ELIA Monográfico 2
Bilingualism and Heritage Languages

EXPATS IN PRAGUE: CZECH BORROWINGS IN L1 ENGLISH SPEAKERS

EXPATRIADOS EN PRAGA: PRÉSTAMOS GRAMATICALES DEL CHECO AL INGLÉS

Chloe Castle
The University of Adelaide, Australia
chloe.castle@mq.edu.au

Abstract

This paper endeavours to identify instances of possible grammatical borrowing and replication in the speech of the L1 English speaking bilingual community in Prague. Phenomena found within the data are analysed with regard to whether they can be attributed to language-contact induced grammatical borrowing from Czech, or whether they are influenced by language accommodation to L1 Czech L2 English speakers, attrition, internal variation or the effect of Czech parentage.

This study builds on the findings of Porte (1999, 2003) in identifying grammatical phenomena occurring within English as the L1 in a bilingual situation, as well as adding to the debate on whether grammatical borrowing occurs at all and in what circumstances.

The method for this exploratory study involved conducting seven observation sessions and thirteen interviews. The findings included: article omission andoveruse, word order changes, noun or verb omission, verb tense instability, preposition instability, grammatical

number and person mismatch, and use of suffixes and diminutives. This study focuses on unconventionalities (Doğruöz & Backus 2009) in the speech of each individual participant (Clyne 2003: 96), with emphasis on innovations (Matras & Sakel 2007) rather than community-wide propagation.

The analysis reveals that some of the phenomena are potentially the result of contact-induced language transfer, accommodation to L1 Czech L2 English speakers, non-contact related attrition processes, the influence of Czech parentage, colloquialisms and speech performance errors. Some phenomena are attributed to a combination of several of these factors.

Keywords: grammatical borrowing, L1 English speakers, language attrition, structural change, language contact.

Resumen

En este artículo se propone identificar posibles casos de préstamo gramaticales en el habla de la comunidad bilingüe de hablantes de inglés como lengua materna de Praga. Se analizan los fenómenos lingüísticos que se identificaron en la investigación a fin de determinar si pueden atribuirse a préstamos gramaticales del checo al inglés causados por el contacto entre ambos idiomas, o si son el resultado de procesos lingüísticos como la acomodación al comunicarse en inglés con hablantes de checo L1, la erosión, la variación interna o la influencia del origen checo de algunos participantes. Este estudio se basa en los hallazgos de Porte (1999, 2003) quién identificó los fenómenos gramaticales que ocurren dentro del inglés como lengua materna en contextos bilingües, y también contribuye al debate sobre el préstamo gramatical y en qué situaciones ocurre. En cuanto al método, este estudio exploratorio supuso llevar a cabo siete sesiones de observación y trece entrevistas. Entre los resultados se destacan la omisión o el uso excesivo de artículos, omisión del sustantivo con adjetivo, omisión del verbo,

inestabilidad del tiempo verbal, los cambios en el orden de palabras, la inestabilidad preposicional, la discordancia de número y genero, y el uso de sufijos y diminutivos. Este estudio se centra en las singularidades (Doğruöz y Backus 2009) en el habla de cada participante (Clyne 2003: 96) haciendo hincapié en las innovaciones (Matras y Sakel 2007) más que en su propagación dentro de la comunidad de habla.

El análisis revela que algunos fenómenos podrían ser el resultado de la transferencia lingüística inducida por contacto, la acomodación al hablar inglés con nativos checos, la erosión sin estar causada por el contacto lingüístico, la influencia de la ascendencia checa, los coloquialismos y otros errores en la comunicación. Algunos fenómenos se atribuyen a la combinación de varios de estos factores.

Palabras clave: préstamo gramatical, inglés como L1, erosión lingüística, cambio estructural, contacto lingüístico.

1. Introduction

This paper explores the reverse situation of Castle's (forthcoming) paper on grammatical borrowing in South Australian Czech. It identifies whether possible *borrowing* (of morphological items), *grammatical replication* (structural borrowing) (Heine & Kuteva 2003; 2008: 2) and *language attrition* have occurred in individual L1 English bilingual expatriates and immigrants in the Czech Republic. This paper views the speaker as the *locus of change* (Weinreich 1953; Romaine 2005; Li Wei 2013), providing a window into contact-induced innovations produced by the *individual* which may or may not become complete, community-wide changes. The researcher seeks to determine whether the participants' English grammar has changed, and whether this is due to attrition-based processes, language transfer-

related grammatical replication and borrowing, or internal variation. This paper considers how grammatical resources can be used across and between languages (e.g., use of certain semantically fuelled suffixes from Czech not existing in English).

This paper distinguishes between material borrowings (morphological material and phonological shape from one language replicated in another [MAT]) and pattern borrowings (function but not phonological form is borrowed [PAT]) (Matras & Sakel 2007). Incomplete acquisition through intergenerational language attrition is not a factor in this paper, as all participants (excepting those with Czech heritage, whose parents now live overseas) are first generation Czechs[1].

Another facet analysed is whether any apparent grammatical borrowing is based on interaction between the bilinguals' two languages, or instead sourced from L1 Czechs' English. The existence of Global English pushes divergence from "standard" English speech by exposure to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Cogo & Jenkins 2010; Drljača Margić 2017) and Czech L2 English speakers, but also aids in maintenance through exposure to "standard English" media and fellow L1 English speakers.

Variation from the standard language and differing standard forms (Australian, US, UK) will be considered in this paper. Corpora from each country are utilised in the analysis. The paper adds to the literature on grammatical borrowing, focussing on English.

[1] Participants are both expatriates and immigrants; they are first-generation Czechs. They are long-term residents in the Czech Republic. This is the same concept as the first-generation Australians in Castle's (2020a) paper.

2. Background

2.1. L1 English Grammatical Borrowing

Studies analysing grammatical borrowing by L1 English speaking bilinguals are not common in the literature. Studies exist involving:

- borrowing from English into other languages (Albirini & Benmamoun 2014; Campbell 1993; 1980; Clyne 1967),
- how other languages have borrowing from foreign languages (Alves 2001; Berk-Seligson 1986; Brody 1987; Campbell 1993; de Haan 1990; Li 1983; Menovščikov 1968; Sakel 2007; Seifart 2017),
- how English has historically borrowed from other languages (Crystal 2018; Geipel 1971), and
- how L2 English speakers have changed the way English is spoken (Cogo & Jenkins 2010; Cook 2003).

However, few exist regarding how/whether L1 English speakers' language has been affected by grammatical borrowing and attrition processes under language contact.

Porte's (2003, 1999) studies focus on this, analysing how long-term L1 English L2 Spanish speakers in Spain have experienced language loss and linguistic change in English. In Porte's (1999) study, 29 participants (n = 52) admitted to blending their languages, with half of the group claiming that lexical items and grammatical structure are affected. Eight participants admitted to morphological borrowing. They added Spanish past-tense suffixes to English verbs, or noun suffixes to similar English words (Porte 1999). Participants mentioned that their use of prepositions in English had been reduced

to utilising only "in" or "of" in following the Spanish *en* and *de* (Porte 1999: 30).

Examples of morphological borrowing are described as *code blending* (Porte 2003: 116). The focus in this paper is on *innovation* rather than *propagation* in the sense of Matras and Sakel (2007) and the wider language contact literature. Matras and Sakel (2007: 849) state "change is instigated at the level of the individual language user, where it initially takes the form of an *innovation* at the level of the individual utterance". Individuals may engage in borrowing regardless of whether the change is propagated and results in language-wide change through linguistic transfer. It is important to distinguish happenstance language borrowing into the L1 from contact and borrowing that gains currency in the community.

The shortage of literature on L1 English speakers' engagement in grammatical borrowing may be attributed to English as a global language; many speakers exist worldwide and the language has permeated into many spaces. It may be assumed that L1 English speakers would not undergo borrowing or attrition processes.

2.2. English in the Czech Republic

English is regarded as a basic skill in the modern Czech Republic; it is a "component of basic education; like having computer skills or a driver's license" (Cogo & Jenkins 2010: 274). It is considered integral to professional development (Nekvapil & Sherman 2013). University students are offered language courses and predominantly choose English (Kaderka & Prošek 2014).

Czechs may want to practice their English (Scallon 2015). They may assume expatriates cannot speak Czech and thus use English. In 2003, Czechs were unused to foreigners having Czech proficiency and responded in English or German, even if this was at a lower level than the foreigner's Czech (Crown 1996; Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003). Anglicisms carry a degree of "coolness" when used within Czech speech. Venková (1998: 18) and Svobodová (1996) claimed that use of Americanisms are fashionable and represent being "in". Entlova and Mala (2020: 140) reaffirm this, suggesting that this trend continues today, and "concerns all areas of social life".

English teachers may have to maintain their native English (Porte 1999) after spending many years in the Czech Republic, due to the effect of listening to L1 Czech L2 English learners speak English and a communicative style called "foreigner talk" (Ferguson 1975). This speaking style occurs when, for example, an expatriate realises that a local with whom they are conversing does not understand them well and switches to a slower speech tempo and simplified grammar (Nekvapil & Sherman 2018).

2.3. The L1 English Community in Prague

There are expatriate English-speaking communities in Prague, including the Czech Australia New Zealand Association (CANZA), Americans in Prague, and Expats in Prague. When contacted, whilst keen to assist, CANZA was unable to identify suitable candidates for participation because, in their words, "Aussies with no CZ family connection, who came to CZ and now speak fluent Czech… these people are as rare as hen's teeth". The rarity of expatriate Australians proficient in Czech could be for many reasons, including the status of

English in the Czech Republic (outlined in §2.2) and English speakers' status as "elite migrants" (Dong 2016).

However, thirteen participants were found, though only four of them were Australian. Several participants mentioned that Australians living abroad tend not to form tight-knit communities as other nationalities do, and they do not engage with expatriate life. Only a few participants mentioned involvement in expatriate communities to some degree, and only one was still involved in expatriate life. L1 English Czech speakers do exist, but they are not easily found because they do not engage with the expatriate community. It can be further surmised that the more engaged one is with the expatriate community, the less likely they will be to learn the language and fully integrate into the local society.

L1 English Czech speaking "non-communities"– individuals living out their lives in local society – are somewhat difficult to find. These individuals are the focus of the study.

3. Method

3.1. Design and Procedure

The method involved conducting seven two-participant observation sessions and thirteen one-on-one interviews[2].

Observation sessions had a 10 to 15 minute duration. A prompt sheet in both languages was provided (Appendix 1). Prompts were designed to represent situational influences for language choice and memory from both places.

[2] An Ethics Clearance was obtained from the University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. H-2018-230).

Interviews were semi-structured, allowing participants to share content-rich relevant information or to discover topics or phenomena about which the researcher was previously unaware. The questions are slightly modified from Castle's (2021a) study for the new participants (questions available in Appendix 2). Questions 4 and 5 are the focus, which aim to detect whether the participants use both of their languages in speech and the way that they do this.

The researcher was a silent observer in the observation sessions to limit the effect of participation on data. Limited disclosure was given to participants to avoid undue self-monitoring during speech. Participants were encouraged to speak as naturally as possible, in English, but to allow themselves to use Czech if it would feel natural to them to do so. They were informed that the study was on L1 English speaking bilinguals in the Czech Republic.

The researcher aimed to gather a diverse sample with a range of (1) language abilities, (2) ages (3) educational levels (4) regions of origin (5) genders and (6) length of habitation in the Czech Republic. A basic information sheet was used to obtain this participant metadata.

Participants were required to be L1 English L2 Czech speakers to consider whether their Czech usage had affected their English speech.

Participants' level of language ability was tested through both a self-test questionnaire wherein participants graded their Czech and English from 0 – 10, and an online vocabulary placement test (Gollub,

2020)[3]. It is recognised here that there can be limited validity to a self-assessment in terms of language proficiency, hence the supporting measure of the vocabulary placement test. The self-assessed scores may rather provide an indication of participant confidence in their speaking abilities.

Initially, participants were required to be Australian with no Czech parentage (CP), but a lack of time in the country and participant availability led to this requirement being discarded.

Important distinctions for analysis in this paper are defined in the table below:

Table 1: *Distinctions for Analysis*

Category	Definition	Participants
Non-CP	Those without Czech parentage or heritage.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
CP	Those born in an English majority speaking country to one or more Czech parents.	11, 12, 13
LCCP (low Czech competency participants)	Those scoring less than B2 on the CEFR and self-score of ≤5/10	8, 9
Fluent Czech speakers	Those scoring a B2 level or above on the CEFR and self-scoring ≥6/10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10

[3] This vocabulary placement test was created to place potential students into the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) for selection of an online course. However, it was used here as a test to compare participant abilities using the CEFR and provide a reference point for their self-assessments.

Having CP and thus a different linguistic background may make a difference in the types and amount of borrowing participants engage in. Participants with a lower Czech ability may also be more influenced by L1 Czech L2 English speakers in their English speech.

3.2. Coding and Analytic Procedure

Potential grammatical borrowings were identified by the researcher and six volunteer L1 English analysts. The volunteers were required to be University-educated, and they were instructed to highlight sentences or phrases which were unnatural to them as native English speakers (further details on each participant provided in Appendix 3).

Only instances identified by at least two individuals (two panel members, or the researcher and one panel member) are included as potential borrowings. The researcher analysed each instance to determine whether it could represent grammatical borrowing or another phenomenon e.g. dialectal differences or lexical borrowing. Examples of grammatical phenomena shown in this paper are not exhaustive; the remainder of the attestations are found on Figshare (Castle 2021b).

Several corpora were also utilised in the analysis, including the Australian National Corpus (AusNC), the British National Corpus (BNC) (Davies 2004-), the British National Corpus 2014 (BNC2014 [a more recent British corpus]) (Love et al. 2017), and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davies 2008-). These corpora were used as a supporting tool to identify whether phrases identified as potential borrowings produced by participants were commonly used in Australian, British or American English.

3.3. Participant Data

Sample data was collected based on discoverability and availability of participants in the time the researcher was able to briefly reside in the Czech Republic. The sample size of 13[4] is not adequate to represent the population of Australian, UK and US foreigners residing in the Czech Republic (N=17, 279 in 2018 (Czech Statistical Office 2019)). In any case, it is not known how many of these foreigners are English-Czech bilinguals, and therefore the true population size cannot be known. However, this is not required as the study focuses on *individual* contact-based grammatical innovations in a community setting. It intends to determine whether the phenomenon of grammatical borrowing exists *at the individual level* within this community.

The aim to obtain a varied sample (§3.1) was successful, displayed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: *Participant Data*

Variable	Category	Number of participants	Participants
Age	>50	5	6 7 8 10 12
	<50	8	1 2 3 4 5 9 11 13

[4] Initially, the sample had a size of fourteen participants, but one participant was raised in the Czech Republic and had then lived in Australia for a total of eleven years as an adult. Her data is thus unable to be used in this study. The fact that the other participant's (Participant 1) conversation partner was not an L1 English speaker is considered here, but their data will be used because they represent the ideal target candidate for this research: an L1 English speaker who learned Czech in adulthood and is now fluent in the language.

Gender	Male	7	1 7 8 9 10 11 12
	Female	6	2 3 4 5 6 13
Years living in CZ	<1 year	2	9 13
	1 – 10 years	0	
	10 – 20 years	3	1 2 11
	20 years +	8	3 4 5 6 7 8 10 12
Education Level	High School	1	12
	Bachelor's Degree	6	2 4 6 8 9 11
	Master's	2	1 13
	PhD	4	3 5 7 10
Region of Origin	New South Wales	1	1
	Victoria	3	9 12 13
	USA	7	2 3 4 5 6 7 10
	England	2	8 11

Participant language proficiency assessments are displayed in a separate table, allowing comparison between participant scores.

Table 3: *Participant Language Proficiency*

Partici-pant	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13
Czech Self-score	8	7	9	8	9	6	8	4	2	8	6	10	7
Czech CEFR score	C2	B2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	A2	B1	C2	C2	C2	C1
English Self-score	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

Participants 6, 9 and 11 have self-scores differing significantly from their CEFR score. This is partially explained by the somewhat self-effacing nature of these participants, particularly when discussing their Czech language abilities. For example, Participant 11 states "I'm attending at the moment uh, Czech classes, … I'd say something sort of not quite advanced but sort of hyper intermediate… it's very hard". There is a limitation in the CEFR results as it is based on participants' lexical knowledge.

4. Results

4.1. Article Omission

Several participants displayed a lack of article where it is conventionally required in English. Participant 1 mentioned: "sometimes I read my writing or hear myself speak and I drop articles, I stop using a, the, these kind of things". There are several examples of article omission below:

(1) Participant 7

About … husband and wife couple
about… husband and wife couple
'about **a** husband and wife couple'

AUF, UKF[5]

In this context, *husband* conventionally requires an article. In AusNC, BNC, and BNC2014, there were no matching records for "about husband". In COCA, there were eight matches, but these were either in brief writing (e.g. "omit rant about husband's staunch pro-

[5] Panel member codes: AUF: Australian Female, AUM: Australian Male, UKF: UK Female, UKM: UK Male, USF: US Female, USM: US male. Each example in this section was also selected by the researcher.

gun views"), contexts where this phrase would not need an article (e.g. "she called to tell me about husband number three" or "I'm not talking about husband hate"), or by non-native speakers. The lack of true matches in the corpora indicate that this is not a systematically used grammatical structure in English in such a context.

(2) Participant 11 – CP

> *everyone wants state of the art… level of equipment for cheaper price*
> everyone to.want-3SG state of ART art… level of equipment for cheaper price
> 'everyone wants state of the art… level of equipment for **a** cheaper price'
>
> AUF

There were no matching records for "for cheaper price" in AusNC, BNC, BNC2014 or COCA.

There were no instances of "'into pretty good'" in AusNC or BNC 2014. There was one instance of "'into pretty good'" in BNC and five in COCA. The participant is American in this case. There are three instances of "'pretty good time'" in BNC and 115 instances in COCA. However, these either all included the article or were sentence-beginning or used with the verb "'make'" or "'keep'" (e.g. "'making good time'", "'keeping good time'"). There were no instances in the corpora for "'into pretty good time'". It is possible that this participant was gathering thoughts as there was a slight pause between "'into'" and "'pretty'", but an article seems to be required in this context for standard English.

(3) Participant 12 – CP

> *immigrants were still accepted and supported by country*

immigrant-PL to-be.PST.3PL still to.accept-PST and to.support-PST by country
'immigrants were still accepted and supported by **the** country'

AUF, UKF, USM, UKM

There were no instances of "by country" in AusNC. In COCA, there were 485 instances of "by country", but the vast majority were adjectives e.g. referring to country music, parts of a name e.g. a business name, or statistical analysis e.g. "varies by country". There were two instances where it was used similarly to the above: "a declaration of war by country" and "the best thing that I can do… is to do the right thing by country". In BNC, there were 52 instances of "by country", all of which were adjectives, statistics, or names e.g. "published by Country Life". There was once instance of "by country" in the BNC2014, involving statistical analysis. Given that in three corpora "by country" is used in this sense 0% of the time, and in the COCA "by country" is used only 0.4% of the time, it is likely that this structure is not part of standard English. *Country* is often used without an article by First Nations People in Australia to refer to their lands, but it is not used to refer to Australia as a whole which the participant is aiming to do in their speech.

(4) Participant 6

he had done translation of it
he AUX to-do.PST translation of it
'he had done **a** translation of it'

AUF, UKM

There were no instances of "done translation" in AusNC, BNC or BNC2014. In COCA, there were two instances, but in both cases translation was an adjective rather than a noun as in the case above.

4.2. Unconventional use of Article

Articles do not exist in Czech, though demonstratives are often used in an article-like fashion. L1 Czech L2 English learners thus often have difficulty determining which nouns require an article in English. Participant 2 feels they overuse "the", for example, saying "the nature". They ascribe this to the fact that they are around many L1 Czech L2 English speakers, and they therefore hear this unconventional usage of the article in English. Participant 8, a teacher, mentions using "the nature" to encapsulate the Czech environmental interpretation of the concept in English to aid his Czech students understanding what he is teaching them. This phrase is the main example participants referred to. Participants have acquired the set term from the influence of native Czech speakers' English and the utilisation of accommodation strategies which have permeated into regular use.

The phrase "in the nature" is not found at all in AusNC. It is found 381 times in BNC, but none of these instances match the circumstances under which participants use it (referring to an outside place involving trees, animals, streams, dirt etc). Instances refer to "in the nature *of*", act as an adjective e.g., "the reduction in the nature conservation interest", a name "in the Nature Conservancy Council", or refer to the nature vs. nurture argument. It is found three times in BNC2014, of which only once was it used in the same sense as participants refer to. It is found 1114 times in COCA; however, only 17 of those times it matched the circumstances under which it is used by participants, or 1.53% of the time. On some websites the phrase was no longer present (possibly edited out), or it was written by a non-native English speaker, or, as in one case, it was written in italics to show awareness of its non-native quality.

As participants only referenced the particular example "the nature" when discussing this concept, it is difficult to tell whether it is a broader, more systematic phenomenon or whether it relates particularly to this frozen phrase.

4.3. Czech/Non-English Natural Word Order/Syntax/Mode of Expression

Participant 1 mentions that they "mess up word order a little bit because Czech word order is a bit freer… sometimes I get to the end of the sentence and go, why did I say it that way". Similarly, Participant 2 is self-aware of their syntax occasionally reflecting that of Czech: "I'll say something in English and be like, well that was dumb that's not how you say that in English… let me put the words in the right order in that language".

Participant 7 says "I'll invert things when speaking English like, I'm borrowing from Czech". Participant 11 discusses that their word order can vary:

> *Not often, but sometimes you … say things that you thought, oh hang on that's not right… you've been thinking and speaking in Czech so often for so many years that your native language is still there but it… gets a bit rusty… you can say things… sometimes it just doesn't sound right.*

Participant 5 translates from Czech to English for work and feels that some of their translations are "too close to Czech… in terms of syntax". Participants 7 and 10 mentioned that they are sometimes not sure whether their English grammar is correct after living in the Czech Republic for so long.

(5) Participant 4

you're from originally where
you-to.be-2SG from originally where
'you're from where originally?/where are you originally from?'
AUF

The phrase "originally where" is not attested in AusNC or BNC2014. It is attested three times in COCA, once as a spelling error for "were", and the two other times in different contexts to example 5 e.g., "originally where x equalled 0" and "that's originally where he wanted it". It is possible that Participant 4 was undergoing structural priming from Participant 12 (Loebell & Bock 2003; Pickering & Ferreira 2008). Participant 12 phrased several sentences in this "backwards" (but not ungrammatical) fashion, including "the last time you were back was when then?" and "you were married here or you were married there?".

It is unlikely that this represents a syntactic borrowing from Czech, as the same sentence in Czech is shown below:

(6) *Odkud jsi původem?*
where.from to.be-2SG origin-INS
'you're from where originally?'

The gloss of the Czech statement does not syntactically align with Participant 4's statement in English.

4.4. Omission of noun with adjective

(7) Participant 11 – CP

unless you're an English or a person who hasn't got a lot of money

unless you-to.be-2SG ART English-ADJ or ART person who to.have-AUX-NEG to.get-PST AUX lot of money
'Unless you're an English person or a person who hasn't got a lot of money'

AUF, USF

The phrase "an English or" has no attestations in AusNC or BNC2014. There are 17 attestations in COCA, but all except one (referring to a type of food) follow with another adjective and then the required noun. There are five attestations in BNC, each of which follows with another adjective and the required noun. The sentence produced by Participant 11 is non-standard in English.

It is possible to express the equivalent of "an English" in Czech: *Angličan* (anglič-an, English-M, 'an English man'); in Czech, one does not have to say the word *muž* 'man' in this context. This represents a possible influence from Czech into English.

4.5. Verb Omission

(8) Participant 12 – CP

I'm originally from Melbourne, Australia, but Czech parents
I to.be-1SG original-ADV from Melbourne Australia but Czech-ADJ parent-PL
'I'm originally from Melbourne, Australia, but I have Czech parents'

AUF

The phrase "but Czech" does not return any results in AusNC or BNC 14. It returns two results in COCA and one result in BNC, neither of which are used in the same context i.e. one is a noun, and

the others are sentence-beginning e.g. "but Czech officials, looking beyond Comecon agreements".

(9) Participant 6

it just such a – such a vivid picture of that time
it just such ART such ART vivid picture of that time
'it is just such a – such a vivid picture of that time'
AUF, UKF, USM

The phrase "it just such" does not occur in any of the corpora except once in COCA in the form of a question, wherein the verb occurs before the pronoun "is it just such a compelling moment".

4.6. Verb tenses

(10) Participant 7

I'm wroting about them
I-to.be-1SG-AUX to.write-? about them
'**I'm writing** about them'
UKF, USM, UKM

There were no instances of "wroting" in AusNC, BNC or COCA. It is possible that this participant made a speech performance error in his articulation of the phoneme.

(11) Participant 11 – CP

I was going there since I was a kid
I to.be-1SG-AUX to.go-PST-CONT there since I to.be-1SG-PST ART kid
'I have/had been going there since I was a kid'
AUF, UKF, UKM

There are no attestations for "was going there since" in BNC, BNC 2014, COCA and AusNC. In the context of the participant's sentence, the present perfect is the conventional verb form to use, rather than the past continuous.

4.7. Preposition Instability

(12) Participant 1

> *they're the ones that were born 1996*
> they-to.be-3PL ART one.PL that to.be.born-3PL-PST 1996
> 'they're the ones that were born **in** 1996'
>
> AUF, USM

The query "born 1996" did not have any matches in the corpora. There were 11 instances of "born in 1996" in COCA.

(13) Participant 8

> *'cause I've been Germany, Scotland and all sorts of places*
> because I-to.have-1SG-AUX to.be-PST Germany Scotland and all sorts of place-PL
> 'because I've been **to** Germany, Scotland and all sorts of places'
>
> AUF

The phrase "been Germany" was not present in AusNC or BNC 14 Corpora. It was attested twice in BNC and nine times in COCA, but none of these were in the same context as above. In this case, the preposition is conventionally required.

4.8. Grammatical number and person mismatch

(14) Participant 12 – CP

Australia needed people much more than it probably need people now
Australia to.need-3SG-PST people much more than it probably to.need-? people now
'Australia needed people much more than it probably needs people now'

AUF, UKF, USM

There are no matching records for "it need people" in AusNC, BNC, BNC 14 or COCA. Conventionally, the verb "to need" must be in the third person singular in the above.

(15) Participant 4

I mean there is a normal internal company secrets
I mean there to.be-3SG ART normal internal company secret-PL
'I mean there **is a** normal internal company secret'
OR 'I mean there **are** normal internal company secrets

AUF, UKF, USM

There are no matching records for "there is a secrets" in the corpora.

4.9. Conjunction Issues

(16) Participant 11

a case why that I had to go there
DET case CONJ CONJ I AUX.PST to-go there
'a case why I had to go there' (or a complete rephrasing*)*

AUF, USF, UKF, USM

The construction "why that" is not attested in AusNC. It is, however, attested in BNC 186 times, BNC2014 147 times and COCA 3449 times. It appears that in many of these cases, "that" plays the role

of the subject of the NP or the adjective of the NP e.g. "why that was the case" and "why that Matlack character has not changed". In the case above, "that" operates as a conjunction, as another subject is introduced directly after ("I"), and is not required in the sentence.

4.10. Use of Czech Morphological Resources

Participant use of Czech morphological resources is an example of MAT; both function and form are borrowed (Matras & Sakel 2007). Matras and Sakel (2007) suggest that MAT occurs less than PAT due to speakers aiming to operate within sociolinguistic bounds of not overtly borrowing between languages. As MAT involves phonological substance in that the sound and form are borrowed, it is more obvious than PAT e.g. a syntactic change that may even be subconscious to the speaker themselves. It then makes sense that the MAT found were from examples given in the interviews that participants use only with those they know well (but frequently), rather than being used in the observation sessions with (mostly) strangers.

Participant 3 and their family utilise the Czech place denoting suffix *-ovitě* in English, citing examples such as *mousovitě* "a place where mice have been making a mess", and *plastic boxovitě* "the place where plastic boxes are kept".

There is a difference between utilising this Czech morphological resource in English and inserting an English word into the Czech grammar in Czech speech (thus a lexical borrowing from English). The same participant uses the verb suffix *-ovat* with English words in Czech, which is common practice in the Czech Republic for borrowing foreign verbs into the grammar. Participant 10 mentions this with the verb *googlovat* "to google something".

Participant 1 utilises the rich Czech morphology of diminutives within English. They cite the example of using *hugisek* "a little hug" in the context of *give me a hugisek.* They also add diminutives onto English words, including *-ek*, *-ka*, *-ičekˌ -isek* and *-ička*. Participant 12, when prompted with the fabricated example of *koalka* meaning "little koala" to explain the concept, mentioned that this sort of borrowing is "definitely done".

In Czech, diminutives are often used with names and there is a rich array of meanings that can stem from the choice and context of the diminutive. Three participants discussed utilising name diminutives, but it is in some cases difficult to distinguish whether this represents borrowing, especially if the name was originally Czech. For example, Participant 1 mentions declining names like *Beničekˌ* "little Ben" (or an affectionate way of saying Ben) – but this name can be recognised as Czech, a declined version of *Benjamín*. Participant 10 mentions declining *David*, but this is also a Czech name. Participant 2, however, mentions that their son calls their dog *Lexinku* or *Lexinkovač*. Lexi is not a Czech name and Participant 2 commented that they speak English in the household, leading to the idea that perhaps in this case, the name diminutive represents a borrowing from Czech.

5. Discussion

5.1. Accounting for CP and LCCP

Participants with CP represent 23.07% of the sample. If each instance of deviation from standard English is counted (n = 55 [including only specific examples, not including diminutive names that exist in Czech already]), these participants are responsible for 38% of the deviations. These participants are thus overrepresented in the data, showing that

those whose parent(s) spoke Czech to them as a child had more of an inclination to deviate from standard English.

LCCP represent 15.38% of the total sample, yet they make only 7% of the deviations from Standard English in the dataset. However, only one LCCP deviated from Standard English (who represents 7.6% of the total sample). Thus, 7.6% of participants make 7% of the deviations from Standard English, and the deviation to participant ratio is approximately equal for LCCP.

Therefore, 62% of the deviations from Standard English are from participants with non-CP, and 55% are from fluent Czech speaking participants with non-CP. The phenomena in the data are listed below, along with columns listing the percentage of CP participants and LCCP, and preliminary conclusions regarding each phenomenon.

Table 4: *Preliminary Conclusions regarding CP and LCCP*

Phenomenon	% CP	% Low level Czech users	% high level Czech users, non-CP	Preliminary conclusions
Lack of article	50	0	50	Possibly language contact borrowing-based, possibly partially CP influence
Overuse of article	0	50	50	Likely L2 speaker influence

Non-English natural word order/mode of expression	40[6]	0	60	Possibly CP influence
Adjectives	50	0	50	Possibly CP influence
Verb Omission	33.33	11.11	55.55	Possibly partially CP influence
Verb tenses	62.5	0	37.5	Possibly CP influence
Preposition instability	0	25	75	Possibly partially L2 speaker influence
Grammatical number and person mismatch	43	0	57	Possibly CP influence
Conjunction issues	50	50	0	Possibly CP influence
Use of Czech morphological resources: Suffixes	0	0	100	Possibly language contact borrowing-based
Use of Czech morphological resources: Diminutives	0	0	100	Possibly language contact borrowing-based

5.2. Broader Analysis

Poplack and Levey (2010: 410) outline a set of steps to establish the existence of contact-induced change, drawing on the work of

[6] The non-CP participant (4) was in this case in conversation with the CP participant (12) and could have been influenced by them through structural priming, as discussed in §4.1.

Thomason (2001) (Appendix 4). Poplack and Levey's (2010) work is intended for analysis with a larger dataset in finding what is patterned and predictable in the community's variable grammar. However, the paraphrased steps are useful in determining what could possibly represent grammatical borrowing and attrition versus internal variation or speech performance errors. The general procedures of identifying sources of a phenomenon, whether languages share certain features and consideration of internal variation are used in other studies without referring to this particular set of steps, in Czech communities (Henzl 1982; Dutková 1998; Dutková-Cope 2001a; 2001b; Zajícová 2009; 2012) and in the general contact literature (Campbell 1993; Clyne 2003; Doğruöz & Backus 2009). Thus, the steps are used as a general guide in the analysis of the data gathered and are adapted to identify the source of potential unconventionalities, with a focus on whether phenomena are contact-induced rather than whether they represent community-wide change.

Presumed causes of the change (step 2) include: language-transfer related grammatical replication and borrowing, attrition processes, speech errors, internal variation and the influence of L1 Czech L2 English speakers. Communication Accommodation Theory (Coupland et al. 1988; Drljača Margić 2017; Gasiorek & Vincze 2016; Giles 1971, 1973, 2009; Giles et al. 1991) is used to analyse the latter of these. Several participants claim that they change the way they speak English to accommodate the level of English they perceive from their interlocutors. They simplify the way they speak or match certain terms e.g. "the nature" to increase ease of understanding for their students (Participants 7, 8 and 10) or other interlocutors. It is possible that this enters their usual English speech.

Participant 8 mentions using ELF in their working life, which includes trips to Germany. They mention that in Germany, the word "beamer" is used to mean "overhead projector" rather than a type of vehicle. As the key reasons that participants give for speech accommodation is to aid others' understanding, it seems likely that they use phrasing which is easier for Czechs *specifically* to understand, rather than a standardised simplified ELF.

It is possible that participants undergo structural priming[7] from their Czech L1 English L2 interlocutors when speaking English, and that this priming, if used enough, becomes regular phrasing in their speech. Participants may also have structural priming from Czech into English e.g. Participant 3's husband speaks Czech to them, and they speak back in English. Structural priming is possible between languages, given that the structural possibilities for the phrase or grammatical phenomenon is similar (Loebell & Bock 2003).

Structural features shared and not shared by the recipient and source languages (step 3) are listed in Castle (forthcoming).

Table 5 situates proposed changes with regards to their host linguistic system of English (step 1), indicates whether proposed interference features were present in the pre-contact variety of English (step 4) and proves that the proposed interference features were present in the source variety of Czech prior to contact (step 5). It does not include grammatical number and person issues

[7] Here meaning that use of a particular structure in English, by Czech L1 English L2 speakers, raises its salience and potential for replicating by L1 English speakers in conversation.

as this clearly represents speech performance errors or attrition rather than language contact.

Table 5: *Presence of Feature in Czech and English with Language Contact Conclusions*

Phenomenon amongst l1 English expatriates	Present in English	Present in Czech	Result of borrowing in language contact?
Non-use of articles	No	Yes	Possibly
Unconventional article use	No	No	No
Adjectives: Missing Noun (CP participant)	Noun required	Noun generally required	Possibly
Presence of a verb	Generally required	Required	No
Preposition Instability: Missing 'in' in reference to years Missing 'to' in reference to countries	1. Preposition required 2. Preposition required	1. Preposition required 2. Preposition required	1. No 2. No
Verb tense instability: Use of past continuous with the simple past	No	No	No
Conjunction Issues	No	No	No
Functional Suffixes – use of a place denoting suffix	Yes, but somewhat archaic	Yes	Probably
Diminutives: General Noun diminutives Name diminutives	1. No 2. Yes	1. Yes 2. Yes	Probably

Articles are required in English, but not in Czech (Dryer 2013). This feature could be a result of borrowing in language contact, but also possibly the influence of L1 Czech L2 speakers (accommodation). The use of an article in "the nature" likely due to L1 Czech L2 English speaker influence (accommodation).

Nouns are generally required with adjectives in English and Czech. In example (7), it can clearly be seen where the link would come from for a borrowing (see §4.4).

Verbs are generally required in English, except for stylistic effect e.g. "A white hat. A white coat", and Czech has less of a variety of verbless sentences than English (Mathesius 1975: 87). Verb omission is likely a speech performance error.

The prepositions "in" and "to" are required in the cases where they were omitted in both English and Czech, meaning that the prepositional instability is likely the result of speech performance errors or attrition processes.

In English, it is unconventional to combine the past continuous with the simple past; the present perfect is preferred. In Czech, there is no past continuous though a past tense with an imperfective sense can be achieved using aspect. However, the associated sentence would be phrased differently in Czech: *šel jsem tam od mého dětství* "I was going there since I was a kid" lit. "I went there since my childhood", so this is possibly a speech performance error or from the influence of CP.

Both English and Czech do not have a "double conjunction" in terms of one conjunction appearing right after the other, with a subject following. This is probably a case of speech performance error.

English has a place denoting suffix *-ery* e.g. *bakery, distillery*, though productive use of it outside established forms and "frozen" words can sound somewhat archaic (which can at times be used for stylistic purposes e.g. for a hipster brand). Czech has several place denoting suffixes including *-iště* and *-árna*. This probably represents a case of contact-induced borrowing.

Diminutives are not used on nouns in English beyond baby talk, however, they are used on names in colloquial Australian English e.g. "Davo" for "David", "Debbie" for "Deborah". Diminutives are widely used in Czech for general nouns and names. It is probable that this represents a case of contact-induced borrowing. Though diminutives are used for names in colloquial English, the name diminutives used by participants are MAT (they borrow form and function e.g. using *-ičekon* the end of a name).

The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM) (Herdina & Jessner 2002) is used to rule out or situate internal motivations (step 6). According to the DMM, *transitional bilinguals* experience a change in their language dominance as one language (the L2) is used more often and surpasses the other language, eventually by far and L1 ability is reduced (Herdina & Jessner 2002). A mitigating factor in this reduction is Language Maintenance Effort (Herdina & Jessner 2002). Where the L1 is still used frequently, *balanced bilingualism* or even *stable dominant bilingualism* may result (in this case, where the L1 English is dominant and so is the less fluent L2 Czech, as in the participants below B2 level). In the case of balanced bilingualism, it may be concluded that non-CP participants are not borrowing due to attrition. In the case of *stable dominant bilingualism*, it may be assumed that borrowing represents influence from L1 Czech L2 English speakers. All participants rated themselves a full score for

their English skills, indicating that they believe they are fluent to a native-speaker level. All participants consume English media to some degree, including books, online news, Netflix, TV and films, with Participant 6 even stipulating reading in English to maintain their language skills. Participants visit home or an English-speaking country (where they would get exposure to native speakers of the language) on average once a year or once every two years. Participants (especially those living in Prague) are also constantly exposed to (varying levels of) English in the Czech Republic due to the phenomenon of Global English. Possible motivations involving internal variation are discussed and ruled out using the corpora following each example (§4).

Some participants who have lived in the Czech Republic for an extended time period (over 20 years) claim that they sometimes do not know the "correct" way to say something in English anymore. It is to be expected that they would require a high level of maintenance activities to maintain their English to the same level as their Czech. However, their English self-scores are important to remember here.

With these factors in mind, it is not likely that most participants are undergoing a change in dominance, but rather have either *balanced bilingualism* or *stable dominant bilingualism.* Therefore, it is unlikely that all the deviations from Standard English occur due to attrition processes.

6. Conclusion

Non-use of articles, adjective placement, functional suffix borrowing, and diminutive suffix borrowing are at least partially attributable to language-contact induced grammatical borrowing. Of these, functional and diminutive suffix borrowing can be attributed to

borrowing (morphological items) (Heine & Kuteva 2008) and MAT (form and function) (Matras & Sakel 2007). Non-use of articles and omission of noun with adjective are examples of PAT (function only, syntactic arrangement) (Matras & Sakel 2007) and grammatical replication (Heine & Kuteva 2008). This is quite different to Castle's (forthcoming) study on South Australian Czech borrowing, in that it is not mainly syntactic processes which are borrowed, but a combination of both syntactic and morphological form borrowing. Interviews were also conducted for that study which inquired about morphological form borrowing. It is postulated that the reason for increased use of such borrowings in this study is the rich morphology of Czech and availability of a plethora of useful suffixes, as well as a tendency away from prescriptivism especially in conversations with people well-known to participants (see §4.1.9).

Non-use of articles and unconventional article use are also at least partially attributable to accommodation to L1 Czech L2 English speakers. Omission of noun with adjective is partially attributable to CP influence. Verb tense instability is partially attributable to colloquial speech and CP influence. Verb omission, preposition instability, conjunction issues and verb tense instability are partially attributable to speech performance errors or attrition processes.

The attrition process is at least partially blocked by Language Maintenance Effort (Herdina & Jessner 2002), which is made easier by the existence of English as a global language. However, the existence of this phenomenon also affects the speech of participants through the influence of the plethora of L1 Czech L2 English speakers living in the Czech Republic.

A dynamic system is a set of variables that mutually affect each other's changes over time (Herdina & Jessner 2002; van Geert 1994: 50). It is proposed here that attrition processes (including inter- and intragenerational language attrition, language loss), language accommodation and grammatical borrowing are part of a dynamic system: each of them is able to affect the other and result in the other, whilst they are also able to exist on their own. For example, use of diminutives in English can be regarded as grammatical borrowing only – a resource has been borrowed without any attrition having needed to happen.

Future studies with a larger sample size and greater funding to achieve this sample size (allowing for time spent in the country, finding of adequate participants) could bring forth some more quantitative answers about this phenomenon in the context of the entire L1 English-speaking bilingual community in the Czech Republic. This type of study could also be conducted in countries or places where English is not as accessible as it is now in the Czech Republic, and participants utilise their L2 the majority of the time. This could remove the effect of Global English and L2 speaker English, thus allowing the analysis to be wholly based on language contact-based borrowing and attrition processes. This would be particularly interesting in other morphologically rich languages in comparison to the analytic language of English.

References

Albirini, A., & Benmamoun, E. (2014). Aspects of second-language transfer in the oral production of Egyptian and Palestinian Heritage Speakers. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, *18*(3), 244–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912441729

Alves, M. J. (2001). What's so Chinese about Vietnamese? *Papers from the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, 1999*, 221–41.

Berk-Seligson, S. (1986). Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching: A study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *Language in Society, 15*(3), 313–348. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500011799

Brody, J. (1987). Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages. *Anthropological Linguistics, 29*(4), 507–21.

Campbell, L. (1980). Towards new perspectives on American Finnish. In H. Paunonen & M. Suojanen (Eds.), *Central Problems in Bilingualism* (vol 3., pp. 43–54). Suomen Kielen Seura.

———. (1993). On proposed universals of grammatical borrowing. *Historical Linguistics 1989 - Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, *106*, 91–109. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, IV. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.106.08cam

Castle, C. (2021b). Grammatical phenomena in English L1 Czech L2 speakers found by panel. The University of Adelaide. Dataset. https://doi.org/10.25909/13601165.v1

Castle, C. (2021a). Language loyalty and language purity in a language contact situation: South Australian Czech. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics, 29*(1). 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1353/jsl.2021.0000

Castle, C. (Forthcoming). Czech, mate: Grammatical replication and shift in South Australian Czech. *Manuscript submitted for publication (copy on file with author).*

Clyne, M. (1967). *Transference and triggering: Observations on the language assimilation of Postwar German-speaking migrants in Australia*. Martinus Nijhoff.

———. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact.* Cambridge University Press.

Cogo, A., & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a lingua franca in Europe: A mismatch between policy and practice. *European Journal of Language Policy, 2*(2), 271–93. https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2010.16

Council of Europe. (2020). *Global scale - Table 1 (CEFR 3.3): Common reference levels.* Council of Europe Conseil de l'Europe. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/table-1-cefr-3.3-common-reference-levels-global-scale (last access 4 October 2020).

Cook, V. (2003). Introduction: The changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 1-18). Channel View Publications. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596346-003

Coupland, N., Coupland, J., Giles, H., & Henwood, K. (1988). Accommodating the elderly: Invoking and extending a theory. *Language in Society, 17*(1), 1 – 41. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500012574

Crown, D. (1996). Mluví se v České republice ještě česky? [Is Czech Still spoken in the Czech Republic?]. *Čeština doma a ve světě, 4*, 150–55.

Crystal, David. (2018). *Old English*. British Library. https://www.bl.uk/medieval-literature/articles/old-english. (last access 10 August 2020). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108528931.004

Czech Statistical Office. (2019). *Cizinci v ČR podle státního občanství v letech 1994 – 2018 [Foreigners in the Czech Republic: by citizenship 1994 - 2018]*[Data set]. Ministry of the Interior of the ČR.

de Haan, G. (1990). Grammatical borrowing and language change: The Dutchification of Frisian. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *11*(1–2), 101–18. (last access 15 August 2019). https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1990.9994403

Doğruöz, A. S., & Backus, A. (2009). Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: An assessment of ongoing contact-induced change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *12*(1), 41-63. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728908003441

Dong, J. (2016). Chinese elite migrants and formation of new communities in a changing society: An online-offline ethnography. *Ethnography, 0*(00), 1-19.

Drljača Margić, B. (2017). Communication courtesy or condescension? Linguistic accommodation of native to non-native speakers of

English. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *6*(1), 29–55. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2017-0006

Dryer, M. S. (2013). Definite articles. In M. S. Dryer and M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wals.info/chapter/37 (last access 1 September 2020).

Dutková, L. (1998). *Texas Czech: An ethnolinguistic study* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona].

Dutková-Cope, L. (2001a). The language of Czech Moravians in Texas: Do you know what párknu káru u hauza means? *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 20*(2), 51-84.

———. (2001b). Texas Czech: The language of Texans who say they speak 'a different type of Czech'. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 20*(1). 29-64.

Entlova, G. & Mala, E. (2020). The occurrence of anglicisms in the Czech and Slovak lexicons. *XLinguae, 13*(2), 140-148. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.11

Ferguson, C.A. (1975). Toward a characterisation of English Foreigner Talk. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *17*(1), 1- 14.

Gasiorek, J., & Vincze, L. (2016). Modeling motives for bilingual accommodation by minority and majority language speakers. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *35*(3), 305-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X15605144

Geipel, J. (1971). *The Viking legacy: The Scandinavian influence on the English language*. David & Charles: Newton Abbott.

Giles, H. (1971). *A study of speech patterns in social interaction: Accent evaluation and accent change* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Bristol].

———. (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics, 15*(87), 87–105.

———. (2009). Communication accommodation theory. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships, 3* (pp. 265–268). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Studies in emotion and social*

interaction. Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics (pp. 1–68). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511663673

Gollub, U. (2020, March 4). Czech placement test. language learning portal. *17 Minute Languages*. https://www.17-minute-languages.com/en/Czech-placement-test/. (last access 15 January 2020)

Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614132

———. (2008). Constraints on contact-induced linguistic change. *Journal of Language Contact, 2*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1163/000000008792525363

Henzl, V. (1982). American Czech: A comparative study of linguistic modification in immigrant and young children speech. In R. Sussex (Ed.), *The Slavic Languages in Émigré communities* (pp. 33-46). Linguistic Research.

Herdina, P. & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595547

Kaderka, P. & Prošek, M. (2014). English in the Czech Republic: Linguists' perspectives. *Sociolinguistics, 28*(1), 173–98. https://doi.org/10.1515/soci-2014-0014

Li, C. N. (1983). Languages in contact in Western China. *Papers in East Asian Languages 1*, 31–51.

Li Wei. (2013). Conceptual and methodological issues in bilingualism and multilingualism research. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism 26-51.* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118332382.ch2

Loebell, H. & Bock, K. (2003). Structural priming across languages. *Linguistics, 41*(5), 791–824. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2003.026

Mathesius, V. (1975). *A functional analysis of present-day English on a general linguistic basis* (J. Vachek, Ed.). Academia. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110813296

Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language, 31*(4), 829–65. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.31.4.05mat

Menovščikov, G. A. (1968). Aleutskij jazyk the Aleut language. In P. J. Skorik (Ed.), *Jazyki Narodov SSSR* 5 (pp. 386-406). Nauka.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2013). Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In J. Nekvapil, P. Studer & E. Barat (Eds.), *Ideological Conceptualisations of Language: Discourses of Linguistic Diversity* (85–117). Peter Lang.

———. (2018). Managing superdiversity in multinational companies. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity* (329–344). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315696010-24

Neustupný, J. V. & Nekvapil, J. (2003). Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 4*(3–4), 181–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668057

Pickering, M. & Ferreira, V. S. (2008). Structural priming: A critical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(3), 427–59. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.3.427

Poplack, S. & Levey, S. (2010). Contact-induced grammatical change. In P. Auer & J. E. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation* (pp. 391–491). Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220278.391

Porte, G. (1999). English as a forgotten language. *English Language Teaching Journal, 53*(1), 28–35. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.1.28

———. (2003). English from a distance: Codemixing and blending in the L1 output of long-term resident overseas EFL teachers. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 103–19). Channel View Publications. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596346-008

Romaine, S. (2005). Language-contact studies. In U. Ammon & N. Dittmar & K. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik.*

An international handbook of the science of language and society (pp. 49–58). De Gruyter.

Sakel, J. (2007). Language contact between Spanish and Mosetén: A study of grammatical integration. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11(1), 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069070110010301

Scallon, A. (2015). 10 reasons expats don't speak Czech. Expats.Cz. https://news.expats.cz/czech-language/10-reasons-expats-dont-speak-czech/. (Last access 20 August 2020).

Seifart, F. (2017). Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages. *Journal of Historical Linguistics, 7*(3), 389–431. https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.16002.sei

Svobodová, D. (1996). Anglické výrazy v českém publicistickém stylu [English expressions in the Czech journalistic style]. *Naše řeč, 79*(2), 99 – 102.

Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Georgetown University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03032-1

van Geert, P. (1994). *Dynamic systems of development: Change between complexity and chaos*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Venková, O. (1998). America and her influence on the Czech Republic. In L. Fijas & H. Fink (Eds.), *America and her influence upon the language and culture of post-socialist countries* (pp. 15-35). Peter Lang.

Weinreich, U. (1953). Language in contact: Findings and problems (= Publications of the linguistic circle of New York) (9th ed.). Morton.

Zajícová, L. (2009). Grammatical changes in Czech spoken by the immigrant community in Paraguay. In B. Vykypěl & V. Boček (Eds.), *Recherches fonctionelles et structurales* (pp. 139-150). Lincom Europa.

———. (2012). Language contact, language decay and morphological change: Evidence from the speech of Czech immigrants in Paraguay. In M. Vanhove, T. Stolz, A. Urdze, & H. Otsuka (Eds.), *Morphologies in Contact* (pp. 283- 307). Akademie Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1524/9783050057699.283

Corpora

Australian National Corpus Inc. (2021). *The Australian National Corpus.* https://www.ausnc.org.au/ (last access 9 September 2020).

Davies, M. (2008-). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): One billion words, 1990-2019.* https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/. (last access 10 September 2020).

———. (2004-). *British National Corpus* (from Oxford University Press). https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/. (last access 10 September 2020).

Love, R., Dembry, C., Hardie, A., Brezina, V., & McEnery, T. (2017). The Spoken BNC2014: Designing and building a spoken corpus of everyday conversations. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 22(3), 319-344. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.22.3.02lov

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Observation session prompt sheet

Diskusní témata

- život v České republice
- život v Austrálii
- Cestování:
    - kde jste všude byli
    - jaká místa chcete ještě navštívit
    - v Austrálii, v ČR, jinde na světě
- Filmy, které jste viděli v poslední době:
    - české filmy
    - americké filmy
    - australské filmy
    - filmy odjinud
- Tři nejzajímavější věci, které jste kdy udělali
- Oblíbená kniha nebo nejhorší kniha, kterou jste kdy četli

- Oblíbené jídla nebo neoblíbené jídla, recepty, rozdíly mezi českou a australskou kuchyní
- Co budete dělat o víkendu
- Jaké je vaše vysněné povolání/zaměstnání

Discussion Themes

- Life in the Czech Republic
- Life in Australia
- Travel:
    - Where have you travelled to in the world?
    - What places do you want to visit?
    - in Australia, in the Czech Republic, elsewhere in the world
- Films that you have seen recently:
    - Czech films
    - American films
    - Australian films
    - Films from other countries
- The three most interesting things you have ever done
- Favourite book or worst book you have ever read
- Favourite or least favourite food, recipes, differences between Czech and Australian cuisine
- What you are doing on the weekend
- What is your dream job?

Appendix 2 – Interview questions

1. What languages do you speak?
2. What would you rate your language proficiencies in each of your languages?
    a. What level of the Czech Language Certificate Exam have you passed (if you did a CCE exam)?
3. What is your opinion on mixing between languages in speech?
    a. My opinion: it is wonderful to draw from many languages to express yourself – I am interested in this topic for my research and how it impacts languages throughout time – it is a phenomenon that has occurred most likely as long as humans themselves have been able to speak

4. In conversation with other bilinguals, do you notice yourself using both of your languages? Why do you do this?
   Ideas:
   a. due to momentarily forgetting a word? Give monolingual example for when you forget a word- no way to say it at all!
   b. another word/particle is more useful/better/more appropriate for the situation
   c. another word/particle expresses the meaning more fully
   d. another word/particle feels easier to express in that language
5. How do you do this?
   a. Do you feel that you borrow **words** from between languages in a bilingual situation? Which words?
   b. Do you feel that you borrow **grammar** between your languages in a bilingual situation? Do you use any resources form Czech in your speech – e.g. diminutives, perhaps with children, partner or a pet?
      i. Do you say two words/two morphemes in one sentence that express the same concept but use them both e.g. for emphasis?
   c. Do you have an awareness of the way you phrase sentences changing at all to match the form of your other language? Provide examples.
6. What places are you in when you borrow between languages/mix languages? What places are you in when you speak English? And what places are you in when you speak Czech?
7. Do you feel more relaxed in speaking when you can use both languages rather than just L1 or L2?
   a. How long have you been in this country/were you born here?
   b. How long have you been speaking Czech?
8. Do you feel any form of societal/community pressure to mix two languages in a sentence or to not do so? Or in public/at home? Would it be weird? When would it be weird?

9. Do you feel any social pressure to conform to majority languages? Do you also feel language pride for your own language? How does this play out in your speech?
10. Do you most often listen to media [TV, movies, books, Netflix, YouTube] in Czech or English?
11. What language do you most often speak with your friends? At home? With your partner? Your kids?
    a. Do you find that you often meet other expats who speak the language? Or who don't? Talk about your experiences here… How many of your friends are expats vs Czechs?
    b. Do you have kids? How do you go about English language maintenance with them?
12. How often do you visit home or an English-speaking country?

Appendix 3

PANEL MEMBER	AGE	GENDER	EDUCATION	NATIONALITY
Panel Member 1	43	Female	Bachelor in Arts (Italian) (Hons.), Bachelor in Education	Australian
Panel Member 2	35	Female	Bachelor in Spanish, minor in French	American
Panel Member 3	52	Female	BSc (Hons) in Psychology, PGCE, Postgraduate certifications in education-related areas	British
Panel Member 4	69	Male	Bachelor of Laws, Grad Dip Legal Practise, Grad Dip Legal Studies, Diploma in Secondary Teaching	Australian

Panel Member 5	32	Male	Master's degree, current PhD student in Clinical Psychology	American
Panel Member 6	40	Male	Studied to postgraduate level	British

Appendix 4

The paraphrased steps/rules:

1. Cases for contact-induced structural changes must be supported by other instances of structural interference from the same source language in the same receiving language: there must be more than one type of case.
2. The source and receiving languages must be shown to be in intimate enough contact to make structural interference possible.
3. Structural features shared by the proposed source and receiving languages need to be identified.
4. Prove that the proposed interference features were not present in the receiving language before coming into contact with the source language.
5. Prove that the proposed interference features were present in the source language before coming into contact with the receiving language.
6. Consider plausible internal motivations for the changes, and the "very real possibility of multiple causation".

(Thomason 2001: 93–94; Poplack & Levey 2010: 410)

First version received: June, 2021
Final version accepted: September, 2021