

Learning German after English - the Effect of Cognates in a Translation Task without Explicit Instruction

Sokač, Lucija

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2021

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:248732>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom](#).

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-06**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



University in Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English
Department of German
TEFL

Lucija Sokač

Learning German after English – the Effect of
Cognates in a Translation Task without Explicit
Instruction

Master's Thesis

Supervisors: Stela Letica Krevelj and
Aleksandra Ščukanec

Zagreb, June 2021

Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski Fakultet
Odsjek za anglistiku
Odsjek za germanistiku
Nastavnički smjer

Lucija Sokač

Učenje Njemačkog nakon Engleskog – Utjecaj
Kognata na Prevođenje bez Izravnog Poučavanja

Diplomski rad

Mentorice: Stela Letica Krevelj i
Aleksandra Ščukanec

Zagreb, lipanj 2021.

Examining committee:
Assoc. Prof. Renata Geld
Asst. Prof. Stela Letica Krevelj
Asst. Prof. Aleksandra Ščukanec

Abstract

In the current environment of widespread multilingualism and learning multiple languages in and outside of educational contexts, crosslinguistic influence occurs frequently. Although its effects can be used to enhance the efficiency of the learning and teaching process (Hufeisen & Neuner, 2003b), there is still some hesitation among teachers to integrate other languages into their classes.

This study attempts to discover whether Croatian learners of German as a third language can use their knowledge of English to translate unknown English-German cognates into Croatian. In order to collect the necessary data, a study was conducted consisting of a language background questionnaire and a translation task. The participants were 39 students (learners of English and German) in the eighth grade of an elementary school in Zagreb. The translation task results showed a low percentage of correctly translated cognates. Out of 30 cognates, only a fraction of them were more likely to be translated correctly by all participants. Most cognates had either a very low correct translation rate or were not translated correctly at all. However, the percentage of translation attempts based on similarities between words was very high, indicating that participants were trying to make use of English and other background languages when guessing the meaning of the unknown words. When comparing the results with the information gained through the language background questionnaire, no obvious patterns could be determined.

The results suggested the existence of the facilitative potential of crosslinguistic influence in the translation task. Furthermore, the results opened additional research questions regarding cognates and the effects of CLI, both positive and negative, as well as the influence of individual differences on CLI. This study offers tentative evidence that teachers should not shy away from using another language in their classroom to help their learners acquire German as a third language.

Key words: third language acquisition, tertiary didactics, cognates, crosslinguistic influence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Multilingualism.....	5
3. Third Language Acquisition (TLA).....	11
3.1. Definition and circumstances of TLA.....	12
3.2. Models of multilingual acquisition in TLA.....	13
3.3. CLI in TLA.....	14
3.4. Factors influencing CLI.....	15
3.4.1. Psychotypology and L2 status.....	16
3.4.2. Proficiency and recency of use.....	17
3.4.3. Cognates and cognate facilitation effect.....	18
3.4.4. Cognate awareness.....	19
4. Tertiary Didactics or Tertiärsprachendidaktik.....	21
4.1. Goals and principles.....	22
4.2. The role of L1 and L2.....	23
5. Study.....	24
5.1. Participants.....	25
5.2. Instruments.....	27
5.3. Results.....	29
5.3.1. Language learning background questionnaire.....	29
5.3.2. Translation task.....	32
5.4. Discussion.....	37
6. Conclusion.....	39
7. Summary in German.....	41
8. References.....	47
9. Appendices.....	52

1. Introduction

The study of crosslinguistic influence in foreign language learning has a rich tradition. It was initially connected to the framework of second language learning or SLA, and in the 1990s, researchers started to postulate the existence of qualitative differences between learners of a first and a second foreign language. With this change, the focus shifted to third language acquisition or TLA. Within this framework, the notion of German as a foreign language after English, or in its original form *Deutsch als Fremdsprache nach Englisch (DaFnE)*, provides the language constellation in which the present study was designed and conducted - L1 Croatian, L2 English, L3 German within the school context. Not much research has been done on the CLI effects in the Croatian context so we decided to test whether native speakers of Croatian would spontaneously use their knowledge of English when translating unknown English-German cognates. This diploma thesis has the following structure: in the section following the introduction, multilingualism and its key features are briefly discussed. The third section focuses on crosslinguistic influence in TLA and the factors affecting it: relatedness, psychotypology, L2 status, proficiency, etc. After that, cognates are introduced as the most prominent feature of the facilitative effect of CLI on language learning. Finally, the goals and principles of tertiary language teaching are described. The following section presents the aim of the study and the participant sample. It describes the instruments used and the results of the study. The results are followed by a discussion which offers possible explanations for such results and implications for third language education and further research in the field.

2. Multilingualism

Since its beginnings, multilingualism as a concept is an interesting and abundant area of research for many different disciplines within linguistics, as well as outside of it (psychology, neuroscience, didactics and many other). This has also led to interdisciplinary research of the topic. However, despite the effort of many different researchers, multilingualism remains without a clear definition, with the exception of the most rudimentary of them all: “multilingualism denotes the use of three or more languages by an individual” (Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl & Hofer, 2016, p.158). The reasons for the lack of a definition lie in a multitude of theoretical and practical perspectives, each one of them emphasizing a different aspect of using and learning multiple languages (Aronin & Singleton, 2012).

The origin of multilingualism is closely related to bilingualism. An older scholarly perspective proposed that multilingualism is only an extension of bilingualism, as seen in the

works of Weinreich (1953), in which he claims that all his observations pertain both to bi- and multilingualism. Haugen (1956) even refers to multilingualism as “multiple bilingualism” (as quoted in Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p.4). A very different perspective on multilingualism is considered accurate today. Bilingualism is now seen as a possible and common form of multilingualism. Herdina and Jessner (2000) defined multilingualism as “a varied phenomenon ranging from monolingual acquisition (the acquisition of a foreign language based on the command of one language) through balanced bilingualism, to the command of three or more languages, to name but a few stages of the multilingual continuum” (as quoted in Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p.6).

Bilingualism was undoubtedly an important part of the development of multilingualism as a field of study. Still, knowing multiple languages was not always regarded positively, inhibiting the research. Until the 1960s, bilingualism was seen as an obstacle to linguistic and cognitive development (Jessner et al, 2016). Only in 1962, with the publication of Peal and Lambert’s paper *The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence*, a different perspective on multilingualism was introduced. In their paper, Peal and Lambert criticized the previous research done on bilingualism and previous language knowledge by claiming it had methodological deficiencies (e.g., lack of control regarding the socioeconomic status and type of bilingualism in the participants). Furthermore, Peal and Lambert’s findings were the opposite of what was published before – bilinguals in their study were more intelligent and were thinking more flexibly than their monolingual peers. Then, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, came a time in which researchers focused more on studying people who knew more than two languages. Monolingual bias, i.e., measuring competence or performance in the second language with respect to monolingual norms, was no longer seen as the ultimate perspective when researching multiple language acquisition (De Angelis, 2007). The international conference on multilingualism in 1999 further established the importance of studying multilingualism as a separate field. Despite the consolidation of research, studying multilingualism is still challenging (Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009). When studying multilinguals, who are not a homogenous group of people (e.g., differences in their sociolinguistic situation, psycholinguistic development, ideologies etc.), researchers are led by different research questions and hypotheses, and they use various methodologies to gather and analyse the data. This only adds to the complexity of multilingualism (Kemp, 2003).

Bilingualism and multilingualism have some common features; however, the differences between the two phenomena are most relevant for this study. The first and most obvious

distinction is quantitative in nature. Multilingualism involves learning more than two languages which can happen in many different combinations, i.e., the order of acquisition can be complex. A learner can acquire an L1, L2 and L3 simultaneously, or he/she can acquire an L1, L2 and L3 consecutively. A learner can also acquire an L2 and L3 simultaneously after learning an L1, or they can acquire an L1 and L2 simultaneously before learning an L3.

Except for quantitative, there are also qualitative differences between bi- and multilingualism. Speakers of multiple languages have larger linguistic repertoires, more diverse and dynamic language learning experience, and they use different language learning strategies than learners of a first foreign language (Aronin & Singleton, 2012). This was proven in a study done by Kemp (2007) where learners with more languages used more language learning strategies and used them more frequently. There was also an observable big leap in the number of strategies used when learning an L3, while the increase in use was more gradual with every other language (as cited in Aronin & Jessner, 2015). Moreover, prior language knowledge is another important factor distinguishing multilingualism from bilingualism. Cummins (1976, 1979) proposed two hypotheses in the framework of bilingualism which determined whether previous language knowledge was beneficial for the learner. Other researchers have talked about them in the context of multilingualism. Firstly, the Threshold hypothesis (Cummins, 1976) proposes that there is a certain level of linguistic competence which must be reached for the learners to truly benefit from previous knowledge and consequently, learners with higher competence levels may have better cognitive functioning than those with little competence. Secondly, the Developmental interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 1979) proposes that any skills developed in languages that had been previously learned can be transferred to another non-native language since language competence in one language depends upon another. The higher linguistic competence and skills in previous languages, the higher the probability of influence on the target language. This hypothesis is relevant for this study because it suggests that the language learning experience and strategies from previously learned languages can be applied to languages that are being acquired, which is congruent with the CLI between different languages. The focus in this study is the influence of the knowledge and skills acquired when learning English on the acquisition of German. As it is always the case, some researchers do not agree with Cummins' hypotheses, claiming that learning multiple languages has benefits for the cognitive development even at early stages of acquisition, not only after a certain threshold (De Angelis, 2007). However, the Cummins' point still stands that prior language knowledge constitutes multilingual potential and learners can benefit from it by taking their

previous language learning experiences and skills and using them while learning another language (Horvatić Bilić, 2012a). This transfer of skills or language knowledge is another very important characteristic of multilingualism. Transfer as a process was firstly mentioned by Weinreich (1953) in his book *Languages in Contact* as interference. The term originates from behaviouralism and it clearly has a negative connotation, especially considering its definition as “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which can occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language” (Weinreich, 1953, as quoted in Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p. 22). The term transfer was coined later to account for both the positive and negative effect of previous language knowledge. Learners use their ability to transfer knowledge of vocabulary, grammar and other language rules, as well as their strategies and experiences, to understand a target language more easily (Hufeisen, 2005). The term transfer was later replaced with crosslinguistic influence (CLI) ridding it of the negative connotation and highlighting its interlingual aspect. CLI is applicable to both bi- and multilingualism because any number of languages a speaker knows can influence any other language in the speaker’s linguistic repertoire (Cenoz & Jessner, 2009). CLI plays an essential role in developing a learner’s interlanguage – a term developed by Selinker (1972). The interlanguage is situated between the learner’s source language (often the mother tongue) and the target language or the language which is being learned. It is systematic and dynamic, i.e., it has certain regularities, and it changes all the time spurred on by the interaction between previous language knowledge and the target language (as cited in Aronin & Singleton, 2012).

The source of CLI is researched from different perspectives. According to neurolinguistic research done in Italy and Switzerland using fMRI, the brain processes the L1 in a different area than foreign languages, as if there is a centre for foreign languages in the brain. In line with these findings, Hufeisen (2005) studied German students learning Swedish and found that, when trying to decipher the meaning of an unknown Swedish sentence, German students tended to rely on their knowledge of English as an L2 rather than their L1 German. This phenomenon can be explained with Grosjean’s (1998) foreign language mode hypothesis, which was initially developed for bilingualism, but it has found its place in multilingualism as well. It states that learners shy away from allowing influence from their L1 because they perceive it as being different or distant from their foreign languages (as cited in Lemhöfer, Dijkstra & Michel, 2004). However, the experience of learning the first foreign language (strategies, motivation, understanding of structure, etc.) can greatly influence the learner’s attitude toward learning languages, i.e., it can either encourage them to learn or prevent them from ever learning another

language (Hufeisen, 2005). Crosslinguistic influence will be elaborated on in the context of third language acquisition later in the paper.

Another important characteristic of multilingualism, which is also connected to the ability of using crosslinguistic influence to one's advantage, is metalinguistic awareness. Metalinguistic awareness is the increased awareness of language in multilingual speakers. It has different definitions, from Diaz and Klingler (1991) saying that "it refers to a set of abilities involving an objective awareness and control of linguistic variables, such as understanding the arbitrariness of word-referent relations and the capacity to detect and correct syntactic violations" (as quoted in De Angelis, 2007, p.120-121), over Jessner (2016) saying it is an ability to focus on language as an object and to think about it in an abstract way, to De Angelis (2007) using it in a broad sense for her book *Third or Additional Language Acquisition* and defining it as the speakers ability to divide form from meaning, to distinguish components, to notice ambiguity and to have an understanding of grammar of languages. Both bilingual and multilingual studies showed that learners with additional language knowledge had higher awareness of the language as a system and had more metalinguistic knowledge to rely upon in different learning situations. Learners use their metalinguistic awareness when learning new languages by developing different learning strategies from available information. They also search for similarities between languages to utilize them in the form of CLI and therefore facilitate their acquisition of a target language. Metalinguistic awareness is an integral part of another important feature of multilingualism – the M-factor or the Multilingualism-factor. The M-factor is a characteristic which can only be found in multilingual speakers (Cenoz & Jessner, 2009). It consists of language specific and general cognitive skills which were developed by the multilingual learner based on their previous language knowledge (Jessner et al, 2016).

In order to account for the complexity and multifactorial nature of multilingualism, and in an attempt to consolidate research on the topic, different multilingual models or frameworks have been proposed. Only a few that form the basis for this study will be mentioned. The factor model by Hufeisen (2005) emphasizes the difference between the language learning experience of an L2 and L3. This model will be discussed into detail later in the paper when dealing with TLA specifically. Another model is the complexity approach which highlights the development of properties or patterns of a system through a complex interaction between multiple factors or agents (e.g., multiple languages, attitudes to language programs and aims of language learning, teacher qualifications etc.). In the light of the complexity approach, multilingualism is examined realistically since every little change in factors can lead to a dramatic change in the

system (Aronin & Jessner, 2015). Lastly, an important approach in researching multilingualism is the Dynamic model of multilingualism by Herdina and Jessner (2002). This model puts the fluctuating or dynamic qualities of multilingual development in the spotlight (as cited in Jessner et al, 2016). Within this model, the dynamic systems theory or complexity theory (DCT), which emphasizes the interactive aspect of languages in the mind manifested in the form of metalinguistic awareness, was developed (De Angelis, 2007). Based on its principles, the development of a multilingual system is non-linear, stable, interdependent, and reversible. “Multilingual systems are adaptive and dynamic, which means they are able to change depending on the perceived communicative needs of multilingual individuals” (Aronin & Jessner, 2014, p.61).

There have also been multiple studies done on different aspects of multilingualism in the Croatian context and Horvatić Čajko (2012a) mentions them in her doctoral thesis. Croatian researchers mostly looked at multilingualism from two perspectives: the language policy with its influence on the position of foreign language teaching and individual aspects of a language or language learning process. Gehrmann and Knežević (2011) published a paper on language policies in the countries and bodies of the European Union since Croatia was scheduled to enter the EU soon. Rončević (2011) wrote about multilingualism in high education or how English was asserting its place as the academic language in non-anglophone countries including Croatia. Velički (2007) noticed that multilingualism was becoming a standard in Europe and highlighted the importance of language policy, which determines the order and way of acquiring foreign languages in instructional contexts, in preparing future Europeans for having detailed knowledge of their own mother tongue and multilingualism. Furthermore, Gehrmann (2005, 2007) talked about the differentiation of learning goals, how native-like competence was no longer expected, and that the ultimate goal of instruction was having competences in many languages. Moreover, he noticed that learning English as an L2 did not influence the motivation of learners to learn another foreign language positively because of its reputation as an easy language to learn in early acquisition. He believed that the possibility of learning English as an L3 should be considered. Finally, Budimir (2009) emphasised early foreign language learning as the basis for developing multilingualism and as an accomplishment of the Croatian educational system. Other researchers pointed out that Croatian should be the basis of the development of communicative competence. Moreover, more studies must be done in the Croatian context for better understanding of multilingualism, especially on primary school

linguistic development, changes must be made to the curriculum, and language teacher education must be improved (Horvatić Čajko, 2012a).

The study of multilingualism through different perspectives can be very facilitative of language teaching. By taking results into account and implementing them in class, language teaching and language learning processes can be enriched. Teachers should use the learners' previous language knowledge and build upon it. Pointing out similarities and relationships between languages, and therefore developing learners' metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness, can show learners that they already know some of the target language, which in turn raises the motivation for learning (Jessner et al, 2016). More on teaching will be elaborated later in the paper in the context of third language teaching.

3. Third Language Acquisition (TLA)

Research on multilingualism gave much insight into foreign language acquisition and into its essential parts: crosslinguistic influence, multilingual speech production, the multilingual lexicon, and the impact of multilingualism on cognitive development and language acquisition process. However, it is not enough to focus only on L2 acquisition, as was mostly the case, because the majority of the population can speak more than two languages. Consequently, researching only the second language acquisition is not sufficient when it comes to understanding the concept of non-native language acquisition (De Angelis, 2007). According to Flynn, Foley and Vinnitskava (2004), investigating third language acquisition sheds new light on the language learning process and reveals insights which cannot be provided by studying first or second language acquisition alone (as cited in Aronin & Jessner, 2015).

Before getting into the specifics of third language acquisition, it is important to consider how the focus shifted from the second language to the third language. Early foreign language classes were characterized by a meticulous division between languages. In the foreign language classroom, the mother tongue or any other known language could not have been used except for the language which was currently instructed. Languages were taught systematically through translation tasks and practicing grammar rigorously, without any actual connection to the real-world use of a particular language. Hufeisen (2003) also touches upon the topic by saying that mixing of languages was considered to be the source of interferences or errors. Such practice was informed by research on language acquisition that was relevant at the time. In the 1990s quantitative and qualitative differences were discovered between learners of L2 and L3 or additional languages. From this point on, third language acquisition was starting to develop as

a separate discipline. According to Horvatić Bilić (2012a), three key publications appeared from the year 2000: Cenoz and Jessner (2000) published *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*, then Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner (2001) published *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, and finally the same authors (2003) published *Multilingual Lexicon*. These works have paved the way for research on third language acquisition.

3.1. Definition of TLA

Let us move on to the definition of the third language and when and how it is acquired. In the introduction to their book *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept*, Hufeisen and Neuner (2003) defined the notion of the third language as referring to all the languages learned after the first foreign language. German is learned as a third language after L2 English most often (Hufeisen & Marx, 2010). According to Wypusz (2015), third language acquisition occurs mostly during the learners' teen years, which is a time when their cognitive skills are fairly developed, and they already gained some language learning strategies and experience from learning their L2. Moreover, the learners know their learning type and have acquired some emotional factors too (e.g., motivation, fear of learning or speaking). Also, in most cases, third language is not forced upon learners and therefore their choice of language can be telling of their wishes and expectations. She also emphasizes that learning an additional language is under the influence of the learner's experience in language learning, communication, and his/her whole lexicon in the mind. Similarly, Horvatić Čajko (2012a) claims that, with the acquisition of a third language, the *real* multilingualism begins, and it is a process which is tightly intertwined with the existing language knowledge of a learner, i.e., his/her mother tongue and any other language they may know, which form the learner's multilingual potential. How languages interact with each other in the learner's mind, reflects the way humans learn in general. Hufeisen (2003) says that the mind of a learner is not divided into separate knowledge drawers. Our brain is a network in which one element is connected to a multitude of others. According to Targonska (2004), when learning a language (or anything at all), learners incorporate their new knowledge into existing knowledge by drawing parallels between the two items. Without this process the new language would be lost. Consequently, previously learned languages should not be excluded from the process of acquisition of a new target language. The L1 is the basis for further language

learning, and all additional language learning experiences open new dimensions and develop the innate human ability to learn languages.

3.2. Models of multilingual acquisition in TLA

In the chapter on multilingualism, different models of multilingual acquisition were briefly described. At this point, two most prominent models in multilingualism research, as well as third language acquisition research, will be described in more detail since they form the framework for this research. One of the premises upon which the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism was developed is the previously mentioned way in which the human brain works. Herdina and Jessner's model (2002) also emphasizes the importance of previous language knowledge and metalinguistic knowledge. It suggests that the multilingual language system is constantly developing and changing through time. However, this change is non-linear and reversible, it is variable, because of the system's dependency on social, psycholinguistic, and individual factors, and it can also lead to language attrition. The system consists of smaller sub-systems (e.g., different languages spoken by individuals) and these are also divided into layers (syntax, lexis, morphology etc.). These characteristics are telling of the complexity of the multilingual system. Multilinguals make unconscious use of their M-factor in combination with their increased metalinguistic awareness to draw parallels between languages in their mind. The noticed similarities act facilitatively on navigating and enriching their linguistic knowledge. The similarities (and differences) between languages in the mind, and perhaps another target language, influence the process of acquisition and are essential to the notion of CLI or interlingual influence. CLI is recognized by Herdina and Jessner (2002) as a feature of multilingual systems.

Hufeisen's (2005) Factor Model is also relevant for this study because it highlights the differences between acquiring a second and a third language. Hufeisen (2005) claims there is a great qualitative leap between SLA and TLA and the circumstances of learning an L3 are different as well (the possibility of CLI arises). Many different factors are contributing to this shift: cognitive (language awareness and learning experience), emotional (motivation, experiences in culture, and attitudes), social (instructional and non-instructional context), and linguistic (positive or negative language influence) factors. However, the most important factor in TLA, which is the basis for the previously mentioned qualitative differences between learning an L2 and L3, is the Foreign Language Specific Factor. It is defined by the learner's

experience in learning foreign languages, the ability to compare languages and transfer features from one language to another or to make interlingual connections. The mentioned factors are susceptible to change and because of their interconnectedness, each factor is affected by the change in another.

3.3. CLI in TLA

The most quoted definition of CLI is “the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (or perhaps imperfectly) acquired” (Odlin, 1989, as cited in Letica Krevelj, 2014, p.17). However, Odlin was not the first one to notice the influence of previous linguistic knowledge on the acquisition process. Vildomec (1963) pointed out that multiple languages can influence a target language simultaneously (as cited in Letica Krevelj, 2014). This ‘many-to-one’ type of association was dubbed combined CLI by De Angelis (2007) when talking about at least two types of CLI that are possible, when more than two languages in the mind are concerned. The other type is the influence between the source and target language or ‘one-to-one’ type of association. There are also different directions of transfer mentioned by Medved Krajnović (2010): forward transfer (L1 influences L2 and Ln), backward transfer (Ln or L2 influences L1), lateral transfer (influence between L2, L3, and Ln), and bidirectional transfer (two languages influence one another) (as cited in Horvatić Čajko, 2012a). The evidence for crosslinguistic influence was found in all areas of language – phonetics, phonology, morphology, lexis, and syntax – but some areas are more likely to be transferred than others. The question of what is actually being transferred in CLI can be answered by taking into account Ringbom’s (2007) division of the use of crosslinguistic similarities into three manifestations: item transfer, system transfer or procedural transfer, and overall transfer. The differences between these three levels can be understood in relation to the divergence between item learning and system learning. Item learning refers to learning forms or individual sounds, letters, morphemes, etc., while system learning refers to syntagmatic and paradigmatic organizing principles of learned forms and to attaching meaning to those forms. Accordingly, item transfer describes the way in which learners form one-to-one correspondences between items or concepts from their background languages and a new item from the target language. This process occurs mostly in the early stages of learning when the target language proficiency is low. The effect of proficiency on CLI will be discussed later in this paper. Item transfer relies

upon learners perceiving formal similarities and assuming functional and semantic similarities, and this is precisely why the influence is predominantly positive, especially in related languages. In system transfer, on the other hand, principles of organizing information are transferred, i.e., the learner starts from the assumption that two or more languages in question are functionally similar. Since such overlaps rarely happen, system or procedural transfer often leads to errors or negative transfer. However, in languages that are related, positive procedural transfer occurs and enables the learners to understand the language more easily. Finally, overall transfer comprises item and system transfer, and refers to learners relying both on formal similarities across individual items and functional similarity of the systems. The amount of CLI depends on the number of perceived similarities on the two levels mentioned above. It is important to emphasize the difference between actual and perceived similarities between languages. Actual similarities can be linguistically analysed, even though there is still no consensus when it comes to defining and measuring the number of similarities, while perceived similarities are entirely subjective to the individual, and they reflect the learner perception which is vital in CLI. There is always a discrepancy between them since learners can fail to notice some similarities, or have misconceptions about similarities, or can assume there are similarities between languages where there are none. In conclusion, the subjects of transfer are the similarities that are perceived by the learner (Ringbom, 2007; Ringbom & Jarvis, 2009). The area of language which lends itself most easily to transfer is lexis, as Ringbom (2007) claims: “Cross-linguistic similarity is most obviously perceived on the basis of formally similar or identical individual items or words” (as cited in Horvatić Čajko, 2012a, p.208). On the item level, form is what is perceived by learners and readily transferred particularly in related languages, where functional and semantic equivalence can also be assumed. Not all formally similar words cause positive transfer – homonymy and polysemy are obstacles causing negative transfer to occur. At later stages of learning, when item level is replaced by the system level, one-to-one correspondences of words between languages are adjusted and corrected when needed, because the learner gained more understanding of what it is to know a word (Ringbom, 2007).

3.4. Factors influencing CLI

Researchers have been studying the facilitative effect of CLI in language acquisition because it has been confirmed “that learners, when trying to make sense of an unfamiliar text,

look for facilitating cross-linguistic similarities whenever possible...” (Ringbom, 2007, p.11). However, there are many factors influencing the frequency and amount of CLI, so the studies have mostly focused on just a couple factors at a time. They will be briefly mentioned here but the focus will be only on the most important factors.

3.4.1. Psychotypology and L2 status

The first important factor for CLI is typological distance or relatedness of languages, which is defined as “the distance that a linguist can objectively and formally define and identify between languages and language families” (De Angelis, 2007, p.22). However, the learner’s perspective is what matters in CLI and that is where the notion of psychotypology comes to the fore. Psychotypology was proposed by Kellerman (1977) and it refers to the perceived language distance or the degree of relatedness between languages from the learner’s perspective. Some studies showed that, when they are faced with an unknown language, learners most often relied on the language that they believed to be closer to the target language as the source of CLI. Other studies showed that even more distant languages could be the source of CLI, which is due to the variety of factors that influence CLI. One of the explanations for this is another relevant factor for CLI – L2 status proposed by Hammarberg (2001). It has been found that L2 transfer is more frequent than L1 transfer in some studies, e.g., multilinguals have been found to rely on their L2 Arabic rather than L1 English when using L3 Portuguese. De Angelis (2007) suggested that the reason for that is the association of foreignness which comprises learners’ tendency to give non-native languages the status of a foreign language. Learners think about their native language differently than about other non-native languages (Letica Krevelj, 2014). In other words, learners might think that just by relying on their L2 as a foreign language, they have a higher chance of instances of positive transfer than by relying on their native language.

Psychotypology and L2 status are the two main factors influencing the frequency and source of CLI (O Laoire & Singleton, 2009). Letica Krevelj (2014) wrote her dissertation focusing on these two factors while researching instances of CLI between L1 Italian and L2 Croatian (ItaL1 group), or L1 Croatian and L2 Italian (CroL1 group) learners of L3 English. Her study showed that both Italian and Croatian were used as a source of CLI when doing tasks in English but to different extents. The synonym provision task in the study comprised 40 sentences in English and in each sentence, there was an underlined word. The participants had to provide a synonym

for the underlined word, which was above their proficiency level. Because of this, the participants had to search their existing language knowledge for an appropriate word, resulting in CLI. Both groups relied on their respective L1 more when trying to come up with a synonym, regardless of their perception about which language is closer to another. Her results did not confirm Hammarberg's (2001) L2 status hypothesis.

3.4.2. Proficiency and recency of use

Proficiency in the target language (TL) and L2 is an important factor as well. According to Ringbom (2007), different types of CLI take place at different stages of proficiency. In the early stages of learning, CLI is mostly formal (formal similarities between languages are noticed) and its source is mostly the native language or a related language with higher proficiency. With increasing proficiency in the TL, the instances of CLI decrease and transfer of meaning mostly takes place. Furthermore, the source language is no longer L1 since learners rely less on CLI and more on intralingual similarities, i.e., they use their knowledge of the TL to infer forms and structures they need for comprehension and production of the TL itself. Other background languages can be the source of CLI as well, especially if learners are highly proficient in them because of the threshold proficiency level, which has been found by Tremblay (2006), for instance. In his study, the influence of participants' L1 English and L2 French on L3 German was tested. The results showed mostly L1 influence on L3, which was explained by psychotypology and the participants' insufficient proficiency in French for it to exert influence on the TL. Recency of use is another factor which may determine the source of CLI. It is often assumed that recently used languages will be the source more often, but some studies have found that even languages which had not been used for a while could act as sources of CLI. The last factor that will be mentioned here is metalinguistic awareness. It enables the learners to perceive similarities and differences between languages and exploit their previous language knowledge to facilitate their learning (De Angelis, 2007; De Angelis, Jessner & Kresnić, 2015; Letica Krevelj, 2014).

3.4.3. Cognates and the cognate facilitation effect

The most prominent feature of the facilitative effect of CLI on language learning are cognates. Cognates, or translation equivalents in form and sound in two or more languages, are found in related languages, but similarly to CLI, cognates can also be found between unrelated languages because of contact between languages for a certain period of time (Friel & Kennison, 2001). The importance of cognates has been recognized in foreign language learning for at least a century. Sweet (1964) noticed that words in science, art or other areas were of Latin or Greek origin, which is a commonality of most European languages, and they did not have to be learned at all (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011). Cognates were defined as “historically related, formally similar words, whose meaning may be identical, similar, partly different or, occasionally even wholly different” (Ringbom, 2007, p.73). Consequently, the semantic relationship between words that are similar in form can be divided into: true cognates (meaning identical or similar), deceptive cognates or false friends (wholly different meaning), and partial cognates (partly different meaning). However, not even true cognates have complete overlap in meaning because of the differences in the frequency of use, in the degree of markedness, etc. True cognates most often have a facilitative effect, while false friends result mostly in a negative effect (Letica Krevelj, 2014). In other words, true cognates are recognized faster, translated more correctly, easier to remember and retrieve, and more resistant to forgetting than non-cognate words, which was shown in psycholinguistic research in relation to lexical access by Otwinowska, Forsy-Nogala, Kabosko & Szewczyk (2020). Cognates are well suited for researching the question of lexical access, or whether all languages in the learner’s mind are activated simultaneously or if only a specific language is activated, since they have similar form representations in more than one language. Hence, cognates are processed more quickly which was shown in studies where response times had been measured. Based on the results that reaction times for cognates were shorter, the non-selective access hypothesis was confirmed. If only one language were activated at a time, there would be no difference in reaction times between cognates and non-cognates (Lemhöfer et al, 2004; Szubko-Sitarek, 2011). Most studies on lexical access were focused on the structure of the bilingual mental lexicon, but there are some studies dealing with trilinguals. For instance, Dijkstra and Van Hell (2002) showed in their study that trilinguals (L1 Dutch, L2 English, L3 German) had recognized English-Dutch cognates faster than non-cognates, but Dutch-English-German cognates (triple cognates) had been recognized even faster. The study showed that in triple cognates, an additional cognate facilitation effect could be found (as cited

in Lemhöfer et al, 2004). Other researchers concluded that the cognate facilitation effect could also be expected when further languages are involved (Letica Krevelj, 2014; Friel & Kennison, 2001).

3.4.4. Cognate awareness

There are also researchers who suggested that the benefits of cognate vocabulary could only be reaped if the learners were aware of it. In her study, Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2020) used Schmidt's (1990, 1993) definition of awareness. Schmidt differentiated between two levels of awareness – awareness at the level of noticing (noticing the form of a word) and awareness at the level of understanding (forming rules by generalizing observed regularities). When applied to cognates, it could be concluded that learners notice the formal similarities between words in different languages at the level of noticing, while, at the level of understanding, they are aware of the existence of similar words in different languages, and they use this knowledge when acquiring a new language. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2001, 2009, 2011 and 2020) studied whether awareness at any of the two levels was enough for the cognate facilitation effect to occur. In her studies, she set out to research the proposed hypothesis that the target language vocabulary of a beginner learner could be dramatically improved by cognates if learners were instructed in noticing cognate vocabulary. In her small-scale study (2001), eight participants, who were beginners in English, had been exposed to cognates through the medium of exercises. While they were quizzed after the instruction, the experimental group was using words that were beyond their proficiency level, e.g., tolerant, racism, arrogant. All these words had not been explicitly taught in the exercises and all used words had translation equivalents in L1 Polish. Her results were in accordance with those of other researchers such as Ringbom (2007), and they confirmed the cognate facilitation effect. She also proposed that, “when sensitized to the existence of cognates, even beginning learners of English tried to rely on cognates vocabulary in oral production tasks” (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2009, p.6). The study on awareness of cognates between Polish and English (2009) was done on advanced learners of English. The aim of the study was to see whether Poles were aware of the existence of the cognate vocabulary shared by the two languages and what the perceived typological distance between English and Polish was. The majority of the participants did not perceive the two languages as being related and claimed that most similarities were found in the area of vocabulary, just as it had been stated repeatedly by multiple researchers including Ringbom

(2007). Even at the advanced level of English, learners were not completely aware of the cognate vocabulary. Even though they knew some cognates, they did not think that Polish and English were similar enough for them to take advantage of the transfer strategy. The implication being as it was for the previous study, that raising awareness of cognates would allow the learners to benefit from cognates to a greater extent. The two studies were not elaborate enough for her to draw definitive conclusions from. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic's (2011) third study investigated whether there was a difference in the perception of language distance between Polish bilingual and multilingual learners of English and whether training in and activation of cognate vocabulary would change the bilinguals' and multilinguals' language learning strategies. The results regarding the first research question showed that the majority (95%) of both bilinguals and multilinguals had not perceived Polish and English as being related. However, there was a difference when it came to cognate awareness: it was higher in multilinguals. Despite the higher awareness, multilinguals were not confident they knew more than 500 cognate words, which was surprising due to their high mastery of the languages. The results also showed that multilinguals chose the transfer strategy as the second most important strategy in language learning. Based on the results, Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2011) decided to give bilinguals tasks for raising cognate awareness and see the effect on their ability to notice similarities. At the end of the study, bilinguals chose the transfer strategy more often than at the beginning, reducing the difference between bilinguals and multilinguals. This showed that learner's attitudes toward cognates could be changed through instruction (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011). Up to this point, Otwinowska-Kasztelanic's studies showed that raising awareness of cognate vocabulary was beneficial for learning a language. But in her 2020 study on learning orthographic cognates and the effects of awareness on learning, she found that awareness of cognates did not have a facilitating effect on cognate learning. Both the experimental and control group had had workshops on vocabulary learning strategies, but only the experimental group had been trained in recognizing cognates. Even before the intervention, participants recognized cognates better than non-cognates and false cognates. All word types benefitted from the instruction, but cognates benefitted to a lesser extent since they had already been known better. Additional vocabulary training did not have an additional facilitative effect on cognate advantage. Since "one session of raising awareness of cross-linguistic similarity did not affect the learning rates" (Otwinowska et al, 2020, p.23), a second study was done in which the participants attended four workshops on vocabulary learning strategies. The study only replicated the previous results: cognates were learned at the same rate as false cognates and

non-cognates, and they were not showing cognate advantage. Otwinowska-Kasztelanica (2020) proposed that instruction, which facilitated the learning of all word types, provided such a level of attention and support for each word that it did not leave much space for the effect of other variables such as lexical crosslinguistic similarity. It is also interesting that, because cognates were known better than other word types before the instruction, it seemed “that cognate advantage does not require awareness of cross-linguistic similarity” (Otwinowska et al, 2020, p.35). The premise of the present study relies on Otwinowska’s results. The participants did not have any instruction which might have raised awareness of the cognate vocabulary between English and German before doing tasks from the study. The students should recognize cognates spontaneously and should use their facilitative effect while translating unknown words.

4. Tertiary Didactics or Tertiärsprachendidaktik

Based on the effects of crosslinguistic similarities on third language learning, a new methodology was developed for instructional contexts – tertiary didactics or *Tertiärsprachendidaktik* in German, from where it originated. The concept, which emphasizes connecting multiple languages and raising awareness of the individuals’ multilinguality, was initiated by Gerhard Neuner between 2000 and 2003. Wiater (2006) defined the term tertiary didactics as the theory of combined and coordinated teaching and learning of multiple foreign languages within or without the instructional setting. Its goal is the facilitation of multilingualism by focusing on learning optimization and learning efficiency of foreign languages as well as focusing on experiencing the richness of languages and cultures (Horvatić Čajko, 2012a).

Another important concept for this paper is Learning German as a foreign language after English or *Deutsch als Fremdsprache nach English (DaFnE)* which falls within tertiary didactics, but it focuses on the language constellation L1 (any native language) – L2 English – L3 German. As 50% of the learners learn German as an L3, it makes sense to focus on this position of the German language and how its teaching can be facilitated by using similarities between English and German. The similarities between the two languages are based on three factors: relatedness of languages, tendency for internationalization by European languages, and transfer of words of English origin into German. Regarding the relatedness, German and English both belong to the Germanic language family. Therefore, similarities are easily perceived in words such as *Haus, Vater, Fisch, Name*, etc. Because of the number of shared words, there had been multiple dictionaries of different volumes made which comprised the

cognate words between English and German (Hammer, 1957). Secondly, because European languages tend to have internationalisms, or words of Latin, Greek or even English origin, it can be a help in learning German. Some examples of such words are *Internet, Taxi, Telefon, Politik...* Lastly, anglicisms or words of English origin transferred to German are found in different linguistic and extralinguistic areas such as commercials (*Spot, Discount*), technology (*Hifi, Flipchart*), IT (*PC, Laptop, surfen*) and others (Karavela & Alexandris, 2013). In their book on tertiary didactics, Hufeisen and Neuner (2003b) claim that there is no need for a completely new teaching concept. The existing one must only be differentiated regarding specific features of teaching and learning of an L3 and further languages (Horvatić Čajko, 2012a). Tertiary didactics puts the interlingual transfer to the fore. The learner's perception of the similarities forms their multilingual potential, which is to be fully exploited to facilitate L3 learning. Not only the perception of similarities is emphasized, but also differences, since not acknowledging them could lead to interference. However, tertiary didactics nurtures a positive view of errors as evidence of learners' processing of linguistic information and forming different hypotheses about how the target language functions (Hufeisen, 2005). Discussions about processes of language learning are also encouraged, i.e., the learners should be aware of the language learning process so they can utilize this knowledge when learning other languages. Moreover, in tertiary didactics the ultimate goal is not near-native proficiency of learners. Instead, the focus is on understanding of the language and perceiving interlingual connections, which, in turn, help learners in producing the language.

4.1. Goals and principles of tertiary didactics

There are two main goals of tertiary didactics: expanding the language knowledge and experience, and the development of language learning awareness. The language knowledge is to be expanded by making parallels between background languages and the target language based on relatedness of languages and language contact. When languages are closely related and have a lot of contact, as English and German have, learners can perceive similarities easily and facilitate their learning, especially in the area of vocabulary. Language learning awareness can be developed through discussions about the language as a system, language learning processes, and learning experiences. Learners can apply this information to enhance the acquisition of a target language (Neuner, 2003). Except for goals, Neuner (2003) defined five principles of tertiary didactics. The first principle is cognitive learning which is achieved by

comparing, discussing, and activating everything in the learner's mind related to language knowledge and language learning experiences. In other words, instruction must develop declarative (knowledge of language) and procedural knowledge (knowledge of language system and language learning processes). The second principle highlights understanding as the basis for learning. It refers to making learners aware of the learning process through discussions and providing appropriate learning materials. The third principle – content orientation – is anchored in the fact that learners are cognitively more mature and have language learning experience when learning an L3. This is why topics in class must be relevant to learner experiences and sufficiently complex to challenge them. Text orientation is the fourth principle and it focuses on using texts to inductively learn about language systems by comparing the same text in different languages known to the learner. The goal is to develop global strategies for understanding in different topics and simultaneously recognize similarities as potential vocabulary. The final principle is the economization of the learning process which is necessary to use the limited amount of time given to learning a second foreign language in instructional contexts to the fullest. The biggest challenge of tertiary didactics is developing economical, time-saving, and efficient ways of learning and teaching (Horvatić Čajko, 2012b; Wypusz, 2015).

4.2. The role of L1 and L2

In tertiary didactics, both the native and first foreign language play an important role. According to Neuner (2003), the L1 is a reference point for foreign language learning and should be actively integrated in teaching foreign languages. The mental language network is structured in the native language, in which the new language knowledge will be rooted. When acquiring the native language, learners should be sensitized to different language phenomena (e.g., dialects, registers, etc.) and the native language system should be analysed and discussed to raise language awareness. Teachers should also use learners' potential experience in other languages and make them aware that foreign words can occur in their L1 (e.g., borrowings, internationalisms). The first foreign language is the learners' first contact with new dimensions of language learning and the possibility of inductive learning through comparing two languages. The more typologically related two languages are, the more cognate words can be found. Learners are faced with new learning strategies and processes that are useful for learning further languages if they are aware of them, which is what the notion of *learning to learn* revolves

around. In tertiary didactics, it is considered that teachers of all languages are important. In relation to DaFnE, L3 German teachers see the incorporation of English in German classes as something positive, according to a survey by Horvatić Čajko (2012a). Teachers of L3 German already implement English in their classes even without developed educational and instructional theoretical background (Wypusz, 2015). Still, Meißner (2005) found there are some constraints which are preventing teachers from applying multilingual principles. Three out of four constraints have to do with the lack of appropriate teacher education on multilingual didactics. Their psychological constraints prevent them from developing learners' linguistic competencies since they consider themselves experts only in their language and are not comfortable with the idea of using another language in their classes. Teachers also assume their multilinguality is constrained because they do not have sufficient knowledge in multiple languages. However, high proficiency in production in a particular language is not necessary. They must only acknowledge learners' background languages and use them to build the proficiency in the target language. Furthermore, since teachers are educated on didactics and methodics of only one language, they are reluctant to develop their own instructions to encourage learners in forming interlingual connections. Lastly, there are very few schoolbooks which embrace the multilingual approach. Taking all these characteristics into account, it is not surprising that not many schools operate in accordance with the goals and principles of tertiary didactics. However, there are efforts being made. According to Jessner (2008), at The University of Innsbruck students had been taking classes of integrated foreign language didactics for a couple of years now (Horvatić Čajko, 2012a).

5. Study

Based on the features of third language acquisition elaborated in the theoretical part of the paper, the present research was designed. It aims to determine whether students in the eighth grade of an elementary school are able to use cognates found between their L2 English and L3 German to their advantage without explicit instruction when faced with a translation task, where out-of-context German words should be translated into their L1 Croatian¹. The hypothesis was that students would notice similarities between English and German and use them to translate unknown German words into Croatian, especially because the German teacher in this

¹ Unexpectedly, two participants were native Albanian speakers, but have been learning Croatian ever since starting school or even earlier. For the sake of simplicity, Croatian is marked as L1.

elementary school had been known to use the students' knowledge of L2 English and L1 Croatian when introducing new German vocabulary or grammatical structures. However, her efforts are unsystematic, i.e., she draws comparisons between the languages without using materials specifically designed to facilitate multilingual potential. She mostly relies on her appraisal of the necessity of such parallels.

The two languages in focus, English and German, belong to the same language family, which is only one of the reasons why there is a multitude of cognates between them. Croatian is not part of the same language family, belonging to the Slavic language family instead. Hence, a situation is created in which participants should rely more on their knowledge of English when translating German words. However, it was mentioned previously that CLI can occur from any background language at the learner's disposal regardless of the typological distance. Therefore, English was not expected to be the sole source of CLI in this task, but the assumption of English being one of the main sources of CLI remained. The design of the translation task encouraged students to look for translation equivalents in their background languages, since there was no context offered to aid them in inferring the meaning of the words.

The study aimed to provide the answer to the following question: Are students using their English-German cognate vocabulary to their advantage when translating unknown German words into Croatian without context or previous explicit instruction?

Since this study was conducted in 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic, the author was not allowed to be present when the students participated in the study. Instead, their German teacher kindly took it upon herself to help collect parents' and principal's approvals and conduct the study in her four classes of eighth graders.

5.1. Participants

The participants in this study were students attending the eighth grade in an elementary school. Four different classes with the same German teacher participated in the study. All together forty students participated, but one of the students had not turned their parent approval in and therefore was not taken into account when analysing results. Consequently, 39 tests were analysed. Out of 39 participants, 23 were male and 16 were female as it is depicted in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Participants according to gender

The participants' mean age was 13.79. The students are considered to be consecutive multilinguals. They all acquired their mother tongue from birth (37 participants: L1 Croatian two participants: L1 Albanian) and they started learning German in the fourth grade of elementary school after learning English since the first grade. This order of acquisition is one that is mostly found in Croatia. English is most often the first foreign language and is taught from the first grade. It is followed by other foreign languages (most often German). Furthermore, the learners' proficiency level was not tested separately since its effect on CLI was not central in this study. Instead, proficiency of the participants was determined according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR). The formal level of proficiency which should be achieved by students in the eighth grade for English is A2/B1, while the proficiency for German is A1+.

The participants mostly learned just two languages in school – English and German – but some of them had been learning Latin and Greek in school as well. Quite a few of them took private English lessons outside of school, while only few had private German lessons. Additional languages appear as well (see Table 1). Taking all of this into account, some students have learned up to five languages already, which could have a great facilitative effect on their multilingual awareness, which in turn, should help them solve the translation task more easily.

Table 1. Languages learned by participants

Language	Number of students
English	15
German	5
French	2
Italian	2
Albanian	1
Chinese	2
Latin	8
Greek	8

5.2. Instruments

In the study, two instruments of collecting data were used: language learning background questionnaire and translation task.

The language learning background questionnaire was based on Horvatić Čajko (2012a). It was, however, modified to fit the participant sample and aim of the study. It consisted of questions regarding participants' age, gender, language learning experience before school, in and outside school, as well as the frequency of German and English language use outside of the instructional context. Furthermore, there were questions on the participants' motivation to learn foreign languages and their aptitude for language learning. Also included in the questionnaire was the question designed to broadly determine the participants' awareness of the number of cognates existing between English and German, as well as another question on the number of cognates they knew. The last two questions had been adapted from Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2011). The questions on cognate awareness were included to potentially provide an explanation of the results. If a participant chose the higher cognate awareness range and had better results, i.e., more correct translations, cognate awareness could be taken as the individual difference which facilitates language learning. This could lead to the tentative conclusion that the development of cognate awareness would facilitate language acquisition.

The translation task consisted of 15 control words and 30 cognates to be translated from German into Croatian. In order to find out which cognate and control words to use in the test,

a list of words was sent to the teacher, and she was asked to assess whether the students knew the words or not. Cognate words had to be unfamiliar to the participants, because only in that case the participants would be forced to find another way to infer the meaning and translate the word. On the other hand, the participants had to be familiar with the control words. The chosen control words were high-frequency words which participants had already acquired. Their purpose in the task was to increase the number of items to hide target words and to serve as a motivating factor for the participants. Knowing how to translate some words should have kept them from getting frustrated and not attempt to solve the task at hand. Control words were not taken into consideration in the results. The unknown cognates were words which are usually introduced in instructional context at a higher proficiency level, and they were chosen from the lists of cognates, with different degrees of similarity between languages, in Hammer Jr. (1957) and Banta (1981). Internationalisms were not included as they could be recognized too easily. In the case of cognates, it was expected that participants had perceived formal similarities between languages and then tried to use them to guess the appropriate translation of a word. To account for this, confidence ratings ranging from 1 to 4 were added to the translation task as it is the case in Otwinowska and Szewczyk (2017). In this study, if the confidence rating of a translation were high, one could infer that the participants knew the word beforehand, despite the teacher confirming the words were not introduced in class. The confidence rating feature was used in the opposite way than in Otwinowska et al (2020) study. When studying cognate awareness, she used confidence ratings to distinguish between guessing and knowing. However, she controlled for guessing because it was unwanted in her study. When confidence levels were low, in most cases the translations were wrong (Otwinowska et al, 2020). In the present study, the confidence ratings of most translations were under 2, which highlighted that the students were, in fact, guessing the meaning of cognate words based on formal similarities. As opposed to Otwinowska-Kasztelanic's (2020) study, the translations in this study did not need to be completely accurate to be considered correct. Even translations that were in the same semantic domain (e.g., *Nacken* (neck) = *ogrlica* (necklace)) were considered correct. Consequently, the participants' use of crosslinguistic similarities to guess the correct meaning of a cognate was highlighted, which had been the purpose of the study. In cases when students had not attempted to translate a cognate or when translations had been outside of the intended semantic domain, the answers (or lack thereof) were deemed incorrect.

5.3. Results

5.3.1. Language learning background questionnaire

In the language learning background questionnaire, many different languages were mentioned by the participants in the study. Out of 39 participants, 29 of them indicated they had learned another language in their childhood, in school (excluding English and German), or outside of school, while 10 participants did not mention any additional languages (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Number of students learning another language outside of the obligatory curriculum

The following figures show the languages mentioned in each of the aforementioned categories (Figure 3, Figure 4, Figure 5), along with the average years of learning (excluding the languages learned in early childhood). The figures serve as a visual representation of the overall results because the following paragraph focuses only on particular students and languages.




Figure 3. Languages learned in the participants' childhood




Figure 4. Languages learned in the school context (excluding English and German)




Figure 5. Languages learned outside of the school context

After establishing that many participants had learned more than three languages, the focus will be shifted on the students that took additional German and English lessons only. There were 17 participants who had indicated learning German and English outside of school on the questionnaire. Interestingly, these participants mostly had three or four correct answers, which is still higher than the average of correct answers per student which lies at 2.6. The defeating percentage of 8.8% of correct answers with an average of only 2.6 correct answers per participant may suggest that students are either not able to use similarities when trying to decipher unknown words on their own or they do not even recognize them. Additional research should be done on whether targeted exercises and instruction on CLI would be beneficial for the students in the Croatian context, just as Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2001, 2009, 2011, 2020) had done in Poland. Despite having additional input in both languages, only three students had more than 20 translation attempts (21, 27, and 30 attempts). Out of those three students, only one had eight correct translations of cognates, which was the highest number of correct answers among all participants.

When taking the whole participant sample into consideration with respect to cognitive awareness, the following results can be seen (Figure 6):




Figure 6. Participants' awareness of cognate vocabulary

Out of 39 participants, 19 believed there are more than 500 English-German cognates and relative to that these participants had more translation attempts - 10.47 on average. On the other hand, 20 students who believed there are less than 500 cognates between English and German attempted to translate them on average 9.25 times. Most participants that had learned more than three languages showed higher cognitive awareness by choosing the two highest ranges. However, some students learning only English and German in school contexts also chose the highest ranges. It could be presumed that the number of languages learned could not be taken as basis for higher awareness, at least regarding the results in this particular study. However, not enough data is present to make any definite conclusions. To sum up, a slight majority of participants showed lower cognitive awareness and consequently made fewer attempts to translate them, as opposed to the slight minority with higher cognitive awareness.

5.3.2. Translation task

Only 8.8% of all given cognates were translated correctly by the participants. However, despite not translating the majority of the cognates correctly, the students relied on their previous language knowledge and attempted to translate cognate words, as depicted in Figure 7.




Figure 7. Cognate translation attempts range

Still, not all participants attempted to translate unknown German words. Three students (7.69% of all participants) did not make an attempt at translating any cognates at all. Up to ten attempts at translating were found in 53.84% of the cases or in twenty-one participants. Ten participants (25.64%) attempted to translate cognates between ten and twenty times, while only five participants (12.82%) had more than twenty attempts. Therefore, the vast majority or 92.31% of students tried to use their previous language knowledge to translate the cognates in the task. The participants did not rely only on their knowledge of English and German, languages which are typologically related to one another, when trying to translate a word, but they also relied on their L1 Croatian (and in the case of two participants, L1 Albanian), which was not taken into account when developing the study. Still, it should not come as a surprise since learners tend to rely on background languages in which they are highly proficient, and their proficiency is high when it comes to their mother tongue. The influence of Croatian is easily perceptible in the following examples: the word *Kupfer* (copper) was translated to *kofer* (suitcase) 13 times. *Wespe* (wasp) was translated to *Vespa* (brand of scooters) or *vesta* (sweater), and *Minze* (mint) was translated to *mina* (landmine) or *šos / minica* (short skirt). The word *Kalb* (calf) was translated to *kabel* (cable) or *kalup* (mould). The participants connected the formal similarities to their previously learned foreign language as well, as was expected in the study. As exemplified in words such as *Flut* (flood) translated to *flauta* (flute), which can be due the influence of both English and Croatian, and *gripa* (flu). *Kessel* (kettle) was translated to *dvorac* (castle), while the cognate *Heim* (home) was translated to *šunka* (ham). Except for interlingual influence, there were some instances of L3 German influence too. The word *Macht* (might /

power) was translated to *rad* / *raditi* / *radnik* (work / to work / worker) based on the German verb *machen* (to work / to do). Moreover, the word *Wachs* (wax) was translated to *prati* (to wash) and *perilica* (washing machine) because of the formal similarity to the verb *waschen* (to wash). If the participants had heard the pronunciation of these words, I believe the connection to the English equivalents would have been established more easily. The word *Kessel* (kettle) was translated to *sir* (cheese), since the German equivalent would be *Käse*, and *magarac* (donkey) which is *Esel* in German. The source language of CLI depended on the phonetic representation which was given to a certain word by each participant. Finally, the translations of the word *Braut* are a very good representation of influence from different source languages on the same word. The translation *kruh* (bread) was influenced by German *Brot*, *brada* (beard) was influenced by Croatian, and *donesti* (to bring) was influenced by the English past participle *brought*. The results of the study showed less reliance on CLI and cognate vocabulary between English and German than expected when deciphering unknown words, especially since the teacher herself sometimes made conscious use of these similarities during classes. Furthermore, the participants seemed to rely more on their L1, which was not expected when developing the study.

Out of 30 cognates in the task and 1170 possible answers, only 8.8% of them were correct, bearing in mind that translations within the semantic domain were also correct. Some examples of such translations within the semantic domain were the cognate words *Nacken*, *Braut*, *Zwielicht*, *Nuss*, *Flut*, *Wunde*. Four participants translated the word *Nacken* (neck) as *ogrlica* (Necklace). The word *Braut* (bride) had no correct translations except for one, where *punica* (mother-in-law) was given as an answer. This translation was considered correct because it fell into the category of familial relations. Moreover, the word *Zwielicht* (twilight) was translated within the domain of parts of a day as *zora* (dawn). For the word *Nuss* (nut) different types of nuts were given as translations: *lješnjak* (hazelnut), *orah* (walnut), and *badem* (almond). Translations for *Flut* (flood) had to do with water: *plutati* (float) and *splav* (raft). Lastly, the word *Wunde* (wound) was translated as *zavoj* (bandage) which also fell into the appropriate semantic domain. Without taking the semantic domain into account, the percentage of correctly translated cognates would have been even lower.

There was a noticeable difference among cognate words considering the number of correct translations per cognate word, as can be seen in Figure 8.




Figure 8. Percentage of correct translations per cognate word

Out of 30 cognate words, eleven were not translated correctly at all. These words were *Pfad* (path), *Kupfer* (copper), *reif* (ripe), *Heim* (home), *Kessel* (kettle), *Kohle* (coal), *Ochse* (ox), *Wachs* (wax), *Pfund* (pound), *Macht* (might / power), and *Aal* (eel). The cognates that were the most transparent, easiest to decipher, and contributed to the 8.8% of correctly translated cognate words the most were *Schild* (shield) with 51.2% of correct translations, *Sturm* (storm) with 28.2%, *Wurm* (worm) with 35.89%, and *Asche* (ash) and *Nuss* (nut) with 20.51% of correct translations. The average confidence rating of correctly translated cognates did not exceed two out of four, leading to the presumption that the participants had not known the words previously, but used the similarities between English and German to their advantage.

Despite not taking control words into account in this study, it is interesting to point out that just 61.53% of their translations were correct. This percentage is surprising because, as mentioned before, the teacher went through the control words and assessed that the students should know these words. The key word here being *should* since her judgement was based on topics covered in class and her impression of the students' knowledge. Yet it turned out that many students have difficulties with basic German vocabulary after four years of learning.




Figure 9. Percentage of correct translations of control words

Figure 9 shows some interesting examples of their lack of knowledge in percentages. *Flugzeug* (aeroplane) was translated to *vlak* (train) instead of *zrakoplov* (aeroplane). Then *Kartoffel* (potato) translated to *mrkva* (carrot) or *povrće* (vegetables). The word *Flugzeug* had only five correct translations and was a word translated incorrectly most often along with *traurig* (sad) which only two participants got correctly. On the other hand, words such as *Hund* (dog), *Buch* (book), *Fernseher* (TV), *Haus* (house), *Fahrrad* (bicycle), *schön* (pretty / nice), *Katze* (cat), and *Meer* (sea) were translated correctly in 84 to 100% of the cases. Confidence ratings (1 to 4) of the control words mentioned above were mostly 3 or 4, reflecting the vocabulary knowledge of the participants. In the case of the relatively low percentage of correct translations of control words, the question arose whether the students really had not known the words, despite the teacher's claims, or perhaps they had not been motivated enough to bother translating the words correctly or at all. However, based on the teacher's accounts, the participants found the task very interesting, which should have raised their motivation. This might lead to the conclusion, they simply did not know the words, even though they had encountered the words during their education in the German language.

Out of the 39 tests in total, the ones with most correct translations and most translation attempts were isolated for a closer look in two categories: most correct translations and most translation attempts. Potential reasons for better results or better effort might be found in the information provided by the language background questionnaire. There were four examples for each category. Firstly, tests with the most correct answers had 8, 7, 6, and 6 correct translations each. There were two female and two male participants in this category. Three out of four

participants with most correct translations thought they were motivated for language learning, while all four thought they had the aptitude for it. Similarly, three out of four participants showed lower cognate awareness (150-500 cognates) despite all of them having learned between three and five languages. All in all, most of the information gathered from the questionnaire could not be directly connected with a higher number of correct translations and the features from the questionnaire were mainly evenly distributed among the four highest-scoring participants. Only in the case of the participants with five (Croatian, English, German, Latin, Greek) languages could a correlation between higher cognate awareness (500-1000 cognates) and more correct translations be assumed. However, this participant still did not have the highest number of correct translations.

Regarding the translation attempts, three participants had 30 attempts and one participant had 27 attempts. All of them were male and believed to know less than 50 English-German cognate words. The cognate awareness was equally divided with two participants choosing the range from 150 to 500 cognates and the other two choosing 500 to 1000 cognates. All of them thought they had aptitude for language learning, but just three out of four were motivated for it. Two participants took additional language classes outside of school, while the other two did not. The high translation attempt rate mostly overlapped with higher number of attempts based on formal similarity. However, there was no clear indication of a particular characteristic being crucial when it came to the number of translation attempts yet again. What could be offered as a possible explanation is that having some proficiency in more than three languages or having more input in a foreign language due to taking private lessons could increase the number of translation attempts. Nevertheless, more testing should be done when trying to determine which factor affects the correctness of translations or the number of translation attempts of cognates. As this was not the focus in this study and since the number of participants is not sufficient, no general conclusions could be drawn.

5.4. Discussion

Having analysed the results of this study, the hypothesis, looking into whether participants used their knowledge of English when translating German cognate words into Croatian, has been confirmed. However, additional elements that have not been accounted for before the study have come to the fore. The results are in accordance with the theoretical background of the study. As Horvatić Čajko (2012a) and Targonska (2004) pointed out, the real

multilingualism begins when the second foreign language is being acquired. The participants' translations and translation attempts were indicative of the influence between their background languages and the target language. This influence between languages is in accordance with Herdina and Jessner's (2002) Dynamic model of multilingualism, as well as being a manifestation of Hufeisen's (2002) Foreign language specific factor. The students successfully used the connection between languages in their mind and took notice of the parallels and similarities between their English, Croatian, and German language learning experience. Cognates, as "historically related, formally similar words" (Ringbom, 2007, p.73), were the needed incentive for the participants to transfer their knowledge of one language to another. The types of transfer that occurred most often were forward transfer (influence of L1 Croatian on L3 German) and lateral transfer (influence of L2 English on L3 German). German as the target language was also influenced by the participants' knowledge of German itself; however, such intralingual influence is not part of CLI and was therefore not given more attention. The 8.8% of correct translations are evidence of positive transfer, i.e., the similarities that the students had perceived between English and German helped them decipher the meaning of an unknown cognate word. However, the majority of the incorrect answers were also driven by formal similarities between languages and are evidence of negative transfer, as highlighted by Ringbom (2007). Most of the participants (92.31%) attempted to translate words based on formal similarities. The orthographic similarities between two words in English and German, or Croatian and German, caused the participants to wrongly assume that the meanings of the two words were similar as well. The influence of both Croatian and English on the participants' translations of cognate words did not confirm Hammarberg's (2001) L2 status hypothesis, which proposed that the first foreign language should have influenced the acquisition of the second foreign language because the learners had identified the two languages as foreign and believed that this association would result in mostly positive transfer. The findings in this study were similar to those in Letica Krevelj (2014), in which she found that participants, regardless of whether they were Italian or Croatian native speakers, relied significantly more on their L1 in the synonym provision task.

According to Wypusz (2015), when acquiring a third language, learners had already developed their cognitive skills and had made emotional connections with learning languages, regardless of whether they were positive or not. These characteristics represent the individual differences of learners. In the language background questionnaire of this study, most of the students (79.49%) showed a positive attitude toward learning languages by claiming to be

motivated for learning. Most of them (74.36%) also indicated that they had an aptitude for learning languages, which might not have been confirmed by the results themselves. The majority of the participants (74.3%) also indicated that they had been taking additional language classes in and out of the school context, which could be connected with the fact that they were motivated to learn languages. Interestingly however, those participants who had not learned any additional languages (25.6%) did not have significantly worse results, compared to those participants who had learned up to five languages. Quite the contrary, the results were comparable. Such findings could suggest that the language learning background did not play a significant role in relation to correct translations of cognates in this participant sample. Cognate awareness was another individual difference included in the questionnaire, which was researched by Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2001, 2009, 2011, 2020). It was questioned in a broad sense – the participants were required to assess their awareness by choosing an approximate range of cognates between English and German. Most of the participants (84.6%) chose the middle range between 150 and 1000 cognates. The students who chose the lower or higher range did not perform significantly worse or better respectively than the students in the middle range, which could possibly suggest that the differences in cognate awareness did not influence the results of this participant sample. Since the sample is not big, the suggestions based on the results in this study cannot be generalized to the whole Croatian context without additional research.

6. Conclusion

In the previous sections, the theoretical background of the study was summarized, grounded in multilingualism and third language acquisition with specific reference to learning German as a foreign language after English, which fits to the language constellation of the participant sample. Moreover, the methodology and results of the present study were also described in detail.

In order to answer the research question, whether students attending the eighth grade of an elementary school could use their previous knowledge of English as the source of CLI when translating unknown German-English cognate words, the participants had been given a questionnaire about their language learning background, motivation, and cognitive awareness, as well as a cognate translation task with confidence ratings. The results showed that not only English, but also Croatian were used as sources of CLI, and there was also evidence of the influence of the participants' knowledge of German on L3 German. English as a source of CLI

was used mostly when translations were correct exemplifying positive transfer. When the participants guessed the translations based on formal similarities and the guesses were incorrect, German and Croatian influenced the participants more often than English exemplifying negative transfer. These results offered a perspective to the study which was not initially expected or attempted to be proven. Moreover, regarding the individual differences (aptitude, motivation, number of languages learned and cognate awareness) from the questionnaire, within the context of the participant sample in this study, no possible firm connections between an individual's characteristic and better results could be suggested. Most participants learned additional languages (74.3%), showed motivation (79.49%) and had aptitude (74.36%) for language learning and the number of correct translations and translation attempts based on formal similarities did not differ significantly. All in all, the study showed that the vast majority (92.31%) of the participants tended to use their previous language knowledge to translate unknown German-English cognates, but the percentage of correct translations was very low at 8.8% despite the fact that imprecise translations, which belonged to the same semantic domain, were taken as correct.

The results of the study open possibilities for further research on CLI in the Croatian context. One can focus more on individual differences (motivation, aptitude, number of languages learned) of the students and how they influence the amount and type of CLI, similar to Horvatić Čajko (2012a). Awareness of cognates can be researched more closely, following the example of Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2001, 2009, 2011, 2020) in the Polish context, to see whether there is a correlation between higher awareness and heavier use of background languages as sources of CLI or more correct translations. The present study could be replicated in different school types or with participants of different proficiency levels in German in order to compare the results and determine what the source of possible differences could be. Since not too many psychotypical studies were done in the Croatian context, there are many opportunities for research of CLI.

7. Summary in German

Das Thema dieser Diplomarbeit ist der Einfluss der Kognaten auf die Übersetzungen aus dem Deutschen ins Kroatische, ohne dass die Teilnehmer auf die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Deutsch und Englisch aufmerksam gemacht werden. Der spezifische Rahmen dieser Arbeit ist das Konzept *Deutsch als Fremdsprache nach Englisch* (DaFnE), das besonderen Wert auf die Vorteile und die fördernden Einflüsse der englischen Sprache auf das Lehren und Lernen der deutschen Sprache liegt. Dieses Konzept befindet sich unter dem Oberbegriff der Mehrsprachigkeit. Die Mehrsprachigkeit, deren Ursprung nah mit Zweisprachigkeit verbunden ist, hat keine einheitliche Definition wegen der Vielfalt der Charakteristiken und Faktoren, die sie beeinflussen. Eine der einfachsten Definitionen der Mehrsprachigkeit bezieht sich auf den quantitativen Aspekt und wurde von Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl und Hofer (2016) als die Nutzung von drei oder mehr Sprachen formuliert. Jedoch ist Mehrsprachigkeit nicht so einfach zu betrachten oder definieren, weil es unter den Forschern keine Übereinstimmung gibt bezüglich der Faktoren, die die Mehrsprachigkeit beeinflussen (z. B. Muttersprache, bilinguale oder multilinguale Person usw.). Solche Unklarheiten sowie die persönlichen Unterschiede zwischen den mehrsprachigen Personen stellen eine methodologische und theoretische Herausforderung für die Forschung dar. Eine der Besonderheiten von Mehrsprachigkeit ist Transfer. Dieser Begriff bezieht sich auf die Möglichkeit der Übertragung vom Wissen und von Erfahrungen der schon gelernten Sprachen auf das Erlernen einer neuen Fremdsprache. Transfer kann sich im positiven und negativen Sinne (Interferenz) offenbaren, wobei der positive Transfer den größten Einfluss auf die Lerner Sprache nimmt und sie fördert. Die Lerner- oder Interimsprache ist als ein unabhängiges Sprachsystem zu betrachten, das sich ständig verändert und der Zielsprache nähert. Die metalinguistische Bewusstheit ist eine weitere Besonderheit der Mehrsprachigkeit und bezeichnet die Fähigkeit der Lerner, die Sprache als ein vom Inhalt losgelöstes Objekt zu betrachten. Vielen Studien nach, je mehr Sprachen ein Individuum beherrscht, desto größer und entwickelter seine Sprachbewusstheit ist. Solche Lerner müssen sich weniger bemühen, wenn sie Ähnlichkeiten und Parallelen zwischen den zu lernenden Sprachen finden. Die metalinguistische Sprachbewusstheit ist ein Teil der letzten wichtigen Besonderheit von Mehrsprachigkeit: des M-Faktors oder Mehrsprachigkeitsfaktors, der sprachspezifische und generelle kognitive Fähigkeiten umfasst.

DaFnE als Thema dieser Diplomarbeit wurde innerhalb der Domäne des Tertiärsprachenerwerbs entwickelt, der wegen der qualitativen Unterschiede vom Erwerb der

ersten Fremdsprache gegründet wurde. Wenn die Tertiärsprache erworben wird, sind die kognitiven Fähigkeiten und Sprachbewusstheit der Lerner schon entwickelt und Sprachlernerfahrungen erworben. Wegen der neuen Umstände, in denen eine Fremdsprache erlernt wird, ist die Interaktion zwischen den schon gelernten und zu lernenden Sprachen unvermeidbar. Die Interaktion tritt wegen des Verfahrens beim Lernen allgemein auf. In anderen Worten, neues Wissen muss ins bestehende integriert werden, damit es im Gedächtnis erfolgreich behalten werden kann. Im schulischen Kontext sollen daher die Sprachen nicht abgesondert, sondern gezielt genutzt werden, um den Erwerb zu fördern und beschleunigen. Da kommt der Begriff des Transfers erneut zum Vorschein, allerdings in Bezug auf den Tertiärsprachenerwerb. In diesem theoretischen Rahmen wird der interlinguale Transfer von unterschiedlichen Faktoren beeinflusst: die zwei wichtigsten sind die Verwandtschaft der Sprachen und der L2-Status Faktor. Die objektive Verwandtschaft der Sprachen spielt keine wichtige Rolle im Tertiärsprachenerwerb, während die vom Lerner perzipierte Verwandtschaft oder Psychotypologie von höchster Bedeutung ist. Da die individuelle Wahrnehmung der Sprachverwandtschaft für Transfer relevant ist, können sowohl verwandte Sprachen als auch Sprachen, die überhaupt nicht verwandt sind, Transferquellen sein. Trotzdem ist die Fremdsprache öfter die Quelle des Transfers wegen des L2-Status Faktors, so Studien. Die Lernenden nehmen ihre Muttersprache als Fehlerquelle wahr, weil die Fremdsprachen im Gedächtnis mit unterschiedlichen kognitiven Zusammenhängen versehen waren, im Vergleich zu der Muttersprache.

Die prominentesten Ausdrücke des fördernden Einflusses von Transfer sind Kognaten. Kognaten sind Wörter, die formale Ähnlichkeiten in zwei oder mehreren Sprachen aufweisen. Sie können eine ähnliche, aber auch eine komplett andere Bedeutung haben (falsche Freunde). Falsche Freunde verursachen meistens Interferenz, wobei Kognaten mit ähnlicher Bedeutung den Erwerb einer Fremdsprache fördern. Man kann sie schneller erkennen, korrekter übersetzen, leichter behalten und schwieriger vergessen. Deswegen wurden Kognaten für diese Studie gewählt: man konnte prüfen, ob die Lerner selbständig die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den Sprachen erkennen und für die Übersetzung nutzen können. Einige Forscher, wie Otwinovska-Kasztelanic (2001, 2009, 2011), sind der Meinung, dass die Kognaten den Spracherwerb nicht positiv beeinflussen können, ohne dass man die Lerner explizit auf die Kognaten aufmerksam macht. Otwinowskas (2020) Studie, die in Polen durchgeführt wurde, zeigte aber, dass die Lerner trotz expliziter Schulung für Kognatenerkennung nicht vom Kognatenvokabular profitierten. Der fördernde Einfluss der Kognaten war schon vor der Intervention vorhanden.

Diese Einsicht war für diese Studie und die Hypothese vielversprechend: die Lerner könnten ohne Förderung der Kognatenbewusstheit die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den Sprachen ausnutzen.

Aus der Sicht des Lehramtes, muss auch die Tertiärsprachendidaktik erwähnt werden. Tertiärsprachendidaktik ist ein Konzept des schulischen Unterrichts, das die Zusammenarbeit mehrerer Sprachen fördert, um die Mehrsprachigkeit zu entfalten und ihre Vorteile für den Spracherwerb auszunutzen. Sie wurde in Deutschland vom Gerhard Neuner in den frühen 2000er entwickelt. Ihr Ziel wird durch die Verzahnung der Erstsprache und der anderen gelernten Fremdsprachen mit der zu lernenden Sprache erreicht. Die Erstsprache baut die mentale Struktur auf, in der das neue Sprachwissen verankert wird. Außerdem soll man während des Erstspracherwerbs die Lerner für unterschiedliche Sprachphänomene sensibilisieren (z. B. Sprachregister und Dialekte), aber auch das Sprachsystem im Allgemeinen analysieren, um die Bewusstheit von Sprachen als System zu steigern. Weiterhin stellt die erste Fremdsprache den Erstkontakt mit Fremdsprachen dar. Sie veranschaulicht eine unterschiedliche Art vom Sprachenlernen und ermöglicht das produktive Lernen von Fremdsprachen. Ein Teil dieses Konzeptes, das auf die Sprachkonstellation dieser Studie besonders zutrifft, ist der schon erwähnte Terminus DaFnE oder Deutsch als Fremdsprache nach Englisch. DaFnE wurde als ein Konzept aufgebaut, weil 50% aller Deutschlerner die Sprache als zweite Fremdsprache nach Englisch lernen und weil die zwei Sprachen von Ähnlichkeiten wimmeln. Drei Gründe für diese Ähnlichkeiten, die die Literatur angibt, sind die Verwandtschaft der Sprachen (beide Sprachen gehören der germanischen Sprachfamilie), die Internationalisierungstendenz europäischer Sprachen und der Transfer von Wörtern englischen Ursprunges ins Deutsche. Da das DaFnE-Konzept innerhalb des Rahmens der Tertiärsprachendidaktik entstand, teilt es die gleichen Ziele und Prinzipien. Das Ziel der Tertiärsprachendidaktik ist zweifach. Auf der einen Seite soll man das Sprachwissen und die Spracherfahrungen durch das Ziehen der Parallelen zwischen den gelernten und zu lernenden Sprachen entfalten. Auf der anderen Seite soll die Sprachlernbewusstheit durch Gespräche über die Sprache als System, die Sprachlernprozesse und die Lernerfahrungen gefördert werden. Neuner (2003) arbeitete fünf Prinzipien der Tertiärsprachendidaktik aus: Kognitives Lehren und Lernen (Vergleich der Sprachen, Besprechen der Unterschiede und Lernerfahrungen), Verstehen als Grundlage des Sprachenlernens (Aufnahme, Verarbeitung und Verankerung von Informationen, Aktivierung des Wissens, usw.), Inhaltsorientierung (authentische und dem Alter und Interesse der Schüler entsprechende Materialien), Textorientierung (Entwicklung der globalen und selektiven Lesestrategien) und Ökonomisierung des Lernprozesses (effiziente

Lehr- und Lernmethoden, Motivation usw.). Für die Umsetzung dieser Ziele und Prinzipien sind die Fremdsprachenlehrer zuständig. Die Lehrer sollten eine passende Ausbildung bekommen, die die möglichen Hemmungen bei der Durchführung von Prinzipien der Tertiärsprachendidaktik beseitigen würde, um dieses Konzept erfolgreich zu implementieren. Entsprechende Materialien müssten auch entwickelt werden, damit die Unterrichtsvorbereitung leichter erfolgen kann.

Aufgrund der oben genannten Befunde und Konzepte wurde diese Studie entwickelt. Mit der Studie wollte man feststellen, ob Lerner in der achten Klasse einer Zagreber Grundschule die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen dem Deutschen und Englischen bemerken und für erfolgreiche Übersetzung deutsch-englischer Kognaten ins Kroatische ausnutzen können. Die Teilnehmer der Studie waren die Schüler der achten Klassen einer Grundschule, die von derselben Deutschlehrerin unterrichtet wurden. Die 39 teilnehmenden Schüler waren durchschnittlich 13,79 Jahre alt, wobei 23 Schüler männlich und 16 weiblich waren. Alle Schüler lernten Englisch ab der ersten Klasse und Deutsch ab der vierten Klasse der Grundschule. Es muss aber auch hervorgehoben werden, dass einige Schüler andere Sprachen (z. B. Latein, Griechisch, Italienisch und Chinesisch) zusammen mit Englisch und Deutsch außer- und innerhalb des schulischen Kontexts lernten. Weiterhin war es unerwartet, dass zwei Teilnehmer Albaner waren: ihre Muttersprache unterschied sich von der, der anderen Schüler, aber die Reihenfolge des Erwerbs von Englisch und Deutsch blieb trotzdem erhalten. In der Studie wurden zwei Instrumente genutzt, um die nötigen Daten zu sammeln. Zuerst füllten die Teilnehmer eine Umfrage über ihre Sprachlernerfahrungen aus. Die Umfrage bestand aus Fragen über das Alter, das Geschlecht, die Sprachlernerfahrungen vor, innerhalb und außerhalb der Schule. Weiterhin wurden Fragen zur persönlichen Einschätzung ihrer Motivation und Begabung für Fremdsprachenlernen sowie Fragen über ihre Bewusstheit von deutsch-englischen Kognaten gestellt. Das zweite Teil der Studie war die Übersetzungsaufgabe mit Kognaten und den Schülern schon bekannten Wörtern. Mithilfe der Deutschlehrerin wurden 30 Kognaten ausgewählt, die die Schüler nie gelernt hatten, und 15 Wörter, die die Schüler bereits gewusst hatten und die dazu dienten, die Teilnehmer beim Übersetzen zu motivieren. Bei den Kognaten war es wichtig, dass sie den Schülern unbekannt waren, weil sie in dem Fall ihr Vorwissen benutzen mussten, um die Bedeutung des Wortes herauszufinden. Innerhalb der Übersetzungsaufgabe befand sich auch die Übersetzungsbewusstseins-Bewertung, mit deren Hilfe erschlossen wurde, ob die Teilnehmer ein Wort schon gewusst hatten oder die Bedeutung des Wortes erraten. Das Erraten ist in dieser Studie erwünscht, weil die Schüler ihr Wissen

benutzten, um Inferenzen über die Sprachen und deren Ähnlichkeiten zu ziehen. Die durch die Instrumente gesammelten Resultate waren unerwartet. Nur 8,8% der Kognaten waren richtig übersetzt, obwohl auch Antworten, die nicht ganz präzise, sondern nur innerhalb der semantischen Domäne waren, als korrekt genommen wurden (z. B. *Nacken* übersetzt als *ogrlica* oder *Halskette*). Einige Kognaten waren einfacher zu erraten, beispielsweise *Schild*, *Sturm* und *Wurm*, während andere Wörter keine einzige richtige Übersetzung hatten (z. B. *Pfad*, *Kupfer*, *Kassel* usw.). Trotzdem bemühten sich die Teilnehmer beim Erraten von Wörterbedeutungen aufgrund ihrer orthografischen Ähnlichkeiten. Die Mehrheit der Teilnehmer (92,31%) versuchte, Kognaten wenigstens einmal zu übersetzen. Bei der Inferenz der Bedeutung verließen sich die Schüler nicht nur auf ihr Englischwissen wie erwartet, sondern auch auf ihr Deutschwissen und ihre Erstsprache. Den Einfluss des Englischen kann man am Beispiel des Kognaten *Flut* sehen, der als *gripa* übersetzt wurde (Einfluss des englischen Wortes *flu* oder *Grippe* im Deutschen). Das Deutsche beeinflusst die Übersetzungen in Wörtern wie *Wachs*, das als *prati* oder *waschen* und *perilica* oder *Waschmaschine* übersetzt wurde. Letztens findet man den Einfluss des Kroatischen in Übersetzungen *kofer* (Koffer) und *minica* (Rock) von Kognaten *Kupfer* und *Minze*.

Während der Analyse von Resultaten wurden einige Tests isoliert, und zwar die, mit der höchsten Anzahl von korrekten Übersetzungen und die, mit der höchsten Anzahl von Übersetzungsversuchen. Die zwei Kategorien überschritten sich im Test nur eines Teilnehmers. Daraus kann man vermuten, dass die höhere Anzahl der Versuche nicht die höhere Anzahl der korrekten Übersetzungen verursacht. Die meisten korrekten Übersetzungen (8) hatte eine Teilnehmerin, deren Besonderheit die Tatsache war, dass sie sieben Jahre lang Englischunterricht außerhalb der Schule nahm. Trotzdem unterschieden sich ihre Resultate nicht wesentlich von den Resultaten anderer Schüler und man kann annehmen, dass der zusätzliche Unterricht keine große Rolle spielte. Eine ähnliche Situation war auch bei den vier Teilnehmern mit den meisten Übersetzungsversuchen zu finden. Keine Besonderheit bezüglich ihrer Sprachlernerfahrung löste wesentliche Unterschiede in den Resultaten der Schüler aus.

Die in Kürze beschriebenen Resultate haben die Hypothese bestätigt, dass die Schüler ihr Vorwissen im Englischen benutzen, um Deutsch ins Kroatische zu übersetzen, jedoch kamen unerwartete Faktoren auf. Die Teilnehmer benutzten nicht nur ihr Englischwissen, sondern auch Wissen im Deutschen und Kroatischen, um die Bedeutung von Kognaten zu erraten. Mit diesen Resultaten wurde die L2-Status Faktor Hypothese nicht bestätigt, weil die Teilnehmer nicht nur ihr Vorwissen in Fremdsprachen als Transferquelle ausnutzten. Jedoch ist diese Studie nicht

umfassend genug, um diese Resultate zu generalisieren. Da die Mehrheit der Schüler, die unbekanntes Wörter, die formelle Ähnlichkeiten aufwies, zu übersetzen versuchten, ist es theoretisch möglich, den positiven und sprachlernfördernden Effekt des interlingualen Transfers durch präzise Beschäftigung mit dem Vergleich zwischen den gelernten und zu lernenden Sprachen zu erhöhen.

Alles in allem eröffnete diese Studie unterschiedliche Forschungsrichtungen im kroatischen Kontext. Man könnte sich mehr darauf fokussieren, wie die individuellen Unterschiede zwischen den Teilnehmern, den interlingualen Transfer beeinflussen. Irena Horvatić Čajko (2012a) hat sich mit einem ähnlichen Thema beschäftigt. Die Bewusstheit der Kognaten könnte auch näher geforscht werden, damit man feststellen kann, ob größere Bewusstheit mit mehr Transferinstanzen und korrekten Übersetzungen zusammenhängt. Die genannten Forschungsmöglichkeiten sind nur einige im psycholinguistischen Bereich, der in Kroatien noch nicht ausführlich genug erforscht wurde.

8. References

- Aronin, L. & Hufeisen B. (2009). On the Genesis and Development of L3 Research, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition In Aronin, L. & Hufeisen B. (Ed.). *The Exploration of Multilingualism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Aronin, L. & Singleton, D. (2012). *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Aronin, L. & Jessner, U. (2014). Methodology in Bi- and Multilingual Studies: From Simplification to Complexity. *AILA Review*, 27, 56-79. doi: [10.1075/aila.27.03aro](https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.03aro)
- Aronin, L. & Jessner, U. (2015). 11. Understanding Current Multilingualism: What can the Butterfly Tell Us? *The Multilingual Challenge, Checkland 1981*.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614512165-013>
- Banta, F. G. (1981). Teaching German Vocabulary: The Use of English Cognates and Common Loan Words. *The Modern Language Journal*, 65(2), 129-136.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/325590>
- Budimir, M. (2009). *Potrebe za znanjem njemačkog jezika u Hrvatskoj*. Neobjavljen stručni magistarski rad. Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen B. & Jessner U. (Eds.) (2001). *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition. Psychological Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen B. & U. Jessner (2003). *The Multilingual Lexicon*. Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cenoz J. & Jessner U. (Eds.) (2000). *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto/ Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Cenoz, J. & Jessner, U., (2009). The Study of Multilingualism in Educational Contexts. In Aronin, L., Hufeisen, B., (Eds.). *The Exploration of Multilingualism* (Vol.6, pp. 121-138). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cummins, J. (1976). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 9, 1-43.
- Cummins, J. (1979) Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222-251.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690050>
- De Angelis, G., Jessner, U. & Kresnić, M. (2015). The Complex Nature of Crosslinguistic Influence in Multilingual Learning. In De Angelis, G., Jessner, U. & Kresnić, M. (Eds.)

Crosslinguistic Influence and Crosslinguistic Interaction in Multilingual Language Learning. (pp. 1-11). UK: Bloomsbury Academic. doi: [10.5040/9781474235884.0005](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474235884.0005)

- Diaz, R. M. & Klingler, C. (1991). Towards an explanatory model of the interaction between bilingualism and cognitive development. In E. Bialystok (ed.) *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 167–191.
- van Hell, J. G., & Dijkstra, A. (2002). Foreign language knowledge can influence native language performance in exclusively native contexts. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 9(4), 780–789.
- 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. *The International Journal of Multilingualism* Vol.1, No 1, 3–16.
- Friel, B. & Kennison, S. (2001). Identifying German-English Cognates, False Cognates, and Non-Cognates; Methodological Issue and Descriptive Norms. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 4(3), 249-274. doi: 10.1017/S1366728901000438
- Gehrmann, S. (2005). Mehrsprachigkeit und Bildungsreformen in Kroatien – europäische Perspektiven für das Fach Deutsch. *KDVinfo*, Jahrgang 14, Nr. 26/27, Zagreb: Kroatischer Deutschlehrerverband – KDV, 8 – 17.
- Gehrmann, S. (2007). Mehrsprachigkeit, Sprachenpolitik und DaF-Lehrerbildung im Wandel. In *Germanistentreffen Deutschland – Süd-Ost-Europa. Dokumentation der Tagungsbeiträge*. Bonn: Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, 181 – 202.
- Gehrmann, S., Knežević, Ž. (2011). Višjejezičnost kao obrazovni cilj: europska jezična politika u „borbi jezika“. U Domović, V., Gehrmann, S. Krüger-Potratz, M. i Petravić, A. (ur.). *Europsko obrazovanje. Koncepti i perspektive iz pet zemalja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2011., 55 – 80.
- Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 131–149.
- 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.
- Hammer, Jr., C. (1957). Stress the German-English Cognates!. *The Modern Language Journal*, 41(4), 177-182. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/320994>
- Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide* [Publication of the American Dialect Society 26]. Tuscaloosa AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Herdina, P. & Jessner, U. (2000). The dynamics of third language acquisition. In *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*, J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (eds), 84–98. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Herdina, P.H., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism – Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Horvatić Čajko, I. (2012a). *Uloga Višejezične Kompetencije u Učenju i Podučavanju Drugoga Stranoga Jezika – Njemački Jezik kao L3*. Doctoral Thesis. Zagreb: University of Zagreb
- Horvatić Čajko, I. (2012b). DaF-Unterricht aus der Schülerperspektive – Spezifika und Potenzial der DaF/nE-Kostellation. *KDV-Info*, 40/41, 69-79. Retrieved from <https://www.kdv.hr/index.php/kdvinfo/135-kdv-info-40-41-2012>
- Hufeisen, B. (2003). Kurze Einführung in die linguistische Basis. In Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – Tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach English*. (pp. 7-11) Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing
- Hufeisen, B. (2005). Mehrsprachigkeit: Fit für Babel. *Gehirn&Geist*, pp. 28-33
- Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. (2003a). Zur Einführung. In Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – Tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach English*. (pp. 5-6) Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing
- Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. (2003b). *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – Tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach English*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing
- Hufeisen, B. & Marx, N. (2010). Mehrsprachigkeitskonzepte. In Krumm, H.-J., Fandrych, C., Hufeisen, B., & Riemer, C. (Eds.). *Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. (pp. 826-832) doi:10.1515/9783110240245
- Jessner, U., Allgäuer-Hackl, E. & Hofer, B. (2016). Emerging Multilingual Awareness in Educational Contexts: From Theory to Practice. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(2), 157-182. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/619409>
- Karavela, I. & Alexandris, C. (2013). Deutsch als zweite Fremdsprache nach Englisch – Fluch oder Segen?. In Chrissou, M. et al (Eds.). *Schnittstellen von Linguistik und Sprachdidaktik: DaF in Griechenland*. (pp. 91-104). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327043776>
- Kellerman, E. (1977) Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 2, 58–145.
- Kemp, C. (2003) Defining Multilingualism. In Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – Tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach English*. (pp. 11-26) Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. <http://archive.ecml.at/documents/pub112G2003.pdf>
- Kemp, C. (2007). *Strategic processing in grammar learning: do multilinguals use more strategies?*. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 4(4), 241–261.

- Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004). Three languages, one ECHO: Cognate effects in trilingual word recognition. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 19(5), 585–611. doi:10.1080/01690960444000007
- Letica Kregelj, S. (2014). *Crosslinguistic interaction in Acquiring English as L3: Role of Psychotypology and L2 Status*. Doctoral Thesis. Zagreb: University of Zagreb
- Medved Krajnović, M. (2010). *Od jednojezičnosti do višejezičnosti. Uvod u istraživanje procesa ovladavanja inim jezikom*. Zagreb: Leykam international.
- Meißner, F. J. (2005). Vorläufige Erfahrungen mit autonomen Lernen qua Mehrsprachenunterricht. In Hufeisen, B., Lutjeharms M. (Eds.). *Gesamtsprachencurriculum. Integrierte Sprachendidaktik. Common Curriculum. Theoretische Überlegungen und Beispiele der Umsetzung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 129 – 135.
- Neuner, G. (2003). Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept und Tertiärsprachendidaktik. In Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. *Mehrsprachigkeitskonzept – Tertiärsprachen – Deutsch nach English*. (pp. 13-34) Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
<http://archive.ecml.at/documents/pub112G2003.pdf>
- Odling, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O Laoire, M. & Singleton D. (2009). The Role of Prior Knowledge in L3 Learning and Use. In Aronin, L., Hufeisen, B., (Eds.). *The Exploration of Multilingualism* (Vol.6, pp. 79-102). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Otwinowska-Kasztelanica, A. (2009). Raising Awareness of Cognate Vocabulary as a Strategy in Teaching English to Polish Adults. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 3(2), 131-147. doi:10.1080/17501220802283186
- Otwinowska-Kasztelanica, A. (2011) Awareness of Cognate Vocabulary and Vocabulary Learning Strategies of Polish Multilingual and Bilingual Advanced Learners of English. In Arabski, J., and Wojtaszek, A. (Eds.) *Individual Learner Differences in SLA* (pp. 110-126). Bristol: Multilingual Matters doi: 10.21832/9781847694355-009
- Otwinowska, A., & Szewczyk, J. M. (2017). The More Similar the Better? Factors in Learning Cognates, False Cognates and Non-cognate Words. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–18. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1325834
- Otwinowska, A., Foryś-Nogala, M., Kobosko, W., & Szewczyk, J. (2020). Learning Orthographic Cognates and Non-Cognates in the Classroom: Does Awareness of Cross-Linguistic Similarity Matter? *Language Learning*, 1-47 doi: 10.1111/lang.12390
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-Linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Ringbom, H. & Jarvis, S. (2009). The Importance of Cross-Linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning. In Long, M. H., & Doughty C. J. (Eds.). *The Handbook of*

- Language Teaching*. (pp. 106-118) United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781444315783
- Rončević, I. (2011). Europska višejezičnost na primjeru odabranih studijskih programa hrvatskih sveučilišta. In Domović, V., Gehrman, S. Krüger-Potratz, M. i Petravić, A. (Eds.). *Europsko obrazovanje. Koncepti i perspektive iz pet zemalja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2011., 121 – 140.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206–226. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002476>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10(3): 209–231.
- Sweet, H. (1964). *The Practical Study of Languages: A Guide for Teachers and Learners*. London: Oxford University Press
- Szubko-Sitarek, W. (2011) Cognate Facilitation Effects in Trilingual Word Recognition. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(2), 189-208. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.2.2>
- Targonska, J. (2004). Zur Nutzung von Englischkenntnissen beim Erwerb des deutschen Wortschatzes. Eine empirische Untersuchung an polnischen Schülern. In Hufeisen, B. & Marx, N. *Forum Angewandte Linguistik, Band 44 – Beim Sprachenlernen sind Englisch und Deutsch ganz hilfreich*. (pp. 117-136) Bern: Peter Lang
- Tremblay, M-C. (2006). Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: The Role of L2 Proficiency and L2 Exposure. *CLO/OPL*, 34, 109-119.
- Velički, D. (2007). Nova višejezičnost učenje stranih jezika kao dio jezične politike. *Metodički ogleđi*, Nr. 14, pp. 93 – 103, Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo.
- Vildomec, V. (1963). *Multilingualism*. Leyden: A.W. Sythoff.
- Weinreich, P. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wiater, W. (2006). (Eds). *Didaktik der Mehrsprachigkeit. Theoriegrundlagen und Praxismodelle*. München: Verlag Ernst Vögel.
- Wypusz, J. (2015). Konzept Deutsch als Fremdsprache nach Englisch (DaF/E) – Notwendigkeit oder Wunschvorstellung? Empirische Untersuchung in Grundschulen in Großpolen. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(1), 81-91. <https://doi.org/10.14746/gl.2015.42.1.6>

9. Appendices

Lucija Sokač
Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu
Odsjek za anglistiku
Odsjek za germanistiku
Email: luci.soka@gmail.com

Melita Haluga
OŠ Silvija Strahimira Kranjčevića
Bogišićeva 13, Zagreb
Email: melita.haluga@skole.hr


Draga ravnateljice Haluga,

moje ime je Lucija Sokač i studentica sam anglistike i germanistike nastavničkog usmjerenja na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu. U Vašoj sam školi odrađivala dio svoje obavezne prakse s profesoricom Kalinski.

Sada bih Vas zamolila da mi omogućite provođenje svog kratkog istraživanja u svrhu izrade diplomskog rada u kojem ću pisati o kognatima — riječima koje se slično pišu i slično ili isto znače u više jezika, konkretno u njemačkom i engleskom u mom slučaju. Također ću u obzir uzeti neke čimbenike koji utječu na prepoznavanje tih riječi kao što su međujezična svjesnost, razina znanja engleskog jezika i druge.

Potrebne upitnike ispunili bi učenici osmih razreda koje poučava profesorica Kalinski, a samo ispunjavanje bi trajalo maksimalno sat vremena. Molila bih Vas da mi potpisom date Vaš pristanak.

Hvala Vam unaprijed!



Lucija Sokač


_____ potpis ravnateljice

Pristanak na sudjelovanje učenika u istraživanju

Istraživač: Lucija Sokač

Mentorice: Stela Letica Krevelj, Aleksandra Ščukanec

Svrha istraživanja

Cilj je ovog istraživanja istražiti poveznice prethodnog jezičnog znanja u učenju vokabulara u njemačkom jeziku. Od učenika će se tražiti da pokušaju, na temelju prethodnog jezičnog znanja, pogoditi što određena riječ znači na njemačkom jeziku te je prevesti u pisanom obliku na hrvatski jezik.

Prikupljeni podaci koristit će se isključivo u istraživačke svrhe.

Postupak istraživanja

Učenici će ispuniti kratak upitnik vezan uz njihovo iskustvo u učenju stranih jezika. Zatim će riješiti zadatak u kojem će trebati prevesti njemačke riječi na hrvatski jezik. Rješavanje testa trajat će jedan školski sat.

U testu se nigdje neće tražiti podatak o učenikovom imenu.

Razina stresa i/ili neugode u ovom istraživanju nije veća od one koju učenici doživljavaju u vrlo uobičajenim svakodnevnim situacijama u školi. U ovom istraživanju oni neće biti izloženi nikakvom specifičnom riziku.

Ostale informacije

Naglašavam da je sudjelovanje učenika u ovom istraživanju dobrovoljno i da kao roditelj imate pravo bez ikakvih posljedica ne pristati da učenik sudjeluje u istraživanju.

Također naglašavam da ovo istraživanje nikako neće utjecati na učenikovu ocjenu.

Potpis roditelja

*Draga učenice, dragi učenice,
hvala ti što ćeš odgovoriti na pitanja i riješiti zadatak. Time ćeš mi pomoći u istraživanju za
diplomski rad. Istraživanje je anonimno, a prikupljeni će se podaci koristiti isključivo u
istraživačke svrhe.*

Ovo nije test, nema ocjena, uspješnih ili neuspješnih rješenja.

Pokušaj spontano i opušteno odgovarati na pitanja i rješavati zadatak.

Hvala ti na suradnji!

Odgovori na neka pitanja o sebi te zaokruži i dopuni ako je potrebno.

1. Tvoj spol? Ž / M
2. Godina tvoga rođenja? 20__
3. Jesi li od ranog djetinjstva (od 3. godine ili ranije) učio / učila još jedan jezik?
DA / NE Ako jesi, koji? _____
4. Od kada učiš engleski jezik u školi? od 1. razreda OŠ / od 4. razreda OŠ / dulje
5. Učiš li uz engleski i njemački jezik u osnovnoj školi još jedan strani jezik?
DA / NE Ako da, koji? _____
Koliko dugo? _____
6. Jesi li u školi stranih jezika i / ili privatno učio / učila engleski i njemački ili neki drugi jezik (navedi koji)?
DA / NE Koji jezik(e)? _____
Koliko dugo? _____
7. Koliko imaš sati nastave engleskog jezika tjedno? 2 / 3 / 4
8. Koliko imaš sati njemačkog jezika tjedno? 2 / 3 / 4
9. Koliko često koristiš engleski jezik i izvan nastave (gledanje TV-a, chat, internet, glazba)?
vrlo rijetko / rijetko / pokatkad / često / vrlo često
10. Koliko često koristiš njemački jezik i izvan nastave (gledanje filmova, internet, glazba)?
vrlo rijetko / rijetko / pokatkad / često / vrlo često
11. Učiš li rado strane jezike? DA / NE
12. Smatraš li da imaš dar za strane jezike? DA / NE

13. Jesi li išao/išla na natjecanje iz engleskog jezika?

DA / NE

14. Što misliš, koliko postoji riječi čiji je oblik (kako se piše) i značenje jednako u engleskom i njemačkom jeziku? Zaokruži.

KOLIČINA RIJEČI
a) 20 -150
b) 150 - 500
c) 500 – 1000
d) 1000 - 5000

15. Što misliš, koliko takvih riječi znaš? Zaokruži.

KOLIČINA RIJEČI
a) manje od 50
b) oko 100
c) više od 500

*Slijedi dio upitnika u kojem je zadatak. Pokušaj ga riješiti najbolje što možeš. Ako neke odgovore ne znaš, nema nikakvih posljedica, no potruđi se napisati sve što znaš!
Hvala ti što mi pomažeš diplomirati! Viel Glück!*

Prevedi njemačke riječi na hrvatski. U trećem stupcu zaokruži broj od 1 do 4 koji predstavlja koliko si siguran/sigurna u svoj prijevod. (1 – pogađam, 2 – mislim da je točno, 3 – poprilično sam siguran/sigurna, 4 – znam sigurno)

RIJEČ	PRIJEVOD NA HRVATSKI	KOLIKO SAM SIGURAN/SIGURNA			
1) Ellbogen		1	2	3	4
2) Pfad		1	2	3	4
3) Kalb		1	2	3	4
4) Hund		1	2	3	4
5) Nacken		1	2	3	4
6) Kartoffel		1	2	3	4
7) Kupfer		1	2	3	4
8) reif		1	2	3	4
9) Braut		1	2	3	4
10) Buch		1	2	3	4
11) Faust		1	2	3	4
12) Acker		1	2	3	4
13) Schild		1	2	3	4
14) Wespe		1	2	3	4
15) Zwielficht		1	2	3	4
16) traurig		1	2	3	4
17) Fernseher		1	2	3	4
18) Haus		1	2	3	4
19) Stuhl		1	2	3	4
20) Sturm		1	2	3	4
21) Stift		1	2	3	4

22)	Asche		1	2	3	4
23)	Heim		1	2	3	4
24)	Kessel		1	2	3	4
25)	Schatten		1	2	3	4
26)	Nuss		1	2	3	4
27)	Fahrrad		1	2	3	4
28)	schön		1	2	3	4
29)	Kohle		1	2	3	4
30)	Ochse		1	2	3	4
31)	Flut		1	2	3	4
32)	Wachs		1	2	3	4
33)	dumm		1	2	3	4
34)	Katze		1	2	3	4
35)	Pfund		1	2	3	4
36)	Stamm		1	2	3	4
37)	Wunde		1	2	3	4
38)	Flugzeug		1	2	3	4
39)	Meer		1	2	3	4
40)	Macht		1	2	3	4
41)	Geld		1	2	3	4
42)	Minze		1	2	3	4
43)	Aal		1	2	3	4
44)	Nadel		1	2	3	4
45)	Wurm		1	2	3	4