

CHARLES UNIVERSITY PRAGUE
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Department of English Language and Literature

Master Thesis

Multilingual Compensatory Strategies
of Czech Native Speakers in English

Author: Vítězslava Pokorná

Supervisor: PhDr. Klára Matuchová, Ph.D.

Majors: English - French

Prague 2011

Declaration:

I hereby declare that that this diploma thesis, entitled “Multilingual Compensatory Strategies of Czech Native Speakers in English”, is the result of my own work and that I used only the cited sources.

Prague, April 4th 2011

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank my supervisor PhDr. Klára Matuchová, Ph.D. for her time, patience, support, encouragement, for giving me advice and at the same time leaving me enough liberty and space regarding the compilation of this diploma thesis.

Abstract:

The proposed thesis treats the topic of multilingual language acquisition and the occurring language interference. It aims to demonstrate the negative language transfer by the means of the results of a field research. The theoretical part introduces and discusses relevant topics, such as language learning, language processing, bilingualism and multilingualism. Furthermore, it focuses on the character of language transfer itself. In the practical part, two hypotheses are presented, specifically “the interference of the dominant foreign language is considerably higher than the interference of the other language, i.e. L3” and “passive interference reaches a higher degree than the active one”. Eventually, the results interpretation is presented and both the hypotheses are verified.

Key words:

interference, transfer, language acquisition, multilingualism, bilingualism, language aptitude

Anotace :

Tato diplomová práce předkládaná k obhajobě se zabývá tématem osvojení více cizích jazyků a jejich vzájemné interference. Cílem práce je prokázat prostřednictvím praktického výzkumu přítomnost negativního jazykového transferu. V teoretické části jsou čtenáři seznámeni s relevantními tématy, tj. učení jazyků, zpracování jazyka, bilingvismus a multilingvismus. Dále se zaměřuje na samotný transfer. V praktické části jsou formulovány tyto dvě hypotézy: „interference dominantního cizího jazyka je podstatně vyšší než interference dalšího cizího jazyka“ a „pasivní interference dosahuje vyšší míry než aktivní interference“. Následuje prezentace výsledků výzkumu a potvrzení obou hypotéz.

Klíčová slova:

jazyková interference, transfer, osvojení jazyka, multilingvismus, bilingvismus, jazykové nadání

Table of Contents:

1. Introduction	7
2. History of English Language – its origins and the Norman influence.....	11
2.1 The period of Old English (450 – 1066).....	11
2.2 The period of Middle English (1066 – 1476)	13
3. Learning process.....	17
3.1 Psychology of learning	17
3.2 Language proficiency.....	18
3.3 Learner’s profile	20
3.3.1 Children vs. adult language acquisition.....	20
3.3.2 Predicting learners’ success in language acquisition	21
3.3.3 Cognitive style	21
3.3.4 Personality and affective factors.....	22
4. Language processing	24
4.1 Transition stage.....	24
4.1.1 Types of transition.....	25
4.1.2 The role of consciousness	26
4.2 Memory.....	27
4.3 Phases of language production	28
4.4 Factors involved in speech process.....	29
4.5 Bilingualism	31
4.5.1 Approaching bilingualism	31
4.5.2 Interlanguage and approximative systems	33
4.5.3 Types of bilingualism	33
4.6 Multilingualism.....	35
4.7 Transfer	36
4.7.1 Occurrence of transfer.....	36

4.7.2	Types of transfer according to its effects.....	37
4.7.3	Negative transfer.....	38
4.7.4	Types of transfer from the linguistic point of view	39
4.7.5	Contrastive rhetoric	40
4.7.6	Language differences	41
5.	Practical part – research on language interference.....	44
5.1	Research design and structure.....	44
5.2	Criteria of evaluation.....	45
6.	Presentation of the test, its assessment and interpretation	53
6.1	English test	53
6.1.1	English test – 1 st exercise.....	53
6.1.2	English test – 2 nd exercise.....	56
6.1.3	English test – 3 rd exercise	60
6.2	French test.....	65
6.2.1	French test – 1 st exercise.....	66
6.2.2	French test – 2 nd exercise	67
6.2.3	French test – 3 rd exercise	69
6.2.4	French test – 4 th exercise	71
6.3	The final overview of both tests.....	73
6.4	Students’ self evaluation	76
6.4.1	The questionnaire and its outcomes.....	76
6.4.1.1	EN-GE students.....	77
6.4.1.2	EN-FR students	79
7.	Summary and Conclusions	81
8.	Appendix	83
9.	Bibliography	90

1. Introduction

Due to the current trend of promoting and facilitating contact and communication of people all over the world, the Czech primary and secondary education should provide students with the knowledge of at least two foreign languages. After the school leaving exams, the students' expected level of competence, according to the latest curriculum¹, should be B2 for the first foreign language and B1 for the second language. The study of the latter one starts usually later and is allocated a lower number of lessons than the former.

Even though the languages are taught in separate classes, our brain does not treat them as separate entities and cannot avoid their interaction and interference. There are situations in which we are fully aware of the fact that we use a particular language, other than our mother tongue, as a mediator to help or enable us to express ourselves, make ourselves understood, enrich our vocabulary, embellish our style, guess or deduce the meaning of the message that we hear or read.

Apart from this intentional behaviour there are also situations in which we get influenced by another language unconsciously. In fact, a simple allusion to a different language or to the culture of the country where it is spoken may cause a deviation from the language system we are using and our further language production is more or less marked by this influence.

¹ Baladová, G. (2009, March 19). Společný evropský referenční rámec pro cizí jazyky v ČR. Retrieved from <http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/o/z/3024/SPOLECNY-EVROPSKY-REFERENCNI-RAMEC-PRO-CIZI-JAZYKY-V-CR.html/>

My interest in the topic of multilingual compensation strategies may be briefly explained by my personal frustration about the impact of language interference on my own language production. The longer I study several foreign languages at the same time, the more I am aware of my inability to master any foreign language at a near-native level. It may often occur that when we deal with the topics for which we do not have sufficient vocabulary, we tend to 'help' ourselves with our knowledge of other languages.

In my research I focus on the students whose foreign language knowledge includes English and French. The reason for this choice is not only the fact that these are the two languages that I study at university, but there is also a more objective reason – the immense impact of French on the development of English, which I comment on in greater detail below.

Logically, the ability to speak French should increase the speaker's competence in English. In general, we may claim that both, comprehension and production of FL1, are supported and enhanced by the FL2. This assertion may be mostly valid when talking about the lower levels of language (A1, A2) where the purpose is to put the message successfully across and to understand what we hear or read.

The positive effect of language transfer is essential here, supposing that we omit the cases of paronyms, bilingual false cognates, unusual collocations and misunderstandings based on different cultural norms and customs. If we take into account more advanced levels of competence (B2, C1, C2), the features mentioned above become less clear cut because they may remain unnoticed by the users and the results of the interference will become more striking in relation to the whole production or comprehension for a native speaker.

The favourable effect of the reciprocal influence of languages is evident and cannot be denied, so, further on, I would rather like to draw attention to the interference that brings along more or less significant mistakes and any possible kinds of misinterpretations.

I also find it interesting to discover whether the mistakes with which I have to deal in my own writing are similar for other foreign language students and where our problems differ. From the point of view of a future teacher, it will be useful to create a classification of the main kinds of interference and illustrate them with concrete examples of the mistakes that most frequently occur in my questionnaires so as to be able to take them into account later in my teaching practice.

Going back to my first conception of the practical part of my thesis, my intention then was to analyse the already existing English essays and other written production of university students of English and French. I expected that at their level I would deal especially with the interference of the typical French syntagmatic features and the fact that they tend to prefer the lexis of Romanic origin, which only occasionally may appear inadequate in a particular context.

However, I was confronted with a problem concerning the fact that most students of our faculty (who were willing to provide me with some pieces of their writing) had studied English as their first foreign language and the level of their French was considerably lower. As they mostly admitted, they were rather more aware of the negative English interference in their written French production.

Moreover, as the students' aptitude for learning foreign languages is usually high and it is not only English and French that they speak, their production is often influenced also by other foreign languages and there the analysis becomes more complicated. Nevertheless, I will use some of the specific results of this essay analysis to illustrate the typology of French-English interference. On this basis a test for secondary school students is designed and its results interpreted.

Naturally, the less advanced level in both languages has to be considered, the more problems in the domain of lexis should be taken into account and, on the other hand, the lower

proportion of French syntagmatic interference can be traced. The students' English production will probably also bear more traces of the tendency towards word for word Czech-English translation. The interference in pronunciation might be considerable at this stage, however, I want to concentrate only on written production and comprehension.

As I intend to teach both these languages, I hope that this research will help me better realise more clearly what problems are significant for the major part of my students and how I could possibly prevent them, and, at the same time, I will become more alert and sensitive to the effects of interference in my own production.

The theoretical part of my thesis is divided into the three following chapters: History of English Language – its origins and the Norman influence (ch. 2, p. 11-16), which explains the importance of French influence on English; Learning process (ch. 3, 17-23) giving a psycholinguistic overview on language learning and learner's personality; and Language processing (ch. 4, p. 24-42), which is subdivided into the sections dealing with transition stage, memory, phases of language production, factors involved in speech process, bilingualism, multilingualism and transfer. This is followed by the Practical part – research on language interference (ch. 5, p. 44-52), where the hypotheses are formulated, the research is described and the criteria of evaluation are clarified; Presentation of the test, its assessment and interpretation (ch. 6, p. 53-80), where all the variants of test are analyzed and interpreted; and Summary and Conclusions (ch. 7, p. 81-82), which summarises the whole work and verifies my hypotheses. Moreover, the Appendix (ch. 8, p. 83-89) contains the questionnaire the students were presented with.

2. History of English Language – its origins and the Norman influence

For the purposes of my thesis I find it important to briefly introduce the first two periods of the development of English. I leave out the periods of the Early modern and Modern English because they are not as relevant for depicting the French influence on English.

2.1 The period of Old English (450 – 1066)

The first tribes that settled in the lands of today's Great Britain, were Britons (Celts), followed by Picts and Scots. The Celts were attacked by the Romans and the land was conquered in the year 43, however, the Celtic language was not overtaken by Latin. In the year 410 AD Roman legions withdrew from Britain, which symbolically left enough space for the main settlement of the Germanic tribes - Angles, Saxons and Jutes during the following decades. This was followed by a period of a long struggle for dominance and lands with the local Romano-Celtic population; however, by about 700 the Anglo-Saxons had occupied most of England and a part of southern Scotland.

There are not many words of Celtic origin in today's English, but some names of towns and rivers are taken from Celtic words: e.g. London, Leeds, Avon, Thames (= dark river) (Barber, 1993: 101).

Crystal (2004) attempts to explain the reasons for the scarce influence of the Anglo-Saxons by the Celtic speech around them: first, he suggests that their way of life had little in common

and there was no need of borrowing Celtic words. Or, conversely, their lifestyles were so similar that the Anglo-Saxons already had all the words that they needed. Second, it might have been a conscious avoidance of them, either because of Anglo-Saxons' feeling of superiority, or, reversely, because of their feeling of inferiority which caused the refusal of the langue belonging to the disliked incomers (Crystal, 2004: 30).

The Old English had four major dialects, Northumbrian in the north of England, Mercian in the Midlands, West Saxon in the south and west, and Kentish in the Southeast. Most manuscripts were copied by West-Saxon scribes, which was also the language of King Alfred. This caused that the copy of the Old English epic poem Beowulf is also written mainly in the West-Saxon dialect, although, the evidence of all four Old English dialects may be found in this text (Crystal, 2004: 50)

The Old English morphology is a simplification of the complicated Proto-Germanic system – nouns have 4 cases, are divided into 3 large declensions, adjectives have more distinctive endings than nouns, grammatical gender is still present. They use the Proto-Germanic two-tense system (present and past), and 3 moods -indicative, subjunctive and imperative. Gradually, auxiliaries, perfect forms and passive structures come into use.

As concerns syntax, the inflectional system enables a rather free word-order in comparison with Modern E, the V-S-O order is rather frequent.

Vocabulary is enriched by using these four dialects as a resource, new words are formed by the use of prefixes and suffixes or compounding (Barber, 1993: 116-120).

The geopolitical development of the land continued and during the 8th and 9th centuries the land was invaded by Norsemen (the Danes) and, two centuries later, in 1066 by Normans. Although both these tribes were Scandinavian in origin, only Norsemen retained their Scandinavian speech; Normans settled in the northern France and became French-speaking.

The Scandinavian influence may be seen in English place-names (Grimsby - 'by' = village; Grimsthorpe – 'thorpe' = secondary settlement). Old English and Old Norse interacted, they were rather similar, which facilitated the mutual comprehension. In the end, Old Norse died out in England and Old English was left, but it had already beard some traces of Scandinavian.

Their two cultures were similar, so the loan-words were those from everyday life (sister, fellow, cake, fog, knife, skill, skin, sky, window, wrong, odd, ugly, call, get, give, raise, take, smile, want, though, they, them, their). The number of Scandinavian loans is small, but these words are frequently used (Barber, 1993: 127-134). The influence of Scandinavian dialects was not long lasting, “a factor relevant to the later period would have been the rise of Norman influence, making Danish world less prestigious.” (Crystal, 2004: 72). There was enough space for Normans to enrich the vocabulary of ‘more prestigious’ areas of life, in comparison to Scandinavian, such as government, church and the life of noble people.

2.2 The period of Middle English (1066 – 1476)

This period is marked by the year 1066 at its beginning, in other words by the Norman Conquest, and as its end the year 1476 may be considered, when printing was introduced and significant changes in spelling, pronunciation and grammar, among others, were its consequence.

Normans had originally been Scandinavian Vikings, who occupied parts of northern France. In 912, Rollo became the first Duke of Normandy, and he accepted the king of France as his overlord. Normans started to speak French, they adopted the French culture as their own. Normans were good at superior military techniques, construction of castles, churches,

cathedrals. Accordingly, English was enriched by their vocabulary in these domains (Barber, 1993: 134).

In fact, there was already a strong French influence on the English people before the Norman Conquest, at the higher levels of society. After 1066, French became the language of the English upper classes because it was the language of the conquerors. Normans owned the lands and they also occupied important positions, so the church and education were dominated by them. French remained the language of the aristocracy and the court for more than two hundred years. It was considered to be prestigious and it ruled the domain of cultural life and administration.

By the end of the 12th century, the early cases of bilingualism can be found, many children of the nobility who had English as a mother tongue had to learn French at school. Another prestigious language then was Latin which was the language of the church, of scholarship, and of international communication. However, the majority of common people spoke English. The English of that time had many dialects, but none of them had a norm or a literary standard (Crystal, 2004: 129).

The Normans spoke Norman French, which gradually turned into Anglo Norman by the 13th century. By that time, Central French dialect of Paris starts to have a strong influence on the rest of France. Thus, from the point of view of prestige, the Anglo-Norman dialect lost its value in France and, consequently, also in England. French was still spoken at court, literature was still written in French for the English nobility, but the numbers of common people who wanted or needed to speak it were on decline. When in the 14th century Normandy became ruled by the French crown, for England it meant a definitive triumph of English language. Literature was written rather in English, English was used for grammar-school education, French ceased to be the mother tongue of the nobility.

The Middle English was enriched by a great deal of vocabulary in the following semantic fields:

Military terms	armour, battle, castle, tower, war;
Court	baron, court, duke, marquess, peer, prince, sovereign
Government	council, country, crown, government, nation, parliament, people, state
Church	abbey, clergy, parish, relic, prayer, religion, saint, sermon, service, virgin
Literature	poem, romance
Law	accuse, attorney, court, crime, judge, justice, prison, punish, sentence, verdict
Arts	art, beauty, chant, colour, column, music, paint
Fashion	costume, dress, fashion
Cuisine	veal, beef, mutton, pork'
Moral qualities	charity, courtesy, cruelty, mercy, obedience
Life of nobility	manor, palace, heir, nurse, butler, servant

(Barber, 1993: 145)

In Modern English we may often find French and Germanic words side-by-side with similar meanings. In such cases words of Germanic origin tend to be more popular and perhaps more emotionally charged, while the French words are often more formal, refined, official (e.g. folk x nation; hearty x cordial) (Barber, 1993: 147).

The early French loan-words were taken from the Norman dialect which was different from Central French. These words were assimilated, there were more ordinary everyday words among them (garden, hour, market, people, wage). We may find that some words were borrowed in their Norman form and then later borrowed again in their Central French form, so English comprises some French doublets (catch-chase, warden-guardian) (Barber, 1993: 147).

Both Norman and Central French made part of the processes of word formation and were combined with Middle English, it is entirely common to find French-English hybrids (beautiful, gentleness, preaching, ungracious) (Barber, 1883: 148).

The Normans also reflected the changing English spelling. They were not familiar with the Old English of the preceding centuries and they used and worked only with the variants occurring in the period after the Conquest, trying to adjust it to their own linguistic norms. As a consequence, their English written form was an illustration of the developmental changes in language. As Barber (1993) claims: “Norman scribes disregarded traditional English spelling and simply spelt the language as they heard it, using many of the conventions of Norman French. Consequently, many changes that had not been reflected in Old English spelling, now emerged clearly” (Barber, 1993: 151).

Middle English brought changes in morphology, the inflectional system was reduced, only two main declensions remained and were generalized, the rest of other declensions may be found only in several cases, such as irregular plural forms (mice, geese, feet, men).

In syntax, SOV word-order was needed, the reduced inflection resulted in a more frequent use of prepositions.

After having explained the importance of the role of French in the English language development, namely its vocabulary and spelling, a theoretical background to the learning process and language processing will be given. The contribution of the theoretical chapter should be the reader's understanding of what interference is and of the fact that the two languages mentioned have a considerably wide common ground and that particularly French interference has even historically provided conditions to appear in English.

3. Learning process

To introduce the topic of language learning, I will first consider the learning process in general (Psychology of learning, ch. 3.1, p. 17-18), its expected outcomes (Language proficiency, ch. 3.2, p. 18-20) and at the characteristics of the learner that is involved in this process (Learner's profile, ch. 3.3, p. 20-23).

3.1 Psychology of learning

The object of the psychology of learning is to study the characteristics of the learner and individual differences among learners' abilities, personality, attitudes and motivation, different kinds of learning, the learning process and outcomes of learning (Stern, 1991: 309).

Among the learner characteristics Stern (1991) lists the following: the influence of age and maturity on mental development and learning, the effects of heredity and environment on abilities and achievement, specific aptitudes for particular learning tasks (language learning aptitude), the influence of home and community on motivations and attitudes that impel learners to attend to learning tasks and the degree to which learners are prepared to persevere with it.

The learning process is further influenced by the degree of learner's awareness or volitional control. Some learning processes are more or less unconscious, they are often referred to as **blind, latent, or incidental learning**, which is just the case of language acquisition. On the other hand, the learning in educational settings is designed to be **intentional or deliberate learning** and it is at least to some extent under the learner's volitional control.

When we want to assess the degree of the learner's conceptual understanding of the learning task, we may contrast between **rote / mechanical learning** and **insightful / meaningful / cognitive learning**. It is evident that the latter are more probable to have long lasting positive results and to facilitate better incorporating of new structures into the language that learner acquires (Stern, 1991: 309-311).

The learner's opportunities to practice or the conditions under which a learner can practice the language being acquired also matters, especially the frequency, intensity, techniques and methods. Repetition is also needed to retain the acquired items as a part of learner's active production.

These are the constituents of the process that mark the learner's path to achievement, which might be language proficiency, supposing that the learner is interested in the subject matter and sufficiently motivated.

3.2 Language proficiency

Proficiency in a second language, i.e. the learner's ability to use this knowledge for various tasks, can be looked at as the desired competence level, and thus be defined in terms of specific objectives. As an ideal state to which the level is compared is considered the level approaching that of a native speaker, which was characterized by Stern (1991: 341-347) by the following **competences**:

- the language user knows the rules governing his native language and he can apply them without paying attention to them

- he has an intuitive grasp of the linguistic, cognitive, affective, and sociocultural meanings expressed by language forms (these two characteristics describe a linguistic competence, with reference to mainly formal and semantic features of the language)
- he spontaneously uses language for the purpose of communication and has an intuitive understanding of the sociolinguistic functions of a language in use
- linguistic and communicative competence manifests itself in language behaviour receptively and productively
- the speaker uses the language creatively

Viewed from the aspect of skills, he should have mastered all four **intralingual skills** (i.e. listening, speaking, reading, writing) as well as **crosslingual** or **mediating skills**, in other words interpreting and translating.

Similarly, Cummins divides **language competence** into two distinct skill types: basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), later, he renamed them **conversational skills** versus **academic language proficiency**.

BICS include mainly pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and fluency, whilst CALP denotes the ability to make use of the cognitive functions of language, to use language effectively as an instrument of thought and to represent cognitive operations via language (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 16).

It must be taken into account that not only different second language learners but also different first language users are likely to acquire a language competence to a different degree based on their language aptitude, notwithstanding their effort. The **interlanguage** of each

learner always bears some traces of certain relatively fixed defects which are often referred to as **fossilizations** (see 5.2).

3.3 Learner's profile

3.3.1 Children vs. adult language acquisition

It is a wide-spread notion that better results in language learning can be reached at the age before puberty because of brain lateralization and specialization of functions. However, Krashen claimed that the cortical lateralization occurs much earlier, i.e. before the age of five. On the other hand, he asserted that the lateralization does not necessarily cause loss of any abilities (Stern, 1991: 362).

In fact, children may be more successful than adults in acquiring an appropriate accent in a new language, however, it was described by Thorndike that they make less rapid progress than adults in other aspects of foreign language learning, in case that both group are given the same learning time (Stern, 1991: 363).

Other studies comparing early and late immersions into a foreign language (e.g. Genesee, 1981) also proved that the achievement results that he obtained are comparable and that there is no evidence that starting the study of a foreign language early is advantageous, maybe with the exception that thus, student will have more time to attain a desired level at a given age. Basically, each stage of development may both advantageous and disadvantageous for second language acquisition.

Generally speaking, young children will acquire a language most easily in social and communicative situations, while older learners can profit more from conscious cognitive approaching a language (Stern, 1991: 364-366).

3.3.2 Predicting learners' success in language acquisition

It has been in the centre of attention for five decades to find a way to predict second or foreign language aptitude. Intelligence tests and achievement tests in the native language did not prove to be reliable sources of this information. On one hand, they include some characteristics which do not relate closely to second language learning and, on the other hand, they do not contain others which play a role in the second language learning process (e.g. the ability to discriminate different phonemes).

To give an example of such **language aptitude** tests, we may refer to Carroll and Sapon's Modern Language Aptitude Test (1959 MLAT) and their Elementary Modern Language Aptitude Test (1967 EMLAT) or Pimsleur's Language Aptitude Battery (1966 PLAB). The word **aptitude** in their titles can be defined as a set of different characteristics which are involved in the process of second language learning. PLAB differs from the other two tests in that it also contains an assessment of interest in second languages (i.e. motivation), an assessment of first language vocabulary and an assessment of general school achievement (Stern, 1991: 368).

3.3.3 Cognitive style

Cognitive style is one of the aspects relevant to second language learning. It is "a characteristic self-consistent mode of functioning which individuals show in their perceptual and intellectual activities" (Stern, 1991: 374). It usually is rather consistent and invariable because people automatically tend to choose the strategies and attitudes towards new information which are the most effective for them.

Choosing the relevant ones, I will briefly mention the division between **field dependence** and **field independence**, where the field independent learners are believed to be more successful, because they are able to understand language items in context, interpret it pragmatically, and at the same time to generalize an item independently on that context (Stern, 1991: 373).

The distinction between **interference-prone** learners versus **low interference prone** ones designates the suggestibility by various conflicts of intrusive ambiguities. The ability of either **broad** or **narrow categorization** describes in the extreme cases either the tendency to overgeneralizations, or, on the contrary, to limiting a rule only to a specific context in which it was encountered (Stern, 1991: 373-374).

Not to forget that even the best results attained in different language aptitude tests and convenient cognitive styles cannot guarantee reaching the level of proficiency in a desired time span. What can effect learning process to a considerable degree are affective and personality factors and the social context of the learner.

3.3.4 Personality and affective factors

If we choose among the **affective components** the not instantaneous but rather durable ones, we can name attitudes, motivation, general attitudes towards the community and people who speak the target language, attitudes towards learning the language concerned, attitudes towards languages and language learning in general (Gardner & Lambert, 1972: 132).

As concerns **personality factors**, it is important to point out that the higher the language level is, the more true is the claim that successful language learners are not necessarily those who can learn a language fast and easily but rather those who have been able to persevere, who

have overcome various failures, errors and frustrations, when they have compared themselves to the native speakers' level.

An ideal prototypical learner should be capable of **self reflection** and of an adequate amount of self-criticism. The result of this should not cause demotivation and frustration followed by abandonment, although especially the beginnings of the learning process are difficult. When starting with a new language, the learners already know their first language, and affectively, they have to come to terms with the frustration by the fact, that they are not able to communicate in the same way in the second language. It is a common intellectual and emotional crisis that is experienced in the early stages of exposure to the second language environment. The self-reflection should only serve as a kind of evaluation of the effectiveness of the learning process, and coming up with potential changes and improvements. The learner should have an internal need for achievement, be **motivated** and reasonably ambitious (Stern, 1991: 375-380; 398).

Other variables considered relevant are learning conditions, educational objectives, content, procedures, techniques, strategies, materials and evaluation. A somehow broader, but not negligible, influence has **social context**, in other words sociolinguistic, socio-cultural and socioeconomic factors.

4. Language processing

This section has the aim to explain how a learner incorporates a new language system, which processes come into play and what the role of consciousness and unconsciousness is (Transition stage, ch. 4.1, p. 24-27), which types of memory are involved (Memory, ch. 4.2, p. 27-28), what phases the language production goes through (Phases of language production, ch. 4.3, p. 28). Some other factors having impact on the process and the final outcome are mentioned (Factors involved in speech process, ch. 4.4, p. 29-31). The theoretical background of bilingualism (Bilingualism, ch. 4.5, p. 31-34) and multilingualism (Multilingualism, ch. 4.6, p. 35-36) will be provided and the notion of transfer (Transfer, ch.4.6, p.36-43) will be introduced.

4.1 Transition stage

Students at lower stages of learning a foreign language usually are not able to ‘think’ in the target language yet. Their level does not allow them to proceed directly from the stage of a conception or an idea directly to its expected form in the target language. They need an interphase during which they formulate their idea first in their mother tongue, till after then they produce the final utterance. This **transition** through the mediation of the mother tongue is not automatic, it needs some time and effort to find an appropriate foreign equivalent to the utterance in the other tongue, to remember all the rules that may be concerned and apply them. It is natural that this interphase causes that students tend to translate word by word and thus they make more mistakes, yet, it the aim is to develop the capacity to conform one’s production to the language system of the target language. As claimed by Leontiev (1981),

“The learner should not translate only but should be acquainted especially with the rules governing the transition from the speech operations of the other tongue to those of the foreign one” (Leontiev, 1981: 27).

It seems irrefutable to suppose that if the learners are multilingual, they will get influenced not only by their mother tongue, but they will use the knowledge of their second language as well, at least to a certain degree. Especially in cases when the second language belongs to the same language family as the target one, or if some aspects of the second language are closer to it than the learner’s mother tongue is.

4.1.1 Types of transition

The process of transition consists of several operations that can be divided into two main types, macro-operations and micro-operations (Leontiev, 1981: 27).

Micro-operations are universal and occur in all languages, they do not relate only to speech. Such an operation is for example the probability prognosis. It is ‘activated’ immediately after we have some information, the beginning of a phrase. At this moment, we unconsciously and automatically prognosticate its most probable ending.

Macro-operations are more complex and include the micro-operations. They are specific for each particular language, or, it might be rather said, for each speaker. The speaker repeatedly uses some particular ‘transformations’ among all the languages that he knows and that may influence his speech processes. (Leontiev, 1981: 27-28)

Leontiev distinguishes 3 types of transition from operations in the mother tongue to those used in the foreign language:

- 1) simple transference of the operation to new linguistic material
- 2) the sort of transference which requires corrections and clarification
- 3) the operation has to be formed from the basis (explaining of those grammatical aspects that are unknown from the first language)

At higher levels of mastering a foreign language, speech operations should pass through the transition from conscious to fully automatized activity.

4.1.2 The role of consciousness

This transition is never a sudden one, it goes through several stages:

- 1) actual consciousness – we focus our attention on the object of conscious grasp
- 2) conscious control – we are not directly aware of the object of conscious grasp but we may gain this awareness at any moment if needed
- 3) unconscious control – the object of conscious grasp is related to a standard in our memory, without any conscious interference
- 4) complete unconsciousness

(Leontiev, 1981: 41-42)

When the foreign speech skill has been attained, we should be aware of the content of an utterance, to control our speech habits and some concrete elements consciously, whereas most of the peculiarities, such as the aspect of pronunciation should be under unconscious control.

If we want to trace the influence of the second foreign language that the person speaks, both consciously and unconsciously applied, it could be supposed that we might find more evidence of it in oral production (an unprepared one), because it is spontaneous and one has to react immediately and says what comes first to his or her mind. Meanwhile, the unconscious interference discovered in written production would be even more significant because in such case, even though the person had more time to think about the formal aspects of language (compared to spontaneous speech), the other foreign language model asserted itself into the final result.

4.2 Memory

When analyzing the learners' oral production, we may clearly see whether the language, when not seen itself as a goal, but just as a means of communication, has already gone through the "transition from conscious to fully automatized activity", as the **degree of language acquisition in terms of speech operations** is defined by Leontiev (1981: 41). Similarly, we may use other terms and ask whether the knowledge of various grammatical rules have already shifted from **direct memory** (that Leontiev conceives as the short term retention of certain elements which has the restricted span of 7 ± 2 units) through **operative memory** (that is used for the period of a given activity, and it is slightly extensible) to **permanent memory** (long-

term memory), which would mean that the learner is able to use them without paying any special attention to them (Leontiev, 1981: 52).

Memory has many functions during speech activity, it is the storage of concrete grammatical characteristics of the given utterance, of the content and plan of the utterance and of the external form of an utterance or a whole text (here we distinguish between a **mechanical** or **semi-mechanical/meaning-dependent memorizing**) (Leontiev, 1981: 53-54).

Memory can be characterized also from the aspect of **learning styles** (Stern, 1991: 373-375), which distinguishes visual learners, auditory learners and kinesthetic or tactile learners. As may be logically deduced from the terms, a **visual** learner prefers learning by seeing, they remember a new word or locution best when seeing it written; **auditory** learners learn best through listening, lectures, recorded speech and discussions are ideal for them; and **kinesthetic** and **tactile** learners prefer to learn via experience. The need to move, touch objects, the project method is also useful for them. It may be supposed that the learning style will be recognisable also in learners' production, visual learners may be more accurate in spelling and auditory learners will be better in various aspects of pronunciation.

4.3 Phases of language production

Our **language production**, as well as any other intellectual acts consists of three phases: **preliminary orientation** in the overall situation, circumstances and conditions, creating a plan of action; **performance** – the execution of this plan; and **checking** of the result, comparing to the expected aim (Leontiev, 1981: 63).

4.4 Factors involved in speech process

There are many **negative factors** influencing the learning process in general, such as stress, anxiety, lack of sleep, work overload, boredom, or bad environmental conditions, but these can be outweighed by the **positive** aspect of motivation, volition, emotions, feelings and moods. (Leontiev, 1981: 67-74)

What plays a significant role is our ability to concentrate on the formal part of our speech. Our **concentration** usually depends strongly on our effort, on our volition to pay attention for a longer time and to keep in mind the new information and also to recall and older one. We may say that not only but especially in case of lower levels of language, the **topic** of a particular text or a conversation has a huge impact on the quality and correctness of learners' written and oral production.

Grammar may be partially "put aside" if the speakers try to explain a kind of system, a process, a complicated story, to give instructions or make clear some logical relations to the reader or hearer. Similarly, an interesting topic that causes a higher **emotional involvement** lessens learners' concentration on the formal part.

In case that a **high percentage of expressions** that learners need or want to use are completely **unknown** to the learners or very recently learnt, they are more likely to reduce paying attention to the formal part and they switch all their effort to putting the content across. Individual learners have different tolerance to the amount of unknown vocabulary that still may be overcome and one does not abandon. It depends among other aspects on their

promptness to compensate their lack on knowledge and to activate some interlanguage strategies or on their ability to deduce the meaning from context.

Taken from the morphological point of view, we might suppose that what makes us most unsure is especially the lack of nouns, followed by verbs (generally, they contain the key information in an utterance). Unknown adjectives and adverbs need not to be perceived as such a barrier and, in our production, we usually either choose an expression with an acceptably similar meaning or we omit the modification completely. The closed sets of lexemes are usually already acquired and used more or less correctly without any special care (an incorrect usage of pronouns or numbers usually does not change the meaning as much, if this grammatical difference is not exactly the point of conversation, in which case, they would supposedly be paid more attention to).

Moreover, the learners' **personality** may either facilitate or inhibit the learning process, because it shapes their attitude to the process of learning as such.

It could be claimed that extraverted students in general feel at ease rather in case of oral production, they perceive communication and the reactions of their partner as supportive and they don't mind their insufficient language knowledge as much (supposedly except for cases when one has to speak with a partner or in front of someone who makes him or her feel ashamed, embarrassed, nervous or afraid). Extroverts want their idea or the content of the message to be well understood by their interlocutor. As they are more outgoing than introverts, they rely widely on gesticulation and face expressions, however, this is not the object of our interest herein.

From the linguistic point of view, they might be expected to help themselves with synonyms, general expressions, hyperonyms or also hyponyms, antonyms, simplified descriptions and explanations. If their partner speaks their mother tongue, they may tend to fill the vocabulary

gaps with the expressions from their mother tongue, which is typical for beginners. However, if they are forbidden to do this, they may try to use loan words from other foreign languages that they know (either hoping that their partner speaks the same language and will understand, or expecting that this word really might exist also in English). Depending on their language experience, they either use the word in an unchanged form or they use it with the pronunciation of the language they need (in this case English); or they are already aware that they should pay attention to the suffixes and prefixes and some regularities in how certain groups of phonemes differ while borrowing (e.g. the French prefix “sou(s)-” either retains in English the Latin form “sub-” or is translated as “under-”).

Introverted people might be expected to feel safer with written production. They probably appreciate the possibility to think about it first, prepare their plan of production carefully and to have enough time for revision and possible changes before being willing to let someone else evaluate the result of their work. If they are not stressed by their interlocutors personality or behaviour and by the pace of communication, they can effectively focus their attention on the content as well as on the formal part of their written or oral production.

4.5 Bilingualism

4.5.1 Approaching bilingualism

At the beginning of creating the first concepts of bilingualism, a bilingual was viewed as two monolinguals in one person. Thus, their bilingual proficiency was measured against monolingual proficiency in both languages. The results of such tests showed that bilingual speakers have reached worse results than monolinguals, even when their bilingual competence

was acquired before the critical period. Most recent findings still confirm the linguistic disadvantage when compared to monolinguals of the same age, if they are measured according to monolingual criteria and that a bilingual person does not really command the fine points of either language (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 6).

Bilinguals' deficiency can be found at the level of syntactic comprehension, text information recall and word comprehension (Cook, 1993: 110), where the cause is believed to be the lack of exposure. Actually, their linguistic experience is split between two languages, which means that their exposure to each of them separately is insufficient for acquiring full competence.

In the traditional conception where bilingualism was seen as a reduplication of the processes required to learn one language, it was believed that these the two acquired proficiencies were separated. The early researchers supposed the existence of **codeswitching**, the presence of a neurophysiological switch that would enable the alternation of the accessibility of the two psycholinguistic systems and ensure the avoidance of general interference phenomena occurring between the two language systems (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 15-23).

Cummins (1991: 70-89) suggested the idea of a **common underlying proficiency**, which can be affected by the use of either language. It means that the linguistic development of the second language can show its positive effects in the native language, which is just the case of additive bilingualism.

The positive effects of the development of proficiency in two languages may be seen in greater degree of metalinguistic awareness. Usually, it facilitates a further acquisition of another language.

The metalinguistic awareness functions on a similar basis as Krashen's idea of a **monitor** in the language learner which is defined as "the part of the learner's system that consciously inspects and, from time to time, alters the form of the learner's production" (Dulay et. al.,

1982: 279). Moreover, they tend to have higher cognitive flexibility, creativity, divergent thought or problem solving and communicative sensitivity (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 62-68).

4.5.2 Interlanguage and approximative systems

In 1972, the term **interlanguage** (i.e. the intermediate stages between the native and target language observable in learners' language) was introduced by Selinker (1972: 31-49). He mentions the existence of **fossilizations** (i.e. linguistic items, rules and subsystems kept by a speaker from his native language and used in his interlanguage – thus, this term may be compared to **negative interference** from the learner's native language; see 5.2).

A similar attitude with a different terminology is used by Nemser (1971: 55-62), who explains his theory of **approximative systems** (i.e. deviant linguistic systems of the target language interpreted as transient stages, he focuses on the phonological aspects). Approximative language system usually describe a situation in which only partial achievement was gained and where certain fossilization can be observed, it is either a partial command of a complete language system or complete command of a partial system (lack of language learning process).

4.5.3 Types of bilingualism

If we start our overview with researches concerning the impact of the second language on the first one, we may distinguish **additive** and **subtractive bilingualism** (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 15). The additive denotes positive outcomes of being bilingual and subtractive refers to the negative affective and cognitive effects of bilingualism (the acquisition of one language sometimes threatens to replace or dominate the other language).

Bilingualism may be found under different forms, depending on the proportion of acquisition in both languages (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 118-123), as will be explained below:

Ambilingualism or **ambilingual balanced bilingualism** denotes ideal native-like competence in both languages, both language systems are fully developed.

Balanced bilingualism or **non-ambilingual balanced bilingualism** describes the state when both language systems are equally developed, but not to the ideal speaker proficiency level. However, the speaker has increased communicative needs either because he lives in a multilingual society or a bilingual community or because of professional demands. It may occur that the speaker's performance may be different in dependence on the situation, e.g. hypercorrectness in written form may be combined with an increased number of slips in speech.

We may speak about **unbalanced bilingualism** when the development of both languages varies. It may have three forms (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 118-123):

Transitional bilingualism is the state when one language system is gradually replaced by another, from the long-term point of view, it is a reversion that results to result in monolingualism.

Stable dominant bilingualism occurs when the first language is not fully replaced by the second one, but it becomes a dominant (primary) language and the first language takes the role of subordinate (secondary) language.

Passive bilingualism means that the speaker has only passive/receptive knowledge of the second linguistic system and does not use it for active communication.

4.6 Multilingualism

The term **multilingualism** is designed to describe the command and/or use of sometimes two, but usually of more languages by the respective speaker (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 52).

For a long time third (or other-) language learning has been treated by linguists as a variety of second language learning and acquisition (Jessner, 2006: 13). Nowadays it is already known that learning a second language differs in many aspects from learning a third language. The contemporary research in the domain of **third language acquisition** focuses on cross-linguistic influence, early trilingualism, and the effects of third language learning on bilingualism.

Similarly to the case of second language acquisition, it can be expected that the less the learner knows about the target language, the more he relies on any other prior knowledge he possesses and gets use of it, more or less consciously. This previous knowledge also includes other foreign languages previously learned. In case of the lack of knowledge, lexical or sometimes also grammatical insecurity, speakers get use of both conscious and unconscious strategies. They activate their knowledge from their supporter first and second languages to find here for alternatives.

As proposed by Ringbom (1986: 150-62), the L1 influence is present more at the early stages of learning, while the L2 influence rather at later stages. However, if L2 and L3 are more related than L1 and L3, language learners tend to transfer their L2 knowledge already since the very beginning of the learning process. As concerns the **language relatedness**, it may be taken both objectively and also on the basis of learners' personal impression.

The **cross-linguistic influence** is usually found mainly in the area of lexicon.

Bilinguals and multilinguals are not able to eliminate their knowledge of other languages, to ‘switch them off’, they can only activate the language they are speaking at the moment on to a higher degree than their other languages. The interaction of all the languages is dynamic and the gradual development of learners’ knowledge of the newly acquired language is much less linear than that of their previous languages. The learners also develop skills and qualities that cannot be found in an inexperienced learner, they reach a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness (Jessner, 2006: 30-34).

Let us refer to the concept of **Krashen’s monitor model** (Krashen, 1977: 159-161) based on the idea that the learner has an internal system that consciously controls and, if needed, modifies the form of the learner’s production. In accordance with this theory, we may state that one’s conscious knowledge of rules and forms of all the languages he or she knows, i.e. one’s metalinguistic awareness, enables spontaneous self-corrections employed also in the foreign language being newly acquired.

4.7 Transfer

4.7.1 Occurrence of transfer

Since 1940s, there were linguistic discussions on language contact and language mixing. In 1960s Lado claimed that the second language acquisition is so different from the first language acquisition in that the learner has to cope with the existence of cross-linguistic differences. Those differences could be determined through contrastive analyses and thus, in future, could

help other learners predict potentially problematic aspects and be more attentive to them (Odlin, 1989: 15-16).

It is a general tendency that language learners are inclined to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture, both in case of production and comprehension (Odlin, 1989: 15-16).

In case of similarities between the two languages, **transfer** (i.e. application of a structure in one language to a structure in another language) is assumed to have a positive influence on second language acquisition, and a negative one in case of dissimilarities.

It occurs on all linguistic levels, it can be easily identified in orthography and pronunciation; it may be less distinct on syntactic, semantic and pragmatic level (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 24-34).

4.7.2 Types of transfer according to its effects

Positive transfer (Odlin, 1989: 36) occurs in cases when the similarities between native language and target language vocabulary, between vowel systems, writing systems, syntactic structures or other areas help learners produce or comprehend a word, an utterance or a text in case that they would not be able to do so without the knowledge of the native language. As far as multilingual speakers are concerned, here, the use of knowledge of the native language may be replaced by profiting from the knowledge of a second language, while dealing with a third language.

Interference (i.e. **negative transfer**) (Odlin, 1989: 36) involves divergences from expected norms in the target language. It was defined by Weinreich (1953) as “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result

of their familiarity with more than one language.” It is the transfer of structures characteristic of L1 to L2 and is distinguished from conscious bilingual transfer procedures such as borrowing and codeswitching.

The opinions on when which type of transfer is probable to occur often differ. It is commonly agreed that transfer is related to the structural similarity of the two language systems (Herdina & Jessner, 2002: 11). Some linguists state that the more similar the two linguistic systems are, the more likely the positive transfer is to occur; and vice versa, the greater the difference between the two systems is, the more likely negative transfer is to arise (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991: 53). Other linguists (e.g. Osgood, 1953) claimed that a greater similarity between two systems can lead to the lack of differentiation and increased negative transfer. As a result, it was acknowledged that the language similarity provokes a strong interaction and both, positive and negative transfer, may be observed.

4.7.3 Negative transfer

Odlin (1989: 36-41) states that the divergences between two language structures cause four possible forms of **negative transfer**:

underproduction – this means that learners either do not produce, or do it only scarcely, examples of a target structure, they avoid it, usually in cases that the structures in the target language are very different from the counterparts in their native language

overproduction – it may be a logical consequence of underproduction; while learners try to avoid one structure, they have to replace it by using a different one (which is less appropriate in the target language). However, sometimes, it is not a case of avoiding something more

difficult, learners just may be familiar and already sure when using a certain structure and they ‘overestimate’ its possible applicability in that particular context.

production errors

- a) substitutions – the native language form is used in the target language without any change
- b) calques – errors that reflect very closely a native language structure (e.g. using ‘of-structures’ in English where a possessive should be more appropriate; or literal translation of idioms)
- c) alternations of structures – problems with using structures that either do not exist or are used under different rules in the native than in the target language

misinterpretation – misperceptions of sounds, false cognates, associating wrong sentence elements due to a different word order, wrong pragmatic interpretation

4.7.4 Types of transfer from the linguistic point of view

As to the transfer between the first and second language (or among other languages that learners speak), especially **lexical transfer** is likely to be strong, because of strong associations of words and meanings across languages (McCarthy, 2001: 83-84). Lexical similarities can considerably facilitate comprehension and production in a second language, not only semantically but also morphologically and syntactically. We just must be aware that some of the information may be misleading.

The advantage of lexis common to two languages is incontestable, there are nevertheless dangers in the form of **false cognates** or false friends (“les faux amis” in French). The form

of two expressions in two languages seems to be very close but there is only a partial semantic identity or they may have a completely different meaning.

Alternatively, a pair of cognates may be semantically similar, but there are often grammatical restrictions that differ in the two languages, which can cause difficulties (e.g. a verb is reflexive only in one language, or is used with a different auxiliary).

In some cases of linguistic similarity, there may arise difficulties due to partial but not complete overlap in spelling conventions of the two (or more) languages. However, some errors can not be contributed to the transfer, they are often identical to those made by native speakers (e.g. certain irregular forms of past tense).

The studies of language transfer also comprise the learner's use of **word-order** patterns (Odlin, 1989: 85-96). It depends on the syntactic relatedness whether some problems are likely to occur. To give an example - those whose native language is rich in inflexion that enables a rather free word order, may have difficulties with observing the English SVO pattern.

Romance languages speakers may have difficulties with accepting that in English in noun phrases adjectives normally precede adjectives, that in English possessive case is preferred instead of 'of-structures', that they can not apply the rules from their native language for the placement of adverbials and that they have to forget about their customs for using negation. On the other hand, the 'simple' universal form of English imperatives and only a rare use of subjunctive may be a 'nice surprise' for them (Odlin, 1989: 78-134).

4.7.5 Contrastive rhetoric

Contrastive rhetoric is "an area of research in SLA that identifies problems in composition encountered by SL writers and, by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language,

attempts to explain them” (Connor, U. 1996: 5), its beginnings date back to the year 1966. Its initiator, American applied linguist Kaplan (1966: 11-26), proclaimed that language and writing are cultural phenomena and that each language has its particular rhetorical conventions and that learning a particular language means to master its logical system. The linguistic and rhetorical conventions of the first language then interfere with writing in the second language.

The dominant model of the contrastive analysis hypothesis of the sixties emphasized the negative effects of **interference** on L2 acquisition. The negative impact of one’s native language on the second language acquisition may be noticed also in the **Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity**, which suggests that different languages affect perception and thought in different ways (Connor, 1996: 28). Our native language influences and controls our thought, which causes that it prevents us from fluent second language acquisition, especially in case that the two languages are of a different linguistic family. In 1991, psychologists Hunt and Agnoli claimed that every language is translatable but there is often a loss involved. An utterance that sounds completely natural in one language may be utterly unacceptable in another. This supports the weaker version of the Sapir-Whorfian hypothesis that language influences thought (Connor, 1996: 29).

4.7.6 Language differences

As concerns second language acquisition, the expected length of study needed to achieve a high degree of mastery of second or other foreign languages differs, some languages are considered to need more time to be acquired, if learned as a second language; or at least it seem so if we look at the length of courses proposed by various language schools leading to achieving a comparable level. In general, it seems that it largely depends on language relatedness (e.g. in our country, Indo-European languages are considered to need less time to

be acquired than Asiatic ones). (Meanwhile, as linguists agree on, first language acquisition of children takes approximately the same time).

Many linguists are persuaded that not only the differences among languages are caused by the differences in thought processes of people of different nations, but that this influence is reciprocal. Whorf (1956) claims the following: “the background of linguistic system (in other words, the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual’s mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Formulation of ideas is not an independent process, strictly rational in the old sense, but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from slightly to greatly, between different grammar” (Whorf, 1956: 212-213).

As a matter of fact, this is not any novelty. There exists a traditional Czech and Slovak proverb with an English translation “The more languages you know, the more of a person you are”, which was also used as one of the headlines of the European Commission 2005 “Framework Strategy for Multilingualism”. Thus, we can state that any language that we acquire enriches our personality, our spirit, our perception of the world.

Yet, we might conceive of this claim in a less determining way. Possibly, a learner, when getting in contact with different languages with a different conception, different ways of expressing ideas, may not let himself formed according to these new models, incorporate and accept them, he can only realise that he can identify himself with the new system or conception much better than with that one of his native language. Probably, he will not share this impression of identification with a language as a whole, he will choose some particularities of a higher or lower degree from all the languages he knows. And that can also explain the

reason why multilinguals are often influenced more by the interference from a second language than from their native one.

5. Practical part – research on language interference

This chapter will be further divided into two following sections: Research design and structure (ch. 5.1, p. 44-45) introducing the conditions of my research and Criteria of evaluation (ch. 5.2, p. 45-52) explaining the criteria considered relevant for this research.

5.1 Research design and structure

The practical part of my thesis is intended to demonstrate the presence of interference by the means of a specific research that was conducted at the grammar school Gymnázium Jana Nerudy in Prague. The choice of school was not accidental, my reason for it was that this school provides classes with specialisation in French. As I wanted to examine especially the French interference in English, I was looking for such students whose level of French acquisition will be at least at level B1/B2 and it will be their dominant foreign language. Simultaneously, I was interested in the comparison with a reverse interference, i.e. English interference in French. I wanted to verify whether the French and English interference would be equally represented or whether the French interference in English would be more traceable than the English one in French. This would mean that a different degree of acquisition of the two languages causes a different degree of interference and it would allow us to claim that “the interference of the dominant foreign language is considerably higher than the interference of the other language”, which is my first hypothesis.

When devising the test, I first attempted to cover all the common mistakes with which me and my fellow students had problems during our studies of French and English. I selected the mistakes from our tests and essays to find the cases where the knowledge of these two

languages often causes interference. After confronting my own results with Swan & Smith's *Learner English* (2001: 52-89), I started compiling a list of sentences that would reveal the most frequent instances of the negative transfer in following questionnaire.

My aim was to select especially those cases where French and Czech rules differ and thus, if a potential French interference appears, it would not be the instance of Czech interference as well. When choosing the type of exercises through which the interference should be observed, I decided to choose more of them so as to distinguish different amount of students' liberty in production (i.e. translation without setting any limits in the target language; choosing a suitable expression among the given possibilities; and either correction or a passive acceptance of the proposed model). This was aimed to either proof or to refute my second hypothesis, i.e. the claim that "passive interference reaches a higher degree than the active one".

To make the evaluation perspicuous, I have decided to categorize the mistakes into eight major groups. Making a separate group of some of them might seem redundant at first sight, however, e.g. in case of articles I did not want to conceive them as a part of grammatical rules, because their use is rather intricate and requires not only comprehension of some general principles but also a great deal of memorising (or at least more practice than secondary school students usually have).

5.2 Criteria of evaluation

For a brief orientation in the test, I propose the following distinction and an overview of the eight categories. Not all the differences will be mentioned, only those with which I worked. As I explained above, I put aside some instances where French and Czech rules would have the same impact on English. Moreover, I did not include the basic differences that might be

confused only at very low levels of language acquisition. The illustrating examples are usually taken from the test or are very similar to them. The questionnaire is to be found in the Appendix (8).

The eight categories mentioned above could be assigned to three larger groups (the acronyms will be explained in detail subsequently):

- 1) The first group (**P**) concerns the correct choice and use of separate sentence elements, i.e. the **paradigmatic viewpoint**. Here, I would place **VOC + FORM**.
- 2) The second group (**G**) groups basic morphological **operations** and rules application and the **use of articles**, thus **GRAM + ART** come into play.
- 3) The third group (**S**) covers **syntagmatic point of view**. Here, **COLL + PREP/CON + TV+WO** are concerned.

FORM (hereafter as FORM):

Focus is put on the specific word form, its correct spelling. The most frequent cases where English and French orthography differ may be summarised to three main areas in which students of these two languages make mistakes most frequently:

- a) capitalizing of the first letters in case of days of the week, months, languages and national adjectives (Friday x vendredi; October x octobre; English x anglais)
- b) spelling of cognates with a difference in single or double consonants inside the word (address x adresse; mutton x mouton)
- c) different endings of adjectives, different suffix-parts (egoistic x égoïste; classical music x musique classique; neutral x neutre; illogical x illogique)

GRAMMATICAL RULES (hereafter as GRAM):

Practical use of all types of word classes is observed, with depicted contrast between the two language systems, correct application of the principles of word-formation² (compounding, conversion...)

- a) in English, where noun compounds are preferred, in French, noun + postmodification is used (a tennis player x un joueur de tennis)
- b) in French, comparatives and superlatives are always formed with the equivalents of 'more' and 'most' (shorter x plus court; the easiest x le plus facile)
- c) French adjectives can be nominalised simply by adding definite article, both in plural and in singular (a/the rich one x le riche)
- d) French possessive pronouns taking the role of subject or object are used with definite article and thus nominalised, whereas in English nominal ellipsis is preferred (I can lend you mine. x Je peux vous prêter le mien.)
- e) French has no difference between object pronouns and reflexive pronouns of first and second persons, there is no equivalent of 'each other' (we looked at each other x nous nous sommes regardés)
- f) some nouns are countable in French and uncountable in English (in the corresponding sense) (hair x les cheveux; information x les informations)

² In this categorisation, the grammatical rules are understood from the morphological rather than the syntactic viewpoint, equally the word-formation processes are approached morphologically rather than lexically in my current concept.

- g) multiple negation in French allows the use of negative quantifiers even if they appear later in the sentence than the negated verb (I don't know anybody. x Je ne connais personne.); and in case that a negative quantifier is placed at the beginning of a sentence, the verb still takes one of the two negators, whereas in English the verb is not negated any more (No one knows me x Personne ne me connait).

TENSES, VERBS (hereafter as TV):

Many difficulties may occur when searching for the adequate tense, because a verb form created on the same principle in one language may often have in the other language a function that does not correspond.

- a) in English, in many cases where gerund is used, e.g. when the verb takes the role of subject, object, subject complement or is a part of various postmodifications, the French use the infinitive (Talking is a waste of time. x Parler est une perte de temps.)
- b) progressive forms do not exist in French, instead, they use either simple present or simple past (I have been living here for two years. x Je vis ici depuis deux ans.)
- c) French equivalent of past simple is formed in the same way as English present perfect simple (except for reflexive verbs and about twenty special verbs, usually expressing some kind of movement), which may lead to the use of present perfect in English, where it is not adequate
- d) in French, a postmodification that expresses modality usually has the form of a relative clause containing a verb in conditional or subjunctive mood, while English tends to use sentence structure condensation by an infinitive (I need somebody to help me. x J'ai besoin de quelqu'un qui m'aiderait/qui m'aide.)

- e) French adverbial clauses of time expressing future use verbs in future tense (When you come to me, I will show it to you. x Quand tu viendras, je te le montrerai.)

USE OF ARTICLES (hereafter as ART):

Specific situations where the rules for using articles differ were chosen. Some cases were already mentioned in the part concerning grammatical rules (instances of articles accompanying other word classes than nouns).

- a) French nouns that express a generic reference are accompanied with definite article (I Like rock music. x J'aime la musique rock. I prefer red wine. x Je préfère le vin rouge.)
- b) in French, professions are used without any article; or, if occasionally an indefinite article precedes, it suggests a kind of disdain or disgrace of the person doing this profession (he is a dentist x il est dentiste)
- c) French nationality adjectives may be converted to nouns with definite article (a language) or indefinite article (the inhabitant of the country)
- d) names of the countries occur with definite articles, as well as the names of buildings, universities (France x la France; Charles University x l'Université Charles)
- e) possessive case in French is expressed by the equivalent of 'of-structure' which is preceded by the definite article (John's book x le livre de Jean)

VOCABULARY (hereafter as VOC):

This concerns identifying the case of false cognates and replacing them by a suitable counterpart.

The pairs appearing here in the questionnaire are e.g. gain – gagner (earn); support (F- ‘soutien’) – supporter (stand, tolerate); sympathetic – sympathique (nice, kind); decade (in French – 10 days) – décennie; to realise (se rendre compte) – réaliser (to effectuate); to ignore has in French a neutral meaning (‘not to know’, without any negative connotation); library (bibliothèque) x librairie (bookshop)

COLLOCATIONS (hereafter as COLL):

Collocations, set expressions and locutions may be sometimes similar in more languages, but very often, it is not possible to use them in another language, especially if the two of them are of different language families. I have chosen some of them, with which a word-for-word translation would not be admissible, e.g. French universal question tag ‘n’est-ce pas?’; ‘il faut’ which may be interpreted in various ways, depending on the context (there should be; we need; it would be good to...); ‘pour commencer’, which an equivalent of the linking expression ‘to begin with’ or ‘for starters’; ‘prendre une douche’ which means ‘have a shower’, here the verb in French means ‘to take’; in a restaurant an Englishman will ‘have’ a meal, while a Frenchman ‘va prendre’ (will ‘take’ sth); ‘on va’, which can be translated e.g. as ‘shall we’ or ‘let us’; English ‘can’ used for expressing intrinsic modality (I can’t speak English; I can’t hear you.) versus French tendency to use simple infinitives without any modal verbs (Je ne parle pas anglais; Je ne vous entends pas.); in English, something makes sense, whereas in French it ‘has’ sense (‘avoir sens’); to ‘pay’ attention versus ‘faire’ (make) attention; in English something ‘is said’, while in French ‘on dit’ (‘on’ is a general pronoun, like general ‘it’ in English, but the

verb has an active, not a passive structure); if you 'are lucky', in French, you say you 'have chance' ('avoir de la chance')

WORD ORDER (hereafter as WO):

Using certain features of the French word order in English may not always be perceived as utterly incorrect, sometimes it may be in accordance with English syntactical rules, however, coming across as somehow inappropriate.

- a) The French use extraposed subjects and objects very often ('Elle s'intéresse à quoi, ta soeur?' – which could be transformed to English, leaving the original French WO, as 'She is interested in what, your younger sister?')
- b) most attributive adjectives are placed after the noun (egoistic behaviour x comportement égoïste; classical music x musique classique)
- c) the order of personal, possessive and demonstrative pronouns is rather complicated in French and varies in affirmative sentences, negative sentences and in imperatives (here also affirmative variety differs from the negative one)
- d) noun-noun compounds are used only rarely and possessive case does not exist; in both cases the counterpart of 'of-structures' is used (a tennis player x un joueur de tennis; Albert Einstein's theory x la théorie d'Albert Einstein; his country's politics x la politique de son pays; summer days x les jours en été)
- e) the French counterpart of the intensifier 'enough' precedes adjectives (big enough x assez grand)

- f) English exclamatives imply inversion, whereas French ones only put an equivalent of 'how' at the beginning, the rest of the sentence remains the same (How beautiful she is! x Comme elle est belle!)

PREPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS (hereafter as PREP/CON):

The use of appropriate prepositions that make part of verb/noun/adjective/adverb complementations and the use of conjunctions are also language specific phenomena to which attention must be paid. A wrong preposition or conjunction may considerably change the meaning.

- a) in French, expressing purpose is possible by placing conjunction 'pour' (the equivalent of English 'for') before the infinitive (I'm here to help you. x Je suis là pour t'aider.)
- b) among the 'tricky' prepositional complementations in this test are e.g. responsible for x responsable de ('of'); marry sb, to be married to sb x se marier avec ('with'); listen to sth écouter qc ('listen sth'); look at each other x se regarder ('look sb'); we leave 'for' another city, but 'on part à...' ('to' or 'in'); to 'have' a cold, if translated literally ('avoir froid') means to be/to feel cold

6. Presentation of the test, its assessment and interpretation

The test was designed for four different groups, initially planned to have 25 students each. Factually, I received 83 tests in the following proportion: 27 students of English and German (hereafter as EN-GE/EN-GE-CZ; students who did not speak French for the purpose of comparison), 21 students of English and French writing the same test as the previous group (hereafter as EN-FR-CZ), 18 students of English and French writing the same two thirds of the test (EN-FR-FR), 17 students of English and French writing a test in French (hereafter as FR-FR). Both tests and the exercises will be explained and analysed in the following chapters: English test (ch. 6.1, p. 53-65) and French test (ch. 6.2, p. 65-72). Their results will be compared and confronted in The final overview of both tests (ch. 6.3, p. 73-76) and the Students' self evaluation will be provided (ch. 6.4, p. 76-80).

6.1 English test

6.1.1 English test – 1st exercise

The test itself consists of three exercises. In the first exercise (see below), the students' task is to choose the 'correct' variant (two or four are proposed) that fits the sentence structure. In this part of the test, choosing the 'incorrect' possibility equals to choosing the variant that would correspond closely with its French counterpart (even if there are four possibilities to choose, the three incorrect ones bear at least partially the influence of French). There were some cases when students did not decide for any variant. In such situation, it is evident that their missing answer could not be regarded as correct, nor did I judge it as incorrect, just because these 'incorrect' variations were designed to show the possible influence of French. I

decided not to count their results in, thus, the total percentage of correct and incorrect answers does not always make 100%.

I. Choose (circle) the correct form:

1. I would like to study *japanese / the japanese / Japanese / the Japanese* at *Charles University / the Charles Univeristy*.
2. Do you drink wine or are you a total abstainer? Oh, I really love *the red wine / red wine*.
3. Which quality is typical for your best friend? *Loyalty / the loyalty*.
4. *The most people / most of people / most people / the most of people* dislike hypocrisy.
5. If you need a laptop, I can lend you *the mine / mine*.
6. I don't *earn / gain* much money. In our family, my husband is *the rich / the rich one*.
7. No one *doesn't know / knows* the answer.
8. I am here *for helping you / to help* you.

This part was identical for all students (except for those writing the French test), 27 of them have German as the second foreign language (EN-GE), 39 study English plus French (EN-FR). The numbers in brackets next to the acronyms of the categories observed mark how many times the particular feature appeared in the exercise. As the two student groups differ in number and some categories occur more often than the others, the percentage of students' correct or incorrect answers was calculated according to this principle (the 'correct answers of EN-GE students in the GRAM category' serving as an illustration):

The total number of correct answers from each category was added up (GRAM: $13 + 25 + 26 + 26 = 90$). This sum was divided by the number of the occurrence of this feature ($90 : 4 = 22,5$) to get the average result of all students of this group; and then this number was divided

by the number of students to get the average result of one student ($22,5 : 27 = 0,833$); which, expressed in percents (multiplied by 100), gives us the average score of one student in this category (83,3%).

	EN-GE (27) Correct	EN-GE (27) Incorrect	EN-FR (39) Correct	EN-FR (39) Incorrect
GRAM (4)	83,3%	15,7%	74,2%	24,5%
ART (3)	65,4%	29,6%	62,1%	36,2%
VOC (1)	96,3%	0%	84,2%	15,8%
FORM (1)	48,1%	40,7%	33%	61,9%
PREP/CON (1)	100%	0%	97,6%	2,4%

We may see, that, almost surprisingly, in **absolutely all** cases, the percentage of correct answers is higher with students of German, and, respectively, the percentage of the incorrect (=influenced by French) answers is higher with students of French.

If we use the three hyper-categories mentioned above, i.e. the paradigmatic aspect, grammar (on the morphological level; + articles) and the syntagmatic level, we will obtain the following average results. (The number of the (in)correct answers from categories involved (e.g. GRAM + ART) are added up ($90 + 35 = 125$), divided by the number of occurrences ($125 : (4+3) = 17,9$); this result is divided by the number of students ($17,9 : 27 = 0,661$) and then multiplied by 100 to get the percentage (66,1%):

	EN-GE (27)	EN-GE (27)	EN-FR (39)	EN-FR (39)
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
P (VOC, FORM)	72,2%	20,4%	59%	38,5%
G (GRAM, ART)	66,1%	21,7%	69,2%	29,3%
S (PREP/CON)	100%	0%	97,4%	1,3%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, PREP/CON)	77,4%	<u>19,3%</u>	74,8%	<u>23,9%</u>

If we take a look at the results in grammar, we will notice that the German group has reached a lower score in correct answers. Meanwhile, the percentage of their incorrect answers is also lower. The reason is that five of them did not choose any answer.

Here, the overall degree of French transfer is **19,3%** with the **German** speaking students compared to **23,9%** of those speaking **French**. This type of exercise was suitable especially for testing the interference on the paradigmatic level, and we may be satisfied with the fact that here, the **French** students' interference was almost twice higher (**38,5%**) than of **German** students (**20,4%**).

6.1.2 English test – 2nd exercise

The second exercise contains eleven sentences in English with mistakes that could a French speaker make (to make them clearly visible, here, in my thesis, the wrong constructions are underlined). The students' task was to recognize and correct them.

II. Do you think that these sentences are correct? If so, write C (for “correct”). If not, rewrite them. (You don’t have to rewrite the whole sentence, just make sure that your corrections are visibly and clearly marked).

1. He is dentist, isn't it? No, he is a player of tennis.
2. It needs someone who would solve our problem and give us new informations.
3. Since how many years do you live in Paris?
4. For start, I would like to tell you some basic facts about the England.
5. According to me, to talk about feelings is a loss of time.
6. She is interested in what, your younger sister?
7. Is the water enough warm? Sorry, I don't hear you, I take a shower.
8. He was a such talented piano player.
9. I will take care of the John's son for the five next days.
10. How she is beautiful! I must take a photo of her before to say goodbye.
11. I have spent the whole last week in the mountains.

As a ‘correct’ answer is understood such case, when student recognizes the mistake and gives the correct variety. An ‘incorrect’ answer in this exercise means that the student tried to correct a mistake (either a factual or a presumed one), however, his variety was erroneous. ‘French’ answer designs the cases, where a correction has been made, and the transfer from French can be detected here (the answer in fact corresponds to the close translation of the French counterpart). In most cases, this transfer is incorrect (i.e. negative transfer/interference), but sometimes, it is a variety that would hardly be said by a native speaker, yet it still can be evaluated as correct (i.e. positive transfer).

	EN-GE (27) Correct	EN-GE (27) Incorrect	EN-GE (27) French	EN-FR (39) Correct	EN-FR (39) Incorrect	EN-FR (39) French
GRAM (4)	79,6%	2,8%	0%	53,5%	3,2%	1,9%
ART (3)	38,3%	0%	0%	31,4%	3,7%	0%
VOC (3)	12,3%	6,2%	0%	19,5%	23%	0,9%
FORM (1)	66,7%	0%	0%	42,8%	0%	0%
WO (5)	56,3%	18,5%	3,7%	37,2%	12,2%	1,5%
TV (4)	30,4%	4,6%	0%	28,6%	7%	4,5%
COLL (5)	34,1%	6,7%	0%	34,8%	5,2%	0,5%

If we summarize the eight categories again to the three main groups proposed above, we will get the following results:

	EN-GE (27) Correct	EN-GE (27) Incorrect	EN-GE (27) French	EN-FR (39) Correct	EN-FR (39) Incorrect	EN-FR (39) French
P (VOC, FORM)	25,9%	4,6%	0%	17,3%	6,4%	0,7%
G (GRAM, ART)	61,9%	1,6%	0%	48%	3,3%	3,3%
S (COLL, TV, WO)	67,1%	10,3%	1,3%	34,6%	8,1%	0,9%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO)	45,6%	7%	0,7%	35,6%	6,1%	1%

Now, let us look only at the transfer itself. We will get the total amount of the presence of French influence ('total French') by adding the percentage of the students who perceived the sentences proposed in the test as correct and did not make any corrections ('uncorrected') with the percentage of those who corrected the mistakes but their answers still showed marks of French transfer.

	EN-GE (27) Uncorrected	EN-GE (27) Total French (F+U)	EN-FR (39) Uncorrected	EN-FR (39) Total French (F+U)
GRAM (4)	17,6%	17,6%	43,3%	45,2%
ART (3)	61,7%	61,7%	64,9%	64,9%
VOC (3)	81,5%	81,5%	57,5%	58,4%
FORM (1)	33,3%	33,3%	57,2%	57,2%
WO (5)	25,2%	28,9%	50,6%	52,1%
TV (4)	65%	65%	64,4%	68,9%
COLL (5)	59,2%	59,2%	60%	60,5%

We may observe an increased percentage in most cases. Surprisingly, we may remark that the percentage of students of German who perceived the mistaken varieties as appropriate in English is even higher in case of vocabulary, which was exactly the category where I had expected the highest percentage of interference of all cases, but with French students. The high interference in case of articles and tenses in both students groups might possibly be assigned to the fact that students have usually a rather passive knowledge of the rules concerned and if, in the test, they do not know what to pay attention to exactly, they may

overlook the case. In this exercise, the relevant difference in interference values may be seen in grammar, form and word order.

And again, working with the simplified model, the results will be subsequent:

	EN-GE (27) Uncorrected	EN-GE (27) Total French (F+U)	EN-FR (39) Uncorrected	EN-FR (39) Total French (F+U)
P (VOC, FORM)	69,5%	69,5%	57,4%	58,1%
G (GRAM, ART)	36,5%	36,5%	52,6%	53,6%
S (COLL, TV, WO)	48,7%	50%	57,9%	59,9%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO)	48,6%	<u>49,4%</u>	56,3%	<u>57,9%</u>

These results show that students have great difficulties with recognising what can be said in English and what can not. In comparison with the first exercise (G:19,3 x F:23,9), we may see that the percentage of interference increased more than twice. We may assume that the form of the test plays a very important role and, possibly, if the content of the first exercise were to be solved under the settings of the second exercise and vice versa, the results could change considerably.

6.1.3 English test – 3rd exercise

The third part of the test was translation to English. Two groups with different second foreign language (EN-GE-CZ and EN-FR-CZ) had Czech as the source language:

III. Translate from Czech to English:

1. Už dál nesnesu jeho egoistické chování.
2. V zimě jsou dny kratší než v létě.
3. Provdala se za sympatického Angličana.
4. Prezident se stává navždy zodpovědným za politiku své země.
5. Je třeba znát slavnou teorii relativity Alberta Einsteina.
6. Poslechneme si trochu jazzu? Ne, mám raději klasickou hudbu.
7. To bylo poprvé, kdy jsme se potkali. Bylo to v listopadu a byla to neděle.
8. Až k nám přijdeš, ukážu ti to. - To doufám.
9. Rychle jsme se na sebe podívali.

The third group of students of English and French (EN-FR-FR) received the sentences with the same content to translate, though not from Czech, but from French, for the purpose of comparison of the possible effect of the influence of the source language. In this French version, the transfer-prone elements are underlined.

III. Translate from French to English:

1. Je ne peux plus supporter son comportement égoïste.
2. En hiver les jours sont plus courts qu'en été.
3. Elle s'est mariée avec un anglais sympathique.
4. Le président devient responsable pour toujours de la politique de son pays.
5. Il faut connaître la célèbre théorie de la relativité d'Albert Einstein.
6. On va écouter un peu de jazz? Non, c'est plutôt la musique classique que je préfère.
7. C'était la première fois qu'on s'est rencontrés. C'était en novembre et c'était un dimanche.

8. Quand tu viendras chez nous, je te le montrerai. - Je l'espère.
9. Nous nous sommes vite regardés.

If no transfer existed, the target production of all three groups should be factually the same. However, we are aware of the presence of the interaction of the languages that we know. In an ideal case, the results should demonstrate that even when the source text is in students' mother tongue, the French speaking students will be more likely to make mistakes that would correspond with the French equivalents. To compare further, the source text with the same content in French should influence students to be even more interference-prone than those who speak French but translate the sentences from Czech and their confrontation with French is less explicit.

In the table below, 'C' stands for the correct translations (i.e. correctly formulated in English), 'I' for the incorrect ones (i.e. not acceptable in English, or at least not in the particular context).

	EN-GE-CZ (27) C	EN-GE-CZ (27) I	EN-FR-CZ (21) C	EN-FR-CZ (21) I	EN-FR-FR (18) C	EN-FR-FR (18) I
GRAM (3)	53,3%	46,7%	45,2%	54,8%	38,9%	61,%
ART (6)	35,7%	64,3%	36%	64%	31,5%	68,5%
VOC (5)	65%	35%	69,6%	30,3%	56,2%	43,8%
FORM (6)	66%	34%	41%	59%	41,3%	58,7%
WO (5)	72,2%	27,8%	62%	38%	70,2%	29,8%
TV (3)	81,5%	18,5%	78,5%	21,5%	66,7%	33,3%

COLL (6)	66,7%	33,3%	81,5%	18,5%	64%	36%
PREP/ CON (4)	54,5%	45,5%	54,9%	45,1%	41,5%	58,5%

Not to forget the most significant results for this research, varieties resulting from or bearing the marks of transfer. Their percentage is taken from the whole, not only from the incorrect varieties. The reason is that a small percentage of these varieties may be acceptable in English, however, they would seem unnatural or slightly awkward from the point of view of a native speaker.

	EN-GE-CZ (27) French	EN-FR-CZ (21) French	EN-FR-FR (18) French
GRAM (3)	16,7%	22,6%	50%
ART (6)	50%	32%	28%
VOC (5)	27%	24,1%	39,7%
FORM (6)	11,5%	39%	33,7%
WO (5)	18,5%	25,5%	26,2%
TV (3)	11,1%	18,5%	28,7%
COLL (6)	6,3%	8%	15%
PREP/CON (4)	29,3%	24,2%	29,2%

If we look at the categories of grammar, tenses and collocations, we may notice a rather small difference among the first two groups. Probably, the language of the source text (Czech)

mattered more than the fact that they speak either German or French. Nevertheless, their comparison in these three categories with the students translating from French, may serve as an exemplary proof of the language interference. As concerns the form, the distinction between German and French students is evident, even though the EN-FR-CZ had the source text in Czech, they tend to apply the French form even more than those who translated from French. The resulting percentage in the category of articles may again support rather the possibility that the incorrect answers are caused by the lack of knowledge more than by anything else.

We may apply here again the broader categorisation to obtain the following results:

	AJ-N-CZ (27) Correct	EN-GE-CZ (27) French	EN-FR-CZ (21) Correct	EN-FR-CZ (21) French	EN-FR-FR (18) Correct	EN-FR-FR (18) French
P (VOC, FORM)	65,5%	32,2%	54%	32,2%	48,1%	36,4%
G (GRAM, ART)	41,6%	38,9%	39,1%	29%	34%	35,3%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	68%	15,6%	69,7%	18,2%	61,2%	23,6%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	61%	<u>22%</u>	58%	<u>24,8%</u>	50,9%	<u>30,1%</u>

Here, the average results are again closer to those of the first exercise, the interference is lower; possibly because here, compared to the second exercise, the cases of interference could not be observed simply in cases where a student accepted the form that has been proposed.

This type of activity gave more space to students to form the whole sentences according to themselves, which, at the same time, brought also some extra mistakes than had not been expected. Nevertheless, I focused exclusively on those with the possible French interference in the background, and ignored the several extra errors that were solely the consequence either of Czech or of insufficient knowledge of English.

As the obtained results demonstrate, it would be misleading to evaluate only the interference itself and separate it from the method with the help of which we obtained them. There is a notable difference among the results of the three exercises. It is obvious that in the first case, when students focus their attention on the two (or four) possibilities offered, they realize that logically one (three) of them will have to be incorrect in English. With this awareness, they are usually rather successful in discriminating the right from the wrong varieties. The second exercise may be difficult in that they have no clue what to concentrate on, how many mistakes they should correct, which leads to overlooking of some of them and an ‘oversuspicious’ correcting of faultless varieties. The third exercise leaves them most liberty, but meanwhile keeps them alert and attentive.

6.2 French test

It is not the aim of this study to analyze the English interference in French in great detail; it is meant to serve especially as an approximative comparison of the reciprocal effect of interference. The conditions for the transfer to occur are not the same as in previous case. In fact, I gave this test on purpose to students whose dominant foreign language is French, so as to verify my hypothesis that in this case, the English influence on their production in French

will be less apparent. To admit, the distribution of the eight categories in the test is not exactly the same as in the previous test. However, I tried to make it as balanced as possible and not to omit any important transfer-prone feature; several instances of potential ‘transfer pairs’ from the original test reappear here.

6.2.1 French test – 1st exercise

The task in the first exercise was to choose the correct possibility. There were two possibilities in six sentences, one sentence contained four. Similarly to the English test, the incorrect possibility shows the marks of interference, of English, this time.

I. Choisissez la meilleure possibilité:

1. Elle a pris une position *neutrale* / *neutre*.
2. C’était un mouvement littéraire typique pour la dernière *décade* / *décennie* du siècle précédent.
3. *Je prendrai* / *j’aurai* une bouillabaisse, s’il vous plaît.
4. Votre réponse est *illogicale* / *illogique*, croyez-moi, cela *n’a pas* / *ne fait pas* de sens.
5. J’adore *italien* / *Italien* / *l’italien* / *l’Italien*.
6. Tu as tout mon *soutien* / *support*, n’importe quand tu en auras besoin.
7. J’aimerais vous *introduire* / *présenter* un texte avec des arguments bien *balancés* / *équilibrés*.
8. Quand tu *viens* / *viendras* sonner à ma porte, il n’y aura personne.

Only half of the eight categories are to be found in this first exercise. This is due to the fact that this type of task seems to be most favourable for testing the paradigmatic level of language.

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect
GRAM (0)	0%	0%
ART (1)	82,4%	17,6%
VOC (4)	70,6%	29,4%
FORM (3)	86,3%	13,7%
WO (0)	0%	0%
TV (1)	76,5%	23,5%
COLL (2)	66,7%	33,3%
PREP/CON (0)	0%	0%

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect
P (VOC, FORM)	77,3%	22,7%
G (GRAM, ART)	82,4%	17,6%
S (COLL, TV, WO)	70%	30%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO)	75,8%	<u>24,2%</u>

As we may see, the average interference is rather comparable to the English test. However, as to the distribution of the categories, the paradigmatic level was in the centre of attention, and here, we may already observe a considerable difference – the average paradigmatic English interference is 22,7%, whereas in case of French interference in the English test it was 38,5%.

6.2.2 French test – 2nd exercise

This is again a parallel exercise to that of the original test. Students are expected to make corrections of the sentences that contain mistakes transferred from English (the underlined

expressions). Leaving a sentence without any correction means accepting this interference as sounding appropriately in French.

II. Corrigez les phrases. Vous ne devez pas réécrire toute la phrase, il suffit de corriger visiblement ce qui est faux. Indiquez l'ordre des mots si vous voulez le changer:

1. Il a bu une glace de bière.
2. Je dois faire les courses avant aller chez moi.
3. Payez attention!
4. On est dit que c'était un responsable homme.
5. Je manque mes parents.
6. Demain, on part pour Paris, tu accompagnes nous?
7. Trois heures avant, je prenais le taxi pour être ici en temps.

As in the English test, apart from the 'correct' answers, we may distinguish 'uncorrected' (i.e. leaving them in their original form bearing signs of interference) and 'incorrect' answers (i.e. corrected, but not appropriately). There were no students who would make any correction that would be incorrect and in the same time caused by English transfer, thus, such cell is not present in the table.

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Uncorrected (En)	FR-FR (17) Incorrect
GRAM (4)	67,6%	8,9%	23,5%
ART (2)	0%	0%	23,5%
VOC (2)	58,8%	42,2%	0%
FORM (0)	0%	0%	0%

WO (2)	82,4%	17,6%	0%
TV (1)	52,9%	35,3%	11,8%
COLL (3)	52,9%	47,1%	0%
PREP/CON (2)	41,2%	58,8%	0%

And the generalised model follows:

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Uncorrected (En)	FR-FR (17) Incorrect
P (VOC, FORM)	58,8%	42,2%	0%
G (GRAM, ART)	67,6%	8,9%	23,5%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	57,3%	41,2%	1,5%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	60,5%	<u>32,1%</u>	7,4%

In this second exercise, as it was in the English test, the percentage is again higher than in the first exercise, but we must bear in mind that it is also due to the type of activity. Just to remind, the EN-FR students' average French interference of the second exercise was 57,9%, thus nearly twice as much as in this case.

6.2.3 French test – 3rd exercise

The following exercise is translation from English, the interference-prone varieties are underlined.

III. Traduisez ces phrases en français:

1. I can't go with you, I have a cold.
2. You might borrow this picture book in a library.
3. It was a situation that no one had expected.
4. He ignores the details, he has nothing to say.
5. As I say, it's not as easy as you might think, as your knowledge of mathematics can't be sufficient to solve this problem.
6. Have you ever realised how clever she is?
7. No one knows me and I don't know anyone.

As concerns the answers' evaluation, 'correct' stands for correctly used features that were observed. 'Incorrect' stands for all incorrect varieties. 'Incorrect + English' separates from them those that may be caused by the knowledge of English and their percentage is counted from the whole.

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect	FJ- FJ (17) Incorrect + English
GRAM (2)	88,2%	11,8%	2,9%
ART (1)	70,6%	29,4%	0%
VOC (6)	63,7%	36,3%	7,8%
FORM (0)	0%	0%	0%
WO (2)	85,3%	14,7%	0%
TV (1)	41,2%	58,8%	0%

COLL (2)	67,6%	32,4%	5,9%
PREP/CON (5)	82,4%	17,6%	9,4%

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect	FJ- FJ (17) Incorrect + English
P (VOC, FORM)	63,7%	36,3%	7,8%
G (GRAM, ART)	82,3%	17,7%	1,45%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	70%	30%	7,65%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	75,9%	24,1%	<u>6,8%</u>

From both models we may see that the English interference is here really minimal and appearing especially in case of prepositions/conjunctions and vocabulary. To remind, the EN-FR-FR group translating to French from English reached the average 30,1% interference score.

There is one more exercise compared to the English test. It is the translation from French to English, the aim of which is to show whether this group of students really is an adequate language level as their colleagues writing the English test. Otherwise, this French test could not be used as a suitable comparison.

6.2.4 French test – 4th exercise

IV. Traduisez les phrases suivantes en anglais:

1. J'aime beaucoup manger.

2. Différentes personnes sont venues, on se connaît depuis longtemps.
3. On ne sait jamais.
4. Il a toujours de la chance, même le vendredi 13.

The results are to be found below, the 'correct', 'incorrect' and 'incorrect + French' are analogical to those of the preceding exercise.

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect	FR-FR (17) Incorrect + French
GRAM (2)	88,2%	11,8%	8,8%
ART (1)	88,2%	11,8%	0%
VOC (3)	58,8%	42,2%	39,2%
FORM (1)	5,9%	94,1%	76,5%
WO (1)	41,2%	58,8%	11,8%
TV (1)	5,9%	94,1%	82,4%
COLL (3)	51%	49%	13,7%
PREP/CON (1)	23,5%	76,5%	11,8%

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) Incorrect	FR-FR (17) Incorrect + French
P (VOC, FORM)	45,6%	54,4%	48,5%
G (GRAM, ART)	88,2%	11,8%	5,9%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	37,3%	62,7%	24,5%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	51,6%	48,4%	<u>27,6%</u>

Resulting from these percentages, we may assume that the degree of interference (27,6%) is perfectly comparable with the results of the third exercise (translation) of the English test, where the group EN-FR-CZ reached 24,8% and the group EN-FR-FR 30,1% interference.

6.3 The final overview of both tests

Finally, I decided to count the overall interference in the complete tests. However, this should be seen rather as a kind of expected logical conclusion of a research, not as something that would yield the most important final conclusions or that should serve as a main source for interpreting the results. As I have already stated, the types of exercises differ, and the eight categories are not distributed equally in all cases.

	EN-GE- CZ (27) Correct	EN-GE- CZ (27) Inter	EN-FR-CZ (21) Correct	EN-FR- CZ (21) Inter	EN-FR-FR (18) Correct	EN-FR- FR (18) Inter
GRAM (11)	73,8%	16,7%	58,8%	21,5%	57%	39%
ART (12)	43,8%	47,8%	41,4%	41,3%	39,1%	39,3%
VOC (9)	50,9%	42,2%	54,5%	34,6%	47,1%	43,3%
FORM (8)	63,9%	17,9%	42,2%	44,1%	40,5%	40,2%
WO (10)	64,3%	23,7%	40,3%	38,8%	53,7%	39,2%
TV (7)	52,3%	41,9%	50%	47,3%	44,9%	51,7%
COLL (11)	51,9%	30,3%	60,3%	31,9%	35,5%	35,7%
PREP/CON (5)	63,6%	23,4%	63,4%	19,8%	52,7%	23,8%

	AJ-N-CZ (27) Correct	EN-GE- CZ (27) Inter	EN-FR- CZ (21) Correct	EN-FR- CZ (21) Inter	EN-FR- FR (18) Correct	EN-FR- FR (18) Inter
P (VOC, FORM)	57%	30,8%	46%	39,1%	44%	41,8%
G (GRAM, ART)	58,1%	32,9%	49,7%	31,8%	47,7%	39,2%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	57,5%	29,7%	52,2%	35,4%	45,6%	38,4%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	57,6%	<u>31%</u>	50,8%	<u>35,1%</u>	45,9%	<u>39,4%</u>

These average results again support the assertion that the difference in the form of input (Czech versus French) is relevant for the result.

The 31% presence of French interference with students of German is rather high, which is especially because of their mistakes in articles and tenses (and also vocabulary rate is significant). This, as I have already mentioned, could originate in the lack of knowledge of the tense system and the rules where and how articles should be placed. Obviously, this statement would then be applied also for the French speaking students; however, here the potential influence of the French systems is expected to come into play at least to a certain degree.

The following charts summarise the French test:

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) English Interference
GRAM (6)	74,5%	6,9%
ART (4)	38,3%	4,4%
VOC (12)	65,2%	20,7%
FORM (3)	86,3%	13,7%
WO (4)	83,9%	8,8%
TV (3)	56,9%	19,6%
COLL (7)	61%	31,4%
PREP/CON (7)	70,6%	23,5%

	FR-FR (17) Correct	FR-FR (17) English Interference
P (VOC, FORM)	69,4%	19,3%
G (GRAM, ART)	60%	5,9%
S (COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	68%	22,8%
TOTAL (VOC, FORM, GRAM, ART, COLL, TV, WO, PREP/CON)	66,7%	<u>18%</u>

The resulting percentage should again support my claim that the foreign language that we speak better causes higher interference than the foreign language on the lower level of acquisition. This fact was proved not only in this result, but also in case of each one of all the average results of the three types of exercises.

When mentioning the different types of exercises in English and French tests' results, we may remind that the highest amount of interference showed up in the second exercise. This confirms my second claim that “passive interference reaches a higher degree than the active

one”, in other words we are less sensitive to recognising the mistakes when we read than we are prone to the transfer when we write. We may suppose that this could be generalised and we might claim that the interference is higher on the productive level than on the receptive level; however, further research would have to be done so as to prove that this statement will be valid also for the relation between listening and speaking.

6.4 Students' self evaluation

6.4.1 The questionnaire and its outcomes

The last eight minutes of the test were reserved for completing a short questionnaire in Czech (see below):

Věk:

Pohlaví:

	AJ	FJ	NJ	Jiný (jaký?)
Kolik let tento jazyk studujete?				
Kolik hodin týdně se jej učíte ve škole?				
Učil vás ho i rodilý mluvčí? Pokud ano, kolik let?				
Věnujete se mu mimo školu? Jak? (kroužky, samostudium, četba, filmy v cizím jazyce...)				
Jak často?				

Jak byste sami své znalosti jazyků ohodnotili (např. mluvíte plynně, máte problém se vyjádřit, dobře mluvíte, ale hůře rozumíte, atd.?)

Aj

Fj

Nj

Jiný cizí jazyk

Máte pocit, že se vám jazyky, které znáte, občas navzájem „pletou“? Které a jak?

To make the evaluation clear and in accordance with the style of presenting the results of the tests, I decided to continue in analyzing each group separately. Nevertheless, this time it will be only two distinct groups – those who study English plus German and those who study English plus French. In fact, it was only my decision to divide the second big group into three for the purpose of this research. I conceived this resume as a description of the profile of a typical representative of each group, also with highlighting several outstanding exceptions.

6.4.1.1 EN-GE students

These 12 men and 15 women are all aged 17 or 18. They have studied **English** mostly for nine or ten years; for one student, it is a second mother tongue. They have 3 lessons a week, five students have 5 lessons a week (an optional course). They have been taught by a native speaker for 3 years, in several cases for 6 or 8 years (3 or 5 more years at primary school). They seem to perceive the courses at their school as sufficient, because only one respondent takes courses at a language school. As for the extra activities developing their language skills, two thirds of students watch films and series, one half of them likes reading in English, only five of them mentioned browsing on the internet, using ICQ, Skype and playing PC games (it is possible that others also spend time similarly and that they only do not perceive it as an activity meant to improve their English). These activities make an important part of their life because they usually state that they do them every day or almost every day. Three people do so only once a week, six respondents do not use English outside school at all.

As concerns their studies of **German**, approximately one half of them they have studied it for five years, the rest is for six or seven years; four and ten years experience have been also once mentioned each, mostly they were taught only by a Czech teacher. They have three courses a week at school. Three students answered that they take some time once a week to watch a

film, read a book or newspaper or listen to some songs in German. However, all the others responded that they do not spend any extra time with German (their answers were often written in capitals, with exclamation mark and accompanied with such comments as “Never; No and I am not going to; I hate it” etc.).

Their usually have no experience with **French**, only five students know some basics after one or two years of study.

As concerns other foreign languages that they speak, one respondent studies **Russian**, one **Swedish**, three students have been learning **Japanese**. Four students can speak **Spanish** and ten students have studied **Latin** at school for two years, with the dotation of two lessons a week. These two last cases (plus students knowing the basics of French) might explain the occurrence of Romanic interference in their tests (after having compared their tests with other EN-GE students, their interference percentage really is notably higher).

The students' self evaluation shows that they are rather confident in **English**, they believe that they can speak fluently, sometimes they have problems with oral comprehension. They are aware of their mistakes in grammar but they do not perceive it as a problem, they especially appreciate their ability to communicate, to express themselves according to their needs.

As to their **German**, with five exceptions, they usually state that they do not understand much, they have problems when they have to speak, they have a rather limited vocabulary and the idea of talking with a native speaker scares them. The only thing they evaluate rather positively is their competence in grammar.

Less than a half of them admit the possibility that there might be some **negative transfer** among the languages they speak. If so, they mention vocabulary (6x), grammar (1x) and word order and the whole phrase construction (3x). They are aware of the interference especially in cases that they have courses of two foreign languages immediately following one another.

6.4.1.2 EN-FR students

These 45 females and 11 men are eighteen (32x) or nineteen (23) years old, one is seventeen. They have studied **English** for 8-13 years (10 years is the most frequented length of studies). Most of them have had a native speaker teacher for three years. Apart from school, they especially watch films in English (sometimes with subtitles), only occasionally they read. Using internet has been explicitly mentioned only in exceptional cases, similarly as talking with friends. One third of them do this every day, one third 2-3 times a week and one third not at all. They evaluate their level as lower compared to the previous group. In most cases, they state that they have only scarce problems with comprehension, but usually, they have difficulties in expression (both written and oral were mentioned), they feel they have a rather limited vocabulary.

Their contact with **French** is shorter (6-9 years), on the other hand it is overweighed by the fact that not only they have six courses of the language itself, but they also have twelve courses a week of content subjects taught in French. They have been taught by a native speaker usually for five or six years (i.e. at this school; their study program is devised for six years). They feel very comfortable both when speaking and listening, occasionally, they are not at ease with writing because of complicated orthography and grammar. As concerns reading, it belongs to their free time activities, approximately two thirds of students regularly read in French (but not in English), they also watch films, TV or radio, they are also in contact with their French friends.

As concerns other languages they know, 4 students have studied **German** for one or two years, 6 of them study **Latin**, 8 of them **Russian**, 16 **Spanish**. These three last languages are optional at their school and they have studied them for one or two years, only two students

attend language schools. Two respondents have studied **Italian** in language schools, one for three, the other already for twelve years.

Twelve students refuse any presence of possible transfer, the others usually are aware of its existence, especially in the case of vocabulary, pronunciation and spelling, two students also explicitly mentioned false cognates. In fact, all students who can speak Spanish, Italian and Latin confirm their experience with transfer, they also often appreciate its positive aspect.

7. Summary and Conclusions

In my thesis I attempt to explore the topic of multilingualism with the main interest in compensation strategies causing interference, namely French interference in English in Czech native speakers' written production. I introduce my thesis with a chapter explaining the immense impact of French on the English language, by which I want to illustrate the close relatedness of these two languages and, consequently, to support the relevance of conducting a research on the French interference in English.

The body of the theoretical part of my thesis is constituted by the description of learning process in general, the learner's profile and language processing. The possible outcomes of foreign language acquisition are compared to native language proficiency. I pursue my work by presenting the notion of bilingualism, its different conceptions and typologies, which is followed by introducing a more recent and less explored linguistic topic of multilingualism. As an effect arising from multilingual contact, the notions of transfer and interference are introduced; the related domain of contrastive rhetoric is mentioned.

In the practical part of my thesis, I first explain where and by what means the research was conducted, how the test was constructed and conceived and what and according to which criteria was assessed. Furthermore, I introduce here my two hypotheses on which the research was expected to give an answer and either verify or refute them, at least as concerns their validity under the current circumstances, the results and interpretation of this particular research.

My first hypothesis was that "the interference of the dominant foreign language is considerably higher than the interference of the other language". As I may judge from the

results obtained, this assessment proved to be accurate. The students participating in my research were mostly all at the similar level in English and their language competence of French was generally higher than their English language competence. I divided them into two groups. The students who were writing a test in English used French transfer on average more than twice as often as those who wrote a test in French and were expected to be influenced by English transfer.

My second claim was that “passive interference reaches a higher degree than the active one”. Here, the results again support my theory. The tasks in which students were expected to recognise and correct sentences containing the second foreign language transferred mistakes were solved with more than two times lower achievement than the tasks in which students either translated from another language or in which they knew what expressions they should focus on.

I am aware of the fact that the specific examples that were chosen for my test might also have brought specific results. In case that different examples distributed adequately in the same proportion according to the same categories were chosen, the resulting percentage of achievement might differ. To get more objective results, a more comprehensive test would have to be filled in by a considerably higher sample of respondents.

Thus, I do not want to generalize my results and present any resolute final statement. However, there is one objectively reliable result. We may state that each chosen method of testing has its limitations and it may occur that we do not verify someone’s knowledge or competence but rather their ability to deal with a specific type of exercise. Moreover, the students’ answers in a test might largely depend on their knowledge of the specific vocabulary or grammatical structures occurring there and their results should not be generalised as mastering of the tested feature.

8. Appendix

Tests that were given to students:

Test A

(written by group EN-FR-CZ and EN-GE-CZ):

I. Choose (circle) the correct form:

1. I would like to study *japanese* / *the japanese* / *Japanese* / *the Japanese* at *Charles University* / *the Charles Univeristy*.
2. Do you drink wine or are you a total abstainer? Oh, I really love *the red wine* / *red wine*.
3. Which quality is typical for your best friend? *Loyalty* / *the loyalty*.
4. *The most people* / *most of people* / *most people* / *the most of people* dislike hypocrisy.
5. If you need a laptop, I can lend you *the mine* / *mine*.
6. I don't *earn* / *gain* much money. In our family, my husband is *the rich* / *the rich one*.
7. No one *doesn't know* / *knows* the answer.
8. I am here *for helping you* / *to help* you.

II. Do you think that these sentences are correct? If so, write C (for "correct"). If not, rewrite them. (You don't have to rewrite the whole sentence, just make sure that your corrections are visibly and clearly marked).

1. He is dentist, isn't it? No, he is a player of tennis.
2. It needs someone who would solve our problem and give us new informations.
3. Since how many years do you live in Paris?
4. For start, I would like to tell you some basic facts about the England.
5. According to me, to talk about feelings is a loss of time.

6. She is interested in what, your younger sister?
7. Is the water enough warm? Sorry, I don't hear you, I take a shower.
8. He was a such talented piano player.
9. I will take care of the John's son for the five next days.
10. How she is beautiful! I must take a photo of her before to say goodbye.
11. I have spent the whole last week in the mountains.

III. Translate from Czech to English:

10. Už dál nesnesu jeho egoistické chování.
11. V zimě jsou dny kratší než v létě.
12. Provdala se za sympatického Angličana.
13. Prezident se stává navždy zodpovědným za politiku své země.
14. Je třeba znát slavnou teorii relativity Alberta Einsteina.
15. Poslechneme si trochu jazzu? Ne, mám raději klasickou hudbu.
16. To bylo poprvé, kdy jsme se potkali. Bylo to v listopadu a byla to neděle.
17. Až k nám přijdeš, ukážu ti to. - To doufám.
18. Rychle jsme se na sebe podívali.

Vyplňte, prosím, tento krátký dotazník:

Věk:

Pohlaví:

	AJ	FJ	NJ	Jiný (jaký?)
Kolik let tento jazyk studujete?				
Kolik hodin týdně se jej učíte ve škole?				
Učil vás ho i rodilý mluvčí? Pokud ano, kolik let?				

Věnujete se mu mimo školu? Jak? (kroužky, samostudium, četba, filmy v cizím jazyce...)				
Jak často?				

Jak byste sami své znalosti jazyků ohodnotili (např. mluvíte plyně, máte problém se vyjádřit, dobře mluvíte, ale hůře rozumíte, atd.?)

Aj

Fj

Nj

Jiný cizí jazyk

Máte pocit, že se vám jazyky, které znáte, občas navzájem „pletou“? Které a jak?

Test B

(written by group EN-FR-FR):

I. Choose (circle) the correct form:

1. I would like to study *japanese* / *the japanese* / *Japanese* / *the Japanese* at *Charles University* / *the Charles Univeristy*.
2. Do you drink wine or are you a total abstainer? Oh, I really love *the red wine* / *red wine*.
3. Which quality is typical for your best friend? *Loyalty* / *the loyalty*.
4. *The most people* / *most of people* / *most people* / *the most of people* dislike hypocrisy.
5. If you need a laptop, I can lend you *the mine* / *mine*.
6. I don't *earn* / *gain* much money. In our family, my husband is *the rich* / *the rich one*.
7. No one *doesn't know* / *knows* the answer.
8. I am here *for helping you* / *to help* you.

II. Do you think that these sentences are correct? If so, write C (for “correct”). If not, rewrite them. (You don’t have to rewrite the whole sentence, just make sure that your corrections are visibly and clearly marked).

1. He is dentist, isn’t it? No, he is a player of tennis.
2. It needs someone who would solve our problem and give us new informations.
3. Since how many years do you live in Paris?
4. For start, I would like to tell you some basic facts about the England.
5. According to me, to talk about feelings is a loss of time.
6. She is interested in what, your younger sister?
7. Is the water enough warm? Sorry, I don’t hear you, I take a shower.
8. He was a such talented piano player.
9. I will take care of the John’s son for the five next days.
10. How she is beautiful! I must take a photo of her before to say goodbye.
11. I have spent the whole last week in the mountains.

III. Translate from French to English:

1. Je ne peux plus supporter son comportement égoïste.
2. En hiver les jours sont plus courts qu’en été.
3. Elle s’est mariée avec un anglais sympathique.
4. Le président devient responsable pour toujours de la politique de son pays.
5. Il faut connaître la célèbre théorie de la relativité d’Albert Einstein.
6. On va écouter un peu de jazz? Non, c’est plutôt la musique classique que je préfère.
7. C’était la première fois qu’on s’est rencontrés. C’était en novembre et c’était un dimanche.
8. Quand tu viendras chez nous, je te le montrerai. - Je l’espère.
9. Nous nous sommes vite regardés.

IV. Vyplněte, prosím, tento krátký dotazník:

Věk:

Pohlaví:

	AJ	FJ	NJ	Jiný (jaký?)
Kolik let tento jazyk studujete?				
Kolik hodin týdně se jej učíte ve škole?				
Učil vás ho i rodič mluvčí? Pokud ano, kolik let?				
Věnujete se mu mimo školu? Jak? (kroužky, samostudium, četba, filmy v cizím jazyce...)				
Jak často?				

Jak byste sami své znalosti jazyků ohodnotili (např. mluvíte plyně, máte problém se vyjádřit, dobře mluvíte, ale hůře rozumíte, atd.?)

Aj

Fj

Nj

Jiný cizí jazyk

Máte pocit, že se vám jazyky, které znáte, občas navzájem „pletou“? Které a jak?

Test C

(written by group FR-FR):

I. Choisissez la meilleure possibilité:

1. Elle a pris une position *neutrale* / *neutre*.
2. C'était un mouvement littéraire typique pour la dernière *décade* / *décennie* du siècle précédent.
3. *Je prendrai* / *j'aurai* une bouillabaisse, s'il vous plaît.
4. Votre réponse est *illogicale* / *illogique*, croyez-moi, cela *n'a pas* / *ne fait pas* de sens.
5. J'adore *italien* / *Italien* / *l'italien* / *l'Italien*.

6. Tu as tout mon *soutien / support*, n'importe quand tu en auras besoin.
7. J'aimerais vous *introduire / présenter* un texte avec des arguments bien *balancés / équilibrés*.
8. Quand tu *viens / viendras* sonner à ma porte, il n'y aura personne.

II. Corrigez les phrases. Vous ne devez pas réécrire toute la phrase, il suffit de corriger visiblement ce qui est faux. Indiquez l'ordre des mots si vous voulez le changer:

1. Il a bu une glace de bière.
2. Je dois faire les courses avant aller chez moi.
3. Payez attention!
4. On est dit que c'était un responsable homme.
5. Je manque mes parents.
6. Demain, on part pour Paris, tu accompagnes nous?
7. Trois heures avant, je prenais le taxi pour être ici en temps.

III. Traduisez ces phrases en français:

1. I can't go with you, I have a cold.
2. You might borrow this picture book in a library.
3. It was a situation that no one had expected.
4. He ignores the details, he has nothing to say.
5. As I say, it's not as easy as you might think, as your knowledge of mathematics can't be sufficient to solve this problem.
6. Have you ever realised how clever she is?
7. No one knows me and I don't know anyone.

IV. Traduisez les phrases suivantes en anglais:

1. J'aime beaucoup manger.
2. Différentes personnes sont venues, on se connaît depuis longtemps.
3. On ne sait jamais.
4. Il a toujours de la chance, même le vendredi 13.

V. Vyplníte, prosím, tento krátký dotazník:

Věk:

Pohlaví:

	AJ	FJ	NJ	Jiný (jaký?)
Kolik let tento jazyk studujete?				
Kolik hodin týdně se jej učíte ve škole?				
Učil vás ho i rodilý mluvčí? Pokud ano, kolik let?				
Věnujete se mu mimo školu? Jak? (kroužky, samostudium, četba, filmy v cizím jazyce...)				
Jak často?				

Jak byste sami své znalosti jazyků ohodnotili (např. mluvíte plynně, máte problém se vyjádřit, dobře mluvíte, ale hůře rozumíte, atd.?)

Aj

Fj

Nj

Jiný cizí jazyk

Máte pocit, že se vám jazyky, které znáte, občas navzájem „pletou“? Které a jak?

9. Bibliography

- Baladová, G. 2009 *Společný evropský referenční rámec pro cizí jazyky v ČR*. 19 Mar 2009. 3 Apr. 2011. Retrieved from <http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/o/z/3024/SPOLECNY-EVROPSKY-REFERENCNI-RAMEC-PRO-CIZI-JAZYKY-V-CR.html/>
- Barber, C. 1993 *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. Glasgow: Cambridge University Press
- Bley-Vroman, R. 1989 'What is the logical problem of foreign language learning?', in Susan M. Gass and Jacquelyn Schachter (eds), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Connor, U. 1996 *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cook, V. 1993 *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. London: Macmillan
- Cummins, J. 1991 'Interdependence of first- and second language proficiency', in E. Bialystok (ed), *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Crystal, D. 2004 *The Stories of English*. London: Penguin Books
- Dulay, H., Burt, M. and Krashen, S. 1982 *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Flynn, S. 1989 'The role of the head-initial/head-final parameter in the acquisition of English relative clauses by adult Spanish and Japanese speakers', in Susan M. Gass and Jacquelyn Schachter (eds), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House
- Gregg, K. R. 1989 'Second language acquisition theory: the case for a generative perspective', in Susan M. Gass and Jacquelyn Schachter (eds), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. 2002 *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Cromwell Press
- Jessner, U. 2006 *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Kaplan, R.B. 1966 'Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education' in T.J. Silva and P.K. Mastuda (eds), *Landmark Essays on ESL Writing*. Philadelphia: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Krashen, S. D. 1977 'The Monitor Model for Adult Second Language Performance'; in Burt & Dulay & Finocchiaro (eds), *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language*. New York: Regents Publishing
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. 1991 *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman
- Leontiev, A. A. 1981 *Psychology and the Language Learning Process*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- McCarthy, M. J. 2001 *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nemser, W. 1971 'Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners' in Richards, J. C. (ed) *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman
- Newmeyer, F. J. 1983 *Grammatical Theory: Its Limits and Possibilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

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

Ringbom, H. 1986 'Crosslinguistic influence and the foreign language learning process', in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds), *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press

Selinker, L. 1972 'Interlanguage' in Richards, J. C. (ed) *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman

Stern, H. H. 1991 *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Whorf, B. L. 1956 *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press