

MARCIN ZABAWA
University of Silesia

LANGUAGE CONTACT, BILINGUALISM AND LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE: THE INFLUENCE OF L2 ON L1 COMPETENCE*

The aim of the present study, set in the Polish-English context, is to discuss to what extent, if any, L1 competence (semantic, phraseological and grammatical) is influenced by the language contact, understood here as the (advanced) knowledge of L2, i.e. English. The research is based on the questionnaire consisting of 23 short excerpts taken from newspaper articles or texts published on the Internet, adapted by the author of the article. The texts in the questionnaire contain various kinds of borrowings and calques from English, such as semantic loans, loan translations (new phrases, collocations or idiomatic expressions) and grammatical constructions modelled on English. The questionnaire was given to two groups of informants: the main group (i.e. the bilingual one), consisting of 4th year students of English at the University of Silesia enrolled in the teaching programme, and the control group, consisting of students of various fields (excluding English or Polish studies) who declared limited knowledge of English. The respondents from both groups were given the questionnaire and their task was to read the sentences carefully and then to decide whether some words or phrases seemed incorrect or unnatural in a given context. The study has corroborated the view that language contact has some repercussions at the individual level: the knowledge of L2 may and does influence L1 competence. Not all the areas (semantic, phraseological and grammatical), however, are affected to an equal extent.

1. Introduction. The notion of language contact

The notion of language contact can be understood in two different ways. First, as a sociolinguistic concept, referring to the situation of closeness of two languages (geographical or social, or both); in this understanding, direct and

* This is a substantially revised and updated version of the paper presented at "Languages in Contact" Conference in Wrocław, Poland (2011).

indirect contact situations can be distinguished, the former being connected with contact between speakers of the two languages (e.g. in the situation of immigrants) while the latter can be realized e.g. through the media, the Internet, etc¹. Second, language contact can be understood in a more restricted sense, with reference to bilingual people only: two languages are then said to be in contact when they are used by the same person in different situations. It is this, i.e. the more restricted sense, that will be discussed and analyzed in the present paper.

The most evident sign of language contact is the existence of borrowings of various kinds, primarily, albeit not exclusively, lexical ones² (both at the individual level and at the level of the society as a whole, which reflects the two approaches to language contact outlined in the previous paragraph). Furthermore, the language contact at the individual level may be, and often is, manifested through the influence of one language upon the competence in another. Thus, it should be explicitly stressed that it is not only the production, i.e. linguistic performance, which is affected (cf. the borrowings in one's speech or writing), but linguistic competence may be affected as well.

The aim of the present study will thus be to discuss to what extent, if any, L1 competence (semantic, phraseological and grammatical) is influenced by the language contact, understood here as the (advanced) knowledge of L2. The paper is set in the Polish (L1) – English (L2) context. The research is based on the questionnaire of the type referred to as acceptability judgment test³. Other studies of this type (i.e. trying to measure the influence of L2 on both competence and production in L1) include e.g. Latkowska (2001a, 2006a, 2006b), who discusses the results of a translation task from English into Polish (2001a, 2006a), an acceptability judgment task (2001a) and the results of a picture-naming task (2006b), Ewert (2008), who analyzes L1 syntactic competence among mono- and bilingual speakers⁴ and Krężałek (2007), who analyzes the summaries in Polish written by the students of English, studying at the University of Silesia, in their MA theses and then discusses the results of the grammaticality judgment task based on such sentences. The present study, unlike most of the previous studies, tries to focus on all three perspectives at the same time: semantic (i.e. connected with semantic loans of English origin in Polish), phraseological (i.e. connected with collocations modelled on English and literal translations from English), and grammatical. First, however, the notion of the loss of linguistic competence, i.e. language attrition, must be briefly discussed.

¹ For more on this, cf. Zabawa (2007, 2010).

² For more on various types of English borrowings in Polish, cf. e.g. Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1993, 2006), Markowski (1992, 2004), Miodek (1980), Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000), Witalisz (2007), Zabawa (2012).

³ For more on such types of tests, cf. Latkowska (2001b), Altenberg and Vago (2004). The questionnaire used in the present study comprises both lexical acceptability and grammaticality judgement test.

⁴ Ewert uses a preference test, which, as she explains, can be seen as a subtype of a grammaticality judgement test.

2. Language attrition: general remarks

According to de Bot and Hulsen (2002: 254), language attrition can be defined as “a decrease in language proficiency *at the individual level*” [emphasis mine] and should be clearly distinguished from language shift, understood as “a decline of L1 proficiency *at the group level*” [emphasis mine]⁵. A somehow different definition of L1 attrition (influenced by L2) is provided by Pavlenko (2004: 47), who sees it as “loss of some L1 elements, seen in inability to produce, perceive, or recognise particular rules, lexical items, concepts, or categorical distinctions”. Richards and Schmidt (2002: 286) add that the process is gradual rather than sudden. De Bot and Hulsen (2002: 254) also specify possible causes of language attrition (loss), which may arise from both (1) non-pathological processes, including language contact, language change and disuse of a language and (2) pathological processes, including brain damage, aphasia and dementia. The present paper is concerned with only one of these processes, namely language contact.

Furthermore, de Bot and Hulsen (2002) distinguish four types of language loss:

- L1 loss in an L1 environment
- L1 loss in an L2 environment
- L2 loss in an L1 environment
- L2 loss in an L2 environment.

The present paper is concerned with one of the least frequent types, i.e. the first one (L1 loss in an L1 environment). Such loss of L1 competence may happen as a result of heavy exposure to L2; such situation can potentially exist in the case of students studying a foreign language. The present article is concerned with the Polish students studying English in the Institute of English at the University of Silesia.

As Krężalek and Wysocka note, students themselves admit that their language is in the constant process of change and can be described as “incomplete” and “far from ideal”. What is more, it applies to both L1 and L2. The authors claim that, interestingly but perhaps not surprisingly, “the more proficient the target language learner, the greater the perception of their linguistic deficiencies” (Krężalek and Wysocka 2009: 254). As their research, carried out on the group of students studying English at the University of Silesia, indicates, the majority of first year students tend not to notice any signs of L1 attrition: as much as 50% of the informants *rather* disagreed with the possibility of L1 attrition, 6% *strongly* disagreed, while only 31% *rather* agreed, and, perhaps most unexpectedly, *none* of the informants strongly agreed with the possibility of L1 attrition⁶.

⁵ Cf. also Yagmur (2004: 135-136), who discusses other definitions of language attrition.

⁶ 12% of the informants choose the answer “I do not know”. The numbers must have been approximated as they amount to 99%.

Interestingly, the picture becomes completely different when final year students have been taken into account: this time, in Krężałek and Wysocka's research, as much as 41% of the informants strongly agreed with the possibility of L1 attrition⁷, the next 41% rather agreed, whereas only 17% rather disagreed and *none* of the informants strongly disagreed with the possibility of L1 attrition⁸. Thus, there is a clear difference in the perception of L1 attrition among the students of the first and final year of study. In the former case, no one has strongly agreed with the possibility of losing some of L1 competence, whereas in the latter no one has strongly disagreed with the possibility in question.

3. Research design

3.1. The questionnaire

The research, as was stated at the beginning, has been based on a questionnaire. It consists of 23 short texts; each text comprises between 1 and 5 sentences (between 9 and 40 words). All the texts were in the informants' L1, i.e. Polish. They were mostly quotations, either from newspaper articles or from texts published on the Internet (some of the quotations were manipulated in some way by the author, e.g. by replacing one word with a different one). A full text of the questionnaire (in Polish) can be found in the appendix.

The majority of the sentences in the questionnaire contain one of the three types of borrowings and calques from English: borrowed at the level of (1) words, (2) phrases and (3) grammatical constructions. The list of erroneous constructions is given in Table 1 below.

The first group (the level of words) includes semantic borrowings⁹, abbreviated to S (see Table 1 below), e.g. **dwie alternatywy* (lit. 'two alternatives') instead of correct (*jedna alternatywa* or *dwie możliwości* (lit. '(one) alternative', 'two possibilities')).

The second group (the level of phrases) comprises various kinds of loan translations and literal translations of idioms, collocations, etc., abbreviated to F. As for examples, one could mention the phrase **ślepy jak nietoperz* ('blind as a bat') instead of correct *ślepy jak kret* (lit. 'blind as a mole').

⁷ In fact, as Krężałek and Wysocka note, most of the students in this group perceived some regression of their skills in L1, i.e. Polish, under the influence of L2, i.e. English.

⁸ Additionally, 5% of the informants choose the answer "I do not know". Again, the numbers must have been approximated (cf. Footnote 6) as they amount to 104%.

⁹ Some of the semantic borrowings used in the questionnaire were described in some detail by various linguists, cf. e.g. Chłopicki and Świątek (2000), Markowski (2002), Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000), Markowski and Pawelec (2001), Markowski (2004) and the present author (Zabawa 2004).

The third group (the level of grammatical constructions) consists of grammatical (mostly syntactic) borrowings of various types¹⁰, abbreviated to G, including e.g. the position of adjectives with respect to adjacent nouns, the use of noun clusters, etc. One could mention here such examples as **komiowy serial* ('sitcom', lit. 'comedy (Adj.) series') instead of correct *serial komiowy* (lit. 'series comedy (Adj.)').

Five texts contained no calques or borrowings from English, as they were meant as distractors. A complete list of erroneous constructions (together with possible corrections) used in the questionnaire can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1: List of erroneous constructions, together with corrections

Number & Type ¹¹	Erroneous construction	Proper correction ¹²	Other corrections given by the respondents (examples)
1 [F]	<i>*lepiej późno niż nigdy</i> [better late than never]	lepiej późno niż wcale [°better late than not at all]	
2 [-]	[meant as a distractor]		
3 [F]	<i>*ślepy jak nietoperz</i> [blind as a bat]	ślepy jak kret [°blind as a mole]	kura, koń [hen, horse]
4 [S]	lider [leader]	potentat, czołowy / największy producent [°the biggest / leading producer / manufacturer]	
5 [-]	[meant as a distractor]		
6 [F]	<i>*zamknąć na to oczy</i> [close your eyes to sth]	przymknąć na to oko [°squint an eye on sth]	przymknąć na to oczy [°squint eyes on sth]
7 [G]	<i>*komiowy serial</i> [sitcom; lit. comedy-adj. series]	serial komiowy [°series comedy-adj.]	

¹⁰ Some of the syntactic borrowings used in the questionnaire were discussed by a number of linguists, including Arabski (2006), Otwinowska-Kasztelanica (2000), Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1993), Markowski (1992), Chłopicki and Świątek (2000). In fact, some of them were noticed in Polish as early as in 1980 (cf. Miodek 1980).

¹¹ 'Number' refers to the number of the sentence (cf. Appendix), 'type' to the type of borrowing: F – a loan translation (a new phrase, collocation or idiomatic expression); S – a semantic borrowing; G – a grammatical borrowing.

¹² Literal translations are preceded by the sign °. The majority of the constructions of this type are of course non-existent in English and are given here in order to help the people who do not speak Polish.

Number & Type	Erroneous construction	Proper correction	Other corrections given by the respondents (examples)
8 [S]	*dwie alternatywy [<i>two alternatives</i>]	(jedna) alternatywa, dwie możliwości, dwa wyjścia [<i>°(one) alternative, two possibilities</i>]	
9 [S]	*wyrafinowany system komputerowy [<i>a sophisticated computer system</i>]	wyspecjalizowany, nowoczesny, dokładny, skomplikowany, zaawansowany technicznie, specjalistyczny, dobrze działający [<i>°specialized, modern, complicated, complex, advanced</i>]	
10 [S]	*nowa generacja żyletek [<i>a new generation of razor blades</i>]	model, typ, seria, rodzaj [<i>°model, type, kind</i>]	
11 [F]	*suchy jak kość [<i>dry as a bone</i>]	suchy jak pieprz [<i>°dry as pepper</i>]	suchy na kość, suchy jak wiór, suchy jak pustynia, suchy jak nitka, suchy jak liść, suchy jak Sahara, twardy jak kość, bardzo suchy, naprawdę suchy [<i>°dry to the bone, dry as a desert, dry as a thread, dry as a leaf, dry as the Sahara, hard as a bone, very dry, really dry</i>]
12 [-]	<i>[meant as a distractor]</i>		
13 [G]	*generalnie [used on the model of English <i>generally</i> , i.e. to modify an entire sentence]	zazwyczaj, zasadniczo, ogólnie [<i>°usually, generally</i>]	ostatnio [<i>°recently</i>]

Number & Type	Erroneous construction	Proper correction	Other corrections given by the respondents (examples)
14 [F]	*czerwona szmata na byka [<i>a red rag to a bull</i>]	czerwona płachta na byka [<i>°a red sheet to a bull</i>]	
15 [-]	<i>[meant as a distractor]</i>		
16 [G]	*auto szyby [<i>windcreens, lit. car panes</i>]	szyby samochodowe [<i>°panes car-adj.</i>]	auto-szyby
17 [G]	*żeglarski obóz [<i>a sailing camp</i>]	obozы żeglarskie [<i>°a camp sailing-adj.</i>]	
18 [S]	*dieta [on the model of English <i>diet</i> , i.e. a food that a person normally eats]	jadłospis, pożywienie, jedzenie, menu [<i>°menu, food</i>]	
19 [G]	*Biznes Linia [<i>Business Line</i>]	Linia Biznesowa [<i>°Line Business-adj.</i>]	Business Linia
20 [F]	*drugi największy dziennik [<i>the second largest daily newspaper</i>]	drugi co do wielkości [<i>°second as to the size</i>]	drugi dziennik, drugi najpopularniejszy dziennik [<i>°a second daily newspaper, the second most popular newspaper</i>]
21 [-]	<i>[meant as a distractor]</i>		
22 [F]	*ubrania z drugiej ręki [<i>second-hand clothes</i>]	ubrania używane [<i>°used clothes</i>]	
23 [S]	*morze było perfekcyjnie spokojne [<i>the sea was perfectly calm</i>]	morze było idealnie spokojnie [<i>°the sea was ideally calm</i>]	

3.2. The informants

The research was conducted on the group of 100 students of English at the University of Silesia. One could perhaps raise an objection that the number of informants is too small to draw general conclusions concerning the influence of English on native (i.e. Polish) language competence. It seems, nevertheless, that it is large enough to highlight certain tendencies. Besides, the present study is a small-scale one, intended for obtaining some introductory results and meant as a guide to future research, rather than for achieving final and conclusive results.

The main group of informants (i.e. the bilingual group) consisted of 4th year students of English at the University of Silesia enrolled in the teaching programme (extramural supplementary master's degree programme). For the purpose of comparison, it has been necessary to form the control group, which should ideally consist of educated monolingual speakers of Polish. However, the task of completing such a group proved very difficult, not least because the vast majority of young Poles know English to a greater or lesser extent. Nevertheless, the control group (also referred to as the monolingual group, despite the possible inadequacy of the term) has been gathered: it consists of students of various fields (excluding English or Polish studies) who declared limited knowledge of English. Both groups consist of 50 informants; altogether, as was mentioned above, 100 people have been questioned.

3.3. The procedure

The informants were given the questionnaire and their task was to read the sentences carefully and then to decide whether some of the words or phrases seemed incorrect or unnatural in a given context. They were instructed not to look for spelling or punctuation errors, but concentrate rather on lexical and syntactic ones. Additionally, they were asked to underline such incorrect or unnatural fragments and offer a correction¹³. Finally, they were asked to tick all the sentences that they perceived as perfectly acceptable without any changes. They had as much time as they needed to complete the task.

It must also be added at this point that the respondents offered plenty of corrections, but most of them were connected with word order and stylistics. It can thus be said that the informants concentrated mostly on stylistic improvements. Such corrections are, however, irrelevant from the point of view of the present study and have not been taken into account.

4. The results of the study

It was expected that the knowledge of L2 would have a clear influence on L1 competence, i.e. bilingual respondents would accept erroneous constructions in Polish more frequently than the monolingual group (cf. the results obtained by e.g. Latkowska 2001a: 155-156). Interestingly and rather surprisingly, this has proved to be only partly true in the present study.

The results are presented in detail in Table 2 below. The table is arranged according to the types of loans. Semantic loans (S) are preceded by phrasal borrowings (F) and followed by grammatical ones (G).

¹³ Examples of informants' corrections are given in Table 1.

Table 2: The results of the study

Key to the table:

Column 1: the type of borrowing and the number of the sentence (cf. Appendix).

Column 2: the key word of a borrowing (given here for easy identification).

Column 3: the number of respondents from the main (bilingual) group (given also in percentage terms) who did not react to a given construction.

Column 4: the number of respondents from the main (bilingual) group (given also in percentage terms) who reacted to a given construction.

Column 5: the same as Column 3, but with respect to the control ('no English') group.

Column 6: the same as Column 4, but with respect to the control ('no English') group.

1	2	3		4		5	6
		Group 1 (bilinguals)		Group 2 (no English – control group)			
Type [№]	Key word	No reaction	Reaction	No reaction	Reaction		
F [1]	nigdy <i>[never]</i>	5 [10%]	45 [90%]	8 [16%]	42 [84%]		
F [3]	nietoperz <i>[bat]</i>	39 [78%]	11 [22%]	32 [64%]	18 [36%]		
F [6]	przymknąć <i>[close]</i>	11 [22%]	39 [78%]	5 [10%]	45 [90%]		
F [11]	kość <i>[bone]</i>	20 [40%]	30 [60%]	13 [26%]	37 [74%]		
F [14]	szmata <i>[rag]</i>	5 [10%]	45 [90%]	3 [6%]	47 [94%]		
F [20]	drugi największy <i>[second largest]</i>	45 [90%]	5 [10%]	42 [84%]	8 [16%]		
F [22]	z drugiej ręki <i>[secondhand]</i>	41 [82%]	9 [18%]	44 [88%]	6 [12%]		
S [8]	alternatywa <i>[alternative]</i>	49 [98%]	1 [2%]	39 [78%]	11 [22%]		
S [4]	lider <i>[leader]</i>	50 [100%]	-	47 [94%]	3 [6%]		
S [9]	wyrafinowany <i>[sophisticated]</i>	31 [62%]	19 [38%]	24 [48%]	26 [52%]		
S [10]	generacja <i>[generation]</i>	41 [82%]	9 [18%]	39 [78%]	11 [22%]		

1	2	3	4	5	6
		Group 1 (bilinguals)		Group 2 (no English – control group)	
Type [№]	Key word	No reaction	Reaction	No reaction	Reaction
S [18]	dieta [<i>diet</i>]	50 [100%]	-	50 [100%]	-
S [23]	perfekcyjnie [<i>perfectly</i>]	28 [56%]	22 [44%]	16 [32%]	34 [68%]
G [7]	komediodowy serial [<i>sitcom</i>]	44 [88 %]	6 [12%]	45 [90%]	5 [10%]
G [17]	żeglarski obóz [<i>sailing camp</i>]	47 [94%]	3 [6%]	47 [94%]	3 [6%]
G [16]	auto szyby [<i>windcreens</i>]	45 [90%]	5 [10%]	47 [94%]	3 [6%]
G [13]	generalnie [<i>generally</i>]	46 [92%]	4 [8%]	39 [78%]	11 [22%]
G [19]	Biznes Linia [<i>Business Line</i>]	49 [98%]	1 [2%]	45 [90%]	5 [10%]

As one can see, there exists a clear correspondence between the bilingual and control groups as to their sensitivity to changes in the Polish language triggered by English. The distinction between the two groups is particularly easily noticeable in the case of semantic borrowings (S): the monolingual group was able to spot the semantic borrowings more frequently, as the ‘no reaction’ rate was significantly lower than in the case of the bilingual group. The only exception was the word *dieta*, used on the model of English *diet* (i.e. ‘a food that a person regularly eats’), which was accepted by all the respondents irrespective of the group¹⁴.

The situation looks a bit different in the case of the borrowings at the level of phrases (F). Again, the monolingual group noticed more improper constructions, but the difference between the groups is less significant than in the case of semantic borrowings: the informants from the ‘no English’ group reacted more frequently than those from the bilingual one in five out of seven cases. In the remaining two cases (sentences number 1 and 22) it is the bilingual group that was able to spot the improper constructions more frequently. The difference between the two groups is thus still easily noticeable, but nevertheless less significant than in the case of semantic borrowings (see above).

¹⁴ *Dieta* in the new meaning is frequently used nowadays e.g. in the Polish press, TV, etc. As a result, this new usage has become completely assimilated and does no longer appear to be foreign or unnatural.

As for the third group of borrowings, i.e. grammatical ones (G), the situation is different, as the results obtained by both groups appear to be roughly similar. The 'no English group' was better in spotting inappropriate grammatical constructions in two cases (out of five): the use of *generalnie* as a discourse marker¹⁵ (sentence 13) and the use of a noun qualifying other noun¹⁶ (*Biznes Linia*, sentence 19). The bilingual group, by contrast, reacted more frequently in the case of an adjective in the attributive position instead of the postpositive one¹⁷ (*komediowy serial*, sentence 7) and the use of a noun qualifying other noun (*auto szyby*, sentence 16). In the remaining case (the improper use of an adjective in the phrase *żeglarskie obozy*, sentence 17) the same number of informants from both groups has reacted to the construction in question. It can thus be stated that there are no noticeable distinctions between the two groups in spotting the improper syntactic constructions. It might be due to the fact that, on one hand, the monolingual group may retain a higher competence in L1 (cf. Krężalek and Wysocka's research), but on the other hand, the bilingual respondents' attention was most probably directed towards certain differences between English and Polish grammar (such as the position of an adjective in relation to a noun) during the course of their studies (especially during such courses as contrastive grammar and/or translation).

It is also worth noting that, in general, wrong grammatical constructions were spotted much less frequently (by the informants from both groups) than the majority of semantic borrowings and improper constructions at the level of phrases.

5. Conclusions

The present study has corroborated the view that the knowledge of L2 may and does influence L1 competence. Not all the areas, however, are affected to an equal extent. The influence of L2 upon L1 competence was most readily detectable in the case of semantic borrowings: the monolingual group performed much better than the bilingual one. In almost all of the cases, save one, the respondents from the control group spotted the wrong use of words more frequently. The only exception was the case of *dieta*, described in the article. Thus, it can be concluded that the knowledge of L2 may somehow negatively affect semantic competence in L1; this, in turn, seems to be a plausible explanation of the sources of many of semantic borrowings in Polish: they are clearly introduced by bilingual people due to lowered semantic competence in L1.

¹⁵ For details on this use of *generalnie*, cf. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000: 100-102).

¹⁶ For more on the attributive use of nouns under the influence of English, cf. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000: 107-110).

¹⁷ For more on the wrong use of adjectives (modelled probably on English), cf. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000: 103-107).

In the case of changes in Polish at the level of phrases, the control group was, on average, again able to spot faulty constructions with greater frequency than the bilingual group. The distinction is, however, not as readily noticeable as in the case of changes at the level of the meaning of individual words. Interestingly, the changes at the level of phrases (i.e. wrong collocations, literal translations of English phrases and idiomatic expressions, etc.) were noticed by a relatively high percentage of the informants (irrespective of the group). This may point to the fact L1 collocations and idiomatic expressions are deeply rooted and are not likely to be replaced by their English counterparts. Thus the phraseological competence, i.e. the one connected with the proper formation of collocations and idiomatic expressions, seems to be the most resistant to change, especially in contrast to changes at the level of syntax (see below). It may, nevertheless, be negatively affected by L2.

Finally, in the case of changes at the level of syntactic constructions, the results for both groups are roughly similar. What is perhaps even more important, the percentage of the respondents who noticed given grammatical borrowings was very low, irrespective of the group. This may point out to the fact that changes in Polish at the level of syntactic constructions are particularly insidious, as they were very rarely noticed and commented upon by the respondents, both monolingual and with the advanced knowledge of English. This shows that the influence of L2 on L1 competence does not always amount to the fact that a bilingual person is not able to trace as many calques and loans of English origin as the monolingual one.

It should be stressed as a final conclusion that Polish university teachers of English, particularly those teaching the courses related to students' L1, such as e.g. contrastive linguistics or written translation, should pay a great deal of attention not only to students' L2, but to their native language as well. In particular, students' attention should be directed to semantic and grammatical influence of English upon present-day Polish. They, i.e. the students of English, as reported by Krężałek and Wysocka (2009), are usually aware that their L1 competence has decreased; it is necessary to help them understand what has actually changed.

References

- Altenberg, E. P., and R. M. Vago. 2004. The role of grammaticality judgments in investigating first language attrition. A cross-disciplinary perspective. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer and L. Weilemar (eds.) *First Language Attrition. Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*, 105-129. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Arabski, J. 2006. Language Transfer in Language Learning and Language Contact. In J. Arabski (ed.) *Cross-linguistic Influences in the Second Language Lexicon*, 12-21. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- de Bot, K., and M. Hulsen. 2002. Language Attrition: Tests, Self-Assessments and Perceptions. In V. Cook (ed.) *Portraits of the L2 User*, 253-276. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chłopicki, W., and J. Świątek. 2000. *Angielski w polskiej reklamie*. Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ewert, A. 2008. L1 Syntactic Preferences of Polish Adolescents in Bilingual and Monolingual Education Programmes. In D. Gabryś-Barker (ed.) *Morphosyntactic Issues in Second Language Acquisition*, 47-62. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kreżalek, A. 2007. Linguistic change within a bilingual mind: in search of L1 attrition among the Polish university students of English. In J. Arabski, D. Gabryś-Barker and A. Łyda (eds.) *PASE Papers 2007, vol. 1: Studies in Language and Methodology of Teaching Foreign Languages*, 390-398. Katowice: Para.
- Kreżalek, A., and M. Wysocka. 2009. The state of incompleteness in a bilingual user. *Linguistica Silesiana* 30: 253-260.
- Latkowska, J. 2001a. The influence of the L2 on L1 competence: a study of crosslinguistic interaction in an L1 environment. In J. Arabski (ed.) *Insights into Foreign Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 149-162. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Latkowska, J. 2001b. Remarks on the application of grammaticality judgment tests in studies of cross-linguistic influence. In J. Arabski (ed.) *Research on Foreign Language Acquisition*, 19-24. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Latkowska, J. 2006a. On the Use of Translation in Studies of Language Contact. In J. Arabski (ed.) *Cross-linguistic Influences in the Second Language Lexicon*, 210-255. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Latkowska, J. 2006b. L2 influence on L1 conceptual representations: a case for multi-competence? *Linguistica Silesiana* 27: 147-160.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. 1993. Uwagi o wpływie języka angielskiego na polszczyznę końca XX w. *Język Polski* LXXIII 4-5: 279-281.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. 2006. *Angielsko-polskie kontakty językowe*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Markowski, A. 1992. Nowsze zapożyczenia w polszczyźnie: anglicyzmy gramatyczne i leksykalne. *Poradnik Językowy* 3: 237-241.
- Markowski, A. (ed.). 2002. *Nowy słownik poprawnej polszczyzny PWN*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Markowski, A. 2004. O pojęciu i typach internacjonalizmów semantycznych. *Poradnik Językowy* 2: 39-50.
- Markowski, A., and R. Pawelec. 2001. *Wielki słownik wyrazów obcych i trudnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wilga.
- Miodek, J. 1980. A klasa i test-mecz. *Język Polski* LX 2-3: 180-181.
- Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. 2000. *A study of the lexico-semantic and grammatical influence of English on the Polish of the younger generation of Poles (19-35 years of age)*. Warszawa: Dialog.
- Pavlenko, A. 2004. L2 influence and L1 attrition in adult bilingualism. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer and L. Weilemar (eds.) *First Language Attrition. Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*, 47-59. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Richards, J. C., and R. Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Third edition*. London: Longman.

- Yagmur, K. 2004. Issues in finding the appropriate methodology in language attrition research. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer and L. Weilemar (eds.) *First Language Attrition. Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*, 133-164. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Witalisz, A. 2007. *Anglosemantyzmy w języku polskim – ze słownikiem*. Kraków: Tertium.
- Zabawa, M. 2004. Nowe zapożyczenia semantyczne w polszczyźnie. *Poradnik Językowy* 9: 59-68.
- Zabawa, M. 2007. Language Contact and Foreign Language Teaching. In J. Arabski (ed.) *On Foreign Language Acquisition and Effective Learning*, 89-102. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Zabawa, M. 2010. The influence of English on the Polish language of Internet message boards: investigating the role of individual differences and the context. *Linguistica Silesiana* 31: 219-233.
- Zabawa, M. 2012. *English lexical and semantic loans in informal spoken Polish*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Appendix

Proszę uważnie przeczytać poniższe teksty (są to głównie cytaty z artykułów prasowych i tekstów zamieszczonych w Internecie), a następnie podkreślić wszystkie wyrazy, frazy i zwroty, które wydają się Państwu niezręcznie lub nieprawidłowo sformułowane czy też niepasujące w danym kontekście. Proszę spróbować poprawić podkreślone fragmenty. Jeżeli akceptują Państwo dane zdanie jako prawidłowe, proszę o postawienie znaku ✓ obok tego zdania.

UWAGA! Proszę nie korzystać ze słowników podczas wypełniania ankiety, lecz opierać się wyłącznie na swojej intuicji językowej.

1. Rowerzyści naszego powiatu zostali w końcu docenieni. Zostały wytyczone nowe drogi rowerowe i postawione oznaczenia szlakowe. Cóż, lepiej późno niż nigdy. Choć patrząc z drugiej strony, takie trasy powinny powstać ładnych kilka lat temu.
2. Desperacja polskich wydawców „opowieści z dymkiem” nie zna granic. Jej wyrazem był ostatni Międzynarodowy Festiwal Komiksu w Łodzi, podczas którego ogłoszono konkurs na kontynuowanie cyklu o Kajku i Kokoszu.
3. Lojalnie cię ostrzegam, że to może być niebezpieczne. Widziałem raz chłopaczka, który wychłął butlę metanolu – niby nic mu nie było, a za chwilę był ślepy jak nietoperz. No cóż, taki los.
4. Zaczynał jako skromny przedsiębiorca działający na niewielką skalę, a obecnie stworzona przez niego firma jest światowym liderem w produkcji pasty do zębów.
5. Realizm socjalistyczny oficjalnie w Polsce trwał zaledwie pięć lat. Tak naprawdę nie umarł nigdy, a ostatnio przeżywa renesans. Zwłaszcza w rzeźbie.

6. „Nigdy nie używaj przekleństw”. Drugi punkt regulaminu. Nie zawsze przestrzegany, nawet przez mnie. Są po prostu sytuacje, w których można zamknąć na to oczy, ale takie przeklinanie na siłę to już jednak jest irytujące. Bardzo zatem proszę o pohamowanie się.
7. Komediodowy serial „Świat według Kiepskich”, wyświetlany w Polsce, bije rekordy popularności. W niedawne święta przyciągnął przed telewizory kilka milionów widzów.
8. Człowiek dojrzały potrafi nie pić alkoholu w ogóle lub spożywać go w sposób symboliczny. Natomiast alkoholikowi pozostają dwie alternatywy: całkowita abstynencja lub coraz bardziej dramatyczne nadużywanie alkoholu.
9. Metro wygląda bardzo nowocześnie. Jest też bezpieczne, bo kontrolowane przez wyrafinowany system komputerowy; w efekcie jest to najbardziej sensowny środek komunikacji w Sapporo. Szczególnie w mroźne zimowe dni.
10. Firma wprowadziła niedawno na rynek nową generację żyłek. Szefowie koncernu już zacierają ręce w oczekiwaniu na spodziewane zyski.
11. Poza kilkoma błotnistymi miejscami, Kampinos jest suchy jak kość, tak więc latem rowerzyści nie mają tu żadnych problemów; zresztą od pewnego czasu poziom wód w Puszczy generalnie się obniża.
12. Kiedy po śmierci wielkiego poety jego bliscy wyciągają z osieroconych szuflad wiersze, szkice i notatki, muszą się czuć niezręcznie. Mają przecież świadomość, że gdyby autor żył, niektóre z tych tekstów nigdy nie ujrzałyby światła dziennego.
13. Generalnie, dochód coraz bardziej idzie w parze z wykształceniem.
14. Kontrola skarbową działa na podatnika jak czerwona szmata na byka. Warto jest posiadać minimalną wiedzę na jej temat, by nie wpadać w panikę, nie tracić rozumu i zachowywać się przytomnie.
15. W ostatnich latach nordic walking zdobył ogromną popularność. Chodzenie z kijkami angażuje ponad 90 proc. wszystkich mięśni (ok. 600 mięśni).
16. Auto szyby – u nas najtaniej! Nasza firma oferuje nie tylko szeroki asortyment towaru, ale i bardzo szybką i sprawną realizację zamówień.
17. Przygodę z żeglarstwem zacząłem dość późno; dopiero w wieku 16 lat poznałem pierwsze tajniki tego sportu na żeglarskim obozie w Lubczynie nad jeziorem Dąbie. Niestety obóz był kiepsko zorganizowany.
18. Niestety, dieta przeciętnego Polaka jest wciąż zbyt uboga w ryby, warzywa i owoce, za dużo natomiast w niej mięsa i tłuszczu.
19. Dzięki Biznes Linii w każdej chwili, z dowolnego miejsca, możesz przez telefon przeprowadzać operacje finansowe lub umówić się na spotkanie ze swoim osobistym Doradcą Bankowym.
20. 22 października 2003 roku ukazała się nowa gazeta codzienna „Fakt”, wydana przez Axel Springer Polska. Średnia sprzedaż dziennika w pierwszym tygodniu wyniosła ponad 300 tys. egzemplarzy, co oznacza, iż „Fakt” od razu stał się drugim największym dziennikiem w Polsce.

21. Koniec z imprezami i głośną muzyką na Wielkim Murze Chińskim. Od maja władze wprowadzają surowe kary za niewłaściwe zachowanie na terenie tej budowli, umieszczanie na murze rysunków i zabieranie z niego cegieł.
22. Niestety, wciąż wiele osób przyznaje, że ich sytuacja materialna pozostawia bardzo dużo do życzenia. Twierdzą na przykład, że stać ich jedynie na ubrania z drugiej ręki. Jeszcze mniej osób stać na zakup porządnych nowych butów.
23. Załoga statku, dosyć błada i wymęczona, zapobiegawczo rozdawała kartonowe pudełka (takie, jak od chińskiego żarcia) i ostrzegała przed najgorszym. Jednak przez całą podróż morze było perfekcyjnie spokojne, tak że bez żadnych niespodzianek dotarliśmy do celu.