

THE IMPORTANCE OF CROSS-LINGUISTIC INTERACTION IN THIRD LANGUAGE LEARNING

SZABÓ, NOÉMI

PhD student of applied linguistics, foreign language teaching, third language learning
University of Pannonia (Veszprém), Institute of Hungarian and Applied Linguistics, Multilingualism Doctoral School
e-mail: szabonoemi@almos.uni-pannon.hu

The issue of learning foreign languages is still receiving an increasing attention these days. According to the latest statistical data, learning foreign languages and speaking more than one language can still be counted as a peculiarity in Hungary. Surveying the current literature on the chosen topic, several works, studies and articles on trilingualism and third language acquisition (TLA) appear to be a matter of curiosity, for example Cenoz & Jessner, 2000; Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner, 2001; Fouser and Hufeisen, 2005; De Angelis, 2007. Cross-linguistic awareness deserves more attention in consideration of third language acquisition and trilingualism because this area of research is still counted as a neglected area in multilingualism research.

Moreover, far too little attention has been paid to metalinguistic awareness related to TLA research in the educational context (Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl & Hofer, 2016). Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer (2016) focuses on the understanding of multi-competence with regard to multilingual learners. The classroom activities described in the article have concentrated on multilingual, especially metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness. The results would seem to suggest that multilingual approaches to teaching and learning have a positive reference at the linguistic and metalinguistic levels as well.

In the DMM, a so-called Multilingualism or M-factor unfolds as a property which comprises "a set of skills and abilities that the multilingual user develops owing to her/his prior linguistic and metacognitive knowledge" (Jessner, 2008, p. 275). This multilingual repertoire promotes new skills, which consist of three main parts: language learning skills, language management skills, and language maintenance skills. (Herdina and Jessner, 2002).

The focus of the research proposal is teaching English/German as third language in the Hungarian educational context. The aim of the study is to investigate the influence of cross-linguistic awareness on third language acquisition. Flynn and Berkes's article (2012) gives the theoretical framework of the research which focuses on explanatory model (CEP) for multiple language acquisition with special attention to the relationship between Hungarian, German and English languages. The first research question is whether students' level of multilingual awareness is higher at German minority primary schools in Hungary than at the Hungarian primary schools. The second question is how cross-linguistic influence affects the lexical repertoire in relation to the order of language acquisition (L2: German, L3: English, and vice versa).

Keywords: multilingualism, holistic view, cross-linguistic interaction, metalinguistic awareness, Dynamic Model of Multilingualism, multicompetence approach.

ABSTRACT

Питання вивчення іноземних отримує все більшу увагу в наші дні. Згідно з останніми статистичними даними, розмовляти більш, ніж однією мовою, все ще непоширене явище в Угорщині. Міжлінгвістична обізнаність заслуговує на більшу увагу при вивченні третьої мови та тримовності, оскільки ця сфера досліджень все ще враховується як пропущена область у дослідженні багатомовності. Більше того, надто мало уваги приділяється вивченню металінгвістичних навиків, пов'язаних з дослідженнями вивчення третьої мови (TLA) в освітньому контексті. Робота в класі, описана в статті, зосереджена на багатомовному, особливо металінгвістичному та міжмовному розумінні. Результати, здається, свідчать про те, що багатомовні підходи до викладання та навчання мають позитивні посилання на мовному та металінгвістичному рівнях. У центрі уваги – викладання англійської/німецької як третьої мови в угорському освітньому контексті. Метою дослідження є вивчення впливу міжмовної обізнаності на вивчення третьої мови. Перше питання в дослідженні полягає в тому, наскільки ступінь багатомовної обізнаності студентів є вищим у початкових школах німецької меншини в Угорщині, ніж у звичайних початкових школах. Друге питання полягає в тому, як впливає крос-лінгвістичний вплив на лексичний репертуар щодо порядку вивчення мови (L2: німецька, L3: англійська і навпаки).

1. INTRODUCTION

The majority of the world's population speaks more than one language in our globalised world. Amaro & de Bot & Rothman (2013) formulated due to the statistical estimations, „Although fewer than 2 percent of the nations of the world have two or more official languages, the number of multilinguals in the world far outweighs the number of monolinguals” (p. 373). There is evidence for the increasing contact between different languages due to the globalization processes. It is stated that “a linguistic repertoire certainly important in economic prosperity when individuals and societies are bound into international and global markets, but language education is important to individuals as citizens in democratic processes at national, regional and international levels” – says the document of the Hungarian language policy profile.¹

The answer to what extent we should be proficient in languages in order to be bi- or multilingual is still a hard and not fully answered question. Edwards (2013) formulates, “Even if we are able to gauge bilingual or multilingual capacities with some accuracy, there would remain problems of adequate labelling, for it is hardly to be expected that measured individuals would neatly fall into a small number of categories of ability.” (p. 13) Multilingualism is known as a phenomenon which is affected by psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic aspects. Literature on bilingualism takes into account different aspects related to bilingualism (Groto Butler, 2013): functional ability (receptive and productive bilingualism), the age of acquisition (simultaneous, sequential and late bilinguals), the relationship between language proficiencies in 2 languages (balanced and dominant bilingualism), the effect of L2 learning on the retention of L1 (additive and subtractive bilingualism),

the organization of ling. codes and meaning unit environment (elite/elective, and folk/circumstantial bilingualism). Expansion of multilingualism (social, cultural and linguistic changes) and the changes are deriving from globalisation, geographical and social mobility, economic and political transformations, and the omnipresence of technology. Nowadays, it is becoming more and more popular to see emerging multicultural and multilingual societies what Vertovec (2007) has named as “super diversity”. Multilingualism has become the backbone of these societies to a great extent because multilingualism can be seen in every field of life. Consequently, multilingualism regards as a new social phenomenon which they have called new linguistic dispensations and the language(s) got a new status quo. Multilingualism is viewed as a bidirectional process thanks to the new status quo condition. Multilingualism is ranging all over the world and it takes effect on every country, society and culture. We can talk about multilingualism which alters from one community to the other one and each community is considered to be multilingual in its own special way (in Edwards, 2013).

Various social elements reside in very different contexts and it is in practice due to the language users from that particular context. Two main factors can influence the emergence of multilingualism so an individual command of two or more languages is a natural process nowadays. Firstly, English spreads all over the world due to the political, historical, economic and technological development (see: Grosjean, 1992; Cook, 1995; Cenoz & Genesee, 1998; Jessner, 1999; Cenoz, 2005). Secondly, multilingualism can be a phenomenon thanks to the “mobility of the world population and the recognition of the autochthonous minority languages in some European regions, such as Galicia, Frisia, the Basque Country, Brittany, Wales, Ireland or Catalonia (see: Cenoz, 1997, 2005). These regions make their speaker

¹ https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Profile_Hungary_EN.pdf

to increase their linguistic repertoire because they sometimes do not have the possibility use their first languages at official sites like bureau, post, school or workplace (in Ortega, 2017). Multilingualism regards as a general phenomenon in the current era because youngsters often learn English parallel with many other languages (Hoffmann in Cenoz & Jessner, 2000). According to the latest statistical data, learning foreign languages and speaking more than one language is still be counted as a peculiarity in Europe.² The Eurobarometer survey indicated that Hungary has not gained a prominent place related to the knowledge of foreign languages compared to other European countries. The issue of learning English or German as a foreign language is receiving an increasing attention even in the Hungarian educational context (Jessner, 2008). As a consequence, language acquisition models need to interpret the processes which takes place amongst the languages involved in the speakers' linguistic repertoire. These innovations should be implemented in the teaching of foreign languages that can help learners in the acquisition process.

Literature on multilingualism and third language acquisition takes place in the second paragraph of the paper which is further divided into 4 main subsections. The first subsection discusses ideas about the multicompetence approach which is a stepping stone towards the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. The second subsection talks about the distinctions between second- and third language acquisition. The third subsection informs the reader about the Dynamic Systems Theory or Complexity Theory (DSCT) and about the dynamic view of multilingualism (Herdina and Jessner, 2002). The fourth subsection presents the innovations of multilingual pedagogies and multilingual view of teaching foreign languages in the classroom.

The research proposal connected to the Hungarian educational context is discussed in the third paragraph of this paper. Whilst, some concluding remarks and implications for the future are found in the fourth paragraph of the current article.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Multilingualism and multilingualism research have received more and more attention over the last decade. As Herdina and Jessner emphasize (2002), "research interest in the linguistic phenomenon of multilingualism has been increasing over the last decades" (p. 1) The term multilingualism carries several meanings with itself, however researchers haven't treated the terminology of multilingualism in much detail in the past. Previous studies have reported on L2 learning or bilingualism which are used as cover terms related to the field of multilingualism. According to Grosjean's definition (2010), there is no need for distinguishing bilingualism from multilingualism. Beyond Braun (1937), Jessner refers to Haugen (1956) who categorized multilingualism as part of bilingualism. Recently, a number of researchers share the opinion about the study of two languages that bilingualism can operate as a variant of multilingualism (Herdina and Jessner, 2002 in Jessner 2008). A great number of researchers share the view that language development should be adapted to the multilingual norm in the linguistic research. (Cenoz, 2013; Herdina and Jessner, 2002; Cenoz and Jessner, 2000; Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner, 2003; Cook, 2006). Herdina and Jessner (2002) published their work entitled by the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM) which can be contemplated as the core publication in the multilingual development from a dynamic point of view.

Research on third language acquisition (TLA) and trilingualism counts as a young disci-

² http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.html

pline in the field of linguistics. Third language acquisition is considered to be a rather innovative segment in language acquisition studies. The term TLA indicates ‘the acquisition of a language that is different from the first and the second and is acquired after them’ (Cenoz, 2013, p. 71). Cenoz uses the term third language in order to refer a language chronologically acquired after the first one or after the first 2 languages in case of early bilinguals. Distinctions between L2 and L3 have been often disregarded because it counts as a neglected area in bilingualism research and in second language acquisition (SLA). There are international and annual conferences (e.g.: International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism), edited volumes on TLA (Safont 2005; De Angelis 2007; Cenoz 2009; Aronin & Hufeisen 2009; Leung 2009; Lindqvist & Bartel 2010) and special journal (International Journal of Multilingualism) which serve as an evidence for the rise of TLA (cited in Cenoz, 2013).

Surveying the current literature, several works, studies and articles on trilingualism and third language acquisition appear to be a matter of curiosity: Cenoz & Jessner, 2000; Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner, 2003; Fouser & Hufeisen, 2005; Jessner, 2008. Two important books and one research study needs to be highlighted in the topic of linguistic awareness: Jessner, 2006; De Angelis, 2007; Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016. Additionally, one outstanding book has been found related to the specified research area which is Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner (2001).

2.1 Multi-competence approach

An important trend has appeared on the scene what one calls the multicompetence approach. The advent of the concept dated back to the birth of the bilingual perspective (Cook, 1992, 1996, 2013 in Jessner 2008), the term was frequently used especially in the field

of language acquisition and use. Multicompetence approach covers a wide range of notions in relation to learning and teaching multiple languages. Grosjean (1985) introduced the holistic perspective of bilingualism therefore this attitude maintains the idea of the fully competent speaker-hearer in both languages. A new approach which tries to connect the fields of SLA and bilingualism. This notion is derived from the definition of Cook (1991, p. 112) who defined this term “the compound state of mind with two grammars”. There is a definition of multi-competence which is more up to date: ‘the overall system of a mind or a community that uses more than one language’ (Cook, 2016). So multi-competence is claimed to be “a language super system”, which differs in distinctive ways from the language knowledge of monolinguals (in Opitz, 2011). Multi-competence introduces a different perspective of SLA based on L2 users rather than on the monolingual individual. Multi-competence cannot be considered either as a psychological or sociological concept. The notion is the nearest to the approach which views language as a constantly changing system. Cook brings forward the holistic view of multi-competence which treats the language systems of a bilingual/multilingual speaker not as two autonomous systems in one mind (Herdina and Jessner, 2002). Cook (1992) suggested the multicompetence view which means a qualitative distinction from the competence of the monolingual speaker (mono-competence). According to the multicompetence view, monolingual speakers have a different view of the world than their multilingual peers in terms of having more languages in their mind. Herdina and Jessner (2002) suggest in their work that current research on linguistics should be focused on the multilingual speaker and not on the monolingual individual. There is an increasing tendency towards the holistic view of multilingualism which has been appeared in different countries in the last decade. The focus on multilingualism issue

consists of three different entities: the multilingual speaker, the whole linguistic repertoire, and the social context.

Holistic view of multilingualism assumes that the development of multilingual competence is dynamic and involves changes in language acquisition and language use (Jessner, 2008). The appearance of Dynamic System Theory and Complexity theory is connected to the holistic view of multilingualism and multilingual development. The development of the multilingual system is described as a non-linear, reversible, stable, interdependent and complex system based on the theory of DCT (Aronin and Jessner, 2015). Multilingual system is viewed as an adaptive and dynamic organization so they can adjust to the altering communicative needs of the learner. Additionally, multilingual system works in a way that “language choices are psychologically and socially determined”. We should take into consideration that language development of multilinguals contains both acquisition and attrition processes (de Bot & Jaensch, 2013). The order of acquisition is another cardinal point from the dynamic point of view which is discussed in the next subsection of the second chapter.

2.2 Terminological challenges: second- and third language acquisition

Multilingualism research concentrates on more than two languages which can be resulted in a terminological confusion compared to the traditional monolingual norms. Multilingualism is based on mostly psycholinguistic aspects from the perspective of the DMM. According to Grosjean's definition (2010), there is no need for distinguishing bilingualism from multilingualism. Beyond Braun (1937), Jessner refers to Haugen (1956) who categorized multilingualism as part of bilingualism. Recently, a number of researchers share the opinion about the study of two

languages that bilingualism can operate as a variant of multilingualism (Jessner 2008). Some researchers believe in the fact that learning a third language (L3) has a same mechanism as learning a second language (L2) (e.g. Sharwood Smith 1994; Gass 1996 in Jessner 2008). Despite the fact that a growing number of scholars have a different point of view. If one takes a deeper look at this matter, major differences can be diagnosed between SLA and TLA. A major difference is apparent between SLA and TLA because learning an L3 should be treated variously than learning an L2 for many reasons. Consequently, one has to keep in mind that the notion of multilingualism can be used to the learning of more than 2 languages (Jessner, 2008). Referring the quotation of Jessner confirms that the main difference can be the point that the effect of the first language (L1) in learning or using a second language (L2) qualitatively differs from the influence of the L1 and L2 on acquiring an L3 (Jessner, 2006). The complexity of TLA resides in individual and psychosocial factors of language learning. Cenoz (2000) demonstrates the distinction between SLA and TLA/ multilingual acquisition with the help of 3 major differences: a) the order in which languages are learned, b) sociolinguistic factors, and c) the psycholinguistic processes involved. Learning an additional language was an easier task for multilinguals than monolinguals on the basis of some research: Cenoz, 2003; De Angelis, 2007; Jessner, 1999, 2006; Kemp, 2001; Lasagabaster, 1997, 2000; Ringbom, 1987 (cited in Jessner, 2008). The scope of multilingualism is to observe the various differences between Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Third Language Acquisition (TLA). According to Jessner (2007), bilingualism and SLA differs from trilingualism and TLA, thus L3 learners promote a kind of metasystem which varies from the metasystem found in SLA research. It has been demonstrated that the choice of supporter languages (the so called

“bridge” languages) are dependent on several factors and these languages unravel atypical patterns from those found in SLA and bilingualism research (Jessner, 2006). In contrast to SLA studies, the routes of learning or order of acquisition shows a greater variety in multilingual acquisition. The DMM creates the terms of primary, secondary, tertiary language systems in the development of a multilingual system in order to make distinction from the L1, L2 and L3 notions (Jessner, 2008). However it is not considered to be a totally new terminology, its relevance is more essential in case of learning two or more languages. Multilingual speakers’ language change is often related to the communicative situation where they can adapt more easily than their monolingual peers.

2.3 Dynamic Complexity/Systems Theory (DCT/DST) and Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM)

The next subsection examines dynamic systems or complexity theory (DCT) which applies to multilingualism with regard to the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM). DCT approach serves as a prerequisite in order to understand better the evolution of multi-competence related to the learners and this conceptualization helps the teachers from the perspective of multilingual approaches in the language classroom. Taking the DMM as a basis, one supposes a connection between third language acquisition and multilingual/metalinguistic awareness (MLA). DCT looks at the multilingual system as an open organization that is reliant on various factors like social or psychological ones (Aronin & Jessner, 2014).

Herdina and Jessner (2002) suggest in their work that current research on linguistics should be focused on the multilingual speaker and not on the monolingual individual. Multilingual proficiency is viewed as individual multilingualism and this proficiency can be regarded as a fluctuating and not as a stable construction. It is identified as the dynamic correlation

between the different psycholinguistic systems (LS1, LS2, LS3) in which the individual languages are included (Jessner, 2008). From the viewpoint of DMM, multilingualism relates to those languages that one can acquire after the second one. So DMM can serve as a link between Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Multilingual Research (MR) (Herdina and Jessner, 2002). The multilingual model seems to be a learner oriented one as the learner stands in the centre of the language acquisition. There are several characteristics for the dynamic model of multilingualism which are recognized as non-linearity, reversibility, stability, interdependence, the change of quality, stability and complexity. A dynamic perspective of the multilingual speakers’ learning system puts together the learner-oriented system and the changes within the language systems. Furthermore, the relationship between socio- and psycholinguistic factors need to be taken into account so a holistic approach makes possible to understand the behaviour and organisation of multilingual systems.

Language acquisition recognizes as a complex and dynamic process. According to the DMM, the multilingual system should be seen from a psycholinguistic aspect therefore language is treated at the individual level. Additionally, the dynamic view regards the speaker as an intricate psycholinguistic system. Using a dynamic view is quite reasonable: languages are in permanent motion and the language systems are interrelated. In the focus of this view stands “the understanding of the behaviour and the organization of the living systems” (Jessner, 2003, p. 235). Van Geert formulated so that a dynamic system is nothing more than ‘... a set of variables that mutually affect each other’s changes over time’ (Jessner, 2003, p. 235). The next issue deals with the relationship between language attrition and maintenance as they are key components from the dynamic view of multilingualism. Language systems have their own dynamism related to the DMM so attrition and mainte-

nance take place in the process. “According to the dynamic systems approach, the process of language acquisition is modelled as mirrored in the process of language attrition” (de Bot & Weltens, 1991 quoted in Jessner, 2003). Language maintenance is strongly related to language attrition because of a very simple reason. If one language system is maintained by the learner, the other one consequently should be eroded due to lack of its frequent usage. Language attrition can be explained by the process of active competition amongst the language systems (Herdina and Jessner, 2000). This interpretation assumes that languages are not only required to acquire through certain efforts but they need to be maintained, as well. Language maintenance work is considered to be one of the pillars in multilingual acquisition. The absence of language maintenance work may be one of the probable reasons in relation to language loss. The DMM offers a certain interpretation in order to make the relationship between language maintenance and attrition crystal-clear from the viewpoint of multilingual acquisition. This model indicates that these two processes go hand in hand in the multilingual system (Herdina and Jessner, 2000, Fig.1., p. 136). The first one is a gradual process of attrition while the second one is the gradual process of replacement. It is believed that multilingual proficiency is reliant on the amount of effort which the individual puts into the maintenance of his/her language system. The dynamic balance is one of the most important issues related to the DMM and creating equilibrium between language attrition and acquisition is possible with the help of the key factor of language maintenance (Jessner quoted Cook, 2003). Language maintenance plays a significant role with regard to the stability of the language system. The stability of the language system can be eroded due to the lack of time and energy invested in the maintenance of the language system. Language systems are interdependent and they cannot be viewed

as autonomous systems within the psycholinguistic model. Besides of the systems stability, subject-specific parameters specify the complexity and the variability of the system. The given systems operate with the notion of cross linguistic influence concerning the structure and development of these systems.

Proceeding from DMM, the so-called Multilingualism or M-factor evolves from an emergent property that “is made up of a set of skills and abilities that the multilingual user develops owing to her/his prior linguistic and metacognitive knowledge” (Jessner, 2008a, p. 275). In the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (Herdina and Jessner, 2002) new emergent skills, that is language learning skills, language management skills, and language maintenance skills characterize the multilingual repertoire. These proficiency skills are strongly related to multilingual awareness which is divided into metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness (Jessner 2006). Metalinguistic awareness (MLA) includes the set of skills /abilities which develop owing to prior linguistic and metacognitive knowledge. The influence of MLA can be a determining and beneficial factor with the regard of further language learning in the long run. Cross-linguistic awareness (XLA) is understood as the awareness of the relationships between languages expressed “tacitly or explicitly during language production and use” (Jessner, 2006, p. 116). Cross-linguistic interaction (CLIN) is considered to be one of the key components in the DMM. CLIN includes codeswitching and borrowing besides transfer and interference phenomena.

2.4 Multilingual education and multilingual methodologies: new perspectives

There is a growing number of literature on multilingualism research and on multilingual education. Despite of the fact that the multilingual approach has several advantages, one has to keep in mind that this field of research

is at an early stage related to multilingual education. One should understand the beneficial effect of multilingual approach in language teaching which can be utilized in the multilingual classroom (Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016). The number of third language studies has been getting larger over the last ten years. Some of the studies deal with lexical transfer phenomena in TLA which gives evidence for activation of other than the target language from cross-linguistic aspects. The present study provides additional evidence with respect to the research conducted on emergent multilingual awareness in case of children in the Austrian school context. The benefits of multilingual proficiency can be exploited to the full if one can focus on the advantages of multilingualism. As Jessner mentions (2008), a reorientation is needed towards the dynamics of multilingualism instead of remaining by the conventional monolingual norm. One can take multilingualism for granted with the help of the application of multicompetence view related to language proficiency of the learner. Multicompetence approach can help to face with the multifaceted challenges of multilingual education (Jessner, 2008). Multilingual advantage involves emergent skills on the level of higher creativity and mental organization (flexibility in thinking). Multilingual awareness exists at different levels so it can take an effect on learners, on teachers, on the interaction between teachers and learners and on the common curriculum in the educational setting. One can develop meta-competences in multilinguals which should be trained in the classroom context. Teachers should be aware of minority languages in the classroom because they can understand their students better with the help of using multilingual methodology in the education (Jessner et al, 2016). Multicompetence approaches give alternatives to language development in the classroom. Teachers should promote mul-

tilingual awareness in students and they need to take part in multilingual training programs in order to develop multilingual materials for their students (Herdina and Jessner, 2002).

The objective of the multilingual methodology is to introduce some ideas about classroom activities (e.g. Multilingual Seminar) through examples in case of upper-secondary school classes based on the Austrian school context. All of the participants were aged between 16 and 18 years and they are at different levels related to the proficiency in these languages. There is some evidence that multilingual activities may affect language learning due to the examples below. One of the possible utilizations is to focus on MLA and XLA training in the language classroom related to the Multilingual Seminar. One of the greatest assets of MLA and XLA training is that we can compare and contrast different structures, vocabulary and concepts amongst instructed languages and languages that are taught at home. Teachers have the possibility to introduce a new grammatical unit with the help of prior language knowledge of students (Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016).

Moreover, EUROCOM approach has played a vital role in generating tertiary language learning from the view of the multilingual approach. The EUROCOM programme was firstly adapted to the European context and therefore to the European language families. The aim of this method is to mark one supporter language which helps to understand and to analyse the texts to the learners. Hufeisen and Marx (2014) call this innovative approach the Seven Sieves method that refers to the seven different linguistic analysis, including international vocabulary, morphology and syntax, pronunciation, orthography, and prefixes and suffixes. This method is becoming increasingly popular amongst young adults because it can enhance the metalinguistic awareness owing to the exciting

structures in the multilingual classroom (in Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016).

From a DCT aspect, “knowledge is a process of language using and language use is strongly related to language proficiency” (Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016). Unfortunately, languages are taught in an isolated manner in the majority of cases in Austrian schools. Although this may be true, most of teachers maintain the respectabilities with regard to the teaching methods. Jessner et al. (2016) argues that teachers need to be encouraged in order to accept the multilingual approaches in language teaching: Allowing switches to other languages helps the students exploit their “multilingual monitor” which, in turn, enhances their linguistic, communicative, and cognitive abilities. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that Multilingual Seminar classes indicate the path to the process of new learning strategies.

Allgäuer-Hackl and her peers (2016) deal with the work-out of new reading, listening and speaking strategies in the hope of the “cross-language” approach. This case demonstrates the need for better strategies related to language learning because it has a motivational force to the students, as well. With respect to this, multilingual approaches should be extended to all schools thereby students have the opportunity to benefit from the multilingual learning environments. As explained earlier, we need to pay attention to the role of teachers in the teaching and learning procedure and not just to the students. Research findings (as García (2008), Otwinowska (2014), and Stratilaki (2012)) show that teachers need to be aware of the multilingual competencies which lead to the positive outcome of language teaching. When one gives reference to the topic of multilingual awareness in the classroom, one should take into consideration the psycholinguistic perspectives of multilingualism. Otwinowska (2014) found that teachers should promote multilingual

awareness which is based on cross-linguistic and metalinguistic knowledge and knowledge about pluri- and multilingual approaches. Teachers need to be aware of multilingual awareness in order to handle plurilingualism in the right place (in: Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016).

De Angelis (2011) noted that teachers know a little about interaction of languages in the mind or they do not realize the linguistic and cognitive advantages of bi- and multilingualism. They tend to look at the heritage language not as a supporter language in the classroom when students start to acquire their additional language in the frame of instructed setting. In terms of multilingualism in the classroom, developing the concept of multi-competence is one of the key issues, as well. Herdina and Jessner (2002) maintain the idea that managing more than one language is considered to be a defiance to the students but balancing between languages can enhance learners’ flexible and creative thinking. Teachers’ role cannot be inessential in this regard, because they should reconsider the issue of code-switching and code mixing or trans-languaging. Further improvements need to be implemented in the language classroom such as no languages are excluded or the non-target languages are allowed to use in order to help the host languages in the multilingual classroom. Last but not least, the cooperation and team work are indisputably important factors in the advancement of teaching materials regarding to specific conditions like in the case of multilingual education. One feasible approach is the so-called PlurCur project which is situated at the European Centre for Modern Languages (Allgäuer-Hackl, Brogan, Henning, Hufeisen, & Schlabach, 2015). The aim of this project is to be suited to the whole-school curricula where language learning and teaching are strongly related to each other and one can take account of the individuals’ language repertoire.

3. RESEARCH PROPOSAL

The scope of the research is learning English/German as third language (L3) in the Hungarian educational context. The aim of the study is to investigate the influence of cross-linguistic awareness on third language acquisition. The article of Flynn and Berkes (2012) partly gives the theoretical framework of the research. It focuses on explanatory model for multiple language acquisition (Cumulative Enhancement Model): in relation to Hungarian, English and German. The research questions were formulated after having read the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. The first research question is whether students' level of multilingual awareness is higher at German minority primary schools in Hungary than at the Hungarian primary schools. The second question is how cross-linguistic influence affects the lexical repertoire in relation to the order of language acquisition (L2: German, L3: English, and vice versa). The establishment of the research context was the major goal in January and the task was to collect primary schools in the region of County Vas, Győr-Moson Sopron and Veszprém. I searched for the schools according to the given criteria (school types: nationality primary school vs. normal primary school, foreign languages: English and German, order of acquisition).

As far as the research context is concerned, data will be collected both from minority and normal primary schools in Hungary. The first group will be students who are learning German as L2 and English as an L3 (from the 5th grade). While, the second group will contain students who are learning English as L2 and German as an L3 (from the 5th grade). Tests will be used in order to assess students' proficiency level from the starting point of acquiring the L3. Furthermore, a questionnaire will be filled in by the students, which aims to measure motivation, attitude and teacher's support after the language courses. A longer time frame is needed in order to plan

the detailed observations because one has to visit the schools for several times. This will be a comparative study so one needs to collect a great amount of data in order to take a deeper look at the situation related to both types of schools in a detailed manner. Carrying out the research will last approximately 3 years that is why it will be advantageous to concentrate on younger multilingual individuals (primary school learners). Focusing on upper-grade learners can be ideal, because 5th graders start learning a new language (L3) from that particular age. Concentrating on the theoretical and methodological parts of the research will be one of the most important goals for the future. Additionally, it is crucial that one has to make effort on compiling tests and questionnaires. Permissions are still needed in order to start observations at schools although consultations are already in process with one or two schools. A cooperation will be held between Austria and Hungary in the frame of a joint project (probably January 2019) therefore working on the details of this future collaboration is the next goal related to the plans.

4. CONCLUSION

The aim of this current article is to present the research proposal based on the newest research on multilingualism, especially on third language acquisition (TLA) and trilingualism. The reader encounters the different views on bi- and multilingualism and therefore one can explore the distinctions between second and third language acquisition. Dynamic Systems Theory taken by Herdina and Jessner (2002) creates an opportunity for negotiating the multilingual phenomena. The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism evolves from the Dynamic Systems Theory which serves as a basis for the current research proposal. So DMM can serve as a link between SLA research and research on bilingualism (Herdina and Jessner, 2002).

Although multilingual acquisition has already existed in the past century, the attitude towards multilingualism favours the attention due to the introduction of foreign language(s) at an early age in the school context, to the spread of English as lingua franca worldwide, and to the changing status of minority languages. Scholars start to examine the process of multilingual acquisition from the last decade. The studies support the idea of complexity in learning additional languages and language learners have all the languages in their repertoire even they are in the passive status. Their languages are generally related to each other and they are all the time in contact: languages influence each other, they complement each other. The issue of negative interference should be reconsidered because more positive effects are visible than negative one seeing the interrelatedness of languages. According to the new results, multiple language learning should be encouraged in the educational setting. The interaction between languages is becoming more and more important thanks to the changing world. The heterogeneity of students is a natural issue in the 21st century classroom and it means a trial to the language teachers (Ortega, 2017).

The article written by Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer (2016) is designed to determine the pedagogical effect of multilingual awareness in the language classroom from the DST perspective. There are findings related to this field of research which support the idea of teaching strategies with the help of multilin-

gual approach in the multilingual classroom in Austrian context (Jessner and Allgäuer-Hackl 2014; Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl and Hofer, 2016). The majority of the explorations were carried out by Jessner and other members of the DYME. Findings from these studies focus on the benefits of multilingualism approach in the classroom. According to Jessner (2016), students profit more from multilingual classroom approaches than from traditional monolingual approaches for their linguistic and metalinguistic knowledge (p. 159). The research proposal was organized from the perspective of multi-competence approach in relation of three languages: Hungarian, English and German. The chosen model of the future research is the DMM taken by Herdina and Jessner (2002) and the Cumulative Enhancement Model of Flynn and Berkes (2012). The major goal is to work on the methodological and practical part of the research which can be started in the near future.

As a final remark, one should pay more attention to the topic of multilingualism in the school context for two reasons. English has become as an international language with its spread all over the world and our society is constantly modifying due to globalization and mobility. Teachers need to be aware of cross-linguistic comparisons and the challenging task of multiple language acquisition. Younger generation learn several languages besides of their mother tongue so it would be reasonable to evaluate the whole linguistic repertoire of these people in this changing world.

REFERENCES

1. Allgäuer-Hackl, E. & Brogan, K. & Henning, U. & Hufeisen, B. & Schlabach, J. (2015). *MehrSprachen? – PlurCur! Berichte aus Forschung und Praxis zu Gesamtsprachencurricula*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren
2. Amaro, C. J. & Rothman, J. & de Bot, K. (2013). Third Language Acquisition. In Herschensohn, J. and Young-Scholten, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 372–393.
3. Aronin, L. and Jessner, U. (2014). Methodology in Bi- and Multilingual Studies. From simplification to complexity. *AILA Review*, Volume 27, Issue 1, pp. 56–79.
4. Berkes, É. & Flynn, S. (2012). Further evidence in support of the Cumulative-Enhancement Model: CP structure development. In Amaro, C. J., Flynn, S. & Rothman, J. (eds.), *Third Language Acquisition in Adulthood (Studies in Bilingualism 46)*, pp. 143–164. Philadelphia – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
5. Cenoz, J. & Jessner, U. (eds.) (2000). *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon – Buffalo – Toronto – Sydney: Multilingual Matters
6. Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*, Volume 46, Issue 1, pp. 71–86.
7. Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B. & Jessner, U. (eds.) (2003). *The Multilingual Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers
8. Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B. and Jessner, U. (eds.) (2001). *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Clevedon – Buffalo – Toronto – Sydney: Multilingual Matters
9. De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Clevedon – Buffalo – Toronto: Multilingual Matters
10. De Bot, K. & Jaensch, C. (2013). What is special about L3 processing? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. FirstView Article, pp. 1–15.
11. De Zarobe, L. R. & de Zarobe, Y. (2015). New perspectives on multilingualism and L2 acquisition an introduction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. pp. 393–403. Source: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14790718.2015.1071021> (Downloaded: 01.02.2020.)
12. Edwards, J. (2013). Bilingualism and Multilingualism: Some Central Concepts. In Bathia, T. K. & Ritchie, W., *Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Source: <https://clil.pedagog.uw.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Edwards-2013.pdf> (Downloaded: 01.02.2020.)
13. Fouser, R. J. & Hufeisen, B. (2005). *Introductory Readings in L3*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag
14. Grosjean, F. (1985). “The Bilingual as a Competent But Specific Speaker-Hearer.” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Volume 6, Issue 6. pp. 467–77.
15. Herdina, P. & Jessner, U. (2000). Multilingualism as an Ecological System. The case for language maintenance. In Ketteman, B. and Penz, H. (eds.) *ECONstructing Language, Nature and Society. The Ecolinguistic Project Revisited. Festschrift für Alwin Fill* (pp.131–44). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag
16. Herdina, P. & Jessner, U. (2002). *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspective of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon – Buffalo – Toronto – Sydney: Multilingual Matters. Source: <https://www.jbeplatform.com/docserver/fulltext/aila.27.03aro.pdf?expires=1580898811&id=id&acname=guest&checksum=8D4E764B7599E806771C598290E4549A> (Downloaded: 01.02.2020.)
17. Jessner, U. & Allgäuer-Hackl, E. & Hofer, B. (2016). Emerging Multilingual Awareness in Educational Contexts: From Theory to Practice. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Volume 72, Issue 2, pp. 157–182.
18. Jessner, U. & Allgäuer-Hackl, E. (2014). „Und was sagt die Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung dazu?“. *Neue Perspektiven in der Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung und deren Relevanz für Unterricht und Lehrerinnenbildung*. In Wegner, A. und Vetter, E. (eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit und Professionalisierung in pädagogischen Berufen: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zu aktuellen Herausforderungen im Bildungsbereich*. Opladen – Berlin – Toronto: Budrich
19. Jessner, U. (2003). The Nature of Cross-Linguistic Interaction in the Multilingual System. In Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., Jessner U. (eds.), *The Multilingual Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers
20. Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic Awareness in Multilingualism: English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
21. Jessner, U. (2008a). A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, Volume 92, Issue 2, pp. 270–283.

22. Jessner, U. (2008b). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, Volume 41, Issue 1, pp. 15–56.
23. Language Education Policy Profile: Hungary. Language policy division Strassbourg. Ministry of Education. Department of International Relations Hungary. 2002–2003. Source: <https://rm.coe.int/language-education-policy-profile-hungary/16807b3c2d> (Downloaded: 21.06.2018.)
24. Opitz, C. (2011). First Language Attrition and Second Language Acquisition in a Second Language Environment. Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics University of Dublin, Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies
25. Ortega-Duran, M. (2017). Is the acquisition of multiple languages a challenge? *Verbeia*, Año I, Número 1, pp. 143–159.
26. Public Opinion in the EU. Eurobarometer 81. European Commission. Spring 2014. Source: https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb81/eb81_publ_en.pdf (Downloaded: 01.09.2018.)

