Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht

Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen: Lexical transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English learners of L3 German

Bilal Kırkıcı

Department of Foreign Language Education, Faculty of Education, Başkent University Faculty of Education, Bağlıca Yerleşkesi, Eskişehir Yolu 20. km, 06530 Ankara, Turkey. Tel: +90-312-2341010/1080, bkirkici@baskent.edu.tr, bkirkici@yahoo.com.

Erschienen online: 1. September 2007

Abstract. This study investigates Cross-linguistic Influence (CLI) at the lexical level in L1 Turkish, L2 English learners of L3 German. 282 written exams of 174 students of German as a Foreign Language at Middle East Technical University in Ankara/Turkey were analyzed for three different types of lexical CLI. The results showed that while CLI from L1 Turkish was almost completely absent, lexical transfer from L2 English was identified in various forms. These results are taken as further support for the widely accepted impact of two factors on CLI in multilingual acquisition settings: psycho-typology and the tendency to remain in a 'foreign language mode' during the processing of additional foreign languages.

1. Introduction

The study of cross-linguistic influence (CLI), or *transfer*, has been central in the field of second language acquisition. Studies dealing with CLI have, until recently, predominantly focused on the effects of a first language (L1) on the acquisition of a second language (L2) and vice versa (e.g., Kecskes & Papp 2000). Particularly over the past decade, however, the scope of CLI studies has broadened to include multilingual acquisition contexts, encompassing research studies that go beyond mere L1-L2 interaction and take into account the complex transfer relations of L1-L2-L3-Lx combinations. In spite of the fact that the study of CLI in multilingual acquisition contexts is still relatively unexplored and possibly poses more questions than it currently answers, it has been firmly established that not only a learner's L1, but also his additional language(s) can act as a source of influence in the acquisition of further languages (e.g., Cenoz 2001; König, Cedden & Onaran 2005; Sağın Şimşek 2006; Tremblay 2006).

Bilal Kırkıcı, *Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen*: Lexical Transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English Learners of L3 German**.** *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 12:3, 2007, 15 S.

Research into multilingual CLI has dwelt upon a wide array of areas, ranging from phonological influence (e.g., Bannert 2005; Beach, Burnham & Kitamura 2001) to the transfer of discourse patterns (e.g., Kellerman 2001), metalinguistic awareness (e.g., Jessner 1999; O'Laoire, Burke & Haslam 2000), pragmatic competence (e.g., Jorda 2005), syntax (e.g., König et al. 2005), and lexis (e.g., Ringbom 2001), just to mention a few. A common theme that has emerged from these studies is that previously learned languages are activated in the process of acquisition of an additional language in qualitative and quantitatively different ways. Among a number of factors that have been identified as significant in the choice of the background language from which a given structure is transferred into the target language, such as linguistic typology of languages, learners' age, learners' proficiency levels in the languages involved, the status of the languages and recency (Sağın Şimşek 2006), *psychotypology* and the tendency to transfer from a foreign language into another foreign language have emerged as particularly salient.

2. (Psycho)typology and the L2→L3 transfer preference

Psychotypology basically refers to the *perceived distance* between languages by the language learner. Kellerman (1977, 1983) argues that psychotypology is central to CLI in that a learner is more likely to transfer a structure from one language to another if the two languages are perceived as similar as regards the target structure. If, on the other hand, the two languages are perceived as dissimilar, the learner will tend to avoid the transfer of a particular structure from the source language to the target language, a point that Kellerman (1983: 117) summarizes with his frequently quoted statement "not everything that *looks* transferable *is* transferable". Ringbom (2001: 65) lends support to this view, stating "languages perceived to be similar (roughly=related) to the target language naturally provide many more reference points for the learner than do wholly unrelated languages." Thus, under this view, in a multilingual acquisition context the learner is expected to prefer to transfer a target structure to Language Z from Language Y, rather than from Language X, if the perceived similarity between Languages Y and Z by the language learner is higher than that of Languages X and Z – a view that has received affirmation in the relevant literature (e.g., Hammarberg 2001; Ringbom 1983, 1987, 2001).

Ringbom (1983, 1987), for example, analyzed more than 10,000 student essays written by L1 Finnish-L2 Swedish and L1 Swedish-L2 Finnish learners of L3 English in Finland. He found that independent of whether Swedish or Finnish was the L1 of the learners, the source of transfer errors into English was more often Swedish than Finnish – not only in cases in which Swedish was the L1 of the learners but also when Swedish was the learners' L2. In other words, Ringbom provided evidence for the view that the perception of two languages as similar, such as in the case of Swedish and English (in contrast to Finnish and English), may lead to comparatively more transfer between the languages perceived as similar (even if both constitute foreign languages) and override the L1

as a source of CLI. Williams & Hammarberg (1998: 323) provide two possible reasons for such a non-native language dominance in multilingual CLI that possibly go hand-in-hand with the psychotypology effect:

- Differences in the acquisition mechanisms in L1 and L2, and a reactivation of the L2 mechanism in L3 acquisition
- A desire to "suppress" the L1 on the basis of its being "non-foreign" and to use a foreign, non-L1 language in the acquisition of another foreign language.

Similar findings were obtained by Cenoz (2001), who presents the results of a study on the acquisition of L3 English by 90 Spanish/Basque bilingual children at three different age levels in the Basque country. In the total subject group, Basque is reported to be the L1 for 44%, Spanish for 23% and both Basque and Spanish for 32% of the students. Using Mayer's (1969) wordless picture story *Frog, where are you?* Cenoz (2001) collected oral production data from the child participants, which were analyzed for CLI at the lexical level from Basque/Spanish into L3 English. The results revealed that students tended to transfer more from Spanish (an Indo-European language) than from Basque (a non-Indo-European language) into L3 English (an Indo-European language), the transfer rates across age groups being 62%-87% and 13%-38% from Spanish and Basque, respectively. In other words, more transfer was found to take place between typologically similar languages. Furthermore, similar to the findings in Ringbom (1983, 1987) stated above, it was found that the L1 Basque children displayed a stronger preference to transfer from Spanish into English than the L1 Spanish children; thus, transfer from L2 to L3 was preferred over transfer from L1 to L3. A further relevant point that emerged in the obtained results is that the students in the highest age group tended to transfer from Basque the least. Cenoz (2001: 16f) explains this finding by establishing a connection between the higher metalinguistic skills that the older students are expected to possess and their resulting perception of similarity/dissimilarity (i.e., psychotypology) between Basque, Spanish and English:

> Older students are able to perceive that Basque and English are typologically more distant than Spanish and English, and they could use Spanish rather than Basque as a base language when acquiring English. Younger learners' lower metalinguistic ability does not allow them to perceive objective linguistic distance, and they find both Spanish and Basque terms as transferable.

In a recent study, Sağın Şimşek (2006) also found a similar L2-over-L1 dominance, possibly also coupled with a psychotypology effect, in the acquisition of L3 English by 14 L1 Turkish/L2 German learners. As part of the study, Sağın Şimşek collected written data from her participants that were analyzed for CLI in word order from Turkish/German into L3 English. The results of her analyses revealed that in nearly 25% (149 tokens) of the total written L3 English production data, it was possible to find L2 German-induced word order features as in

examples (1) and (2) below. Influence from L1 Turkish, on the other hand, was almost absent (5 tokens) in the L3 written data. Sentence (1) below from Sağın Şimşek (2006), for example, constitutes a clear illustration of how the learner has employed German topicalization, placing the verb in the main clause (*dance*) immediately after the topicalized adverbial (*after the break*) as required in German but not in English or Turkish. Similarly, example (2) also illustrates clear CLI from L2 German since in the main clause the verb *give* is in clause-initial position, exactly as required in German main clauses preceded by subordinate clauses.

(1) *After the break **dance** 8-9 people*.
(Example 2 in Sağın Şimşek 2006: 77).

(2) *When we come to the airport, **give** we the suitcase there fort and go to the plane.*
(Example 27 in Sağın Şimşek 2006: 83).

On the basis of these findings, Sağın Şimşek (2006: 131) identifies "typological similarities between the target language and the languages already known as the most dominant factor [in multilingual CLI]", and taking into consideration the many surface similarities between German and English, in comparison to Turkish and English, she adds that "the subjects are aware that their knowledge of Turkish will not be of use when learning English". In other words, L2 German was found to be preferred as the base language from which to transfer structures into L3 English, thus overriding L1 Turkish, most probably due to the similarities the learners perceived between the two former languages and due to the pressing need to stay in a 'foreign language mode' and not revert back to the 'L1-mode'.

3. The present study

The aim of the present study was to analyze CLI at the lexical level in the written L3 German productions of Turkish-English-German trilinguals. As mentioned above, a common point that arises from earlier studies conducted on multilingual CLI is that psychotypology has been identified as a highly influential factor in determining from which previously learned language a language user will transfer a given structure into a target language. As summarized, the findings obtained from previous studies indicate that learners employ certain beliefs as to which previous language is more similar to the target language and try to restrict potential transfer actions as much as possible to the language identified as more similar.

Thus, considering the fact that English and German, both being Indo-European languages, are structurally more similar than Turkish (an Altaic language) and German and, therefore, more likely to be perceived as such by language learners, it was expected that the subjects in the present study would pre-dominantly

transfer from L2 English, rather than from L1 Turkish, into L3 German. This expectation was also directly related to the observed tendency of multilinguals analyzed in previous studies to transfer from a previously learned L2 rather than from their L1 into another additional language, which was found to act as an additional determining factor besides the psychotypology effect. In other words, from the perspective of both psychotypological impact and the previously observed tendency of learners to suppress non-foreign impact and prefer non-L1 mechanisms in the acquisition of additional foreign languages (cf. Williams & Hammarberg 1998), the likelihood that the L3 German written production data of L1 Turkish/L2 English participants would predominantly contain manifestations of lexical transfer from L2 English appeared much higher – particularly considering the widely acknowledged view that "in no other area … is the importance of psychotypological factors, perceived similarities, more in the foreground than lexis" (Ringbom 2001: 60).

4. Method

4.1 Subjects

The subjects of the present study were 174 L1 Turkish/L2 English learners of L3 German, who were undergraduate students from various departments at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara/Turkey. 50 of the subjects were males (29%) and 124 were females (71%). METU is one of the few English-medium universities in Turkey; i.e., with the exception of additional foreign language courses offered at the university (like German, French, Italian), all lectures, examinations, etc. are conducted exclusively in English. Therefore, all newly admitted students are required to take an English proficiency exam administered by the university. On the basis of the scores obtained from this examination, students are either allowed to start studying at their intended departments or are placed into the department of Basic English, where they receive intensive English tutoring for one year or, if necessary, a maximum of two years. Thus, the L2 English level of all participants in the present study was high enough to receive instruction, write essays, give presentations and attend exams in English, which requires an upper-intermediate to advanced English proficiency level in all four language skills.

In addition, the subjects in the present study were also attending elective German language classes offered by the Department of Foreign Language Education for three hours per week. Basically being German proficiency classes, these German courses also focus extensively on metalinguistic abilities, explicit German grammar, and German socio-culture. The German proficiency level of students enrolled in these courses may be roughly classified as pre-intermediate to intermediate.

4.2 Data collection

282 authentic exam papers (midterm and final exams) written by the 174 subjects in the German courses they were either taking at the time of the investigation or had taken in a previous semester were analyzed. The exams in the elective German courses they were enrolled in included a number of different question types, ranging from more controlled fill-in-the-blanks and rewrite questions as in (3) and (4), respectively, to less controlled, freer question types as in (5) and (6).

(3) Sample fill-in-the-blanks question:

Bitte ergänzen Sie sinngemäss:

1. Meine Eltern sprachen ganz leise, ……. das Kind nicht ……. wecken.
2. Er hat nicht viel gelernt, ……. hat er die Prüfung bestanden.
3. Mein Vater schickt mir jeden Monat Geld, ……. ich hier studieren kann.

(4) Sample "rewrite" question:

Sie haben hier positive Aussagen. Bilden Sie bitte negative Sätze!

1. Ich warte auf Sarah. ……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..
2. Das ist ein Buch. ……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..
3. Ich mache meine Hausaufgaben. (plural). ……..……..……..……..……..……..……

(5) Less controlled question:

Ergänzen Sie die Sätze mit einer passenden Konjunktion.

1. Hans ist ganz unglücklich, …..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..
2. Der Film war so langweilig, …..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……
3. Wir können nur dann kommen, …..……..……..……..……..……..……..……..……

(6) Sample "free" writing questions:

1. Schreiben Sie einen Aufsatz: Meine Familie (50 Wörter)

2. Schreiben Sie 5 Sätze zu folgendem Thema: "Was wäre passiert, wenn Ihr Wecker heute morgen nicht geklingelt hätte und Sie verschlafen hätten?"

Bilal Kırkıcı, *Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen*: Lexical Transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English Learners of L3 German**.** *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 12:3, 2007, 15 S.

The fact that the data was comprised of authentic exam papers embodied some significant dimensions that need to be focused on at this point. Taking into consideration that the exam papers were going to be scored and actually constituted part of their final grades, it was expected that the participants would, where possible, refrain from transferring any lexical items from either L1 Turkish or L2 English into their L3 German written productions because of the straightforward reason that in either case the result would be a loss in valuable points. Thus, it was expected that the number of transferred lexical items would be much less when compared to earlier studies of CLI at the lexical level. However, this was on the other hand seen as an advantage since this restraining nature of the data collection method was likely to ensure that participants would only resort to transfer at points where they really needed to transfer and work hard to retrieve German lexical items. In other words, it was going to be possible to infer with some confidence that students exclusively transferred lexical items from their L1 (Turkish) or L2 (English) when they felt obliged to use a lexical item that was actually not part of their lexical repertoire in L3 German; i.e., in case of a knowledge gap. It is a well-established fact that language learners do not always transfer intentionally from their previously learned due to lack of knowledge, but may also employ non-intentional transfer resulting from various strategies (e.g., Poulisse & Bongaerts 1994; Williams & Hammarberg 1998). In this study, however, this was very unlikely to be the case because of the obvious concern of the participants to achieve high scores.

4.3 Data analysis

The collected L3 German written production data were analyzed for three types of lexical CLI:

(I) ***Full lexical switches****,* in which a complete lexical item from a non-target language is used in the production of the target language (e.g., an acceptable L1 Turkish word in L3 German production). De Angelis & Selinker (2001) and Ringbom (1987, 2001) in their analyses of CLI in spoken L3 production focused on this category as well, referring to it as *Lexical Interlanguage Transfer* and *Language Switches*, respectively.

Ringbom (2001: 64, Table 4.2) defines the underlying cause of this type of CLI as "insufficient awareness of [an] intended linguistic form" and Serindağ (2005: 12), in his study of Turkish-English-German CLI, provides the following examples for this category (among others), in which lexical items from L2 English (in italics) are used in the production of L3 German:

(7) Wie *large* ist die Wohung?
(8) Es ist *half* zehn.
(9) Ich trinke morgens *tea*.

(II) ***Morphologically hybrid forms*****,** which are lexical items in which a free or bound morpheme from any of the three languages involved is combined with a free or bound morpheme from another one of the three languages. De Angelis & Selinker (2001: 53) present a number of interesting examples of morphologically hybrid forms (which they call *morphological interlanguage transfer*) in their analyses of CLI in spoken L3 Italian production, one of which is presented under (10) below:

(10) *bombas*.

Example (10) comes from subject 2 in De Angelis & Selinker, who is reportedly a native speaker of British English with Spanish and Italian as additional languages. The example illustrates how the Spanish plural bound morpheme *-as* has been attached to the Italian stem *bomba* (sing. for English *bomb*) to form the hybrid form *bombas,* whereas the actual target form would be the Italian plural noun form *bombe.*

(III) ***Orthographically hybrid forms****,* which are lexical items in the target language that have been altered orthographically due to CLI and manifest orthographic properties from the target language (German) and, additionally, from (at least) one of the non-target languages (Turkish/English). Since the collected L3 German data was in written form, this category was also of importance because it was expected that the orthographic properties of Turkish and/or English would certainly have impact on the accuracy of the participants' spelling of words in L3 German.

Serindağ (2005) also analyzed his L3 German data for this CLI category. Below is one of the examples he identified as orthographic CLI from L2 English. As the example demonstrates, the orthographic cluster *sh*, which frequently represents the phoneme [š] in English, has been substituted for the orthographic *sch* cluster in the target form *Flasche* (English: bottle).

(11) *Flashe*.

5. Results

The data analysis revealed a total of 124 instances of CLI at the lexical level falling under the three categories outlined above. As can be seen in Table 1 below, out of these 124 items, only 8 instances (7%) were identified as CLI from L1 Turkish, whereas the remaining 116 (93%) were identified as CLI from L2 English. In other words, the participants clearly regarded English and German as more similar, predominantly taking L2 English as the source language from which to transfer a lexical structure into L3 German. It possibly needs to be pointed out once more at this point that the analyzed data source consisted of authentic exam papers, which meant that no matter which language the students transferred from, they knew that the result would be a loss of valuable points

since their instructors expected them to produce exclusively German lexical items. However, regardless of this fact, the students nevertheless tended to avoid using Turkish lexical items in cases in which a knowledge gap existed in their L3 German and instead provided lexical items they transferred from L2 English. Thus, this finding goes hand-in-hand with results of earlier studies in which it was found that the perception of two additional languages as similar may easily lead to comparatively more transfer between these similar languages and may override the L1 as a source of CLI, as is the case in the present study. This finding also provides support for the view of Williams & Hammarberg (1998: 323), who, as mentioned at the outset of the present study, state that the underlying reason for this widely observed tendency might also be the desire to "suppress" the L1 on the basis of its being "non-foreign" and to use a foreign, non-L1 language in the acquisition of another foreign language instead.

Table 1: CLI from L1 Turkish and L2 English across types of lexical CLI.

	Source language	
	L1 Turkish	*L2 English*
Full lexical switches	7	48
Morphologically hybrid forms	-	10
Orthographically hybrid forms	1	58
Total	**8**	**116**

As the analysis of the individual utterances below illustrates, this quantitative overall dominance of L2 English rather than L1 Turkish as the source language for CLI on L3 German also clearly manifested itself in the qualitative analysis:

5.1 Full lexical switches

Full Lexical Switches constituted 55 (44%) of the total 124 identified instances of CLI at the lexical level. While 48 (87 %) out of this subset of 55 full lexical switches were identified as CLI from L2 English, only 7 tokens (13 %) were analyzed as CLI from L1 Turkish. With the exception of one item, the striking majority (98%) of full lexical switches from L2 English were, as exemplified in samples (12)-(20) below, lexical items that embodied important formal (phonological and/or orthographic) and semantic similarities to the German target items. The only exception to this pattern is sample (21) below, in which the English lexical item *ache* was substituted for the German lexical item *Schmerzen* despite the fact that no formal similarity whatsoever existed between them.

(12) Sie ging ins **Bath** (Bad) und wusch ihre Haende.
(13) Wenn ich nicht studieren wüde, würde ich ein **singer** (Saenger) werden.
(14) Wenn ich studiere, kann ich ein guter **engineer** (Ingenieur) werden.
(15) Ich arbeite, dabei höre ich **music** (Musik).

(16) Ich brauche einen **Paper** (Papier), ein Bleistift, ein Radiergummi und eine Briefmarke.
(17) Ich möchte eine liter **milk** (Milch), bitte.
(18) Er ist krank. Er hat eine **wound** (Wunde) und schmerzen.
(19) Um 8 Uhr geht sie ins **Bed** (Bett) .
(20) Ich war krank gestern, da ich das **ice** (Eis) ass.
(21) Ein Mensch der so krank ist muss viel **Ache** (Schmerzen) haben.

A possible explanation for this tendency to use non-target lexical items that bear a significant amount of similarity to the target lexical item is provided by De Angelis & Selinker (2001), who extend Dell's (1995) view on monolingual processing that phonologically and semantically related words in L1 processing may be activated in the lexical retrieval. In the same vein, De Angelis & Selinker claim that phonologically and semantically similar lexical items may also be activated *cross-linguistically* as a compensation activity for weak or absent target language knowledge, which they regard as a possible explanation for the established high impact of cross-linguistic similarities on CLI. Though rather speculative, this explanatory approach appears to have a grain of truth since, as mentioned at the outset of the present study, formal (typological) similarities have indeed been found to act as an important factor in CLI in that more similarities between languages result in more CLI between them.

This can also be taken as part of the reason for why full lexical switches from L1 Turkish were so infrequent compared to L2 English. As mentioned above, full lexical switches from Turkish were only 7 in number (the noun *Müzik* for German *Musik* was used three times). As illustrated in samples (22)-(25), two of these Turkish lexical items (*kanser-cancer*; *müzik-musik-music)* displayed a significant degree of similarity to their English and/or German counterparts, which again points to the likelihood of the impact of cross-linguistic similarity on CLI.

(22) Es ist ratsam dass ich nicht rauchen wil ich kann **Kanser** (German: *Krebs*, English: *cancer*) werden.
(23) Meine Hobbys sind **Müzik** (German: *Musik*, English: *music*) hören und Swimmen.
(24) Ich gehe jetzt shon zur Uni um meine **Vize** (German: *Prüfung*, English: *exam*) zu bestehen.
(25) Jemand der so gut Englisch spricht muss **başarılı** (German: *erfolgreich*, English: *successful*) sein.

5.2 Morphologically hybrid forms

Morphologically Hybrid Forms constituted only 10 (8%) of the total 124 identified instances of CLI at the lexical level. A striking fact that was observed was that the few morphologically hybrid forms in the present study were exclusively formed from morphemes from L2 English and L3 German and did not include a

single morpheme transferred from L1 Turkish. In other words, morphological transfer from L1 Turkish was entirely inexistent.

It was in fact expected from the outset that examples of CLI falling in this category would be rather few on account of the fact that especially the transfer of bound morphemes is described in the relevant literature as rare (Odlin 1989), though not totally inexistent as illustrated in De Angelis & Selinker (2001) and Ringbom (2001). However, as is illustrated in the samples below, the participants in the present study did not transfer any bound morphemes from their L2 English into their L3 German at all. Instead, they either merged a stem from L2 English with a bound morpheme from L3 German as in examples (26)-(30) or constructed a nominal compound by using a free morpheme from the two languages each, as in (31) and (32).

(26) Ich kann das nicht **rightig** *(richtig)* schreiben.
(27) Wir **abandonieren** *(verlassen)* die Schule um 17:00.
(28) Er will den Nobel Preis **winnen** (*gewinnen)*.
(29) Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und **Swimmen** (*schwimmen)*.
(30) Ich habe viel zu viel Arbeit, aber trotzdem gehe ich **dancen** (*tanzen)*.
(31) Wenn ich wache auf im Morgen, ich trinke **Apfeljuice** (*Apfelsaft)* und esse eine Banane.
(32) Man braucht einen Topf für eine **Tomatosuppe** (*Tomatensuppe)*.

5.3 Orthographically hybrid forms

Orthographically Hybrid Forms, which represented the most frequent category of CLI in the present study, constituted 48% (59 tokens) of the total 124 tokens identified. Among these, only one, sample (43), was directly attributable to influence from L1 Turkish orthography. The remaining 58 reflected the direct influence of the learners' knowledge of L2 English orthography. Samples (33)-(42) below clearly display how frequent orthographic clusters in English were preferred. In some instances, it was very obvious that the effect of English orthography was even preferred when an alternative form in the Turkish orthography was available. The *sh* cluster exemplified in samples (33), (35) and (42), which is widespread in high-frequency words of English like ***sh****oe, bu****sh****, fi****sh****,* etc., for example, was preferred to using the Turkish letter *"ş"* (as in ***ş****emsiye, ***ş****i****ş****e, ı****ş***ık, etc.) which represents the same phonetic realization [š]. The strong effect of the English orthographic system was also evident in the frequent use of the *th* cluster as in highly frequent English words such as *three, brother,* and *father*, exemplified in (34), (40) and (41), and the *gh* cluster as in English words like *weight, light, fight,* exemplified in (36)-(39).

(33) Ist die Milch **frish** (*frisch*)?
(34) Was **felth** (*fehlt*) ihnen?
(35) Um 11:00, sie ging Bazaar und einkaufte das **Geshenk** (*Geschenk)* für ihre Freundin.

(36) Um 8:30 **flieght** (fliegt) die **Machiene** nach New York ab.
(37) Nein, ich **steighe** (*steige*) lieber um.
(38) Sie ruft an und **fraght** (*fragt*) nach den Preisen.
(39) Er **seight** (*sieht)* aus wie jung.
(40) Sie **thrinkt** (*trinkt)* eine Cola.
(41) Mein **Bruther** (*Bruder*) arbeitet bei Akbank.
(42) Ich gehe jetzt **shon** (*schon)* zur Uni um meine Vize zu bestehen.
(43) Ich mag **Müsik** hören, Bücher lesen, fernsehen und mit meiner Freundinen sprachen.

6. Discussion and conclusion

Overall, the results of the present study have demonstrated that the Turkish-English-German trilingual participants under investigation clearly preferred to transfer lexical items from their L2 English rather than from their L1 Turkish into L3 German. As was shown, independent of type of CLI, the great majority of lexical items transferred into written L3 German was transferred from L2 English (116 out of 124) rather than from L1 Turkish (8 out of 124). This was in fact expected in the light of findings of previous studies into multilingual CLI since, as mentioned at various points throughout this article, studies conducted on CLI to date have pointed to the strong impact of two independent factors (among others), which apparently were in strong interaction in the present study: psychotypology, the perceived distance between languages by a language learner, and the tendency of language learners to suppress their L1 in foreign language environments due to the belief that using non-L1 structures would constitute a better strategy in 'foreign language' environments (Williams & Hammarberg 1998).

In the present study, both of these above-mentioned highly plausible factors were embodied in the L2 English of the participants. Their L2 English was very likely to be perceived as more similar to the target language L3 German due to the various formal features that these two languages share and at the same time constituted the only possible source language to fall back upon in instances where the L1 was going to be suppressed in order to use non-L1 structures. Therefore, it might be possible to refer to an 'augmented' L2 English effect in the present study due to the probable interaction of these two factors, which reflected itself in the almost complete absence of CLI from L1 Turkish in the L3 German data. As mentioned before, the students were well aware of the fact that any non-German structure, no matter if English or Turkish, would lead to the loss of valuable points on the exam. However, regardless of this notion, the participants displayed a distinct preference for transferring items from L2 English, which clearly speaks for the view that the participants most probably felt it would be more reasonable to stay in the 'foreign language mode'.

A relevant, striking observation that was not part of the original focus of investigation, but emerged in the course of the analyses of the exam papers of the par-

ticipants relates to little notes that the participants were found to have taken on the papers during their exams. It was observed that these individual notes, basically translations or vague definitions of unknown or lesser known German lexical items scribbled in the immediate environment of unknown target words within question stems, were almost exclusively written in English. In other words, the participants tried to refrain from using L1 Turkish and instead preferred using L2 English even in instances that they knew would actually not constitute part of the evaluation process. This observation can be taken as further evidence for the tendency of language learners outlined above to stay in the foreign language mode in the learning of additional languages.

In conclusion, the results of the present study have further confirmed the findings of earlier studies on CLI in multilingual acquisition contexts that have underscored the impact of (psycho)typology and the tendency of language learners to stay in a 'foreign language' mode in the processing of additional languages. However, as mentioned at the outset of the present study, the field of multilingual CLI is still so young and comparatively unexplored that further studies may yield clues to different directions that need to be taken to arrive at more valid and reliable results. Therefore, needless to say, it is absolutely required to increase the number of studies on multilingual acquisition and to vary the languages involved to be able to arrive at a clearer picture of the processes involved.

References

Bannert, Robert (2005), *Phonological Interferences in the Third Language Learning of Swedish and German (FIST)*. Vortrag bei FONETIK 2005, Goteborg.

Beach, Elizabeth; Burnham, Denis & Kitamura, Christine (2001), Bilingualism and the relationship between perception and production: Greek/English bilinguals and Thai bilibial stops. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5: 2, 221-235.

Cenoz, Jasone (2001), The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In: Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), 8-20.

Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Angelis, Gessica & Selinker, Larry (2001), Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. In: Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), 42-58.

Bilal Kırkıcı, *Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen*: Lexical Transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English Learners of L3 German**.** *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 12:3, 2007, 15 S.

Dell, Garry S. (1995), Speaking and misspeaking. In: Gleitman, Lila R. & Liberman, Mark (Hrsg.) (1995), *Language. An Invitation to Cognitive Science Vol. 1*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 183-208.

Hammarberg, Björn (2001), Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 production and acquisition. In: Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), 21-41.

Jessner, Ulrike (1999), Metalinguistic awareness in multilinguals: cognitive aspects of third language learning. *Language Awareness* 8: 3 & 4, 201-209.

Jorda, Maria Pilar Safont (2005), Pragmatic production of third language learners of English: A Focus on Request Acts Modifiers. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 2: 2, 84-104.

Kecskes, Istvan & Papp, Tünde (2000), *Foreign Language and Mother Tongue*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kellerman, Eric (1977), Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 2: 1, 58-146.

Kellerman, Eric (1983), Now you see it, now you don't. In: Gass, Susan M. & Selinker, Larry (Hrsg.) (1983), *Language Transfer in Language Learning.* Rowley: Newbury House, 121-134.

Kellerman, Eric (2001), New uses for old languages: cross-linguistic and cross-gestural influence in the narratives of non-native speakers. In: Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), 170-191.

König, Wolf; Cedden, Gülay & Onaran, Sevil (2005), Language production in Turkish-German-English trilinguals. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 2: 2, 135-148.

Mayer, Mercer (1969), *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

O'Laoire, Muiris; Burke, Mary & Haslam, Mary (2000), From L2 to L3/L4: an investigation of learner's metalinguistic awareness and learner strategies. *Teangeolas Journal of the Linguistic Institute of Ireland* 38/39, 52-58.

Odlin, Terence (1989), *Language Transfer. Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poulisse, Nanda & Bongaerts, Theo (1994), First language use in second language production. *Applied Linguistics* 15: 1, 36-57.

Bilal Kırkıcı, *Meine Hobbys sind Müzik hören und Swimmen*: Lexical Transfer in L1 Turkish-L2 English Learners of L3 German**.** *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 12:3, 2007, 15 S.

Ringbom, Hakan (1983), Borrowing and lexical transfer. *Applied Linguistics* 4: 3, 207-212.

Ringbom, Hakan (1987), *The Role of First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ringbom, Hakan (2001), Lexical Transfer in L3 Production. In: Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta & Jessner, Ulrike (Hrsg.) (2001), 59-68.

Sağın Şimşek, S. Çiğdem (2006), *Third Language Acquisition*. *Turkish-German Bilingual Students' Acquisition of English Word Order in a German Educational Setting*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Serindağ, Ergün (2005), Zur Relevanz des bewussten Einsatzes des Englischen im Unterricht "Deutsch als zweite Fremdsprache" bei Muttersprachlern des Türkischen. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 10: 2, 16 S. [Online: http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-10-2/beitrag/Serindag4.htm. 16. Mai 2007.]

Tremblay, Marie Claude (2006), Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: the role of L2 proficiency and L2 exposure. *Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa/Ottawa Papers in Linguistics* 34, 109-119.

Williams, Sarah & Hammarberg, Björn (1998), Language switches in L3 production: implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics* 19: 3, 295-333.