

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Series Editor: Professor David Singleton, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland

This new series will bring together titles dealing with a variety of aspects of language acquisition and processing in situations where a language or languages other than the native language is involved. Second language will thus be interpreted in its broadest possible sense. The volumes included in the series will all in their different ways offer, on the one hand, exposition and discussion of empirical findings and, on the other, some degree of theoretical reflection. In this latter connection, no particular theoretical stance will be privileged in the series; nor will any relevant perspective – sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, neurolinguistic, etc. – be deemed out of place. The intended readership of the series will be final-year undergraduates working on second language acquisition projects, postgraduate students involved in second language acquisition research, and researchers and teachers in general whose interests include a second language acquisition component.

Other Books in the Series

Portraits of the L2 User

Vivian Cook (ed.)

Learning to Request in a Second Language: A Study of Child Interlanguage Pragmatics

Machiko Achiba

Other Books of Interest

Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition

J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen and U. Jessner (eds)

English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language

Jasone Cenoz and Ulrike Jessner (eds)

Foreign Language and Culture Learning from a Dialogic Perspective

Carol Morgan and Albane Cain

The Good Language Learner

N. Naiman, M. Fröhlich, H.H. Stern and A. Todesco

Language Learners as Ethnographers

Celia Roberts, Michael Byram, Ana Barro, Shirley Jordan and Brian Street

Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects

Kendall A. King

Language Use in Interlingual Families: A Japanese-English Sociolinguistic Study

Masayo Yamamoto

The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology and Practice

Bernard Spolsky and Elana Shohamy

Motivating Language Learners

Gary N. Chambers

Reflections on Multiliterate Lives

Diane Belcher and Ulla Connor (eds)

The Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching

Joan Kelly Hall and William G. Eggington (eds)

World English: A Study of Its Development

Janina Brutt-Griffler

Please contact us for the latest book information:

Multilingual Matters, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,

Victoria Road, Clevedon, BS21 7HH, England

<http://www.multilingual-matters.com>

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION 3

Series Editor: David Singleton, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland

Effects of the Second Language on the First

Edited by
Vivian Cook

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD

Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto • Sydney

Chapter 3

**'I Feel Clumsy Speaking Russian':
L2 Influence on L1 in Narratives
of Russian L2 Users of English**

ANETA PAVLENKO

Introduction

The focus of this paper is on second language (L2) influence on first language (L1) in Russian L2 users of English, all of whom learned their English between the ages of 10 and 27 in the target language context. In previous work, I have argued that many seemingly disparate instances of L2 influence on L1 in such diverse areas as morphosyntax, the lexicon or semantics can be brought together within a unitary classificatory framework that ties these instances to conceptual restructuring in bilingual memory (Pavlenko, 1999, 2000). The present paper will use this approach to analyse L2 influence in L1 Russian narratives elicited from Russian L2 users of English. This data set forms part of a larger corpus of narratives, collected by using the same stimuli with monolingual Russians and Americans, Russian foreign language (FL) learners of English, American FL learners of Russian, simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals, and Russian L2 users of English (Pavlenko, 1997). While parts of this corpus have been examined from different perspectives in Pavlenko (1999, 2002a, 2002b), Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002), and Dewaele and Pavlenko (2002, and this volume), the present chapter represents the first attempt to analyse the full set of L2 users' L1 Russian narratives from the perspective of L2 influence on L1. The analysis will be supplemented by evidence from narratives elicited with the use of the same stimuli from simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals, and from American FL learners of English. Furthermore, to provide a full picture of L2 effects in Russian users of English, I will also refer to in-depth interviews conducted with the study participants.

In my discussion I will follow Kellerman and Sharwood Smith's (1986) suggestions and adopt the term *transfer* to refer to processes that lead to the incorporation of elements from one language into another (e.g. borrowing

or restructuring), and the more inclusive term *crosslinguistic influence* to refer to transfer and any other kind of effect that one language may have on the other (e.g. convergence or attrition). I will also argue that L2 influence on L1 in production and perception of individual adult L2 learners and users can be best understood within the multi-competence framework, proposed by Cook (1991, 1992). In accordance with this framework, the participants will be referred to interchangeably as '[late] bilinguals' and 'L2 users' (Cook, 1999), to acknowledge the fact that they are legitimate speakers of both languages.

Theoretical Framework

A review of the literature on L2 influence on L1 in adult L2 users suggests that a second or additional language may influence the first in all areas of language, whether phonology, morphosyntax, lexis, semantics, pragmatics, rhetoric or conceptual representations (Pavlenko, 2000). In what follows, I will discuss L2 influence on L1 in Russian L2 users of English in several of these areas with the exception of phonology (for an informative discussion of L2 effects on phonology of Russian L2 users of English, see Andrews, 1999). The L2 effects will be further examined within the classificatory framework proposed earlier (Pavlenko, 1999, 2000) and linked to possible changes in L2 users' conceptual representations. The proposed analytical framework theorises instances of L2 influence on L1 as evidence of one or more of the following five phenomena:

- (1) *borrowing transfer*, or addition of L2 elements to the L1: e.g. lexical borrowing, such as the terms *bid* ('bid') or *bebisitter* ('babysitter') in the speech of Russian immigrants in the US, documented in Andrews (1999);
- (2) *convergence*, or creation of a unitary system, distinct from both L1 and L2: e.g. the use of the same phonetic realisation rules for French and English /t/, which results in a moderately aspirated stop, different from both L1 and L2 values, documented by Flege (1987) in the speech of late French/English bilinguals;
- (3) *shift*, or a move away from L1 structures or values to approximate L2 structures or values: e.g. semantic extension of the meaning of the verb *correr* ('to run') documented by Otheguy and Garcia (1988) in the speech of Cuban immigrants in the US, where, under the influence of English, the verb has acquired the metaphoric meaning of running for office (e.g. *correr para gobernador* 'to run for governor');
- (4) *restructuring transfer*, or incorporation of L2 elements into L1 resulting in some changes, substitutions or simplifications: e.g. the loss of

possessive clitics in the L1 Finnish of Finnish L2 users of Swedish, attributed by Boyd and Andersson (1991) to Swedish influence;

- (5) *L1 attrition*, i.e. loss of (or inability to produce) some L1 elements due to L2 influence: e.g. acceptance of syntactically deviant L1 sentences under the influence of L2 constraints, documented by Altenberg (1991) in a case study of two German users of English.

In what follows, I will demonstrate how this framework could be successfully applied to an analysis of L2 effects in the L1 narratives.

Research Design and Methodology

Objective

The purpose of the present study is to examine L2 influence on L1 in Russian narratives elicited from Russian L2 users of English. Transfer patterns identified in these narratives will be compared with those identified in Russian narratives elicited from simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals and from American FL learners of Russian.

Subjects

Thirty Russian L2 users of English (14 males, 16 females), aged between 18 and 31, participated in the study. All were middle-class urban adults, students at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Twenty were undergraduates (mean age = 19.5, SD = 0.5, range 18–21) and ten were graduate students (mean age = 27, SD = 1.4, range 24–31). All participants are seen as 'late' bilinguals, as they had learned their English between the ages of 10 and 27 (mean = 16, SD = 2.7), upon arrival in the US, through ESL classes, public or private school attendance, and naturalistic exposure. By the time of the study 23 subjects had spent between 3 and 8 years in the US (mean = 6, SD = 0.95). Among the seven outliers, four subjects had spent 1.5 years in the US, and three had spent between 10 and 14. Despite the differences in the length of exposure, I will consider these participants as members of the same group, since a previous study (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002) demonstrated that in this corpus of L2 users' narratives, differences in the length of exposure do not significantly affect either directionality or amount of language transfer. Because Cornell has a sizeable Russian student population, all the participants interacted both in Russian and English on a daily basis. According to the background questionnaires, the participants used Russian with their families, relatives and Russian-speaking friends, and English with English-speaking friends, as well as for educational and interactional purposes.

Two additional groups of participants provided narratives for comparative purposes: (a) four simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals who had arrived in the US between the ages of 1 and 3 and had grown up in Russian-speaking families, and (b) twelve American FL learners of Russian enrolled in advanced Russian classes. All these participants were undergraduate students at Cornell University, closely matched with the main group in age and socio-economic background.

Stimuli

Four 3-minute long films, with a sound track but no dialogue, were used to elicit the narratives. Narratives, rather than grammaticality judgements or spontaneous conversations, were used in the present study for several reasons. To begin with, narratives present researchers with samples of language use in context and, for this reason, have been used in previous studies of both bilinguals' and L2 learners' L2 competence (e.g. Berman, 1999; Rintell, 1990; Wenzell, 1989) and L1 attrition (Schmid, 2000). At the same time, it has been noted that personal and spontaneous narratives exhibit a significant amount of variation across participants and contexts. For this reason, the present study used video retelling, a task that has a number of advantages. Doughty and Long (2000) argue that a narrative orientation to displaced time and space allows for a greater complexity of output. Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002) suggest that presenting uniform non-verbal prompts allows researchers to keep the data more or less homogeneous by holding the semantic referents constant. At the same time, using films rather than pictures permits researchers to make the storytelling task less artificial and more similar to spontaneous narratives (Tannen, 1980, 1993). Consequently, video retelling has been successfully used for narrative elicitation purposes in several studies in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Bardovi-Harlig & Bergström, 1996; Becker & Carroll, 1997; Hyltenstam, 1988; Jarvis, 1998; Klein & Perdue, 1992; Perdue, 1993).

The four films used as stimuli in the present study were specifically made to allow the researcher to manipulate content and context as variables in examination of language use by Russian/English bilinguals. Prior studies, using the same stimuli with Russian and American English monolinguals (Pavlenko, 1997, 2002a), have shown differences in the participants' interpretation of the content of the four films and have linked them to differences between the two speech communities in the conceptualisation of emotions and privacy. Two films, *The Ithaca Story* and *Kiev Story*, portrayed a situation interpreted by monolingual American participants as an invasion of personal space: a stranger sitting down too close to someone. Monolingual Russians, in contrast, perceived the situation as an attempt at

a pick-up. The other two films, *The Letter* and *Pis'mo* (The Letter), portrayed a roommate reading someone else's letter without that person's permission. This situation was perceived by monolingual Americans as a violation of informational privacy and by monolingual Russians as an attempt to invade someone's emotional and spiritual world. The first film of each pair was made in the US, and the second in Kiev, Ukraine, to see whether the context in which the interaction takes place has any influence on the linguistic means chosen by bilingual storytellers. Ukraine, rather than Russia, was chosen for reasons of production cost. As expected, although the film was actually made in Kiev, the participants inferred that the action was taking place in Russia, or 'somewhere in the former Soviet Union'.

During the course of the study, eleven participants (6 males, 5 females), saw *The Ithaca Story*, nine (4 males, 5 females) saw *The Letter*, four (1 male, 3 females) saw *Kiev Story*, and six (3 males, 3 females) saw *Pis'mo*. The impact of context and content variables on L2 influence on L1 will not, however, be a subject of discussion, as previous research (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002) has determined that differences in content of the narratives and the context in which the action took place did not significantly affect directionality or amount of transfer in this narrative corpus.

Method

To induce a Russian language mode (Grosjean, 1998) or at least to activate Russian, all participants were greeted and interacted with in Russian by the bilingual researcher. Each participant was shown one film, then given a portable tape recorder and the following instructions: *Pozhaluista, rasskazhite chto vy videli v fil'me* ('Please, tell what you just saw in the film'). Subsequently, all narratives were transcribed and analysed in Russian. All instances of language use that appeared to be errors (or deviations from the range of language variation exhibited by monolingual native speakers of Russian) were compared with patterns of language use in the monolingual narratives elicited previously by the same films (Pavlenko, 1997, 2002a).

Even though no explicit directions were given with regard to code-switching, the amount of code-switching in the data was negligible, possibly because of negative attitudes towards code-switching in the Russian community in the US (Andrews, 1999). At the same time, since the study took place in a US context, it cannot be claimed that the participants told their stories in an exclusively Russian mode. Most likely, they remained in a somewhat bilingual mode, common for their interactions with other Russian speakers in the US. In fact, from the multi-competence perspective, it is possible that they no longer have access to a purely mono-

lingual Russian mode. Consequently, it is Russian produced in a bilingual mode in an American setting that is the focus of this paper.

Results and Discussion

Narratives

Thirty narratives were collected from the main group of participants, one from each subject, with a mean length of around 35 clauses. In terms of word length the narratives were about 158 words in total (*Ithaca Story* mean = 155; *Kiev Story* mean = 153; *The Letter* mean = 183; *Pis'mo* mean = 142) – for more details see Dewaele and Pavlenko's chapter in this volume.

In what follows, to give the reader an idea of what these tape-recorded oral narratives looked like, I will provide two stories, elicited by two different films, and then discuss the results of the analysis of the corpus. To demonstrate that the L2 effects in my corpus are not limited to participants who had spent several years in an English-speaking context, I have on purpose selected narratives told by participants with a relatively limited period of exposure to English: 1.5 years in the first case and 3 years in the second.

The first narrative is elicited by *The Ithaca Story* and is told by a 24-year-old male who arrived in the US at the age of 23 (all instances considered to be L2 influence on L1 are underlined):

- (1) Центр города... скорее всего/мне сперва показалось, весна, но потом к концу уже фильма, я подумал, что это уже где-то конец лета... итак, центр города... жизнь кипит там... много прохожих, музыканты... жонглёры, и в это время... прогуливается де/девушка... мм, просто, наверное, какая-то очередная обычная прогулка... проходит мимо... мимо кафе... по-моему, Декаданс, на... Коммонсе... на Коммонсе... потом... на случ/наталкивается на знакомых людей, на/на пару, на знакомую пару... там, здороваются с ними там, привет-привет, и дальше идет... это, показалось, что она хочет быть... одной, но в то же время бу/будучи не одинокой, то есть, она хочет быть внутри с/внутри одной но/но чтобы ее окружали какие-то люди, чтобы она не была одинокой... ну, потом она там проходит, садится... около дерева какого-то... и там достает чего-то там, пытается писать, потом, нет, и в это время подходит/думает о чем-то там, я не знаю там, медитирует, в это время подходит какой-то парень, садится рядом с ней, ну, она так, чуть-чуть в сторону отодвигается, потом... о... ну, я подумал, что, ну все нормально, но потом опять парень, опять как-то/ей хочется быть одной, а он все время, он как-то сделал какое-то движение, ну, убрал/поднял ноги, положил, ну, на это... на какой-то, ну на... на... на

бетон, где они сидели... ну, это мне так показалось, что... м... э... как-то она почувствовала, что он... мм... вторгается в ее одиночество... отодвинулась в сторону, потом, в конце концов, встала и ушла. Всё.

'Downtown... most likely/at first it seemed to me it was spring, but then, by the end of the movie I thought it was the end of summer... so, downtown... life is busy there... many passersby, musicians... jugglers, and at that time... a gi/girl is walking around... мм... simply, possibly on a regular common walk... she passes by... by a café... I think, 'Decadance', on the... on the Commons... on the Commons... then... sudden/she bumps into some acquaintances, a/a couple, a couple she knows... well, says hi to them, hello-hello, and keeps going... it seemed that she wants to be... alone at the same time not be/ being lonely, in other words, she wants to be alone in/inside, but/but to be surrounded by some people so that she wouldn't be lonely... well, then, she walks by, sits down... next to some tree... and then gets something out, tries to write, then, no, and at that point comes over/thinking about something, I don't know, meditating, at that point some guy comes over, sits down next to her, so, she moves away a little, then... well, I thought, well, everything is OK, but then again, the guy again somehow/she wants to be alone, and he keeps, he made some movement, well, moved away/put up his legs, put them on that... on some... well, on... on... on the cement where they were sitting... well, so it seemed to me that... м... э... somehow she felt that he... мм... was invading her solitude... [she] moved away, then finally she got up and left. That's it.'

The second narrative is elicited by *The Letter* and is told by an 18-year-old male who arrived in the US at the age of 15 (all instances considered to be L2 influence on L1 are underlined):

- (2) Я только что посмотрел кино... какое-то... женщина шла по улице, потом она зашла в свой дом, когда она заходила через дверь у неё в руке были письма, её почта... она зашла, она по... прошла в комнату, и села в кресле, к нам... спиною, она положила почти что все/всю почту на стол и открыла одно письмо... она его читала, где-то в середине письма она стала... мм... она выглядела как будто бы она была зла на кого-то и в то же время ей было или страшно или она была очень расстроена, она вначале бросила письмо, потом она его опять подобрала и начала его читать опять, и она стала ещё более расстроенная, но она не выглядела как будто бы она была зла, она, потом она его опять положила, и она/она не плакала, но она

выглядела как будто бы ей было очень не грустно, но, но, не зн/ непонятно что с ней было, потому что её волосы закрывали её лицо, поэтому мы не могли видеть её лицо, потом зашла другая женщина, она подошла к окну вначале, потом она увидела женщину которой было грустно, и она подошла к ней, э, она у нее что-то спросила и та, наверное, сказала про письмо, потому что женщина подобрала письмо и начала его читать, но женщина которой письмо это было адресовано, его забрала у той и бросила его опять на стол, и что-то ей сказала, другая женщина не поняла почему первая так действовала, и она села в кресло, перед этим первая женщина вышла из комнаты.

'I have just seen a film... some [film]... a woman was walking down the street, then she entered her house, when she was entering through the door she had some letters in her hand, her mail... she entered, she ca... came into the room, and sat down in an armchair, with her... back to us, she put almost all/all mail on the table, and opened one letter... she was reading it, somewhere in the middle of that letter she became... uhm... she looked as if she were angry at someone and at the same time she was either scared or very upset, she first threw the letter down, then picked it up and started reading it again, and she became even more upset, but she didn't look as if she were angry, she, then she put it down again, and she/she wasn't crying but she looked as if she were not sad, but, but I don't/it is not clear what was happening to her, because her hair covered her face, and so we couldn't see her face, then another woman came in, she first came to the window, then she saw the woman who was sad and came over to her, uhm, asked her something, and the other one probably said something about the letter, because the woman picked up the letter and started reading it, but the woman to whom the letter was addressed, took it away, and threw it back on the table, and said something to her, the other woman did not understand why the first one was acting this way and she sat down in an armchair, before this the first woman left the room.'

Data analysis

As already mentioned, the first step in the data analysis involved identifying instances of deviation from standard Russian. In all cases where particular uses were questionable, comparisons were made with the 80 narratives elicited by the same films from monolingual Russian speakers (Pavlenko, 1997, 2002a), in order to see whether particular instances fall within the range of acceptable language variation. These comparisons were

made possible by the fact that these elicited narratives required storytellers to refer to a common – and limited – set of visual representations. Thus, resulting narratives were relatively short, employed a limited range of morphosyntactic and semantic means, and allowed for meaningful comparisons across various groups. These comparisons allowed me to eliminate instances that represent deviation from standard Russian, but are nevertheless part of colloquial Russian speech. Then, I have analysed remaining instances and excluded obvious performance errors and errors whose origin could not be traced to English (and which might also be performance errors). The remaining instances were compared with those identified in narratives elicited from simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals and from American FL learners of Russian to ensure that the patterns identified indeed reflect the cross-linguistic influence of English on Russian. The patterns were also compared with those identified by other researchers in the speech of Russian L2 users of English (Andrews, 1993, 1999; Schmitt, 2000). Altogether, I have found 56 instances of L2 influence on L1 in the narratives of 21 Russian L2 users. Below, I will describe the L2 effects in three broadly defined areas of language use:

- (1) lexicon and semantics
- (2) morphosyntax, and
- (3) linguistic framing.

L2 influence on L1 in the lexicon and semantics

Lexical and semantic influence of L2 on L1 are extremely well documented in the literature on language contact, and in particular on immigrant bilingualism, where the need to name new phenomena in the new reality and the desire to keep the referential meaning constant may prompt lexical borrowing and semantic extension (Romaine, 1995). Many scholars suggest that the lexicon is the first and the main area where L2 influence on L1 is visible. Four main types of L2 effects on L1 lexis have been documented in the literature: lexical borrowing (Andrews, 1993, 1999; Boyd, 1993; Haugen, 1953; Li, 2001; Otheguy & Garcia, 1988, 1993), loan translation (Jaspaert & Kroon, 1992; Lomax, 1998), semantic extension (Otheguy & Garcia, 1988), and difficulties in lexical retrieval (Lomax, 1998; Olshtain & Barzilay, 1991). In the present corpus, all four types of L2 influence on L1 were observed in the lexicon and semantics of the study participants, who produced 29 L2-influenced lexical and semantic errors.

Six instances of *lexical borrowing* (i.e. L2 items adopted phonologically and, in the first case, morphologically) were identified in the narratives of four participants: *intruzivnost'* 'intrusiveness', *dauntoun* 'downtown', *lendlord* 'landlord', *apointment* 'appointment', and *boifrend* 'boyfriend' (the

last item was used by two different participants). The latter two items were also documented by Andrews (1999: 90–91, 96) as common items in the speech of immigrant Russians, designating concepts that have no exact counterparts in Russian.

Three instances of *loan translation*, or literal translations of compound words, idioms, and lexical collocations from the source language, were found in three different narratives:

- (3) он... мм... вторгается в её одиночество
'he... uhm... invades her solitude'

он вторгается в её эмоции, чувства
'he invades her emotions, feelings'

предлагает ей какую-то эмоциональную помощь
'offers her some emotional help'

The first two instances are prompted by the fact that Russian lacks the notion of privacy, and thus, in order to describe what they see as an invasion of privacy, the participants have to appeal to its translation equivalents in Russian, such as *odinochestvo* 'solitude'. The third instance was a literal translation of a collocation 'emotional help' where an appropriate Russian expression would have been *podderzhka* '[moral, emotional] support'.

L2 influence was also observed in the area of *semantic extension*, that is to say, extension in the use of L1 words and expressions to include the meaning of a perceived L2 translation equivalent (a phenomenon also known as loan shift). Twenty instances of semantic extension were found in the narratives of 13 participants; they can be further subdivided into four subcategories. The first subcategory, extension per se, involves attribution of a meaning of a polysemous English word to the Russian word that shares some but not all of the meanings of its 'translation equivalent', as in the examples below:

- (4) поменять как бы... сцену
'to change the scene somehow' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *обстановку* 'surroundings'

она явно становится... становится как-то неудобно и неудобно
'she clearly becomes... becomes somehow uncomfortable and ill at ease' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *некомфортно* 'uncomfortable [psychologically]'

The first instance illustrates semantic extension of the Russian word *stsena* 'scene, stage.' While in Russian *stsena* could also mean an embar-

raising display of anger or bad manners, like its English counterpart, its primary or core meaning is that of a theatre stage. It does not refer to areas or spheres of activity (e.g. the fashion scene) or places where events or actions occurred (e.g. the scene of the accident). The utterance does not constitute a loan translation, however, because there is a Russian expression *pomeniat' obstanovku* 'to change one's surroundings', which would have been appropriate. In a similar vein, two participants extended the meaning of the English 'uncomfortable' to the Russian adverb *neudobno* 'uncomfortable', which is typically used in apologies (*mne tak неудобно* 'I am so sorry') or when discussing physical discomfort. The speakers, however, used the adverb to refer to the psychological discomfort of being close to a stranger. This type of semantic extension was also encountered in the narratives of American FL learners of Russian and that of simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals, in particular with regard to the use of *neudobno*. In contrast, Russian monolinguals and some Russian L2 users of English used *nekomfortno* 'uncomfortable' or *diskomfort* 'discomfort' in the same context.

The second subcategory involves instances that may be interpreted as a loss of semantic and conceptual distinctions, and, in the first example, as semantic narrowing. These instances contain references to human emotions:

- (5) но ещё была очень как бы... зла на кого-то
'and also [she] was very somehow... angry at someone' – an appropriate lexical choice would be сердита 'cross, angry at the moment'

она видит, что её дочь не очень такая... счастливая
'she sees that her daughter is not that... happy' – an appropriate lexical choice would be недовольная 'dissatisfied' or грустная 'sad'

With regard to the first instance, Russian has three translation equivalents of angry – *serdityi* 'cross', 'angry at the moment', *zloi* 'malicious', 'very angry', 'mean' (typically used as a personality characteristic), and *gnevnyi* 'irate', 'in wrath' – each adjective more intense than the preceding one. Russian monolinguals favoured the first term, *serditaia* 'cross/Fem', in their narratives. In contrast, some Russian L2 users of English appear to have collapsed the distinctions, using instead the short adjective *zla* 'malicious', 'angry/Fem' in describing the main protagonist. In the second case, the participant similarly misused the adjective *schastlivaia* 'happy/Fem' which in Russian refers to a lasting state of happiness. In contrast, the English 'happy' has a much wider range of usage and may be used to mean 'pleased' or 'satisfied' (for an argument that the English 'happy' is weaker than its Russian counterpart, see Wierzbicka, 1999: 53).

The third subcategory of semantic extension involves the use of references in the inappropriate register:

- (6) девочка ходила по улице
'a [little] girl was walking down the street' – an appropriate lexical choice would be девушка 'young woman'

Here, two of the participants in the study referred to the main character in the movies as *devochka* 'little girl' and *devchonka* (pejorative term for a young girl), confounded by the overlap in the core meanings of the English 'girl' and the Russian *devochka*, *devchonka* 'girl'. The English word, however, has a much broader range of meanings and, depending on the context, may refer to women of all ages. In Russian, however, *devochka* can only mean a little girl up to the age of 10 to 13, at which point she transforms into *devushka* 'a young woman', which would have been an appropriate term to use in this context.

The last subcategory involves the attribution of a particular meaning to the word, based on superficial word-structure similarities, for example:

- (7) просматривала письма, которые она выбрала из почтового ящика
'[she] was looking through the letters which she chose from the mailbox' – an appropriate lexical choice would be вынула 'took out'

In the example above, the participant used the verb *vybrat'* 'to choose, to pick out' in the meaning of 'taking out' [the mail]. In doing so, he reinterpreted the meaning of the Russian verb, based on the literal meaning of its constituents *vy*/'out' + *brat'*/'take.' Similarly, another participant used the word *sozhitel'nitsa* (literally: 'co-habitant'/Fem) to mean 'roommate', whereas in Russian the word is used exclusively as a derogatory or ironic reference to a female who cohabitates with a male without being married to him.

Finally, ten narratives and five subsequent interviews also provided evidence of lexical access and retrieval difficulties (see also the discussion section). In some cases, the participants hesitated specifically at points where they were having problems with lexical choice or were about to violate either syntactic or semantic constraints of Russian – see narratives in (1) and (2), as well as examples (4) and (5). Others explicitly admitted difficulties in expressing their thoughts in Russian where particular concepts, such as privacy, were involved:

- (8) мне пришло в голову понятие, но я не нашел слов в русском языке, чтобы это описать... в общем, пришлось бы достаточно долго и неточно как-то описывать

'A notion came to me, but I didn't find Russian words to describe it... I would have had to describe it for a long time and inexactly'

когда парень убирает, ставит ноги, я уже не/не знаю как по-русски это объяснять... она уже, я так подумал, что это уже, для неё это уже было, что он пересек, то есть, что она уже не может быть одна
'when the guy moves away, puts his legs on, I already don't/I don't know how to describe this in Russian... she already, I thought, that this already, that for her it was, that he crossed, in other words, that she can no longer be alone'

Together, the narratives and the interviews provide convincing evidence that English influences both the Russian lexicon and the semantics of these Russian L2 users of English, and may also prompt temporary difficulties in access to Russian lexical items.

L2 influence on L1 in morphosyntax

Previous research on L2 influence on L1 in late bilinguals suggests that the lexicon is not the only area that is vulnerable to L2 influence, and that L1 morphosyntactic performance (and at times even competence) could also be subject to L2 influence and L1 attrition in adulthood (Pavlenko, 2000). L2-induced changes are particularly visible in L1 speakers who had spent a substantial amount of time in their L2 environment, generally between ten and twenty years (De Bot *et al.*, 1991; Py, 1986; Waas, 1996), and at times even forty years or longer (Altenberg, 1991; Schmid, 2000). De Bot and Clyne (1994) argue that L1 attrition may be visible much earlier, and that immigrants who managed to maintain their language in the first years of their stay in the L2 context are likely to remain fluent L1 speakers. Most pronounced changes and attrition are found in those who have few if any contacts with the speakers of L1 (De Bot *et al.*, 1991; Waas, 1996) and in those who have negative attitudes toward the L1 (Schmid, 2000). Considering the fact that L1 attrition is a complex phenomenon that cannot be reduced to L2 influence (for an up-to-date treatment, see Schmid, 2000), the focus of the present chapter will be exclusively on the L2 effects on L1. To date, the L2 influence on L1 morphosyntax of adult L2 users has been documented in the areas of case-, gender- and number-marking (Håkansson, 1995; Schmid, 2000), preposition choice (Py, 1986; Schmid, 2000), and word-order rules and subcategorisation (Boyd & Andersson, 1991; Py, 1986; Schmid, 2000; Seliger & Vago, 1991; Waas, 1996), where some L2 users not only extend L2 rules to their L1 but also accept sentences syntactically deviant in the L1 but permissible in the L2 (Altenberg, 1991).

In the present study, seventeen L2-influenced errors were identified in

the L2 users' narratives in four areas: tense and aspect, subcategorisation, case marking and prepositional choice. It is not surprising that the participants' morphosyntax is less affected than their lexicon. Most of them had spent less than ten years in the L2 environment, and only three participants had been in the US for ten years or longer (interestingly, they are not the ones who exhibited traces of L2 influence on L1 morphosyntax, which confirms De Bot and Clyne's (1994) observations). In addition, all participants indicated that they interacted both in English and in Russian on a daily basis, and were very committed to maintaining their native language (even though, as will be discussed later, several informants found L1 maintenance to be a daunting task). As a result, this section will examine trends and possible areas of influence rather than make sweeping claims about the present population. In what follows, I will discuss each area in turn, with the understanding that future work may uncover L2 English effects on other areas of Russian morphosyntax.

The first area where difficulties may arise and changes occur in Russian/English contact is that of tense and aspect (see Wenzell, 1989, for a discussion of L1 transfer in the use of tense/aspect by Russian learners of English). English verbs have an inherent lexical aspect (activity, state, accomplishment, achievement) and a grammatical one (simple, perfective, progressive). In turn, each Russian verb is either perfective or imperfective, and most of them have an aspectual pair. Thus, an English verb would typically have two corresponding Russian verbs (e.g. 'to do' corresponds to *delat'* 'to be doing something' and *sdelat'* 'to have done something'). The Russian verbs that make an aspectual pair generally have the same lexical meaning, but refer to the action from different perspectives (Vasilenko *et al.*, 1982). The imperfective form, which is the unmarked member of the pair, names the action without referring to its temporal limits, manner, direction, etc. The perfective form refers to a completed action; it is usually derived from the imperfective by the addition of a prefix or a suffix (in some cases, however, it is a verb with a different stem). Both types of verbs are marked for tense (past, present, perfect) and could be translated into English in a variety of ways (e.g. *ushel* 'left', 'has left', 'had left' vs. *ukhodil* 'was leaving', 'left several times', 'used to leave'). Just as Russian learners of English find the English tense system challenging (Wenzell, 1989), American FL learners of Russian have considerable difficulties in learning Russian aspectual distinctions, because they do not fully correspond to the perfective/progressive aspect in English. The difficulties are compounded by the fact that at times both members of an aspectual pair may be grammatically acceptable in a sentence, and lexical choice is ultimately determined by context. Consequently, learners are often under a false impression that

imperfective is the unmarked option and can be used in a wider variety of contexts than is acceptable in Russian. Additional difficulties are created by the fact that Russian verbs of motion have several imperfective forms, subcategorised into determinate and indeterminate (e.g. *idti/khodit* 'to walk'). Determinate verbs describe motion generally proceeding in a forward direction, usually at a given point in time (*idti po ulitse* 'to be walking down the street'), while indeterminate verbs describe aimless and/or multidirectional motion, and habitual or repeated motion (*khodit' tuda siuda* 'to walk back and forth'; *khodit' v shkolu* 'to go to school every day') (Muravyova, 1986). As a result of this seeming prevalence of the imperfective and the fact that it refers to action in general, American FL learners of Russian often opt for the imperfective when referring to accomplished past tense actions, as seen in the FL learners' narratives in the present study. Influenced by the lack of distinction between indeterminate and determinate verbs in English, at times they also appeal to indeterminate verbs when referring to specific movement proceeding forward:

- (9) она ходит по улице

'she is walking [herself] down the street' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *идет по улице*, as the woman is moving forward in a specific direction; the narrator also erroneously used the verb as a reflexive and chose an inappropriate preposition, *на*/'on', which refers to location, rather than *по*/'on', which refers to direction

когда она входила в комнату, она постала спокойную классическую музыку

'when she was entering the room, she turned on some quiet classical music' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *вошла* 'entered', as the two actions are sequential, not simultaneous, the first was completed before the second

та же самая женщина пришла домой, видимо, домой... э, бабушка шла, не знаю, мимо

'the same woman came home, it seems, home... mm, a grandmother was walking, I don't know, by' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *прошла* 'walked by', as the action was singular and completed, with no simultaneous actions described

я только что смотрел фильм, который происходил в каком-то русском городе

'I was just watching a movie that took place in some Russian city' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *посмотрел* 'saw', as the reference

is to a completed action, with no simultaneous actions described, and the intended meaning is 'I have just seen/watched a movie'

и парень сидел на эту скамейку

'and a guy was sitting on that bench' – in the context of this story, which describes a series of completed actions, the intended meaning is 'sat down' and an appropriate lexical choice would be *сел* 'sat down'; the case markings on the determiner and the noun confirm that this was the meaning intended by the speaker

Similar problems occur in the speech of simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals dominant in English:

- (10) она пришла, хотела сесть, сама быть

'she arrived, wanted to sit down (meaning: to sit for a while), to be alone' – since the reference in this context is to a progressive action limited in time, an appropriate lexical choice would be the perfective verb *посидеть* 'to sit for a while'

женщина ходит по улице

'a woman is walking down the street' – in this context, an appropriate lexical choice is *идёт* since the woman is moving forward in a specific direction, and not walking back and forth

The L2 users' narratives indicate that the perfective/imperfective and determinate/indeterminate distinctions in Russian may also be getting somewhat blurred for some Russian L2 users of English, who, just like FL learners, may be perceiving imperfective verbs and indeterminate verbs of motion as unmarked options. In the present corpus, seven instances of tense and aspect errors were identified in the narratives of five participants. All instances involved the use of imperfective aspect where perfective was required (and used by Russian monolinguals); some instances involved the use of verbs of motion and the additional use of indeterminate rather than determinate verbs. What makes it impossible to discard these instances as performance errors is that they mirror the patterns of L1 transfer in narratives told by American FL learners of English and simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals:

- (11) пришел... мм... какой-то парень и сидел рядом с ней

'some guy arrived and was sitting down next to her' – an appropriate lexical choice would be *сел* 'sat down'

она шла через мост, в Итаке, скорее всего в центре внизу в Итаке...
 мм... мимо неё проезжала машина
 'she was walking across the bridge, in Ithaca, most likely in downtown Ithaca ... uhm... a car was passing by her' – since проезжать refers to repeated or multiple actions, appropriate lexical choices here would be проехала 'passed by' if one car was involved, and проезжали 'were passing by' if multiple cars were involved

девочка ходила по улице
 'a young girl was walking down the street' – in this context, an appropriate lexical choice is шла 'was walking', since the woman was walking forward in a specific direction; the verb ходить generally implies repeated or habitual action, or multiple directions

я смотрела фильм
 'I was watching a movie' – in the context of the story, an appropriate lexical choice would be посмотрела 'I just watched, I have watched, I have just seen', since the reference is to a completed action with no mention of events taking place simultaneously

она смотрела на свою почту
 'she was looking at her mail' – in the context of the story, an appropriate lexical choice would be посмотрела 'looked', as the woman glanced at the mail briefly

The second area where L2 influence was observed is that of subcategorisation. In the present study, five violations of subcategorisation constraints were found in the narratives of five participants, involving instances such as the following two:

- (12) она чувствовала грустная
 'she felt sad'

она явно становится... становится как-то неудобно и неуютно
 'she clearly becomes... becomes somehow uncomfortable and ill at ease'

In the first instance, the participant violated subcategorisation constraints which specify that, as a reflexive verb, *chuvstvovat'* 'to feel' subcategorises either for a limited range of adverbs, or for nouns and adjectives in Instrumental case and, as a non-reflexive verb, for nouns in Accusative case. Instead, the reflexive particle required in this context is omitted, and the verb is followed by the adjective in Nominative case, as it would have been in English. In the second case, another participant violated the constraints

for the verb *stanovit'sia* 'to become' which in Russian subcategorises only for nouns and adjectives in Instrumental case. However, there are no adjectives in Russian that correspond to the English 'uncomfortable', and to complete the thought the speaker violated the constraints and used two adverbs that correspond in meaning to 'uncomfortable' (see also the discussion in the previous section on the problems with the lexical choice in this example). To use these adverbs, the sentence should have been constructed in the passive voice, with the subject pronoun 'she' in the Dative case (*ei*) and not in the Nominative (*ona*) – see also further discussion of this example in the section on linguistic framing.

The discussion above demonstrates that not only Russian subcategorisation constraints but also Russian case marking is subject to L2 influence. Two more study participants produced the utterances below where a noun and a subject pronoun were marked incorrectly:

- (13) она села в кресле
 'she sat down in an armchair' / Prep – should have been кресло / Acc

он ей не только начинает не нравится, но очень даже раздражает
 'he not only displeases her / Acc, but really starts irritating her' – should have been ей / Dat

Both errors can be explained by the fact that Russian has a six-case system with obligatory morphological case marking, while English has three cases with case marking most visible in pronouns (e.g. *he/him*). Thus, under the influence of English, the distinction between the cases in question may have become subject to intralinguistic simplification. It is also possible that in the second example we are witnessing a performance error where the pronoun is in agreement with the verb *razdrazhat'* 'to irritate' which introduces the new topic, rather than with the one immediately following it. Schmitt (2000) observed similar instances of subcategorisation violations and of case marking errors in the speech of Russian immigrant children living in the US. In the present study, case-marking errors, all in prepositional phrases, have also been observed in the narratives of FL learners (the first three instances) and simultaneous Russian/English bilinguals (the last two):

- (14) сначала фотоаппарат следовал... какую-то девушку
 'first the camera followed... some girl / Acc' – an appropriate wording would be за какой-то девушкой / Instr

она... мм... пошла на мосте

'she... uhm... walked over the bridge' /Prep – an appropriate wording would be по мосту/Dat or через мост/Acc

похоже на Москве

'similar to Moscow' /Prep – an appropriate choice would be Москву/Acc

она... вх... вых... выходит из комната

'she l... le... leaves the room' /Nom – an appropriate choice would be комнаты/Gen

кто-то пришел, сел к ней

'someone came, sat down next to her' /Acc – an appropriate choice would be к ней/Dat

The examples above illustrate not only patterns of case-marking errors but also the difficulties that FL learners and simultaneous bilinguals have in selecting appropriate prepositions in Russian. This area may also be of interest in future investigations of L2 influence on L1 in Russian L2 users of English. In the present study, two Russian L2 users produced three L2-influenced errors in selecting a preposition (the second instance was repeated twice):

- (15) когда она заходила через дверь, у неё в руке были письма
'when she was entering through the door, there were letters in her hand' – an appropriate prepositional choice is в дверь 'in the door', moreover, in this context, the mention of the door is simply redundant

села на кресле

'sat on the chair' – an appropriate prepositional choice is в кресло 'in the chair'

In sum, the present study identified four specific areas of Russian morphosyntax (tense and aspect, subcategorisation, case marking, and prepositional choice) that are likely to be subject to L2 influence in Russian-English contact and may also be the first areas to exhibit such influence. Clearly, to make substantial claims about L2 influence on L1 competence, rather than performance, a significantly larger database will need to be assembled, in particular from speakers who have been exposed to and interacting in English for decades.

L2 influence on L1 linguistic framing

Another important area where L2 influence on L1 of the study participants was evident is that of *linguistic framing*, or the choice of a structural

category or grammatical class to express a mental representation (Slobin, 1996). To give an example, in satellite-framed languages, such as English, information about the motion path is provided in a satellite of the verb (prefixes or particles), while in verb-framed languages, such as French, the path is indicated through the main verb. To this researcher's knowledge, to date this category has not yet been examined in the study of L2 influence on L1 (see, however, Pavlenko, 2002b; Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002). In the present study, ten instances of L2 influence on L1 framing were identified in seven narratives, all involving references to emotions. This is not surprising, as the two speech communities in question differ in the framing of emotions, and two of the four films aimed to elicit such differences. In what follows, then, I will first discuss differences in linguistic framing of emotions between Russian and English, and then proceed to discuss the L2 effects.

Previous research on Russian discourses of emotions suggests that experiences comparable to 'joy', 'sadness', or 'anger' are often conceptualised in Russian as inner activities in which one engages more or less voluntarily (Wierzbicka, 1992). As a result, these activities involve duration and are often designated by verbs, rather than by adjectives (e.g. *radovat'sia* 'to rejoice', 'to be actively happy, joyful'; *serdit'sia* 'to be angry', 'to rage'; *stydit'sia* 'to be ashamed', 'to be experiencing shame'). While it is possible in Russian to use perception copulas and change-of-state verbs when discussing emotions, such references would be typically made in passive voice (e.g. *ei bylo/stalo grustno*; literally 'it was/became sad for her'). In contrast, in English emotions are conceptualised as passive states caused by external and/or past causes; as a result, they are more commonly expressed by means of adjectives and pseudo-participles, such as 'worried', 'sad' or 'disgusted'. Moreover, as Wierzbicka (1992: 401) points out, English has only a very limited number of intransitive emotion verbs, such as 'to rejoice', 'to grieve', 'to worry', or 'to pine' – and the whole category may be losing ground in modern English.

Pavlenko's (2002a) study of emotion narratives of monolingual speakers of Russian and English provides empirical support for these claims, demonstrating that American narrators favour an adjectival pattern in their emotion narratives, while Russian narrators favour a verbal one. Moreover, not only did Russian speakers use more verbs than adjectives in their narratives, they also used predominantly imperfective and reflexive emotion verbs that stressed the processual aspect of the experience. Of particular importance in the Russian corpus was the verb *perezhiivat* 'to suffer things through', which, together with the noun *perezhiivania* 'feelings', 'emotions', 'suffering' accounted for 9% of all emotion word tokens in the monolingual Russian corpus. *Perezhiivat* has no translation equivalent in

English. The meaning of the verb's perfective counterpart *perezhit* is 'to live through' (e.g. difficult times), while the meaning of the imperfective lemma (literally referring to 'suffering through') is more immediate and refers to the act of experiencing, processing and dealing with particular emotions caused by unfortunate experiences. It is difficult to render the verb precisely in English, as its closest counterparts 'experiencing' and 'processing' lack the emotional overtone of being nervous, anxious, suffering and engaged in observable actions, crucial for understanding of *perezhiwat*.

In the present study, under the influence of the L2, some Russian L2 users of English attempted to substitute verbs for adjectives and, consequently, incorporated perception copulas and change-of-state verbs in their texts. The first L2-influenced tendency, found in the narratives of five different participants (see also narrative in (2) above), is to use the verb *stat*' (perfective)/*stanovit'sia* (imperfective) 'to become' with emotion adjectives, in contexts where monolingual participants use action verbs such as *rasserdit'sia* 'to get angry' or *rasstroit'sia* 'to get upset'. This framing transfer also involves subcategorisation violations, as in Russian the verb subcategorises for adjectives in Instrumental (and not in Nominative) case:

- (16) она явно становится... становится как-то неудобно и неуютно
'she clearly becomes... becomes somehow uncomfortable and ill at ease' – an appropriate linguistic framing here, as discussed earlier, would be ей стало как-то некомфортно

она стала ещё более расстроенная
'she became even more upset'/Nom – an appropriate linguistic framing here is она ещё более расстроилась 'she got even more upset'

она была, стала... сердиться
'she was, became (meaning: started) ... getting angry' – an appropriate linguistic framing here is она рассердилась 'she got angry'

она становится очень какая-то такая... трудно, я даже не знаю как это сказать... ну, как-то меланхолическое у неё состояние
'she becomes so very... it's hard, I don't even know how to say that... well, she is in a melancholic state' – an appropriate linguistic framing here is passive voice ей становится 'it becomes for her'

Another L2-influenced framing pattern involved the use of perception verb *vygliadet*' 'to look as if':

- (17) она выглядит как, может быть, она будет плакать
'she looks as if, maybe, she will be crying' – here the subject missed an obligatory particle *будто* 'if' which should have followed *как* 'as'

она выглядела как будто бы она была зла на кого-то
'she looked as if she were angry at someone'

она не выглядела как будто бы она была зла... она выглядела как будто бы ей было очень не грустно, но не зн/непонятно что с ней было

'she didn't look as if she were angry... she looked as if she were not sad, but I don't kn/it's not clear what was going on with her'

The uses of this verb exemplified above are inauthentic for a number of reasons. To begin with, the use of *vygliadet*' is a rhetorical strategy, not encountered in the narratives produced by monolingual Russians, who favour either action verbs, such as *rasstroit'sia* 'to get upset' or direct descriptions of states such as *ona rasstroena* 'she [is] upset'. In contrast, monolingual speakers of English in the previous study (Pavlenko, 2002a) preferred to phrase their opinions in a qualified way, stating that the woman 'seemed upset' or 'looked as if she was upset.' Secondly, the use of *vygliadet*' is inappropriate in this context for pragmatic reasons, as in Russian it is used in a limited range of contexts to tell people that they either look well (*khorocho vygliadet*') or do not (*plokho vygliadet*' 'to look badly', i.e. tired). Finally, the use of *vygliadet*' also creates morphosyntactic problems for the participants. To begin with, the Russian verb is most frequently used with a limited range of adverbs, such as the ones above; in rare cases when it is used with adjectives, it subcategorises for adjectives in Instrumental case. In contrast, in English the verb may subcategorise for multiple adjectives and pseudo-participles (e.g. 'to look dapper, elegant, confused'). Thus, the participants often pause, hesitate, and then resort to the construction *kak budto* 'as if', which allows them to avoid subcategorisation errors (in particular, if they are no longer comfortable with case marking) by producing a subordinate clause. Not surprisingly, similar uses of *vygliadet*' are documented in the narratives by simultaneous Russian bilinguals and by FL learners of Russian, for example:

- (18) и выглядела как она была очень тронутая
'and looked as she were very moved' – note that the actual Russian adjective used *тронутая*, while literally meaning 'moved', in reality means 'crazy'; also the particle *будто* 'if' is missing

L2 effects were also seen in the inappropriate use of the verb *chuvstvovat*' 'to feel', already illustrated in example (12). Similar to *vygliadet*' 'to look as if', this verb is frequently used with a limited range of adverbs such as *khorocho* 'well' (as in *chuvstvovat' sebia khorocho* 'to feel well') or *plokho* 'badly' (*chuvstvovat' sebia plokho* 'to feel badly', i.e. to be ill). With adjectives

the verb subcategorises for Instrumental (and not for Nominative) case. In addition, it is obligatory to use the reflexive form of the verb that includes the particle *sebia* 'self' (e.g. *ona chuvstvovala sebia neschastnoi* 'she felt [herself] unhappy' /Inst).

In sum, it appears that L2 influence on L1 prompted some study participants to frame emotions linguistically as states, rather than as active processes, violating both semantic and syntactic constraints of Russian. In many cases, the speakers realised that they were not using the appropriate frames and, as seen in the narrative in (2) and in some of the examples above, started pausing, stumbling, stuttering, self-correcting and offering a metalinguistic commentary.

Discussion

The analysis above shows that L2 effects were identified in narratives elicited from 21 Russian L2 users of English, some of whom have been in the target language context for less than 10 years (and in some cases only 1.5 years). It is possible that, if more extensive data were collected, the L2 effects would have been visible in the speech of the other participants as well. In the present study, the L2 influence on L1 was found in the areas of the lexicon, semantics and morphosyntax, and in linguistic framing that involves both semantics and grammar. From the point of view of the theoretical framework presented earlier, the results of the study are interpreted as evidence for four out of five processes taking place in the bilingual mental lexicon: borrowing, shift, restructuring and L1 attrition (but not convergence).

The first and most important process evident in the present data is *borrowing* or internalisation of new concepts, which are either differentially encoded in English and in Russian (e.g. emotion concepts) or encoded in English but not in Russian (e.g. 'privacy'). The fact that Russian L2 users of English are internalising new concepts is evident in instances of lexical borrowing, all of which refer to concepts non-existent in Russian culture (see also Andrews, 1993, 1999), instances of loan translation and hesitation whereby participants declare the inability to express a notion or a concept, and in the few instances of code-switching. As seen in the excerpt below, the study participants are aware of these conceptual differences between their two speech communities, which may lead to difficulties in lexical choice:

- (19) Или, например, privacy... какая privacy?... по-русски этого нету, я не могу сказать по-русски, знаешь, ну я могу сказать 'Я хочу побыть одна', но это звучит слишком драматично, да?... когда ты говоришь

по-английски 'I need my privacy' это более как ежедневная вещь и никто, никого это не волнует...

'Or take, for instance, *privacy*... what *privacy*?... in Russian this doesn't exist, I cannot say in Russian, you know, well, I can say "I want to be alone", but this sounds too dramatic, yes?.. when you say in English "I need my privacy" this is more like an everyday thing and no one, it doesn't bother anyone...'

Another process evident in the data is *shift*, whereby some conceptualisations shift towards L2 conceptual domains. This shift is particularly evident in the domain of emotions, where the participants appeal to English means of encoding emotions and, in the process, violate syntactic (in particular, subcategorisation) and semantic constraints of Russian. Once again, some are aware that English is becoming their preferred mode of self-expression. In the interview below, a 25 year old female study participant who arrived in the US five years earlier complains that her Russian is no longer adequate to describe her feelings and newly-acquired concepts (note that she also code-switches when describing how she feels, using first the English word 'clumsy', and only then the Russian approximation *nelovko*):

- (20) Что я хочу сказать? Что я чувствую себя/все более и более clumsy, неловко, когда я говорю по-русски, мне трудно подбирать слова, и очень часто мне кажется, что мне легче выразить это по-английски, даже не потому что я не знаю слов по-русски, а потому что выражение, которое я хочу употребить в данной ситуации, оно настолько английское, и оно настолько... например... что-то очень трудно сделать, да?... и я не знаю получится у меня или нет, я говорю себе сама по-английски 'I can make it'... почему – потому что по-русски это не звучит, это не то же самое, и нету такой... уверенности, что ты, да, ты сможешь это сделать, нет такой бравады, нет такого спокойствия, ещё чего-то такого, нет вот этого, нету... 'What do I want to say? That I feel more and more clumsy, uncomfortable, when I speak Russian, it is difficult for me to choose words, and very often it seems to me that it is easier for me to express something in English, not even because I do not know Russian words, but because the expression I want to use in a particular situation, it is so English, and it is so... for example... something is very difficult to accomplish, yes? ... and I do not know if I will be able to succeed or not, and I say to myself in English "I can make it"... why – because in Russian it doesn't sound right, it is not the same, and there is no such... confidence, that

you, yes, you will be able to do this, there is no such bravado, no such calm, and something else, it is not there, no...

A further process we have witnessed is *restructuring*, in which the violation of syntactic and semantic constraints suggests that the Russian of some of the study participants may be incorporating some L2 elements and undergoing some intralinguistic simplification in the domains of tense and aspect and case marking, as well as with regard to particular lexical items, such as *zloi* 'angry' or *schastlivyi* 'happy.' These data also point in an interesting direction for future research in the area of tense and aspect. Slobin (1996, 2000) has repeatedly argued that speakers of different languages vary in the ways in which they perceive and encode motion. Some languages (such as French) are verb-framed and indicate 'path' through the main verb, and others (such as English) are satellite-framed and thus indicate 'path' by a satellite to the verb while focusing on 'manner of motion'. What is interesting about Russian is that, even though it is considered to be a satellite-framed language, Russian motion verbs encode both 'path' and 'manner of motion', with 'path' often being doubly encoded through both prefixes and prepositions. Moreover, as discussed earlier, Russian also distinguishes between determinate and indeterminate motion. If L2 influence did indeed begin to impact on ways in which tense and aspect, and in particular motion, are encoded by Russian L2 users of English, in the future it would be interesting to investigate whether some aspects of motion (such as determinacy or even path) that are emphasised by Russian but not by English are becoming less salient for Russian L2 users.

Finally, self-corrections, hesitations, pauses, metalinguistic comments and explicit statements indicate that the participants are aware of lexical retrieval difficulties that may be interpreted as a sign of – at least temporary – *L1 attrition* (limited perhaps to on-line performance). One 18-year-old male participant, who arrived in the US four years earlier, mentioned that during his annual summer visits to Moscow people tease him about his Russian:

- (21) they say that I have an accent in Russian (laughs)... no, I don't make mistakes, but... I have a bit of an accent, but sometimes I forget words...

On the conceptual level, attrition is evident in the fact that, not only do American conceptualisations of emotions surface in the narratives, but also only one of all the study participants referred to the specifically Russian notion of *perezhiivat'* 'to suffer through', which dominated the narratives of Russian monolinguals (see also Pavlenko, 2002b).

At the same time, despite the signs of perhaps inevitable L2 influence,

for many, if not all, of the study participants, Russian remains an important means of self-expression. They are fully invested in maintaining their Russian competence – even though they cannot help but witness the interaction between their two linguistic systems, described as follows in one of the interviews:

- (22) if I am with my Russian friends, I think it's very important that I do speak Russian to them, but there is always that mixing of two languages, which personally I don't appreciate, especially when people try to conjugate Russian or American verbs or like different words in Russian way, so... I mean, you can mix it but to a certain point, and that's what I do...

The awareness of the dynamic nature of linguistic competence prevents us ultimately from seeing the instances discussed in this study as language loss, a phenomenon which, according to Schmid (2000: 191) may not even exist. Rather, they may constitute a case of temporary inhibition or deactivation of particular linguistic items and morphosyntactic constraints.

Conclusion

The data discussed above provide evidence that L2 influence on L1 takes place in the lexicon, semantics and morphosyntax of Russian L2 users of English who learned their L2 in late childhood or adulthood. In the area of morphosyntax, the L2 influence was exhibited in violations of tense and aspect, case-marking rules, subcategorisation constraints, and prepositional choice. In the area of lexicon and semantics, the influence was visible in the instances of lexical borrowing, loan translation and semantic extension, as well as in lexical retrieval difficulties. L2 influence was also found in the area of linguistic framing, where both semantic and syntactic constraints were violated by the narrators.

Clearly, the present investigation is limited in a number of ways. To begin with, the data collected here consist of relatively short oral narratives, elicited by specific visual stimuli. While these data allow us to conduct very useful across-group comparisons, in future studies of L2 influence on L1 it would also be important to collect longer samples consisting of both oral and written performance, both elicited and spontaneous. In future studies with Russian participants, it would be interesting to examine L2 influence on L1 in participants who emigrated to the US at various socio-historic points, as language and assimilation attitudes of various groups of immigrants may differ and have important implications for L1 maintenance and L2 influence on L1 (Schmid, 2000; for discussion of three Russian emigra-

tion waves, see Andrews, 1999). To encourage cross-linguistic inquiry, it is also important to move beyond numerous comparisons of language X and English, and in particular to examine interaction between languages rich in inflectional morphology. It is equally important to examine cross-linguistic influence as a multidirectional phenomenon that may involve simultaneous L1 influence on L2 and L2 influence on L1 (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002) and the interaction between three or more languages (Cenoz *et al.*, 2001).

In sum, I argue that the complex phenomenon of L2 influence on L1 is best understood from a multi-competence perspective, advanced by Cook (1991, 1992), which sees multilinguals' linguistic repertoires as a 'unified, complex, coherent, interconnected, interdependent ecosystem, not unlike a tropical forest' (Sridhar, 1994: 803). This dynamic perspective accommodates the framework proposed here, and allows us to examine further which L2-influence processes take place in which language areas, and what prompts particular changes. Most importantly, it allows us to see L2 influence as a potentially positive and enriching phenomenon, beautifully described by the Polish/English writer Eva Hoffman:

When I speak Polish now, it is infiltrated, permeated, and inflected by the English in my head. Each language modifies the other, crossbreeds with it, fertilises it. Each language makes the other relative. (Hoffman, 1989: 273)

Acknowledgements

An early draft of this chapter was presented at the International Workshop on Effects of the Second Language on the First Language, organised by Vivian Cook at Wivenhoe House, Colchester, UK, in April 2001; I am very thankful to the workshop audience for their comments and suggestions. I am also deeply grateful to Vivian Cook, Istvan Kecskes, Monika Schmid and Masha Shardakova for their insightful and constructive comments on the earlier versions of this chapter. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the fact that many of the ideas discussed in the chapter were born in discussions of the data with two outstanding and generous colleagues, Jean-Marc Dewaele and Scott Jarvis. All errors and inaccuracies remain my own.

References

- Altenberg, E. (1991) Assessing first language vulnerability to attrition. In H. Seliger and R. Vago (eds) *First Language Attrition* (pp. 189–206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Andrews, D. (1993) American-immigrant Russian: Socio-cultural perspectives on borrowings from English in the language of the third wave. *Language Quarterly* 31 (3–4), 153–176.
- Andrews, D. (1999) *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora: Soviet Immigrants in the United States*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. and Bergström, A. (1996) Acquisition of tense and aspect in second language and foreign language learning: Learner narratives in ESL and FFL. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 52 (2), 308–330.
- Becker, A. and Carroll, M. (1997) *The Acquisition of Spatial Relations in a Second Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Berman, R. (1999) Bilingual proficiency/proficient bilingualism: Insights from narrative texts. In G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (eds) *Bilingualism and Migration* (pp. 187–208). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Boyd, S. (1993) Attrition or expansion? Changes in the lexicon of Finnish and American adult bilinguals in Sweden. In K. Hyltenstam and A. Viberg (eds) *Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neuropsychological and Linguistic Perspectives* (pp. 386–411). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyd, S. and Andersson, P. (1991) Linguistic change among bilingual speakers of Finnish and American English in Sweden: Background and some tentative findings. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 90, 13–35.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B. and Jessner, U. (eds) (2001) *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (1991) The poverty of the stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research* 7, 103–117.
- Cook, V. (1992) Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning* 42, 557–591.
- Cook, V. (1999) Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33, 185–209.
- De Bot, K. and Clyne, M. (1994) A 16 year longitudinal study of language attrition in Dutch immigrants in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15 (1), 17–28.
- De Bot, K., Gommans, P. and Rossing, C. (1991) L1 loss in an L2 environment: Dutch immigrants in France. In H. Seliger and R. Vago (eds) *First Language Attrition* (pp. 87–98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dewaele, J.-M. and Pavlenko, A. (2002) Emotion vocabulary in interlanguage. *Language Learning* 52 (2), 265–329.
- Doughty, C. and Long, M. (2000) Eliciting second language speech data. In L. Menn and N. Ratner (eds) *Methods for Studying Language Production* (pp. 149–177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flège, J. (1987) The production of 'new' and 'similar' phones in a foreign language: evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics* 15, 47–65.
- Grosjean, F. (1998) Transfer and language mode. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1 (3), 175–176.
- Håkansson, G. (1995) Syntax and morphology in language attrition: A study of five bilingual expatriate Swedes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5 (2), 153–171.
- Haugen, E. (1953) *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hoffman, E. (1989) *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language*. New York: Penguin Books.

- Hyltenstam, K. (1988) Non-native features of near-native speakers. On the ultimate attainment of childhood L2 learners. In R. Harris (ed.) *Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals* (pp. 351–368). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Jarvis, S. (1998) *Conceptual Transfer in the Interlingual Lexicon*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club Publications.
- Jaspaert, K. and Kroon, S. (1992) From the typewriter of A.L.: A case study in language loss. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, and S. Kroon (eds) *Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages* (pp. 137–147). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kellerman, E. and Sharwood Smith, M. (eds) (1986) *Crosslinguistic Influence on Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Klein, W. and Perdue, C. (1992) *Utterance Structure. Developing Grammars Again*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Latomaa, S. (1998) English in contact with 'the most difficult language in the world': The linguistic situation of Americans living in Finland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 133, 51–71.
- Li, D. (2001) L2 lexis in L1: Reluctance to translate out of concern for referential meaning. *Multilingua* 20 (1), 1–26.
- Muravyova, L. (1986) *Verbs of Motion in Russian*. Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publishers.
- Olshtain, E. and Barzilay, M. (1991) Lexical retrieval difficulties in adult language attrition. In H. Seliger and R. Vago (eds) *First Language Attrition* (pp. 139–150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Otheguy, R. and Garcia, O. (1988) Diffusion of lexical innovations in the Spanish of Cuban Americans. In J.L. Ornstein-Galicia, G.K. Green and D. Bixler-Marquez (eds) *Research Issues and Problems in US Spanish: Latin American and Southwestern Varieties* (pp. 203–242). Brownsville: University of Texas.
- Otheguy, R. and Garcia, O. (1993) Convergent conceptualisations as predictors of degree of contact in US Spanish. In A. Roca and J. Lipski (eds) *Spanish in the US: Linguistic Contact and Diversity* (pp. 135–154). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pavlenko, A. (1997) *Bilingualism and Cognition*. PhD thesis, Cornell University.
- Pavlenko, A. (1999) New approaches to concepts in bilingual memory. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2 (3), 209–230.
- Pavlenko, A. (2000) L2 influence on L1 in late bilingualism. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11 (2), 175–205.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002a) Emotions and the body in English and Russian. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 10 (1/2), 201–236.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002b) Bilingualism and emotions. *Multilingua* 21 (1), 45–78.
- Pavlenko, A. and Jarvis, S. (2002) Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (2), 190–214.
- Perdue, C. (ed.) (1993) *Adult Language Acquisition: Crosslinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Py, B. (1986) Competence and attrition in the native language of immigrants. In E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith (eds) *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 163–172). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rintell, E. (1990) That's incredible: Stories of emotion told by second language learners and native speakers. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen and S. Krashen (eds) *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 75–94). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Romaine, S. (1995) *Bilingualism* (2nd edn). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Schmid, M. (2000) First language attrition, use, and maintenance: The case of German Jews in Anglophone countries. PhD thesis, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Germany.
- Schmitt, E. (2000) Overt and covert codeswitching in immigrant children from Russia. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4 (1), 9–28.
- Seliger, H. and Vago, R. (1991) The study of first language attrition: An overview. In H. Seliger and R. Vago (eds) *First Language Attrition* (pp. 3–15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, D. (1996) From 'thought and language' to 'thinking for speaking.' In J. Gumperz and S. Levinson (eds) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity* (pp. 70–96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, D. (2000) Verbalised events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier and R. Dirven (eds) *Evidence for Linguistic Relativity* (pp. 107–138). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sridhar, S. (1994) A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 800–805.
- Tannen, D. (1980) A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. In W. Chafe (ed.) *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production* (pp. 51–87). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1993) What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Framing in Discourse* (pp. 14–56). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vasilenko, E., Yegorova, A. and Lamm, E. (1982) *Russian Verb Aspects*. Moscow: Russian Language Publishers.
- Waas, M. (1996) *Language Attrition Downunder: German Speakers in Australia*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Wenzell, V. (1989) Transfer of aspect in the English oral narratives of native Russian speakers. In H. Dechert and M. Raupach (eds) *Transfer in Language Production* (pp. 71–97). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992) *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-specific Configurations*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1999) *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.