UDK 811.111’25
Izvorni naučni rad

Goran Grubešić, MA
Dr. sc. Nadira Aljović

L2 CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE ON L1: A CASE STUDY OF STUDENT’S TRANSLATION ASSIGNMENTS

Abstract

Most language transfer studies focus on the influence that L1 may have on the comprehension and production of L2. When such influence inhibits L2 production, it has been often referred to as interference or negative transfer (see Isurin 2005 among others). The present study is a report on a pilot survey with the aim of investigating whether cross-linguistic influence (CLI) or language transfer occurs when L2 is rendered into L1, i.e. to what extent L2 can influence production of L1. Fifteen translations from English into Bosnian / Croatian / Serbian were examined (approx. 10500 words), done by 15 University of Zenica advanced (MA) students of English. The zero hypothesis was that the students’ foreign language (English) would have certain influence on native language production and create instances of “language deviations from the norm” (see Weinreich 1966) in the students’ native language (BCS), e.g. translating “visiting” in “The visiting Evlija Čelebi summarized (...)” as “gostujući” (appearing within “Gostujući Evlija Čelebija sažeo je(...)”). The primary objective has been to determine the linguistic categories in which instances of transfer occur, borrowing the taxonomy from Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008). The classification would serve as a starting point for the analysis of translations of a larger number of English texts, whereby it would be possible to identify those instances of lexical items, syntactic structures, morphological forms, etc. in the source language which are the most frequent triggers of language transfer in the target language. The translations can prove a fertile ground for such research. According to Hatim and Munday (2004) “translated language in general displays specific characteristics, known as universals of translation”, including the “law of interference – common ST lexical and syntactic patterns tend to be copied creating unusual patterns in TT”. In order to achieve the objective, the present study has two practical goals: the first is

to find out which linguistic category/ies is/are most represented in the instances of transfer, and the other is to establish the ratio of negative transfer errors in all translation errors on the basis of a minute inspection of two individual translations.

***Keywords**: cross-linguistic influence, negative transfer, naive translation equivalent, L1, L2*

Introduction

The human mind copes with new learning situations by applying structures and patterns already at its disposal to novel experiences. According to Isurin (2005), "transfer is a traditional term from psychology of learning which means imposition of previously learned patterns onto a new learning situation". More narrowly applied to the study of foreign language acquisition and use, this term, sometimes used interchangeably with cross-linguistic influence, refers to those instances of foreign language use which share a noticeable phonetic, morphological, syntactic, semantic or lexical attribute with their equivalents in the native tongue. Obviously, cross-linguistic influence (CLI) may have a "facilitation or inhibition effect on the learner's progress in mastering a new language" (ibid.). Sometimes, an apparent influence of L1 can be beneficial, especially when L1 and L2 are linguistically related, and this influence is termed positive transfer. Those instances of L2 use that seem stilted or odd or are downright unacceptable to a native ear and at the same time exhibit certain linguistic properties characteristic of L1 are potentially caused by negative transfer.

Several approaches have been adopted to account for this phenomenon. In the mid-20th century the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis promulgated by Lado and others tried to establish a correlation between the level of structural similarities and differences between a pair of languages and the presence of transfer (Lado, 1957). Seliger (1991) attempted to establish a link between the markedness of linguistic entities and the relative difficulty of their acquisition, which may be increased by negative transfer. Within the cognitive perspective of the Generative Grammar, the Universal Grammar by Chomsky (1965) contributed significantly to a novel understanding of possible mechanisms, related to universal vs. parametrized grammar rules, and the ways they are copied from L1 to L2.

Even though there is a considerable body of literature dealing with CLI, especially in the field of language instruction and teaching

methodology, attempting to offer to foreign language teachers guidelines which can foster their student's learning, to the best of our knowledge, comparatively little research has been done of this phenomenon occurring in the opposite direction, namely from L2 (foreign language) into L1 (native language). Some research into language acquisition of bilingual children (cf. Paradis and Navarro 2003) has yielded useful insights which can be applied to foreign-to-native influence.

Aims and methodology

This study will attempt to provide some new insights into to the issue of foreign-to-native linguistic influence. Our primary goal is to establish the relation between three major CLI error types (form, structure and lexical meaning). To achieve it, we inspected a total of 15 translations of an English text in order to determine the number of different negative transfer errors and their categories. We analysed translations done by fifteen M.A. students who were tasked as a part of their Contemporary English classes to translate English texts into their mother tongue, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS). The translations were done as home assignments over a 5 day period, allowing the students ample time and access to any resources that could aid them with the work. The proficiency of students whose translations were used ranged from B2 to C1 level. There were 10 translation assignments with texts consisting of approximately 1000 words each. The texts selected belonged to various genres, including excerpts from literary works, history books and newspaper articles. They usually involved language structures and vocabulary of the C1 level, and only occasionally B2 and C2. This gave us a corpus of 150 translations with the combined length of 150 000 words. The data set selected for the statistical analysis consisted of a single text translated by 15 students from English to BCS, yielding 15 translations comprising 10 543 words. All translations were analysed in great detail in group sessions during in-class activities, which yielded many observations pertinent to our study. All the translations were later scoured by the authors of the paper for instances of transfer among the observed translation errors. The aim of the present study is two-fold: to determine which language areas are most affected by CLI in the form of negative transfer, and to determine the extent to which it is present in L1 translations. Hopefully, the findings can contribute to a better understanding the mechanics of CLI for those interested in

CLI as well as its presence in the L2-L1 direction, which may prove beneficial to ESL teachers, BCS learners of English, and English-BCS translators and interpreters, by increasing their awareness of negative linguistic transfer in their own teaching and translating practices, and their use of English.

Defining which translation errors constituted cases of CLI and which could be attributed to other factors and opting for the appropriate methods in their analysis and classification presented several problems. Determining which translation error was due to L2 influence requires an in depth study of individual learners translation methods and choices. Luckily, the in-class discussions and translation analyses proved an invaluable source of this information, but even with the input of the translators themselves it was not always easy to pinpoint the causes of these errors. Furthermore, many instances of errors that exhibited clear roots in (potential) CLI could have occurred at several levels of language processing. For example, (a potential) CLI yielding "škola pacifista" ('Pacifist school') from "Pacific school" could have obviously taken place at the phonetic level, but the context might also have contributed, as this example occurred in a text about anti-war efforts of European artists during WWI. For these reasons, it is important to point out that our aim was not to probe into deep (psychological) reasons underlying CLI, but to use it as a descriptive tool in our error analysis in order to establish the presence (or absence) of an L2 influence in the process of switching from one code (L2, foreign language) to another (L1, native language). We adopted Jarvis and Pavlenko's (2008) approach consisting in classifying CLI into phonological, orthographic, lexical, semantic, morphological, syntactic, discursive, pragmatic and socio-linguistic transfer and simplified it to differentiate between transfer which occurred due to and at the level of form, syntax and lexical meaning respectively. Even with such simplification there were instances of translation errors which it was possible to classify in more than one category. In the next section we illustrate these categories with detailed explanation of our motivation and reasons justifying a particular classification.

The paper is organized in the following way: in section 3 we illustrate and explain examples of the three categories of CLI in the form of negative transfer (i.e. CLI errors), in section 4 we present our statistical analysis, and in section 5 we offer concluding remarks.

Results

In the following section examples of CLI will be shown grouped according to the framework presented above, starting with those attributed to form, which mostly includes phonological and morphological transfer. The examples will be presented in source text (English, foreign language) / target text (BCS, native language) pairs, with transfer-induced mistakes highlighted and a better translation solution offered in parentheses. We will also indicate where other linguistic factors may have been a contributing factor, and what the possible triggers for CLI might have been.

CLI at the level of form

(1) a. inner courtyard that often included a central **fountain**
dvorište u kojem se uglavnom nalazila centralna **fontana** (česma)

b. a **social** center[2]
socijalno središte (društveno)

c. a distant huge tan **object**
udaljeni ogromni tamni**o bjekat** (predmet)

Phonological similarity is evidently a probable cause for CLI, as illustrated in (2). In this case, the transfer yields an acceptable form in target language, but not one equivalent in meaning to the source text term. This situation can often involve false cognates (words that have similar forms in both languages, but different meanings).

(2) **nonhuman** mammals
nehumani sisavci (sisavci, osim čovjeka)

In example (3), the target language contains an unnatural phrase (the expression „–ih godina“ can be used for decades, as in *osamdesetih godina*, ‘in the 80s’, not for centuries). This error seems to be triggered by transferring into the target language the form of the source language expression. In (3b-d), the translation strategy seems to consist in using the most resembling (cognate) form existing in the target language for rendering the source language expression, yielding thus incorrect translations (the meanings not being translated at all) – in fact, (3b-d) illustrate typical examples of false cognates:

(3)a. in the mid-**1500s**.
sredinom **1500-tih godina** (šesnaestog stoljeća)

[2] The term refers to the role of the city’s marketplace, not of some institution, as apparent from the context: “The čaršija also became a social center, the focal point of the city’s common life”

b. [the] **actual** French window
aktuelni francuski prozor (taj isti/upravo taj francuski prozor)
c. **hymn** to colour
himna boji (hvalospjev/oda)
d. a **novel**
novela (roman)

CLI at the level of syntax

Syntactic or structural CLI could be less evident or self-explanatory compared to that at the level of form. Therefore, in the following section we provide explanations of translation mistakes. We illustrate several cases of structural transfer and begin by a situation where a single concept involving a verb and its two arguments (complements) is expressed by different structures in the source and target language. In example (4), the source language has the verb *substitute* which requires a PP argument introduced with *for* referring to the entity being substituted, while the argument having the role of 'substitutor' appears in the objective (accusative) case. BCS has an opposite situation: the corresponding verb *zamijeniti/ zamjenjivati* selects an accusative argument noun phrase having the role of the entity being substituted (not a prepositional phrase as in English), while the entity with the role of 'substitutor' is in the instrumental case (while English has an accusative NP here). The two languages thus oppose two structures: *substitute something*$_{[\text{substitutor}]}$ *for something*$_{[\text{PP, 'entity being substituted'}]}$ and *zamijeniti nešto*$_{[\text{'entity being substituted', accusative NP}]}$ *nečim*$_{[\text{'substitutor', instrumental NP}]}$. The error in (4) appears to be caused by the English structure directly transferred into BCS with the PP *za ravnodušnost* (denoting the entity being substituted) corresponding to the English *for indifference*, and the accusative NP *predanost* corresponding to the English *devotion*. The structure in BCS cannot be understood properly since the verb's selectional requirements are not met; in fact, it is ungrammatical. This as an example where structural transfer from L2 makes a native speaker use/produce an ungrammatical structure in L1, his/her native language.

(4) **For indifference** they substitute devotion
Za ravnodušnost oni zamjenjuju predanost (Ravnodušnost zamijenjuju predanošću)

In (5), the English structure involving an infinitive clause *to flee* functioning as complement of the adjective *quick* seems to trigger a transfer error in the target language. Namely,**brzi da pobjegnu* is ungrammatical in BCS: the adjective *brz* cannot take a complement clause in the same way that the English adjective *quick* can. Nevertheless, the translation seems to be copying the structure of the source language.[3]

(5) [They] were **quick to flee**
bili su **brzi da pobjegnu** (Brzo su pobjegli / Nisu oklijevali da pobjegnu)

Similarly, in (6) the English complement structure of the verb *debate* is copied in the target language. *Debate* selects an accusative object in English, while BCS *raspravljati* selects a prepositional phrase (introduced by the preposition *o* 'about'); the translation involves an ungrammatical structure, and can be viewed, in our opinion, as a result of transferring the source language structure:

(6) The two men had **debated the nature of reality**
Dva su čovjeka **raspravljala prirodu stvarnosti** (o prirodi stvarnosti)

BCS is a pro-drop language (allows null subjects in finite clauses) and overt pronominal subjects always contribute an additional effect (contrastive focus or topic). English requires overt subjects in finite clauses, and in (7) the pronoun *she* is obligatory for structural reasons. However, its presence in the source language seems to trigger the use of an overt pronominal subject in the target language, too. In this way the translation adds new meaning (of topicalisation or contrastive focus), absent in the source language.

(7) By 9:00 a.m. **she** was downstairs
Ona je bila do 9 sati u prizemlju (Do/U 9 sati bila je već u prizemlju)

In (8) we have an interesting example of transfer which seems to be the result of a misinterpretation of the source structure. Namely, *in the spectrum* is a prepositional phrase conjoined with *in this or that phenomenon*, with the whole conjunction functioning as complement of *interested*. However, the second conjunct (*in the spectrum*) was translated not as a (part of) complement of the adjective but possibly as a postmodifier of the noun *phenomenon*, or alternatively

[3] Note that transfer here is not complete: the English infinitival is correctly rendered by a BCS finite clause.

as some kind of adverbial. In both cases, the result structure in the target language is a prepositional phrase:[$_{PP}$*in the spectrum*...]>[$_{PP}$*u spektru*...], and this produces an inexact translation.

(8) I am not **interested in this or that phenomenon**, **in the spectrum** of this or that element
Ne zanima me ovaj ili onaj fenomen **u spektru** ovog ili onog elementa (niti spektar ovog ili onog elementa)

Summarizing, the examples in (4-8) are instances of structural transfer where it is possible to describe ungrammatical or unacceptable translation choices (in L1) by correlating their structure to the structure of the source language sentences and phrases (L2).In other words, translation errors seem to be „caused" by copying the source language structure in the target language so that the produced structures are either ungrammatical or do not render the intended meaning of the source text. In the next section, we illustrate the same type of transfer which involves meanings of lexical items.

CLI at the level of meaning

While CLI can be difficult to detect and describe without advanced linguistic knowledge, it is more discernible in the remaining meaning-related examples.

The translation errors (or deviations) to be illustrated can be described in the following way: the target language expression (phrase or word) translates the most obvious, possibly the most frequent meaning, of the source language expression, and when this yields an unnatural or incorrect translation (one that does not correspond to the source language meaning or results in unnatural collocations), we get translation errors. The use of the most frequent translation equivalent when it is not a correct translation equivalent, or a most natural one, is referred to as *Naive Translation Equivalent* (NTE) by Riđanović (2007).

We begin our presentation by example (9) where the translation is not incorrect nor does it yield an ungrammatical expression; instead, it is simply not the most natural expression of the target language for the concept denoted by the source language expression (where it is clear in the larger context that what is referred to by 'first language' is 'native language').

(9) Hungarian as a **first language**.
madžarski kao svoj **prvi jezik** (maternji)

The example in (10) involves a similar transfer, i.e. translation of the most obvious/frequent meaning of *equipped* by *opremljeni*, yielding the translation unnatural, with the meaning of the source language not being completely altered or lost.

(10) **equipped** with these skills
opremljena ovim vještinama (sa ovim vještinama / zahvaljujući ovim vještinama)

The error in (11) is caused by the use of *usidrena* which corresponds to the most frequent meaning of *anchor(ed)*(as, for example, provided by the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2009): "to lower the anchor on a ship or boat to hold it in one place". Of course, this is not the intended meaning of the source language expression – the translation is therefore incorrect:

(11) **anchored** by a Serbian Orthodox church
je **usidrena** od strane srpske pravoslavne crkve (sa srpskom pravoslavnom crkvom u sredini / kao okosnicom)

Similarly, the phenomenon of NTE can be detected in (12) where the translation corresponds to the most frequent meaning of the noun *host* (BCS *domaćin*):

(12) a **host** of fountains
na **domaćinskim** česmama

As we have already seen in the section on syntactical CLI above, L2 can mislead speakers to produce ungrammatical structures in their own native language (L1). Similarly, naive translation equivalents can produce unnatural collocations. Collocations are specific combinations of words inside a phrase, and can for example involve an adjective and a noun like *heavy rain*. Collocations are very often language specific. Thus, the adjective *heavy* cannot be translated by its most frequent equivalent into BCS: *teška* does not collocate with *kiša*. In English the adverb *strongly* collocates with *disapprove* or *disagree*; its most frequent equivalent in BCS does not collocate with the equivalents of these verbs: **snažno se ne slagati*, **snažno ne odobravati*. Some of our examples of lexical negative transfer or naive translation equivalence involve wrong collocations in the target language.[4]

Thus in (13) we see a wrong collocation: *swelling* was rendered here as *bujanje* (variants that appeared in other translations

[4] In principle, the other two categories of CLI, phonology- and structure-related, can result in wrong collocations, too.

included *nalet*, *porast*, *veličina*, *povećanje*, *nadiranje*, etc. more or less related to the most typical meaning of English swell as 'become greater in amount, volume'); in fact, *bujanje* does not collocate with *značenje* (nor do other target variants above), although it does translate the meaning of *swelling*; instead BCS has *poplava* or *bujica* which collocate with nouns such as *značenja* or *informacije*.

(13) the sudden **swelling** of meanings
naglo **bujanje** značenja (iznenadna poplava / bujica informacija)

The examples above are a small sample of the kind of translation errors extracted from the total sum of errors as a subset which was open to description by the notion of several types of CLI. In the following section we will present statistical data based on all the errors analyzed and categorized. Summarizing the previous subsections, we can say that CLI does occur when L2 is rendered into L1, i.e. under influence of L2, where L2 is a foreign language and L1 is the native language of the authors of the examined translation assignments. Why there is such tendency to copy phonological and syntactic structure, or to be guided by the most frequent meaning of the source text expression, is a question that lies well beyond the scope of this paper. We use CLI as a tool for detecting and describing errors in L1 which can be correlated with L2. One important insight we are making here is that the influence of the source language, even if it is a foreign language, can be so strong as to lead speakers to use ungrammatical structures in their own native language. In the following section we will present statistical data based on all the errors analyzed and categorized.

Discussion

The data set selected for the statistical analysis consisted of a single text translated by 15 students from English to BCS, yielding 15 translations comprising 10543 words. The translations were marked for all the translation errors, also making use of the in-class notes acquired during teacher-student discussions and reports made by the students themselves. The errors were subsequently examined in detail to ascertain the instances in which CLI might have been the underlying cause. This analysis found 148 distinct items fitting that description. This number excludes the repeated instances of the same item within the same translation or different translations, and

represents the amount of distinct CLI errors. There are approximately 14 cases of distinct CLI per 1000 words of translated text. While this number is an aggregate of all 15 translations analyzed, meaning no single translation was this heavily saturated with instances of CLI, the number is sufficiently high to confidently state that the presence of CLI from second to first language is confirmed and of statistical relevance. As shown in Chart 1, the categorization we have adopted favors (lexical) meaning-related CLI (NTE), with 73 of those 148 items belonging to that category, or around 49%. CLI items related to form are represented with 50 items or 34%, and structure-related CLI comes in last with 25 items or 17%. While syntactic transfer is thought to be more salient in the L1 to L2 direction, as noted by Merilainen (2010), the opposite seems to hold firm when it comes to L2 to L1 influence, suggesting that a speaker's L1 syntax may be more resilient than lexical forms and meanings, and that CLI is more likely to occur at the word level than at the level of a phrase and in more complex structures when a foreign language influences the native language.



As an additional layer of analysis we chose one particular translated text which contained more translation errors in comparison to other translations and had three native BCS speakers with no formal training in advanced linguistic read it and point out all the words, phrases and sentences which seemed odd in any respect. This was done firstly in order to gain an additional perspective on the translation in question and also to acquire further data on the items which, while not translation errors proper, do bear a certain stylistic markedness which is not in keeping with BCS norms and which could have gone unnoticed otherwise. This yielded a total of 51 items for that text, and 24 of those could be linked to CLI, which is a high 47%. The percentage may indicate a negative correlation between the occurrence of CLI errors and the quality of a translation. Out of those CLI items, 54% were form-related, 25% (lexical) meaning-related

and 21% syntax-related, roughly confirming the bias of CLI towards (lexical) form and meaning when the L2 to L1 direction is concerned.

Finally, we attempted to ascertain the percentages of the categories of CLI errors in two individual translation assignments. Our practical goal was to do a "small-scale" and more precise counting of CLI errors with a particular focus on lexical CLI (i.e. NTE). In this analysis we did not disregard repeated instances of CLI, in other words we counted occurrences of CLI, rather than distinct items. This way we also checked the methodology of "counting" and the strategy of identifying CLI errors. Furthermore, we also wanted to double-check the tendency observed above of lexical (form and meaning) CLI errors being the most frequent type of CLI in the L2 to L1 translations we examined. The source text comprised 1079 words. One target text was a high quality translation with a total of 38 translation errors, the other was a lower quality translation with a total of 134 translation errors. We counted 18 CLI errors in the high quality translation out of 38, i.e. 47% of all errors. Among those, 6 or 33% are lexical CLI errors (NTE), 9 or 50% are structure-related CLI errors, while 4 or 22% are form (phonology/morphology)-related CLI errors. The percent of NTE errors among all translation errors amounts to 16%. Charts (2-3) below depict the counting results:





The second translation presented the total of 134 translation errors, among them 59 identifiable as negative CLI, 44%. 8 of them are form-related CLI errors, or 14%. 20 of them are structure-related CLI errors, or 34%. And finally, 31 of them are NTE errors, or 52%. NTE errors in this translation present 23% of all translation errors. Charts (4-5) show these results:

An interesting insight is provided by the two CLI errors percentages in Chart 2 and 4: namely, both the high quality translation and the lower quality translation contain a similar percentage of CLI errors among all translation errors (47% vs. 44%).

Another significant insight is that the number of form-related CLI errors in both translations is lower than the average of the same category of errors appearing in Chart 1 (cf. 22% and 14% vs. 34%). We will not speculate at this point on possible reasons for this discrepancy since the second error analysis, although different in that





we counted error occurrences and not distinct CLI error items, was based on two individual translations and not all 15. Also evident from these numbers is an interesting fact about NTE, i.e. that, as a category of negative transfer or CLI, it shows an interesting tendency, namely that with the increase of errors in a given translation version, the number of NTE's rises in an accelerated proportion. These findings point to a possible decrease of NTE in the language use of students who have attained a higher proficiency of L2, as demonstrated by the quality of the translation work, while translation skill may also be a determining factor in eliminating such errors. It is also possible, in our view, that the decrease could be more important if foreign language students (teachers and translators, too) were systematically trained to develop the awareness of all categories of CLI.

Conclusion

Our research carried out into the influence of L2 in L1 in written assignments has provided us with partial answers to the questions we posed. This was a pilot study primarily aimed at establishing whether negative CLI can be identified in the L2 to L1 direction, otherwise not conventionally researched. Our hypothesis that CLI can be identified in this direction is borne out by the data examined and analysed. We now know that CLI is clearly exhibited in L1 forms and patterns which can be traced to L2. What is particularly interesting and surprising, a significant number of incorrect (wrong) translation choices, non-standard, unnatural and ungrammatical forms in L1 (a native language in our study) can be described as directly correlated with forms and structures of L2 (a foreign language in our study). We

find this insight relevant for foreign language teaching methodology and translation theory (and practice), pointing to the importance of learners/translators being aware of the influence L2 can have on their L1. We have also provisionally determined that within our corpus, most instances had to do with simpler language forms and meaning, and fewer instances were related to the structure, or syntax – a deeper examination of a larger corpus is certainly needed, as indicated by our minute analysis of two individual translation assignments. We have also discovered a correlation between a language proficiency level and the probability that CLI (more precisely NTE) will occur: obviously, the greater the proficiency in L2, the lower presence of NTE. These findings have implications for linguists, translators and teachers who could benefit from shifting at least a part of their focus on how a foreign language influences the mother tongue.

References

1. Alahmadi, N. S., & Kesseiri, R. (2013). Language Transfer and Grammatical Speaking Errors among Saudi Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(3), 251-265.
2. Archvadze, E. (n.d.). *The Problems of First language Interference in the Process of Teaching Second Languages*. Kutaisi, Georgia: Akaki Tsereteli State University.
3. Bhela, B. (1999). Native Language Interference in Learning a Second Language. *International Education Journal*, 1(1).
4. Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routlege.
5. Hui, B. (2010). Backward Transfer from L3 french to L2 English Production of Relative Clauses by L1 Cantonese Speakers in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 45-60.
6. Isurin, L., 2005. *Cross Linguistic Transfer in Word Order; Evidence from L1 Forgetting and L2 Acquistion*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
7. Jarvis S & A. Pavlenko, 2008. *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. London/New York: Routledge.
8. Merilainen, L. (2010). *Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students*. University of Eastern Finland.
9. Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Paradis, J., & Navarro, S. (2003). Subject Realization and Crosslinguistic Interference in the Bilingual Acquisition of English and Spanish. *Journal of Child Language*, 30-II, 371-393.
11. Riđanović, M. (2007). *Praktična Engleska Gramatika*. Sarajevo: Šahinpašić.
12. Shaffer, D. E. (2002). Erring in English: Korean L1 and Cultural Interference. *KOTESOL Proceedings.*
13. Sinha, A. (2009). Interference of First Language in the Acquisition of Second Language. *Journal of Psychology and Counseling* , 1(7), 117-122.
14. Telebi, S. H. (2014). Cross—linguistic Transfer among Iranian Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Issues in Educational research*, 24(2).
15. Weinrich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. London/Paris: Mouton.

NEGATIVNI TRANSFER IZ STRANOG U MATERNJI JEZIK: ANALIZA STUDENTSKIH PREVODA

Sažetak

Većina studija o jezičkom transferu se fokusiraju na utjecaj koji maternji jezik može ispoljiti na razumijevanje i upotrebu stranog jezika. Kada je taj utjecaj negativan, često se naziva interferencija ili negativni transfer (vidi Isurin 2005). Ova studija je izvještaj o pilot istraživanju kojim se htjelo ispitati da li se međujezični utjecaj (CLI) ili transfer javlja i kad se strani jezik prevodi na maternji jezik. Predmet ispitivanja bili su prevodi deset tekstova sa engleskog na BHS (svaki je sadržavao oko 10500 riječi) koje su radili master studenti anglistike. Polazna hipoteza je bila da će strani jezik (engleski) imati vidljiv utjecaj na upotrebu maternjeg jezika te dovesti do slučajeva "jezičkih odstupanja od norme" (vidi Weinrich 1966), npr. prevođenje izraza "visiting" iz rečenice "The visiting Evlija Čelebi summarized (...)" sa "gostujući" u rečenici "Gostujući Evlija Čelebija sažeo je (...)". Glavni cilj bio je da se odrede jezičke kategorije u kojima se javlja transfer koristeći taksonomiju koju su postavili Jarvis i Pavlenko (2008). Ova klasifikacija treba da posluži kao polazna tačka u analizi većeg broja tekstova na engleskom čime bi se mogli utvrditi primjeri leksičkih jedinica, sintaksičkih struktura i morfoloških i fonoloških

formi u izvornom jeziku koji su najčešći okidači za jezički transfer u ciljnom jeziku. Prevodi mogu poslužiti kao izvrstan teren za takvo istraživanje. Prema Hatimu i Mundayu (2004) "jezik prevoda inače ispoljava određene osobine, koje nazivamo univerzalnim osobinama prevoda", a one uključuju "zakon interferencije - uobičajeni leksički i sintaksički obrasci iz jezika izvornika imaju tendenciju da se prekopiraju na jezik prevoda čineći tako neobične obrasce". Izučavanje je imalo dva praktična cilja: prvi je da se ispita koje lingvističke kategorije su najzastupljenije pri negativnom transferu, a drugi je da se utvrdi udio negativnog transfera u ukupnom broju grešaka u prevodima na osnovu detaljne analize dva prevoda jednog istog teksta na izvornom jeziku.

***Ključne riječi**: jezički transfer, negativni transfer, naivni prevodni ekvivalent, izvorni jezik, ciljni jezik*