

Ghostbusting: On Consciousness, Psychotypology, and the Role of Explicit Instruction:

Brian DRIER*

Key words : second language acquisition (SLA) ; consciousness ; psychotypology ; explicit instruction

- 1 . Introduction : Some Background on Emerging Notions of Cross-Linguistic Influence
- 2 . Psychotypology : What Is It? How Does It Work?
- 3 . Can We See It? Will We Know It If We Do?
- 4 . What Should We Do About It? What Can We Do About It?
- 5 . Consciousness, Psychotypology, and the Role of Explicit Instruction : Some Prospects (Parting Words)

1 . Introduction

Researchers and other figures in the field of second language acquisition have offered various models and proposed myriad theories to explain the process(es) by which learners acquire a second language. Typically, one of the major starting points in developing an understanding of second language acquisition (SLA) is the proposition that it is fundamentally different in some way (or ways) from first language acquisition.

Perhaps the single most critical difference—as well as the most obvious one—identified by researchers and academicians throughout the years has been the fact that second language learners¹ already possess knowledge of a first language.

However, even having identified that difference, there is apparently room for reasonable minds to differ as to the implications of the difference for the process(es) of second language acquisition. In other words, if one were to ask a roomful of researchers the provocative question, “ So what?, ” one might well receive a number of earsful, each with a somewhat different spin or account.²

Received May 20, 2004

*Language Center, Nagaoka University of Technology

For the purposes of this paper, we should at least make note of an evolution in the popular understanding of the relationship between learners' first language (L1), or native language (NL), and the second language (L2), or target language (TL) being acquired.

Earlier understandings of the L1-L2 relationship and its role in SLA were based largely in a behaviorist paradigm and were encapsulated most popularly and influentially in Robert Lado's Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) (Lado, 1957). According to the CAH, one could in effect conduct a line-by-line analysis of a learner's L1 and the L2, thereby predicting learner difficulty by reference to the comparison. In short, proponents of CAH asserted that, where the L1 and L2 differed, one could expect difficulty, which would in turn manifest itself in the form of learner errors. Conversely, the argument went, similarities between L1 and L2 would facilitate learning, resulting in correct form.

CAH, borne as it was out of the behaviorist trend in psychology, placed great stock in the importance of habit formation. On that view, the key to language learning—and, by extension, teaching—was to replace an old set of bad habits with a new set of good habits. Typically, the old habits were viewed as exerting influence through so-called “transfer.” Although “positive transfer” was at least theoretically possible, CAH seemed more preoccupied with “negative transfer” and the resulting errors that were thought to prove the soundness of the theory.

Over time, however, challenges to CAH as the dominant paradigm mounted. Persuasive arguments by the likes of S.P. Corder (1967), Larry Selinker (1972), and Jacquelyn Schachter (1974), among others, seemed to undercut the relatively rigid position of CAH in even its weak form.³ They constituted, as it were, signposts on the journey in linguists' path to a more sophisticated understanding of the nature of second language acquisition, and signs of the times.⁴

Perhaps most importantly, for the purposes of this paper, a more or less absolute faith in language transfer as a powerful and essentially unconscious phenomenon was shaken by suggestions of a variety of more complex and often more conscious phenomena. A critical theoretical construct in this emerging view was that of psychotypology.

2 . Psychotypology : What Is It? How Does It Work?

It was Eric Kellerman (1986) who, in effect, introduced the term “psychotypology” into the continuing dialogue concerning the role of native language in SLA. In so doing,

Kellerman in essence brought notions of L1 influence from the domain of behaviorism into the realm of cognition, from a “black and white” model that was heavily mechanistic and whose contours were shaped largely by behaviorist theory to a more nuanced “color” model. This transformation can be gleaned even from the changing terminology: Kellerman rejected the label “transfer,” with its rather negative and simplistic connotation, in favor of the term “crosslinguistic influence,” which many in the field of SLA have come to adopt as their own. See, e.g., Ringbom (1986); cf. Corder (1983) (rejecting the terms “transfer” and “interference” on the basis of their association with CAH).

According to Kellerman, learners’ cognitive efforts—in the form of judgments, strategies, and decisions—play a large, if not decisive, role in SLA. Thus, he offers, as an alternative to the essentially external perspective of CAH—one in which the phenomenon of second language acquisition is dictated by purportedly ironclad objective facts about L1 and L2—a largely internal perspective that honors the importance of a learner’s perceptions about both the L1 and L2. Put another way, if he does not outright trade in notions of typological proximity for what a learner makes them out to be, Kellerman at the very least supplements the former with the latter—that is to say, with psychotypology.

In Kellerman’s model of crosslinguistic influence, there are “three interacting factors in the determination of language transfer: (1) a learner’s psychotypology, how a learner organizes his or her NL; (2) perception of NL-TL distance; (3) actual knowledge of the TL” (Gass & Selinker, 1994: 104). One key dimension of the first of these three factors finds its expression in the notions of “language-neutral” and “language-specific” as key axes of a learner’s consideration of her L1.

As Gass and Selinker describe these notions, “language-neutrality” and “language-specificity” are most properly conceived of as two opposing points on a spectrum that describes the degree to which any given element of a language is universal and common to all languages. By way of example, a learner might well perceive that the semantic concept expressed in the English sentence “I love you” is universal—this is, after all, the message in many works of great and classic literature, as well as the latest Harlequin romance—but she might decide that the idiomatic expression “You are the sunshine of my life” is quite specific to the English language. We shall see soon enough the impact these judgments have on the processes by which crosslinguistic influence is exerted.

Related to this first factor is the second factor, the learner’s perception of the distance

between the L1 and L2. Although how learners come to form judgments about typological proximity between two languages is no less nebulous than how they come to conclusions about the language-neutrality and language-specificity of particular features of their native language, Kellerman and others nevertheless posit that these judgments come into play, in a prominent role, in SLA. But how? If the three factors set forth above are the key ingredients, what is the recipe? How does psychotypology work? According to some linguists, the third factor described above—a learner's knowledge of the L2—is where it all begins.

Ringbom (1986), among others, has suggested that learners resort to psychotypology as a default strategy, in effect, to fill a (perceived) gap in their L2 knowledge by recourse to their L1 knowledge. As he has put it: "Especially for the beginner, one obvious way of facilitating the foreign language learning process is to rely upon his L1 or other languages he may know" (p. 150). Similarly, Sajavaara (1986) has asserted that

[w]hen a non-native speaker does not know a word, his only chance is to resort to his native language knowledge, his general knowledge of human behavior, language, and communication or, what is more noteworthy, the explicit knowledge of the grammatical structures of the foreign language as taught in the foreign language classroom (citation omitted) (p. 76).⁵

Finally, this view is put forth by Faerch and Kasper (1986), who, in their description of "cognitive dimensions of language transfer," refer to "goal formation" and a "planning phase in communication attempts." According to the authors:

If the language user's repertoire does not contain an item needed for the realization of a particular goal, she invokes a special class of procedures in order to solve such problems. These procedures have been termed communication strategies... One of the functions of L1 transfer is as a communication strategy in strategic planning (pp. 52-3).

Thus, we can conceptualize the processes by which psychotypology makes its presence felt as conscious instances of decision-making.⁶ Learners, in short, invoke a "strategy" by which they cope with insufficient knowledge in the target language.⁷

Of course, learner decisions about whether, when, and to what degree (and in what manner : see the next section) to invoke their L1 knowledge in resolving ambiguity or uncertainty in the L2 is in no small measure a function of the three “ interacting factors ” referred to above; perhaps above all, we might expect that learners ’ perceptions of the typological proximity between their mother tongue and the language that they are learning will play a key role. As Rutherford (1982) puts it, “ If perceived distance is small... the learner will more readily transfer... But if perceived distance is large... the learner will be less inclined to transfer ” (p. 90).

3 . Can We See It? Will We Know It If We Do?

Of course, being an operation of the mind, the cross-linguistic influence of psychotypology is arguably likely to evade detection. To the extent that we view the phenomenon as a mental construct, will we know it when we “ see ” it? How can we hope to catch a glimpse of the unseen?

At the outset, it should be borne in mind that the field of second language acquisition is full of suppositions regarding the existence of unseen processes, mechanisms, and phenomena. Universal Grammar (UG), for example, stakes its claim on the so-called “ black box ” of a Language Acquisition Device. Nevertheless, researchers have never shied away from attempts to lay bare the veil that cloaks the unseen and the internal. Over the years, a number of researchers have made use of various methods in order to render the invisible visible, and they have claimed to unmask and identify the phantom phenomenon of psychotypology in a number of guises.

Kellerman (1986), for example, examined the “ transferability judgments ” of native Dutch speakers in his groundbreaking attempts to track the influence of psychotypology. In sum, he found that their judgments about the transferability of the Dutch word *breken* (“ to break ”) were tied to notions of so-called “ coreness ” of meaning. That is, informants were more likely to judge the word transferable (by way of literal translation) to English when they perceived the usage to be somehow basic or prototypical. This somewhat airy concept was seen to be tied to factors including frequency of usage, literalness, and concreteness. In particular, Kellerman identified similarity of a word in usage to its “ prototypical ” sense and frequency of occurrence in everyday speech as the key factors in learners ’ transferability judgments as to polysemous words. Returning for a moment to the three factors discussed earlier, we can see that Kellerman’s “ coreness ”

concept relates quite strongly to the first factor listed, specifically in the sense that determinations of “ coreness ” or prototypicality amount to pronouncements of language-general. Kellerman’s psychotypology paradigm posits that crosslinguistic influence is more likely when a learner perceives an element of the L1-in this example, a lexical item-to be language-general. One might expect this dimension of psychotypology to manifest itself in patterns of L2 word choice by second language learners.

Other researchers have explored the possible influence of psychotypology in the areas of comprehension and reception.⁸ Sasaki (1991), for example, looked at informants’ intuitions concerning sentence subjects when presented with word strings consisting of two nouns and one verb. In so doing, he was able to address the ways in which the comprehension strategies of second language learners may be conditioned by the strategies that are dominant in their native language and/or those that are universal. Viewing the data from the perspective of Bates & MacWhinney’s “ competition model, ” according to which people are thought to resolve ambiguity and determine meaning (as of novel utterances) by deciding among competing cues, Sasaki posited that meaning-based comprehension strategies such as are found in Japanese take developmental precedence over, and are more common than, grammar-based strategies. It has also been suggested that when faced with competing cues, language learners will seek recourse to L1 comprehension strategies first and resort to more universal strategies (if they are different from the L1 strategies) only if the initial strategy fails to resolve the ambiguity. See generally Gass & Selinker, *supra*, at 139-143.

Perhaps most of all, however, researchers have looked to patterns of production in second language learners for evidence of psychotypological influence, perhaps mindful of Larry Selinker’s caveat that it is best to focus one’s attention on observable output.

For example, Ringbom (1986) documented a number of examples of what he identified as instances of crosslinguistic influence by way of psychotypology. In his empirical studies of psychotypology, he considered the relationship between the English, Finnish, and Swedish languages, focusing in particular on the comparative English-language production skills of Finnish-speaking Finn nationals and Swedish-speaking nationals.

In brief, Ringbom outlined a number of areas-ranging from phonology to the use of articles and prepositions-in which there is greater typological proximity between Swedish and English than between Finnish and English. More to the point, the more objective

reality of proximity influences learners' psychotypology, as a result of which Swedish learners will often be inclined to transfer L1 knowledge. Typical manifestations include so-called " borrowings, " as for example when learners incorporate L1 lexical items into the L2 in slightly modified or unmodified-or, in the case of " false friends, " resort to an L2 word (in L2 production) that is " formally similar to, but semantically different from, " the semantically appropriate L1 counterpart.⁹

Similarly, Faerch and Kasper (1986) traced what they took to be the arc of crosslinguistic influence as manifested in the L2 English production of L1 Danish speakers, identifying such phenomena as foreignization, in which L1 lexical items are adjusted to interlanguage phonology and/or morphology, as well as the use of literal translation as a transfer strategy (p. 58).

Also, it should be noted that the footprints of psychotypology can be discerned not only in production but also in its absence-i.e., what some researchers have identified as the result of learner decisions not to produce certain L2 structures. Perhaps the most famous example of this sort of linguistic sleuthing is provided by Jacquelyn Schachter in her article, " An Error in Error Analysis " (1974). In that case, a comparison of learners of English with L1 Arabic, Persian, Japanese, and Chinese suggested that their respective judgments concerning L1-L2 typological proximity may well have strongly influenced their respective decisions to chance or not to chance English relative clause construction. That is, members of the former two L1 groups tended to produce more errors, but they also attempted the structure under consideration far more often than members of the latter two L1 groups.

Additionally, differential rates of acquisition and overproduction might reflect the influence of psychotypology, our " ghost in the machine. " An example of the former case can be found in, for example, Schumann's (1979) study of L1 Spanish speakers' acquisition of L2 English negation. According to Schumann, the coincidence of an interim stage of L2 development of negation with the full and final realization of proper negation in the learners' L1 caused the learners to linger at that stage of L2 development longer than learners with other L1 backgrounds-for example, Japanese. Overproduction has been documented by Schachter and Rutherford (1979) in their study of L1 Chinese and Japanese use of so-called " topic-comment " structures such as the use of " There is/are " sentence forms. In this case, a dominant L1 function gives rise to overproduction of an L2 form.

Finally, crosslinguistic influence has been studied in the area of phonology, perhaps most closely in the work of Eckman (1977) (on the Markedness Differential Hypothesis)⁰ and Broselow (1983) (epenthesis in Arabic learners of English), although it seems less clear to what degree the influence in this linguistic area is a function of psychotypology in the classic cognitive sense.

What seems key in these attempts is the rigor of hypothesis-testing and the well-reasoned construction of experimental design-i.e., we must look at the logic by which researchers come to the conclusion that “ ghosts ” in the machine of second language processing can be found in a certain place, a certain behavior, the production of a certain structure. As Han and Selinker (1999) make clear, it is only through concerted efforts that one can hope to glimpse and identify the operation of psychotypology in SLA.

4 . What Should We Do About It? What Can We Do About It?

So, we’ve taken a look at what the “ ghost ” of psychotypology “ is ” and gotten a sense of what it might “ look like. ” But is it to be feared or loved?

Arguably, the answer is “ both. ” Unlike the traditional CAH-inspired conception of “ transfer, ” which is most commonly associated with negative progressive transfer-i.e., the detrimental influence of L1 resulting in non-targetlike L2 production-psychotypology can often offer positive contributions to L2 (knowledge and) performance. It is, after all, a coping strategy, as discussed above, and it may well result in targetlike performance, if not understanding, in many cases.

On the other hand, just as CAH conceived of difference as the “ enemy, ” so can L1-L2 similarity prove to be an “ enemy ” of second language acquisition. In general terms, it can be rightfully said that “ similarities obscure the learner the fact that there is something to learn ”(Gass & Selinker, 1994 : 100) (citing Ringbom (1986)). A similar view has been espoused with regard to the distinction between “ similar sounds ” and “ new sounds ”(Flege, 1988 : 77). Perhaps a slightly sharper picture of the situation is presented by Ringbom (1987), when he quotes pioneer figure Henry Sweet :

We are naturally inclined to assume that the nearer the foreign language is to our own, the easier it is... But this very likeness is often a source of confusion. It is a help to the beginner who merely wants to understand the allied language, and is contented with a rough knowledge ; but it is a hindrance to any thorough

knowledge, because of the constant cross-associations that are sure to present themselves... In learning a remote, unconnected language the difficulties are reversed. The beginning is much more difficult, and, of course, it takes a much longer time to understand the language. But when the initial difficulties have been once overcome, it is easier to get a minutely accurate knowledge of the language, because the learner is less disturbed by cross-associations (p. 44).

Cast in terms of our analogy, then, ghosts can be friendly, like Caspar, as alluded to earlier by Ringbom; they can also be mischievous poltergeists, tinkering with linguistic development, as suggested in work by researchers such as Schumann and Faerch & Kasper,¹¹ or, worse still, they may be hellbent on destruction, as seemed to be the case with the learner Siri & ghosts (demons?) in Han and Selinker & study. What if we think that we've stumbled across the latter? What can we do? Can we be effective " ghostbusters "?

Assuming for the sake of argument (and in light of the foregoing) that we can identify psychotypological operations, and in the event that those operations in the learner appear to be a source of (persistent?) non-targetlike L2 production, what is to be done? Can anything be done? Put another way, can psychotypology-and learners ' underlying judgments-be influenced? More specifically, is there a role for explicit instruction in addressing/redressing the matter?

On the one hand, we can find a clue-and encouragement-in the notion, put forth above, that the cross-linguistic influence of psychotypology is the result of conscious " decision-making, " the application of strategies by learners. That is, one may see fit to presume that what can be " done " consciously can be " undone " consciously. If that is, in fact, the case, then an instructor might attempt pedagogical input at the metalinguistic level. In deciding what constitutes appropriate content, one might look to a model of the way in which crosslinguistic influence-psychotypology, in particular-plays out in second language acquisition. For example, if we suppose that learners perceive gaps in their L2 knowledge, refer to background knowledge (including L1) to fill that gap, decide what is " transferable, " and then engage in strategic transfer, then we can ask ourselves how we can fill the gap in L2 knowledge, what background knowledge (apart from the L1) would likely assist learners in their quest for more nativelike competence, and whether the learners are perhaps laboring under any illusions regarding what is transferable-in terms of their notions of language-generality and language-specificity and/or L1-L2 distance.

On the other hand, as has been suggested herein, classroom practitioners must still wade through the difficulties of rendering the invisible visible, of seeing clearly in the muddied waters of mental processes. They must be extremely attentive, reflective, and persistent in considering how best to elicit and/or otherwise identify the influence of psychotypology.

Furthermore, it has been suggested elsewhere that the influence of explicit instruction, of the sort of “ pedagogical intervention ” proposed by Han and Selinker, will depend (among other things) on whether the learner in question is a child or an adult. Specifically, a number of researchers have opined that child learners are less likely to invoke psychotypology and make conscious choices about language guided by metalinguistic consciousness than are adult learners. See, e.g., Ringbom (1986) at 160 ; 12 Sajavaara, *supra*, at 68.13

Finally, Sajavaara (1986) has suggested that explicit instruction can actually have the reverse effect of that intended by well-meaning instructors :

Formal language teaching in the classroom cannot give the learner access to knowledge similar to that of a native speaker. Thus, communication in a foreign language involves constant recourse to conscious problem-solving strategies to patch up gaps in the lexicon and pragmatic information necessary for the correct interpretation of data. The gaps in the lexicon make it impossible for the learner to utilize the inferencing systems which are normally activated by lexical key elements, and he has to resort to pragmatic information related to his mother-tongue or look for translation equivalents for L1 structures. Such translation schemata may become automatic and may result in the fossilization of L1 features in the second language (76-77).

5 . Consciousness, Psychotypology, and the Role of Explicit Instruction : Some Prospects

It appears, therefore, that the prospects for explicit instruction remain mixed : although the work of Han and Selinker demonstrates that the admirable goal of consciousness-raising by way of “ fine-tuned ” (explicit) instruction informed by empirical pedagogy is achievable, it does not come easily. A conscientious, sensitive, and well-planned “ campaign ” is necessary to achieve the ultimate end.

There is much more work to be done as we continue to explore this area of study. In

my present teaching environment, given that the L1 of the learners in question is Japanese, generally considered to be typologically distant from English, any evidence of L1 transfer will raise questions regarding the degree to which it has resulted from conscious strategies and-in the event that it does appear to be the result of conscious decision-making-whether learners perceived the two languages (Japanese and English) to be closer (at least in the case of the structures under consideration) than they are ordinarily considered to be.

Although it may well be, as Sajavaara and others suggest, that second language acquisition is inevitably and irrevocably different from first language acquisition and, further, that this difference prevents second language learners from acquiring and processing language in the same precise way that first language learners do, I am nevertheless determined to strive for the sort of ideal set out by Meara (1978). In his work on the word associations of L1 English learners in French, he opined that “ if we could develop learning methods that as a side-effect produced learners with native-like association patterns, we would also be producing learners who were better able to communicate in their foreign language ” (p. 211). To this end, I intend to pursue the ambitions of a good “ ghostbuster, ” in hopes of rooting out the internal and unseen causes of strategic and conscious, as well as incidental and unconscious, crosslinguistic influence.

Endnotes

1 I will forgo the “ learning ”-“ acquisition ” distinction advocated by Stephen Krashen, opting instead to use the two terms interchangeably. However, if valid, such a distinction would suggest that what I am holding out for is not to be: a fairly substantial role for explicit classroom instruction and so-called “ pedagogical intervention ” of the sort proposed by Han and Selinker (1999) in their paper on “ Error resistance: towards an empirical pedagogy. ” As I will discuss elsewhere in this review, I do not share Krashen’s “ no-interface ” position on implicit and explicit knowledge. As a result, I am far more optimistic regarding the prospects for explicit instruction.

2 For the purposes of this paper, I will put aside-for the most part, at least-issues of Universal Grammar (UG) and the various positions (no-access, full access, partial access) espoused by various prominent figures in the field of second language acquisition (SLA).

3 In its strong, “ a priori ” form, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) claims that second language learner errors can be predicted (on the basis of areas of difference between the L1 and the L2) ; in its weak or “ a posteriori ” form, the CAH merely lays claim to an ability to explain errors once they have occurred.

4 In his work, “ The Significance of Learner’s Errors, ” Corder in effect fired the first shots in the battle against the CAH, positing a new model, termed “ error analysis, ” in place of CAH. In this model, for the first time, the suggestion was raised that a system of interlanguage existed. Moreover, errors were no longer viewed as an

indication of difficulty ; rather, the notion was introduced that “ errors ” could provide indications of attempts at systematic development via intake. Selinker carried the concept of interlanguage further in his article of the same name, focusing still more sharply and clearly on the phenomenon of interlanguage as a system with its own integrity and worthy, as it were, of respect as a language and entity all its own. Finally, Schachter came along to point up difficulties with error analysis-for example, its failure to consider the ability of interlanguage to generate targetlike results and the fact that such results do not necessarily correlate with knowledge of the correct rule involved.

5 In the selected quote, Sajavaara anticipates some of the issues that will be discussed further along in this paper. As should become clear, I do not necessarily share his slightly pessimistic view on the limitations of second language learning and teaching. However, his work does point up an apparent paradox in second language pedagogy: the possibility that exposure to explicit instruction may actually foster rather than curb inappropriate crosslinguistic influence.

6 This conceptualization of resort to the L1 as a conscious strategy predates the coining of the term “ psychotypology ” in the work of Kellerman. In his seminal work on interlanguage, Selinker (1972) made reference to the position that “ strategies for handling TL [target language] material evolve whenever the learner realizes, either consciously or subconsciously, that he has no linguistic competence with regard to some aspect of the TL ” (p. 219).

7 This characterization of the role of L1 in second language acquisition is consistent with both the “ no-access ” and “ partial-access ” positions regarding the role of UG in second language acquisition. In both the former position, championed by Jacquelyn Schachter, and the latter position, currently held by a majority of SLA researchers, decreased access to UG is linked to-indeed, it can be said to necessitate-reliance upon the L1 by second language learners. Under partial-access, learners will behave essentially as described herein, resorting first to L1 knowledge and only looking to UG when that initial strategy fails.

8 Although I have sought to avoid comment on any conjectured relationship between comprehension and production, it should be pointed out that this topic has generated a considerable literature. There are many who claim that one cannot and should not speak of comprehension issues and production issues, or comprehension processes and production processes, in the same breath. See, e.g., Sajavaara (1986) at 67. There are also those scholars who view receptive competence as the bridge to productive competence. See, e.g., Ringbom (1986) at 154. In the area of phonology, at least, one also finds suggestions that production can precede perception. See, e.g., Sheldon and Strange (1982). For my part, I opt at present not to enter the fray, noting with approval the old adage to the effect that “ discretion is the better part of valor. ” I hope, however, to explore this area of study in the future, with an eye toward pedagogical implications.

9 As should be clear from review of other studies-including, for example, those of White (1991) and Han and Selinker (1999)-crosslinguistic influence and the effect of psychotypology is not limited to the transfer of lexical items. The effects of psychotypology extend, for example, to the areas of syntax and grammar. However, Faerch and Kasper (1986) have suggested that crosslinguistic influence is most prominent at the lexical level. They explain their position thusly :

Content words are likely to be experienced as the semantically most important elements of an utterance and are often consciously chosen rather than automatically activated. Hence the language user will usually be aware of lexical gaps and initiate attended problem solving. Strategic transfer is theoretically possible at linguistic levels other than the lexical, but

unambiguous examples are few in the literature on communication strategies (p. 58).

A related issue implicated in the foregoing discussion is that of the phenomena of “ transfer to somewhere ” and “ transfer to nowhere. ” The former concept, articulated by Andersen (1983), derives from L1-L2 similarities, and consists in the consistent and significant occurrence of a specific grammatical form or structure owing to a structural L1-L2 similarity and/or the effect of L2 input. It is observable in learner output at the surface level, and it is a conscious form of transfer fueled by the learner’s perceptions of L1-L2 distance. “ Transfer to nowhere, ” on the other hand, is likely to occur at a deeper level, where it can remain undetected, and it is considered an unconscious form of transfer. It may be generated by differences as well as by similarities, and it relates more to a transfer of the learner’s way of thinking, or what is sometimes referred to as “ thinking for speaking. ” We can imagine different discourse styles or rhetorical slants in how we present our views of reality. Perhaps, for example, native speakers of Japanese tend to think of reality as what happens to them, while native speakers of English (Americans, above all?) generally conceive of reality as what they make happen. In that event, it might turn out that these differing views are reflected in the predominance of the passive voice in the former case and the active voice in the latter case.

10 In fact, the issue of markedness, along with the related though more subjective notion of salience, is yet another dimension of the sprawling influence of psychotypology. That is, markedness and salience are factors in determining the extent of crosslinguistic influence. See, e.g., Rutherford (1982) *infra*. Regrettably, constraints of time and space prevent me from giving this aspect of the question its due in the present paper.

11 Not to be confused with Caspar.

12 In addition to learner age, Ringbom also singles out stage of learning and mode of learning as key factors in the degree of crosslinguistic influence. Thus, in his analysis, L1 influence (and, for that matter, all other-language influence) is likely to be greater at the early stages of learning and in the context of classroom learning rather than natural acquisition (p. 159)

13 Indeed, it bears mention that Siri, the informant in the Han and Selinker study, was twenty-six years old.

References

- Andersen, R. (1983). “ Transfer to Somewhere. ” In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.) Language Transfer in Language Learning (pp. 250-268). Rowley, MA : Newbury House.
- Broselow, E. (1983). “ Nonobvious Transfer : On Predicting Epenthesis Errors, ” in S. Gass and L. Selinker (eds.), Language Transfer in Language Learning. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Corder, S.P. (1967). “ The Significance of Learner’s Errors. ” *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 160-170.
- Corder, S.P. (1983). “ A role for the mother tongue. ” In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), Language Transfer in Language Learning (pp. 85-97). Rowley, MA : Newbury House.
- Eckman, F. (1977). “ Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. ” *Language Learning*, 27, 315-330.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1986). “ Cognitive Dimensions of Language Transfer, ” in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition. New York : Pergamon Press.

- Flege, J.E. (1988). " Factors affecting the degree of perceived foreign accent in English sentences. " *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 84, 70-79.
- Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (1994). Second Language Acquisition : An Introductory Course. Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Han, Z. & Selinker, L. (1999). " Error resistance : towards an empirical pedagogy. " *Language Teaching Research*, 3(3), 248-273.
- Kellerman, E. (1986). " An Eye for an Eye : Crosslinguistic Constraints on the Development of the L2 Lexicon, " in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition. New York : Pergamon Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across Cultures. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press.
- Meara, P. (1978). " Learners ' Word Associations in French. " *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3, 192-211.
- Ringbom, H. (1986). " Crosslinguistic Influence and the Foreign Language Learning Process, " in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition. New York : Pergamon Press.
- Rutherford, W. (1982). " Markedness in second language acquisition. " *Language Learning*, 32(1), 85-108.
- Sajavaara, K. (1986). " Transfer and Second Language Speech Processing, " in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds.) Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition. New York : Pergamon Press.
- Sasaki, Y. (1991). " English and Japanese interlanguage comprehension strategies : An analysis based on the competition model. " *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12, 47-73.
- Schachter, J. (1974). " An Error in Error Analysis. " *Language Learning*, 24(2), 205-214.
- Schachter, J. & Rutherford, W. (1979). " Discourse function and language transfer. " *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 19, 3-12.
- Schumann, J. (1979). " The acquisition of English negation by speakers of Spanish : A review of the literature. " In R. Andersen (ed.), The acquisition and use of Spanish and English as first and second languages (pp. 3-32). Washington, DC : Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Selinker, L. (1972). " Interlanguage. " *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-230.
- Sheldon, A. & Strange, W. (1982). " The acquisition of / r / and / l / by Japanese learners of English : Evidence that speech production can precede speech perception. " *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 3, 243-261.
- White, L. (1991). " Adverb placement in second language acquisition : some effects of positive evidence and negative evidence in the classroom. " *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-161.