



Cross-linguistic influence in learning English as a third language: The case of L1 Arabic, L2 Turkish learners and their attitudes towards learning foreign languages

^aMehmet Saraç  and ^bDerin Atay 

^aLecturer, Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey, mehmetsarac@uludag.edu.tr

^bProf. Dr., Bahçeşehir University, Turkey, dyatay@yahoo.com

APA Citation : Sarac, M., & Atay, D. (2021). Cross-linguistic influence in learning English as a third language: The case of L1 Arabic, L2 Turkish learners and their attitudes towards learning foreign languages. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 3(1), 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.2021.00026>

ABSTRACT

This study aims to reveal the attitudes of the third language (L3) learners of English towards learning foreign languages and to investigate the source of syntactic and lexical transfer in their writing assignments at a Turkish university. For this purpose, a mixed study method was chosen by using a questionnaire consisting of 30 questions and think aloud protocols (TAP). Being analyzed descriptively, the quantitative data revealed that L1 Arabic, L2 Turkish, L3 learners of English from different backgrounds largely have positive attitudes towards learning foreign languages. When the quantitative data was analyzed according to the group dynamics in detail, the results showed that L3 learners of English with L1 Arabic, L2 Turkish backgrounds showed statistically significant differences in terms of their attitudes towards foreign language learning. The participants who were in the L2 dominant group have more positive attitudes than the ones in the L1 dominant group. As for the source of transfer, the results showed that the participants displayed some syntactic transfers in their writing productions, but they could not be clearly defined as resulting from whether Turkish or Arabic because the transferred forms (for example, absence of verb to be) were similar in both L1 and L2 of the participants. However, when they are observed during the production process, regardless of the dominance of L1 or L2 in their everyday life, they thought aloud in Arabic.

Keywords

cross-linguistic influence,
syntactic transfer,
lexical transfer

Article History

Received : 12.10.2021
Revised : 21.04.2021
Accepted : 06.06.2021
Published : 25.06.2021

Type

Research Article

Introduction

In recent years there has been a growing interest in third language (L3) acquisition. As a result of this interest, a significant number of language groups are under investigation. The research studies about L3 acquisition have become an independent focus of research in recent years (e.g. Cenoz, 2003). According to the scholars, more complex factors are at work in L3 acquisition than the second language (L2) acquisition, and most of these complex interactions are not apparent in the L2 acquisition process. As mentioned in the studies in the related literature (e.g. Bardel & Falk, 2007; Falk & Bardel, 2011; Ringbom, 2007; Rothman, 2015, 2011; Williams & Hammarberg, 1998), one of the main differences between these two language learning processes is the potential source of transfer because for the L2 the only source is (L1); however,

 **Corresponding Author:** mehmetsarac@uludag.edu.tr

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to Focus on ELT Journal.

there are two existing languages to serve as potential sources in L3 acquisition. Therefore, examining the interplay among L1, L2, and L3 may help researchers discover the key determinant of the transfer.

Full transfer, partial transfer or no transfer issues are also valid for the L3 acquisition: however, there is a fundamental difference between the acquisition of a second and third language as the L3 acquisition happens in the presence of two potential sources for cross-linguistic influence. In the context of L3 acquisition, the key question is whether the first language or the second one or both of the previous languages serve as a source. In the related literature, a number of factors have been stated as affective for cross-linguistic influence, such as the order of acquisition, typological proximity of the languages and similarity in the structural levels.

With the growing number of refugees in Europe and especially in Turkey, the number of students for whom English is the third language is growing rapidly. At the research site of the current study, these students take a Turkish proficiency exam, and if they can pass it, they can pursue their education in their departments, if not so they are required to get one year of Turkish preparatory class prior to the English preparatory class. As a result of this regulation of the university, English becomes the third language for these students. Taking the number of these learners into consideration and the differences between the acquisition of the second and third languages, the attitudes and source of transfer of these students deserve further investigation. With these in mind, the present study aims to reveal the attitudes of the participants (from L1 dominant setting and L2 dominant setting) towards learning foreign languages (in this case learning English). After revealing the attitudes of the L3 learners, the study also aims at investigating the source of syntactic and lexical transfer: whether L1 or L2 in their writing assignments. The impetus behind the current research is to make the implicit production process explicit through TAPs and, by doing so, to develop the quality of materials, to arrange the curriculum and content accordingly and in general to develop the quality of the language teaching to these L3 learners of English.

Literature Review

Cross-linguistic influences

The literature on Cross-Linguistic Influence (CLI) has identified a variety of factors that determine the influence on the acquisition of the third language, such as (psycho) typological similarity (Cenoz et al., 2001; Kellerman, 1986; Ringbom, 2001), the learner's level of proficiency (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Hammarberg, 2001), language exposure to L2 and L3 (Dewaele, 2001; Ringbom, 1986), the frequency of use (Hammarberg, 2001; Magiste, 1986), the relative status of L2 (Williams & Hammarberg, 1998), source and target language proficiency, and formality of context, educational factors (course, teacher), parental encouragement.

Another factor regarding L2 lexical transfer during third language acquisition is the amount of L2 exposure in the learner's environment, as Williams and Hammarberg (1998) show. Increased L2 exposure leads to less language transfer (Dewaele, 1998). This is because the students often notice an improvement in their L2, such as an increase in their vocabulary, which in turn leads them to use their L1.

Transfer source in L3

The studies in the literature are not conclusive in terms of the role of the previously learned/acquired languages in the process of the third language. As a result, it is not possible to state one single determiner for cross-linguistic interference. A case study conducted by Williams and Hammarberg (1998) pinpoints three potential determiners of cross-linguistic influence, which are; recency of use, status of the second language, and typology. According to the researchers, the language (L1 or L2) which scores the highest on these mentioned determiners can be accepted as the most influential factor.

According to De Angelis (2007, p. 35), the recency of use is related to "how recently a language was last used". This issue was also highlighted in some other studies as it is assumed that the more recently a language is used, the easier it will be activated in the learner's mind. According to Dewaele (2001), the more recent source will potentially serve as the supplier of transfer in learning the third language. The researcher also states that the recency is the main factor for the lexical source of transfer as the more recent one is also activated and assessed more recently. On the other hand, some other studies such as (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Herwig, 2001; Rivers, 1979) show that the last language is not always the first source to rely on. In these studies, it is asserted that in addition to recency, there are some other higher-order psycholinguistic factors such as the country of origin, target culture and the personal experience of the learners with the target languages.

Typology, on the other hand, is related to the distance among languages. In the related literature, there are studies focusing on this distance issue, such as Cenoz et al. (2001). This study reports that if the typology of the languages relates to one another, then the connection and transfer between those languages would be more robust. In the same study, typological closeness has been found to be one of the most influential factors in the L3 acquisition of lexis (Cenoz et al., 2001).

Within the scope of typology, another aspect is proposed by De Angelis (2007), that is the "perceived language distance", which can be explained as the distance that the learners perceive but may or may not be present between the compared languages. A typologically closer language might be perceived as far by the learners, or it might be the other way around. One more potential determiner is stated as the role of the second language. This perspective might have an influential role in the current study as the role of the second language is the main distinction between the two groups of participants. For one of the participant group, the second language is the primary language of daily communication and education because they are living in the dormitories with their Turkish friends and they are also using the second language actively at school, on the other hand, the other group members are living with their families, and their family members have little or no knowledge in Turkish. These participants stated in their form at the beginning that they use their L1 dominantly in their daily lives. For the effect of the role of L2, Williams and Hammarberg (1998) suggest that especially at the initial stages of acquisition, the L2 and L3 interlanguages are activated simultaneously, but over time this role is taken over by the third language itself. Bardel and Falk (2007) assert that the role of L2 in L3 is more like a filter, and it blocks the transfer from the first language. According to Flynn et al. (2004), vocabulary is the main area where the status of L2 can be determined as the effect of L2 is accepted as more influential than the L1 in terms of vocabulary.

Some other studies discussed the issue of transfer from a syntactic perspective. Some of those studies discovered that syntactic transfer was not proved to be effective on L3 acquisition

(Bouvy, 2000; Håkansson et al., 2002). The findings and discussions of these studies are related to the present study; although they are working on different languages, they present a theoretical background for the cross-linguistic issue.

The Current Study

The Purpose and Significance of the Study

One of the aims of the study is to reveal the attitudes of the participants (from L1 dominant setting and L2 dominant setting) towards learning foreign languages. After revealing the attitudes of the L3 learners, the study also aims at investigating the source of syntactic and lexical transfer: whether L1 or L2 in their writing assignments. The study is worth conducting because in our language teaching contexts, there is a growing number of students from varying language backgrounds. L1 Arabic L2 Turkish situation is the most frequent situation as a result of the number of students coming from Arabic language background countries. Revealing their attitudes towards learning a foreign language and investigating the source of transfer while they are learning languages could enable us to create more effective courses. What is more, the results of this research might have implications for designing the contents of L2 Turkish or L3 English prep classes. The current study was designed to answer the following research questions specifically;

1. What is the difference between the attitudes of L3 English learners with L1 (Arabic) dominant setting and L2 (Turkish) dominant setting towards learning foreign languages?
2. Which language (L1 Arabic or L2 Turkish) is the source of syntactic and lexical transfer for L3 learners of English at the elementary level?

Methodology

Research Design

A mixed research approach was used in the current study to investigate attitudes and origins of syntactic and lexical transition of L1 Arabic L2 Turkish L3 to English language learners at the Uludağ University School of Foreign Languages. In order to gain accurate information about the central phenomenon, a hybrid (quantitative and qualitative) approach was found to be beneficial, which was difficult to find by more traditional research methods (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This research incorporated a case study method to "see the case from the inside out" and to see the core phenomenon from the point of view of English L3 learners (Gillham, 2000, p.11). An attitude questionnaire (Appendix A) was implemented to get the quantitative data concerning the behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of the attitude of the learners towards foreign language learning. This research tool was adopted from Eshghinejad (2016). This attitude questionnaire was constituted by the researcher in the light of the Attitude Questionnaire Test employed by Boonrangsri et al. (2004 as cited in Eshghinejad, 2016), the Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) designed by Gardner (1985), and a Behavioral, Cognitive, Emotional Attitude (BCEA) questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 30 individual items. A five-point Likert scale from Level 1: Strongly Disagree to Level 5: Strongly

Agree was used. At the end of the questionnaire, the participants were asked an optional open-ended question about the effective factors on their attitudes towards learning a foreign language.

In addition to the attitude questionnaire, Think Aloud Protocols (TAPs) was administered in order to make the cognitive process observable. In the processes of language learning, whether L1 or L2, it is not possible to observe the cognitive and individual processes; with this in mind, the present study tried to make it as straightforward as possible what the students think while they are writing in L3, and more specifically which language is the source of syntactic and lexical transfer. To this end, the data were collected through the think-aloud protocols (TAPs or concurrent verbalizations) as the main verbalization methods (Ericsson & Simon, 1993).

Think-aloud protocols which are also known as concurrent reports is one of the effective tools of data collection for the researchers of SLA who try to discover the insights. TAPs enable the researchers to explain the phenomenon which cannot be addressed with the products alone by visualizing the cognitive process, thought process and strategies (Bowles, 2010). In the L2 writing literature, with the aim of revealing the cognitive process, TAPs are employed in many studies such as (Cohen, 1989; Faerch & Kasper, 1987; Green, 1998). The most significant advantage of the TAPs is that it provides the researchers with understandings into the learners' cognitive processes. Sachs and Polio (2007) used TAPs to examine the L2 writers' thinking process, Barkaoui (2010) implemented that to get a deeper insight of rater performance during grading, some other researchers such as Yanguas and Lado (2012) used the protocols to see whether thinking was being in the first or second language. The research questions and data collection and analysis details for each research questions are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Research questions, data collection and analysis

Research Question	Data Collection Tool	Data Analysis
RQ1. What is the difference between the attitudes of L3 English learners with L1 (Arabic) dominant setting and L2 (Turkish) dominant setting towards learning foreign languages?	Attitude questionnaire	Descriptive statistics of SPSS.
RQ2. Which language (L1 Arabic or L2 Turkish) is the source of syntactic and lexical transfer for L3 learners of English at the elementary level?	TAP	Analysis of TAP

Setting and Participants

The participants of the current study consist of twenty-three L3 learners of English. The demographic data of the participants was at hand before the implementation because they are accepted to our school after one year of Turkish preparatory class, and at the beginning of the term, they were asked to fill in a form about where and with whom they live, whether they had English instruction before or not, and the results of the Turkish level exams. English is the third language for them because most of these students are refugee students from Arabic countries, mostly from Syria whose L1 is Arabic. At the beginning of their university education, they had one year of preparatory class for learning Turkish. This Turkish preparatory program is required and is given by the Turkish Teaching Practice and Research Centre (ULUTÖMER). The primary purpose of this establishment in the university is to teach Turkish to the foreign students

prior to their undergraduate program for academic purposes. Turkish teaching course at Uludağ University for international students is structured in five levels, A1-A2 (Beginner Level), B1-B2 (Intermediate Level) and C1 (Advanced Level), taking into consideration language levels in the framework of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. A student who achieves B2 level in reading, speaking, listening and writing skills is entitled to complete the program successfully. A placement is given before starting the courses. All of the participants in this study completed this program last year, and currently, they are studying at English prep classes at the elementary level. Their current level was determined according to the results of the general proficiency exam applied by the language school of Uludağ University. The participants had no or very little English instruction during their prior education life.

In terms of their general characteristics, they are divided into two groups: (a) L2 dominant group and (b) L1 dominant group. In the L1 dominant group, there are 12 participants who are living with their parents, and in their daily life and at home, they are actively and more dominantly using their first language. On the other hand, in the L2 dominant group, the participant students are living at the dormitories of the university with their Turkish friends, and there are 11 students in this group. As they have to pursue their daily life with L2 (Turkish), this group is characterized as being L2 dominant group. Prior to grouping the demographic data which was gathered at the beginning of the term regarding the students' living conditions, the intensity of using L1 and L2 and their prior education especially on learning foreign languages, were thoroughly analyzed. The participants are 15 females and 8 males. Their age ranges between 18-22. After completing the Turkish preparatory class for two terms successfully, they started their English prep class, and they have 26 hours of English classes in a week. A skills-based approach is adopted at the language school, and they have 7 hours listening and speaking, 7 hours grammar, 6 hours reading, 5 hours writing and 2 hours of vocabulary lessons. In the beginning, there were 26 participants, but 3 of them stated that they had B1 level English course at their previous schools and English is not really the third language for them. So, these participants were excluded from the participant groups.

Data Collection and Analysis

For the first research question, an attitude questionnaire was applied to the participants, and the results of the questionnaire were analyzed according to the group variables (L1 dominant or L2 dominant learners) were analyzed via SPSS and the relation between the group dynamics and attitudes of the learners was compared.

The researcher performed a training session with the students individually to make the students acquainted with the TAP process and feel relaxed during the operation, as the students were not acquainted with the TAP. In order to perform an efficient think-aloud protocol (TAP), a collection of instructions should be provided to the participants, according to Bowles (2010). These guidelines are described as "(1) a summary of what is meant by" thinking aloud, "(2) participants are permitted to use the language(s) to verbalize their thoughts, and (3) the degree of detail and reflection needed in the think-aloud" (Bowles, 2010, p. 115). The participants were informed about the aims of the study, participation was voluntary based, and a consent from was taken from each participant. Apart from the participants, the necessary permission from the institution was also taken. For the second research question, think-aloud protocols were introduced to consider the cognitive process of the learners during writing. In order to reveal

the lexical and syntactic source of transfer (L1 or L2), the cognitive mechanism at work during writing has been studied. A lecturer at the same university, who is a native speaker of Arabic and whose English is fluent, aided the researcher in evaluating the think-aloud session. As this independent rater was a native speaker of Arabic, he translated the Arabic expressions of the students in the TAP recordings.

Individual TAP sessions of the students were transcribed and translated into English. The data gathered through the transcriptions of TAPs were analyzed in a qualitative manner by content analysis. The data coming from the TAP were grouped into four categories, depending on the source (L1 or L2) and lexical or syntactic. At this phase of the analysis, a native speaker of Arabic whose English is at an advanced level participated in the analysis process.

The writing task that the participants produced was one of the extra evaluation tasks for their regular writing evaluation process. Within a term, the students are required to take part in 2 mid-term exams and in addition to mid-terms, they write three writing evaluation tasks. The task used for the research purpose was the third task. The students were asked to write about their experiences in the language learning process, the difficulties they faced, the type of lessons that they enjoy the most and they were also asked to write about the most effective teacher in their education life. The third task was chosen for research purpose as it was considered that the students had become familiar with the procedures in writing tasks.

Results and Discussion

Attitudes of Learners towards Foreign Language Learning

The analysis of the quantitative data has revealed that L1 Arabic L2 Turkish L3 learners of English from different backgrounds largely have positive attitudes towards learning foreign languages, which is also in line with the research evidence in the related literature (e.g., Grannet & Williams, 2003; Özönder, 2015; Tsuda, 2002). When the quantitative data is analyzed according to the group dynamics in detail, the results show that L3 learners of English with L1 Arabic, L2 Turkish backgrounds showed statistically significant differences in terms of their attitudes towards foreign language learning. The participants who were in the L2 dominant group have more positive attitudes than the ones in the L1 dominant group.

Table 2. Attitudes of the participants towards learning foreign languages.

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	Sig.
L1 Dominant	12	3.25	.500	21	.001
L2 Dominant	11	4.13	.636		

As it is displayed in Table 2, the participants who are in the L2 dominant group have more positive attitudes than the L1 dominant group. The difference between the two groups was statistically significant at $p = 0.05$ level. The mean score of the participants in the L1 dominant group is 3,25, whereas the L2 dominant group has 4.13 mean score. This finding is in parallel with Eshghinejad (2016). The participants in those studies also showed significant differences in terms of their attitudes toward learning foreign languages. On the other hand, the analysis of the quantitative data in the current study reveals contradicting results with some studies in the related literature, such as Zuniarti (2016). In those studies, the group dynamics, such as

language backgrounds, were not a discriminative factor among the groups in terms of their attitudes.

In the current study, the students were asked to write any factor affecting their attitudes towards learning English and some of the participants in the L1 dominant group stated that their families affect their attitudes in a negative way. It might probably be explained by historical, cultural, and to a certain degree, political perspectives of the families as they are in another country as refugees and their community blames English speaking countries for the disorder in their countries. Surprisingly, one of the participants wrote in her L1 that it was not a pleasure for her to study English which is the language of soldiers in her country.

However, some other participants wrote some factors affecting their attitudes in a positive way. Five participants wrote social media as a positive factor because the more fluent they become in English, the more comfortable they feel in their communication in social media. Another positive factor was the presence of other nationality students in their groups. In the classes of the participants, there are some students from different countries such as Russia, Ukraine and Georgia. The participants stated that being able to communicate with them in English affects their attitudes positively.

The Findings of the Analysis of the TAPS

Through the think-aloud protocols, which were digitally captured separately for each participant while the students wrote their paragraphs, the qualitative data for the current study was collected. Following the introduction of the TAPs, only one question concerning the origins of the switch was posed to the participants in order to explain the issues resulting from the TAPs. The results obtained from the transcriptions of the TAP sessions were divided and will be presented in two main categories:

1. The analysis of students' TAPs on syntactic items
2. The analysis of students' TAPs on lexical items

The Analysis of Students' TAPs Relating to Syntactic Transfer

Prior to the analysis of TAPs, the writing performances of the students' writings were analyzed by the researcher, and it was seen that a major part of the grammatical mistakes made by the students were verb form, gender, article mistakes and pronoun mistakes regardless of their dominant foreign language status. The most frequently syntactic error made by the participants was the absence of the verb to be. The students produced sentences such as "they going to bank, he learning French.....". According to Abu-Rabia and Siegel (2002) regarding grammar, the learners of English with Arabic background often make such mistakes as there is not an equivalence for the verb to be in Arabic. This syntactic feature is a complex one, and it is not easy to group the verb to be errors resulting from L1 (Arabic) or L2 (Turkish) because both languages share the same feature in terms of the verb to be use. However, during the TAPs, almost all of the participants were observed thinking in Arabic while producing these sentences.

Although it was not one of the concerns of the current study, it was clearly observable that the participants have too many capitalization errors that is because they do not have capital letters in their L1. Although they were taught the issue during their L2 and L3 instruction, they seem to transfer this information from their L1.

In terms of syntactic features, regardless of the dominant language, whether L2 or L1, most of the participants had great difficulty in producing perfect tense sentences. Even for specific events in a certain time in the past, they used the present perfect aspect such as "I've seen them at school yesterday afternoon". Again, it is not clear here whether this issue is resulting from L1 or L3 because, in both Turkish and English, there is not a direct equivalence of the present perfect aspect.

Another syntactic signal of transfer was the use of pronouns by the students. In English, all of the pronouns are separate words; however, in Arabic, they are not always separate words and most of the time, they are dropped, which is not grammatical in English. The participants preferred to drop the pronouns in some cases, especially in long sentences referring to the same subject, such as "Ahmad is my cousin, working in İstanbul and living with family". In such cases, they preferred not to use pronouns as separate units. This type of errors signals the transfer from their L1 in which this kind of dropping is quite common.

During the production, the students were observed to use the article "the" more than necessary. When compared with English, there are not counterparts for a and an in Arabic. In Arabic, they have an article like the only, so the learners used the English equivalent the even when it is not necessary. During the production process, they were observed thinking aloud in Arabic and trying to find English correspondences of their Arabic thoughts.

The analysis of the TAPs in terms of syntactic transfer revealed a very limited number of distinctive results, and what is more, the results did not show differences between the groups whether they were in the L1 dominant group or L2 dominant group. Even though the students in L2 dominant group and L1 dominant groups have different language atmospheres in their daily lives, most of the time, they transferred from their L1 during the production phase of their writing evaluations. One of the possible reasons for this finding might be the features focused. For example, the case of verb to be use, perfect aspect and dropping the pronouns are the most frequently repeated syntactic errors, but these problems are not clearly distinguishable because both Arabic and Turkish share similar aspects in terms of these features. Some other aspects for possible cross-linguistic transfer might be investigated, such as morphological structure, pronunciation in order to be able to reach more precise results.

The Analysis of Students' TAPs Relating to Lexical Transfer

In terms of lexical transfer, the TAPs were analyzed in order to find some signals for the source of transfer. The analysis revealed that the lexical transfer of the learners was very limited, and it was like trying to remember the right word in English rather than transferring from L1 or L2. In Arabic, there are some nouns and verbs that are identical to their English counterparts, but only a few participants used such common words. When TAPs were analyzed, most of the participants were observed thinking aloud in their L1 (Arabic), which means that they try to control the production process in their L1 even though they do not transfer lexical items directly from a specific source, the mental process is conducted in their mother language.

A retrospective interview was performed following the application. Following the performances of the participants in TAPs, retrospective interviews are also performed to learn about their impressions about their own performances (Gass & Mackey, 2000). The interviewer asks questions in this type of interview a short time after the performance, which helps participants to recall their processes of reasoning. The source of linguistic assistance and transition during development in L3 was questioned by all the participants. 17 out of 23

respondents showed that when they were evaluating and producing in L3, they were speaking in their mother tongue rather than in Turkish, which is their second language.

Conclusions

The present study was set out to reveal the attitudes of participants from L1 dominant setting and L2 dominant setting towards learning foreign languages. The findings of the quantitative analyses showed statistically significant differences between the two groups' attitudes. The students who are living in the dormitories of the university with their friends and using L2 dominantly in their daily lives showed significantly more positive attitudes than the other group. In the related literature, there are numerous studies relating the attitudes of foreign language learners; however, with such grouping dynamics, no other study was found to the best knowledge of the researcher.

As for the source of transfer, the results showed that the participants displayed some syntactic transfers in their writing productions, but they could not be clearly defined as resulting from Turkish or Arabic because the transferred forms (for example, absence of verb to be) were similar in both L1 and L2 of the participants. However, when they are observed during the production process, regardless of the dominance of L1 or L2 in their everyday life, they thought aloud in Arabic. Only a few participants used Turkish during the think-aloud protocols. In addition to this observation, they were also asked about the source of linguistic assistance and transfer for third language production, and 17 of the participants stated that they were controlling all the process in their L1 as they feel more secure and confident while doing so.

Over recent years, transfer from the L2 of learners has attracted increasing attention (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001; Jessner, 2006), and research has indicated numerous possible causes for facilitative and negative L2 transfer, as well as showing mixed results on the individual aspects of language that may be susceptible to transfer from the L2 of a learner. However, there is a need for such studies for more comprehensive discussions.

The current study might be conducted in different settings with different languages. The compared languages in the present study share some common aspects, which makes it more complex to identify the exact source of transfer. If conducted with different language combinations, it may result in more tangible results. Furthermore, conducting longitudinal studies focusing on different potential sources might be more effective.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Abu-Rabia, S., & Siegel, L. S. (2002). Reading, syntactic, orthographic, and working memory skills of bilingual Arabic-English speaking Canadian children. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 31(6), 661-678. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021221206119>
- Bardel, C., & Falk, Y. (2007). The role of the second language in third language acquisition: The case of Germanic syntax. *Second Language Research*, 23(4), 459-484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658307080557>
- Barkaoui, K. (2010). Variability in ESL essay rating processes: The role of the rating scale and rater experience. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 7(1), 54-74.
- 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). Multilingual Matters.
- Bowles, M. A. (2010). *The think-aloud controversy in second language research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203856338>

- Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 71-87.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000218>
- Cohen, A. (1989). Reformulation: A technique for providing advanced feedback in writing. *Guidelines*, 11(2), 1-9.
- De Angelis, G., & Selinker, L. (2001). Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 42-58. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-004>
- Dewaele, J. M. (2001). Activation or inhibition? The interaction of L1, L2 and L3 on the language mode continuum. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 69-89. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-006>
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690050>
- Eshghinejad, S. (2016). EFL students' attitudes toward learning English language: The case study of Kashan University students. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1236434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1236434>
- Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5657.001.0001>
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). Introspection in second language research. *Multilingual Matters*
- Falk, Y., & Bardel, C. (2011). Object pronouns in German L3 syntax: Evidence for the L2 status factor. *Second Language Research*, 27(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386647>
- Flynn, S., Foley, C., & Vinnitskaya, I. (2004). The cumulative-enhancement model for language acquisition: Comparing adults' and children's patterns of development in first, second and third language acquisition of relative clauses. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1(1), 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668175>
- Gardner, R. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning. The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Routledge.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. Continuum.
- Green, A. J. F. (1998). *Using verbal protocols in language testing research: A handbook*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-003>
- Herwig, A. (2001). Plurilingual lexical organization: Evidence from lexical processing in L1-L2-L3-L4 translation. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 115-137). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-008>
- Håkansson, G., Pienemann, M., & Sayehli, S. (2002). Transfer and typological proximity in the context of second language processing. *Second Language Research*, 18(3), 250-273. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0267658302sr206oa>
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals*. Edinburgh University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9780748619139.001.0001>
- Jessner, U. (2008). *Teaching Third Languages: Findings, Trends and Challenges*. *Language Teaching*, 41, 15-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004739>
- Kellerman, E. (1986). An eye for an eye: Crosslinguistic constraints on the development of the L2 lexicon. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition* (pp. 35-48). Pergamon.
- Magiste, E. (1986). Selected issues in second and third language learning. *Language processing in bilinguals: Psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic perspectives*, 97-122.
- Özönder, Ö. (2015). Prospective ELT students' foreign language reading attitudes and motivation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 722-729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.603>
- Ringbom, H. (1986). Cross-linguistic influence and the foreign language learning process. In E. Kellerman, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 150-162). Pergamon Press.
- 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). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-005>
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Rothman, J. (2015). Linguistic and cognitive motivations for the Typological Primacy Model (TPM) of third language (L3) transfer: Timing of acquisition and proficiency considered. *Bilingualism: language and cognition*, 18(2), 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672891300059X>

- Rothman, J. (2011). L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: The typological primacy model. *Second Language Research*, 27(1), 107-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386439>
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' use of two types of written feedback on an L2 writing task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 67-100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070039>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Tsuda, B. E. (2002). Attitudes towards English Language Learning in Higher Education in Japan and the place of English in Japanese society. *Japan: Intercultural International Studies*
- Williams, S., & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied linguistics*, 19(3), 295-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295>
- Yanguas, I., & Lado, B. (2012). Is thinking aloud reactive when writing in the heritage language? *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(3), 380-399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01198.x>
- Zuniarti, N., Salam, U., & Arifin, Z. (2016). Students' Motivation in Learning English. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan pembelajaran*, 5(10). 1-10.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

APPENDIX A

Attitude questionnaire

The following items ask about your attitudes toward learning the English language. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers; answer as accurately as possible. Please read the statements below carefully and tick the appropriate choices that reflect your attitudes toward the English language. Use the scale below to answer the questionnaire items: **1 = Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.**

		1	2	3	4	5
		S	D	N	A	S
		D				A
1	Speaking English anywhere makes me feel worried					
2	Studying English helps me to have good relationships with friends					
3	When I hear a student in my class speaking English well, I like to practice speaking with him/her					
4	Studying English helps me to improve my personality					
5	I put off my English homework as much as possible					
6	I am not relaxed whenever I have to speak in my English class					
7	I feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other students					
8	I like to practice English the way native speakers do					
9	When I miss the class, I never ask my friends or teachers for the homework on what has been taught					
10	I do not feel enthusiastic to come to class when English is being thought					
11	Being good at English will help me study other subjects well					
12	I have more knowledge and more understanding when studying English					

13	Frankly, I study English just to pass the exams					
14	In my opinion, people who speak more than one language are very knowledgeable					
15	Studying English helps me communicate in English effectively					
16	I cannot apply the knowledge from English subject in my real life					
17	Studying English makes me able to create new thoughts					
18	I am not satisfied with my performance in English subject					
19	In my opinion, English language is difficult and complicated to learn					
20	English subject has the content that covers many fields of knowledge					
21	I prefer studying in my mother tongue rather than any other foreign language					
22	To be honest, I really have little interest in my English class					
23	I don't get anxious when I have to answer a question in my English class					
24	Studying foreign languages like English is enjoyable					
25	I feel proud when studying English language					
26	Studying English subject makes me feel more confident					
27	I am interested in studying English					
28	Knowing English is an important goal in my life					
29	I look forward to the time I spend in English class					
30	Studying English makes me have good emotions (feelings)					
