

剑桥应用语言学丛书
CAMBRIDGE APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Language Transfer

**Cross-linguistic influence
in language learning**

语言迁移

——**语言学习的语际影响**

Terence Odlin



外教社

上海外语教育出版社

剑桥应用语言学丛书

CAMBRIDGE APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Series Editors: Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards

Language Transfer

**Cross-linguistic influence
in language learning**

语言迁移

—— **语言学习的语际影响**

Terence Odlin



外教社

上海外语教育出版社

H09
O219

Language Transfer

Cross-linguistic influence in
language learning

Terence Odlin

The Ohio State University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

语言迁移: 语言学习的语际影响 / (美) 奥德林 (Odlin, T.) 著. —上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2001

(剑桥应用语言学丛书)

书名原文: Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning

ISBN 7-81080-288-7

I. 语… II. 奥… III. 语言教学—研究—英文 IV. H09

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字 (2001) 第068388 号

图字: 09-2001-161 号

出版发行: 上海外语教育出版社

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300 (总机), 65422031 (发行部)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflep.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflep.com.cn> <http://www.sflep.com>

责任编辑: 刘华初

印 刷: 常熟市印刷八厂

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 889×1194 1/32 印张 7 字数 300 千字

版 次: 2001 年 10 月第 1 版 2001 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 3 500 册

书 号: ISBN 7-81080-288-7 / H · 112

定 价: 14.00 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题, 可向本社调换

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1989

First published 1989

Fourth printing 1994

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Odlin, Terence.

Language transfer / Terence Odlin.

p. cm. — (Cambridge applied linguistics series)

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-521-37168-6 hardback. ISBN 0-521-37809-5 paperback

1. Language transfer (Language learning). I. Title. II. Series.

P118.25.035 1989

418 — dc19

88-30760

CIP

British Library Cataloging in Publication Data

Odlin, Terence

Language transfer. — (The Cambridge applied linguistics series).

1. Foreign languages. Learning. Role of native languages.

I. Title

418'.007

ISBN 0-521-37168-6 hardback

ISBN 0-521-37809-5 paperback

Originally published by Cambridge University Press in 1989

This reprint edition is published with the permission of the Syndicate of the Press of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England.

Licensed for distribution and sale in the People's Republic of China only and may not be distributed and sold elsewhere.

本书由剑桥大学出版社授权上海外语教育出版社出版。

仅供在中华人民共和国境内销售。

出版前言

1999年5月至2000年6月间,上海外语教育出版社先后出版了从牛津大学出版社引进的“牛津应用语言学丛书”19种、“牛津语言学入门丛书”6种和“牛津应用语言学丛书续编”10种,受到了外语界师生的一致好评和欢迎。为了向我国的外语教学与研究人员提供更多的有关专著,帮助读者了解近年来国外应用语言学和外语教学研究的理论,促进我国外语教学研究水平的提高,上海外语教育出版社又精心挑选了剑桥大学出版社的应用语言学丛书10种,形成与“牛津应用语言学丛书”相辅相成的“剑桥应用语言学丛书”。相信这套丛书也同样能开阔我国学者的视野,通过借鉴国外研究成果,进一步总结我国自己的外语教学经验,形成具有中国特色的外语教学理论。

《语言迁移:语言学习的语际影响》是一本有关第二语言习得中母语研究的学术专著,作者特伦斯·奥德林(Terence Odlin)是美国俄亥俄州州立大学英语系副教授。该书初版于1989年,至1994年已是第四次印刷。

语言迁移长期以来一直是外语教师关注的研究课题。20世纪50年代,语言迁移研究在第二语言习得理论和第二语言教学法中占重要地位。到了60年代,随着错误分析的深入,学习者所犯的的错误被看作是学习过程中出现的问题,而并非语言迁移的作用。赞同乔姆斯基普遍语法观点的则否认语言迁移现象的存在。时至今日,语言迁移在第二语言习得中的作用得到了广泛的承认,并已形成了较为全面的理论。

本书作者对不同母语的英语学习者中介语进行了研究,根据研究所获得的数据及相关文献对语言迁移现象的本质及其在第二语言习得中的作用作了全面独到的阐述。全书共有十章。第一章是总述,简要说明语言迁移研究的重要性和复杂性。第二章对话

言迁移这一概念及有关争议作了简短的历史回顾。第三章解释了语言迁移研究中四种常见的问题。第四、五、六、七章分别从语言学的不同分支,如语篇、语义(包括词法)、句法、语音学、音系学和写作体系,探讨了第二语言习得中语言迁移的影响及其与普遍语法的关系。第八章详细论述了影响个人语言习得差异的因素,从而进一步揭示语言迁移在第二语言学习中的作用。第九章结合最新研究成果对上述研究作总结。第十章谈论了语言迁移研究成果对语言教学的启示。

本书的特点是理论结合实践。作者以不同母语的英语学习者的学习实例为基础阐述语言迁移,深入浅出,简洁易懂,并对有关的术语以通俗的语言加以解释,可读性强。本书对加深和拓宽读者对第二语言习得过程的理解,对提高和改进英语教与学有一定的指导意义。

本书的读者对象为外语教师、应用语言学家和教育研究人员,也可供英语专业研究生及其他读者参考使用。

In memory of Walter Odlin
1908–1985

Series editors' preface

Language transfer has been a central issue in applied linguistics, second language acquisition, and language teaching for at least a century. Within the last few decades, however, its importance in second language learning has been reassessed several times. In the 1950s it was often deemed the most important factor to consider in theories of second language learning as well as in approaches to second language teaching. In the 1960s its importance waned as learners' errors were seen not as evidence of language transfer but rather of "the creative construction process." Some researchers virtually denied the existence of language transfer in their enthusiasm for universalist explanations. In recent years, however, a more balanced perspective has emerged in which the role of transfer is acknowledged and in which transfer is seen to interact with a host of other factors in ways not yet fully understood.

This reassessment of the significance of language transfer is lucidly demonstrated in this new addition to the Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. In this timely book, Terry Odlin presents a comprehensive and original account of the nature of language transfer and its role in second language acquisition. Dr. Odlin documents the historical development of the concept of language transfer, explores the role of transfer in discourse, semantics, syntax, phonology, and writing systems, and examines the way language transfer interacts with linguistic as well as cultural, social, and personal factors in second language learning and use. In the process, he surveys a large body of literature and examines data from many different languages.

Dr. Odlin's analysis challenges simplistic notions of language transfer and offers instead a convincing account of the process as a phenomenon that is fundamental to research in second language acquisition and applied linguistics. This book will hence be invaluable to students entering the field of second language acquisition, researchers, language teachers, and anyone interested in the fundamental question of how language systems interact during the process of sec-

ond language acquisition. We are therefore delighted to be able to make Dr. Odlin's research available to a wider audience through the Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series.

Michael H. Long
Jack C. Richards

Preface

The significance of cross linguistic influences has long been a controversial topic. As this book indicates, the controversy has had a long life not only among second language teachers and researchers, but also among linguists interested in questions of language contact and language change. Although it would be too much to hope that this book will cause such a long-standing controversy to die, the discussion of transfer here may help to set to rest some dubious claims and to point the way toward more productive thinking about cross-linguistic influences. While I have tried hard to avoid the sweeping claims that unfortunately have been frequent in discussions of transfer, I make no secret of my belief that transfer is an extremely important factor in second language acquisition. The available evidence, I feel, warrants that belief. Thus, the focus of this book is on empirical investigations of learners' behavior in many contexts. There is some discussion of the pedagogical implications of certain investigations, but it seems to me that relatively little is known about the best ways to make use of transfer research in the classroom – hopefully, more teachers and teacher trainers will begin to think about what those ways are. There is also some discussion of theoretical work in other areas of linguistics, but I have made efforts to limit that discussion, which could go on interminably, and to limit the jargon that usually accompanies such discussion. Readers familiar with *Government and Binding*, *Schema Theory*, and *Sprachbund* will not find those terms, though they will note allusions to research using those terms. Some background in linguistics will be helpful in reading certain chapters (especially Chapter 7), but the glossary provided should help with some of the terminology that seemed impossible to avoid.

While this book has just one author, there are many people who have helped bring about whatever may be praiseworthy in it. In my graduate work I had the good fortune to take courses with Diana Natalicio, who recognized the seriousness of challenges to contrastive analysis in the 1960s and 1970s but who also recognized that the most extreme – albeit fashionable – criticisms of work on transfer were themselves open to challenges. Some of the more novel ideas in this book owe a great deal

to work by Jacquelyn Schachter, Sarah Grey Thomason, and Eric Kellerman, all of whom also provided valuable feedback on a number of my ideas. As this work took shape, Jack Richards provided much encouragement and support – without his interest, this book might never have been finished. Ellen Shaw and Linda Grossman of Cambridge University Press helped in many ways to see the manuscript through the final stages. I would also like to thank several people who made my search for studies of transfer easier by sending me some of their work: Christian Adjemian, David Birdsong, Susan Gass, Lynn Eubank, Markku Filppula, John Hinds, Richard Schmidt, David Singleton, and Lydia White. Many thanks are also due to Lisa Kiser, Alan Brown, and other members of the Department of English at Ohio State who provided valuable comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript. Moreover, I received many forms of assistance from friends and colleagues in the Department of English, the Department of Linguistics, the programs in English as a Second Language, and also from members of the Linguistics Institute of Ireland. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the generous support provided by other units at Ohio State, including the College of Humanities, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and the Instructional and Research Computation Center. Finally, I would like to thank my family for their encouragement not only with this project but with much else besides.

Contents

Series editors' preface	ix
Preface	xi
1 Introduction	1
2 Earlier thinking on transfer	6
2.1 Languages (and dialects) in contact	6
2.2 Transfer as a controversy in language teaching	15
3 Some fundamental problems in the study of transfer	25
3.1 Problems of definition	25
3.2 Problems of comparison	28
3.3 Problems of prediction	35
3.4 Problems of generalization	43
4 Discourse	48
4.1 Politeness	49
4.2 Coherence	58
4.3 Discourse transfer and other factors	64
4.4 Summary and conclusion	69
5 Semantics	71
5.1 Propositional semantics	71
5.2 Lexical semantics	77
5.3 Summary and conclusion	83
6 Syntax	85
6.1 Word order	85
6.2 Relative clauses	97
6.3 Negation	104
6.4 Summary and conclusion	110
7 Phonetics, phonology, and writing systems	112
7.1 General versus specific predictions	112

7.2	Phonetic and phonological transfer	113
7.3	Pronunciation, language universals, and typologies	120
7.4	Writing systems	124
7.5	Summary and conclusion	127
8	Nonstructural factors in transfer	129
8.1	Individual variation	130
8.2	Transfer and age of acquisition	136
8.3	Transfer, linguistic awareness, and social context	140
9	Looking back and looking ahead	151
9.1	Some caveats	151
9.2	Some conclusions	152
9.3	Some areas for further research	155
10	Implications for teaching	157
	Glossary	165
	References	171
	Language index	197
	Author index	200
	Subject index	205

1 Introduction

When people hear a speaker with a “foreign accent,” they often try to guess the speaker’s background. Sometimes racial features and sometimes a style of clothing will help listeners guess correctly, but often the only reliable clue seems to be how the individual talks. In such cases, questions put to the speaker such as “Are you German?” or “Are you Spanish?” suggest an intuition about the nature of language, an awareness, however unconscious, that the native language of a speaker can somehow cause the individual to sound “foreign” in speaking another language.

The detection of foreign accents is just one example of the awareness that people may often have of *cross-linguistic influence*, which is also known as *language transfer*.¹ That awareness is also evident from time to time in opinions that people have about foreign language study. Many believe that the study of one language (e.g., Latin) will make easier the study of a closely related language (e.g., French). Similarly, people often believe that some languages are “easy” in comparison with others. For example, many English-speaking university students see European languages such as French as less difficult than Oriental languages such as Chinese. Since the similarities between English and French seem to be relatively great, French is often considered “easy.”

An awareness of language transfer is also evident in the mimicking of foreigners. While the representation of foreigners in ethnic jokes is often crude in more ways than one, stereotypes of the way foreigners talk are sometimes highly developed among actors. The following passage comes from a manual to train English-speaking actors in the use of different foreign accents, in this case a Russian one:

Oh! I very good fellow! why? because I Cossack. I very big Cossack. Yah! I captain of Royal Cossack Guard in Moscow – in old country. Oh! I got fifty – hundred – five hundred Cossack they was under me. I be big mans. And womens, they love me lots. Nastia Alexanderovna – she big ballet dancer in Czar ballet – Countess Irina Balushkovna, she love me. All womens they love

1 A more extended definition and also a justification of the term *transfer* appear in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1).

2 Language transfer

me. And men? Ach! they be 'fraid from me. They hating me. Why? because I big Cossack. I ride big horse. Drink lots vodka. Oh! I very big mans.
(Herman and Herman 1943:340)

The manual provides a pronunciation guide for this passage so that actors can make their phonetic mimicry seem plausible, but a number of grammatical features in the passage also seem to be “typically Russian,” such as the absence of an article and a copula in *I very good fellow*. Another passage in the same manual provides a very different linguistic – and ethnic – stereotype. While the Irishwoman’s speech in the following passage might be that of a monolingual speaker of English, it is similar to stereotypical portrayals of Irish-English bilinguals by modern Irish playwrights:

And what business is it of yours that I be awake or no? Be what right do you come snooping after me, following me like a black shadow. Are youse never going to leave me alone? Yous’d be after doing better minding your own business and letting me for to mind mine. For I have an ache in me long-suffering heart and lashin’s of pain cutting through me brain like a dull knife. And me eyes is looking at a world that’s not of your living. For it’s a revelation I’m after having – a view into the banshee world of devils and spirits and the dear departed dead now rotting their whitened bones under the cold, black sod. Ah! sure, now, and it’s the likes of you and your friends that call themselves sane, that disbelieves in what I’m after seeing and knowing. (Herman and Herman 1943:100)

Analogous to the Russian passage, some of the grammatical features in the Irishwoman’s speech appear to be stereotypically Irish: for example, the syntactic pattern in *what I’m after seeing and knowing*, which in standard English would be *what I have seen and known*. While these portrayals of accents may seem exaggerated, they do typify the use of special linguistic structures to characterize the speech of bilinguals.²

The distinctiveness of foreign accents often seems understandable in light of cross-linguistic comparisons. For example, Russian does not have present tense copula forms such as *am* or articles such as *a*, and so omissions of the copula and indefinite article in *I very good fellow* may seem to be clearly due to a difference in the grammatical systems of Russian and English. The comparison of such differences, which is known technically as **contrastive analysis**, has long been a part of second language pedagogy, and in the twentieth century contrastive analyses have become more and more detailed.³ Since such cross-linguistic comparisons constitute an indispensable basis for the study of transfer, the

2 The Irishwoman’s speech is a more accurate characterization than what is often found in so-called Stage Irish (cf. Bliss 1978; Sullivan 1980).

3 Technical terms that appear in the glossary (see page 165) are indicated by boldface at their first occurrence.

discussion of second language research in this book will frequently include contrastive observations.

In light of such everyday abilities as the recognition and mimicry of foreign accents and in light of common beliefs about cross-linguistic similarities and differences, there appears to be a widespread assumption that language transfer is an important characteristic of second language acquisition. It might seem obvious that many characteristics of a learner's linguistic behavior will closely approximate or greatly differ from the actual characteristics of the second language because of similarities and differences predicted by a contrastive analysis. In fact, however, the role of language transfer in second language acquisition has long been a very controversial topic.⁴ Some scholars have indeed argued for the importance of transfer; some have gone so far as to consider it the paramount fact of second language acquisition. Yet other scholars have been very skeptical about the importance of transfer. Among linguists and language teachers today, there is still no consensus about the nature or the significance of cross-linguistic influences.

Much of the discussion in the next chapter will review the reasons for the skepticism about transfer, but a brief consideration of one of the most important reasons is appropriate now. As already noted, characteristics of the Russian language seem to explain sentences such as *I very good fellow*. A contrastive explanation, however, seems less than compelling in light of other facts. For example, speakers of Spanish, which, like English, has copula verb forms, frequently omit forms such as *am* and *is* (cf. Section 2.2). Moreover, such errors are found not only among Russian and Spanish speakers but also among speakers of other languages – and also among children learning English as their native language. Thus, while a contrastive analysis might explain a Russian speaker's omission of copula forms, a Spanish-English contrastive analysis would not explain the same error, and a contrastive analysis is irrelevant for monolingual children who make this same error as they acquire English. The pervasiveness of certain types of errors has thus been among the most significant counterarguments against the importance of transfer.

Despite the counterarguments, however, there is a large and growing

4 The terms *acquisition* and *learning* will be used interchangeably throughout this work even though much of the writing on second language acquisition (e.g., Krashen 1981) distinguishes between the two terms. I agree with Krashen and others that the outcomes of acquisition can differ depending on the awareness of language that individuals have (cf. Section 8.3). However, I strongly disagree with Krashen's analysis of transfer and with much else in his interpretation of second language acquisition (cf. Sections 2.2, 3.1). Since his characterization of *acquisition* and *learning* is questionable in several respects, I see no reason to use his terminological distinctions (cf. Gregg 1984; Odlin 1986).