

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Odsjek za anglistiku

Lucija Jurašin

ENGLISKI I HRVATSKI U KONTAKTU NA PRIMJERU GOVORNIKA IZ  
DIJASPORE

Diplomski rad

Mentor: dr. sc. Anđel Starčević, poslijedoktorand

Komentor: dr. sc. Damir Kalogjera, professor emeritus

listopad, 2017.

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB  
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
Department of English

Lucija Jurašin

ENGLISH AND CROATIAN IN CONTACT ON THE EXAMPLE OF  
DIASPORA SPEAKERS

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Anđel Starčević, Postdoctoral Researcher  
Co-Supervisor: Dr. Damir Kalogjera, Professor Emeritus

October, 2017

## Sažetak

Predmet ovog rada je hrvatsko-engleski bilingvalizam i razni fenomeni koji se pojavljuju u situacijama dodira ta dva jezika, prikazani na primjeru sedam bilingvalnih govornika u dobi od 10 do 86 godina, koji su se vratili u Hrvatsku nakon života u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama. Ispitanici su, prema Haugenovoj klasifikaciji govornika, svrstani u generacije 1A, 1B, 2A i 2/3. U svrhe rada proveden je polustrukturirani sociolingvistički intervju sa svim ispitanicima, što je omogućilo bolji pristup njihovom vernakularu te prikupljanje mnoštva podataka. U radu su analizirane vrste međujezičnih utjecaja prisutnih u govoru ispitanika, koji su pronađeni na svim razinama jezika – od fonologije do semantike. Zatim su istraživani i razlozi prebacivanja kodova, za koje je ustanovljeno da su povezani sa situacijskim kontekstima te temama o kojima se raspravlja. U fokusu analize su bili i znakovi 1) jezičnog nazadovanja u govoru generacije 1A, koji, međutim, nisu pronađeni te 2) nepotpunog usvajanja (nasljednog) jezika, koji su pak pronađeni u govoru pripadnika generacije 1B i 2/3, dok su odsutni iz govora pripadnika generacije 2A. Nadalje, ovaj se rad bavi i jezičnim stavovima i preferencijama, koji su se pokazali raznolikima te povezanima s različitim sociolingvističkim fenomenima.

Ključne riječi: bilingvizam, jezici u dodiru, međujezični utjecaji, prebacivanje kodova, jezično nazadovanje, nepotpuno usvajanje (nasljednog) jezika, jezični stavovi, jezične preferencije

## **Abstract**

This thesis deals with the subject of Croatian-English bilingualism and various contact phenomena between those languages, as exemplified in the speech of seven bilinguals, aged 10-86, who moved back to Croatia after living in the United States. The participants belonged to generations 1A, 1B, 2A and 2/3, as defined by Haugen. For this thesis a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview was carried out with each of the participants, which enabled better access to the speakers' vernacular, as well as collecting a wealth of data. The analysis deals with the types of crosslinguistic influence present in the speech of the participants, which are found at all levels of language – from phonology to semantics. Furthermore, the reasons that govern their codeswitching are also explored and shown to be related to situational contexts and topics being discussed. The study also looks for possible signs of 1) language attrition in the production of Generation 1A speakers, which turn out to be absent and 2) incomplete (heritage) language acquisition in the production of Generation 1B, 2A and 2/3 speakers, which are found in the interviews with the Generations 1B and 2/3 speakers, but not in the speech of the Generation 2A speaker. In addition, one of the foci of this study is also language attitudes and preferences, which are shown to be diverse and related to different sociolinguistic phenomena.

Key words: bilingualism, language contact, crosslinguistic influence, codeswitching, language attrition, incomplete (heritage) language acquisition, language attitudes, language preferences

# Table of Contents:

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical Background	
2.1 Bilingualism.....	3
2.2 Linguistic transfers, transferences, crosslinguistic influences and codeswitching.....	5
2.3 Reasons behind codeswitching.....	9
2.4 Language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition.....	11
2.5 Language attitudes, preferences and attitudes towards codeswitching.....	13
3. Methodology	
3.1 Participants.....	16
3.2 Procedure.....	18
4. Results	
4.1 Linguistic transfers/transference/crosslinguistic influences.....	21
4.2 Codeswitching and the reasons behind it.....	30
4.3 Language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition.....	36
4.4 Language attitudes, preferences and attitudes toward codeswitching.....	41
5. Conclusion.....	52
6. References.....	55

# 1. Introduction

---

Bilingualism and contact phenomena are a linguistic reality for many people in this world, including Croats. According to the Central State Office for Croats Abroad, ever since 1880, Croats have emigrated to other countries, oftentimes in huge numbers and waves, due to various economic and political reasons (“Status of Croatian immigrants and their descendants abroad” n.d.) Using the statistics of the Central State Office for Croats abroad on Croatian diaspora and Croatian minorities, we can calculate there are now around 3.2 million Croats and their descendants living outside of Croatia (“Status of Croatian immigrants and their descendants abroad”, n.d.; “Status of Croatian minorities abroad” n.d.), which is approximately three quarters of the number of Croats living in the homeland. This does not include Bosnia and Herzegovina, where there are around 500,000 Croats (Agencija za statistiku Bosne i Hercegovine 2016). It stands to reason that a certain percent of them are bilingual. If we limit our statistical overview only to English-speaking countries, we are still faced with a number of approximately 1,753,000 Croatian expatriates – 1,200,000 living in the USA alone (Croatian Diaspora n.d.). This points to the fact that there are potentially around 23% of all Croatians (including the diaspora, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the homeland of Croatia) who are Croatian-English bilinguals due to migration and who experience bilingual and language contact phenomena on a daily basis. Even though this percentage may not reflect the real state of the matter since not all descendants of Croats are speakers of the Croatian language, 23% of theoretically possible migration-conditioned Croatian-English bilinguals is not a number that should be overlooked, especially considering the recent wave of emigration from Croatia, which will probably increase this number. In addition to this, there is also a certain number of Croats who have returned to the homeland after having lived in English-speaking countries, which makes the above-mentioned percentage even higher. The participants in this study belong to this group of people.

This study was not only carried out because of the personal interest of the researcher, it was also conducted in order to gain further insight and possibly contribute to the study of the linguistic realities of so many Croats. Of course, this was not the first and hopefully not the last such study. Some of the names that researched English and Croatian in contact are

Louis Adamic, Rudolf Filipović, Dunja Jutrović, C. A. Ward, H. P. Stoffel, Jim Hlavač, and Anđel Starčević (Starčević 2014).

As previously stated, our participants belong to a group of people who returned to Croatia after having lived in one English-speaking country, namely the USA. Four of them emigrated as adults, one at an early age, and two of them were born in the States. Their ages range from 10 to 86. They were all interviewed following the methods of the sociolinguistic interview, after which the interviews were transcribed. In the analysis we focused on four major areas: 1) linguistic transfers from English into Croatian as well as codeswitching; 2) patterns in and reasons for those linguistic transfers and codeswitching; 3) signs of possible language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition and 4) the participants' language attitudes.

Regarding the structure of this thesis, first the theoretical background of those four foci of the research will be presented. Afterwards follows a presentation of the participants and of the methodology that was used. At that point attention is turned to the analysis of the results, grouped according to the above-mentioned four areas of interest.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

---

### 2.1 Bilingualism

There are numerous definitions of *bilingualism* offered by various scholars in the field. Different definitions are partly a product of the fact that there is no single unanimously agreed-upon definition of *language*. For example, Weinreich (1953:vii), one of the pioneers of the study of bilingualism and multilingual communities, comments in the preface of his *Languages in Contact*:

“What we heedlessly and somewhat rashly call 'a language' is the aggregate of millions of such microcosms many of which evince such aberrant linguistic comportment that the question arises whether they should not be grouped into other 'languages'”.

Haugen (1953:6) also raises the question of defining languages:

“The definition of bilingualism is actually dependent on our definition of language. In the widest sense, bilinguals come into being wherever differing dialects meet, even within the same overall languages”.

A further problem arises due to the fact that there is no common consensus about the level of proficiency one has to have in both (or more than two) languages to be considered *bilingual*. Edwards comments that every person could actually be considered bilingual because almost everyone is capable of uttering at least a few words or greeting someone in a foreign language, although, he states, many do not conceive of bilingualism in this way (Edwards 2006:7). In contrast to Edwards' statement, Haugen (1953:6) claims that pupils learning a language in a school cannot be considered bilingual – he calls them *pre-bilinguals*. Bilinguals are only those persons, according to Haugen, who are able to use “more than single words in the other language”. In his preface, Weinreich (1953:vii) also touches upon “an ideal bilingual situation”, where a person sets aside one language and moves to another one. However, recognizing that such a situation rarely happens in reality, he moves on to define bilingualism simply as “the practice of alternately using two languages”. Grosjean (2008:9) explains that there are two different views on bilingualism: *the fractional* and *the bilingual or wholistic view*. The fractional view of bilingualism somewhat resembles Weinreich's (1953) “ideal bilingual situation” in that the proponents of this model define a bilingual as someone

who keeps his linguistic competencies separate. In addition, a bilingual would have to be proficient in their languages just as much as a monolingual is proficient in their one language. Therefore, one could define, according to the fractional view, a bilingual as two monolinguals in the same person (Grosjean 2008:10-13). The other view on bilingualism Grosjean (2008:13) presents is the bilingual or wholistic view, according to which a bilingual is “an integrated whole which cannot be easily decomposed in two separate parts” and that “is *not* the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals”. Language proficiency depends, under this view, on how much a bilingual person needs to use a certain language. However, since the need to use both languages is rarely the same, the outcome is that bilinguals are only rarely equally proficient in both the languages (Grosjean 2008:13-14). Similarly Myers-Scotton (2006: 3) claims that bilinguals are “rarely equally fluent in two languages”, which she relates to different levels of exposure to languages and different frequencies and types of usage. She also goes on to state that linguists have difficulties defining which level of proficiency should be achieved in both languages for the person to be considered a bilingual because their competencies are not necessarily the same at all levels of language, nor are their writing, speaking, listening, reading and writing skills always equally developed (Myers-Scotton 2006:39-41). In addition to that, while presenting the idea that bilinguals have a fluency continuum in the above-mentioned skills, Myers-Scotton (2006:43-44) points out that their performance can depend on various situational factors – the participants, the topics and the goals which they wish to achieve.

The speech of bilinguals can also differ with regard to whether they immigrated at a young or early age or whether they were born in the countries their parents emigrated to. This provides a basis for Haugen's (1953:334) classification of bilingual speakers of Norwegian and English living in the US into the following generations: *generation 1A* immigrated after the age of 14, *generation 1B* immigrated before the age of 14, *generation 2A* are born in the US and are children of parents who belong to generation 1A, while *generation 2B* are children of the generation 1B. Haugen (1953:334) sees the age of 14 as the time by which our speech habits are already formed. Clyne (2003:5) also uses this classification, but sets the age limit at 12 – for example, his generation 1A are speakers who immigrated after the age of 12 and generation 1B are bilinguals who immigrated before they were 12.

## 2.2 Linguistic transfers, transferences, crosslinguistic influences and codeswitching

Just like in the case of bilingualism, the terminology surrounding the question of *linguistic transfers* and *codeswitching* is not unanimously agreed upon. Linguistic transfer and codeswitching lie on the spectrum of contact phenomena and cannot be sharply delineated. Some of the terms that generate most confusion are linguistic transfer, codeswitching and borrowing.

Regarding crosslinguistic influences, we can start from Weinreich (1953:1), who uses the term *interference* when discussing influences that languages have on each other. He further makes a distinction between phonic, grammatical and lexical interference (Weinreich 1953:14-28; 29-46; 47-62). However, this term can be somewhat problematic due to its negative connotations (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008:3), and it is now used mostly in the field of psychology (Bullock & Toribio 2009:59). Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008:4) use the term *crosslinguistic influence* as well as *transfer* explaining that they are “the most conventional cover terms” (4), and they distinguish between:

1) *phonological transfer* – the influence of the phonology and phonetics of one language on another language (62-70);

2) *orthographic transfer* – the influence of the writing system of one language on the writing system of another language (70-72) Although orthographic influences are sometimes not considered as a type of linguistic transfer since language and orthography are two distinct phenomena, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008:70) count it as transfer because of the interplay and mutual influence between the phonology and the writing system.

3) *lexical transfer* – the influence of one’s lexical proficiency in one language onto the proficiency and usage of the lexis of another language (72-92). Of particular interest is their discussion of the relationship between transfer and morphophonological as well as semantic errors. They claim that a transfer that entails morphophonological errors is usually called *formal lexical transfer*, whereas a transfer that results in semantic errors is termed semantic lexical transfer, lexicosemantic transfer or semantic transfer (75). They also discuss the interrelationship between crosslinguistic influences and lexical representation accessibility and activations, as well as word choice transfers – how lexical knowledge connected with one language can influence the choice of lexemes in another language (74-92).

4) *morphological transfer* – the influence of the morphological system of one language on the morphology of another language (92-96);

5) *syntactic transfer* – the transfer of syntactical features of one language into another (96-102);

6) *discursive transfer*, for which they state that it refers to organization of written discourse, conversational strategies and “the concepts and notions that are conventionally expressed in a particular discursive context” (102-105);

7) *pragmatic transfer* – the transfer of illocutionary competence regarding the performance of speech acts (105-108);

8) *sociolinguistic transfer* – the transfer of social variables that condition the use of one language into another language (109-111);

Haugen (1956: 40), on the other hand, distinguishes between *switching* – “the alternate use of two languages”, *interference* – “the overlapping of two languages” and ‘integration’ – “the regular use of material from one language in another”. Clyne (2003:76-80) in his work operates with four different terms – *transfer*, *transference*, *transversion* and *convergence*. Clyne (2003:76) sees a linguistic transfer as a result of transference, a process “where the form, feature or construction has been taken over by the speaker from another language, whatever the motives or explanation for this”. Clyne (2003) further divides transference into 14 types:

1) *lexical transference*, where both the meaning and the form of the word are transferred (76);

2) *multiple transference*, where a number of words (usually collocations) both in their meaning and their form are transferred (76-77).;

3) *morphemic transference*, which results in the transfer of a bound morpheme (77);

4) *morphological transference*, in case of which a morphological pattern is transferred (77);

5) *semantic transference*, the result of which is a transfer of meaning of a word from one language to a word in another language. The words are usually similar in their forms or in their meanings (77).

6) *syntactic transference*, where syntactic rules of one language are transferred into another (77-78);

7) *lexicosyntactic transference*, which results in the transfer of lexemes along with the syntactic construction (78);

8) *semanticsyntactic transference*, where the meaning of lexemes is transferred together with the syntactic construction (78);

9) *phonological transference*, where phonemes are deleted or added under the influence of the other language (78);

10) *phonic transference*, defined as the transference of phones from language to language (78)

11) *graphemic transference*, where phoneme-grapheme relations are transferred from one language into another (79);

12) *prosodic transference*, whose result is a transfer of prosodic elements such as intonation (79);

13) *tonemic transference*, “the transference of tones or absence of tones from another language” (79)

14) *pragmatic transference*, where pragmatic elements are transferred, e.g. discourse markers, forms of addresses, etc (79);

Regarding convergence, Clyne (2003:79-80) sees it as a process by which linguistic elements from different languages become more similar.

With respect to transversion, Clyne (2003:75, 80) contrasts it to transference and defines it as a process in which one switches to another language rather than transferring a linguistic element from language to language – for example, a whole clause in another language would be regarded as transversion. Clyne (2003:75) argues that it is possible that psychological processes that underlie transversion are different from those that govern lexical transference, which is why he separates the two phenomena terminologically. However, it is also possible that from a psycholinguistic point of view those two phenomena are quite similar and should be treated as such (Bullock & Toribio, 2009:59-60).

Clyne (2003:75-76) is well aware of problems in defining these types of contact phenomena and of different definitions that exist – he notices that some scholars do not differentiate between what he calls lexical transference and transversion and subsume both phenomena under the umbrella term of *codeswitching* or *codemixing*. He also recognizes the fact that various scholars treat the term *codeswitching* in different ways (Clyne 2003:71-73). For example Muysken uses the term *codemixing*, which he further divides into three types: *insertion*, *alternation* and *congruent lexicalization* (Clyne 2003:73-74), where alternation and congruent lexicalization can be seen as equivalent to Clyne’s transversion (Bullock & Toribio 2009:66). Among those three types, however, alternation is the only one that according to Muysken (2010:1) could be described as codeswitching, seeing that he defines codeswitching as “the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event”. Here we must note that when Muysken (2010:3) discusses insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization, he talks about intrasentential codemixing. He is not the only one who makes a distinction between *intra-* and *intersentential codemixing (codeswitching)*. Ritchie and Bhatia (2006:337) distinguish between codemixing, which is intrasentential and subject to grammatical constraints role and codeswitching, which is intersentential, in which case discourse principles play an important role. However, there is a sociopsychological motivation behind both codemixing and codeswitching (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:337). Macswan (2006:283) also employs a distinction between intrasentential codeswitching, “in which an alternation occurs below sentential boundaries” and intersentential codeswitching, with “switching between sentences”.

Bullock and Toribio (2009:5-7) give a good overview of relations between codeswitching (CS) and other language phenomena. They start by giving a wide definition of codeswitching as the bilinguals’ ability to alternate between languages without any substantial effort, but acknowledge the fact that codeswitching can include various phenomena and that it is hard to arrive at a single definition (Bullock & Toribio, 2009:5). With regard to different phenomena, Bullock and Toribio (2009:5) first contrast it to *borrowing*. According to them, codeswitching is to be distinguished from *lexical borrowing*, when that term is used to designate words that are morphophonologically integrated in the recipient language. However, in the case of borrowings that have not gone through the process of morphological and phonological integration they cannot be easily distinguished from instances of codeswitching (Bullock & Toribio 2009:5). Bullock and Toribio (2009:6) also make a

distinction between codeswitching on the one hand, and *loan translations* and *semantic extensions* due to crosslinguistic influence on the other.

With regard to the troublesome terminology, Gardner-Chloros (2009:13) warns that the study of the phenomenon in certain occasions suffers because of the term for the phenomenon itself. In her introduction to the question of terminology, she gives her view on the matter at hand, which can at this point be used as a summation of the discussion presented above:

CS is not an entity which exists out there in the objective world, but a construct which linguists have developed to help them describe their data. It is therefore pointless to argue about what CS is, because, to paraphrase Humpty Dumpty, the word CS can mean whatever we want it to mean (Gardner-Chloros 2009:10-11).

### *2.3 Reasons behind codeswitching*

Codeswitching was sometimes considered to be random, a phenomenon that is governed by no rules or patterns – however, over time due to various accomplishments and insights made in research and studies of codeswitching, it became apparent that the phenomenon is not as random as was once thought (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:338-339). There are numerous reasons why one might codeswitch. We will now present some of those reasons that we deemed most relevant for this research. In this case we will use the term codeswitching as an umbrella term for codeswitching/mixing, lexical/multiple transference and transversion, since the primary focus of this section are the reasons behind those phenomena. Those reasons are essentially the same or at least similar across the relevant literature, whatever the term for the linguistic behaviorbehavior in question may be.

One of the reasons why speakers switch to another language is to express ideas or talk about things that are usually present in the culture to which that language belongs, but that are absent or not really represented in the culture of the other language (Clyne 2003:111-112). Another reason, closely related to the one described above, is that usually the work domain is also language-specific, in the sense that speakers usually use vocabulary from the language of the country they live and work in, i. not from their home language (Clyne 2003:112). Similarly, Bullock and Toribio (2009:2) also report that speakers use different languages in different domains – for example, speaking one language at home, but switching to another to

discuss work or school, often in the same conversation. This is what Grosjean (2008:23) calls *the Complementarity Principle*, according to which:

“Bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people. Different aspects of life often require different languages”.

The third reason for codeswitching is the fact that a certain word has become unavailable in one of the languages for the reason of language attrition or incomplete language acquisition (Clyne 2003:113).

Another reason is what Clyne (2003:162-166) calls trigger words. Those words are uttered in one language within an utterance, which was up until that point produced in another language, which then leave two possibilities open for the speaker: to proceed in the language of the trigger word or to continue using the same language as before the trigger word (Clyne 2003:162-163). Clyne (2003:164-166) also mentions bilingual homophones and proper nouns, which can also facilitate codeswitching.

Quotation is also given as one of the reasons for codeswitching, that is, speakers often switch to another language to quote something that they read or heard in that language (Clyne 2003:160; Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:345). Reiteration is also found to cause codeswitching. Namely, an utterance made in one language is sometimes repeated in another language, either to additionally clarify or highlight the meaning of the utterance (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:345).

Furthermore it has been shown that also interjections and fillers are spoken in another language, making that yet another cause for codeswitching behaviorbehavior (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:347).

Other reasons presented in the literature are also the topic-comment function of codeswitching, hedging in order to, for example, deal with taboo words or quoting culture-specific sayings (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:346-347; Clyne 2003:160)

Besides these reasons, it should be noted that codeswitching can be conditioned by the setting in which the communication takes place (informal-formal), the persons with whom the conversation is being held (their social class, age, gender), the aims of that communication as well as a wish to express group membership, the opposition or difference between the ‘we-code’ and the ‘they-code’ of the speakers, convergence, divergence or

neutrality (different modes of speech accommodation) toward the interlocutor or the prestige that a certain language variety has (Clyne 2003:159-162; Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:339-345; Backus 2006:708-711; Gardner-Chloros 2009:42-43; Myers-Scotton 2006:142-174).

At this point we shall also mention the phenomenon of *switching back*. Namely, it has been shown that oftentimes shortly after their initial codeswitch, speakers switch back to the language used before the codeswitch (Clyne 2003: 168).

#### *2.4 Language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition*

Although in various studies *language attrition* and *incomplete language acquisition* were treated as the same thing, recent research into the matter has shown that they are to be distinguished from one another (Schmid 2011:7; Gharibi 2016:3-4, 17). Language attrition namely signifies a decline in L1 proficiency of speakers who have acquired their second language after completing the acquisition their first language (Schmid 2011:7) Incomplete language acquisition, on the other hand, occurs to young bilinguals who did not have an opportunity to reach the level of proficiency in their L1 otherwise found in other same-aged speakers of that language (Schmid 2011:7; Gharibi 2016:4, 17; Montrul 2004:259). However, distinguishing between the two, especially in the case of young bilinguals, is not always an easy task (Gharibi 2016:17). If we stick to Schmidt's (2011:7) definition of language attrition, this phenomenon can be connected with the speakers belonging to the generation 1A.

Language attrition usually occurs in case of bilingual speakers who emigrated to another country, which caused them to experience a lack of or a decline in exposure to their first language – that is, attrition is not only a result of learning an L2, but also of a decline in use and exposure to L1 (Schmid 2011:70; Gharibi 2016:17). Language attrition may also be dependent upon various factors: the age, education and gender of the speaker, their exposure and frequency of use of L1 as well as their language attitudes and feelings of identity (Schmid 2011:69-80). Furthermore, attrition as a language phenomenon can affect all levels of language – from (phonetics and) phonology to morphosyntax and lexis (Schmid 2011:47-68). In general, the effects of language attrition, however, must be distinguished from linguistic transfers that can also occur on all language levels, since in their essence they are two different linguistic (and contact) phenomena (Pavlenko 2004:54). However, when analyzing the speech of a concrete individual, it is not always easy to determine whether the observed

non-native-like element is the result of language attrition or crosslinguistic influence (Schmid 2011:26).

Incomplete acquisition is sometimes used in the context of *heritage language acquisition*. In certain studies and articles (Gharibi 2016; Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinsky 2010; Montrul 2012) scholars only use the term heritage language acquisition, in which case incomplete language acquisition and language attrition are seen as phenomena that belong to the study of heritage language acquisition. Some even argue against using the term incomplete language acquisition, stating that no grammar can ever be said to be completely acquired and that what studies in bilingual speech usually find is a different, rather than incomplete grammar (Otheguy & Zentella 2012:202-207). Here we will use incomplete acquisition and heritage language acquisition as interchangeable terms since they both refer to non-target acquisition of language due to restricted use and exposure and in order to reflect the fact that both terms are represented in literature and current research. In this sense incomplete/heritage language acquisition can be linked with Haugen's (1953:334) generation 1B, second and the following generations of speakers. Incomplete/heritage language acquisition can be linked to the Critical Period Hypothesis (Schmid 2011:72). According to this hypothesis, there is a time frame within which a person has to be exposed to language in order to attain an optimal level of language acquisition. Otherwise language acquisition will not be as successful. However, the age at which the critical period ends remains controversial (Morgan 2014:115). A corollary of the Critical Period Hypothesis might be incomplete language acquisition in bilinguals who emigrate at a young age affecting all levels of language because of a short period of exposure to their L1 (Gharibi 2016:19). Therefore in those speakers non-native-like linguistic elements can be found (Gharibi 2016:17-18; Polinsky, 2006:25-41). Just as in the case of speakers who emigrated at an early age, exposure to heritage language input is influential in the process of acquisition on part of bilinguals who were born in the new country (Benmamoun et al 2010:134-135; Montrul 2012: n.p.) In both cases oftentimes the heritage language is spoken at home, non-prestigious and usually not taught in schools; while the majority language is used in most areas of life, it carries prestige and is usually the language taught in schools (Benmamoun et al 2010:133). As a result of that restricted use and input of heritage language, "it tends to lag behind in morphosyntactic and lexical development by comparison to the speaker's stronger language, and even to monolingual development norms, thus becoming the weaker language" (Montrul 2012: n.p. ). Furthermore Montrul (2012: n.p.) reports that the proficiency of heritage speakers is usually

not native-like nor uniform; that they are better at understanding the heritage language than at speaking it and that their language production is similar to production of speakers who acquire a second language in school. Heritage speakers are usually also not familiar with the formal registers of the heritage language, due to the fact that they mostly use it at home (Flores 2015:254). Furthermore, Benmamoun et al (2010: 141-144; 147-153) report that in their study they have found that heritage speakers' lexical competency is usually weaker in comparison to native speakers' competency; that they have difficulties with (inflectional) morphology; that case marking may be problematic and that syntax is usually well preserved and acquired. On the other hand, it is important to note that bilinguals' linguistic competence and proficiency can vary (Benmamoun et al 2010:134).

However, both in cases of people who emigrated at an early age and who were born in the new country, their proficiency in the heritage language also depends on parental behavior and especially their own attitudes towards the heritage language (Miller 2017:101-105). It has been reported that bilingual children's preference for languages is influenced by their peers (Miller 2017:114; Caron & Caron-Caldas 2012:511). Therefore, upon entering school a preference for the L2 on part of the young bilinguals can emerge. This is especially true for children in the first several grades of elementary school, during which time they often shift their preference to the L2 because of bigger exposure to their peers and the educational system, which can ultimately lead to a decline in their L1 proficiency (Miller 2017:114).

## 2.5 *Language attitudes, preferences and attitudes towards codeswitching*

Myers-Scotton (2006: 120) defines *language attitudes* as "subjective evaluations of both linguistic varieties and their speakers". Those attitudes can ascribe a positive value to certain language varieties and a negative value to other language varieties (Myers-Scotton 2006:120). For example, speakers of some varieties can be seen as funny, intelligent or kind and speakers of other varieties as uneducated or lazy (Coulmas 1998: n.p.; Trudgill 2000:194). Oftentimes positive attitude is shown towards the linguistic variety that has *prestige* – that is spoken by a socioeconomically powerful group, while a negative attitude is related with the varieties spoken by those less powerful (Myers-Scotton 2006:121, Trudgill 2000:8-9). According to Trudgill (2000:8-9), *the standard variety* of a language also usually has prestige since it is usually associated with highly educated and successful people. Furthermore, the standard variety is usually equated with language itself, as if the standard

were not just one of the many varieties of that language, which can result in speakers of, for example, English and Croatian non-standard varieties being perceived as not speaking *proper* English and Croatian (Trudgill 2000:8-9). Additionally the speakers themselves might perceive themselves as less fluent in the standard variety and might sometimes think they cannot speak their language because of the equal sign that often stands between the standard variety and the language itself (Trudgill 2000:8-9).

Because social mobility is usually an important factor in people's lives, a switch to the prestigious linguistic variety is not uncommon (Myers-Scotton 2006:132). This also applies to bilingualism. It is not uncommon that the majority language carries more prestige and status in a society and that its acquisition leads to a lot of social and economic advantages, which can result in language shift or even extinction (Rovira 2015:163). On the other hand, some bilinguals maintain their heritage language due to organizing various clubs and organizations where they can spend time with their L1 speakers, organizing lessons in L1, experiencing strong ties between language and religion, belonging to a ethnic group whose culture has specific features etc. (Myers-Scotton 2006:90). Although certain parents want their children to excel at the majority language, even at the cost of their heritage language, most parents value its maintenance (Miller 2017:101-102). Those parents, according to Miller (2017:101-103) usually speak the heritage language at home and enforce various measures, which differ in their directness and strictness, to ensure their children acquire that language. In certain cases bilingual speakers even openly resent the fact that their children and a certain number of subsequent generations do not acquire the heritage language (Haugen 1953:235).

At this point it would be useful to mention the relationship between language and *nation(alism)*. Myers-Scotton (2006:111) points out that "the language may be the most 'visible' symbol of a group". This is also true of nations, as language can be a sign of national identity – speaking a certain language can be seen as a token of loyalty to a certain ethnic group (Trudgill 2000:44,127). The effect to which language is tied with national identity can be seen in a positive correlation in the rise number of new nation-states in Europe and the rise of new official languages, as was the case after the break-up of Yugoslavia (Trudgill 2000:46-48); Myers-Scotton 2006:111-114). Furthermore, it is not unheard of that states have tried to suppress the use of a minority language in effort to suppress the whole ethnic group (Trudgill 2000:127).

The prestige of the majority language is also a sociolinguistic fact in the United States, where English as the majority language enjoys great prestige and where the use of the heritage language significantly drops already in the second generation of speakers (Rumbaut & Massey 2010:152). Not only their heritage language, but also the way that immigrants speak English can be seen as an aberration and called 'broken English' (Puleo 2007:86). In certain cases immigrant speakers themselves can also have a negative attitude towards their speech, also calling it broken or bad (Haugen 1953:54; Weinreich 1953:83). A good example of this is the attitudes of bilinguals towards codeswitching. For example, bilinguals themselves sometimes do not favour codeswitching (Gardner-Chloros 2009:14-15). According to Gardner-Chloros (2009:14-15), they see it as a sign of laziness, of poor intelligence, bad manners or uneducatedness. Generally speaking, many bilinguals see codeswitching as something wrong. It is interesting, however, to notice that even those bilinguals who express a negative attitude towards codeswitching and try to keep the languages separate still codeswitch, whether on purpose or without noticing (Gardner-Chloros 2009:14-15).

## 3. METHODOLOGY

---

### *3.1 Participants*

Seven participants were included in the study. They can be divided into different groups according to Haugen's classification:

Generation 1A: Toni, Ljiljana, Branko, Gabriela

Generation 1B: Nina

Generation 2A: Marko

Generation 2A/3: Cecilia

**Toni** was born in 1930. He comes from Studenci, a village near Imotski, Croatian. He moved to Germany when he was 24 and spent two years working for the United States Army. After that he moved to Cleveland in 1956, where he spent 60 years. He finished secondary education in the USA. He did not visit Croatia for the first 25 years he spent in the USA. Afterwards he visited Croatia several times. In the years leading up to him moving back to Croatia he would come to Studenci and Split and stay there for several months. At Christmas 2015 he moved back to Croatia – the city of Split – and now plans to split his time between the USA and Croatia. When he moved to the USA, he did not speak English, but he then enrolled in an English course. In addition to Croatian and English, he speaks also German, Spanish and Russian to a certain degree. His children still live in the USA. While he was living in the USA, he was an active member of the Croatian community living there. He is a speaker of a Neo-Shtokavian subdialect called Dalmatian-Bosnian, characterized by the Ikavian reflex of jat.

**Ljiljana**, Toni's wife, was born in 1936. Prior to moving to Cleveland, she lived in Zagreb. Upon retiring she moved to the USA in 1986, where she spent 29 years. During that time she visited Croatia on several occasions, sometimes staying for several months in Studenci and Split with Toni. She has two sons, one of whom moved with her to the USA, whereas the other stayed in Zagreb. Together with Toni she moved to Split. Like her husband Toni she plans on living both in Split as well as Cleveland. Her first encounter with the English language was while still in school in Croatia. Due to her retirement in Croatia, she did

not pursue any employment while in the USA. While still living in the USA she socialized with other members of the Croatian community and took part in their activities. She is a speaker of the Northwestern Kajkavian dialect of Croatian, characterized by the Ekavian reflex of jat.

**Branko** was born in Kaštela in 1942. In 1961 he moved from Kaštela to Chicago. He first worked in building maintenance but then went on to buy his own buildings. He moved back to Croatia 11 years ago, in 2006, having spent 45 years there, but has travelled to the USA several times since then because his children and grandchildren live there. Before moving to the USA he learned German and French, and did not know English. After arriving in Chicago he went to evening school for two years where he learnt English. In the USA he participated in the activities of the Croatian community and socialized with other Croatian speakers and immigrants. He is a speaker of the Southern (or Ikavian) Chakavian dialect.

**Gabriela**, Branko's wife, was born in 1947. She moved to the USA after completing her secondary education, in 1965 she moved from Split to Chicago. She soon became an entrepreneur and opened her own restaurant and a florist shop. She studied English while in high school in Croatia. She moved to Kaštela together with her husband in 2006, but travels frequently to the USA to visit her children and grandchildren. While living in the USA she took part in the activities of the Croatian community and socialized with other Croatian speakers and immigrants. She is also a speaker of the Southern Chakavian dialect.

**Cecilia** was born in 1993. She was born in New York, but moved as a small child to St. Petersburg, Florida. Her parents are Croatian. She has a younger brother and sister. Her brother was born in 1995 and her sister in 1998. Her father was born in the USA, where her paternal grandparents, who now live in Orlando, moved from Croatia, Her mother moved to the USA after graduating from university in Croatia. Cecilia's parents, both doctors, own their private practice. She used to spend every summer in Kaštela, where her maternal grandparents live. At the age of 19, in 2012, she decided to quit her studies in the USA and moved to France, where she spent six months. At the age of 20, in 2013, she moved to Split to study medicine at the University in Split, where classes are held in English. Her brother also moved to Croatia three years ago, where he also studies medicine within the same program. Her sister is in high school in St. Petersburg. Cecilia now travels back to the USA once a year. Besides Croatian and English, Cecilia speaks Spanish, which she learned in high school and French, which she started learning while at college in America and continued to learn upon moving to

France. In the USA she visited the Croatian Club and socialized with Croatian immigrants and their children; however she never formally learned Croatian there. She is a speaker of the local dialect spoken in Split, which contains a mixture of Chakavian and Shtokavian features.

**Marko** was born in 1993. He was born and raised in Chicago. His parents are both Croatians who moved to Chicago during the 1970s. His father is a locksmith, while his mother had her own butcher shop. Since moving to Croatia his mother has been unemployed. He has two older sisters and a brother. While he lived in Chicago, he used to come to Croatia every other summer. Every two years two of the children would come with one parent, while the other two children would stay with the other parent in Chicago. He moved together with his family to Croatia (Kaštela) when he was 8 years old, in 2001, where he continued his education from the third grade on. In Croatia he also completed his secondary education and is now pursuing his university degree. After finishing high school, his older sister and his brother moved back to Chicago, while the other sister stayed in Croatia. Marko now visits them in Chicago once every several years. While living in the USA, he participated in the activities of Croatian Cultural Community, where he spent time with Croatian immigrants and their children. He also received lessons in the Croatian language and history there. He is a speaker of the local dialect of the city of Split.

**Nina** was born in 2006. Her father moved to Vancouver in 2008. Nina and her mother followed him there in 2009, where they spent several months. In the same year the whole family moved to Seattle, Washington. Her father works in the IT industry, while her mother is a doctor, who could not find employment in the USA because her medical degree and medical specialty certificate are not recognized in the States. After finding a job in Split, she moved back in February, 2016 with Nina to Croatia, while her father stayed in Seattle. While in the USA she had no contact with the Croatian community. She is a speaker of the local dialect of Split. Her mother participated in the interview with Nina, however, she only talked about Nina's experience.

### *3.2 Procedure*

As previously stated, seven participants were included in this research, which was conducted through a series of interviews that took place on the 28<sup>th</sup> and the 29<sup>th</sup> of June, 2016 in Split and Kaštela. While choosing the participants, I tried to include both older speakers

who emigrated later in their lives, after their L1 acquisition was complete as well as younger bilinguals who emigrated at an early age or were born in the USA in order to be able to present various types of bilingual experience. Furthermore, I was also interested in recording the speakers' vernacular – the way they speak at home, with close friends and in other situations in which they feel relaxed i.e. “when the minimum attention is paid to speech” (Labov 1984).

With the seven participants a *semi-structured sociolinguistic interview* was conducted. That is a type of interview for which the researcher prepares their questions and topics, however, during the interview itself those questions can be modified or new questions can be added, depending on the answers the interviewer receives (Labov 1984:36). This creates more room for the participants to discuss the topics the interviewer presents (Labov 1984:37-38) To be more precise, *tangential shifting* –“any contribution by the speaker which represents a tangent or a shift away from the topic which the interviewer initiated” (Labov 1984:37-38) – should be encouraged since it results in a wealth of data and a better access to their vernaculars. However, it can also lead to digressions on part of the participants, in which case the researcher needs to carefully guide them back to the main topics (Bijeikienė & Tamošiūnaitė 2013:94; Starčević 2016:6). Careful guiding back to the main topic does not mean that the interviewer should insist on the order of questions that was planned before the interview, but that the researcher should pay attention to the speaker's interests, relate their experiences and attitudes to the ones presented by the speakers and acknowledge new topics which the participants introduce (Tagliamonte 2006:39; Starčević 2016:6).

A problem that arises when conducting sociolinguistic interviews, but which is not exclusive to the field of sociolinguistics, is *the observer's paradox*. The observer's paradox refers to a situation in which a researcher wants to investigate naturally occurring phenomena, but their presence itself modifies those phenomena (Shanmuganathan 2005:79). Since the researcher is usually a member of an institution, they can be perceived as being in a dominant position vis-à-vis the participant (Labov 1984:40; Starčević 2016:7). Although the observer's paradox can never be fully eliminated, which is something that every researcher should keep in mind when analysing the data, one should always strive to reduce it (Labov 1984:40). In theory, there is one way of getting around it – recording speakers without their knowledge. However, candid recording is unethical, potentially illegal and to be avoided at all costs (Labov 1984:51-52) On the other hand, the researcher can try to minimize the observer's effect by making the participants feel relaxed. This can be done by if the researcher rejects

their authority, and shows that they are there to learn (Labov 1984:40; Starčević 2016:9-10). Labov (1984:40) suggests using colloquial language instead of the standard, adjusting the speech to the speech of the participants and paying genuine attention to what the participants talk about, not just to what the researcher is interested in for the purpose of his research. Starčević (2016:9-10) also suggests telling the participants that their experiences are valuable, and avoiding wearing formal clothes.

In conducting the interviews I tried to acknowledge and implement the insights made by the above-mentioned researchers. A total of five interviews were carried out – one with Branko and Gabriela together, one with Ljiljana and Toni, one with Cecilia, one with Marko and one with Nina, with her mother being present. After the interviews were carried out, I transcribed and analyzed them. The focus of the analysis was on the four main subjects of this research, as stated in the Introduction.

## 4. RESULTS

---

### 4.1 Linguistic transfers/transference/crosslinguistic influences

#### PHONOLOGICAL LEVEL

##### Phonological convergence:

There are several examples of phonological convergence (Clyne 2003:79-80) towards English forms.

For example, Cecilia uses *tekno* whereas in Croatian one usually hears *tehno*. This can be seen as the result of the Croatian *tehno* converging towards the English /teknoʊ/:

C: mi bi slušali, ne znam, tekno par sati i onda bi otišli do plaže i onda tamo slušali tekno, znaš

Toni similarly uses the words *teknologiju* and *teknički*, which can be explained as Croatian *tehnologiju* and *tehnički* converging towards the English /teknɔ:lədʒi/ and /teknɪkl/ respectively:

T: oni najviše govore o športu, o autima, o teknologiji

T: imaju kotareve, oni pluže, on nemaju ništa tekničkoga

However, Toni uses *tehničari* and not *tekničari*, which one might expect if it converged towards the English form /teknɪfns/:

T: kad se auta ne proizvode, onda mi moramo tehničari šta treba

Another example of convergence in Toni's speech is the form *priviligiran*, the result of the Croatian *privilegiran* converging towards the English /privəlɪdʒd/:

T: kad ja iman u banci tamo dosta novaca, oni te dočekaju i vode te čak na ručkove i šta ja  
znan...priviligiran

When at one point during the interview his cell phone rang, Toni answered with /haloʊ/, whereas in Croatian *halo* is what one usually says. As in the previous cases, this is also an example of convergence towards English, in this case towards /həloʊ/.

There are also instances of phonological convergence in Gabriela's speech, but in these cases the forms converge towards English by changing the word stress placement:

G: on je više introvert, ja san ekstrovert

G: po tome šta je taj restoran egzistira prije tog zakona

In all three cases the word stress is placed on the first vowel (syllable) corresponding with the English / 'intrəvɜ:rt/, / ekstrəvɜ:rt / and / restərə:nt/. In Croatian the second vowel (syllable) is stressed: /introvert/, /ekstrovert/ and /restoran/.

### **Diphthongization:**

Gabriela diphthongizes the first, stressed vowel /o/ from the Croatian word *dobro* into /oo/, making it sound /doobro/. Clyne (2003:78-79) sees this as the case of phonic transference and mentions the case of second generation Polish speakers diphthongizing the stressed vowels:

G: Doobro je, glavno da se ide

She uses this form of the word throughout the interview, however, she does not diphthongize the vowel /o/ in any other word, nor does she diphthongize any other vowel.

## **MORPHOSYNTACTICAL LEVEL**

### **Conditional clauses:**

In English the second conditional is used to describe a hypothetical situation. This type of clause uses the conjunction *if* paired with the past tense form of the verb. In Croatian, however, one uses the conjunction *da* to express the unreality of the clause (Barić et al 1997). Since the conjunction *if* oftentimes translates as *ako* in Croatian conditional clauses, Cecilia uses the conjunction *ako* instead of the conjunction *da* under the influence of the English *if*, which, unlike Croatian *ako*, can be used in all conditional clauses:

C: Može nešto biti super, pomoć ti, ajmo reći, srce poslije nekog infarkta, dva mjeseca poslije, ali... i onda oni kao prestanu to istraživanje, ali ako su čekali još 5 mjeseci, vidili bi da umiru ljudi [instead of: da su čekali]

Similar examples can be found in Starčević (2014:222).

### Temporal clauses:

Cecilia uses a combination of two conjunctions *čim* and *kad*, whereas in Croatian one would simply expect *čim*:

C: čim kad počneš o toj temi govorit, baš se, ono, vidi se kako se naljutu

C: ali čim kad počneš čitat taj članak, ta titula nema veze s nalazima

Similarly, Starčević (2014:220) reports the use of *ipak ako* with the meaning of *iako* and raises the possibility that two conjunctions are used under the influence of the English conjunction *even though*, in which case that would be an example of convergence. In that respect it is possible that Cecilia's use of both conjunctions where only one is needed is modeled after the English complex subordinator *as soon as*.

### Dependent alternative and interrogative clauses

Cecilia repeatedly uses the conjunction *ako* in dependent alternative and interrogative clauses, which is a direct transfer from English where the conjunction *if* is used in those clause types (Quirk & Greenbaum 1976:318-319), and which is usually translated as *ako* in the case of conditional clauses (more examples in Starčević 2014:223). In Croatian one usually uses *li* or '*je li*' (Barić et al 1997).

C: ja ne znam ako ću se vratiti, ne znam ako ću ostati u Hrvatskoj [typical in Croatian: hoću li se vratiti, hoću li ostati u Hrvatskoj]

: C: pitaju me ako sam s otoka [typical in Croatian: jesam li s otoka]

C: prvo se trebaš ubacit, onda ćeš vidit ako ti se sviđa [typical in Croatian: sviđa li ti se]

### Overgeneralization of the adverb *kao*

In several cases English *like* can be translated as Croatian *kao*, which in contact situations leads to overgeneralization of *kao* under the influence of the English usage of *like*. For example, Starčević (2014:227) shows how Croatian-English bilinguals use *kao* in order to introduce quotations or to mark imprecision. He also states that the latter usage is now common among young people in Croatia (Starčević 2014:227). Besides using *kao* to mark imprecision, it can also be used to avoid expressing commitment, that is, as a sign of hesitation (Andersen 2000:21-32). Examples of using *kao* with these functions can be found in Gabriela's:

G: jesi čuja kako su govorili ka “vokala san u štoru, vokala u stor” [quotative like],

in Cecilia’s:

C: onda uvijek bi nešto mene kao spriječilo da mogu sto posto dati za američke šeme [imprecision]

and

C: kad sam ja otišla sam kao prekinila s njim [hesitation].

### Omitting the adverb *kao*:

In the next example Toni omits the adverb *kao* from the phrase *biti rođen kao* + a noun:

I: Vi imate još i djecu gore?

T: Koja su rođena, koja su rođena Amerikanci [instead of: koja su rođena kao Amerikanci]

This is the result of the influence of the English phrase *to be born* + a noun where there is no adverb between ‘born’ and the noun.

### Conversion of a noun into an adverb:

Gabriela uses the noun *hvala* where one would expect the deverbal adverb *zahvaljujući*:

G: puno puta su mi prije rekli ajme meni, šta ste se vratili, šta van je, ja bi rekla, hvala mome mužu, ne bi ja baš

This can be seen as a result of the process of analyzing the English thanks *to my husband* not as the preposition *thanks to* + the noun phrase *my husband*, but as the noun *thanks* + the prepositional phrase *to my husband* and then literally translating the constituent parts, whereby the prepositional phrase was translated with the Croatian noun phrase in the dative case, which is enforced both by the fact that the prepositional phrase with *to* is often translated as the Croatian dative and that that case follows the noun *hvala*.

### Conversion of a noun into an adjective:

In Croatian *introvert* is a noun, and the corresponding adjective is *introvertiran*. In English, however, the word *introvert* can be both a noun and an adjective. With regard to this

fact it is likely that Gabriela's use of the word *introvert* as an adjective is influenced by English:

G: Bija si dosta introvert prije [common in Croatian: bija si dosta introvertiran prije]

We can judge that an adjective is in place here because the word *introvert* follows the adverb *dosta* which in Croatian is used with adjectives and other adverbs, while its use with nouns is not common.

### Translating empty *it* as *to*:

In this example Ljiljana also translates the empty *it* as *to*:

LJ: Sunshine State, to je prekrasna klima zimi

In Croatian one would expect a construction without the pronoun *to*, something along the lines of *prekrasna je klima zimi*.

Since this is the only example of carrying the English empty *it* over into Croatian, we conclude that in this case it probably happened under the influence of the fairly common English phrase *it's a beautiful climate* (similar example can be found in Starčević 2014:233).

### Verbal government and dependent prepositions

In English the dependent preposition of the verb *depend* is *on*. Since this preposition is often translated into Croatian with the preposition *na* – for example, *on the desk* = *na stolu*; *on your side* = *na tvojoj strani* – Cecilia paired the preposition *na* with the verb *ovisiti* which takes the preposition *o*:

C: ali onda isto ovisi na specijalizaciji [instead of : ovisi o specijalizaciji]

In Croatian the prepositions *u/na* is used after the verb *odseliti se* if one wishes to state the destination. In English, however, one moves *to* somewhere. Under the influence of the fact that *to* in a number of cases can be translated as *do* – for example, *in she went from door to door* = *išla je od vrata do vrata*; *he went to the kitchen* = *otišao je do kuhinje* and the fact that even combinations of prepositions such as *next to* or *up to* are translated as *do*, Cecilia produces the following:

C: ja san u New Yorku rođena, ali, ali san već od malih nogu se odselila do Floride [instead of: odselila na Floridu]

Similarly Cecilia translates directly the English *graduate from* when she says:

C: on je maturira iz srednje škole [instead of simply: on je maturira(o)]

In Croatian the verb *maturirati* already means to ‘graduate from highschool’. It is an intransitive verb and it cannot take any type of object.

It should be noted here that what underlies such usage is the crosslinguistic influence happening on the semantic level. Namely, Cecilia first extended the meaning of the verb *maturirati* to also denote “completing an academic degree, course, or training” (graduate, 2017) under the influence of the English *graduate*, which made it possible for her to add *iz srednje škole*.

### **Prepositions in time expressions:**

In each of the following examples certain Croatian prepositions were used instead of the ones that would be expected, which was a result of direct translation of English prepositions.

Gabriela transfers the use of the preposition *on* from the English phrase *on the weekend* and uses Croatian preposition *na*:

G: jer ja san odgojena u splitu, uć u školu, spavat na vikend, ić prošetat, okupat se [where one expects to hear: za vikend]

Toni does the same thing:

T: kad smo radili na vikend, onda imali smo oni voki toki

Cecilia uses the phrase *u tjedan dana*, where the preposition *u* is a direct translation of the English preposition *in* from the phrase *in a week*:

C: Pia će sad maturirati...sad u tjedan dana [instead of: za tjedan dana]

In this example Cecilia translates the expression *at the same time* into Croatian, which results in her using the preposition *na* where one usually uses the preposition *u*. This has to do with the fact that it is not uncommon for the preposition *at* to be equivalent to *na*, for example, *at work* = *na poslu*; *at a meeting* = *na sastanku*; *at the lake* = *na jezeru*, and so on:

C: sve, sve, sve isto samo nije na istom vrijeme, vremenu [instead of: u isto vrijeme]

**Word order:**

In the following example we find that the word order was influenced by the English word order (more examples of the clitic order can be seen in Starčević 2014:233-234)

G: i onda je rekao, sad konačno nisam dežuran ono kad god trebaju me [instead of: kad god me trebaju]

Namely in English one would say *whenever they need me*, with the pronoun following the verb, and not standing before it.

Gabriela also transfers English word order when she says:

G: to je bilo par godina unazad

In Croatian *unazad* would be placed before *par godina* (*to je bilo unazad par godina*), but under the influence of the English *a few years ago/back* Gabriela places *unazad* after *par godina*.

Similarly in the following example the word ‘prvo’ comes after ‘Amerikanci’:

G: oni su sigurno ka Amerikanci prvo [instead of: oni su sigurno prvo/prvenstveno/ponajprije Amerikanci],

which reflects the English word order in ‘they are surely Americans first’.

**SEMANTIC LEVEL*****korektno***

To speak *correctly* in English would primarily mean to speak in such a manner that one obeys the rules of English. Even though the word *korektno* in Croatian also has the meaning of not making mistakes, *govoriti korektno* would rather imply that one is polite and follows certain societal standards. If one wishes to say that they speak proper Croatian, whatever that may be, they would much more likely use the word *pravilno*. Therefore we find that the following use of the adverb *korektno* is a result of semantic transference from English:

G: i ja san se trudila pa i naši prijatelji da korektno govorimo, da ne ubacujemo uopće engleštinu

***egzistirati***

In English the verb *to exist* primarily means “to be real; to be present in a place or a situation” (exist 2017) In Croatian however the verb *egzistirati*, which is similar in form, means ‘to be alive’, ‘to stay alive by fighting hard’, and if used figuratively, it means ‘to exist’ (egzistirati n.d.) As a corollary, in Croatian it would be highly unusual to hear the following:

G: po tome šta je taj restoran egzistira prije tog zakona [instead of: je postoj(a)]

Therefore we analyse this usage as a case of semantic transference due to similarity of form.

***tukli su se***

In English when people are fighting, it can mean that they are having an argument or that they are being physically aggressive to each other. In Croatian the verb *tući se* has only the latter meaning. Thus when Cecilia produces the following sentence, she transfers the other meaning of the verb *fight*, namely ‘to have an argument’, into Croatian *tući se*:

C: ali znaš kako su oni žestoko se tukli na fejs [instead of: svađali se]

***nagovarati***

The verb *to convince* can be translated in Croatian as *uvjeriti/uvjeravati* and *nagovoriti/nagovoriti*. Let’s take a look at the following sentences: “I’d convinced myself (that) I was right.” (convince 2017) Here we can use the verb *uvjeriti/uvjeravati*: *Uvjerila sam se da sam u pravu*. If one wishes to translate the following sentence – *I’ve been trying to convince him to see a doctor*. – one can use the verb *uvjeriti/uvjeravati*, but also *nagovoriti/nagovarati*: *Pokušavam ga uvjeriti/nagovoriti da posjeti doktora*. As it is shown here: the verb *to convince* is translated as *uvjeriti/uvjeravati* or *nagovoriti/nagovarati*, depending on whether it means “to make somebody/yourself believe that something is true” or “to persuade somebody to do something” (convince, 2017). In the following example we can see how Cecilia extends the range of meaning of the verb *nagovarati* to include *uvjeravati* under the influence of the fact that both those verbs correspond to one English verb – *to convince*:

C: to je meni ono bilo vrh momenta da ja treban nekoga nagovarati da nisam odavdje [instead of: nekoga uvjeravati ]

***artikl***

A (newspaper) article is in Croatian usually (novinski) *članak*. In the following example Cecilia uses the Croatian word *artikl*, which can denote an item in a store, a grammatical category or a legal article, and adds the meaning of a newspaper article to it. It is a semantic transfer from English due to similarity of forms:

C: pročitat će bilo koji artikl u Cosmopolitan [instead of: članak]

However, Cecilia also uses the word *članak*:

C: ali čim kad počneš čitat taj članak

***titula***

The Croatian word *titula* and the English word *title* do have similar forms, but they do not share the same range of meaning. For example, *titula* does not denote a title of a newspaper magazine; in Croatian one commonly says *naslov*. However, due to similar forms Cecilia transfers the meaning of the English *title* (of an article) into the Croatian *titula*:

C: čim počneš čitat taj članak ta titula nema veze sa nalazima [instead of: naslov]

***romantični jezici***

In Croatian the adjective *romantičan* simply means ‘romantic’. Spanish, French, Portuguese and so on are not *romantični*, but *romanski jezici* (*Romance languages*). However, the noun *romance* from the term *romance languages* can sometimes be translated as *romansa*, when it refers to romantic relationship or feelings. Therefore Cecilia chooses the adjective *romantični* and not *romanski*, because the former is the adjective usually connected with the noun *romance*, albeit in a different meaning; and effectively gives the adjective *romantični* an additional sense:

C: ja sam uvijek volila te romantične jezike

***signali***

In the following example Toni talks about his experience with driver’s education in the USA and mentions that the worst part is having to learn all the traffic signs. However, due to similarity of forms he calls those signs *signali*, instead of the more usual *znakovi*:

T: najgori je ovaj pisani test, signali [instead of: znakovi]

### *na liniji*

The assembly line used in factories is called *traka* in Croatian. However, Toni chooses the word *linija*, whose form is similar to the English *line*, but which usually in Croatian does not have that meaning of an assembly line:

T: oni su radili većinom svi bez kvalifikacija na liniji, jel [instead of: traci]

### *instrukcije*

The English word *instructions* from the expression *to give someone instructions* is usually translated as *upute*, that is, *dati nekome upute*. *Dati nekome instrukcije*, however, would mean to give someone private lessons. In the following example Ljiljana talks about parking issues we can see that she transfers the meaning of the word *instructions* into Croatian *instrukcije*:

LJ: ja bi bila uvijek ljuta na njega jer mi nije dao dobre instrukcije pa ono...prvi put pa drugi put pa ajde van pa unutra [instead of: upute]

## 4.2 Codeswitching and the reasons behind it

Various reasons for lexical transference/transversion/crosslinguistic influences/codeswitching were observed in the interviews.

### **Talking about distinctly American phenomena**

In this example Toni talks about the English varieties he encountered while visiting the southern states:

T: To je taj njihov South, ono, južnjački, ono, oni zavlače.

In the USA the term South is often informally used when talking about the southern states. It carries specific connotations and it evokes certain associations regarding cultural and political phenomena related to that part of the US. As a result of that, Toni switches to English when discussing the southern states, considering all the implications of using the English term for South as opposed to using the Croatian term *jug*.

Here is an example of Cecilia switching to English to discuss something that was an important part of her everyday routine while living in the USA as opposed to living in

Croatia, where visiting shopping malls is not such a part of everyday life and a meeting place for young people as it is in America:

C: priko dana ideš poslije faksa, poslije srednje ono škole u mall, provedeš, ne znan, sat i po

Here Gabriela talks about her identity as Croatian American. That is also a concept that first she probably first encountered in the USA. *Croatian American* is also probably the term she is used to hearing and using in discussions about people in America with Croatian heritage. In addition to that, various Croatian organisations in the USA use the same term in their titles, whereas there are also other ethnic designations which follow the same pattern – African American, Native American, German American etc:

G: ja se smatram Croatian American, jer ja imam i putovnicu i imam državljanstvo, a oni su American Croatian, pola Amerikanci pa Hrvati

In the following examples Toni, Cecilia and Gabriela turn to English to talk about distinctly American phenomena that they encountered while residing in the States:

C: Ja mislim da sam ja samo dva puta slavila 4th of July jer bi ja uvijek ovdje bila

T: snowbirds, oni kažu, snowbirds

G: ali onda su mi računali po kao Old Grandfather hm Law, the Grandfather Law, po tome šta je taj restoran egzistira prije tog zakona i onda mi je bilo dozvoljeno da funkcionira

### **Talking about the work/school domain**

In the following examples Toni and Gabriela talk about their jobs. It is not uncommon for the first generation immigrants to switch to their L2 for purposes of discussing their job domain:

T: nisam bio vojnik, nek sam bio civil namještenik

T: zamisli koliko je project tu bio

G: a ja sam bila mali entrepreneur

In this example Cecilia discusses the area of her life with which he became acquainted while still living in the USA and the area which she still deals in English with due to the fact of studying medicine in English in Croatia:

C: jer ovako u Americi prvih par, četiri godine nisu baš ono medicina ili strojarstvo, ništa, nego undergraduate, znaš, trošak vrimena i para.

C: Ne bi dovoljno dugo čekali da vidu side effects.

C: ...jer ono može se bilo šta printati i isprintati i reći da si našao statistically significant \_\_\_\_\_  
evidence...ono, tamna čokolada je dobra za srce.

### **Inaccessible Croatian terms**

In certain instances the participants switch between the codes because they probably cannot remember the Croatian term for the concept.

The following example comes from Toni, who used the word “limited”, because he could not remember the Croatian word, until his wife Ljiljana helped him:

T: Oni su limited, kako bi rekao...

LJ: ograničeni.

T: E, oni su ograničeni.

In this example Gabriela could not remember the Croatian word for ‘honeymoon’ and asked the interviewer how to say it in Croatian:

G: na honeymoon je iša...kako se reče kad se ide...kako se kaže na hrvatski?

I: medeni mjesec

G: medeni mjesec, kvragu

In the following situation Cecilia switched to English for the same reason:

C: Ali moje odluke su doslovno iz...aaa... from my gut, you know, it's like my feeling, you know, I do pros and cons and that shit whatever but that never works, ultimately my decisions are from my gut, I always trust my gut. So...kako san ja odlučila za medicinu, ja san...prvo svega, ideja je bila, kad iden u Francusku da ja o tome razmišljan, šta ću, gdje ću, ja san totalno to zaboravila razmišljati...

### **Reiteration**

The following examples show how codeswitching happens in order to reiterate the already stated message in the other language:

G: Yeah, and we have two kids, imamo dvoje djece, koji su tamo, i unučiće i tako smo ni na nebo ni na zemlju.

G: Marx and Engels, ja san čitala njegovu teoriju, to je ono humano, ideja fantastična, ali u practice, praksi niko neće da ide kod dragoga vođe tita

G: Croatian Cultural Centre, Hrvatski kulturni centar se zove ta...ustanova

## Quotation

The following examples show that transversion sometimes happens due to quoting utterances that were originally said in English:

T: naš predstavnik kaže: “Toni, javi se da čujemo malo tvoj akcent onaj engleski...da slušamo tvoj broken English” (laughter), zafrkancija više....i onda sam ja (laughter) reko: “At least I Croatian and English, what about you?”

In this example Toni talks about different varieties of English in the United States and how he sometimes had trouble understanding them:

T: obično svi crni rade tako po restoranima i onda ja: “I want coffee, you know, breakfast”, i onda on kao: “What, what did you say?”...oni kažu kafa coffee, “coffee, man”, a još zešće, znaš

Here Ljiljana describes the reaction of her friend when Ljiljana showed her some pictures from Croatia:

LJ: i sad na jednoj slici je bio taj janjac na štapu na ražnju, na ražnju na ražnju, kad je ona to vidila, ona, ona je tako bila iznenađena: “oh my gosh, lamb on the stick”...ko da sam Turčin pa sam da sam nekoga nabila na štap

LJ: Amerikanac će vam odmah reći: “You are my friend”, makar vas prvi put vidi

In the following example Cecilia talks about a fight she and her ex-boyfriend had and the excuse he tried to give:

I: I kako se iskupija?

C: “You misunderstood me”...yeah, yeah, I misunderstood you shit

Here Cecilia describes an encounter with a man in Croatian club who did not believe her when she said she was from the USA:

C: On je reka “Your accent's kinda funny”and I'm like:“ no“. “Your accent's funny, it's like OK, you probably really worked hard on that” and I'm like: “No, I'm actually from America.”, i on mi nije virova

### Trigger words

a) In certain situations codeswitching was probably triggered by the interviewer's use of English:

I: Ti se više u Hrvatskoj osjećaš ka da si doma, nego u Americi u smislu osjećaja doma, where you belong to?

C: Yes, yes, yes, yes I do. I do not like, I don't like to go back. I go back for the shopping and the sushi.

I: Znači ti si sebe gledala ka Hrvaticu, ne ono, Croatian American, American Croatian?

C: No, I'm Croatian American, to sto posto, iman ti ja baš američke sheme, ja nisan čista Hrvatica, ja ne razmišljan ka čista Hrvatica, nisan ovde odrasla, nije to to”

I: Rođena si gore, you do American things, you have an American accent, onako...

C: I could have been American, I know...ali eto.

### b) Proper names

In the following example we can see how a lexical transfer, in this case English proper nouns, facilitates transversion from Croatian into English:

I: U kojem ste vi dijelu US-a bili?

B :Chicago.

G: Chicago, Illinois. Yeah, and we have two kids, imamo dvoje djece, koji su tamo, unučiće i tako smo ni na nebo ni na zemlju...ni vamo ni tamo cili život.

C: napišu super titulu na taj ono Nature or whatever, the Times Magazine, ali čim kad počneš čitat taj članak ta titula nema veze s nalazima.

### c) Bilingual homophones

In the following example we see facilitation of transversion due to bilingual homophones:

T: nema problem... that's OK, no problem.

In the following example Gabriela talks about the borrowing of the verb *lajkati* in Croatian, which is often used among the younger population in Croatia. The phonological resemblance of the inflected forms of the verb *lajkati* due to the fact that it is borrowed from English facilitates Gabriela's transversion:

G: I lajkat, kaže, oh ne, kaže:“ ja, je li lajkaš, lajkaš, ja lajkam, lajkam, I like it, lajkam”, it's like...oh my gosh (laughter), a mi smo se suzdržavali da ne govorimo tako

In this example Cecilia talks about how her American ex boyfriend asked her to stop practicing Croatian customs after they marry, which he explained by saying that acting as a Croatian would make her look as a terrorist. She uses the word 'terrorist', which is phonetically similar to the English *terrorist*. This facilitates her codeswitching:

C: Kad je reka da će izgledat da san terrorist...we didn't talk for weeks after that, we did not talk for weeks.

### Interjections and fillers

Now follow some examples of codeswitching in case of interjections and fillers, in agreement with Ritchie and Bhatia (Ritchie & Bhatia 2006:347):

G: Imaš, yeah, jednu sklonost nostalgičnu.

B: Ja san čak mislija ić i u, yeah, Meksiko. Florida je onako ima dosta humid, dosta je ovaj i...a Kalifornija je opet daleko, tamo na Pacifiku.

G: Aktivni smo u tom pogledu što smo postali obo dvoje teški zemljoradnici, you know, ja bavim se cvijećem, ja uzgajam cvijeće.

### Switching back

As Clyne (2003: 168) commented, the participants rarely stay in the language they switched to for too long and usually go back to the language they were using before the switch happened.

In the following example we see a confirmation of this statement. Up until this moment Gabriela spoke in Croatian, listened to her husband speaking in Croatian and then for this utterance switched to English and not long after that back to Croatian:

G: no, no problem, you, you know, they don't make fun of you, but they do make sometimes fun like comedians of for some nation, nation, nationalities, kao naprimjer Indijci, Indijci su naj, njihov govor je tako smiješan kad oni počnu engleski.

The following examples show the same “switch back”:

G: ja ne znam kako smo mi izgurali četrdeset i nešto godina, yin and yang, you know, (laughter) so, ali, ali on je, eto, on je s tim gurao

C: to je meni bilo jako nerazumljivo kako moji prijatelji, baš je bilo njima ono stalo da ja razmišljan ka da san Amerikanac...like who cares how I feel? But they care that I care that I was American, shvaćaš, to je njihova ponos. Imaju jako. jako veliku ponos.

C: Kad je bila veći klub, je, bilo mi je super, jer tu su bila isto dica mojih godina, bija je jedan super zgodan lik tamo, aaaajme, baba mi ni mi dopustila mira, šta je, tu je, he was a bad boy, oh my God, ali kad se odvojio taj klub, onda hmmm već su i oni bili te godine da nisu, da ono, manje ih je interesiralo pa nisu ni oni, dolazili.

#### *4.3 Language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition*

In the case of the generation 1A participants no signs language attrition were observed, except for two instances in which Toni and Gabriela switched to English because they forgot the Croatian word for the concept. Those examples were mentioned previously in this thesis, but here they are once again:

T: Oni su limited, kako bi rekao...

LJ: ograničeni.

T: E, oni su ograničeni.

and

G: na honeymoon je iša...kako se reče kad se ide...kako se kaže na hrvatski?

I: medeni mjesec

G: medeni mjesec, kvragu

However, we cannot state with certainty that this was due to language attrition.

The lack of any signs of language attrition could be related to the fact that the participants communicated in Croatian at home with their spouses who were also speakers of the generation 1A, with their children or their spouse's children, as in Toni's case, with other speakers of the generation 1A at Croatian Cultural Centre and elsewhere, visited Croatia and stayed in touch with their families in the homeland; and especially, in Branko's and Gabriela's case, that they are now living in Croatia again.

In the case of the participants belonging the generations 1B, 2A and 2/3, we observe several examples of incomplete /heritage language acquisition, most prominently in Cecilia's speech:

### **Novel verb forms**

*ostrāšiti se* instead of *prestrašiti se*:

C: sad kad je vidila nas i kad je vidila koliko se treba uložiti, malo se ostrāšila

### **Mixing similar verbs**

*popraviti* instead of *ispraviti*:

C: Prija zna da mi može popravit, i ja to volim kad mi padeže popravi

### **Verbal government**

Locative instead of accusative

*Upasti na faksu* instead of *upasti na faks*:

C: U Njemačkoj je jako teško, e, jako je teško uč, upasti na faksu u Njemačkoj

*Biti primljen na faksu* instead of *biti primljen na faks*:

C: Taman kad san ja odlučila doći ovdje, on je maturira, ono, iz srednje škole i bio je primljen na faksu, ali ono...

*Otići na Hvaru* instead of *otići na Hvar*:

C: Bilo je jedno lito gdje smo otišli na, na Hvaru, znaš kako Marin ima tamo neku babu.

Accusative instead of locative

C: Njezine najbolje prije su ovdje u Kaštela.

### Noun and adjective gender

*dan* used as a feminine noun:

C: To jesu bile dobre dane. [instead of: To jesu bili dobri dani]

*pitanje* used as a feminine noun:

C: To mi je bila prva pitanje, di mi može diploma vrijediti. [instead of: To mi je bilo prvo pitanje]

*ponos* used as a feminine noun:

C: But they care that I care that I was American, shvaćaš, to je njihova ponos. Imaju jako jako veliku ponos

adjective *srednja* from the collocation *srednja škola* used in its masculine form:

C: Zato ne ideš po gradu, jer šta ćeš tamo, ono moja ekipa je više bila za plažu tako da bi mi ono treći, četvrti srednjeg svaki vikend otišli na plažu. [instead of: treći, četvrti srednje]

C: to je više kad smo bila dica jer to je bija ogromni klub i onda kad san ono već sredina srednjeg ili početak srednjeg, oni su se, imali neke probleme s financijama, pa su se odvojili pa ima sad dva mala kluba, ali ja ono otkad san u srednju onda san manje to...manje su me oni mogli forsirati da idem. [instead of: sredina srednje, početak srednje]

However, it is interesting to observe that when Cecilia uses the adjective together with the noun *škola*, she uses the feminine form:

C: on je maturira, ono, iz srednje škole

C: dana ideš poslije faksa, poslije srednje, ono, škole u mall, provedeš ne znan sat i po

These signs of incomplete/heritage language acquisition that are so prominent in Cecilia, as compared with Marko, as we will see later, can be related to the fact that she was born in the USA and lived there until the age of 20, where English as the majority and prestige language was used in many contexts and situations. On the other hand, she was exposed to and used Croatian only at home with her parents and to a lesser degree in the Croatian Club, where a lot of children she spent time with were heritage speakers themselves or did not acquire Croatian at all. She never received any formal lessons in Croatian. Furthermore the language of her education both in the USA and in Croatia has been English.

In Marko's speech, which was completely in Croatian, except for the already mentioned switches to English when mentioning the proper name Croatian Cultural Centre and the holidays of the 4th of July and Thanksgiving:

I: Bi li slavili američke blagdane?

M: 4th of July bi slavili, ali Thanksgiving ne bi bilo ništa posebno, šta još ima...

there are no signs of incomplete/heritage language acquisition, probably because of the fact that he moved to Croatia at the age of 9, in 2001, and completed his elementary and secondary education in Croatia, which increased his exposure to and use of Croatian and enabling him to familiarise himself with the formal registers of the Croatian language. However, he remembers the struggles he had when he first moved to Kaštela:

M: ja san loše govoriya u početku, ali baren san ono razumija i mogli su mene razumit, ono faliva san padeže najviše, dobro, i sad tu i tamo falijen koji padež, ali ne iden ni ja ono niti za tin, al ono ritko kada.

He reports that he studying for various subjects in school in Croatia was harder for him at first, probably because of the language but that the situation improved over time:

M: bilo mi je teško učit, sad zbog čega, najvjerojatnije jezika. Čitat lektiru možda prvu godinu, dvi, a kasnije nije baš

Marko claims that his skills in English have remained the same, but that he sometimes notices signs of language attrition, mostly in the area of pronunciation:

I: govoriš engleski jednako kao i prije?

M: jesan, al ono, baš sad kad san nedavno bija tamo, tu neku rič kažen pa osjeti se, ono naglasak, kužiš ono, jer jebiga, kužiš, ono, opet ne govorin ga, ne koristin ga često.

During the interview Nina mostly spoke English. In those stretches of speech made in Croatian no signs of incomplete/heritage language acquisition were observed; only reported. For example, her mother Vera believes that Nina expresses herself better in English. However, due to the fact that they speak mostly Croatian at home, Nina is used to speaking to her mother in Croatian:

V: Mislin da je njoj lakše izrazit se na engleskon s menon, ali ona se obraća meni uvik na hrvatskome, tako smo ono, hrvatski s menon i rekla san joj, u školi ono kad svi pričamo engleski, rekla san joj da je to nekulturno, da mi se onda obrati na engleskome, ali ona neće, ona se zaboravi, ona uvik na hrvatskome.

Vera notices that in spite of her expectations Nina sometimes has difficulties with Croatian due to her long exposure to English:

V: Izložena je ona skroz engleskome, ja san mislila da će joj problem bit naučit engleski, kad je došla, išla je ona u vrtić, išla je, po jedan put tjedno je išla po pet sati u vrtić, pa je kasnije išla po tri puta dva sata...ja san mislila da će joj problem bit engleski, međutin,ne, ona engleski...njoj je engleski sad...ono, ona prevodi sebi engleski na hrvatski, unatoč tome šta smo mi doma pričali hrvatski, ne možeš ti, bombardiran si s engleskim i nema tu...ja sam mislila da će problem bit engleski,međutim, uopće nije problem jezik zemlje u kojoj si, baš joj je hrvatski problem.

According to Vera, Nina has more difficulties understanding than speaking Croatian. Especially problematic for Nina are concepts with which she became acquainted with while living in the USA – from the domain of education, leisure activities or even body parts. When dealing with these topics she primarily relies on using English words:

V: Dobro jako priča, samo mislin da joj je razumijevanje loše. Nije loše, nego ono...recimo na balet san je upisala, ona na baletu misec dana ništa nije razumila, nije razumila šta je to zglob, šta je to list, znala je jedino šta je koljeno, ništa drugo nije. I onda ova njoj kaže da istegne bokove, ona ne zna šta su bokovi. Tako da je učiteljica sad počela engleski pričat na baletu ovde.

V: Ona je odlično usvojila oba jezika, samo šta mislin da joj je problem sad u Hrvatskoj, ne znan ja koliko ona razumi, to nikako ne mogu dokučit, mislin...rekla mi je da učiteljicu 80% razumi, 20% ne razumi. Kad curice se svađaju, rekla mi je da ne razumi. Ne razumi fraze naše. Ne može lektiru čitat, problem je, ne zna puno riječi, vokabular joj je ograničen. Jučer je bilo « nadjeni ime nekome, ona ne zna šta je nadjeni. Ali ima tako dosta tih riječi.. Ona recimo nije znala šta je umnožak, šta je...ona je sve to znala na engleskom pa san ja to njoj trebala sve te riječi prevodit.

Vera also reports that Nina has difficulties following Croatian TV-shows and movies:

V: Recimo, ona ide gledat ove sinkronizirane filmove, ona tu ne razumi baš puno, ona filmne razumi baš puno

During the interview with Nina, she also made the same statements regarding her Croatian and English proficiency:

I: when you wanna talk about certain things, how you feel, what happened in school, which language do you prefer?

N: Well, I know more English, about describing someone so I would first say it in English, because when I'm trying to describe someone and how they act I don't really know that much words in Croatian so I just say it in English.

In the following example Nina confirms that in domain of school she uses predominantly English. It is interesting to notice, however, that although she is acquainted with Croatian words for certain concepts – in this case for ballet – she chooses the English word, probably because she first started doing ballet while in the USA:

I: jel ti se dogodi da s roditeljima pričaš engleski?

N: It doesn't happen, but I do say words in English sometimes because I don't know how to say it...like I said the word math in English and like what was the other word...I just basically say all the subjects and when I go to ballet I say ballet instead of balet.

These observations can be connected with the fact that at the age of two Nina was immersed in the English linguistic environment, that up until several months before the interview she was educated in English and that most of her friends were English speaking. Her exposure and use of Croatian experienced a decline and was mostly restricted to home.

#### *4.4 Language attitudes, preferences and attitudes toward codeswitching*

In the conducted interviews various language attitudes emerged.

Regarding attitudes towards codeswitching and their own varieties, different attitudes were shown. First we will present an example of a negative attitude towards codeswitching and transference that comes from Gabriela and Branko. They commented on the language of older members of the first generation Croatian immigrants in Chicago and that they used to mock them:

B: Mi smo se prij rugali ovin našin starin Amerikanciman, kad smo došli u Chicago, našin Hrvatima: “a iša san vokat”, pa bi smo se mi smijali.

Gabriela considered their language habits to be bad and that they speak broken English (“iskrivljen”):

G: Oni su se družili, ta prijašnja generacija nas, oni su se, oni su se, oni su stvamo nisu nikad naučili dobar engleski i družili su se samo jedni s drugima, ono ostali su prilično, došli su ono, došli su i ova generacija iz manjih sredina, ali oni su baš ako to je ta generacija bila, jedni s drugima, radili su za Hrvate, i to je bilo to. I onda njihov engleski je bija ono iskrivljen,

znaš. I onda bi oni, onda bi se mi smijali njima kad bi išli kod njih i onda kasnije  
jesi čuja kako su govorili ka: “vokala san u štoru”, “vokala u stor”, stor dućan, storu i “bajala  
san”, I don't know šta, nešto.

Commenting on her own language-related aspirations, she stated that she tried to  
speak English in a proper manner:

G: I onda smo se mi trudili i ja san se trudila, ja volin bit korektna inače i ja san se trudila pa i naši  
prijatelji da korektno govorimo, da ne ubacujemo uopće engleštinu, da govorimo čisto hrvatski.

I: Vi ste nastojali ta dva jezika držat odvojeno?

G: Sigurno, kad govorimo engleski, da govorimo engleski, kad govorimo hrvatski, da govorimo  
hrvatski. Pa normalno, mi jesmo.

Gabriela reported of a perceived connection between codeswitching and  
crosslinguistic influences and the rural background of the speakers:

G: Ovi šta su došli možda iz nekih manjih mjesta, zabitnijih sela i tako, oni bi dosta  
miješali...ono, ubacivali bi engleštinu.

However, she stated that although she previously tried to keep the languages separate  
and although she does not find that task to be strenuous, now she switches to English when  
needed, especially after coming back from a visit to her children in the USA when it takes her  
some time to get used to speaking Croatian again (the same thing happens when she comes to  
the USA):

I: Je li vam ikad bilo naporno odvajati ta dva jezika?

G: Meni nije, odvajati, ali recimo kad iden tamo, onda san malo u zaostatku, dok se ne uključin, dok mi  
mozak ne počne mislit na engleski, onda tečnije govorin engleski, i meni skoro je drago  
govorit engleski, nedostaje mi. I onda kad dođen ovde, isto tako, engleski u početku dok se ne  
priviknen, e. Ali samo odvajanje mi nije problem, nego jedino privikavanje, onda tu i tamo ti  
se...zaboraviš koju riječ pa se sjetiš na engleski ili obratno I onda smo se, onda sam se suzdržavala i  
trudila sjetit, a bome sad jednostavno ubacin.

B: meni je ispočetka falija rječnik hrvatski ovde, jer dosta san čita na engleskom knjige i novine i  
sve i onda kad san doša ovde, dok nisan počea malo čitat na hrvatskom knjige, rječnik mi se  
vratija.

Like Gabriela, Ljiljana also expresses her disapproval of the first generation speakers'  
codeswitching and language variety, calling it “a special language”:

LJ: Što se tiče toga što ste vi pitali kako naši ljudi govore, to vam je jedan poseban jezik, posebni jezik, ja bi rekla...to su vam prva generacija, ulove engleske riječi koje onda sa hrvatskim nastavcima govore, to užasno zvuči za nekoga koji to ne zna.

Regarding their own codeswitching they stated that they do not do that:

I: mi ne miješamo, sad ne znam šta je utjecalo na to, ali mi ne miješamo.

The above findings are in line with Haugen's (1953:54) observations on a negative attitude that the immigrants themselves have toward their language variety, connecting it with a low level of educatedness. It shows a commonly reported negative attitude towards codeswitching (Gardner-Chloros 2009:14-15).

An interesting report on her own codeswitching comes from Nina. She namely expressed a strongly negative attitude towards codeswitching calling it "weird" and stating that she refuses to codeswitch within a single conversation on a certain topic. She reports that once she starts discussing a certain topic in one language, she wants to continue speaking in the same language until that discussion is finished. Only after that, when a conversation on another topic begins, she can switch to the other language. Namely, the interviewer first started speaking in Croatian and Nina responded in Croatian too. For the next couple of minutes only Croatian was spoken, until Nina's mother said to Nina that she can also speak English to the interviewer, if it is easier for her. Nina reluctantly switch to English:

I: A koja ti je najdraža serija na TV-u ili film?

N: Pa sada mi je Violeta jer mi se sviđa onako kako je svi pokušavaju onako glumiti, a vidi se baš da dobro glume i onako...

I: Super. A tila bi bit glumica u nekoj seriji, ne zanima te kazalište?

V: Ako je tebi lakše pričat na engleskome, pričaj, ona će te sve razumit.

N: ja bi na hrvatskome.

V: Pa jel ti lakše na engleskome?

N: aaa...nije.

I: It's all the same to me, we can speak Croatian, we can speak English, kako god ti želiš.

N: OK.

I: Reci ti meni, di si ti živila prije?

N: I lived in America, in Seattle, Redmont. Redmont is the town, and Seattle is like the place.

I: I jel ti bilo zabavno?

N: Yeah, it was very fun.

Later on in the interview answering the interviewer's question on why she insisted on speaking in Croatian, Nina answered:

N: Ah...well because I already started talking in Croatian and it would be kinda weird if I just started talking in English.

I: znači, misliš, you think it would be weird if you switched between English and Croatian in the same conversation, that's weird?

N: well, yeah...like I think I would first like quit the conversation and then start another one in English.

I: znači, kad počneš govorit na jednon jeziku, so when you start talking about a certain topic in English, you prefer to keep talking English until you're finished with that topic?

N: yeah.

I: Znači, ne voliš da ti rečenica počne na hrvatskom and that you then switch to English?

N: yeah, I don't like it.

I: zašto?

N: I don't know, it just kinda feels weird. So like whenever my friends say they wanna talkin English here, I just tell them that we should probably first finish the topic and then we should switch

Nina reports that she switches between codes only when the need arises:

I: do you like speaking English and then dropping certain Croatian words?

N: well I kinda like keeping it English, but there are certain words that are in Croatian and you can't explain them English so I then just say them in Croatian and describe them in English.

I: And does the same thing happen when you speak Croatian?

N: Ah...no...yeah. It does kinda happen...yeah...mostly I don't really because in English it's just kinda like different, but in Croatian only some words that I don't know how to put it, then I just say it with Croatian accent and then explain them in Croatian

After Nina switched to English, she continued to speak only in English, switching to Croatian only in order to answer mother's occasional questions, which is probably due to the fact that according to her mother Nina almost always speaks in Croatian to her mother.

On the other hand, Marko reported that he never minded switching between the languages when he was a child:

I: je li ti ikad smetalo to [codeswitching between languages]?

M: ma nije, šta će meni smetat.

However, he says he does not codeswitch anymore and that when he does, he codeswitches deliberately and as a joke:

I: a kad si još gori bija u školi, u Americi, bi li ikad koristija hrvatski?

M: nije, nije nikad. Samo engleski u hrvatski sad, a i to više iz ruganja. Ono čaća i ja radimo, ja ga pitan očemo li paintat ogradu, ali svjesno ono, a kad san bija mlađi može bit nesvjesno.

Cecilia reports on her codeswitching quite neutrally. She states that she does codeswitch but that she does not notice it at all because she got used to it by now. She also comments that sometimes she codeswitches between French and Croatian:

C: a ubacujen ti ja engleski u hrvatski, ali ne primjećujen ti ja to više, već san se navikla, ono koji put ubacin koju rič na engleski kad mi fali, ali zadnje tri godine ti znan ubacivat hrvatski u engleski, ali ne primjećujen ti ja to, jedino se koju put vratin na francuski

Regarding their own attitudes towards the languages they speak, one of the first things to notice is that all of the participants used or tried to use Croatian at home with their families.

For Ljiljana it was also important that they pass their Croatian knowledge on to the younger generation. She stated that she insisted that her granddaughter (the daughter of her son who moved to the USA with her) be fluent in Croatian:

LJ: Ovaj sin koji je u Americi ima, imaju jednu kćerku koja govori i piše hrvatski sve, to je bio moj uvjet da ostanu uopće gore jer su po meni došli gore.

She is against Croatian immigrants not teaching their children Croatian and communicating with them in what she calls "broken English":

LJ: Ja to nisam nikad odobraval, mislim da je to greška, da naši ljudi ne nauče djecu hrvatski govorit...Talijani i nakon sto godina govore neki talijanski, i ne razumiju ovi, ali govore, a mi kao, prva generacija što dođe, počnu taj, što oni kažu, broken English govoriti.

Toni however spoke English with his children at home, because despite his efforts, children found it easier to communicate in English:

T: Ma čuješ moš govorit kolko oš, kad pođ u školu...njima je lakše govorit engleski, I onda tako to ostane...i onda i ti nekako, to ti postane svejedno...želiš da govore hrvatski, ali ne možeš se boriti stalno...znaš, onda nastane komplikacije...leave me alone (laughter)

Resentment towards language loss is in line with Haugen (1953:235).

Gabriela said that she and Branko spoke Croatian at home with their children, but that they did not want to pressure them into strictly speaking Croatian. Lately they speak English when they visit their children in the USA, but they try to change that and speak Croatian more because of their grandchildren:

I: koji van je jezik prevladava u kući u Americi?

G: Hrvatski. Yeah, još uvijek hrvatski. Ali sad u zadnje vrime, ja sad kad iden, sad uglavnon bi engleski, i onda bi se trudili da govorimo više hrvatski radi djece. Ali znaš šta ja nisan htjela niti puno svoju djecu forsirat, unučad da govore hrvatski, nisan im tila otežat, ono na igralištu kad ne znaju govorit...dosta ljudi potenciraju kod svoje djece da govore jezik svojih roditelja i onda su djeca, meni se to činilo malo ža, teško, da su izgubljeni...

B: Nastojali smo da dica učiju hrvatski kroz nas.

Cecilia also spoke Croatian at home, except with her brother:

I: čekaj, jesi ti ikad učila hrvatski u nekoj školi, ili si samo doma?

C: Nisan, samo doma.

I: Vi ste svi doma zapravo govorili hrvatski, niste engleski?

C: Nikad engleski, pa ni sada. Osin s braton. Brat nikad nije uvatija engleski dobro ka i ja.

Marko also reported that they mostly spoke Croatian at home, partly because his father planned on coming back to Croatia and wanted for his children to be able to communicate in Croatian. Howerer, they would also sometimes use English.

I: jeste se držali striktno te politike da doma govorite hrvatski?

M: ma nije, nekad si ti priča engleski ono u kući, samo šta ćaća bi to ono forsira, kad se priselimo u Hrvatsku da nemamo problema ono.

In the case of Nina, it was previously mentioned in this thesis that she and her parents mostly speak Croatian at home, switching to English when discussing school-related topics.

Regarding language preferences, participants gave various answers.

Ljiljana and Toni stated that they like Croatian better, but that it also feels nice speaking English and that they are happy that they can speak that language too:

I: Imate li nekakve preference šta se tiče jezika, je li vam draži hrvatski ili engleski?

LJ: Pa hrvatski nam je draži.

T: Draže mi je govorit hrvatski, ali je lijepo kad govoriš engleski.

Lj: I meni je drago kad me netko tu zaustavi, makar sam stara pa mu znam odgovoriti na engleski, na koju stranu da ide.

Branko and Gabriela, however, explained that they like the two languages the same. It was, however, interesting to notice that, when asked whether they prefer one language over the other, they answered that they love the USA and Croatia the same. This example clearly shows how language is an important building block of national identity and how those two phenomena are closely related (Myers-Scotton, 2006; Trudgill, 2000).

I: Je li imate danas neke preference, čisto da van je jedan jezik draži od drugog?

G: Posve mi je svejedno, ja volin i jedan i drugi.

B: Meni je sve isto, isto ka šta volin Ameriku, toliko volin i Hrvatsku.

G: Ja isto ne bi mogla reć da volin više...ja volin, ja mislin, sva ta...di smo mi sretni, a istovremeno i nesretni šta imamo dvi domovine i dva iskustva

Marko similarly comments that he has no preferences regarding English and Croatian:

I: imaš li kakvu preferencu, govorit engleski ili hrvatski?

M: ma isto mi je, kad triban govorit engleski, onda ću govorit engleski, s nekin, ono šta ja znan, nije to uopće problem.

As a child, he reported, he had no strong feelings about learning Croatian:

I: ocu vam je bilo stalo da naučite hrvatski, a vama?

M: nama je bilo svejedno, neš ti, nije to bija sad neki pritisak da moran naučit hrvatski.

However, he feels that Croatian is his mother tongue, partly due to the fact that he first started speaking Croatian. Nonetheless, he does not consider English being a foreign language to him:

M: Materinji jezik je hrvatski, prvo san počea hrvatski pričat. Ali nije mi ni engleski strani jezik, bliže mi je od toga.

His preferred Croatian variety is the local variety that he encountered in Kaštela and the wider Split region and does not care for the Standard Croatian:

M: nije mi bilo bitno naučit standardni, usvojija san dijalekt, kako ljudi ovde pričaju.

Cecilia stated that she likes learning new languages in general and that her goal upon coming to Croatia was to improve her language skills. Now she finds it unusual to speak English outside of college:

C: Meni je sad neobično govoriti, govoriti, e, engleski van faksa, ja ti uvijek ono hrvatski govorin, meni je to bija cilj, da ja koliko naučin...ja volin jezike tako da je meni to ono bija cilj da lipo naučin, da uvin padže, da se ono usavršin.

She comments that she does not care for Standard Croatian and that her goal was to speak the local variety that people around her do:

I: Je li ti cilj bija naučit standardni hrvatski ili?

C: Ovo, ovo mi je dobro, boli me briga, za kao čistu gramatiku, ne toliko, osin ako će doć mi dan, ako ću trebati nešto kao pisati, članak, onda ću naučiti.

Nina stated in the interview that she prefers English, because she thinks she is more fluent in it:

I: Šta ti je draže govorit, hrvatski ili engleski?

N: Well I like English better because it's kind of easier to speak than Croatian, because Croatian has these words I don't understand and yeah.

With respect to the attitudes of other people (in Croatia and in the US) toward their bilingualism and speech, all participants except for Cecilia stated that they have never received negative comments or other kind of negativity because of the way they talk.

Branko explained that Americans generally liked his speech:

I: Kako su Amerikanci reagirali na vaš jezik, na vaš engleski?

B: Njima je to malo i simpatično bilo...toliko pozitivno i dapače, bilo im je i simpatično kako mi malo govorimo broken English, yeah, ja znan po sebi, baš in je ono...

Gabriela went on to confirm that statement and say that Americans only sometimes find immigrants' English to be funny and exploit it for comedic purposes:

G: no, no problem, you you know, they don't make fun of you, but they do make sometimes fun like comedians of for some nation, nation, nationalities kao naprimjer Indijci, Indijci su, naj... njihov govor je tako smiješan kad oni počnu engleski...ali nikad u poslu, u poslu ono ozbiljno, bez problema.

Regarding reactions of people in Croatia, Gabriela commented that people do not comment on their language, but usually have various questions regarding living in America:

G: ovde su ljudi...ono kad in rečeš da si živija u Americi, a ono drago in je čut, imaju pitanja...puno puta su mi prije ekli ajme meni šta ste se vratili, šta van je...

Ljiljana similarly reports that she has never received any negative comments and related this to the fact that Americans are used to hearing non-native English speakers because of a long history of immigration to the States:

LJ: Ma znate, neće vam se nitko rugat tamo, kako smo mi u Hrvatskoj tu nekad skloni nekom se narugat kad dođe iz nekog sela...nitko se neće narugat, pitat će vas otkud si, koje si nacionalnosti, ali da bi se narugao kako govoriš, nitko, nikada.

Toni confirms Ljiljana's statement:

B: Ja mogu reći da nikada nisam, evo 60 godina, nikakav problem nisam imao, funkcionirao sam, normalno da nikad nisam govorio pravilno engleski jer ne znam hrvatsku gramatiku, kako ću znati onda englesku, išao sam u školu, normalno, ali ništa, nikakvi, samo ako ti radiš svoj posao...nema problem

Toni only reports innocent jokes at the expense of his speech:

I: znači, većinom su bile pozitivne reakcije?

T: jesu, nekada, nekada, nekada jesu malo... a navlasito kod mene...Rečemo kad smo radili na vikend, pa onda imali smo oni voki toki znaš za razgovor, kad nema velike uprave, velikih....naš predstavnik kaže: « Toni, javi se da čujemo malo tvoj akcent onaj engleski...da slušamo tvoj

broken English” (laughter), zafrkancija više...i onda sam ja (laughter) reko: “At least I speak Croatian and English, what about you?”

In Croatia they have also never experienced any negativity regarding the way they talk:

I: Znači, niste imali problema s jezikom ni kad ste došli ovdje, ne bi se niko rugao?

Lj: Ma ne, niko nas ne bi

Marko also reports no negative comments on his speech in the USA, explaining just like Ljiljana that Americans are used to non-native English speakers. Regarding his friends in Croatia, they would only sometimes joke about it, but not in a way that made him feel uncomfortable:

I: jesi ikad ima ikakvu reakciju na svoju dvojezičnost gore?

M: ne, Amerika je jedna multinacionalna država, tu ima milijun nacija i naroda, to nije ništa čudno, oni su svi ono odnegdi, ka ono talijani, kinezi, crnci... Koliko se ja sićan, ostalu dicu nije bilo ni briga.

I: A ovde je li bilo ikakvih reakcija na tvoj jezik?

M: a je, nekima je bilo smišno kako pričam i tako, ali ništa posebno. Nije bilo ničeg neugodnog šta se ja sićan.

Nina has not encountered any negativity regarding her bilingualism either:

I: do your friends in school like that, do they tease you or think it's great that you speak both languages?

N: no, they think it's really good that I speak both languages.

I: a kad kažeš naprimjer na hrvatski nešto i ubaciš englesku rič, to ti prijateljima ne smeta?

N: yeah, they don't really like mind because I like try to explain to them and some of them already know what it means because they know English.

I: and the same thing is in the USA? They don't mind you saying certain things in Croatian?

N: no, they don't really understand but they still don't mind, because they know that I don't know the word in English.

However, Cecilia states that her friends felt bothered by her bilingualism and biculturalism, commenting that people in small towns in America regard you as a foreigner even because of slightest cultural differences:

C: Znaš, ja san njima bila stranac.

I: Ozbiljno?

C: Mojim prijateljima s kojima san ja cilu srednju školu odradila skupa, ja san njima bila stranac. Zašto? Jer ti jedem punjene paprike, znaš, a oni su nikad čuli za punjene paprike. Čin kad si malo drugačiji u te male gradove, ti si stranac njima.

I: Ali ti si rođena tamo.

C: Rođena, i iman naglasak njihov. Neman ti ja neki čudan naglasak, ali zbog toga šta ja iman drugu kulturu i jezik, ono...to je njima već bilo strano. I smetalo me to. Moj bivši momak, on je bija baš čisti Amerikanac, i išli smo skupa na faks i tad počneš ono stvarati svoj karakter i svoju osobu, on je sve više iša na Amerikanac, Amerikance, je, ja san više išla na Evropčane, i onda mi je da kad se oženimo, kad se oženimo, da triban malo više skrivat to da san Hrvatica, da govorin hrvatski, kad je reka da će izgledat ka da san terorist...we did not talk for weeks after that, we did not talk for weeks.

Later on in the interview she similarly stated:

C: Ja bi tamo govorila, ja san ka Hrvatica. Oni bi mi rekli da nisan ja Hrvatica, nego Amerikanka. Mogu ja bit oboje, ali njima je bilo najvažnije da ja samu sebe ne gledan ka Hrvaticu, nego ka Amerikanku.

This again clearly shows how a language, among other things, can be a strong signal of national identity and how it can be perceived as showing loyalty towards one ethnic group instead of the other (Myers-Scotton 2006; Trudgill 2000)

However, Cecilia claims that people in Croatia do not have any negative attitudes toward her speech and that no one tries to correct where while she talks. She in general feels that she is more accepted here than her friends who do not speak Croatian due to her knowledge of Croatian:

C: Kad san ja ovde, ja to ne primjećujen više, jezik, naglasak nije mi toliko sad...još mi je tu nešto iskrivljen, ali nema veze, tako da ja neman takvih problema. Tako da ja osjećam da isto ovde ima tih problema, ali ja nisam to osjetila jer ja znam jezik pa sam ja više prihvaćena.

I: Opet, ovde kad govoriš hrvatski, kad tad netko primjeti pa te pita odakle si?

C: Pitaju me ako sam s otoka.

I: S otoka?

C: Aha, ne znam zašto.

I: Kad razgovaraš s ljudima, je li te krenu ono ispravljat kad kažeš nešto, kad koristiš neki drugi padež?

C: Prija, prija zna da mi može popraviti, i ja to volim kad mi padeže popravi, ali općenito ne...ne, ne, nikada me...van nje nije mi se nikad desilo.

I: I nitko te ne zafrkava?

C: Ne.

## 5. Conclusion

---

This research was carried out by conducting semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews with seven bilingual participants who have returned to Croatia after having lived in the USA and analysing the data while focusing on four major topics: linguistic transfers/crosslinguistic influence/codeswitching; reasons that govern those phenomena; language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition as well as language attitudes.

Regarding crosslinguistic influence, we found numerous examples of transfers from English into Croatian at all levels of language: phonological, morphosyntactical and semantic levels. At the phonological level of linguistic analysis we analyzed examples of convergence towards English forms and diphthongization. At the morphosyntactical level we observed examples of untypical usage of the conjunction *ako* in conditional and dependent alternative and interrogative clauses, the introduction of a novel conjunction *čim kad*, the overgeneralization of the adverb *kao* as well as the omission of the adverb *kao*, conversion of a noun into an adverb and an adjective, the transference of the empty *it* into Croatian, novel verb government, untypical usage of prepositions in time expressions and the transference of

English word order reflected in untypical positions of the clitic. At the semantic level I found several nouns, verbs and adjectives were used with a transferred meaning.

Within this thesis I also tried to shed some light on the reasons behind codeswitching. There are numerous reasons and motivations that lead speakers to codeswitch, whether they do it on purpose or unintentionally. It is not surprising therefore that the codeswitching of the participants served a range of functions. The participants codeswitched when talking about distinctly American phenomena to discuss the work/school domain. Sometimes they switched to English because they could not remember the Croatian word for the concept. There were also instances of codeswitching connected with reiteration of the message in order to clarify it further and sometimes codeswitching occurred because of quoting messages conveyed in English. Furthermore, codeswitching was in certain cases facilitated by different trigger words, proper names and bilingual homophones. In addition to this, interjections and fillers were also often used in English.

With respect to language attrition and incomplete/heritage language acquisition, no signs of language attrition were found in the generation 1A. This can be connected with the fact that they had been exposed to Croatian while in the USA: they frequently used Croatian at home with their children or spouses, that they participated in the activities of and spent time with the Croatian community in the USA, that they visited Croatia and stayed in touch with their families in the homeland, and eventually returned to Croatia.

Regarding incomplete/heritage language acquisition, we observed signs of non-target acquisition, especially in case of Cecilia, such as using novel verb forms, mixing verbs similar in form, untypical choice of cases regarding verbal government and using non-typical noun and adjective gender. This is not unusual considering the fact that Cecilia was born and raised in the USA, which led to her restricted exposure and use of Croatian, which she spoke only at home and in the Croatian Club, where, however, there were second generation immigrants and did not speak Croatian. Furthermore she has never received any formal lessons in Croatian and the language of her education both in the States and in Croatia has been English. We observed no signs of incomplete/heritage language acquisition in Marko. We can connect this with the fact that he moved to Croatia at the age of nine, where his exposure to Croatian language has significantly increased. He has completed his primary, secondary and tertiary education in Croatia, and an additional benefit was that he was given Croatian lessons while still living in the US. However, he reported having some problems when he first moved to

Croatia, mentioning his issues with case-marking. In the stretches of speech that Nina produced in Croatian no signs of non-target language acquisition were observed. Nonetheless both her mother and she report that she has trouble understanding Croatian – when communicating with her teachers, reading or watching TV. A lack of vocabulary, especially in the domain of school, was also reported. We relate this to the fact that Nina emigrated at an early age to a country where her exposure to Croatian was limited and restricted almost exclusively to her home, considering the fact that they did not socialize with other members of the Croatian community in Seattle and that her language of education and communication with her peers was mostly English.

With regard to language attitudes and attitudes towards codeswitching, we found numerous interesting phenomena. The generation 1A expressed a negative attitude towards codeswitching, claiming that they tried to keep their languages separate. They also hold the language variety of their fellow Croatian immigrants, which is laden with crosslinguistic influences and codeswitching, in low regard, even making a connection between such speech and uneducatedness and rural background of the speakers. Toni and Ljiljana regret the fact that Toni's children did not learn how to speak Croatia, with Ljiljana showing resentment towards the fact that a lot of children of immigrants do not acquire their heritage language. Gabriela, on the other hand, despite wanting her children to speak Croatian, did not try to insist on it, feeling that the young bilinguals who are forced into learning their heritage language often seem 'lost'. Marko and Cecilia showed no negative attitude towards crosslinguistic influences and codeswitching, whereas Nina is strongly against switching between codes in her speech because she finds it 'weird'. She insists on finishing the topic in the language in which it started and then proceeding to speak another language, if necessary. Concerning attitudes towards the standard variety of the language, Marko and Cecilia explicitly stated that they do not care for it that much and that they wish to speak the local variety of Croatian.

Regarding language preferences, Toni and Ljiljana prefer Croatian, while Branko and Gabriela state that they like both languages the same and relate that to loving both countries the same – showing that language can be a strong symbol of national identity. Marko and Cecilia did not state any preference for any language, while Nina prefers English due to her higher level of proficiency. With respect to attitudes of other people towards their bilingualism and use of language, everyone except for Cecilia claimed that they experienced no problems or negativity directed towards their speech in either country, in several instances connecting

this with the fact that the US is a multinational state, which is why its citizens are used to multilingualism. Cecilia, however, reported that her friends did not like for her to express her Croatian heritage and language so much. She also received comments that she should stop acting like a Croatian and be more American. This we can relate to the fact that, as previously stated, language can be a signal of national group membership and be seen as a sign of loyalty to that nation.

## 6. References

---

### Books and articles:

Andersen G. (2000). The role of the pragmatic marker *like* in utterance interpretation. In G. Andersen (Ed.), *Pragmatic Markers and Prepositional Attitude* (pp. 17-39). Philadelphia, PA/Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Barić, E., Lončarić, M., Malić, D., Pavešić, S., Peti, M., Zečević, V., & Znika, M. (1997). *Hrvatska gramatika* (2nd ed.). Zagreb, Croatia: Školska knjiga.

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S. A., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage Languages and Their Speakers: Opportunities and Challenges for Linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 39, 129-181. doi:10.1515/tl-2013-0009

Bijeikienė, V., & Tamošiūnaitė, A. (2013). *Quantitative and qualitative research methods in sociolinguistics: study guide: a resource book for students*. Kaunas, Lithuania: Vytautas Magnus University.

Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-Switching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Caldas, S. J., & Caron-Caldas, S. (2002). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Language Preferences of Adolescent Bilinguals: Shifting Allegiances and Developing Identities. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(4), 490-514. doi:10.1093/applin/23.4.490

- Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (Ed.).(1998). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Edwards, J. (2006). Foundations of Bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (1st ed., pp. 7-32). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Flores, C.M.M. (2015). Understanding heritage language acquisition. Some contributions from the research on heritage speakers of European Portuguese. *Lingua 164*, 251-265. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2014.09.008
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gharibi, K. (2016). *Incomplete Acquisition, Attrition and Maintenance of Heritage Speakers' Family Language: Iranians in New Zealand* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10063/5561>
- Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying Bilinguals*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: a study in bilingual behavior* (Vol. I, II). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas. A Bibliography and Research Guide*. New York, NY: American Dialect Society.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Labov, W. (1984). Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In J. Baugh & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Language in Use: Reading in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 28-53). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- MacSwan, J. (2006). Code-Switching and Grammatical Theory . In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (1st ed., pp. 282-311). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Miller, L. (2017). The relationship between language proficiency and language attitudes. *Spanish in Context*, 14(1), 99-123. doi: 10.1075/sic.14.1.05mil
- Montrul, S. A. (2004). Convergent outcomes in L2 acquisition and L1 loss . In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpcke, M. C. Keijzer, & L. Weilemar (Eds.), *First Language Attrition* (1st ed., pp. 259-281). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Montrul, S.A. (2012). Is heritage language like a second language? In L. Roberts, C. Lindqvist, C. Bardel & N. Abrahamsson (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook 2012*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, n.p. Retrieved from: <http://www.eurosla.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Montrul.pdf>

- Morgan, G. (2014). Critical Period in Language Development. In P. J. Brookes & V. Kempe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language Development* (pp. 115-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2008). *Multiple Voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Otheguy, R., & Zantella, A.C. (2012). *Spanish in New York. Language Contact, Dialectal Leveling and Structural Continuity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004). L2 influence and L1 attrition in adult bilingualism. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. C. Keijzer, & L. Weilemar (Eds.), *First Language Attrition* (1st ed., pp. 47-61). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Polinsky, M. (2006). *Acquisition of Russian: uninterrupted and incomplete scenarios*. *Glossos*, 8, 1-64. Retrieved from [https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/uploads/media\\_items/8polinsky.original.pdf](https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/uploads/media_items/8polinsky.original.pdf).
- Puleo, S. (2007). *The Boston Italians: A Story of Pride, Perseverance, and Paesani, from the Years of the Great Immigration to the Present Day*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum S. (1976). *A University Grammar of English* (5th ed). London, UK: Longman.
- Ritchie W.C. & Bhatia, T. K. (2006). Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Bhatia (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (1st ed., pp. 336-356). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Rovira, J.M.R. (2015). Attitudes Towards State Languages versus Minority Languages in the Contemporary World: The Case of Catalan in Sardinia. *New Diversities* 17(2). Retrieved from: [http://newdiversities.mmg.mpg.de/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2015\\_17-02\\_NewDiversities-2.pdf](http://newdiversities.mmg.mpg.de/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2015_17-02_NewDiversities-2.pdf)
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Massey, D. S. (2013). Immigration & Language Diversity in the United States. *Daedalus*, 142(3), 141-154. doi:10.1162/daed\_a\_00224
- Schmid, M. S. (2011). *Language Attrition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shanmuganathan, T. (2005). Ethics and the Observer's Paradox. *RELC Journal*, 36(1), 73-84. doi:10.1177/0033688205053483
- Starčević, A. (2014). *Hrvatski i engleski jezik u dodiru: hrvatska iseljenička obitelj u Kanadi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sveučilište u Zagrebu. Retrieved from <http://beta.bib.irb.hr/738982>

Starčević, A. (2016). Trenirka, diktafon i "iskrivljen hrvatski": metodološki izazovi sociolingvističkog intervjua i sudioničkog promatranja. In S. L. Udier & K. Cergol Kovačević (Eds.), *Metodologija i primjena lingvističkih istraživanja* (pp. 3-17). Zagreb, Croatia: Srednja Europa. Retrieved from: <http://beta.bib.irb.hr/815033>

Tagliamonte, S. (2011). *Variationist sociolinguistics: change, observation, interpretation*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* (4th ed.). London, UK: Penguin Books Limited.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact, findings and problems*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Official government statistics:

Agencija za statistiku Bosne i Hercegovine (2016). *Census of population, households and dwellings in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2013: Final results*. Retrieved from: <http://www.popis2013.ba/popis2013/doc/Popis2013prvoIzdanje.pdf>

“Status of Croatian immigrants and their descendants abroad“. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.hrvatiizvanrh.hr/en/hmiu/status-of-croatian-immigrants-and-their-descendants-abroad/15>

“Status of Croatian minorities abroad“. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.hrvatiizvanrh.hr/en/hmiu/status-of-croatian-minorities-abroad/2>

Dictionary entries:

convince. (2017). In *English Oxford Living Dictionaries*. Retrieved from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/convince>

egzistirati. (n.d.) In *Hrvatski jezični portal*. Retrieved from: <http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search>

exist. (2017). In *English Oxford Living Dictionaries*. Retrieved from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/exist>

graduate. (2017) In *English Oxford Living Dictionaries*. Retrieved from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/graduate>

institution. (2017). In *English Oxford Living Dictionaries*. Retrieved from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/institution>