Language Contact, Session 6, Wednesday 25 August

Aspects of LC: Cross linguistic Influence (CLIN) in L2/L3 Acquisition. The dynamics of transfer

1	Goal: - Interference and transfer in the context of L2 / L3 Acquisition: A discussion of Cross linguistic Influence (CLIN) and of the dynamics of transfer
2	Presentation and discussion I 1) Interference and Transfer in LC (Second Language Acquisition) 2) L2 / L3 Acquisition and CLIN (acquisition of grammar and lexicon in L2 / L3) 3) Interlanguage /Learner variety and the dynamics of transfer
3.	Data analysis : Moroccan learners of French as L2
4.	Presentation and discussion II 4) Transfer and the substratum/ conservative hypothesis in the emergence of contact languages 5) Convergence and divergence in LC
5.	Discussion / Questions/ Summing up

Reading

De Angelis, Gessica (2007), *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*, Clevedo, Multilingual Matters, chap. 1 to 5

Siegel, Jeff (2008). *The emergence of Pidgin & Creole languages*, Oxford, OUP (Chapter 5).

***

1. Interference and Transfer in LC (Second Language Acquisition)

1.1. The CA hypothesis

The field of SLA developed "independently" from early work on bilingualism such as work by Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1956). However, because of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis of Robert Lado (*Languages across cultures*, 1957) [A systematic comparison of two languages in contact in the classroom to determine the points where they differ. These differences are deemed to be the main source of difficulty in learning L2.

"If the expression, content and association are functionally the same in the native and the new languages, there is maximum facilitation. Actually, no learning takes place since the student knows the unit or patterns and merely transfers it.

If the pattern is not the same and will not function as the same in the new language without structural retraining, there will be interference with the new language […]" (R. Lado, *Language Teaching. A scientific approach.*New York: McGraw-Hill).

1.2. Weinreich's interlingual identification (1953)

According to L. Selinker 1992. *Rediscovering Interlanguage.* London: Longman, Weinreich's idea of "interlingual identification" ("formal similarity or similarity in pre-existing functions' leads the bilingual to establish interlingual equivalence of morpheme categories").

Weinreich (quoted by Selinker) 'The transferability of a class of morphemes is function of both systems in contact, not just one".

1.3 "Crosslinguistic influence" (CLI)

"It is a psycholinguistic term referring to the influence on the learner which one language system he or she possesses may have on another language system. This is irrespective of whether the language

system is a mature language or whether it is in a developemental stage or fossilized before attaining maturity. The term is meant to cover more than the word 'transfer' and includes borrowings, influence on L1 from L2, avoidance of transfer etc."M. Sharwood-Smith,1989, Crosslinguistic influence in language loss. In K. Hyltenstam, L.K. Obler (eds.). *Bilingualism across the lifespan. Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity and Loss,* p. 185. Cambridge: CUP.

2. L2 / L3 Acquisition and CLIN

U. Jessner. 2003. The nature of Cross-linguistic Interaction in the Multilingual System. In: J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, U. Jessner (eds.). *The multilingual lexicon,* pp. 45-55, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

"(…) the study of TLA is methodologically based on studies on SLA and bilingualism, that is research on TLA combines two fields of investigation which hitherto have ignored each other in many respects".

In a dynamic model of multilingualism (DMM), the concept of cross-linguistic interaction (henceforth CLIN), resulting from the interaction of two or more language systems, can be taken to include not only transfer and interference but also codeswitching and borrowing phenomena and is thus reserved as an umbrella term for all the existing transfer phenomena. And it is only in that sense that CLIN is a wider concept than that of CLI."

3. Data analysis : Moroccan learners of French as L2

4. Transfer and the substratum/ conservative hypothesis in the emergence of contact languages

I. Van de Craats. 2000. *Conservation in the Acquisition of Possessive Constructions. A Study of Second Lanaguage Acquisition by Turkish and Moroccan Learners of Dutch.* Ph D. thesis, Tilburg University.

"Initially learners are guided by their L1 grammar only (the Conservation hypothesis) and that, in later stages, UG guides learners in (i) identifying mismatches between the derivational output expressions and the primary linguistic input they get, and (ii) restructuring their initial grammar in such a way that, for them, there is a (better) match between the output expressions and the environmental input".

Among aspects of linguistic knowledge conserved in the initial L2 language :

- knowledge of morphology and morphological realization rules (e.g. realization of case)
- knowledge of lexical items: (i) formal features (e.g categorical values) (ii) semantic-conceptual values;
- pragmatic knowledge of information-related grammatical encodings (e.g. the encoding of such pragmatic primitives as topic and focus).

5. Convergence and divergence in LC

Lumdsen, J.S. 1999. Language Acquisition and Creolization. In M. De Graff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change. Creolization, Diachrony and Development,* pp. 129-157, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.

“Relexification is a mental process that builds new lexical entries by combining new phonological forms with the syntactic and semantic information of lexical entries that are already established (…). It is argued that relexification applies only to lexical categories”. (p.129)

“Relexification requires a correspondence between the denotatioanl semantics of the lexical entry of the relexefier’s native language and the perceived semantic interpretation of the selected target language phonetic string. (…). Since one of the defining properties of functional categories is their lack of denotational semantic content (…), it follows that functional categories should be immune to relexification in principle”.

“Although relexification is an important process in creolization, it is not the only one. Another mental process that is typically involved in the development of extended pidgins and creole languages is reanalysis. Reanalysis is here defined as a process that associates the phonological label of a lexical category with the lexical entry of a functional category in the same language”.

“Convergence is speech by bilinguals that has all the surface-level forms from one language but with **part of the abstract lexical structure** that underlies the surface-level patterns **coming from another language** (or languages).” (Myers-Scotton 2006:271).