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Croatian university students’ perception of stylistic and domain-based differences between Anglicisms and their native equivalents

1. Introduction

Attitudes of the public towards the influence of English on their respective languages have been investigated for years in a large number of linguistic communities. In Croatia, however, only linguists, representatives of the official language policy, have expressed their attitudes to the influence of the English language, while the attitudes of the public have been ignored.

In view of the fact that average speakers,\(^1\) representatives of the unofficial language policy, to a large extent dictate the direction of language policy-making (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997, Preisler 2003, Spol-sky 2004), the present paper aims to investigate Croatian university students’ attitudes towards Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents, that is, towards their use in formal and informal contexts and in different domains.

2. Previous research (in other linguistic communities)

Hyrkstedt and Kalaja (1998) analysed attitudes of a group of young Finns towards English and its influence on Finnish on the basis of their written responses to a letter-to-the-Editor which argues that Finnish is losing its vitality to English and that it might be a good idea to protect the purity of Finnish from an assault of English by taking legislative actions. Those who were in favour of the arguments advocated in the

---

\(^1\) Average speakers are all those who are not linguists.
letter, described the popularity of English loanwords as something superficial and fashionable, leading to discrimination against the segment of the population who does not speak or understand English. Those who were against the arguments, described the influence of English as natural, emphasised the practical advantages of adopting words from English into Finnish, and strongly opposed the use of legislative actions.

Oakes (2001) points out that the general public in France is more accepting of English and American borrowings into French than the intellectual elite.

Her observations concerning attitudes of Bulgarian language speakers of different ages, cultural backgrounds, and education levels led Alexieva (2002) to the conclusion that Bulgarian is not in danger of having its basic word stock being congested with Anglicisms because there is a healthy public awareness of how appropriate the use of Anglicisms is in different social spheres and situations. The author notes that the Bulgarian language community is critical about the fashionable use of Anglicisms.

Corr (2003) conducted an online survey in order to investigate public opinion regarding Anglicisms in German, particularly in the area of computing terminology. The analysis of the results shows that although 82% of the respondents think that there are (too) many Anglicisms in the text provided by the author, the majority of the respondents believe that the presence of Anglicisms makes their overall understanding of the text easier.

In Norway, the Norwegian Language Council and Dagbladet, one of Norway’s biggest tabloid newspapers, have established The Word Lab – a Norwegian Internet discussion list – where people have been invited to contribute suitable Norwegian translations for a set of recent English loanwords. This list provided the material for Greenall’s (2005) analysis of the public’s attitudes towards the process of Norwegianising English loanwords. The author divided contributors into three groups: serious contributors, who accept the task straightforwardly, non-serious contributors, who respond to the invitation, but who do not seem to take the task assigned seriously, and rebels, who argue fiercely against the translation of English loanwords and believe that linguists waste re-

sources on making silly and artificial words and neglecting the fact that language is primarily a tool for communication.

3. Aim and methodology

The sample comprised 244 students of the University of Rijeka. The data were collected by means of a questionnaire, and then statistically analysed using Microsoft Office Excel 2003.

The aim of this paper is to investigate Croatian university students’ attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents in formal and informal contexts, and in different domains of the Croatian language. We base our research on two hypotheses. The first predicts that the respondents’ attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms and their native replacements differ according to the level of formality of communication. In other words, we presume that the respondents find Anglicisms, especially connotative ones, less formal than their native equivalents and more appropriate for being used in informal/oral/private communication than in a formal/written/public context. Native equivalents to Anglicisms, as purist-inspired words, are, on the other hand, seen as more formal than Anglicisms; and, more specifically, native equivalents to denotative Anglicisms are seen as more appropriate for use in formal/written/public communication than in an informal/oral/private context. This hypothesis is based on Görlach’s (2003: 98) observation that code mixing in informal communication often turns into keeping the two codes apart in the formal register and on the analysis of results of a series of studies conducted by linguists in different linguistic communities. For example, in France, due to the efforts of the commissions ministérielles, technical French prefers the official replacement term in a formal situation, whereas the direct loan may still be used as a familiar variant (Humbley 2002: 113). In Greek, English loanwords are used extensively in the spoken mode of language, while

2 However, we have to be aware of the fact that the boundaries between public and private communication, as well as between formal and informal communication, are becoming more flexible, which is to a large extent due to electronic communication, which uses a mixture of formal and informal styles, as well as a mixture of private and public communication.
in the written language there is a tendency to use a Greek word where both possibilities exist (Tsagouria 2005: 104). In Icelandic, largely informal registers are affected by loanwords, while formal language is characterised by purism, and that is a tendency which is widely accepted and actively supported by the speakers (Görlach 2003: 98). In Finnish, in situations where two alternative terms are available, the predominant pattern is that the Anglicism is colloquial, but for formal purposes the indigenous term will be preferred (Battarbee 2002: 265).

As attitudes are context-dependent and their decontextualisation can lead to incorrect interpretation (Cooper and Fishman 1977, Bradac et al. 2001), the second hypothesis predicts that the respondents’ attitudes to the use of Anglicisms are contextually differentiated according to different domains. This hypothesis is based on the analysis of results of a series of studies investigating attitudes towards the use of different languages in different domains, which show that the use of a particular language is not considered to be equally appropriate in different domains. For example, in a study carried out by Cooper and Fishman (1977) among high school students in Jerusalem, English was the language viewed most suitable for contexts associated with high culture, science, and popular culture, while Hebrew was seen as the most suitable language for religious rituals, personal prayer, military commands, joking, lying, and sarcasm. Bentahila (1983) reports that in Morocco French is seen to be necessary for modernisation, economic and technical progress, while Arabic is perceived as the language used to talk about the past, religion, and morality.

4. Analysis of the results and discussion

The respondents’ attitudes (i.e., presented as the mean values on a scale ranging from 1 – extremely negative to 5 – extremely positive) towards a person who in (in)formal communication uses a) a large number of Anglicisms, b) native replacements for denotative Anglicisms, c) de

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Attitudes of the respondents towards the use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents in formal and informal communication.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal communication (fc):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a large number of Anglicisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-pošta . . . instead of e-mail . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail . . . instead of e-pošta . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look . . . instead of izgled . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velezgodit(nj)ak . . . instead of jackpot . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal communication (ifc):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a large number of Anglicisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-pošta . . . instead of e-mail . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail . . . instead of e-pošta . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look . . . instead of izgled . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velezgodit(nj)ak . . . instead of jackpot . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis has been confirmed: the respondents hold more positive attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms, especially the connotative ones, in informal communication than towards their use in formal contexts (e.g., e-mail instead of e-pošt a: ifc 3.75 ↔ fc 3.27; look instead of izgled: ifc 2.89 ↔ fc 2.23), and more positive attitudes towards the use of native replacements for denotative Anglicisms in formal communication than in informal contexts (e.g., e-pošt a instead of e-mail: fc 3.08 ↔ ifc 2.87; velezgodit(nj)ak instead of jackpot: fc 2.46 ↔ ifc 2.27). Native replacements for denotative Anglicisms have been classified into two groups: native replacements which have been accepted in the Croatian language (at least in its formal use), such as e-pošt a for e-mail or pisac/stampač for printer, and native replacements which had been unfamiliar to the respondents prior to this research, such as velezgodit(nj)ak for jackpot or straničnik for bookmark.

Positive attitudes to the use of native replacements for denotative Anglicisms, however, do not necessarily exclude the respondents’ positive attitudes to the use of Anglicisms themselves, which are usually described as close, familiar, natural, necessary, and clear. Moreover, the respondents have more positive attitudes to the use of denotative Anglicisms.
Anglicisms in formal communication than to the use of their native equivalents in informal contexts.

In the second part of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to choose from a list of adjectives, among which there were the adjectives formal and informal, the ones they would associate with the Anglicisms listed and their native equivalents. The percentages presented in Figure 1 confirm that the respondents find Anglicisms less formal than their native equivalents.

The Anglicism komputer ("computer") and, especially, the Anglicism sejvati ("save," v.) (consisting of the English root save/sejv and the Croatian suffix (a)iti) are to a large extent seen as informal, while their native equivalents računalo and spremiti are almost exclusively described as formal. The Anglicism bookmark is also largely perceived as informal. Although that was the first time the respondents had heard of its native equivalent straničnik, the term was by the large majority of the respondents described as formal. The connotative Anglicism make-up, is, as expected, largely perceived as informal. However, the connotative Anglicism monitoring is described as formal by almost a half of the respondents, probably due to the fact that they usually hear this expression in the formal media, in different economic and political shows. Their native equivalents, šminka and nadzor, are to a large extent perceived as formal. Words of classical origin, such as edukacija ("education"), the use of which has been additionally stimulated by the widespread knowledge and use of the English language, are described as formal. This confirms the findings of studies conducted in English speaking countries where words of classical origin, such as inundation as opposed to flood or anticipate as opposed to foresee, are perceived as formal and sophisticated (Levin et al. 1981, Winford 2003: 59).

The main difference is that English language speakers describe Anglo-Saxon equivalents as informal, while our respondents perceive both words of classical origin and their Croatian equivalents as formal. This attitude is due to purist activities in Croatia, which, though predominantly moderate, have permanently influenced public opinion.

Usually, when asked whether Anglicisms in Croatian should have native replacements, the majority of the respondents answer affirmatively, but they frequently observe "for formal communication."

The close association of Anglicisms with informal communication and of native equivalents to Anglicisms with formal contexts is to some extent due to purist indoctrination and the influence of language policy, as linguistic prescription almost exclusively concerns public and formal usage, and ignores private and informal usage. This to some extent shows the effect of so-called secondary attitudes (Kalogjera 1985). Primary attitudes lead a speaker to use Anglicisms, but in formal communication he is brought into the position of questioning his steps and opting for words which are presented as correct, appropriate, and authentic.

The perception of Anglicisms as being informal is also largely due to the fact that they to a great extent enter Croatian from bottom up, through colloquial communication, slang, and subcultures.

The informality of Anglicisms and the formality of their native equivalents, however, are most obvious when the two groups of expressions are compared. This explains why Croatian expressions which existed in the Croatian language before English words entered are described primarily as formal (and scholarly), and are almost exclusively deprived of their informal features. This also explains why denotative Anglicisms whose native replacements had not been familiar to the re-
spondents prior to this research are described by a large majority of the respondents as informal.

The third part of the questionnaire enquired into the respondents' use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents in formal and informal communication. Their usage turned out to be in accordance with their attitudes, that is, the respondents (tend to) use Anglicisms, such as *attachment/atacment, kompjuter, look and shopping/soping, in informal/oral/private communication, while their native equivalents, such as *privitak/prilog, računalo, izgled and kupovina, are usually used in formal/written/public contexts. This primarily refers to connotative Anglicisms, such as *look and *shopping/soping, and to native equivalents to denotative Anglicisms, such as *računalo and *privitak/prilog. As the respondents are well aware of the layered nature of language use, that is, the semantic, functional and especially stylistic diversification of language, they strongly encourage the parallel use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents.

The fourth and final part of the questionnaire examined the respondents' attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms in different domains of the Croatian language. Table 2 presents the percentages of the respondents who hold negative, neutral and positive attitudes to them, respectively.

Negative attitudes are primarily directed towards the use of Anglicisms in the formal media: in the news, documentaries, daily newspapers, and especially in political speeches. The respondents still expect the public discourse to create norms and standards, and thus to avoid (connotative) Anglicisms, which are not considered to be a part of the standard Croatian language:3

**#14:** The use of Anglicisms in the news and newspapers should be discouraged.

**#101:** There are some situations in which the use of Anglicisms is acceptable and engaging (e.g., showbiz, everyday communication with friends), and other contexts in which their use is completely inappropriate, such as the news and documentaries.

---

2.10: I see nothing wrong with the use of Anglicisms in everyday communication, but in the media the standard Croatian language should be used.

Negative attitudes are also to a large extent directed to Anglicisms in job titles because the respondents feel that they unnecessarily make jobs seem more prestigious, interesting, and better paid than they really are.

Positive attitudes, on the other hand, are notably shown towards the use of Anglicisms in everyday communication, especially among young people, who are very much exposed to English and learn it from an early age. In addition, they largely grow up as consumers of American popular culture. Through the use of Anglicisms, the young express themselves creatively, form their subcultural identity, distance themselves from the dominant culture, and identify with alternative values.

The respondents also to a large extent hold positive attitudes with regard to Anglicisms in show business, computing and modern technology, domains which have been largely English based. One of the respondents strongly emphasises the close correlation between English and computing:

Table 2. Attitudes of the respondents towards the use of Anglicisms in different domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>news and documentaries</td>
<td>45.90</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday communication</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>48.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily newspapers</td>
<td>46.31</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>15.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisements</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>30.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show business</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>57.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth magazines</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>52.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political speeches</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company names</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the respondents' jargons</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>33.19</td>
<td>35.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition, fair and festival names</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>31.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job titles</td>
<td>44.67</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computing and modern technology</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>72.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#43: I strongly disapprove of translating computing terminology into Croatian. Scientific terms used in the field of computing have been largely coined in English speaking countries, and as such they become a permanent part of our language. One cannot separate computing from English because they go hand in hand. Besides, Anglicisms, such as internet, are internationally recognisable and their semantics is transparent; the native equivalent svemrežje does not mean anything, it has been created in order to satisfy purist aspirations in Croatia.

The respondents’ attitudes are split evenly when it comes to the use of Anglicisms in advertising, company, competition, and festival names. Those who have positive attitudes point out that Anglicisms are attractive, modern, and internationally recognisable, and thus desirable in these domains, the aim of which is to attract the attention of international consumers/visitors/partners. Those who have negative attitudes believe that these domains should keep their local character and in this way arouse the interest of the international public.

The respondents’ divided attitudes come to the fore when it comes to the use of Anglicisms in their jargons. Those who hold positive attitudes towards them observe that the use of English loanwords is a manifestation of the continued, spontaneous renewal of the language of science. In their additional comments, they point out that native equivalents are often uneconomical, imprecise, and artificial, with no support in practice, that the English language and the language of science are inseparable, and that Anglicisms have already been accepted as scientific terms:5

#32: I don’t see Anglicisms as words of foreign origin, but as scientific terms. Besides, in the language of science they are considered standard.

#55: Croatian or any other language cannot catch up with the fast development of modern technology.

#127: I find translating terminology into Croatian unnecessary, confusing and unnatural.

#210: Anglicisms are internationally recognisable, while Croatian equivalents are rarely or never used and are practically considered foreign.

#221: Native equivalents to Anglicisms in the language of science are often incomprehensible, incorrect, comical, and useless.

#240: When I say hardware, at least I am sure everyone will understand me.

The respondents’ language loyalty expressed through their attitude that scientific terminology should be translated and that the language of science should be renewed primarily through native elements is clearly indicated in the following comments:

#3: It is completely unacceptable to literally copy the language of science, in most cases without even making an effort to find native equivalents to English loanwords.

#34: English terms seem better than their Croatian equivalents only because the latter are insufficiently popularised and used.

#100: Anglicisms could and should be translated. The attitude of some people that only Anglicisms are transparent and precise enough to convey scientific meaning is WRONG.

Nevertheless, half of those who have positive attitudes to the use of Anglicisms in the domain of science also have positive attitudes towards the establishment of terminology committees (i.e., groups of linguists and scientists responsible for creating and popularising native replacements for English loanwords), which implies that their positive attitudes to the use of Anglicisms do not necessarily exclude their positive attitudes towards the existence of native equivalents and their use.

5 Emphasises the retrospective character of norm setting.

5. Further discussion concerning the respondents’ attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms in the media language and the popularisation of Croatian equivalents

The respondents expect the language of the media to be pure, correct, and appropriate, and criticise public figures, particularly television presenters and politicians, for departing too much from what they imagine is the standard or correct usage. Additionally, they point out that the language of public communication has a strong influence on and hence
a great responsibility for the speakers’ linguistic culture and linguistic consciousness. Thus, they find using native replacements for Anglicisms in the media discourse more acceptable than using Anglicisms:

#25: The media should employ Croatian equivalents to English loanwords, which are used too often and unnecessarily because they are trendy.

#156: When it comes to English loanwords on television, I have to say I’m allergic to them. I presume they have such frequency because the presenters think that using them will make the topics of their shows more approachable for their viewers.

#200: What gets on my nerves are semi-educated people who use English loanwords because they think this makes them more important and gains them more attention. They get a lot of media space and the message they send to young people is: “This is the right way to talk!” Disgusting!

Although in their additional comments the respondents primarily criticise the use of connotative Anglicisms, they are also very critical of the missing role of the media in the popularisation of Croatian equivalents to denotative Anglicisms. The respondents feel that Croatian terms lack the support of the media, which, according to Ager (2003: 87), have a unique role in spreading neologisms. They think that the influence of English on Croatian should get more media attention in the sense of making speakers familiar with equivalents to Anglicisms.

Although the respondents express negative attitudes towards a certain number of native equivalents because they remind them of numerous and, according to many, aggressive changes in the Croatian language in the last decade of the 20th century marked by the tendency to find equivalents to internationalisms and words of Serbian origin, which were considered to have been imposed on the Croatian language use, they still believe that native equivalents to Anglicisms should be used in the (formal) media and thus be given a chance to survive. The language of the media played an immensely important role in promoting revived words and neologisms in Croatian during the last decade of the 20th century. During the 1990s most speakers of Croatian accepted words such as putovnica, časnik, izvješće, and uhltiti (“passport,” “officer,” “report, n.,” and “arrest, v.,” respectively), revived words that many speakers, particularly younger ones, were not familiar with, because they were not exposed to them on a daily basis. According to a study conducted by Skelin Horvat (2004), the 1970 corpus of three daily newspapers (the Slobodna Dalmacija, the Vеčernji List and the Novi List) had many more internationalisms than the same corpus for the 2000–2004 period (1302 and only 124, respectively).7

Today, however, the nature of the media language is to a large extent dependent on the speed, dynamics, and fluidity of public communication, which allow elements of conversational style to seep in. There is a general trend towards formalising public communication through the dissemination of direct, more expressive and informal communicative patterns. Duszak (2006: 100) notes that the influence of the American style of communication, which is less formal and more personal, has led to the unification of diverse discourses and eroded the elevated style and language norms by spreading superficial, crude and careless speech patterns. This informality trend, the beginnings of which can be dated to roughly the end of World War II, has been fostered by increased literacy, less pronounced class differences, a strong stress on youth culture, and a sense of equality (Gowers 1987: 176). The boundaries between public and private communication, as well as between formal and informal communication, are becoming more flexible; and informal language is increasingly exerting pressure on formal language. This is partly attributable to electronic communication, which uses a mixture of formal and informal styles, and to television programmes, which utilise spoken language close to that used by the viewers. Nowadays television channels, particularly private ones, tend to employ fewer professional journalists and more amateurs, who tend to promote spontaneous and natural speech. According to Bell’s audience design theory, public language use, such as the language of

---

6 This is of course not equally true of all the language of public communication, as it is thematically and functionally extremely heterogeneous; thus, an evening news presenter has more responsibility than a Big Brother host; the author of an article in a daily newspaper has more responsibility than the author of an article in a teen magazine.

7 Conversely, the 2000–2004 corpus has a much higher number of Anglicisms than the 1970 one (565 as opposed to 223).
television presenters and politicians, aims to adjust to the audience's everyday speech and follows societal changes and trends in order to bridge the gap between the language of the audience and the media language (Bell 1991).

This colloquialisation to a large extent lies behind the missing role of the media in the popularisation of Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms. In order for native replacements to survive in language, or have a chance to survive, they need to be promoted, that is, used in public communication, especially in the media. Today's media, however, are increasingly decontextualised and familiarised, constantly keeping a finger on the pulse of the audience. It is therefore to be expected that even the most formal television shows and segments will use words which have already gained currency among their audience, and those are often loanwords. This is a bit of a Catch 22 situation: Croatian replacements need to be promoted and supported by the media in order to survive, but the media often only accept them once they have survived. One of the respondents says in this context:

#13: Paradoxically, on the one hand, in order for equivalents to Anglicisms to survive, people should be exposed to them, while on the other, teachers use Anglicisms in order to get closer to their students, and the media use them to get closer to the audience.

Thus, Croatian replacements of English loanwords often do not get a chance to survive. In other words, it is not entirely true that the word *svemiroplav* has not survived as a Croatian alternative to *space shuttle*. It would be more correct to say that it never got a chance to survive because the Croatian general public is unaware of its existence. It is also debatable whether the Croatian term *svemreže* (to replace the English loanword *internet*, "the Internet") would seem comical and forced, as the respondents described it when they saw it in the questionnaire, if they had encountered it every time they opened a newspaper or watched the evening news. Native equivalents to Anglicisms usually stay hidden in a philological journal, which rarely finds itself in the hands of average speakers, even educated ones. Thus native expressions remain merely suggestions, with no support from the media that reach a much wider audience than a philological journal can. Promoting Croatian words would entail a great amount of effort on the part of philologists and experts in various fields, as well as public figures, such as politicians, television presenters, and journalists. Only then would there be real linguistic choice and only then could we really say that a Croatian equivalent to an Anglicism has or has not been accepted.

Similar views are expressed by the respondents:

#79: In informal situations Anglicisms are fine, but I feel that in formal communication Croatian terms should be used; where they don’t exist, they should be invented. It's all a matter of habit. Perhaps some translations might sound ridiculous now, but I am sure that in a few years we would have got used to them.

#190: Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms should be used in advertising, which reaches most speakers. They will sound strange the first time, but gradually people will get used to them.

In principle, the speakers' lack of familiarity with a native term can be seen as the least of the problems, since there are always ways of promoting a word by using it in the media and in other forms of public communication. Nor can the native replacement's lack of success be attributed to its being unknown, while the loanword is known and widely used: the native word is no less familiar than the loanword was when it first entered the target language together with the new concept it denoted. The only difference is that the loanword suddenly started appearing everywhere and it spontaneously became a part of our lexical inventory. The native replacement was never given that opportunity and it remained unknown to the general public. Every innovation needs to be promoted before it becomes known and gains use. Words are no exception.

To support this let us quote a comment from one of the respondents:

#135: The media have a key role in promoting native equivalents to Anglicisms. If they could be heard or read on television and the radio, the majority of speakers would be exposed to them, leading to these words being adopted and used by the general public. We should always promote native equivalents (and penalise the media for failing to do so), instead of giving up in advance. Each native equivalent should be thought of as a plant and nursed: if it survives, great; and if it doesn’t, it doesn’t.
6. Concluding remarks

Both our initial hypotheses have been confirmed. The respondents' attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms and their native replacements differ according to the level of formality of communication, that is, the respondents find Anglicisms less formal than their native equivalents and more appropriate for use in informal/oral/private communication than in a formal/written/public context. This primarily refers to connotative Anglicisms, while denotative Anglicisms are perceived as an important part of the Croatian language in both its formal and informal use, even though, when compared to their native equivalents, they are also described as less formal. Conversely, the respondents see native equivalents as more formal than Anglicisms, and, more specifically, native equivalents to denotative Anglicisms as more appropriate for use in formal/written/public communication than in an informal/oral/private context. When compared to Anglicisms, native equivalents to connotative Anglicisms are also seen as more formal and more appropriate for formal communication, although we presume that the respondents would have seen them as equally appropriate for both formal and informal communication if they had described them independently of their English counterparts.

The respondents' usage is in accordance with their attitudes, and shows that the respondents are well aware of the stylistic diversification of language, as well as quite willing to accommodate the use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents to different contexts and different interlocutors.

The respondents' attitudes to the use of Anglicisms are also contextually differentiated according to different domains. Anglicisms are perceived to be most appropriate for use in two domains: firstly, in everyday/colloquial communication, and secondly, in leading-edge technology, particularly computing, the research and development of which is notably based in the United States. In contrast, Anglicisms, particularly connotative ones, are seen as least appropriate for the use in the (formal) media, especially in the news and political speeches. Additionally, the respondents are very critical of the modern de-orthodoxisation of the media, seen through the media's lack of interest in promoting native equivalents to Anglicisms, in familiarising speakers with them, and consequently in enriching their vocabulary with partially synonymous expressions.
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On the syntactic and discourse/pragmatic aspects of parenthetical constructions: Evidence from English and Polish

1. Introduction

In actual discourse, expressions of varying function, syntactic category, complexity and length, ranging from simple one-word expressions to complex constructions including clauses, can be juxtaposed, i.e., sequentially ordered before or after the main clause, or interpolated into it "as an explanation, qualification, aside, or afterthought" (OED 2007: 2102). The main clause, which is the current string of the utterance or text to which a parenthetical is juxtaposed or into which it is interpolated, is referred to as the host. While parentheticals are linearly represented within their host sentence, they do not seem to have an obvious syntactic relation with the host (Espinal 1991, Dehé and Kavalova 2007, Kaltenböck 2007, Moroz 2009, 2010). According to Burton-Roberts (2006: 179), a parenthetical has no contribution to make to the structure of its host and likewise OED (2007: 2102) considers the host as "already grammatically complete." As far as their interpretation is concerned, parentheticals are generally taken to be digressive, i.e., peripheral to the meaning of their host. Thus Biber et al. (1999: 1067) take a parenthetical expression, typically occurring in the middle of a linguistic structure, to be "unintegrated in the sense that it could be omitted without affecting the rest of that structure or its meaning." The syntactic and semantic independence of a parenthetical from the host is often marked by punctuation (commas, parentheses / brackets, or dashes) in texts, and special prosody (pitch, tempo and loudness) as well as intonation in speech. For example, Burton-Roberts (2006: 180) takes all parentheticals, regardless of their form and function, to be "marked off from their hosts by some form of punctuation in writing..."