of cognitive flexibility" (De Angelis, 2011, p. 218). As one acquires more languages "their use of strategies may increase in number, frequency, complexity and appropriateness, including strategies related to grammar learning" (Kemp, 2007, p.243). Furthermore, multilinguals should be seen as having a specific intricate multilingual system that is not merely a sum of various monolingual systems. Jessner (2008) states that "in contrast to monolinguals, bi- or multilinguals have a different knowledge of their L1, their L2, a different kind of language awareness and a different language processing system" (Jessner, 2008, p.21). It should be noted here that bilingualism does not necessarily refer only to two languages, but it also takes into account different varieties of a language. *Vertical bilingualism* is defined as "a situation in which someone is bilingual in a standard language and a distinct but related language or dialect" (Wei, 2005, p. 460). Similarly, *diglossia* is a term that refers to "a situation where two different varieties of a language or two distinct languages co-occur in a speech community, each with a distinct range of social functions" (Wei, 2005, p.456). In the 1960s, Spigarelli proved in his classroom research that students who use their dialect develop better communicative competence (Turza-Bogdan, 2013, p.27). Teacher in that context has the opportunity to emphasize and explain the connection between the dialect and other languages, to point to the importance the standard variety or a foreign language play in the dialect, and, in the long run, to better the language learning process. De Angelis (2011) mentions the

importance of literacy in bi-/multilingualism in order for positive effects to manifest, especially in the case of home languages. Family and local community have a crucial role in fostering the use and preservation of the dialect. Germany and Norway are said to be good examples of countries that systematically work towards using both standard variety of the language and dialects (Turza-Bogdan, 2013). In Croatian context, Požgaj-Hadžić (2003) also encourages teachers to use the dialect for students' better understanding and development of standard Croatian, while also suggesting that errors caused by interference should be anticipated and corrected. Research shows (Turza-Bogdan, 2013) that teachers' attitudes towards the Kajkavian dialect is positive, regardless whether the teachers themselves geographically belong to the dialect or not; however, it has been recognized that there exists significant difference. Teachers that do geographically belong to the same dialect have more positive attitudes (Turza-Bogdan, 2013, p.137). Pavličević-Franić (2003) argues that, upon enrolling into school or kindergarten, Croatian students become non-normative bilinguals who “establish a system of parallel language/linguistic codes, i.e. that besides the organic idiom they extend communication to other idioms” and “begin to acquire both a foreign language and standard Croatian from the position of plurilingual communication” (Pavličević-Franić, 2003, p.103). Organic idiom is an individual idiom which is learned at home and in the immediate social context, partially corresponds with the concept of *idiolect* presented by Otheguy et al. (2015). Granić suggests that future bidialectal curriculum should encourage learning the standard variety of a language, but in a new manner so that the teachers are ‘allowed’ to encourage using the organic idiom at school, not just at home (Turza-Bogdan, 2009, p.176). On the other hand, Beerkens claims that “dialects are not accepted in education, professional life, governmental bodies, and even in several sports and cultural organisations” (Beerkens, 2010, p.56). Beerkens (2010) also warns that the number of speakers of dialects is decreasing and that the speaker mostly comprises older people living in villages.

What is pertinent here is that students operate two systems. Add to that the fact that first foreign language is introduced already in the first grade as a subject matter, alongside all the other subjects whose language of instructions is standard Croatian. The second foreign language is introduced only three years later, in fourth grade. Considering that

children are dealing with both vertical (standard language/dialectal variety) and horizontal (Croatian/German/English/etc.) bilingualism at an early age, it could be argued that this is too overwhelming and confusing for the children, which might hinder the language development, or, ultimately, result in semilingualism (with deficiencies in all languages). Nevertheless, De Angelis (2011) sums up that, based on all the relevant studies, “prior language knowledge is beneficial to the language learning process and that children should be encouraged rather than discouraged to learn languages”(De Angelis, 2011, p.219). Jessner (2008) argues: “Teaching across languages presents a promising didactic tool of multilingual teaching, whatever languages are involved in the learning process” (Jessner, 2008, p.40).

Generally, it can be argued that “knowledge of multiple languages impact on all the languages people use” (Gilead, 2016, p.269). However, multilingualism per se is not a given advantage. Haukås (2016) stipulates that “learning multiple languages is best enhanced when learners are encouraged to become aware of and use their pre-existing linguistic and languages learning knowledge” (Haukås, 2016, p.1-2). Teachers have the key role in this process. In Cook’s words:

Whether an idea or an approach in language teaching is useful does not intrinsically depend on which country it comes from. Its merits have to be accepted or rejected by the experts on the situation – the teachers and students who live and work there (Cook, 1996, p.140).

Otwinowska (2014, p.98) believes that, what sets the teachers apart from other proficient language users, is the possession of the competence of a language analyst and the competence of a language educator, besides the linguistic competence.

Multilingual pedagogy is “a learner-centred approach that aims to develop students’ language awareness and language learning awareness across the languages that students know” (Neuner, 2004). Multilingual pedagogy demands a competent teacher. Some characteristics of such a teacher, according to Åsta Haukås (2016) are:

- being a multilingual themselves in order to be role model to their students

- high level of cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness² (as a predisposition to help students realize their full potential)
- stay up to date on the latest research and
- use research to advance students' multilingualism
- have individualistic approach to students to address their cognitive and affective differences
- work closely with other language teachers in order to enrich students' multilingualism

Hornberg and Cassels (2007:527) claim that teachers play an essential role in fostering multilingual behaviour in the language classroom and that they have the power to choose whether to integrate minority languages into their teaching and thus turn students' multilingualism into a useful resource for the entire classroom, or can choose to ignore minority languages and with that to close a source of linguistic knowledge.

European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) is a body of the Council of Europe whose aim is to promote excellence in language education. Through their work they promote plurilingualism and pluriculturalism³. ECML regularly organizes workshops and courses predominantly aimed at teachers. Besides that, they issue *The European Language Gazette* and all ECML publications are available for public and free to download. ECML has also published an intercultural communication textbook titled *Mirrors and windows* which offers theory and practice of developing intercultural communicative competence, and its assessment.

² Thornbury (1997) defines the teachers' language awareness as "the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively" (according to Otwinowska, 2014, p.98).

³ The term *plurilingualism* is mentioned on the official site of the ECML. There are subtle differences between the terms *plurilingualism*, *multilingualism* and *interculturalism*. Namely, *plurilingualism* refers to the society's ability to speak more languages and to shift between these languages. *Multilingualism* and multicultural education work towards acceptance and tolerance in a society where more cultures co-exist. *Interculturalism* is defined as "a government policy regarding the relationship between a cultural majority and cultural minorities, which emphasizes integration by exchange and interaction" (<http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/I/Interculturalism.aspx>). The term is often replaced by the term *interculturality*, which refers to the state of more cultures that are in interaction that exceeds solely acceptance. Intercultural education works toward developing understanding, respect and dialogue between different cultural groups.

2.3. Transfer

Acquiring new languages highly depends on the previously learned and acquired languages. This dependency is usually referred to as *cross-linguistic influence* or *transfer*. Transfer is defined as “the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired” (Odlin, 1989, p.27). Learners’ first/mother language (L1) should be taken into account so that teaching methods for L2, L3, LX could acknowledge the specifics of L1, especially having in mind the similarities and differences between L1 and L2, L3, LX in order to facilitate learner’s process of acquiring a language. In 1960s and 1970s the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis dealt with the influence L1 has on the other language(s), where the phenomenon of interference was described as a negative transfer (Jessner, 2008). The reasoning was that errors made in L2 are due to the interference of L1. Still, not all errors in L2 could be predicted correctly, which goes to say solely contrastive analysis is insufficient to explain the phenomenon. Moreover, today is well known that not only does L1 has a cross-linguistic influence on subsequently learned languages, but the reverse effect exists too – later learned languages influence the use of previously learned languages (Jessner, 2008). Basically, all prior linguistic knowledge can be of use. In Ringbom's words: “The use of cross-linguistic similarities, i.e. transfer, is an integral part of how people learn languages” (Ringbom, 2007, p.2).

It is not just the objective distinctions and closeness between the languages that are relevant (such as being part of the same language family), but it also depends on the subjective perception of similitude between two languages. This phenomenon is called *psychotypology*. Eric Kellerman (1978), who coined the term, described it as “the proximity between the L1 and the L2 sensed by the L2 learners.” The distance between languages is thus measured by the learners’ perception. What is more, these differences and similarities perceived by the learner will have an impact on how s/he communicates in L2. For instance, English belongs to the German language family; however, its vocabulary heavily lies upon the vocabulary of the Romance language family (more specifically, French language) (Singleton & Little, 1991). Learner’s perceived closeness between English and French is an important factor because, due to similarities perceived

between two languages, a learner might opt to transfer a word or a certain language feature from one language to another (in this case from French to English, rather than from German to English – under the condition that the learner speaks all of the before mentioned languages). Otwinowska (2014, p. 97) reports about authors (Odlin, 1989; Schmitt, 1997; Singleton, 2006) who maintain that learners are often not aware of the “potential cross-linguistic advantage that their languages offer.”

2.4. Code-switching and translanguaging

Compartmentalizing the languages may not be the most efficient way to acquire the languages. Otheguy, García & Reid (2015) claim that insisting on speaking only a (standardized version of) designated language in the classroom “does not encourage learners to integrate the new linguistic features and practices into their own repertoire of features and practices” (Otheguy, 2015, p.302). There are discussions on “new developments in both multilingualism research and teaching, which propose to move away from isolation towards cooperation between the languages in the learner” (Jessner, 2008, p.39). By allowing students to use more languages in order to get the message across, metalinguistic abilities such as noticing differences and similarities between languages are expected to develop. Textbooks with contrastive approach are available to Croatian teachers, to name just a few: *Razgovori o engleskom jeziku* (Vilke, 1991) for English, *Razgovori o njemačkom jeziku* (Kruhan, 1992) for German, and for Slovenian *The Scientific Research Institute* of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ljubljana has published several contrastive approaches of Slovenian and Croatian. The focus of contrastive analysis is mainly on raising awareness of the differences between two languages, but is not the only cross-language approach to languages. Hufeisen (2005) recommends that “the use of previous foreign language learning experiences and strategies as well as the development of skills to compare, transfer and infer should be fostered in Third Language Acquisition” (according to Jessner, 2008, p.39) Corcoll (2013) states that “even though spontaneous use of the L1 should be accepted if we believe in turning the language classroom into an authentic plurilingual space of communication, it is only the directed and informed use of the L1, based on pedagogical principles, which can make the teaching process more effective in a tutored, and

therefore non-naturalistic, setting”(Corcoll, 2013, p.28). Code-switching⁴ can be used as a language strategy in everyday life situations to overcome a certain communication gap. However, in a classroom, arguably a more artificial environment, code-switching is used for different, pedagogical reasons – to enable students to create “new and informed routes to go from language to language”(Corcoll, 2013, p.29).

Gilead (2016) enumerates six functions for code-switching in classroom, which she identified based on previous research, as well as her own.

1. Function: Confirming understanding and/or clarifying meaning of the L2 to make sure students have fully grasped the meaning
2. Function: Code-switching to support L2 learning and development, especially in pair and group work
3. Function: Expanding knowledge of L2 culture (historical events, customs, festivals, as well as names of prominent historical figures)
4. Function: Metalinguistic development – in order to focus students’ attention to and support their knowledge of the target language system
5. Function: Classroom management – explaining students the task in front of them to make sure they understand it fully, especially when the instructions are more complex, also referring back to L1 to control students’ disruptive behaviour (maintaining discipline)
6. Function: Communicate socially with the students – developing interpersonal relations with the students and building cohesive classroom environments, e.g. humour

These functions reaffirm the pedagogical importance of using L1 in teaching and learning of L2, while accentuating the value of limited and discerning code-switching.

In line with this is Macaro’s advocacy of ‘optimal use of code-switching’, which, as he suggests, “[in broadly communicative classrooms] can enhance second language acquisition and/or proficiency better than second language exclusivity” (Macaro, 2009, p.38). Optimal use of code-switching implies teachers’ assessment of possible merits of activating L1 connections, as opposed to demerits caused by sticking to L2 where the message is not fully conveyed, or avoiding certain information because it might be too

⁴ The alternation between two or more languages. There are three types of code-switching: tag-switching, inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching (Poplack, 1980).

difficult for students' understanding. Macaro (2009) continues by claiming that "[in broadly communicative language classroom] there are virtually no studies which have demonstrated that switching to the first language as opposed to maintaining second-language discourse, in specific circumstances, actually leads to better learning whether in the short term or the long term"(Macaro, 2009, p.39).

Macaro (2009) summarizes tree belief systems held by the language teachers:

- Virtual position – classroom seen as a 'virtual reality' where only L2 is used as if the students were migrants in the target language country
- Maximal position – L2 should be used in all situations, but since perfect learning conditions do not exist, L1 is used as a necessary evil
- Optimal position – L1 is used in learning and teaching of L2 in order to enhance the progress

Ofelia García is a proponent of translanguaging⁵. Translanguaging is defined as “the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages” (Otheguy et al., 2015, p.283). García (2016) regards translanguaging as “more than going across languages; it is going *beyond* (emphasis in original) named languages and taking the internal view of the speaker’s language use.” She claims that, in order for students to demonstrate their knowledge, especially language knowledge, they should be able to rely on and refer to all the systems that they have a good command of. The role of the teacher (even a monolingual one) is to build classroom ecology where various languages are present, either via books and visual stimuli or approval that students can draw from all known languages. The key notion of translanguaging is that a bilingual person is not simply a sum of two monolinguals, a concept introduced by François Grosjean (2012). Canagarajah claims that for multilinguals “languages are part of a repertoire that is accessed for their

⁵ When it comes to the difference between code-switching and translanguaging, Sayer (2012) explains that code-switching is “the linguistic movement from one language to another, whereas translanguaging emphasizes the potential of bilinguals’ liminal linguistic zones as a mediational sense-making tool” (Sayer, 2012, p. 69-70). In code-switching the languages are sharply outlined and they interact, whereas translanguaging is transitional. “Translanguaging is underpinned by the flexibility and permeability involved in language use such that the linguistic repertoire of a bilingual/multilingual user is considered one depository” (Alimi & Matiki, 2017, p.204). Translanguaging has a higher function in the sense that it is crucial in constituting speaker’s identity and self-awareness.

communicative purposes; languages are not discrete and separated, but form an integrated system for them; multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication; competence does not consist of separate competencies for each language, but a multicompetence that functions symbiotically for the different languages in one's repertoire" (Canagarajah, 2011, p.1). Although translanguaging has recently been a much debated topic, it is not a modern invention, even if it was not labelled so earlier. In pre-colonial times, tribes and communities in neighbouring villages practiced translanguaging when they were in contact (Canagarajah, 2011). The practice of translanguaging still remains a successful means of communication. The key point is to make meaning while using all available resources.

3. Study

3.1. Sociolinguistic context

Border areas are of special interest to linguists due to language contact. For instance, *Communicative Competence in Language Pluralistic Environment* (2001-2003) was a project within the European Union's Tempus programme in the area of curriculum development carried out in Croatia. Participants were primary school students living in multilingual areas where Italian and Hungarian are spoken (in Novigrad and Zmajevac, respectively), and in highly dialectal environments (Pučišća, Dubrovnik, and Čakovec in the Međimurje County). Karačić provides data which demonstrates that between 1995 and 2005 English was chosen by more than half of all students in primary schools, followed by German as a second choice (Karačić, 2009). In the academic year 2003/2004 a foreign language was introduced as a requirement in the first grade. In the academic year 2005/2006 English as a first foreign language was chosen by 85-90% students (341 216 elementary schools). German was the second choice (105 745 elementary schools), followed by Italian (22 221), French (3 255) and Spanish (155) (Medved Krajnović & Letica, 2009). The law stipulates that in case when L2 is not English, English has to be introduced to students in grade 4 (age 10) (Mihaljević Djigunović, 2013). However, Krumm (2005) claims that "pupils are not motivated to

study other languages if they start with English” (as cited in Jessner, 2008, p.42). As well as Krumm, Hufeisen (2005) also maintains that “multilingualism can be achieved more effectively if pupils start learning other languages before having contact with English” (ibid.). On the other hand, according to Vollmer (2011) “English could and should function as a kind of ice-breaker and [in] this way create an openness to linguistic diversity” (ibid.). Mihaljević Djigunović and Bagarić (2007) did a comparative study of attitudes and motivation of Croatian learners of English and German. Learners of English in both Year 8 and Year 12 predominantly reported that they enjoyed learning English. They felt English was easier to learn and that they had to put less effort in to get good results. Learners of German had divided answers concerning acceptance of the language. Some learners of German believed it to be a ‘hard’ language that is not easily acquired. The results showed that their attitudes and motivation changed over time. Specifically, it was observed that motivation for learning German decreased from Year 8 to Year 12, which reflected “a lowering of linguistic self-confidence” (Mihaljević Djigunović & Bagarić, 2007, p.274). The authors believe that the difference in attitudes exists due to different immediate learning environments and out-of-school language learning contexts. English is considered an international language of communication, yet German is used in more specific context, which means that there is less exposure to German and, unlike English, it is hard to acquire it unconsciously (e.g. through media). The opportunities to use German out of class are also fewer, which might ultimately lead to students’ mere extrinsic and instrumental motivation to learn it. Learners of German also complained about learning words they believed to be of no use for them and reading too long and too difficult texts. This is indicative of exposure to increasingly less comprehensible input.

The study was carried out in the specific environment, in a Croatian-Slovenian border area in the Međimurje County. Data for this study was obtained in a municipality in the Međimurje County where Kajkavian dialect is spoken in everyday life. Blažeka (2008) describes three subdialects spoken in Međimurje, and these are: the lower subdialect (comprising five speech groups⁶), the middle subdialect (also comprising five speech

⁶ Speech group is referred to as *skupina govora* in Croatian.

groups), and the upper subdialect (comprising 3 speech groups. This demonstrates the diversity of the dialects in Croatia. In the elementary school where this study was carried out Kajkavian dialect is predominantly spoken in most situations (communication with family and friends; while doing errands in the local area, even in formal institutions in the area). At school Croatian standard language is learnt and spoken. Croatian is the medium of instruction in all subjects, except in German and English classes. German (as L2) and English (as L3) are implemented as subjects at age 7 and 10, respectively. The fact that German is chosen as L2 and English as L3 is somewhat a specific situation considering that in Croatia 85-90% of children choose English as their first foreign language (Medved Krajnović & Letica, 2009).

Kajkavian dialect is somewhat similar to the Shtokavian dialect, which is the basis of the Croatian standard language. In the speech group (subsection of a dialect) that is spoken in the area where the study was conducted eleven vowels are used (in contrast with five used in the standard Croatian), as well as dual grammatical number, which is not used in the standard Croatian, but it is used, for example, in Slovenian (Kovač, 2015). However, Kajkavian is even more intertwined and similar to Slovene language (Silić, 2006), especially in the abovementioned region, namely, in the border area where Croats (speaking Kajkavian) and Slovenians live literally next to each other (the distance between two neighbouring towns in Croatia (Mursko Središće) and Slovenia (Lendava) is approximately 6km. Another specificity of precisely this part of Međimurje where the study has been conducted is the influence of German language. Both German and Hungarian loanwords are one of the characteristics of Kajkavian dialect (Turza-Bogdan, 2013, p.150). One reason for this is work mobility throughout history. Since the living and earning standards in nearby Slovenia, Austria (approximately 40 kilometres to reach the first town), but also in Germany, have been considered more suitable, many people have decided to work abroad as guest-workers. It was already de Saussure (1916 [1986]) who insisted that “neither languages nor dialects have natural boundaries” (as cited in Otheguy et al., 2015, p.287). Similarly, Gordon (2005) argues that “scholars are recognizing that languages are not always easily treated as discrete isolatable units with clearly defined boundaries between them. Rather, languages are more often continua of features that extend across both

geographic and social space” (Kemp, 2009, p.17). For instance, EUREGIO is a cross-border area region between the Netherlands and Germany whose aim is to establish collaboration and cross-border contacts which supersede (arbitrary) imposed borders. Languages have been studied with vested interest within this region (see *Receptive Multilingualism as a Language Mode in the Dutch-German Border Area* by Roos Beerkens).

The favourable status of German language in this learning context could boost learners’ motivation, alongside the use of dialect that is so interconnected with German. In this specific area, the environment where students speak one language at home (a dialect) and another language/variety in school and other institutions may roughly be compared to a situation where immigrant families speak one language at home (often referred to as *home language* or *heritage language*), and another one in public and with other people.

3.2. Aims

Research on language teachers’ beliefs and attitudes on multilingualism is scarce, especially in Croatia. The aim of this study is to examine the language teachers and their perception of multilingualism. In this study we aim to establish language teachers’ beliefs about language knowledge of their students and the capacity to realize their potential, as well as the role of the dialect in this context. Further, the intention is to establish whether teachers stimulate students to use all their linguistic and languages learning knowledge in order to foster their foreign language learning. Finally, we inquire into whether there is any collaboration between teachers of different languages

The study tries to examine the following three research questions:

RQ1: What are language teachers’ attitudes towards multilingualism and intercultural competence?

RQ2: Do language teachers stimulate students to use their linguistic and languages learning knowledge in order to foster their foreign language learning, including the dialect, and how?

RQ3: Is there any collaboration between teachers of different languages in order to advance their students' multilingualism and intercultural competence?

3.3. Participants

Participants in this small-scale study are three language teachers in a primary school in the border area of Međimurje in Croatia. This particular school is chosen because the dialect spoken in this area has recently been recognized and listed as Intangible Cultural Heritage of Republic of Croatia. Pseudonyms are used to secure anonymity of the participants. All three teachers are female and their shared mother tongue is Croatian. Age of the participants is 39, 37, and 39, respectively. All three of them are university educated and have been teaching for at least 11 years (16, 11 and 13 years of teaching experience). All three of them have spent most of their careers in this particular school, which suggests that they are very familiar with the school culture. Although currently neither of them lives in the same village where they work, one teacher was born and lived in the same village until 2 years ago. The participants commute to work daily and data about the distance between place of work and place where they live was obtained. All three participants geographically belong to the Kajkavian dialect. Nevertheless, the speech group within the subdialect spoken in the school area differs from the speech groups spoken in the areas where the teachers live. In the study, the distance proved to be a distinguishing factor.

Considering the participants were language teachers, they spoke at least one foreign language. Teacher 1, who taught German language, is a class teacher majoring in German language. She had learnt English and was reading and listening in English. However, she reported language attrition because of lack of spoken communication in English, which had ultimately resulted in language anxiety since she was afraid of speaking English because she was not sure it would be correct. Interestingly, she did not consider herself a multilingual person because she deemed a multilingual person was

someone who was able to use foreign languages equally in all four skills (speaking, listening, writing, reading), while she spoke very little English. She spoke the Kajkavian dialect, but different speech group than it is spoken in the school environment, but learnt some while working in the school with the students and specifically working with the dialect. She deemed the dialect to be so different from the standard language that it could be considered another language all together.

Teacher 2 majored in English and German language and literature. She reported being very proficient in English and German and believed that languages have to be used daily to avoid language attrition. She also spoke some Spanish and Italian, but was ambivalent whether to list Slovenian as a foreign language that she spoke because she had learnt it informally and deemed that, when you live so close to the border ‘everybody’ spoke Slovenian. She was born and lived in the same village where the school is situated until 2 years ago.

Teacher 3 majored in German and Hungarian language and literature. She opted for Hungarian because she wished to learn a new language and since she had a family member who spoke Hungarian she chose that language. She reported being very proficient in German, English and Hungarian, managing well Latin, and understanding Slovenian well “as we all do.” She also spoke the Kajkavian dialect, but different speech group than it is spoken in the school environment. Working in the school with the students and specifically working with the dialect familiarized her with the dialect of the area.

It can be inferred that teachers view Slovenian as a language that is easily understood and which is almost naturally acquired. We would argue this is inconspicuous for people who do not live in the vicinity of Slovenia and do not have much contact with Slovenians, as is the case in this border area. When it comes to the dialect, although the Kajkavian dialect is umbrella term for all speech groups within the dialect, the difference between the speech groups is substantial, which explains why so far only one speech group in the Međimurje county has been recognized by the Croatian Ministry of Culture.

Table 1. Participants in the study

	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3
gender	female	female	female
age	39	37	39
mother tongue	Croatian	Croatian	Croatian
education	Faculty of Teacher Education, class teacher majoring in German	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, English language and literature and German language and literature	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hungarian language and literature and German language and literature
language taught	German	English	German
years of teaching	16	11	15
years of teaching in this school	16	10	13
distance between home and the school	10km	19km (3km until 2 years ago)	18km

3.4. Methods, instruments and procedure

In order to gather in-depth understanding of human behaviour qualitative methodology was used so as to examine the *why* and *how* questions. A small number of participants segment is another reason why qualitative research paradigm has been employed. Interview has been chosen as a means of conducting the study in order to provide in-depth data. Interviews have been conducted in Croatian language and, with participants' consent, recorded and later transcribed. The interview lasted on average 30 minutes. It consisted of three parts. The first part contained questions to ascertain characteristics of study participants such as age, gender, education, languages spoken, work experience and the distance between place of living and place of work. The latter question was posed based on Turza-Bogdan's (2013) research which states that teachers who geographically belong to the same dialect have more positive attitudes. In second part

statements were read to the participants and they were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with it and to comment on their answer. The statements were referring to different aspects of multilingualism (benefits of knowing more languages, the importance of knowing and respecting one's culture, the role of a teacher and, the impact of a dialect on language learning). Lastly, open-ended questions were asked and follow-up questions ensued if necessary. Questions were grouped according to three research questions posed. Research question 1 is "What are language teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism and intercultural competence?" In this segment the participants were asked to define a multilingual person, to express their opinion about the benefits of speaking more languages and to talk about their own and their students' experience with learning more languages. They were also asked if they obtained any training concerning multilingualism and/or intercultural education. Second research question was "Do language teachers stimulate students to use their linguistic and languages learning knowledge in order to foster their foreign language learning, including the dialect, and how?" Due to the specificity of the environment where the study was carried out, the questions primarily focused on the dialect. Teachers' attitudes towards dialect were examined through questions that dealt with the use of the dialect in class and in various projects and situations outside the classroom. Also, the question of perception of the dialect as another additional language was raised. The third research question is: "Is there any collaboration between teachers of different languages in order to advance their students' multilingualism and intercultural competence?" The questions tried to maintain teachers active participation in school projects and their collaboration with both teachers who teach same language, as well as those who teach different languages. The interview protocol is provided in the Appendix both in English and in Croatian.

One-two sentences on

3.5. Results

In the following the results of the study will be set out. The findings will be clustered around the research questions posed at the beginning of this study.

Research question 1: What are language teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism and intercultural competence?

In third part of the interview, teachers were explicitly asked to give their definition of a multilingual person. The participants were unanimous in saying that the person should speak more languages (at least one more besides mother tongue, according to Teacher 2) and that the person should be able to use it in speaking as well as in writing. Teacher 3 believed that passive speakers also had a great advantage even if one did not speak the language per se; they were still able to communicate in alternative ways and understand the meaning. Teacher 2 on the other hand believed that multilingual person should equally have a good command of a language both in terms of speaking and writing. Teacher 1 implied that a dialect should also be considered an extra language if it was fairly different from the standard variety. She shared her experience when she first started working in that school. The dialect was so strange and distant to her that she had to learn it as if it were a new language.

The answers demonstrated that the participants acknowledged the uniqueness of that border area. For one reason, the fact that receptive bi/multilingualism is perceived as an asset is a consequence of living in the border area where one does not necessarily speak the language of the neighbours, but, due to similarity and frequent input, the language is understood and is definitely an asset in getting a message across. Implications for studying languages in border areas as a specific phenomenon are evident.

Secondly, the issue of the dialect has been mentioned by the interviewer in the context of multilingualism. Teacher 1 lives only 10km away from the school, yet the dialect of the school area is to her so removed from the standard variety that it feels like a foreign language that has to be acquired. Teacher 3 also agrees that the dialect spoken in the area could be considered a separate language. Teacher 2 attests this by reporting about her students: siblings that moved with their parents from England to this area and who, early upon enrolling into Croatian school, recognized that they had to learn two different languages – one which they used in school classes and another one in which they communicated with peers and acquaintances in the local community.

The participants share the belief that knowing more languages is an advantage. They perceive multilingualism to be helpful in the domain of travelling (most frequently mentioned), working and searching employment, tourism (wine tourism is especially

present in this area), media (television, radio and Internet as sources of language input) and online communication. Migration was recognized as a direct indicator of the advantages of speaking foreign languages, especially in the context of recent migration crisis. These attitudes towards multilingualism and purposes of foreign language use correspond to the data provided by the European Union which are reported in the introduction part of the thesis.

Furthermore, the participants recognized transfer of the previously learnt languages. Latin is viewed in this context as the bond that ties together the languages that students learn in the school because Latin is the root of both English and German vocabulary. However, it was noticed that it is not just the vocabulary that is transferred but also grammatical structures. Teacher 2 taught English from grade 4 and she mentioned that children were already used to writing in German, which they learnt from Grade 1, and even if they did not write it perfectly, it was easier for them to accept another way of writing when they were introduced to English. What is more, it was noticed that students who excelled at languages generally performed well in school, which supported the benefits of being multilingual reported in the theoretical part of the thesis. Even though the study did not deal with the cognitive advantages of multilingualism per se, it was expected these benefits would be mentioned. Except the connection between knowing more languages and generally performing well at school, which was first mentioned by the interviewer, no other instances were mentioned. The lack of knowledge of cognitive advantages in multilinguals is understandable when teachers are not offered any training that would make them aware of it. This proves how crucial it is to make the knowledge accessible.

When it comes to intercultural competence, the teachers recognize the importance of implementing cultural knowledge into the language classes. Once again, it has been reiterated that cultural knowledge is a significant element of travelling abroad. Especially so seeing that Croatia is part of the European Union whose main principle lies on the union and understanding of different nations. It has also been indicated that by teaching about culture one learns about tolerance and accepting different lifestyle without judgment. In this context comparisons are probably inevitable. Teacher 1

remembers recent activity in Grade 4 where pupils recognized that German people are more polite than Croats because they use 'bitte' (please/thank you) all the time. Even though pupils like to learn cultural facts, Teacher 1 points out that German textbooks for elementary school, in her opinion, do not contain sufficient cultural material, which has to be compensated by bringing additional materials and organizing extra activities. This might signal a disparity between German and English approaches to teaching a foreign language and, in extension, a difference in approach in curricula. Another difference in approaches was detected when Teacher 2 mentioned that she tried to make classes fun for students by introducing a lot of games, songs, dancing, singing and playing in English, whereas Teacher 3 noticed that German textbook predominantly consist of long texts and grammar lessons. Nevertheless, all language teachers evidently try to make learning languages more fun and relaxed by arranging extracurricular activities that are designed by students' preferences.

It is emphasised that the question of learning to respect other cultures and individuals is not solely a school mission but that this should be instigated from an early age in home environment and preschool education. The role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is certainly a key factor. The respondents believe that parents should work toward preserving their culture, especially if they stem from a different culture. Teacher 3 refers to the home language of such children, stating that the language should not be forgotten and that the school tries to highlight such pupils by giving them opportunity to present their language and their culture to their peers.

As for the role of the school, it has been suggested that school could be a place to learn more about minorities in order to avoid discrimination and prejudice. For instance, Roma people, an ethnic minority living in the Međimurje County, are often faced with negative stereotyping. Openness to cultures that are present in the immediate environment should be of the highest interest. Teachers in the study believe that it is important to be familiar with their pupils and to know as much as possible about their background in order to have a better student-teacher relationship. However, when it comes to the school's responsibility to maintain students' home languages, Teacher 1 points out that the number of such students should be taken into consideration. It is unfeasible to provide a programme that would teach a home language when there is only one student concerned. There was a consideration to introduce Slovenian language

as a subject matter at the school, but the interest of parents and students was insubstantial.

Research question 2: Do language teachers stimulate students to use their linguistic and languages learning knowledge in order to foster their foreign language learning, including the dialect, and how?

In accordance with their positive attitudes toward multilingualism, teachers reaffirm their stance in pedagogical practice. For one thing, pupils are encouraged to rely on knowledge of another foreign language. As previously mentioned, in Grade 4 pupils are introduced to English. Because of their previous encounter with German, they adjust more easily to a new language system with different orthography. Unintentional mixing of languages happens a lot in the beginning, says Teacher 2. Since she teaches both German and English, it comes very naturally to her to compare these languages when she deems pupils would benefit from it. A good example are colours. Since words are very similar (blue (English) – blau (German), brown – braun, red – rot) students are advised to notice the similarities, but also to pay attention to different pronunciation and spelling. Secondly, language teachers are very active and diligent in organizing numerous school projects that deal with languages. Such project were normally linked to an occasion such as Europe Day (May 9) when they organized ‘Europe quiz’ to test pupils’ knowledge of European trivia and questions were in three languages: Croatian, English and German. The quiz was organized in their school and they invited pupils and their teachers from five neighbouring primary schools to participate in the quiz. This was an opportunity not just to learn elements of history, geography and politics, but also to meet peers from other schools. Another project was European Day of Languages (September 29) that was combined with the celebration of the local patron St. Jerome (September 30), who first translated the Bible from Hebrew into Latin and is considered the patron of translators. Pupils were offered to read in Hebrew. In collaboration with the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, a guest lecture talked about personal names and later the pupils researched their own names to learn the origin of the name and what it meant. Furthermore, the school participated in Erasmus+ project “Eco

power dance” that joined forces with schools from Belgium, Latvia, Spain and the USA. The challenge was to dance *haka* (a traditional war dance of Maori people from New Zealand) to an authentic song that had an ecological topic. Yet another approach to multilingualism was storytelling. The story of Pinocchio was told in ten different languages. Pupils who spoke different language at home or studied one outside the school were given an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge while other pupils had a chance to hear a language that they usually did not hear in their everyday life. Languages that were represented were: Spanish, Italian, Romani, French, Albanian, Slovenian, Hungarian, German, English and Croatian. After that, the whole story was repeated one more time, but this time in the dialect.

As previously mentioned, the dialect has an important role in this area. It is in fact the first language for the majority of the students. School achievement might be hindered due to vertical bilingualism with which students struggle, especially upon enrolling into first class of elementary school. Teacher 1 estimated that majority of the pupils spoke the dialect and that a great number of pupils were not able to use the standard properly (neither in writing nor in speech). When students were prompted to speak Croatian they were inhibited, lacked the proper words to express themselves and thus resorted to insertion of dialectal words. Age is a great factor here: the younger they are, the more they express themselves in dialect. For example, when pupils in Grade 2 were asked to draw a skirt (‘suknja’) they did not understand what was expected from them so the teacher had to say to them to draw a ‘šos’ in order to be understood. The behaviour corresponds with Canagarajah's (2013, p.8) statement that “translanguaging is a naturally occurring phenomenon for multilingual students”(according to Alimi & Matiki, 2017, p.206). In order to make meaning all linguistic, cultural and social resources are used.

On the other hand, the other two teachers that have been interviewed stated that the dialect did not have a negative impact on the standard Croatian. In Teacher 2's view the dialect and the standard variety were developing simultaneously. Teacher 3 claimed that the dialect was predominantly used in free time and the standard variety in formal situations such as classes so she concluded that the dialect did not have a negative impact on the development of the standard language.

However, when they were asked about the impact the dialect had on learning foreign languages, they were unanimous that it had a positive effect, especially in German context. Namely, since the dialect is abundant in loanwords from German, learning German vocabulary is facilitated if the connection is detected. During the interviews, the teachers mentioned couple of examples, which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

German	dialect	standard Croatian	English
die Waschmaschine	vešmašina	perilica rublja	washing machine
der Schlafrock	šlafrug	kućni ogrtač	bathrobe
der Anzug	ancug	odijelo	suit
der Koffer	kufer	kovčeg	suitcase
der Schoß	šos	suknja	skirt

The teachers of German language were able to recognize the words that had German root and found this very useful to implement in their classes. They said that pupils realized the advantage the dialect gave them when learning German. Teacher 1 also mentioned that many pupils had family members or acquaintances that worked in German speaking countries and as a result perceived German to be a useful language, which then resulted in higher motivation for learning German.

Teacher 2 said that, although the dialect does not adopt many English loanwords, there are still some examples, such as umbrella (English) – marelo (dialect) – kišobran (standard) – der Regenschirm (German). There are also some similarities beyond vocabulary that can be used to compare the two systems. Since the syntax in the dialect differs from the syntax of the standard, there are some language patterns that are the same in the dialect and English, but different in the standard variety. For instance, when asking a question with the verb ‘to be’ in English the pattern is Verb-Subject-

Complement (Is Peter happy?). In the dialect, the structure is the same (Je Peter sretan/srečen?), whereas in the standard the structure is somewhat different (Je li Peter sretan?). Some phrasal verbs can also be literally translated, as in: throw away (English) – hititi fkraj (dialect) – baciti (standard). Interestingly, even idioms can sometimes be directly translated into the dialect with the same meaning, even though there is no such equivalent in the standard variety (e.g. to have ants in pants – imati kršele v riti). Teacher 2 stated that those examples helped her introduced some grammatical points to her students that she could not have explained so easily on the standard Croatian.

Obviously, code-switching between the dialect and foreign languages is promoted and often used in this school. According to Gilead's classification (2016), the function of code-switching that has been most used is Function 1 (Confirming understanding and/or clarifying meaning of the L2). The dialect is used to reinforce comprehension, especially if English/German word is unfamiliar and in situations when explanation in standard Croatian does not suffice. Moreover, when grammar lessons are being covered, the code-switching helps pupils to understand the subject matter. Apparently, in some cases pupils have trouble understanding some grammar categories in standard Croatian (such as declension), let alone in foreign languages. In these cases it is imperative that L2 comprehension is facilitated.

Function 3 (Expanding knowledge of L2 culture) is also detected in the form of organizing projects that are culturally specific to the area. Such examples are the celebration of St. Jerome and the project 'Štrigovski dišeči puž', the endeavour to plant herbs and provide a dialectal name for them. The task of generating such a nomenclature demands knowledge of the standard Croatian as well as dialectal.

Function 4 (Metalinguistic development) is evident in the comparisons between language systems of German/English and the dialect when pupils' attention is drawn to recognize the similarities between the languages that are supposed to facilitate the acquisition of the target language.

Code-switching is also used in classroom management (Function 5). The tasks are often explained in the dialect and/or the standard to verify that pupils understand correctly what is asked of them in a certain assignment. A good example of that is Teacher 1's

experience of having to translate a German word *der Rock* - skirt to the dialect so that the students would understand the task at hand. Code-switching is also used in order to maintain discipline in classroom.

Function 6 (Communicate socially with the students) is perhaps the predominant function. By code-switching to the dialect, the teachers are able to develop interpersonal relationship with their pupils. By speaking the same language as their students speak, an environment of cohesion is created. Students are more relaxed and confident to express themselves. Humour as a teaching strategy in such an environment is very effective. Teachers claimed that when pupils were encouraged to tell the story in the language they feel very comfortable (the dialect) or were encouraged to speak freely about themselves in a relaxed environment such as school excursions, a special bond between a teacher and the students was developed.

The teachers tend to empower students to speak the dialect instead of being shamed for their speech. When starting high school in a different environment, students from the area are often mistaken for being Slovenian because they are judged based on their speech. Instead of assimilating, students are encouraged to speak freely as they see it fit and to be comfortable with their way of speaking. An environment where they can speak the dialect without passing judgement or being corrected is an encouragement to affirm one's identity.

It is crucial to mention at this point that the interview was designated to be conducted in the standard Croatian, and still the teachers occasionally used dialectal words. One explanation for this is that the teachers and interviewer are acquainted because the interviewer attended that school so they remember her and feel comfortable talking to her. Another reason is that the questions themselves referred to the issue of the dialect so perhaps, willingly or not, this situation induced the use of dialectal words, especially when they were providing examples of dialectal use of their students. All in all, it demonstrates that the limits of the use of dialectal words are not strictly set. The language proved not to be attached to a certain situation or institution.

Teachers reported using the dialect in learning and teaching of L2 and L3 in order to enhance the progress of foreign language acquisition, which corresponds with Macaro's

(2009) category of Optimal position, a belief system of teachers who deem that L1 should be used in such a way that it optimally benefits the learning of L2. Further display of the dialect's status in the school is the Dialectology group, which is active in the school. This is an extracurricular elective group which is attended by pupils from Grade 5 to Grade 8. A teacher of Croatian language and Teacher 3, a teacher of German language, founded this group in order to work with pupils that are interested in discovering their dialect. The teachers themselves are not originally from this area so it was interesting for them to discover the language that is so important to their students. Afterwards Teacher 1 (a German teacher) also joined the group. The group members are encouraged to collect dialectal words by speaking to their elder family members, neighbours, friends and acquaintances in their free time. When they meet in school for the session, they present the words and comment on it, which often results in a spontaneous flow of new words that come to their mind. Sometime a theme is introduced and the words are produced by brainstorming. An example of such an approach is when pupils were instructed to do a picture dictionary of a 'kuhja' (kitchen) and to name all the objects in the room, name the dishes that are traditionally prepared, explain the preparation method, name all ingredients and write down the recipe. The words are then processed – they have to be confirmed by native (older) speakers, they are written down and analyzed. With time this had resulted in a dictionary that is continuing to grow. So far more than 11 000 words have been accumulated (Šmitran, 2016). An online version of the dictionary with pronunciation by a native speaker is planned in the future. The group sparked such interest that now the whole school (pupils, teachers and staff) is involved with the dictionary. When they are approached to confirm a word, they already have a couple of new words prepared to be listed in the dictionary. Teacher 2, who lived her first 35 years in the village, was engaged in the making of the dictionary as a proofreader. *The Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics* recognized the efforts to preserve the dialect and collaborated with the school. The Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia recognized the value of the dialect and enlisted the dialect as *Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Croatia*. (Ministry of Culture, <http://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?ID=3650>)

Local community is also invested in the project. Local cultural and artistic association 'Kulturno umjetničko društvo Sveti Jeronim' implements the dialect in their folklore,

dances and music, plays, and publications (KUD Sv. Jeronim). It is especially praiseworthy that younger generations are involved since the number of speakers of dialects is strongly decreasing and the speakers are predominantly older people living in villages (Beerkens, 2010, p.55). Dialects are normally used in the private sphere within the domains of family, friends and neighbours but the case at hand proves that dialect does not have to be limited only to these domains and can be a part of the formal education and cultural associations. In educational sense this acknowledgment of the dialect gives a special value to something that might have been taken for granted before. Teacher 1 gave an example of a below-average student in Grade 8 who participated in the Dialectal group and who, for the first time, felt he was accomplished in something at school because he was able to demonstrate his knowledge of the dialect in this group.

Research question 3: Is there any collaboration between teachers of different languages in order to advance their students' multilingualism and intercultural competence?

It is evident from the before mentioned projects that teachers of different languages indeed cooperate in order to advance their students' multilingualism and intercultural competence. The school culture is supportive of the endeavour to preserve and maintain the dialect. The school principle recognized the value of the dialect and approved the establishment of the Dialectal group. Teachers of various subjects are working together in different capacity on a project that has cohesive quality, even beyond the school itself. The recognition of the dialect by the Ministry of Culture proves that efforts put in the preservation of the dialect are worthy and valuable. Further projects connected to the dialect in which teachers of different subjects were involved were retelling of the Pinocchio story in multiple languages and in the dialect, celebration of the St. Jerome's day by organizing activities involving translation, analyzing etymology of personal names and inviting a lecturer who is a linguist to present the subject to pupils. The school also presented their achievements on the level of the County by exhibiting a poster which depicts the initiative to plant herbs in their schoolyard and to name all the herbs in the dialect.

The collaboration of teachers of different languages is also visible in their engagement in Erasmus+ project "Eco power dance" in cooperation with schools from around the

globe. The organization of multilingual quiz to mark Europe Day, where they invited five neighbouring schools to participate, demonstrated as well that good neighbourly relations should also be maintained.

The teachers say they are also in contact with their peers who teach same subjects. They regularly attend teacher trainings, which predominantly deal with topics concerning learning disabilities. Teachers report not having encountered multilingualism and intercultural education on such training nor have they had courses concerning these topics at the university. Only Teacher 1 attended a seminar in Germany that dealt with multilingualism. This proves assertions by Bilić-Štefan (2006) and Piršl (2016) who claim that there is no systematic implementation of intercultural education in teacher training, which leaves the matter in the hands of the teachers themselves and they tackle the issues either based on instinct or are forced to self-educate themselves.

The selection of languages taught plays a crucial role and it seems in this situation that the choice is driven by the notion of traditional importance a language has in the specific environment, rather to blindly follow the statistical prevalence. Specifically, due to the influence German has on the dialect and the fact that many families have a family member who works in a German-speaking country, it seems that German is perceived as a more prominent foreign language than English. As speakers of the dialect, these students may have specific knowledge and competences at their disposal, which other German learning students do not have.

3.6. Discussion

In this study qualitative methodology was employed to examine in-depth data on language teachers' perception of multilingualism and intercultural education in an elementary school in the border area of Međimurje. Special emphasis was put on the role the dialect the students speak plays in the teachers' approach to foreign language teaching. The aim was to ascertain whether teachers have different approach to language teaching considering the language repertoire of their students, as opposed to teaching the same languages to students who do not speak the dialect in question, and if

so, how and why do they employ certain teaching methods, as well as the question of language teachers' collaboration.

The study set to answer three research questions:

RQ1: What are language teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism and intercultural competence?

RQ2: Do language teachers stimulate students to use their linguistic and languages learning knowledge in order to foster their foreign language learning, including the dialect, and how?

RQ3: Is there any collaboration between teachers of different languages in order to advance their students' multilingualism and intercultural competence?

In general, all three teachers expressed positive attitudes towards multilingualism. The dialect is perceived as an advantage in learning foreign languages, as well as an advantage in personal linguistic repertoire. Teachers take into consideration the context in which learning and teaching take place. The fact that some teachers are not native speakers of the dialect has proven beneficial in this context because they show understanding and interest for the dialect, which resulted in constructive steps towards analyzing and preserving the dialect. Ultimately, this results in a dictionary of local (dialectal) vocabulary, which is a proof that the dialect is still very much alive and that people are interested in keeping it that way. Furthermore, for pedagogical reasons, the efforts are fruitful: foreign language learning is supported by the affordances provided by comparing similarities between the dialect and target languages. Students are motivated to learn foreign languages because they see the value of these languages in the immediate environment and they are able to transfer knowledge from one language that they speak to another, which makes them more proficient speakers. Their awareness about the dialect is higher and they feel confident speaking it without stigmatization. Students are encouraged to exploit their linguistic knowledge and in doing so they are encouraged to draw from all resources, without strictly compartmentalizing the language systems. Code-switching is used for various functions, the most prominent being affirming understanding in younger students, and developing metalinguistic awareness and improving social communication.

Although the teachers did not receive almost any training in dealing with multilingualism or interculturalism, they encourage development of intercultural communicative competence in their work with the students. However, the lack of such training points to the absence of systematic approach to educate teachers on this subject. In spite of that, the teachers clearly showed that they possess the abilities necessary to make a competent multilingual teacher (as defined in Haukås, 2016): they are multilingual themselves and give a good role model to students, possess high level of cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness, take into consideration students' cognitive and affective differences and work together with other language teachers to make the most of students' multilingual environment.

4. Conclusion

The statistics on language learning in Europe and Croatia point to the benefits of knowing foreign languages, as well as using a dialect as a language asset. A language teacher plays a key role in advancing students' multilingualism and intercultural competence. The study at hand focused on three language teachers and their perception of multilingualism. The study endeavoured to examine three research questions: if in an elementary school in the border area of Međimurje language teachers have positive attitudes towards multilingualism and intercultural competence; if they try to stimulate the students to use their comprehensive linguistic and languages learning knowledge (especially the dialect) to improve their foreign language learning, and in doing this, if the language teachers collaborate. It is evident that the teachers' work reflects the competences for lifelong learning proposed in the *National Curriculum Framework for Pre-school Education and General Compulsory and Secondary Education*, among which are: communication in the mother tongue, communication in foreign languages, social and civic competences, and cultural awareness and expression. A model example of cultivating national heritage by involving the local community and local educational institution to be involved in discovering and preserving local dialect which has resulted in civic pride and official recognition of the importance of the dialect has been demonstrated. Language teachers have an essential role in this by incorporating

intercultural competence to their teaching. Importantly, a lack of systematic approach to intercultural studies has been observed, both among university students in Croatia and among practitioners. The importance of teachers working together is thus more significant, as well as proactive approach.

The limitations of deriving conclusions from one case study alone should be acknowledged. Additional study with a significantly higher number of participants would provide a more reliable, detailed and fine-grained data. Also, further studies could be conducted to evaluate whether strongly dialectal children have equal and/or satisfying command of both Croatian standard language and non-standard dialect(s). Furthermore, different contexts should be taken into account since it is highly unlikely that studies conducted in areas where other dialects than Kajkavian are spoken, or in other border areas for that matter, would yield same result. Further empirical research could be conducted in different environment, but also taking in mind different L1s and proficiency levels of the students. Further research on teachers should be conducted in order to arrive at more conclusive pedagogical implications. Such research-based findings could contribute to improving education of both pre-service and in-service teachers.

In future, environmental languages could be considered to be included in curricula which would entail systematic guidelines to approaching vertical bilingualism, dialectal students, home languages and multilingual and multicultural environment in general. Concerning the issue of a dialect, we hold it should be given more space in the curriculum instead of being confined only to those Croatian lessons that deal with the tripartite distribution of Croatian dialect.

5. Reference list

- Alibien Moutombi, G. C. (2005) *Die Einstellungen der Kameruner DeutschlehrerInnen zur Mehrsprachigkeit*. MA thesis. The University of Bergen. URL: <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/10377/133478727.pdf?sequence=1&isAllo wed=y> accessed 2 March 2017
- Alimi, M.M. & Matiki, A. J. (2017) Translanguaging in Nigerian and Malawian online newspaper readers' comments. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14:2, p. 202-218
- Barcelona European Council, 15 and 16 March 2002, Presidency Conclusions. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/pdf/download_en/barcelona_european_council.pdf Accessed 25 September 2017
- Bartulović, M., Kušević, B. (2016) Što je interkulturalno obrazovanje? Priručnik za nastavnike i druge znatiželjnike. Centar za mirovne studije: Zagreb
- Beerens, R. (2010) Receptive multilingualism as a language mode in the Dutch-German border area. Waxmann: Münster
- Bilić Štefan, M. (2006) Uključivanje interkulturalne kompetencije u poučavanje stranih jezika. *Odgojne znanosti*, 8:1, p.279-288
- Blažeka, Đ. (2008) Međimurski dijalekt – Hrvatski kajkavski govori Međimurja. Matica hrvatska: Čakovec
- Byram, M. (1997) Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon
- Canagarajah, S. (2011) Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In Wei, L.(Ed.) *Applied Linguistics Review* 2. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin. p.1-28
- Central Bureau of Statistics. Population by mother tongue – detailed classification, 2011 census. URL: http://www.dzs.hr/Eng/censuses/census2011/results/htm/e01_01_09/E01_01_09.html Accessed 21 June 2017
- Cook, V. (1996) Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. Second Edition. Arnold: London
- Corcoll, C. (2013) Developing childrens' language awareness: switching codes in the language classroom. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10:1, p. 27-45

- Council of Europe (2001) Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge: Cambridge, UK
- Cvikić, L., Novak Milić, J. (2015) Međukulturna kompetencija u predmetu Hrvatski jezik: teorijske pretpostavke, pripremljenost i stavovi učitelja. In Udier, S. L. & Cergol Kovačević, K (Eds) *Višejezičnost kao predmet multidisciplinarnih istraživanja - Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa HDPL-a. Srednja Europa i Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku*: Zagreb. p.145-162
- De Angelis, G. (2011) Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8:3, p. 216-234
- Duhaime's Law Dictionary URL: <http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary.aspx>
Accessed 21 June 2017
- European Commision, The (2012) *Europeans and their Languages*. The European Commission. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf
- European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts) (2008). *Sharing Diversity: National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe: Study for the European Commission: Report*. European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research: Bonn & Helsinki URL: http://www.interculturaldialogue.eu/web/files/14/en/Sharing_Diversity_Final_Report.pdf Accessed 28 September 2017
- Galtung, J. (1971) A Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8:2, p. 81-117
- García, O. "What is translanguaging?" Interview by Grosjean, F. *Psychology Today*. Sussex Publishers. 2.3.2016. URL <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/life-bilingual/201603/what-is-translanguaging> Accessed 2 September 2017
- Gilead, Y. (2016) Code-Switching Functions in Modern Hebrew Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 82:4, p.268-292
- Gordon, R. G. (ed.) (2005) *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. SIL International: Dallas, TX

- Griva, E. & Chostelidou, D. (2012) Multilingual competence development in the Greek educational system: FL teachers' beliefs and attitudes. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 9:3, p.257-271
- Grosjean, F. (2012) What Do Bilinguals and Hurdlers Have in Common? A holistic view of bilinguals. *Psychology Today*. Sussex Publishers. 27.7.2012. URL: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/life-bilingual/201207/what-do-bilinguals-and-hurdlers-have-in-common>
- Haukås, Å. (2016) Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13:1, p.1-18
- Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations : Software of the Mind*. McGraw Hill: London/New York
- Hornberger, N.H., & Cassels Johnson, D. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41:3, p.509-532
- Hufeisen, B. (2005) Gesamtsprachencurriculum: Einflussfaktoren and Bedingungsgefüge. In Hufeisen & Lutjeharms (eds.), p. 9–18
- Ilišin, V. & Spajić-Vrkaš, V. (2015) *Potrebe, problemi i potencijali mladih u Hrvatskoj: Istraživački izveštaj*. (Eng. The Needs, Problems and Potentials of Young People in Croatia: Research Report). Ministarstvo socijalne politike i mladih Republike Hrvatske: Zagreb. URL: <http://www.mspm.hr/UserDocsImages/AA1/Potrebe,%20problemi%20i%20potencijali%20mladih%20u%20Hrvatskoj%20-%20zavr%C5%A1ni%20izvje%C5%A1taj%20istra%C5%BEivanja.pdf>
- Jessner, U. (2008) Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language teaching*, 41:1, p.15-56
- Karačić, G. (2009) Učenje stranih jezika u Hrvatskoj i u Europskoj Uniji. In Granić, J. (Ed.) *Jezična politika i jezična stvarnost [Language Policy and Language Reality]*. Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku: Zagreb. p. 684-693
- Kellerman, E. (1978). Giving learners a break: Native language intuitions as a source of predictions about transferability. *Working papers on Bilingualism* 15: 59-92
- Kemp, C. (2007) Strategic Processing in Grammar Learning: Do Multilinguals Use More Strategies? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 4:4, p. 241-261

- Kemp, C. (2009) Defining multilingualism. In Aronin, L. & Hufeisen, B. *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia. p.11-26
- Kovač, J. "Nematerijalna baština RH – Štrigovska skupina govora." Muzej Međimurja Čakovec. 05.05.2015. URL: <http://mmc.hr/nematerijalna-bastina-rh-strigovska-skupina-govora/> accessed 7 June 2017
- Krumm, H-J. (2005). Von der additiven zur curricularen Mehrsprachigkeit: Über die Notwendigkeit der Einbeziehung von Minderheiten-, Migranten- und Nachbarsprachen. In Hufeisen & Lutjeharms (eds.), p. 27–36.
- KUD Sv. Jeronim URL: <http://www.kud-svetijeronim.hr/> accessed 10 May 2017
- Lázár, I. (2007) Theoretical background. In Lázár et al. (Eds.) *Developing and assessing intercultural communicative competence – A guise for language teachers and educators*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe: Graz. p. 7-10
- Macaro, E. (2009) Teacher Use of Codeswitching in the Second Language Classroom: Exploring 'Optimal' Use. In Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.) *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon. p. 35–49
- Medved Krajnović, M. & Letica, S. (2009) Učenje stranih jezika u Hrvatskoj: politika, znanost i javnost. In Granić, J. (Ed.) *Jezična politika i jezična stvarnost [Language Policy and Language Reality]*. Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku: Zagreb. p. 598-607
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2013) Multilingual attitudes and attitudes to multilingualism in Croatia. In Singleton, D., Fishman, J., Aronin, L. & Ó Laoire, M. (Eds.) *Current multilingualism: A new linguistic dispensation*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. p. 163-186
- Mihaljević Djigunović, J. & Bagarić, V. (2007) A Comparative Study of Attitudes and Motivation of Croatian Learners of English and German. *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagradiensia*, 52. p. 259-281
- Ministry of Culture. List of Intangible Cultural Heritage. URL: <http://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?ID=3650> accessed 10 April 2016

- National Curriculum Framework for Pre-school Education and General Compulsory and Secondary Education*. Republic of Croatia. Ministry of Science, Education and Sports. Zagreb, July 2010. Accessed 25 April 2017
- Neuner, G. (2004). The concept of plurilingualism and tertiary language didactics. In Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. (Eds.) *The plurilingualism project: Tertiary language learning—German after English*. Council of Europe: Strasbourg, p. 13–34
- Novak-Milić, J., Gulešić-Machata, M. (2006) Međukulturna kompetencija u nastavi hrvatskoga kao drugoga i stranoga jezika. *Lahor: časopis za hrvatski kao materinski, drugi i strani jezik*, 1:1, p.69-82
- Odlin, T. (1989) *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Otheguy, R., García, O. & Reid, W. (2015) Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*. 6:3, p. 281-307
- Otwinowska, A. (2014) Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 11:1, p. 97-119
- Pavličević-Franić, D. (2003) Okomita dvojezičnost i rano učenje jezika [Vertical Bilingualism and Early Language Acquisition] In Kovačević, M. & Pavličević-Franić, D. (Eds.) *Komunikacijska kompetencija u višejezičnoj sredini 2: Teorijska razmatranja, primjena [Communicative competence in language pluralistic environment 2: Theoretical considerations and Practice]*. Naklada Slap: Zagreb, p. 93-105
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Piršl, E. (2016) Interkulturalni odgoj i obrazovanje. In Piršl et al. *Vodič za interkulturalno učenje*. Naklada Ljevak: Zagreb. p. 47-55
- Piršl, E., Benjak, M., Diković, M., Jelača, M. & Matošević, A., (2016). (2016) Odgoj i obrazovanje za interkulturalnu kompetenciju: rezultati istraživanja. In Piršl et al. *Vodič za interkulturalno učenje*. Naklada Ljevak: Zagreb. p. 89-144
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*. 18, p. 581-618.

- Požgaj-Hadžić, V. (2003) Kontrastivni pristup učenju/nastavi (hrvatskoga) jezika [Contrastive Approach to Learning/Teaching a Language (Croatian)] In Kovačević, M. & Pavličević-Franić, D. (Eds.) *Komunikacijska kompetencija u višejezičnoj sredini 2: Teorijska razmatranja, primjena [Communicative competence in language pluralistic environment 2: Theoretical considerations and Practice]*. Naklada Slap: Zagreb, p. 52-63
- Rađa, G. (2013) Bi-, cross-, inter-, multi-, pluri- or trans-cultural education? In Arslan, H. & Rađa, G. (Eds.) *Multicultural Education: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne. p. 3-14
- Ringbom, H. (2007) Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning. *Multilingual Matters*: Clevedon
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1916 [1986]. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Translated as: *Course in general linguistics*, by Roy Harris. Open Court Publishers: La Salle, IL
- Sayer, P. (2012) Translanguaging, TexMex, and Bilingual Pedagogy: Emergent Bilinguals Learning Through the Vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*. 43:1, p. 63-88
- Sercu, L. (2004) Assessing intercultural competence: a framework for systematic test development in foreign language education and beyond. *Intercultural Education*. 15:1, p. 73-89
- Silić, J. (2006) Hrvatski standardni jezik i hrvatska narječja. Funkcionalni stilovi hrvatskog jezika. Disput: Zagreb. p. 29-34
- Singleton, D. & Little, D. (1991). The second language learner: Some evidence from university level-learners of French and German. *Second Language Research*. 7:1, p. 61–82
- Spajić-Vrkaš, V.; Kukoč, M. & Bašić, S. (2001) *Obrazovanje za ljudska prava: interdisciplinarni rječnik (Education for Human Rights: The Interdisciplinary Dictionary)*. Hrvatsko povjerenstvo za UNESCO: Zagreb
- Šmitran, A. "Zaštita štrigovske skupine govora, dosad prikupljeno više od 11 tisuća riječi." *Međimurje*. 26.05.2016 URL:<https://medjimurje.hr/pod-medimurskim-nebom/kultura-i-prosvjeta/zastita-strigovske-skupine-govora-dosad-prikupljeno-vise-od-11-tisuca-rijeci0-23948/> accessed 15 May 2017

- Štrigovska skupina govora na popisu nematerijalne kulturne baštine. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. <http://ihjj.hr/clanak/strigovska-skupina-govora-na-popisu-nematerijalne-kulturne-bastine/167/> accessed 7 June 2017
- Thornbury, S. (1997) About language. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Turza-Bogdan, T. (2009) Stavovi nastavnika o kajkavskome narječju. *Hrvatski, časopis za teoriju i praksu nastave hrvatskog jezika, književnosti, govornoga i pismenoga izražavanja te medijske kulture*. 6:1, p.173-192
- Turza-Bogdan, T. (2013) Kajkavsko narječje u nastavi Hrvatskoga jezika: prilozi za osnovnoškolsku nastavu. Matica hrvatska – Ogranak Čakovec: Čakovec
- UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education (2006) UNESCO: Paris. URL: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147878e.pdf> Accessed 20 June 2017
- Vollmer, H. (2001) Englisch und Mehrsprachigkeit: Die Rolle des Englischen für den Erwerb weiterer Fremdsprachen. In K. Aguado & A. Hu (eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit und Mehrkulturalität*. Pädagogischer Zeitschriftenverlag: Berlin, p. 75–88
- Wei, L. (ed.) (2005) The Bilingualism Reader. Routledge: New York
- “Završen Tempus projekt ‘Komunikacijska kompetencija u višejezičnoj sredini’” *Index*, 4 April 2003. URL: <http://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/završen-tempus-projekt-komunikacijska-kompetencija-u-visejezicnoj-sredini---/129782.aspx?mobile=false> Accessed 7 May 2017

6. Appendix 1

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Language teachers' perception of multilingualism in the border area of Medimurje

Date, time, location _____

Participant's code _____

Instructions

Good morning. My name is _____. Thank you for coming. This interview is part of my master thesis study. It involves three parts. The first part is a survey, in which I will ask you about data concerning age, gender, education, languages spoken and work experience. In second part I will read statements to you. I kindly ask you to say whether you agree or disagree with a statement and to comment on your answer. In third part, I will ask you open-ended questions. There are no right or wrong or desirable or undesirable answers. I would like you to feel comfortable with saying what you really think and how you really feel.

Tape recorder instructions

If it is okay with you, I will be tape-recording our conversation. The purpose of this is so that I can get all the details but at the same time be able to carry on an attentive conversation with you. I assure you that all your comments will remain confidential.

1. General information about participants

1. gender F M

2. age _____

3. What is your major? _____

4. How long have you taught? _____ years

5. How long are you teaching in this school? _____ years

6. What is the distance between the place where you live and the place where you work? _____ km

7. What _____ is _____ your _____ mother _____ tongue?

8. Which languages do you speak? How would you estimate your proficiency in these languages?_____
- _____
- _____

2. Statements

Now I will read statements to you. I kindly ask you to say whether you agree or disagree with a statement and to comment on your answer.

i. multilingualism

1. Knowing one foreign language makes learning another foreign language easier.
2. Students who speak more languages are generally do well at school.
3. One of the aims of language education is to get to know the culture of the language..
4. Children should learn as soon as possible the importance of respecting other cultures.
5. Parents of children of different cultures should encourage their children to preserve their culture.
6. Schools should incorporate and learn about all cultures that are present in Croatia.
7. Teachers should familiarized themselves with culture of their student(s).
8. School should help students that come from a minority culture to preserve their culture.
9. Students should learn that people coming from different cultures have a lot in common.
10. It is important to emphasise cultural differences in language classes.

ii. dialect

1. Knowing a dialect can be an advantage when learning foreign languages.
2. Often use of a dialect can delay the development of the standard language.
3. In my classes I tend to mention students' mother tongue.

4. In my classes sometimes I make comparisons between Croatian language and the language that I teach..

3. Open-ended questions

Q1 attitudes towards multilingualism

1. How would you define a multilingual person? Who do you consider a multilingual?
2. Is multilingualism useful? In what way?
3. Which languages do you speak? Where did you learn them, in formal or informal environment? How would you assess your proficiency?
4. How many languages do most of your students speak? How proficient are they?
5. Do you think you are able to motivate your students to learn languages? How do you do it?
6. Can knowing one language help with acquiring another language? In what way?
7. Could you think of a learning strategy that your students use?
8. Do you think your students would benefit if you or the students used other languages in your language classes?
9. During your studies, did you have any courses that dealt with multilingualism and/or interculturalism? Did you attend any seminar or lecture on the subject of multilingualism and/or intercultural education?

Q2 attitudes toward dialect

1. What role does the dialect have in the environment where you teach?
2. Do you think your students are aware of the fact that they use a dialect in everyday life, although, if asked what their mother tongue is, they would probably state the standard language, and not the dialect?
3. Do you think that knowing a dialect within mother tongue can influence foreign language learning?
4. Would you say that the dialect that your students use could be, in this context, considered as a separate language?
5. Do you use the dialect in your classes? To which end?

6. What is the school's attitude towards using the dialect in classes? Are the students encouraged to use the dialect?
7. Have you noticed students' mistakes in speech or writing as a result of transfer from other foreign language or the dialect? How do you react to the mistakes?
8. Have you or the students considered the connection between the dialect and foreign language(s)? Who brings up this subject, you or the students?
9. Do you encourage your students to use the dialect? In what context? Can you describe a specific situation?
10. Do you use the dialect in your classes? Is the use spontaneous or directed (for instance to compare the dialect and a foreign language)?
11. How do the students react when you encourage them to use the dialect?

Q3 collaboration among teachers

1. What motivated you to become a language teacher? In your teaching, which language competences are especially important to you?
2. Are you a member of any language teachers' organization? Do you collaborate with language teachers who teach other languages than you?
3. Have you organized any activities in your school that promoted using more languages simultaneously? What were students' reactions?

Can you tell me more about the celebration of St. Jerome in your school?

Tell me more about the Dialectal group in your school. Are you a part of it?

IV. End

Thank you again for your willingness to speak with us today. Those are all of the questions that we have.

Is there anything else that you would like to cover? Do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for participating in this interview.

7. Appendix 2

PROTOKOL ZA VOĐENJE POLUSTRUKTURIRANOG INTERVJUA

Language teachers' perception of multilingualism in the border area of Međimurje

Datum, vrijeme, mjesto intervjuiranja _____

Šifra sudionika _____

Uvod: *Poštovani, ovaj intervju se provodi u sklopu diplomskog rada na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu, Odsjeka za anglistiku i Odsjeka za pedagogiju. Ako pristanete na sudjelovanje u istraživanju, Vaši odgovori biti će zabilježeni pod pseudonimom kako bi se sačuvala Vaša anonimnost, a podatci će se koristiti isključivo za izradu diplomskog rada. Dopuštate li da snimam razgovor kako bih se mogla bolje usredotočiti na razgovor i olakšati si kasniju analizu razgovora?*

I. dio: Podaci o sudioniku

1. spol M Ž
2. dob _____
3. završeni stupanj obrazovanja _____
4. Koliko dugo predajete? _____ godina
5. Koliko dugo predajete u ovoj školi? _____ godina
6. Koja je udaljenost između Vašeg doma i škole u kojoj predajete? _____ km
7. Koji Vam je materinski jezik? _____
8. Koje jezike govorite? Kako biste procijenili razinu poznavanja tih jezika?

II. Pitanja za sudionike

Sada ću Vam redom pročitati neke izjave. Nakon što pročitam pojedinu izjavu, molim Vas navedite slažete li se s tom izjavom i da u nekoliko rečenica prokomentirate svoj odgovor.

iii. višejezičnost

11. Poznavanje jednog stranog jezika olakšava učenje dodatnog stranog jezika.
12. Učenici koji govore više jezika općenito postižu bolje rezultate u školi.
13. Jedan od ciljeva nastave jezika je da se upozna i kultura kojoj taj jezik pripada.
14. Djeca trebaju što prije naučiti da treba poštivati druge kulture.
15. Roditelji učenika iz drugih kultura trebaju poticati svoju djecu da čuvaju svoju kulturu.
16. U školi bi se trebalo više učiti o drugim kulturama koje su prisutne u Hrvatskoj.
17. Učitelji treba što bolje upoznati kulturu iz koje dolazi njihovi učenici.
18. Učenicima koji pripadaju drugačijoj kulturi škola treba pomoći kako bi održali svoje kulturno nasljeđe.
19. Učenici trebaju naučiti da osobe koje dolaze iz različitih kultura često imaju mnogo zajedničkog.
20. U nastavi jezika važno je isticati razlike među kulturama.

iv. dijalekt

5. Poznavanje dijalekta može biti prednost kod učenja stranih jezika.
6. Često korištenje dijalekta usporava razvoj standardnog jezika.
7. Na svojim satovima obično spominjem materinski jezik učenika.
8. Ponekad na nastavi uspoređujem hrvatski jezik s jezikom kojeg poučavam.

III. Pitanja za sudionike

H1 attitudes towards multilingualism

1. Kako biste definirali višejezičnu osobu? Koga smatrate višejezičnim govornikom?
2. Je li višejezičnost korisna? U čemu se očituje ta korist?
3. Koje jezike govorite? Gdje ste ih naučili, u formalnom ili neformalnom okruženju? Kako biste procijenili svoje znanje tih jezika?
4. Koliko jezika govori većina Vaših učenika? Na kojoj su razini?
5. Smatrate li da uspijevate učenike motivirati za učenje stranih jezika? Na koji način?

6. Može li poznavanje drugih jezika pomoći pri savladavanju nekog novog jezika?
Na koji način?
7. Možete li se prisjetiti neke strategije učenja stranih jezika koje bi učenici mogli koristiti? Smatrate li da bi njihovom učenju pomoglo da se u sklopu nastave jezika koji Vi predajete učenici ili Vi, kao nastavnica, poslužite i nekim drugim jezikom?
8. Jeste li tijekom studija slušali kolegije iz područja višejezičnosti i/ili interkulturalizma, ili sudjelovali na seminaru ili predavanju na temu višejezičnosti i/ili interkulturnog obrazovanja?

H2 attitudes toward dialect

9. Kakvu ulogu smatrate da ima dijalekt u području u kojemu vi poučavate?
10. Mislite li da su učenici svjesni toga da u svakodnevnom govoru koriste narječje, a ne standardni jezik, premda bi vjerojatno kao materinski jezik naveli hrvatski jezik, a ne kajkavsko narječje?
11. Mislite li da upravo znanje dodatnog idioma unutar materinskog jezika može imati nekakav utjecaj na učenje stranoga jezika?
12. Bi li se dijalekt koji koriste Vaši učenici mogao u tom kontekstu smatrati kao jedan dodatan strani jezik?
13. Koristite li kajkavsko narječje u nastavi? Zašto?
14. Kakav je stav škole prema korištenju dijalekta u nastavi, ohrabruju li se učenici da koriste dijalekt?
15. Jeste li primijetili da učenici griješe u govoru ili pisanju pod utjecajem znanja ili učenja nekog drugog jezika ili dijalekta? Kako reagirate na pogreške u takvim situacijama?
16. Jeste li se bavili pitanjem povezanosti dijalekta i stranih jezika? Spominjete li na nastavi Vi ili Vaši učenici dijalekt? Potičete li učenike da koriste dijalekt?
17. Kako? U kojim situacijama? Možete li opisati neku konkretnu situaciju?
18. Kako reagiraju učenici kada ih se potiče na korištenje dijalekta?

H3 collaboration among teachers

19. Što vas je potaklo da postanete profesor stranog jezika?

20. Na što obraćate posebnu pozornost kada predajete jezik, na razvoj kojih kompetencija ste posebno usredotočeni?
21. Jeste li uključeni u neku mrežu suradnje među profesorima? Suradujete li s profesorima koji predaju isti jezik kao i Vi? Suradujete li s profesorima koji predaju druge jezike?
22. Jeste li organizirali u svojoj školi aktivnosti koje su poticale učenike na korištenje više jezika istovremeno? Kakve su bile reakcije učenika?

Možete li mi reći više o obilježavanju Dana svetog Jeronima u Vašoj školi?

Recite mi nešto više o Rječniku štrigovske skupine govora? Je li on utjecao na Vaše poučavanje stranog jezika?

IV. Kraj

Na kraju, imate li vi kakvih pitanja za mene? Jesam li propustila neko pitanje koje Vam se čini važnim? Želite li ga sada postaviti?

Zahvaljujem Vam na sudjelovanju u istraživanju!

Sažetak

U današnjem svijetu prednosti višejezičnosti često se ističu. Europska komisija također je prepoznala vrijednost poznavanja stranih jezika te preporuča da svaki stanovnik Europske unije uz materinji jezik uči još dva strana jezika. Ovaj rad usredotočio se je na osnovnu školu u pograničnom području Međimurja. Namjena rada bila je ispitati stavove nastavnika stranih jezika o višejezičnosti s posebnim naglaskom na narječje. Naime, u tom području učenici govore narječje koji je prepoznat od strane Ministarstva kulture kao specifični govor koji je uvršten na listu nematerijalnog kulturnog dobra. Narječje obiluje germanizmima i hungarizmima te je istraživanje htjelo ispitati utječe li to na nastavnikovo poučavanje stranih jezika. Pokazalo se je da nastavnici stranih jezika uviđaju vrijednost narječja te ga koriste kao sredstvo poučavanja stranih jezika. Suradnja među nastavnicima prenijela se je i na lokalnu sredinu te je rezultirala osnivanjem školske Dijalektološke grupe koja radi na rječniku dijalekta. Iako je ovo izvrstan primjer pedagoške prakse, još uvijek ne postoji sustavno obrazovanje nastavnika koje bi ih osposobilo za rad s višejezičnim učenicima i razvijanje interkulturalnih kompetencija.

Ključne riječi: višejezičnost, nastavnik stranog jezika, narječje

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to dr.sc. Stela Letica Krevelj in the Department of English at the University of Zagreb and prof.dr.sc. Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš in the Department of Pedagogy at the University of Zagreb for their help and support. I am thankful and indebted to them for sharing expertise, and sincere and valuable guidance and encouragement extended to me.

I would also like to thank Osnovna škola Štrigova and their employees for participating in this study and for a warm welcome.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my family: my parents, grandparents, Emanuel, Josipa and Andrej for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.