

ENGLISH AS A THIRD LANGUAGE IN THE BRAZILIAN CONTEXT: AN INVESTIGATION ON CROSSLINGUISTIC INFLUENCES¹

PÂMELA FREITAS PEREIRA TOASSI*

MAILCE BORGES MOTA**

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated crosslinguistic influences (CLI) in the acquisition of English as a third language in the southern region of Brazil. The languages involved in the present study were Brazilian Portuguese (L1), German (L2) and English (the target language). The goal of the present study was to investigate: (1) the source of language transfer in English as an L3 and (2) the effect of typological distance, order of acquisition, L2 status and recency in CLI. The results showed that both L1 and L2 influenced participants' production in English.

KEY WORDS: crosslinguistic influences, English as a third language, multilingualism.

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, a marked increase of attention has been given to the processes that underlie the acquisition of more than two languages. Studies on third language acquisition (TLA) have demonstrated that the acquisition of an L3, L4, or additional language differs from the acquisition of a second language, mainly due to the influence from one language system into another, which is a more frequent process in multilinguals (HAMMARBERG, 2001; DEWAELE, 2001; ECKE, 2001; DE ANGELIS & SELINKER, 2001; HERWIG, 2001; LEUNG, 2005; CARVALHO &

* Doutoranda do Programa de Pós- Graduação em Inglês da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil.
E-mail: pam.toassi@gmail.com

** Professora do Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil. Bolsista do CNPq.
E-mail: mailcemota54@gmail.com

SILVA, 2006; TREMBLAY, 2006; MELHORN, 2007; BARDEL & FALK, 2007; MAGHSOUDI, 2008).

In the multilingual context, there is great interest in looking at the acquisition of English in very diverse settings, where learners might already have knowledge of two or more languages prior to the learning of English (JESSNER, 2006). The present study was conducted in the south of Brazil, where many people speak immigrant languages². In this context, the learner of English is an L3 learner who already possesses knowledge of two languages, Brazilian Portuguese (BP) and an immigrant language.

The present study approaches the acquisition of English as a third language by focusing on cross linguistic influences (CLI).³ Cenoz (2008) states that CLI looks at the acquisition of an additional language through the interaction of the target language and the previously acquired languages. De Angelis (2007) argues that looking at CLI in L2 acquisition provides an incomplete understanding of the interaction of the previous language and the target language. In other words, third language acquisition offers a better scenario to look at CLI.

Nevertheless, the acquisition of a third language is a more complex process where many variables can interfere with CLI. Moreover, there is no specific conclusion in the literature as regards the role of L1 and L2 in the acquisition of a third language (VINNITSKAYA et al., 2002; TREMBLAY, 2006; BARDEL & FALK, 2007; CARVALHO & SILVA, 2006; GIBSON et al., 2001; FOUSER, 2001; SHOOSHTARI, 2009; ECKE, 2001; PERALES et al., 2009).

There are many factors which can interact with CLI. One of these factors is typology, which, is related to the influence exerted by the most similar language in the target one (CENOZ, 2001). Another factor related to CLI is the L2 status, which concerns the privileged status of the L2 as favoring transfer from a non-native language to the L3 (LLAMA et al., 2007). A third factor reported in the literature is order of acquisition. That is, CLI is determined by the order in which the languages were acquired (CARVALHO & SILVA, 2006). Finally, recency is also one of the factors that may affect CLI. Recency is related to the frequency of use of the person's background languages. As argued by Cenoz (2001, p. 10), "learners are more likely to borrow from a language they actively use than from other languages they may know but do not use".

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2010) state that linguistic transfer can be manifested in all linguistic subsystems: phonology, orthography, morphology, lexical, semantic, syntactic, discursive, pragmatic and sociolinguistic. The present study focused on CLI at the lexical and syntactic levels. Regarding the types of lexical transfer, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2010) suggest that formal lexical transfer – or transfer of form (RINGBOM, 2001) – includes the use of false cognates, unintentional borrowing or the combination of words from different languages that result in a new word (JARVIS & PAVLENKO, 2010). Semantic transfer (JARVIS & PAVLENKO, 2010) – or transfer of meaning (RINGBOM, 2001) – is another type of transfer at the lexical level which includes the use of a word in the target language that reflects the exact meaning of this word in one of the previous languages, and the use of calques (JARVIS & PAVLENKO, 2010), which are the result of transfer of meaning into multi-word units, such as compounds, phrasal verbs and idioms (RINGBOM, 2001, p. 64).

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2010) argue that until the 1990s it was believed that syntax was immune to CLI effects. However, the authors claim that recent studies have provided evidence of ample instances of syntactic transfer in various types of data. The authors also explain that syntactic transfer includes not only word order, but also other grammatical constraints. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2010) mention the effects of CLI on the grammatical judgment of multilinguals, adverbial placement, adjective placement and null subjects. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2010) also mention the influence of effects of CLI in various grammatical areas, such as relative clauses, articles, and prepositions.

The present study aimed at investigating CLI at the lexical and syntactic levels and pursued the following objectives: (1) to investigate the source of language transfer in English as an L3, and (2) to investigate the effect of typological distance, order of acquisition, L2 status and recency on CLI.

METHOD

Participants

The participants were 7 learners of English as a second language (4 male and 3 female) and 7 learners of English as a third language

(4 male and 3 female). The mean age was 25, ranging from 16 to 57 years old. Brazilian Portuguese was their native language. The learners of English as a second language (L2 learners group - L2G) had no knowledge of other foreign languages. In regard to the learners of English as a third language (L3 learners group - L3G), they had learned German (their L2) prior to English. Concerning the origin of the languages of the present study, Brazilian Portuguese is a Romance language (COMRIE, 2007), whereas English and German are Germanic languages (COMRIE, 2007).

In the present study, participants were required to have a B1 level of English (CEFR) because learners at levels A2 and A1 would not have enough knowledge and experience in English to perform the linguistic tasks proposed in the study. Learners at levels B2 and above would not be appropriate for the purposes of this study because they would be too accurate in the tasks proposed and CLI effects would be rare. The level B1 was chosen on the assumption that, at this level, learners would have the necessary knowledge to perform the tasks proposed at an average level. In order to assure that participants were at the B1 level, they were required to perform an adapted version of the Preliminary English Test - PET.

Regarding the assessment of participants' level of proficiency in the L2, this was determined by means of a self-estimation questionnaire, where the L3 learners of English indicated whether their proficiency in the L2 was regular, good or very good. The L3 learners of English chose the highest option (very good) in the questionnaire to inform their level of proficiency in the L2 (German). This method was also used by Bayona (2009). By answering a biographical questionnaire, participants of the L3G reported having learned their second language as a child, mostly speaking with their families and community. Participants also informed that they continued developing this L2 in a language course. Concerning recency, the L3 learners of English reported using Portuguese more frequently than their L2, even though they reported using their L2 frequently.

Tasks

Two narratives were used in this study, one oral, based on spontaneous speech and one written, based on a picture wordless story.

Kellerman (2001) states that learners, in general, are familiar with stories. Since their early years, children are exposed to stories, and even non- native speakers may feel called upon to relate, describe or tell something. Still according to Kellerman, narratives are extended texts, and the way learners construct narratives allows us to study non-native performance at different levels: syntax, morphology, phonology, discourse, pragmatics, lexis: "...narrators will need to have or will need to compensate for the lack of the requisite discourse- organizational skills as well as the grammatical structures and words needed to bring the story across successfully" (KELLERMAN, 2001, p. 171). Kellerman also states that a narrative has more ecological validity as a method of eliciting data because it is a more natural language activity.

In the written narrative, participants were required to tell the story as they saw it in the wordless picture book 'Frog, where are you?' (MAYER, 1969).). This book has been used by other studies (CENOZ, 2001; PERALES et al., 2009; MAYO & OLAIZOLA, 2011) in the area of TLA. The story consists of 24 pictures whose main plot is a boy looking for his frog that has disappeared. Participants had 30 minutes to write the story with a minimum of 150 words and a maximum of 250 words while looking at the sequence of pictures. For the oral narrative, participants were asked to tell the story of a film they had recently seen and that they had enjoyed. Participants had from 5 to 7 minutes to tell the story and, while they were speaking, they were audio recorded.

Procedures

All of the participants were volunteers. Before data collection, participants signed a consent form. After that, participants took the proficiency test in English in order to verify if they were at the level required for this study (B1 – CEFR) These participants were then required to answer the biographical questionnaire. After that, participants performed the written task and the oral task.

RESULTS

CLI at the lexical level

The results of CLI were first analyzed with focus on the lexical level. These results show the influence of the first (Brazilian Portuguese) and second (German) languages in the participant's written and oral production in English. The number and classification of CLI at the lexical level are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1 - CLI AT THE LEXICAL LEVEL IN THE WRITTEN AND ORAL TASKS

	L2G		L3G			
	L1 influence		L1 influence		L2 influence	
	Written task	Oral Task	Written task	Oral Task	Written task	Oral Task
code switching	0	4	0	0	0	1
borrowings	0	2	0	1	0	8
foreignisings	1	1	0	0		
semantic extensions	1	2	0	0		
calques	1	1	0	0		
Total	3	11	0	1	0	9
N = 14	7		7			

Note: N= number of participants

As can be seen in Table 1, the cases of CLI at the lexical level mainly consisted of the phenomena of code switching, borrowings, and foreignisings, which are categories related to transfer of form, and semantic extension and calques, which are related to transfer of meaning. Code switching refers to the use of sentences in the L1 (Brazilian Portuguese) or the L2 (German), but not in the target language (CENOZ, 2001), in this study, English. Regarding this phenomenon, it can be seen that in the oral task, the L2G presented 4 instances of L1 influence and the L3G presented 1 instance of L2 influence. In the written task, no instances of code switching occurred for either of the groups. However, in the oral narrative, perhaps due to the time pressure to perform the task, participants were more prone to switching to their L1 and L2.

Switching to the L1 occurred when participants had to mention the title of the movie they were talking about or simply when they did not find the equivalent lexical item in the L3, as illustrated next:

P9: *There is a film called **Meu malvado favorito**. (Despicable me)*

P27: *The story tells things that really happen, like **contrabando** of **animais**, like **arara azul**.*

There were few cases in which participants mixed the L2 and L3:

P31: ***Es war** a big glass in front of him.*

*(**There was** a big glass in front of him.)*

Still regarding transfer of form, Table 1 presents instances of CLI classified as borrowings, which refers to the use of a word in its original form in the L1 (Brazilian Portuguese) or L2 (German), but not in the target language (CENOZ, 2001), in this case, English. More specifically, in the present study, cases of CLI where participants used a single word in the L1 or L2, but not in the target language were classified as borrowings. On the other hand, the use of phrases in the L1 or L2, but not in the target language was classified as code switching, which was already presented in this article. As can be seen in Table 1, there were no instances of borrowings in the written task, for either of the groups. On the other hand, in the oral task, the L2G presented 2 instances of borrowings, whereas the L3G presented 9 instances, one resulting from the influence of the L1 and 8 resulting from the influence of the L2. The following examples show the terms transferred from the participants' L1- Portuguese (example P43) – and the participants' L2 – German (examples P31 and P60) – which were classified as borrowings:

P43: *I always see the film and I don't **cansar**. (get tired)*

P31: *He has a lot of things about the **tot** man. (dead)*

P60: *The dog is one **japanisch** dog. (japanese)*

The use of a word in the L1 or L2 in the middle of an English sentence shows that participants wanted to tell the story of the film and when they did not know or did not remember the word in the target lan-

guage they used the word in their L1 or L2 so they could continue their narrative. According to Kellerman (2001), when narrating a story the learner will compensate the lack of words necessary to successfully tell the story by referring to his/her knowledge of the previous languages he/she possesses. As illustrated above, learners of the present study compensated their lack of knowledge of the vocabulary necessary to tell the story by using their lexical knowledge of their two previous languages.

Another phenomenon related to transfer of form that was present in the participants' written and oral narratives was foreignising, which refers to the use of a word from the L1/L2 in the target language, but with a modified form (CENOZ, 2001). There were two cases in the L2G, one in the written task and one in the oral task. The L3G, however, presented no instances of foreignisings. The following sentence exemplifies the phenomenon of foreignising with the word "cerve" used by the participant, as an adaptation of the word "cervo" (deer), from the L1 – Portuguese:

*P43: In the sequence, the boy found a **cerve**. (deer)*

Concerning transfer of meaning, that is, when the meaning of a word from the L1/L2 is transferred to the L3, there were cases of semantic extensions, that is, when the meaning is transferred to a single word, and calques, that is, when two or more words are used with the pattern from the L1/L2 that differs from the L3 (RINGBOM, 2001). There were 3 instances of semantic extensions for the L2G, 1 in the written task and 2 in the oral task. The L3G presented no instances of semantic extension. The following example illustrates one instance of semantic extension which was a result of L1 influence:

*P27: The film is very interesting because it **counts** the story of a blue bird.
(The film is very interesting because it **tells** the story of a blue bird.)*

As can be seen in the example above, the word *count* was used instead of *tell*, which is an example of meaning transferred from Portuguese "contar", meaning to tell something. Referring to calques, there were 2 cases for the L2G, one in the written task and one in the oral task. The L3G presented no instances of calques. The following

example shows the participants' use of "it is passed", when the target expression would probably be "it happens". This occurred because the meaning and the pattern of use of "*isso se passa*" from Portuguese was transferred to the target language.

P25: *It was a romantic film and it was passed in New York.*

(It was a romantic film and it took place in New York.)

Taken together, the overall results of CLI at the lexical level showed a significant influence of the L2 in the spoken and written narratives of the L3G, which surpassed the influence of the first language. There were 9 instances of L2 influence and only 1 instance of L1 influence for the L3G. The results also show that the L2G had more instances (14) of CLI at the lexical level than the L3G (10). However, it has to be pointed out that CLI occurred, for the L3G, only in terms of transfer of form. Ringbom (2001) explains that transfer of form may occur when the L3 word is formally similar to that of the L1 or L2 in which case, than this formally similar word is activated instead of the intended one. However, this was not the case for all the instances of transfer of form that occurred for the L3G.

The comparison of the transferred terms at the lexical level also shows that, for both groups, there were more cases of CLI in the oral narrative than in the written narrative. This probably happened because written tasks tend to be more formal than oral tasks, and the formality of the task may influence the results of CLI (DEWAELE, 2001). For the L2G, there were 11 instances of CLI in the oral task and only 3 in the written task. For the L3G there were 9 instances of CLI in the oral task and no instance of CLI in the written task. In short, the results of CLI at the lexical level showed that the L2 (German) exerted greater influence in the production of the target language, English, than the participants' first language, Brazilian Portuguese, and that the type of task contributed to this influence.

CLI at the syntactic level

The results of CLI were also analyzed with focus at the syntactic level. Table 2 shows the results of the instances of CLI at this level in the written and oral tasks.

Table 2 - CLI at the syntactic level in the written and oral tasks

	L2G		L3G			
	L1 influence		L1 influence		L2 influence	
	Written task	Oral task	Written task	Oral task	Written task	Oral task
Articles	0	1	0	2	0	0
Pronouns	1	6	8	5	0	
Plural form	1	0	0	0	0	
Adjective Placement	2	1	0	0	0	
Word order	0	1	0	0	1	2
Tense	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total	4	7	8	7	1	5
N = 14	7		7			

Note: N= number of participants

Table 2 shows the six categories into which the cases of CLI at the syntactic level were divided: (1) articles, (2) pronouns, (3) plural form, (4) adjective placement, (5) word order, and (6) tense. As can be seen in Table 2, at the syntactic level, the first language exerted more influence than the second language in the production of the L3 learners of English: there were 15 instances of L1 influence and 8 of L2 influence. It can also be observed that the L3G had more cases of CLI (23) than the L2G (11). This result differs from the analysis of CLI at the lexical level. The first category of Table 2 is that of articles, where there were 2 instances of L1 influence for the L3G and 1 for the L2G. These instances of CLI were related to the use of the definite article *the* before proper names, as in the following example:

P9: *the Vetores' house*

In Portuguese articles can be placed before proper names. However, in English, proper nouns are generally not preceded by definite articles (YULE, 2009; COWAN, 2008). In the case of the L3G, this influence could also be attributed to the L2, since, in German, the use of definite articles before proper nouns is optional (VAN LANGENDONCK & VAN DE VELDE, 2009). The second category is that of pronouns, in which there were 7 instances of L1 influence for the L2G and, 13, for the L3G. These instances of CLI were all related to the participants' first

language. In this category there were two types of L1 influence, one related to the use of the pronoun *your* instead of *his/her*, and the other was related to the omission of the subject pronoun. The first type of L1 influence is exemplified in the following sentence:

P15: *The boy was sleeping with **your** dog.*

In Portuguese, the pronoun *seu* (your) is also used to indicate possession for the second person of the singular form, mainly in spoken language (CASTILHO, 2010, p. 503). Therefore, it might be for this reason that the participants of the present study transferred the use of the pronoun *your* to English. The second type of L1 influence in this category is related to the omission of the subject pronoun. Portuguese is a null- subject language (COWAN, 2008). In Portuguese, the verb is inflected to indicate number and person. However, English is a language which marks this pro-drop parameter negatively. In English, the subject must be explicit since there is no inflection of the verb indicating the subject of the sentence, except for the 3rd person singular in the present tense, where the verb is inflected to agree with he/she/it. Participants of the L2G and of the L3G were influenced by the L1-Portuguese and produced sentences as illustrated below:

P1: *And he died there because **confessed** his secret.*

P 41: *I recommend this movie because [is very good and [is an action movie.*

As can be seen in the sentences above the [indicates the subject pronoun that is missing. Category number three is that of plural form/agreement, in which there was one case in the L2G that reflected the use of plural in Portuguese. This is illustrated in P46:

P46: *The dog let the bees**angries**.*

*(O cachorro deixou as abelhas **bravas**.)*

In Portuguese the adjective is inflected to agree with number and person (CASTILHO, 2010 p. 511), which does not occur in English (JAENSCH, 2011). In the example above, the learner transferred the inflection of adjectives from Portuguese to English, resulting in the form *angries*.

The next category of Table 2 is related to adjective placement. There were 3 cases of adjective placement in the L2G that reflected the order of adjectives in Portuguese, in which it is possible to have the order *noun* + *adjective* and *adjective* + *noun* (CASTILHO, 2010, p. 517). The following example shows the influence of Portuguese in the order of adjective/noun in English:

P9: he saw a little animal angry
 noun *adjective*

In English, differently from Brazilian Portuguese, adjectives that express a property that is inherent to the referent of the head noun are named attributive adjectives and come before the head noun (COWAN, 2008, p. 241). The sentence the participant produced deviates from grammatical English and an alternative version for this sentence would be:

he saw a little angry animal
 adjective *noun*

The next category of Table 2 is that of word order, in which there was 1 case of L1 influence for the L2G and 2 cases of L2 influence for the L3G. The following example illustrates the influence of the L2 (German) in English word order:

P31: people in a small city live can
 Subject Object Verb

The sentence above was structured in an SOV order, which corresponds to the word order of German (HAWKINS, 2006). However, English is Subject- Verb- Object (SVO) language and the sentence above is uncommon. An alternative version for the sentence above would be as follows:

People can live in a small city.
 Subject Verb Object

Another example of the influence of German in English word order is illustrated below. It can be seen that the participant was influenced by the L2 (German), where the verb give (*geben*) is commonly followed by the dative object or indirect object (IO) first and the accusative object or direct object (DO) next (AUFDERSTRASSE et al., 2003).

P4: He gives to Daniel a house.
 IO DO

(Er gibt Daniel einen Haus.)
 dative object accusative object

The sentence produced by the participant is structured in a dative movement pattern (COWAN, 2008). However, the sentence is constructed in an uncommon order for English, where the verb *give* only requires the preposition *to* before the IO (indirect object) if the sentence is structured in the prepositional pattern (COWAN, 2008), as follows:

He gives a house to Daniel.
 DO IO

However, as the sentence was structured in the dative movement pattern the preposition *to* is not required and the sentence could be produced as follows:

He gives Daniel a house.

The last category of Table 2 is related to tense, in which there were 3 cases of L2 influence for the L3G and no cases of L1 influence for both groups. The 3 cases of the L3G were related to the influence of the L2- German, whereas the Present Perfect was used instead of Past Simple. Cowan (2008) explains that German has a Present Perfect tense formed as the Present Perfect from English. As can be seen in the following schema the structure from both German and English is similar:

haben + *past participle of the verb* Present Perfect in German
have + *past participle of the verb* Present Perfect in English

Cowan (2008) mentions that speakers of L1-French may have problems using the Present Perfect in situations where the Past Simple has to be used in English. This occurs because in French, the *passé composé* resembles English Present Perfect, but has a different use. The same statement holds true for the Present Perfect in German. It is formally similar to English but has a different use. This is exemplified in the following sentence:

P65: *The film I **have seen** was a drama about a dog and a man... The film is very beautiful. In the end the dog died. The film was very good, it is a real story. I watched the movie and I **have cried** a lot.*

Although comprehension of the exert above is not affected by the use of Present Perfect instead of Past Simple, it would be more common for the two constructions in bold to be structured in the Past Simple since they are referring to a specific time, a single event when the film was seen and not a repeated action that started in the past and continues until now. However, the preference of the participant for using the Present Perfect can be explained due to the influence of German, the L2.

In short, the results of CLI at the syntactic level show that the L1 had a stronger influence than the L2 in the production of the target language, there were 15 instances of L1 influence and 6 of L2 influence for the L3G. It can also be observed that the L3G had more instances of CLI than the L2G, even when only the cases of L1 influence are considered. In the written task, there was only one case of L2 influence, and in the oral task there were 5 cases of L2 influence. More specifically, there were 11 cases of L1 influence for the L2G and, 15 cases of L1 influence and 6 cases of L2 influence for the L3G. Moreover, the two groups had a higher number of cases of CLI in the oral task than in the written task, which is consistent with the results found at the lexical level. The highest number of CLI in the oral task, both at the lexical and syntactic levels may be due to task type.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, the results concerning the source of influence for the L3 learners of English depended on the level of analysis. At

the lexical level, the greatest source of influence was the participants' L2, i.e. German. On the other hand, at the syntactic level, the greatest source of influence was the participants' L1, i.e. Brazilian Portuguese. Ringbom (2001) states that the lexicon is the most significant aspect when the influence of the L2 is considered. In addition, the author claims that the greater influence of the native language, as compared to the L2, is due to the greatest knowledge and experience that the learner normally has in his/her native language (RINGBOM, 2001).

Previous studies (PERALES et al., 2009; JIN, 2009; RANONG & LEUNG, 2009) focusing on a specific grammatical aspect of the target language have also found the L1 as the greatest source of influence to TLA. Other studies with focus at the lexical level indicated the L2, and not the L1, as the greatest source of influence in TLA (DE ANGELIS & SELINKER, 2001; DEWAELE, 2001). Another study favoring the L2 as the greatest source of influence is Shooshtari (2009), in which a translation task was applied. In a study concerning phonology (LLAMA et al., 2007) there was also evidence of more influence of the L2 rather than the L1. The results of these different studies are similar to those of the present study, in that CLI may be manifested differently depending on the level of analysis. An alternative view is presented by Flynn (2009), who suggests that experience in any prior language can influence subsequent acquisition, and that the L1 does not have a privileged role in TLA. This explanation also supports the results of the present study, where both L1 and L2 had significant influence on L3.

Concerning the different types of transfer that were manifested in the present study, it was found that transfer of form may occur from the L1 and L2. These results are in line with those found by De Angelis & Selinker (2001), where there was transfer of form from the L2, but no transfer of meaning. In Ringbom's study (2001) it was found that transfer of form may occur from either the L1 or L2. However, L2 transfer will be more frequent when the learner perceives similarities between the L2 and the L3. On the other hand, according to Ringbom (2001), transfer of meaning was restricted to the L1. In the present study, transfer from the L2 occurred only at form, but not at meaning levels.

Regarding the factors which may interact with CLI, the present study had mixed results. At the lexical level, typology could

be hypothesized as the most important factor, since the participants' L2, German, is typologically closer to English than Portuguese is. In addition, at the lexical level, L2 status could be hypothesized as the most important factor since participants transferred more elements from their non native language than from their native language. On the other hand, for the results of CLI at the syntactic level, it could be hypothesized that order of acquisition was the most important factor, since participants were more influenced by the language they learned first (L1). Moreover, at the syntactic level, recency could also be hypothesized as the most important factor, since participants of the L3G reported using their L1 more frequently than their L2. There are various studies in the literature favoring typological distance as the best predictor of CLI (CARVALHO & SILVA, 2006; CENOZ, 2001; FOUSSER, 2001; BAYONA, 2009; FOOTE, 2009). Interestingly, in a study by Bardel and Falk (2007), typological proximity favored transfer from L2 to L3, but not from L1 to L3.

Another important result of the present study was that type of task influenced the results, since in the oral task there were more cases of CLI than in the written task, which is a more formal language expression. This result is in line with the one defined by Dewaele (2001), who concluded that the formality of the task influenced the amount of crosslinguistic effects, since, in his study, code switches were less numerous in the formal situation.

Regarding the main objectives pursued in the present study, it can be stated that both the L1 and L2 are the source of language transfer in English as an L3. At the lexical level transfer from the L2 was more frequent than from the L1. On the other hand, at the syntactic level transfer from the L1 was more frequent than from the L2. With regard to the factors which may interfere with CLI, the results of the present study showed that at the lexical level, the factor that affected CLI the most was typology, since participants were more influenced by their L2, German. On the other hand, at the syntactic level, order of acquisition surpassed typology, since participants were more influenced by their first language, i.e. Brazilian Portuguese.

In short, the results of the present study showed that both the L1, Brazilian Portuguese, and the L2, German, can influence the acquisition

of English as a third language in the Brazilian context. These results are important since they explore the perspective of multilingualism in the Brazilian context, focusing on the interaction of the three languages of the learner. In the present study, it was seen that the possibilities of CLI for the L3 learners are similar to those of the L2 learners, as regards the influence of the native language. However, for the L3 learners there is another source of influence, which is the L2. This intensifies the possibilities of CLI for the L3 learners. Therefore, the present results contribute to the discussion regarding the greater complexity involved in third language acquisition as compared to the acquisition of a second language.

CONCLUSION

For the L3 learners of English who participated in the present study the source of language transfer comes from both the first language, Brazilian Portuguese, and the second language, German. The results of the study pointed to a significant influence of the second language, German, concerning CLI at the lexical level, but only regarding transfer of form. The influence of the first language, Brazilian Portuguese, was also manifested both at the lexical and syntactic levels. However, at the syntactic level, the influence of the L1 surpassed that of the L2.

Concerning the factors that may interact with CLI, the results of the present study showed that at the lexical level, the most important factor was typology, since the greatest source of influence was the participants' L2, German. On the other hand, at the syntactic level the most important factor was order of acquisition, since participants were more influenced by the first language they had learned, Brazilian Portuguese.

Moreover, the present study rendered inference that type of task influenced the results. As compared to the written task, the oral task elicited a significantly higher number of instances of CLI. This can be explained by the fact that the written task may be seen as a more formal language activity. Dewaele (2001) states that the formality of the task may lead to a monolingual mode, which, as a consequence, might result in less interaction among the languages of the multilingual speaker.

In the light of the above, it can be clearly seen that the study of CLI is a complex area that requires the analysis of multiple variables, especially where TLA is concerned. In the present study, typology, recency, L2 status and order of acquisition were analyzed. However, further investigation needs to be carried out in order to produce substantial advances and offer any real enlightenment on the main issues involved in this area of study, mainly in the Brazilian context, where research on multilingualism reflects a growing interest.

INGLÊS COMO TERCEIRA LÍNGUA NO CONTEXTO BRASILEIRO: UMA INVESTIGAÇÃO SOBRE A INFLUÊNCIA TRANSLINGÜÍSTICA

RESUMO

O presente estudo investigou a influência translingüística na aprendizagem do inglês como terceira língua na Região Sul do Brasil. Para isso, as línguas envolvidas foram o português brasileiro, o alemão e o inglês, com o objetivo de investigar: (1) a língua de origem da transferência lingüística no inglês como L3 e (2) o efeito da distância tipológica, da ordem de aquisição, do *status* da L2 e da recentividade na influência translingüística. Os resultados mostraram que tanto a L1 como a L2 influenciaram a produção dos participantes em inglês.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: influência translingüística, inglês como terceira língua, multilinguismo.

INGLÉS COMO TERCERA LENGUA EN EL CONTEXTO BRASILEÑO: UNA INVESTIGACIÓN SOBRE INFLUENCIA TRANSLINGÜÍSTICA

RESUMEN

El presente estudio resulta de una investigación en la que se averiguó la influencia translingüística en el aprendizaje del inglés como tercera lengua en la región sur de Brasil. Las lenguas involucradas en este estudio fueron la variante brasileña del portugués, el alemán y el inglés. Este estudio tuvo por meta investigar: (1) la lengua de origen de la transferencia lingüística en el inglés como L3 y (2) el efecto de la distancia tipológica, de orden de adquisición, del estatus de la L2 y de la actualidad en la influencia translingüística. Los resultados revelaron que tanto la L1 como la L2 influyeron en la producción en lengua inglesa de los participantes del estudio.

NOTAS

1. November, 17th, 2012. Zadar – Croatia. Workshop: “New perspectives on cross linguistic influence in language learning.”
2. There is no official data regarding the number of speakers.
3. The terms transfer and CLI will be used interchangeably along this article (DE ANGELIS, 2007; JARVIS & PAVLENKO, 2010).

REFERENCES

- AUFDERSTRASSE, H. et al. *Themen aktuell 2*, Kursbuch. Ismaning: Hueber, 2003.
- BARDEL, C.; FALK, Y. The role of the second language in third language acquisition: The case of Germanic syntax. *Second Language Research*, v. 23, n. 4, p. 459-484, 2007.
- BAYONA, P. The acquisition of Spanish middle and impersonal passive construction from SLA and TLA perspectives. In: LEUNG, Y. I. *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters, 2009. p. 1-29.
- CARVALHO, A.; SILVA, A. J. B. Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: The Case of Spanish-English Bilinguals' Acquisition of Portuguese. *Foreign Language Annals*, v. 39, n. 2, p. 185-202, 2006.
- CASTILHO, A. T. de. *Nova gramática do português brasileiro*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010.
- CENOZ, J. The acquisition of additional languages. *ELIA*. Spain, v. 8, p. 219-224, 2008.
- _____. The effects of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 8-20.
- COMRIE, B. Languages of the world. In: ARONOFF, M.; REES-MILLER, J. *The Handbook of Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing, 2002. Disponível em: <<http://>

www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781405102520_chunkg97814051025204>. Acesso em: 10 maio 2012.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Preliminary English Test Handbook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Disponível em: <https://www.teachers.cambridgeesol.org/ts/digitalAssets/117381_Cambridge_English_Preliminary__PET__Handbook.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 maio 2012.

COWAN, R. *The teacher's grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

DE ANGELIS, G. *Third or additional language acquisition*, v. 24. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007.

DE ANGELIS, G.; SELINKER, L. Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001, p. 42-58.

DEWAELE, J. M. Activation or inhibition? the interaction of L1, L2 and L3 on the language mode continuum. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 69-89.

ECKE, P. Lexical retrieval in a third language: evidence from errors and tip-of-the-tongue states. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 90-114.

FLYNN, S. UG and L3 Acquisition: new insights and more questions. In: LEUNG, Y. I. *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters, 2009. p. 71-88.

FOOTE, R. Transfer in L3 Acquisition: the role of typology. In: LEUNG, Y. I. *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters, 2009. p. 89-114.

FOUSER, F. J. Too close for comfort? Sociolinguistic transfer from Japanese into Korean as an L₃. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 149-169.

GIBSON, M. et al. Learners of German as an L3 and their production of German prepositional verbs. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 138-148.

- HAMMARBERG, B. Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 production and acquisition. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 21-41.
- HAWKINS, R. *Second language syntax: a generative introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- HERWIG, A. Plurilingual lexical organization: evidence from lexical processing in L1-L2-L3-L4 translation. In: CENOZ, J.; HUFSEIN, B.; JESSNER, U. (Orgs.). *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 115-137.
- JAENSCH, C. L3 acquisition of German adjectival inflection: a generative account. *Second Language Research*, n. 27, v. 1, p. 83-105, 2011.
- _____. L3 enhanced feature sensitivity as a result of higher proficiency in the L2. In: LEUNG, Y. I. *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters, 2009. p. 115-142.
- JARVIS, S.; PAVLENKO, A. *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- JESSNER, U. *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2006. 170 p.
- KELLERMAN, E. New uses for old language: cross-linguistic and cross-gestural influence in the narratives of non-native speakers. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 170-191.
- LEUNG, Y. I. Second versus third language acquisition of tense and agreement in French by Vietnamese monolinguals and Cantonese-English bilinguals. In: ISB4: *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, p. 1344-1352, 2005.
- LLAMA, R. et al. The roles of typology and L2 status in the acquisition of L3 phonology: the influence of previously learnt languages on L3 speech production. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on the Acquisition of Second Language Speech*, p. 313-323, 2007.
- MAGHSOUDI, M. Learning English as a Third Language: a Comparative Study between Iranian and Indian Bilinguals. *South Asian Language Review*, v. 18, n. 1, p. 28-41, 2008.
- MAYER, M. *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial Press, 1969.
- MAYO, M. D. P. G.; OLAIZOLA, I. V. The development of suppletive and affixal tense and agreement morphemes in the L3 English of Basque-Spanish bilinguals. *Second Language Research*, v. 27, n. 1, 129 -149, 2011.

MELHORN, G. From Russian to Polish: positive transfer in third language acquisition. *ICPhS*, v. 16, p. 6-10, 2007.

PERALES, S. et al. The acquisition of L3 English negation by bilingual (Spanish/ Basque) learners in an institutional setting. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, v. 13, n. 1, p. 3-33, 2009.

RANONG, S. N.; LEUNG, Y. I. Null objects in L1 Thai-L2 English-L3 Chinese: An empiricist take on a theoretical problem. In: LEUNG, Y. I. *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters, 2009. p. 162-191.

RINGBOM, H. Lexical transfer in L3 production. In: CENOZ, J. et al. *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001. p. 59-68.

SHOOSHTARI, Z. G. Generative Syntactic Transfer in L2 and L3 acquisition via the channel of translation. *English Language Teaching*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 129- 149, 2009.

TREMBLAY, M. C. Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: the role of L2 proficiency and L2 exposure. *CLO/OPL*, v. 34, p. 109-119, 2006.

VAN LANGENDONCK, W.; VAN DE VELDE, M. The Functions of (In)definiteness Markers with Proper Names, 2009. Disponível em: <<http://llacan.vjf.cnrs.fr/pers/vandavelde/files/pdfs/The-Functions-of-In-definiteness-Markers-with-Proper-Names.pdf>>. Acesso em: 10 maio 2012.

VINNITSKAYA, I. et al. The acquisition of relative clauses in a third language: comparing adults and children. *Proceedings of the 6th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference*, USA, p. 340-345, 2002.

YULE, G. *Explaining English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Submitted in December 4th 2013

Accepted in January 21 2014
