

Cross-Linguistic Influences in Third Language Acquisition (Spanish) and the Relationship between Language Proficiency and Types of Lexical Errors

Barbara Perić¹ and Sonja Novak Mijić²

¹RIT Croatia - Rochester Institute of Technology Croatia

²High school Ivan Lucić

Abstract

This study is focused on lexical cross-linguistic influences in Spanish third language (L3) acquisition. Participants are second and third year students of the American College of Management and Technology with Croatian as their first language (L1) and English as their second language (L2). The study investigates the relationship between proficiency level and error production. The results show that the absolute number of lexical errors decreases as experience with the language increases, but in qualitative terms, some types of lexical transfer such as calques (literal translations) increase with proficiency. The results also show that the type of language transfer can be related to formal similarity of certain features or language components, and therefore English L2 is found to be the main source of lexical transfer.

Key words: *cross-linguistic influences; formal similarity; lexical transfer; third language acquisition (TLA); types of lexical errors.*

Introduction

Third language acquisition (TLA) has been considered simply as another case of second language acquisition (SLA) for a long time. Recent studies have shown that interlanguage development of L2 is not necessarily identical to that of L3, especially regarding potential sources of transfer (Cenoz, 2001, 2003; Leung, 2005; Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro, 2010).

Cross-linguistic influence (CLI) has mostly focused on the influence of L1 on L2. However, De Angelis (2007) states that transfer can occur from more than one language and the theory of cross-linguistic influences cannot be based on L1 influence alone, as a wide range of phenomena would remain unexplored and unexplained. Empirical evidence indicates that transfer can occur from L1 as well as from non-native languages, which means that, in case of multilinguals, the native language does not always have a privileged status and must be looked at together with other possible sources of transfer.

This research focused on lexical cross-linguistic influences in L3 acquisition with participants with Croatian L1 and English L2. The aim of this study is not only to establish Croatian and English cross-linguistic influences but to investigate the role of language proficiency during language transfer as well.

Study of Cross-Linguistic Influences

Third language acquisition is a field of study focused on learners who have previously acquired two languages and who are in the process of acquiring a new one. The learners who acquired L2 – English and who are presently in the process of acquiring L3 – Spanish are the focus of our study.

As De Angelis (2007) points out, the study of cross-linguistic influences seeks to explain how and under which conditions previously acquired linguistic knowledge influences the production, understanding and development of the target language. Cross-linguistic influences were initially studied following the methodology of contrastive analysis (CA) and, later on, following the methodology of error analysis (EA). Our study is focused on errors that are clearly traceable to previously acquired languages, leaving aside those errors that are not connected with CLI. Researchers have recently established a number of detailed classifications of the type of errors found in L3 production (Bouvy, 2000; Celaya & Torras, 2001; James, 1998; Ringbom, 2001).

As already mentioned, recent research has made clear that interlanguage development of L2 is not necessarily identical to that of L3, especially due to potential sources of transfer (Cenoz, 2001, 2003; Leung, 2005; Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro, 2010).

Variables that appear to play a role in L3 acquisition as Hammarberg (2001) states are: typological similarity, proficiency and recency. According to De Angelis (2007), language distance refers to the distance that a linguist can objectively and formally define and identify between languages and language families. Sometimes the term *formal similarity* is also used to refer to a relationship of similarity between the features or components of two or more languages without necessarily implying a genetic relationship between them. De Angelis (2007) states that relatedness and formal similarities are important triggers of CLI. Relatedness is defined on the basis of genetic affiliation, whereby languages are said to be related or close to one another when they belong to the same family (e.g. Indo-European) or the same subgroup of a family (e.g. Romance or Germanic sub-groups within the Indo-European family). Formal

similarity, on the other hand, explicitly identifies the similarity between specific features or components of languages, ranging from their grammatical structures to their lexicons, phonetic features, graphic forms and so forth. Two unrelated languages can consequently be formally similar with respect to some features or components. As far as recency is concerned, it is assumed that speakers are more likely to borrow from a language they have been recently exposed to than from a language they may know but do not use, since recent and frequent use facilitates access to the linguistic information stored in the mind (Hammarberg, 2001). However, other studies have shown that learners do not always rely on the language they acquired most recently. Activation of the previously acquired languages can be influenced by other variables usually neglected in research. It is often necessary to consider the combination of different factors to reach the correct conclusion. A number of authors state that language proficiency in previously acquired languages (Ringbom, 1987; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998) as well as the proficiency in the target language (Bardel, 2010; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998) have a significant role in cross-linguistic transfer. If the learners are proficient in L2, that language can play a different role than L1 in acquiring a new language. Odlin (1989) claims that the language transfer is mainly negative with low competence in the target language due to code-switching. Furthermore, positive language transfer is more likely to be found in language production of highly competent learners. It is often necessary to consider the combination of factors as we have done in our study. The present study aims to investigate how language proficiency and formal similarity affect the way L1 and L2 influence L3.

Study of Lexical Transfer in Third Language Acquisition

This paper focuses on lexical transfer due to the fact that lexis is very sensitive to cross-linguistic influence. Language transfer is much more frequent in lexis than grammar structures (Ringbom, 1987). Most of the authors, examining cross-linguistic influences, study the effects of cross-linguistic influences regardless of the result that can be positive or negative. Two main types of lexical transfer can be distinguished: transfer of form and transfer of meaning (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Ringbom, 2001, 2006). There are three different forms of transfer of form: 1) code-switching, 2) coinages and 3) false cognates (Ringbom, 2006). Ringbom (2006) is mainly concerned with cognates and false cognates and examining the effect they have on learning. The author divides the transfer of meaning into two categories: calques and semantic extension. Ringbom (2006) points out that non-native lexical transfer is mostly transfer of form while the transfer of meaning reflects the L1 influence. According to the author, the transfer of meaning requires a very high level of proficiency in the source language. Language proficiency will be addressed in our study due to the fact that our participants are very proficient in L2.

As mentioned earlier, it is very important to establish which factors cause a parallel activation of languages. Ringbom (1987, 2001) relates cross-linguistic influences

to psychotypology as one of the most important factors of CLI, but also states that a non-native language can be a source of transfer only in case similar proficiency is reached. He claims that even typologically different languages can share certain similarities, mainly in lexis, that can be of great help in the process of acquiring a new language. Cenoz, Hufweisen, & Jessner (2001) suggest that the connection between L2 and L3 is stronger than the connection between L3 and L1, especially when L2 and L3 are typologically similar. In that case, language typology is considered as the most significant factor in acquiring L3 lexis. Celaya (2006) examines the relationship between L3 language proficiency and the type of errors. The results have shown that the production of calques increases with higher levels of L3 proficiency.

The Role of Proficiency in Target Language and Previously Acquired Non-Native Languages

Proficiency, both in target language and source language, plays an important role in the field of cross-linguistic influences. In this respect, many researchers point out that language transfer is more likely to happen in less proficient L3 learners, when they rely more on the previously acquired languages (Celaya, 2006; Muñoz, 2007; Naves, Miralpeix, & Celaya, 2005; Odlin, 1989; Ringbom, 1987; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998). However, that does not necessarily mean that the transfer does not exist in more advanced stages of language acquisition. According to Odlin (1989), certain types of transfer occur during early stages of language acquisition while some occur in later stages. Furthermore, Odlin points out that the transfer in early stages is mainly negative due to the fact that the learners rely on previously acquired languages in order to fill lexical gaps. On the other hand, the effects of positive transfer are mainly present in more advanced stages of language acquisition, when knowledge of other languages can be useful to the learners. Agustín Llach (2011) examines the relationship between error production and the level of language proficiency and claims that error production decreases with higher level of proficiency. However, the type of errors changes with the higher level of language proficiency. There are qualitative and quantitative approaches to lexical transfer. Quantitatively, lexical transfer has been reduced. In qualitative terms, some types of lexical transfer, such as calques, increase with proficiency in the target language. Research by Celaya (2006) also proves that the production of calques increases with proficiency in the target language. Naves et al. (2005) and Celaya (2008) confirmed that code-switching was reduced with proficiency in the target language.

Ringbom (1987) claims that the type of language transfer which will occur in the target language is defined by the proficiency in source languages. The author believes that the transfer of form is a relatively superficial type of transfer that can be applied to both, L1 and L2, since the level of proficiency in a non-native language does not have to be high for this type of transfer to occur. Learners will rely on the typologically more similar language (L1 or L2). On the other hand, according to Ringbom (1987,

2001), the transfer of meaning (e.g. calques and semantic extension) comes mainly from L1, but it can also occur from L2 if learners achieve a high level of proficiency in that language.

Aim

This research examines the role of previously acquired languages in the process of acquiring L3. The study focuses on cross-linguistic influences in Spanish L3 acquisition by learners with Croatian L1 and English L2. The aim is not only to investigate Croatian and English cross-linguistic influences, but also to determine the effect of language proficiency during language transfer. According to De Angelis (2007), it is easy to explain the role of typology when the speakers are familiar with the combination of related and non-related languages, and in the case when only two of them are related (source language and target language). It all becomes more complex when the speakers are familiar with the languages of the same language family, but not of the same sub-group, as it is the case with our combination of languages. Croatian, English and Spanish belong to the same language family (Indo-European languages). However, they do not belong to the same sub-group. Croatian is a Slavic language, English is a Germanic language and Spanish belongs to the Romance language group. Considering this background, it is very hard to predict which language will become the source language during the process of L3 acquisition, since it is difficult to establish the distance between English and Croatian from the Spanish language. According to Hammarberg (2009), it is necessary to consider the profile of language distance that will vary in different language areas.

About 60% of the English lexis comes from Romance languages and therefore, Spanish and English share a number of related words. We come to the conclusion that Spanish and English share more similarities than Croatian and Spanish. Accordingly, English should be the source language. Furthermore, L2 will be the source of transfer of meaning as well, due to the fact that our learners are highly proficient in L2, which confirms Ringbom's theory (1987, 2001). Most researchers (Agustín Llach, 2011; Celaya, 2006; Muñoz, 2007; Navés et al., 2005; Odlin, 1989; Ringbom, 1987; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998) agree that learners at higher levels transfer to a less extent because their better command of the target language allows them to manipulate the linguistic means at their disposal more efficiently. Accordingly, third year students will produce fewer errors than second year students. We also argue that, in qualitative terms, some types of lexical transfer such as calques and coinages increase with proficiency. Learners in upper grades have a higher degree of mastery of the target language vocabulary. Consequently, they are able to use L3 words to translate L1/L2 structures, and do not need to borrow directly words from L1/L2. As Agustín Llach (2011) states, lexical inventions based on L1/L2 knowledge, such as coinages and in particular calques, imply higher proficiency in the target language since they derive from the application of target language phonographemic rules to L1/L2 words in the

case of coinage, and of literal translation and semantic extension of L1/L2 to L3 words in the case of calques.

Our hypotheses are based on three main points:

- The type of language transfer can be related to formal similarity of certain features or language components and to L2 proficiency as well, and therefore English L2 will be the main source in both - transfer of form and transfer of meaning.
- The production of errors is reduced with the higher level of proficiency in the target language (Agustín Llach, 2011)
- The type of lexical errors is changed with the higher level of proficiency. Calques are more frequent, and code-switching is reduced (Celaya, 2006, 2008).

Method

Corpus and Participants

Our total sample was composed of 60 participants (30 second year students and 30 third year students), 33 females and 27 males, 21-29 years old. All participants had Croatian L1, English L2 and were in the process of acquiring Spanish L3 at the time of research. All participants were enrolled in the American College of Management and Technology. The second year students were learning Spanish for 2 semesters (total 120 lessons), and the third year students were learning Spanish for 4 semesters (total 240 lessons). All of them confirmed they had never been to a Spanish-speaking country and their first contact with Spanish was in college. All participants had a high level of English proficiency since they started learning English in their early childhood and lessons in college are held in English.

We used a corpus made of compositions written during the final exam. Students were familiar with this type of tasks. Essays are a part of their final exams at the end of each semester. The topic was related to the material presented in class.

Demographic and linguistic background data were collected by means of a language profile questionnaire, which was completed by students after the exam. The design of the questionnaire was based on an adaptation (Bayona, 2009) of an earlier version of the linguistic profile "Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q)" designed and employed by Marian et al. (2006) in a study that looked into multilingual populations and their self-assessment of linguistic skills. The linguistic profile included an initial section for the name, age, and gender of each participant. The following is a detailed description of the purpose of each of the remaining items of the linguistic questionnaire.

- a) Questions 1 through 3 pertained to the linguistic background of the participants in terms of the number and order of previously acquired languages. The selection of participants was strictly related to the order, type and number of languages previously acquired. Participants were asked if they had acquired Croatian, English, Spanish or any other language as a first, second, third, or fourth language. All the participants qualified for this study having exclusively

Croatian as a first language, English as a second language, and learning Spanish as a third language at the time of the study.

- b) Question 4 inquired about the age at which the participants had started their English and Spanish acquisition respectively, and the age at which they believed they became fluent. This question was used as a corroboration of the answers given in the previous questions and was also employed to give us some overview of students' language proficiency.
- c) Question 5 asked about the time participants have spent in an English or Spanish speaking country, family, or school respectively. This question was also included to determine the level of participants' language proficiency.

A problem that frequently arises in the research design of studies on CLI is the assessment or measurement of target language proficiency. In our study, proficiency is assessed on the basis of accumulated instruction. We classified our university learners according to the course level at the university. At the time of data collection, the participants had not followed any extra Spanish classes, had never been to a Spanish-speaking country and had had no regular contact with the language. In this way the number of hours of instruction at the measuring time was controlled for.

Data were collected from free compositions written during the regular final exam and the participants were students enrolled in American College of Management and Technology, all native speakers of Croatian with L2 English. None of the participants was allowed to use a dictionary and the participants were required to write approximately 200 words within the 100 minutes allocated for the entire test. We did not exclude any of the participants because they all met the criteria for the selection due to their linguistic background. Firstly, we extracted the errors and classified them according to the possible influence from the Croatian or English language that might have caused them. We categorized lexical errors according to possible influence from Croatian or English. Our research is focused on the errors caused by previously acquired languages. As mentioned earlier, we categorized errors according to the source language (Croatian, English or both). We used the term "Ambiguous Items" (Bayona, 2009), in cases where we could not distinguish the source of CLI or we noted the influence from both languages (e.g. the verb *to love* which means the same in both languages – to love a person or to love doing something). However, in Spanish, the verb *querer* means only to love a person and the verb *gustar* is used to describe what someone loves doing. In this case, like in other similar cases, we cannot be sure about the right source of cross-linguistic influences, since Croatian and English use the same form.

Lexical Errors

Our study opts for employing Ringbom's (2001) classification but includes some necessary modifications required for the examination of our corpus in particular.

Lexical errors are grouped into five categories. The following are examples from the data in the present study. Three categories refer to transfer of form and two categories to transfer of meaning. Transfer of meaning errors include:

- a) Semantic extension - usual error of lexical overlap in the languages when the learner wrongly extends the meaning into another area where the overlap no longer exists, such as cases in which one Croatian/English word corresponds to two or more Spanish words.

	He atendido ¹ a una presentación
Target form	He asistido a una presentación
Croatian	Sudjelovao sam na prezentaciji
English	I attended a presentation

- b) Loan translations (calques) - these errors are the result of a direct word-for-word translation of a Croatian/English phrase. In this section, we will also include constructions that present a wrong preposition choice which is clearly attributable to Croatian/English transfer.

	Tuvimos un buen tiempo
Target form:	Nos lo pasamos muy bien
Croatian:	Dobro smo se proveli
English:	We had a good time
	Me enamoré en mi amigo
Target form:	Me enamoré de mi amigo
Croatian:	Zaljubila sam se u mog prijatelja
English:	I fell in love with my friend

Transfer of form errors include:

- c) False cognates - another type of lexical transfer error is caused by the erroneous use of the so-called “false” cognates. Learners assume that words which are similar in form are also similar in meaning.

	Estudiaba en la librería
Target form:	Estudiaba en la biblioteca
Croatian:	Učio sam u knjižnici
English:	I used to study in the library

- d) Code switching (see, e.g. James, 1998) appears when the learner directly inserts an L1/L2 word into the L3 syntax.

	Soy muy grateful
Target form:	Estoy muy agradecida
Croatian:	Vrlo sam zahvalna
English:	I'm very grateful

¹ Bold font will be used in examples to mark the CLI that we are focusing on at the moment.

e) Coinage or “relexification” (see, e.g. Ringbom, 1987) consists of the adaption of an L1 word to the L2 orthography or morphology. For the purpose of this study we tried to find adaptations of an L1/L2 word to the L3 orthography or morphology.

	Mi familia es muy suportiva
Target form:	Mi familia es muy comprensiva
Croatian:	Moja obitelj je puna razumijevanja
English:	My family is very supportive

Results and Discussion

In the present study, we wanted to describe and compare lexical error production at the end of the Beginning Spanish course (second year students) and the Intermediate Spanish course (third year students). The compositions of the third year students provided us with an extensive corpus from which we could extract through error analysis a total of 434 tokens, of which 172 were lexical items with crosslinguistic influence. We extracted 688 tokens of which 473 lexical items with cross-linguistic influence in compositions of the second year students, which confirms our thesis that the production of errors is reduced with proficiency in the target language (Agustín Llach, 2011). As can be seen in Table 1, L1 (Croatian language) influence is the cause of 15% of all of these errors in second year compositions, L2 (English language) influence is seen in 72% of all the errors and there are 13% ambiguous items.

As can be seen in Table 2, the influence of L1 is the cause of 16% lexical errors in third year compositions and L2 is the cause of 58% lexical errors. As many as 26% of the errors are ambiguous items. These results confirm our hypothesis that English will be the main source of lexical cross-linguistic influences due to lexical similarity between English and Spanish. Furthermore, formal similarity between different language components and language proficiency play an important role in lexical transfer.

Table 1

Cross-linguistic influences according to origin - 2nd year students

Cross-linguistic influences (CLI) according to origin	Frequency (%)
Croatian CLI	72 (15%)
English CLI	338 (72%)
Ambiguous items	63 (13%)
Total	473 (100%)

Table 2

Cross-linguistic influences according to origin - 3rd year students

Cross-linguistic influences (CLI) according to origin	Frequency (%)
Croatian CLI	28 (16%)
English CLI	100 (58%)
Ambiguous items	44 (26%)
Total	172 (100%)

These errors were grouped into five categories (Tables 3 and 4) in order to determine whether there were particular types of lexical errors that were typical for different learning stages. Results (Table 3) indicate that the most frequent errors in the compositions of second year students are code-switching (38%), and then those caused by direct translation (21%) and by adjusting the words from L1 and L2 to the morphology of L3 (21%). As can be seen in Table 4, in the compositions of third year students, there is a significant decrease of code-switching (only 5%) and a significant increase of calques (53%). Calques and coinages appear as the most frequent types of errors in the compositions of third year students. These results suggest that higher proficiency in the target language may lead learners to try to adapt the source language item or translate it to the target language (coinage and calque, respectively) and so drawing from the source language (code-switching) does not take place as often. A possible explanation for such a significant increase of calques may come to light following Ringbom's classification (2001); these results may prove that *transfer of meaning (calque)* and *transfer of form* definitely imply different processes in the acquisition of the third language vocabulary, and that some types of transfer involve a more complex linguistic process than others. On the one hand, code-switching implies a direct influence of L1/L2, that is, a type of influence that works independently of the L3 system. On the other, coinage and calque, for which the L1/L2 and the L3 systems interact closely, may therefore require a higher degree of mastering of L3 than in the previous type. According to Agustín Llach (2015), coinage errors are very illustrative of the lexical acquisition process and indicate a creative process.

In the process of identifying and categorising lexical errors, we had the opportunity to focus on some of those which were found to be especially problematic because they were very frequent. They have their origin in L1/L2 literal translation (e.g. using the auxiliary *to be* instead of *to have*: *Soy frío* for *Tengo frío* or the pervasive use of *to be* when referring to age: *Soy 20*, a clear literal translation from L2. We came to the conclusion that some L3 errors are never remedied or are remedied at a very slow pace, and become fossilized, in spite of exposure to L3, or of teaching interventions.

Table 3
Cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors - 2nd year students

Cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors	Frequency
Semantic extension	62 (13%)
Calques	97 (21%)
False cognates	34 (7%)
Code-switching	182 (38%)
Coinage	98 (21%)
Total	473 (100%)

By analyzing cross-linguistic influences in accordance with the types of errors (Tables 5 and 6) we came to the conclusion that English was the main source for all

types of errors. Lexical transfer can be connected with formal similarity between certain features and language components. English is the main source of cross-linguistic influences due to its formal similarity with Spanish and due to a high level of proficiency in L2.

Table 4
Cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors - 3rd year students

Cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors	Frequency
Semantic extension	28 (16%)
Calques	91 (53%)
False cognates	5 (3%)
Code switching	9 (5%)
Coinage	39 (23%)
Total	172 (100%)

Table 5
Source of cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors - 2nd year students

Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Semantic extension	3 (5%)	20 (32%)	39 (63%)
Total		62 (100%)	
Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Calques	26 (27%)	47 (48%)	24 (25%)
Total		97 (100%)	
Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
False cognates	0 (0%)	34 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total		34 (100%)	
Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Code-switching	41 (23%)	141 (77%)	0 (0%)
Total		182 (100%)	
Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Coinages	2 (2%)	96 (98%)	0 (0%)
Total		98 (100%)	

Table 6
Source of cross-linguistic influences according to the type of errors - 3rd year students

Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Semantic extension	2 (7%)	10 (36%)	16 (57%)
Total		28 (100%)	
Type of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Calques	20 (22%)	43(47%)	28 (31%)
Total		91 (100%)	
Types of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
False cognates	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total		5 (100%)	
Types of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Code-switching	0 (0%)	9 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total		9 (100%)	
Types of errors	Cro. CLI	Eng. CLI	Cro./Eng. CLI
Coinages	6 (15%)	33 (85%)	0 (0%)
Total		39 (100%)	

Conclusions

The present study has examined the production of lexical cross-linguistic influences in trilingual learners with Croatian L1 and English L2 in the process of acquiring Spanish as a third language, considering the role of language proficiency in L2 and L3. The results of the research confirmed our initial hypotheses that the type of language transfer can be connected with the formal similarity between certain features or language components and the language proficiency in L2. Accordingly, English as L2 was the main source of the lexical transfer in both the transfer of form and transfer of meaning.

As L3 language knowledge increases, the learner incorporates new words and new morphosyntactic norms. Linguistic competence becomes more stable and relationships among linguistic components strengthen. Consequently, some lexical errors disappear, but some other become more pervasive. In general, we can conclude that as learners' L3 proficiency increases, lexical transfer changes. On the one hand, the influence of L1/L2 decreases. However, if examined qualitatively, research shows that some types of lexical transfer, basically those that have to do with meaning transfer, tend to increase with proficiency. In conclusion, proficiency is one of the most important factors determining language transfer. Since we only focused on lexical transfer, further research is needed with the focus on morphology and syntax in the same combination of languages. Further research in this area would help us understand the dynamic nature of language transfer.

As Agustín Llach (2015) states, it is important to teach vocabulary explicitly and to conduct error correction and remedy programmes that help improve learners' lexical accuracy. The particular lexical errors, which are pervasive in learners' writings, also need to be treated explicitly. Explicit instruction can combine with a contrastive approach where L1/L2 and L3 are compared and similarities and differences put forward, even providing students with negative evidence. This language contrast can be very helpful, since many lexical errors have their origin in L1/L2 influence.

References

- Agustín Llach, M.P. (2011). *Second language acquisition. Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing (1)*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Agustín Llach, M.P. (2015). *Lexical errors in Writing at the End of Primary and Secondary Education: Description and Pedagogical Implications*. Granada: Porta Linguarum.
- Bayona, P. (2009). *Crosslinguistic influences in the acquisition of Spanish L3*. (Doctoral dissertation). London, Ontario, Canada: The University of Western Ontario.
- Bardel, C. (2016). The lexicon of advanced L2 learners. In K. Hyltenstam (Ed.), *Advanced proficiency and exceptional ability in second languages* (pp. 73-108). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614515173-006>
- Bouvy, C. (2000). Towards the Construction of a Theory of Cross-linguistic Transfer. In J. Cenoz, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third language* (pp. 143-156). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Celaya, M.L. (2006). Lexical transfer and second language proficiency: A longitudinal analysis of written production in English as a foreign language. In A.A. Alcaraz-Sintes, C. Soto-Palomo, & M.C. Zunido-Garrido (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 29 AEDEAN Conference* (pp. 293-297). Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.
- Celaya, M.L. (2008). 'I study natus in English': lexical transfer in CLIL and regular learners. In R. Monroy, & A. Sánchez (Eds.), *25 Years of Applied Linguistics in Spain: Milestones and Challenges* (pp. 43-49). Murcia: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia.
- Celaya, M.L., & Torras, M.R. (2001). L1 influence and EFL vocabulary: do children rely more on L1 than adult learners?. *Proceedings of the 25th AEDEAN Meeting* (pp. 1-14). Granada: University of Granada.
- Cenoz, J. (2001). The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 8-19). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Cenoz, J. (2003). The role of typology in the organization of the multilingual lexicon. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The multilingual lexicon* (pp. 103-116). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48367-7_8
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2001). *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G., & Selinker, L. (2001). Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 42-58). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hammarberg, B. (2001). Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 Production and Acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 21-41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hammarberg, B. (2009). *Processes in Third Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Leung, Y.-K.I. (2005). L2 vs. L3 initial state: A comparative study of the acquisition of French DPs by Vietnamese monolinguals and Cantonese-English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8(1), 39-61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904002044>
- Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2006). The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (OLEAP-Q): Assessing Language Profiles in Bilinguals and Multilinguals. *Conference on Second Language Acquisition and Multilingualism*. Toronto: York University.
- Muñoz, C. (2007). Cross-linguistic influence and language switches in L4 oral production. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4, 73-94.
- Naves, T., Miralpeix, I., & Celaya, M.L. (2005). Who Transfers More and What? Cross-linguistic Influence in Relation to School Grade and Language Dominance in EFL. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(2), 113-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710508668380>
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524537>
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ringbom, H. (2001). Lexical transfer in L3 production. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 59-68). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ringbom, H. (2006). *Cross-linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Rothman, J., & Cabrelli Amaro, J. (2010). What variables condition syntactic transfer? A look at the L3 initial state. *Second Language Research*, 26, 189-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658309349410>

Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 259-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295>

Barbara Perić

RIT - Rochester Institute of Technology Croatia
Don Frana Bulića 6, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia
barbara.peric@croatia.rit.edu

Sonja Novak Mijić

High school Ivan Lucić,
Put Muline 2B, 21220 Trogir, Croatia
sonja.novak2@gmail.com

Appendix

LINGUISTIC PROFILE ²

Last name	First name	Gender	
		Male	Female
Age			

Please select the appropriate response from the choices given:

1. Croatian is my
a) First language b) Second language c) Third language d) Fourth language

2. English is my
a) First language b) Second language c) Third language d) Fourth language

3. Spanish is my
a) First language b) Second language c) Third language d) Fourth language

Regarding your knowledge of English:

4. Age when you:

Began acquiring it	Became fluent ³	Began reading it	Became fluent reading it

² Adapted from: Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2006). *The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (OLEAP-Q): Assessing Language Profiles in Bilinguals and Multilinguals*. Toronto: Conference on Second Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. York University

5. Please state the number of years and months you spent in:

	Years	Months
A country where English is spoken		
A family where English is spoken		
A school where English is spoken		

Regarding your knowledge of Spanish:

4. Age when you:

Began acquiring it	Became fluent	Began reading it	Became fluent reading it

5. Please state the number of years and months you spent in:

	Years	Months
A country where Spanish is spoken		
A family where Spanish is spoken		
A school where Spanish is spoken		

³ By fluent we intended to convey being capable to use a language easily and accurately, which was explained orally to the participants.

Međujezični utjecaji u ovladavanju španjolskim kao trećim jezikom te veze između jezičnog umijeća i vrste leksičkih pogrešaka

Sažetak

U središtu su pozornosti ovog istraživanja leksički međujezični utjecaji prilikom usvajanja španjolskog jezika kao trećeg jezika kod učenika kojima je hrvatski jezik prvi/materinski jezik, a engleski drugi jezik. U ovom smo radu također proučavali veze između jezičnog umijeća u trećem jeziku i vrste leksičkih pogrešaka. Cilj je našeg istraživanja istražiti hrvatske i engleske međujezične utjecaje, a naše su pretpostavke usmjerene na dvije glavne točke. Prva je da vrsta promatranog jezičnog prijenosa može biti povezana s formalnom sličnosti između određenih značajki ili komponenti jezika pa će tako engleski jezik kao J2 biti preferirani izvor leksičkoga prijenosa, a druga da se proizvodnja kalkova povećava kako učenici postaju kompetentniji u trećem jeziku. Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 50 ispitanika. Svi su ispitanici studenti druge i treće godine na Američkoj visokoj školi za menadžment i tehnologiju. Metodom analize pogrešaka analizirani su njihovi završni pisani radovi i potvrđene naše pretpostavke.

Ključne riječi: *formalna sličnost; leksički prijenos; međujezični utjecaj; prijenos forme; usvajanje trećeg jezika.*