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Abstract

In view of the fact that research on the influence of English on Croatian primarily focused on linguists’ attitudes, while the attitudes of the general public have been largely neglected, the present paper deals with the views of a group of Croatian average speakers. A questionnaire-based study was conducted among 244 students of the University of Rijeka. The findings of the study indicate that today’s presence of Anglicisms is predominantly seen as an inevitable and expected phenomenon, but also as a manifestation of linguistic snobbery. The present use of Anglicisms in Croatian is also largely perceived to result from the lack of the popularization of their native equivalents and from the public’s negative attitudes toward exaggerated purist activities in the history of Croatian. The minority of the respondents fear language or identity loss and relate the present use of Anglicisms to the underdevelopment of the Croatian language.

1 Introduction

The impact of English on other languages has been largely investigated in different linguistic communities, especially after the Second World War when the United States of America became most influential in the fields of science, technology, commerce and (pop) culture. A series of studies on this particular topic analyzed primarily the attitudes of linguists, while the attitudes of average speakers1 have been somewhat neglected. Picone (1996), for instance, points out that the interest in the French wider public’s perception of Anglicisms and their native equivalents, issued by different committees, should be greater.

In Croatia, research on the influence of English on Croatian has also primarily focused on the attitudes of linguists, who often interpret things from a purist point of view. Purism has been a constant feature of the standard Croatian language, and has appeared in varying degrees of intensity over different periods (Turk & Opašić 2008). Due to the fact that Croatian was for most of its history exposed to strong foreign influence – Latin, Turkish, Italian, German, Hungarian, Serbian – that was seen as a way of protecting and preserving the linguistic and thus national identity and independence (ibid., 81-82). Hence it does not come as a surprise that the recent impact of English revitalized the traditional protective attitudes to Croatian. These are particularly evident among those linguists who regretfully observe that the critical attitude toward Anglicisms is largely missing and that attitudes toward English loanwords are much more tolerant than attitudes toward words borrowed from any other language in the history of Croatian. The cause of this is frequently seen in the lack of adequate and

---

1 Here the term “average speakers” is understood in the broadest sense: ‘non-linguists’.
institutionalized care of the Croatian language, marked by a lack of a centrally controlled language policy and consistent language planning, and by easily observable disregard for Croatian in public communication (cf. Samardžija 2002, Kovačec 2006). Some Croatian linguists (e.g. Babić 1990, Težak 2004) fear that Anglicisms, such as fighter, come back and leader, are slowly supplanting Croatian words. Furthermore, they regret the lack of an active relationship with English loanwords, that is, the activation of the Croatian language’s own linguistic potential also allowing the creation of native equivalents to Anglicisms. According to a number of linguists (e.g. Babić 2004, Opačić 2006), the use of Anglicisms (in the media) clearly reflects Croatian speakers’ snobbery, sycophancy, indifference, conformism and spiritual laziness, which might eventually lead to forgetting who we are. Finally, unlike native expressions, the foreign ones are not readily understandable to people of different social classes, ages and educational levels, and thus frequently perceived as socially divisive.

The present paper aims to investigate the attitudes of a segment of laymen, namely Croatian university students. It continues the line of research on Croatian speakers’ attitudes toward (the use of) Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents we have pursued for some time (Drljača Margić 2010, 2011, 2012).

The paper opens with a short overview of previous research on average speakers’ attitudes to the impact of English on their respective languages. This is followed by the analysis of and discussion on the results of a study on Croatian university students’ attitudes. Finally, some concluding remarks are offered.

2 Previous research (in other European communities)

Stojić (1991) carried out a study among 400 native Serbian speakers, most of them EFL learners. The findings of the study reveal that half of the respondents think that English loanwords enrich Serbian. The large majority of them also hold that the use of Anglicisms should be tolerated and/or supported rather than hindered.

Ridder (1995) reports on a study conducted by a student from the Department of Linguistics and Dialectology of the Catholic University Nijmegen among Dutch of different ages and educational levels. The findings of the study suggest that over-fifty-fives and less educated twenty-to-thirty-year-olds are impressed by people who frequently use Anglicisms. More educated respondents from the latter group, however, find the frequent use of Anglicisms exaggerated.

Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) conducted a qualitative study on college students’ attitudes toward English in Finland, based on their written responses to a letter-to-the-Editor that argued against the use of English in the country for a number of reasons, such as that Finnish is losing its vitality to English. The respondents’ attitudes were divided. Those who were in favor of the arguments advocated in the letter demonstrated an utter contempt for English-Finnish mixing and described it as superficial and fashionable. Those who were against the
arguments pointed out that different languages have always influenced each other and described English loanwords as practical, economical and precise.

Alexieva (2002) found that Bulgarian speakers of different ages, cultural backgrounds and education levels do not perceive the influence of English as a threat to the Bulgarian language, and are only critical of the fashionable use of Anglicisms.

Corr (2003) conducted an online survey to investigate public opinion on the use of Anglicisms in German computing terminology. Her findings indicate that although the large majority of the respondents think that the number of Anglicisms is too large, they still believe that the use of Anglicisms contributes to a better understanding of the text.

Graedler (2004) presented some preliminary results of a comparative study conducted in the Nordic language communities. The author found that the Norwegian respondents to a greater extent than others believed that too many English words were used in their language, while the Danish respondents proved to be the least purist. The results also showed that Faroese and Icelandic groups were most in favor of the substitution of loanwords with native equivalents.

Greenall (2005) investigated the public's attitudes toward the process of Norwegianising, based on contributions to The Word Lab – a Norwegian Internet discussion list where people are invited to contribute suitable Norwegian translations for a set of recent English loanwords – established by the Norwegian Language Council and Dagbladet, one of Norway's biggest tabloid newspapers. On the basis of their contributions and, particularly, additional comments contributors were divided 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 assigned task seriously, and rebels, who argue fiercely against the translation of English loanwords and believe that linguists waste resources on making silly and artificial words neglecting the fact that a language is primarily a tool for communication.

3 The present study

3.1 Participants

The sample comprised 244 students of the University of Rijeka (namely Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences: students of Croatian language and literature (CLL) and students of English language and literature (ELL), Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE), Faculty of Law (FL), Faculty of Medicine (FM), Faculty of Economics (FE), Faculty of Maritime Studies (FMS), Department of Informatics (DI), and Faculty of Teacher Education (FTE). Their average age was 21; 56% were female and 44% were male. All the students were native speakers of Croatian and non-native speakers of English. Most of them started learning English in elementary school, and are to a great extent exposed to English in their everyday life.
3.2 Aims

The present study primarily aims to investigate how the respondents perceive today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian. Drljača Margić (2011) reveals that the media’s lack of interest in popularizing native equivalents to Anglicisms and the public’s critical attitudes toward Croatian equivalents are the most frequently listed concepts/reasons most likely to lead to the present use of Anglicisms in Croatia.

A subsidiary aim is to examine into the respondents’ perception of cultural and core Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents (with a particular focus on possible differences in the perception of core Anglicisms and their native equivalents, of cultural and core Anglicisms, as well as of native equivalents to various cultural Anglicisms, such as those that were familiar to the respondents prior to this research and those that were not).

A related aim is to check whether the respondents feel that core Anglicisms and their native equivalents differ semantically and stylistically.

3.3 Methods

The data were obtained by means of a questionnaire (see Appendix), originally written in Croatian. The survey was conducted in class, and it took the participants about 20 minutes to complete it. The gathered data were then analyzed using Microsoft Office Excel 2003; primarily descriptive statistics were produced to determine frequency rates.

The first part of the questionnaire investigated the respondents’ attitudes toward today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian. The respondents were asked to say to what extent they agree with each of the concepts/reasons listed. The second asked the respondents to choose from a list of adjectives the ones they would associate with the Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents listed. Anglicisms and their native equivalents were classified into five different groups: 1) verbal Anglicisms used in computing and everyday communication which consist of an English root and the Croatian suffix (a)ti and their Croatian equivalents (e.g. forvardirati, ’forward, v.’ – proslijediti); 2) Anglicisms used in computing and everyday communication and their Croatian equivalents (e.g. printer – pisač/stampač); 3) Anglicisms used in everyday communication and their Croatian equivalents, which were probably unfamiliar to the respondents prior to this research (e.g. internet, ‘the Internet’ – svemrežje); 4) Anglicisms used in everyday communication and their Croatian equivalents (e.g. look – izgled); 5) Anglicisms used in politics and often heard in the media (especially in informa-

---

2 Terms taken from Myers-Scotton (2006), who differentiates between cultural borrowings (i.e. words that fill gaps in the recipient language’s store of words because they stand for objects or concepts new to the language’s culture, ibid., 212) and core borrowings (i.e. words that duplicate elements that the recipient language already has in its word store, ibid., 215).
tive shows) and their Croatian equivalents (e.g. establishment – vrh/elita). The following adjectives were provided: educated, precise, forced, clear, cool, awkward, unnatural, modern, snobbish, necessary, unnecessary, neutral, marked, close. The third part of the questionnaire examined whether the respondents consider Anglicisms and their native equivalents (namely rejting, ‘rating’ – status/pozicija; mobbing – zlostavljanje; luzzer, ‘loser’ – gubitnik; menadžer, ‘manager’ – upravitelj/voditelj; biznis, ‘business’ – posao; stejdž, ‘stage’ – pozornica) to differ semantically and stylistically.

Concerning the classification into cultural and core Anglicisms we relied on information from dictionaries, namely Brozović-Rončević et al. (1996), Görlach (2001) and Anić & Goldstein (2004).

The pilot study was conducted among 15% of the respondents forming the final sample. The adjectives that the respondents were asked to associate with the Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents listed were the most frequent responses given to the open-ended question “List at least five adjectives that you would associate with the following expressions”. The pilot study showed that the student population was well aware of the use of Anglicisms in Croatian, that they had an opinion and were willing to share it with others.

3.4 Results and discussion

The averages (on a scale ranging from 1 – I completely disagree to 5 – I completely agree) and percentages (of those agreeing with each category) concerning the respondents' perception of today's presence of Anglicisms in Croatian are presented in Table 1 and Figure 1.

Table 1: Attitudes of the respondents toward today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today's presence of Anglicisms in Croatian is/indicates/implies…</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) an inevitable and expected phenomenon</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) freedom of linguistic choice in Croatia</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) linguistic snobbery</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) the public's resistance toward exaggerated purist activities in the history of Croatian</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) an insufficient popularization of their Croatian equivalents</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) the lack of adequate Croatian equivalents</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) the continued, spontaneous renewal of the Croatian language</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) the lack of Croatian equivalents</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Anglo-American neocolonialism</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) a threat to Croatian language identity</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Gottlieb (2004: 40), the high prestige of English in all corners of society, the enormous popularity of Anglo-American media products, the intensive teaching of English at all age levels, and the extensive international contacts of Europeans have led to an openness to English language features as there has never been before and the perception of the influence of English as inevitable. It thus comes as no surprise that as many as 82% of our respondents see today's presence of Anglicisms in Croatian as an inevitable and expected phenomenon. They are well aware of today's impact of English, which is an expected result of the worldwide spread of English and of speakers' extensive exposure to the language:
#74: I think that in the world today the use of Anglicisms is unavoidable. Television, radio, the Internet → children learn English from an early age, and English loanwords become an inevitable part of their lexical inventory.3

According to 73% of the respondents, the presence of Anglicisms enables Croatian speakers to choose between English loanwords and native expressions and/or to vary their usage according to different situations and interlocutors.

Most of the respondents (68%) also hold that the use of Anglicisms indicates linguistic snobbery among Croatian language speakers, which is primarily seen through the use of core Anglicisms. The respondents find replacing long established Croatian words with Anglicisms absurd and criticize those who force the use of Anglicisms in order to sound modern and educated, although they often make quite the opposite impression:

#2: Nowadays it’s very modern to use English loanwords; they are even used by those who neither know how to pronounce them nor do they know what they mean;
#13: Politicians and other public figures believe that the frequent use of Anglicisms makes them sound more sophisticated. They are so wrong;
#15: When too frequent, the use of Anglicisms sounds snobbish, forced and unnatural;
#31: I don't understand why the shopping mall in Rijeka was called “Tower center”, when it is situated in Croatia and the owner is Italian;
#149: I consider people who use Anglicisms, such as look, loser, no comments, for which there are perfect and well-established Croatian equivalents, uneducated and superficial, as well as insufficiently acquainted with their own language.

The analysis of the adjectives that the respondents associated with Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents shows that core Anglicisms, such as lider, ‘leader’, are perceived most negatively (i.e. more negatively than their Croatian equivalents, and cultural Anglicisms, such as e-mail). Although the respondents describe them as modern and cool, they are also seen as unnecessary, forced and unnatural. Their Croatian equivalents, on the other hand, are perceived as clear, educated, precise and necessary, and cultural Anglicisms as modern and cool, but also as necessary, close, precise and clear. Although core Anglicisms are largely described as unnecessary, as many as 81% of the respondents perceive them and their Croatian equivalents as semantically and stylistically different (see Figure 2):

#67: Voditelj ['manager'] is a small shop manager, while menadžer/manager is a shopping mall manager;

3 All additional comments were originally written in Croatian and subsequently translated by the author.
#201: My opinion is that words have different meanings and collocate with different words, and that prevents any two expressions from being absolute synonyms;

#235: English loanwords are less formal than their native equivalents.

![Figure 2: Semantic and stylistic differences between Anglicisms and their native equivalents](image)

This confirms the findings of Drljaca Margic (2012) according to which the respondents find Anglicisms less formal than their Croatian equivalents. Conversely, native equivalents are described as more formal than their English counterparts. The informality of Anglicisms and the formality of their native replacements, as the author notes, are most obvious when the two groups of expressions are compared. That explains why native equivalents to core Anglicisms are described primarily as formal, and are almost exclusively deprived of their informal features.

It can thus be presumed that the respondents (widely) use core Anglicisms, since most of them in no way see them as semantically or stylistically identical to their native equivalents. The discrepancy between the respondents’ attitudes and their use probably results from the fact that their negative attitudes are primarily directed toward other people’s usage, such as that of public figures who, according to the respondents, use too many Anglicisms, often in order to look sophisticated and well-educated. Besides, our respondents, like most people, tend to see the loanwords they use as more necessary and appropriate than the loanwords other people use.

According to two thirds of the respondents, today’s presence of Anglicisms results from the public’s resistance toward exaggerated purist activities in the history of Croatian (e.g. in the nineties, marked by ethnic conflicts following the break-up of the Yugoslav state), predominantly characterized by forcing the further differentiation between Croatian and Serbian (compare Drljaca Margic
2011). The respondents observe that the public’s resistance has largely led to their negative attitudes toward Croatian equivalents, and toward the very activity of their creation:

#22: It seems to me that Croatian linguists’ only preoccupation is how to distance from Serbian context as much as possible. Hence, they neglect to deal adequately with Anglicisms and fail to invest enough time and effort in creating appropriate native equivalents. Moreover, the public’s irritation with aggressive and grotesque changes in the history of Croatian, marked by replacing words that are supposedly of Serbian origin with authentic Croatian words, resulted in their negative attitudes to (the creation of) Croatian equivalents to any foreign word.

The respondents’ additional comments on (the creation of) Croatian equivalents can be divided into three different groups: made by those who share the (presumed) public’s negative attitudes, by those who comment on the (presumed) public’s perception, but do not reveal their own, and by those who clearly express disagreement with the (presumed) public’s feelings:

#32: Svemrežje [‘the Internet’ :-))))) – just one among many stupid, ridiculous and useless newly coined Croatian words. Let’s call screen...predočnik [‘infrontofeye’] :-o;
#101: We have to bear in mind that English loanwords appear everywhere and that the public gets used to them extremely fast. On the other hand, native equivalents are created too late and, consequently, are perceived as forced and imposed;
#200: The public’s opinion that the large majority of Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms are imprecise, awkward and unnecessary is wrong and should be changed. Željezarija is nothing but a literal translation of the term hardware. People unfortunately do not realize that and unjustifiably describe the word as ridiculous and forced.

Around two thirds of the respondents also believe that Anglicisms are present in Croatian because they do not have adequate native equivalents and/or because the popularization of native equivalents does not get enough media space:

#34: Instead of employing Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms and thus familiarizing the public with them, the media mirror speakers’ everyday communication, which swarms with English loanwords and various awkward Crenglish coinages.

As stated in Drljača Margić (2011), the lack of the popularization of Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms in the media is conditioned by global and local factors. The former refer to the globalization of the modern world implying modern tendencies of purist trends weakening (Görlach 1996), as well as the deformalization of media language under the influence of the dynamics and fluidity of
public communication and the dissemination of more informal communicative patterns (typical of the American media) (Duszak 2006, Šabec 2011). The latter imply the public’s resistance toward and the mockery of (the creation of) Croatian equivalents, resulting from their hostility toward exaggerated purist activities in the history of Croatian. Given that modern public language use aims to get closer to the general audience (Bell 1991), the public’s resistance toward Croatian equivalents, resulting in using Anglicisms instead, is largely mirrored in the language used by TV presenters and journalists.

The respondents’ perception of the presence of Anglicisms as freedom of linguistic choice thus seems to refer only to the parallel use of core Anglicisms and their native equivalents, while in the case of cultural Anglicisms and their native equivalents this freedom is limited only to the use of Anglicisms, as speakers most often are not familiar with their native equivalents or are not sure/aware of their existence. Significantly, a smaller number of the respondents (39%) think that today's presence of Anglicisms in Croatian implies the lack of native equivalents as such. According to the respondents, native equivalents (probably) exist, but they are often not given a chance to be accepted; first, because they are insufficiently popularized, and second, because speakers almost automatically find them unnatural, awkward, unnecessary and forced (the adjectives that the respondents associated with Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms, such as željezarija, ‘hardware’, which were probably unfamiliar to the respondents prior to this research). The respondents' resistance to or negative perception of native equivalents is conditioned by several factors: first, the use of English and English loanwords is perceived to have been prestigious and cool; second, native equivalents are frequently coined too late, only when Anglicisms have been established in Croatian; and third, as already stated, these newly coined expressions largely remind the respondents of the grapes of highest-intensity purist activities in the history of Croatian. Nevertheless, as argued by Drjača Margić (2011), positive/neutral attitudes to Croatian expressions, such as e-pošta (‘e-mail’) and mreža (‘the Web’), show that the (adequate) popularization of native equivalents results in these expressions being described as clear, formal, educated, necessary and precise, as well as in their acceptance and use (in formal communication).

The respondents’ attitudes to today’s presence of Anglicisms indicating the continued, spontaneous renewal of the Croatian language are split evenly. Half of the respondents believe that a language is being renewed primarily through the creation of native expressions and activation of its own resources, and not through the passive adoption of foreign words. This is in accordance with the fact that only 14% of the respondents perceive the use of Anglicisms in Croatian as the vitality and wealth of the Croatian language. The other half of the respondents point out that languages have always influenced each other and that loanwords enrich, modernize and improve languages:
#89: I don’t perceive the influence of English on Croatian as a threat, but as a natural, spontaneous, and expected phenomenon/process. I believe that English loan-words enrich our language, and that the creation of native equivalents is redundant;

#94: My position is that English borrowings modernize our language – Croatian language and culture should be subordinated to the overall progress;

#129: Foreign language influences make a language abundant and alive.

The minority of the respondents perceive the presence of Anglicisms in Croatian as a threat to Croatian national or language identity (significantly larger percentage of the respondents hold that Anglicisms pose a threat to language identity, 35% – 22%) or to the development of the Croatian language (27%). According to 26% of the respondents, the presence of Anglicisms implies the lack of care of the Croatian language, and 37% perceive it as Anglo-Americanization of Croatian. Only 16% see it as the un(der)development of the Croatian language:

#7: I think that Croatian is underdeveloped, as I often find myself in a situation of having no other option but to use Anglicisms in order to express my opinion;

#55: Every language should comprise its own native equivalents to Anglicisms in order to continue to develop;

#102: I’m afraid that small languages such as Croatian will eventually become only a part of folklore;

#104: I think that the impact of English on Croatian threatens Croatian identity.

The majority of the respondents, however, do not worry about the future of Croatian language and national identity. Anglicisms are seen as an inevitable part of Croatian language speakers’ everyday communication and are no longer considered foreign,

#43: Anglicisms are to a great extent present in Croatian, but also in other (world) languages. This should by no means be seen as a threat to Croatian, but as a stimulus to take better care of our own language and linguistic culture;

#129: I think there is too much fuss about the use of Anglicisms. Our linguists unjustifiably fear that we will lose identity – Croatian will remain our mother tongue regardless of foreign words used;

#190: Anglicisms are very much needed in the Croatian language, and they in no way attack Croatian language identity, as they fit perfectly into Croatian.

some are very critical and somewhat sarcastic when discussing the presence of Anglicisms in Croatian as a threat to Croatian identity,

#167: I think that the Croats to some extent have a complex about Croatia and Croatian. What Serbian was in the nineties, English is today – some kind of imaginary
threat to our ostensible identity, which we fight by creating stupid expressions which will never survive in reality.

and some go so far as to consider various attempts of creating (adequate) Croatian equivalents to be vain:

#207: A large number of English loanwords can hardly be replaced with precise and short native equivalents, and we shouldn’t rack our brains trying to invent them.

The majority of both those who see the use of Anglicisms as a threat to Croatian and those who do not believe that their use threatens Croatian in any way, but rather contributes to its development, do not perceive the presence of Anglicisms as a momentary craze. (Cultural) Anglicisms are here to stay, and the use of Croatian equivalents largely depends on their adequate creation and popularization. Taking a closer look at the results, the respondents’ attitudes differ to a statistically significant extent with respect to study field, but not with respect to gender/origin.

As expected, the most negative attitudes toward (the use of) Anglicisms in Croatian were recorded among the students of Croatian. They feel particularly responsible for the Croatian language purity and believe that they should, more than anyone else, be the model of correct, pure and appropriate usage, that is, be acquainted with Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms and use them:

#102: I use too many Anglicisms, and that is not right, especially given that I am a student of Croatian language and literature.

Additionally, in the course of their formal undergraduate education students of Croatian are being familiarized with the standardological awareness in Croatia which “traditionally included an explicit tendency not to accept foreign language models passively, but instead to activate the language's own expressive potential based on these models” (Turk & Opašić 2008: 74). That accounts for the fact that they adopted so-called secondary attitudes (Kalogjera 1985), leading a speaker to use (in formal communication) words that are presented as appropriate and autochthonous, and these are most often purist-inspired words, to a greater degree than students from other study fields. Furthermore, Croatian students have been the least exposed to the English language in the course of their formal education and in their everyday life. Finally, they are the least oriented toward the international labor market.

The students of English also point out that it is important to keep the two languages apart as much as possible:

#116: As much as I try to perfect English, I tend not to use its elements in my mother tongue.
The students of English and students of Croatian are more critical of the fashionable use of Anglicisms than other students. More than 80% of them hold that today's presence of Anglicisms indicates linguistic snobbery among Croatian language speakers:

#121: I despise people whose every second word is of English origin, and who are convinced that the use of Anglicisms makes them cooler, more interesting and trendier.

Less than 10% of the students of Croatian, unlike 36% of the medical students and 28% of the economics students, describe Croatian as an un(der)developed language. Only a small minority of the Croatian language students see today's presence of Anglicisms as the continued, spontaneous renewal of the Croatian language. They also to a lesser extent than students from other study fields hold that the use of Anglicisms in Croatian indicates that (adequate) Croatian equivalents have not been created (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3: The respondents' perception of the use of Anglicisms as an indicator of the lack of (adequate) Croatian equivalents](image)

The students of Croatian also to a lesser degree than other students consider Croatian equivalents to be forced, awkward and unnecessary (see Figure 4).
Figure 4: The respondents’ perception of Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms as forced, awkward and unnecessary

4 Conclusion

The analysis of results shows that extrovert attitudes (Furiassi 2008: 314), referring to the perception of the use of Anglicisms as the wealth and vitality of the Croatian language, and introvert ones (ibid., 315), implying the respondents’ worries that the impact of English threatens Croatian language and national identity and the development of Croatian were both expressed by the minority of the respondents.

The majority of the respondents take a rather neutral stance maintaining that today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian is, given the high levels of exposure of Croatian speakers to English, an inevitable and expected phenomenon. Moreover, as the respondents often point out, the parallel use of Anglicisms and their native equivalents creates space for semantic and stylistic diversification of language and for freedom of linguistic choice.

The use of cultural Anglicisms is, as pointed out by the majority of the respondents, also largely conditioned by the lack of the popularization of their native equivalents and the subsequent speakers’ unfamiliarity with them. As for the use of primarily core Anglicisms, it is closely related to linguistic snobbery, the characteristic/tendency that is far more readily attributed to other people.

Most of the respondents also hold that today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian has much to do with the general public’s resistance to intense purist activities in the history of Croatian. What underlies their additional comments is that the majority of Croatian speakers are tired of all those words that were created only to prove that Croatian is a separate language (from Serbian). Those unwelcome past activities, largely resulting in replacing common and well-
known words with (more authentic) Croatian expressions, made Croatian speakers rather sensitive and prone to reject any recent initiative on creating native equivalents out of the fear that it would resemble heavily criticized initiatives in the past. That is why a large number of today’s neologisms, that were meant to serve as replacements for words of English origin, are, although often unjustifiably, seen as inadequate and rejected (in advance).

To sum up, today’s presence of Anglicisms in Croatian is rarely seen as the wealth or, conversely, the detriment of the Croatian language. It is rather perceived to be implying or indicating: first, Croatia(n) ensuing the globalization of the modern world and (the influence of) English as a global language; second, the negative impact of some past politically enforced linguistic changes on speakers’ perception of present purist-inspired activities; and third, the subsequent missing role of the media in the popularization of Croatian equivalents to Anglicisms.
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Appendix: Questionnaire on attitudes toward contemporary English influence on Croatian

Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire, the purpose of which is to investigate students' views on Anglicisms in Croatian, their usage, and their Croatian equivalents.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

I.

1. Age: ______________

2. Sex: M  F

3. Faculty/Department: ____________________

4. Where did you go to elementary school? ______________

5. I have received ________ years of formal English instruction.

6. How often do you listen to English? (1 – never; 5 – very often)  1  2  3  4  5

7. How often do you read in English? (1 – never; 5 – very often)  1  2  3  4  5

8. How often do you speak English? (1 – never; 5 – very often)  1  2  3  4  5

9. How often do you write in English? (1 – never; 5 – very often)  1  2  3  4  5

II.

1. On a scale ranging from 1 – I do not agree at all to 5 – I completely agree circle as appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today's presence of Anglicisms in Croatian is/indicates/implies…</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. the lack of care of the Croatian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. linguistic snobbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. the un(der)development of the Croatian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. a threat to Croatian language identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Anglo-American neocolonialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. the wealth and vitality of the Croatian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. an inevitable and expected phenomenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. a craze not to be taken seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. the continued, spontaneous renewal of the Croatian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10. the lack of Croatian equivalents
1.11. the lack of adequate Croatian equivalents
1.12. the insufficient popularization of their Croatian equivalents
1.13. freedom of linguistic choice in Croatia
1.14. the public’s resistance toward exaggerated purist activities in the history of Croatian
1.15. a threat to the development of the Croatian language
1.16. a threat to Croatian national identity

2. From the list of adjectives choose the ones that you would associate with each group of Anglicisms and their Croatian equivalents below:

*educated, precise, forced, clear, cool, awkward, unnatural, modern, snobbish, necessary, unnecessary, neutral, marked, close*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Croatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atačirati, forvardirati, daunloudati</td>
<td>priložiti, proslijediti, skinuti/spustiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printer, e-mail, web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pisač/štampač, e-pošta, mreža</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet, hardver, bungee jumping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svemrežje, željezarija, vezno skakanje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look, celebrity, lider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izgled, zvijezda, voda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishment, monitoring, deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrh/elita, nadzor/praćenje, dogovor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. If you feel that the Anglicism and its Croatian equivalent differ semantically and/or stylistically, put X. If you see no difference between them, leave the provided space empty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglicism</th>
<th>Croatian Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rejting – status/pozicija</td>
<td>menadžer – upravitelj /voditelj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobbing – zlostavljanje</td>
<td>biznis – posao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luzer – gubitnik</td>
<td>stejdž – pozornica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

**Glossary**

- atačirati (v.) – attach
- biznis (n.) – business (‘1. trade, 2. company’)
- daunloadati (v.) – download
- dogovor (n.) – deal (‘1. agreement, 2. treatment’)
- elita (n.) – the Establishment
- e-pošta (n.) – e-mail
- forvadirati (v.) – forward
- gubitnik (n.) – loser
- hardver (n.) – hardware
- izgled (n.) – look (‘appearance’)
- lider (n.) – leader
- luzer (n.) – loser
- menadžer (n.) – manager
- mreža (n.) – the Web
nadzor (n.) – monitoring
pisač (n.) – printer
posao (n.) – business
pozicija (n.) – rating
pozornica (n.) – stage (‘a raised area for performances’)
pričenje (n.) – monitoring
priložiti (v.) – attach
proslijediti (v.) – forward
rejting (n.) – rating
skinuti (v.) – download
spustiti (v.) – download
status (n.) – rating
stejdž (n.) – stage
svemrežje (n) – the Internet
štampač (n.) – printer
upravitelj (n.) – manager
vezno skakanje – bungee jumping
voditelj (n.) – manager
vođa (n.) – leader
vrh (n.) – the Establishment
zlostavljanje (n.) – mobbing
zvijezda (n.) – celebrity
željezarija (n.) – hardware
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