УДК 81'246.3
DOI 10.58423/2786-6726/2024-1-101-129

Noémi Szabó, Ulrike Jessner

Multilingual Assessment of Primary School Pupils in the Hungarian Context

1. Introduction

According to Baker and Wright (2017), globalisation and interculturalism are both the cause and effect of bi- and multilingualism. As multilingualism has been identified as the norm, academic research on multilingualism and multilingual education has grown accordingly (Cenoz, 2013; Herdina&Jessner, 2002; Cenoz&Jessner, 2000; Cenoz et al., 2003; Cook, 2016). Many people can acquire a third or fourth language that is why multilingualism or Third Language Acquisition (henceforth TLA) is a natural phenomenon in many parts of the world. However, third language acquisition is more common in multilingual settings like in Africa or Asia, people can acquire second, third or additional languages through instruction in the European context (Cenoz, 2013). The typical language learner acquires a second or third after the first language and therefore multilingualism is considered to play an essential part in language education (Cummins, 2008; Cenoz 2009). Language acquisition models explain the processes that can happen between the languages in the speakers' whole linguistic repertoire. However, the study of more than two language systems ascertained that the conventional application of second language acquisition (henceforth SLA) terminology cannot be used without questioning trilingualism studies (Kramsch& Whiteside, 2007; Hammarberg, 2018; SafontJordá, 2015). Third language acquisition (henceforth TLA) represents a field in applied linguistics, more specifically in multilingualism research, which has made significant advancements over the last twenty years (Fouser, 1995; Jessner, 1999; Cenoz&Jessner, 2000; Cenoz et al, 2001; De Angelis, 2007; Bardel& Falk, 2007; Jessner, 2008; Hammarberg, 2010; Cenoz, 2013; Aronin&Jessner, 2015; Cenoz, 2020). Multilingual processing is a major area of interest in TLA where the multilingual lexicon stands at the centre of investigation (Cenoz et al., 2003, de Angelis, 2007).

Researchers have shown an increased interest in TLA since learning additional languages is becoming more and more popular even in the Hungarian

context (Bacsa, 2012; Boócz-Barna, 2014; Horvath&Jessner, 2020; Szabó&Failasofah, 2021). Over the past decade, the question of acquisition order concerning English and German as foreign languages received special attention in the Hungarian educational scenes (Kecskes&Papp, 2000; Tápai-Balla, 2012; Perge, 2017; Boócz-Barna, 2007, Horvath &Jessner, 2023; Szabó&Failasofah, 2022). One component of multilingual awareness - which is metalinguistic awareness - deserves more attention in TLA as it is considered to be an under-researched area in multilingualism research from a holistic viewpoint (Jessner, 2006; Jessner et al., 2016; Cenoz et al., 2001; de Angelis, 2007; Hofer, 2022). The other variable of multilingual proficiency is cross-linguistic influence (de Angelis, 2007; Odlin, 2003; Jessner, 2016). In the last decades, particular attention has been paid to the influence of the non-native language back to the native language of the speaker (Cook, 2003; Kecskes&Papp, 2000; Pavlenko, 1999; Pavlenko and Jarvis, 2001, 2002). In the Hungarian context, only very few studies have concentrated on TLA or multilingual awareness (Flynn &Berkes, 2004; Kecskes, 2015; Szabó, 2018; Horváth&Jessner, 2022).

In the next sections, we first delineate a literature review elaborating on multilingual acquisition, multicompetence and the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (henceforth DMM) and its main component: multilingual awareness. Then we provide the context of Hungarian foreign language learning. An outline of the Hungarian pilot study follows this. Finally, the conclusion gives a summary and critique of the findings.

2. Literature review

This chapter presents a brief synopsis of the relevant literature which supports the theoretical considerations of this study. In the first subchapter, the background of TLA) is presented. The decisive factors of TLA are explained in the second subchapter. The main theoretical framework of the study is the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism which is introduced in the third subchapter. The fourth subchapter describes the holistic way of multicompetence and multilingual testing. The last subchapter draws attention to the Hungarian language learning context.

2.1. Third Language Acquisition

Some scientists hold the view that third language acquisition is only a by-product of second language acquisition studies. Traditionally, it has been argued that no distinction is usually made between learning one's first non-native language (L2) and learning a further language (L3) in the Second Language Acquisition (henceforth SLA) literature. (Singh &Carrol, 1979; Mitchell& Myles (1998)). However, many researchers have investigated TLA from a psycholinguistic point

of view in the past fifteen years (Herdina&Jessner, 2002; Cenoz&Jessner, 2000; Jessner et al., 2016; Hammarberg, 2018; Bardel,2020) Acquiring a third or additional language differs from acquiring a second language in many respects based on empirical research (Jessner, 2006; Jessner,2008). TLA is a more complex issue based on the structural level and learners differentiate a minimum of three languages in case of third language acquisition. Knowing more than two languages seems to have a facilitative effect on additional language learning because one acquires multiple lexical and grammatical cues in acquiring a further language (Montanari &Quay, 2019).

To differentiate the two terms, the definition of TLA is based on quantitative and qualitative changes in the language learning process. Researchers working in the field of TLA seem to agree with the definition (Cenoz and Genesee, 1998; Cenoz and Jessner, 2000; T.Balla, 2012). However, scholars tend to describe the status of L3 in the TLA studies. The additional term "third language" has come into use so the category is a relative newcomer in terminology as the book of De Angelis (2007) is concerned with the L3 terminology in detail. De Angelis (2007) proposes four possibilities for clarifying the new field by labelling third language acquisition research: (a) Multiple Language Acquisition; (b) Multilingual Acquisition; (c) Third Language Acquisition and (d) Third or Additional Language Acquisition. Researchers working in the field tend to use the latter two versions so TLA or additional language acquisition are the common terms (De Angelis, 2007, p. 10). There is a degree of uncertainty around the terminology in the field of TLA, where language acquisition is placed in a multilingual setting. A generally accepted definition of TLA is lacking as an L3 may be understood in 4 possible ways. A third language may stand for "a) the chronologically acquired third language, b) the next language encountered after the simultaneous acquisition of two languages in early infancy (Cenoz, 2000) c) any non-native language currently being acquired by a speaker who is already familiar with one or more other non-native languages (Williams and Hammarberg, 2009) and d) the notion third or additional language is used instead of a third language" (De Angelis, 2007).

TLA research was a neglected phenomenon in bilingualism studies and SLA research. TLA is used as a synonym for multilingualism in some literature but TLA refers to the acquisition of a third or additional (L_n) language. Cenoz formulates the connection between multilingualism and TLA in the following way: "TLA can be regarded as a specific aspect of the study of multilingualism". (Cenoz, 2013, p. 72) As stated by some scholars (Fouser, 1995; Jessner, 1999), there exists a degree of terminological and conceptual confusion regarding third language acquisition. The number of languages is an influential factor in

defining multilingualism but complexity and routes for learning are other components in third language acquisition. (Jessner, 2008)

2.2. Influencing factors in TLA

Learners of two or more languages should cope with the challenges of building strategies and skills to achieve the language learning tasks. Multilingual speakers can reflect on their learning process and they are more successful in explaining the usefulness of prior linguistic knowledge. The psycholinguistic approach makes it possible to examine the field of TLA concerning the previously acquired language including proficiency level, exposure to the language, and usage-based variables like individual learning experience. (De Angelis, 2007; Hammarberg, 2009; Cenoz, 2001). Cenoz (2013) examined the difference between mono and multilingual learners and the diversity of learning can be a notable feature. Learning a second language can have various routes in case of even a second language. Different background languages operate in the multilingual setting that have an impact on L3. It is well attested in TLA research that both L1 and L2 become activated in the learning process of additional language. The list of De Angelis (2007) contains 8 different factors influencing TLA: psychotypology, age, order of acquisition, level of proficiency in the source language and target language, language mode, prior language knowledge, L2 status and recency of use. Age, prior (L2) language knowledge and order of acquisition are the factors which have been investigated in this pilot study.

L2 knowledge and experience are other variables in the L3 learning process. An extensive literature on TLA summarized that more experienced multilingual learners can gain greater benefits from their L2 experience and knowledge of languages than less experienced learners in learning an L3 (see also Aronin&Jessner 2015; Cromdal 1999; Jessner&Török 2016; Ricciardelli 1992). In TLA studies, age has not been investigated in general as this variable was often controlled in these studies. According to the DMM, the age factor should be considered carefully as a variable. Jessner (2015) claimed that age cannot be studied alone from other variables in language. (p.167)

Cenoz (2003) explains that third language acquisition involves temporal diversity as can be seen above in the case of acquisition orders. When two languages are part of the system, the language contact seems to be bidirectional either L1→L2 or L2-→L1. Acquiring a third language brings along the complexity of the routes therefore we can talk about simultaneous or consecutive acquisition of all the three languages or two languages that are learnt parallel after learning the L1 or before learning an L3 (p.72).

Complexity goes hand in hand with the routes of learning therefore one can learn two languages due to fixed patterns (either parallel or simultaneously).

Cenoz (2000) determines three factors which differ SLA from TLA: (1) the order in which languages are learned; (2) sociolinguistic factors, and (3) the psycholinguistic processes involved.

Jessner (2008) presents various examples that highlight the routes of possibilities for acquiring more than two languages. Additional language learning is strongly related to the context of the learner and the background of the language learner. Three examples below, which illustrate the various ways of learning a third language depending on the context, are taken from the paper of Anastassiou et al. (2017): a) children growing up with three languages from birth (e.g. Oksaar, 1977; Hoffmann, 1985; Barnes, 2005), b) bilingual children learning an L3 – in many cases English – at school at an early age, as in our study and as is the case in the Basque Country (Cenoz, 2005) or in South Tyrol (Jessner, 2006), c) bilingual migrant children moving to a new linguistic environment, such as Kurdish/ Turkish children learning German in Austria (Brizic, 2006).

2.3. The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism

Herdina&Jessner (2002) introduced "The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism" (DMM) as pioneering research on multilingual development from a dynamic systems theoretical point of view, which has become known as the complexity dynamic systems theoretical approach more recently. From this thinking perspective, the characteristics of language development can be described in multilingual systems as non-linearity, reversibility, stability, interdependence, complexity, and change of quality. A remarkable trait of DMM is that language systems are illustrated as interdependent and not as autonomous systems. In DMM, one presupposes that the multilingual psycholinguistic system consists of factors that can change over space or time. These variables include cognitive capacity, language aptitude, and others. Additionally, the dynamic view regards the speaker as an intricate psycholinguistic system. In the focus of the dynamic view stands a reasonable motif: languages are in permanent motion and our task is "the understanding of the behaviour and the organization of the living systems" (Jessner, 2003, p. 235). The order of language acquisition is also a fundamental point from a dynamic point of view. Contrary to SLA studies, the routes of learning show a greater variety in multilingual acquisition. Learning three or more languages has more routes as Cenoz (2000) talks about 4 different orders of acquisition: simultaneous acquisition of L1/L2/L3, consecutive acquisition of L1, L2, and L3, simultaneous acquisition of L2/L3 after learning the L1, simultaneous acquisition of L1/L2 before learning the L3 (Cenoz, 2000 as cited in Jessner, 2008b, p.271). Taking the systems theoretical approach into consideration, individual language systems (LS1, LS2, and LS3, etc.) stand at the

centre of investigation rather than languages. Language systems constitute the psycholinguistic system of a multilingual speaker (Jessner, 2008a).

Jessner's (2006) view supports the idea of emergent qualitative changes in the case of three languages:

“Apart from all the individual and social factors affecting second language acquisition, the process of learning and the product of having learnt a second language can potentially exert influence on the acquisition of an L3 and this involves a quality change in language learning and processing” (p.14)

The DMM is considered to be the most comprehensive model of multilingual development and use to date. It also supports our understanding of multilingual interaction and multilingual language behaviour within the classroom context.

2.3.1 Multilingual awareness

The multilingualism factor (M-factor) is a key component of multilingual proficiency in DMM. The M-factor with its main component of multilingual awareness plays an integrative role in multilingual proficiency in a multilingual system. (Jessner&Allgäuer-Hackl, 2022). New emergent skills, that is language learning skills, language management skills, and language maintenance skills characterize the multilingual repertoire. The M-factor is an emergent property that can supply the catalytic or accelerating effect in TLA. Multilingual awareness can be divided into two main variables: metalinguistic- and cross-linguistic awareness.

Metalinguistic awareness (MLA) consists of “the set of skills and abilities which improve thanks to prior linguistic and metacognitive knowledge” (Jessner, 2008a, p.275). The influence of MLA can be a significant factor with special emphasis on L3 learning (Thomas, 1988; Jessner, 1999). Multilingual speakers’ language change is often connected to their perceived communicative needs and they can adapt to the emergent situation more easily than monolinguals.

Malakoff (1992) describes metalinguistic awareness as “allowing the individual to step back from the comprehension or production of an utterance to consider the linguistic form and structure underlying the meaning of the utterance” (p.152). Jessner (2017) illustrates the role of MLA in the following way: Metalinguistic awareness is "part of the multilingualism factor which also relates to cognitive aspects of multilingual learning such as an enhanced multilingual monitor and/or catalytic effects of third language learning" (p.5).Significant evidence has been found on the increased level of metalinguistic awareness by learners of English as L3 in the Tyrolean contexts (Traxl, 2013; Hofer, 2015).

The study of transfer phenomena in SLA has got a long tradition and it can be dated back to the 70s and 80s Most of the studies in the field of transfer have

focused on bilingualism and SLA studies since too little attention was paid to transfer in TLA in the past. (Odlin, 1989; Kellerman & Sharwood-Smith, 1986; Gass&Selinker, 1983).When elements from one language influence the comprehension or production of another, researchers generally refer to "language transfer" (e.g., Odlin, 1989; Selinker, 1969) or "cross-linguistic influence" (e.g., Odlin, 2003). Cross linguistic influence is a rather neutral concept and it behaves like an umbrella term "for the effects of transfer, interference and delayed effects of a change in the factors determining language acquisition". (Herdina&Jessner, 2002, p. 26) De Angelis (2007) also gives us a definition of cross-linguistic influence: "The study of cross linguistic influence (CLI) seeks to explain how and under what conditions prior linguistic knowledge influences the production, comprehension and development of a target language" (p. 19). From the point of the DMM, cross-linguistic awareness (XLA) is defined as the awareness of the contacts between languages which are used "tacitly or explicitly during language production and use" (Jessner, 2016, p.161). The results of Jessner (2006) have proven that learners express their cross-linguistic awareness by making use of supporter languages.

2.4. Holistic view of multicompetence

In the following subchapter, the holistic way of multilingualism is presented. Grosjean (1985) introduced the holistic perspective of bilingualism therefore this attitude maintained the idea of the fully competent speaker-hearer in both languages. In 1991 Cook introduced the holistic view of multicompetence which treats the language systems as two interrelated systems in one mind of a multilingual individual. A more up-to-date definition says that the multicompetence approach refers to a mind or a community that uses more than one language (Cook, 2016). Monolingual speakers develop a different view of their languages than multilinguals. Cook (1992) suggested the multicompetence view which means a qualitative distinction from the competence of the monolingual speaker (monocompetence).

Grosjean (1985) emphasized that "the bilingual speaker is a human communicator who has developed communicative competence in two languages to be able to cope with the communicative needs of everyday life." (In: Jessner, 2016, p.4) This can be illustrated briefly by a later quotation of Grosjean and Li (2013) which highlighted the aim and context of using two languages but still, they are talking about the use of the language which can be interpreted as "communicative needs". Grosjean and Li (2013) indicate that "bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes in different domains of life, with different people." (In: Baker & Wright, 2017)

2.4.1. Multicompetence from the point of the DMM

Concerning the DMM, Jessner (2007; 2017) suggests multicompetence or holistic approaches be applied to language proficiency development in bi- and multilingual programmes. According to the multicompetence view, monolingual speakers have a different view of the world than their multilingual peers in terms of having more languages in their minds. There is an increasing tendency towards the holistic view of multilingualism which has appeared in different countries in the last decade. The focus on multilingualism consists of three different entities: the multilingual speaker, the whole linguistic repertoire, and the social context. Another important dimension of holistic views of multilingualism is that the development of multilingual competence is dynamic and it involves changes in language acquisition and language use (Jessner, 2008).

In consequence, holistic language testing allows a deeper understanding of the multilingual individual as is shown in the multicompetence test (Hofer &Jessner, 2019a). The multicompetence approach supports a better understanding of multilingual interaction and multilingual language behaviour within the classroom context. Multilingual advantage can correlate with higher creativity and flexibility in mental processes. Holistic language testing can allow a deeper understanding of the multilingual individual as is shown in the multicompetence test (Hofer &Jessner, 2019b). Hofer (2017) mentions that the multilingual approach reinforces "*the motivation-driven and goal-directed forces like attitude, determination, learning motivation, task persistence, academic curiosity, self-efficacy and the ability to maintain a healthy sense of self-esteem in the face of challenging situations"* (p.102). Language teachers should improve meta-competences in multilingual individuals who can be also trained in the classroom context. Instructors should enhance multilingual awareness in students. Furthermore, they need to participate in multilingual training programs to develop multilingual materials for their students (PlurCur, EUROCOM, and Multilingual Seminar). These innovations should be implemented in the teaching of foreign languages that can help learners in the acquisition process (Jessner et al., 2016).

Investigating multilingualism is a continuing concern in the Basque country of Spain (Cenoz&Gorter, 2011; Cenoz&Gorter, 2020). 'Focus on Multilingualism' is a holistic approach to studying multilingualism in educational contexts. This view simultaneously takes into account the acquisition, and use of languages and these two factors should be reckoned in line with the social context. 'Focus on Multilingualism' regards multilingual speakers and their repertories as the starting point. It aims to examine bilinguals' TLA. TLA can constitute part of a bi- and multilingual educational programme or a regular programme in which two

foreign languages are instructed at the school. At the centre of this approach stands the learner who can provide us with new insights into the processes of language learning and teaching. This special view recognizes the learner as a multilingual individual so one person acquiring several languages instead of one should adapt students to the fully monolingual norms. The multicompetence view helps to promote multilingualism in terms of the learner's language proficiency. The approach fosters to tackling of multilingual education's multifaceted challenges (Cenoz, 2013). Hofer (2023) also investigated the influence of metalinguistic awareness on early multilingual acquisition in the SouthTyrolean context. She presented possible solutions for the assessment of multilingual competence (multilingual proficiency, metalinguistic awareness amongst young learners) that could be a great tool in the Hungarian context: the Multilingual Competence Test. (Hofer&Jessner, 2019).

2.5. Foreign language learning in the Hungarian educational system

Hungary is located in the central part of Europe, in the Carpathian Basin. The neighbouring countries are Slovakia, Ukraine, Austria, Slovenia, Romania, Serbia, and Croatia. Medgyes&Nikolov (2014) explained that nearly 98% of the population speaks Hungarian as a first language (L1) so Hungary is certainly less multilingual than most of its neighbouring countries (p.504). So it is true that Hungarians should learn foreign languages to be able to communicate with others outside Hungary. It is also worth noticing that Hungary cannot be regarded as a monolingual country because more than 13 official minorities were recognised like Armenian, Boyash, Bulgarian, Croatian, German, Greek, Polish, Romani, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovene, Ukrainian, and Hungarian Sign Language (HSL) (Kenesei, 2009).

Hungary's accession to the EU was achieved in 2004 and learning foreign languages became more attractive to Hungarian society. A national educational survey was compiled that gives a concise summary of the advancements in foreign language teaching and the quality of language teaching (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2008). Furthermore, Eurobarometer (2006, 2012) studies show outstanding negative results in Hungarian foreign language learning. There was a positive tendency to be seen in Hungarian foreign language learning in the past 20 years. However, Hungary (35%) lagged behind other European countries (53%) in terms of foreign language knowledge. Taking into account the distribution of foreign languages, English outperformed the German language both in Europe and in Hungary (Medgyes&Nikolov, 2014).

Pupils attend primary schools between the age of 6 and 14 based on the National Core Curriculum so they visit primary school at the time of the investigation. According to the older version of the National Core Curriculum

(OFI, 2012), pupils should start acquiring one foreign language in the fourth year of the lower primary section. Most Hungarian primary schools offer both German and English as a first or second foreign language.

Acquiring an additional language(s) (second foreign language) is introduced in the sixth or seventh year in the upper primary section. It depends on the school's local curriculum whether it is possible to integrate those 2 extra lessons as foreign language lessons (Szabó, 2008; Petneki, 2009). Furthermore, the former curriculum maintained the tradition of the two extra lessons at the upper primary level. (OFI, 2012) Learning a second foreign language is not compulsory at the primary level, therefore, a lot of students only start to acquire a second language in secondary school (Csizér&Öveges, 2018). The New National Curriculum (2020) does not make it possible to learn two foreign languages at primary schools with a general curriculum (Magyar Közlöny, 2020). Despite this, the current pilot study is based on the former regulation of the NCC (2012).

The schools have a normal curriculum which means that schools with bilingual curriculum or schools with nationality/minority curriculum did not anticipate in the study. As far as the learning conditions are concerned, pupils start their first foreign language (L2) from the first grade even if the official age of onset is the 4th grade based on the National Curriculum. Primary schools allocate two extra lessons for pupils to start their foreign language learning at an earlier age for practical reasons. (https://www.oktatas.hu/kozneveles/-kerettantervek/2012_nat) Age of onset plays an integrative role in this comparative study. Learners can usually start a second foreign language (L3) at the beginning of the 7th graders have been learning L2 for 6 years meanwhile 8th graders have been exposed to L2 for 7 years. As for the L3, 7th grader subjects have been acquiring German or English for 1 year and 8th grader participants have been learning the L3 language for 2 years.

Several Hungarian examples could be presented to justify the necessity of the research based on the order of language acquisition and multilingual awareness. Boócz-Barna (2007) examined the qualitative differences between the acquisition of German as L2 or German as L3 in the Hungarian school context. In the focus of her investigation stood multilingualism and cross-linguistic influence. The mother tongue of the pupils was Hungarian (L1) and their first or second foreign language was English or German (L2/L3). Participants aged between 14 and 17 took part in the investigation. The paper of T. Balla (2012) is also based on the DMM. She carried out a unique study in the Hungarian context which tried to seek answers on the role of English (L2) in the acquisition of the German language (L3) in secondary school context. T. Balla (2012) also employed multilingual research instruments to assess multilingual secondary school pupils. Horvath (2022) also investigated 9th-grade school learners who started to acquire

German L3 at the beginning of their secondary school studies. The languages involved in the study are the same as in the current pilot investigation: Hungarian (L1), English (L2), and German (L3). The study also explored the multilingual awareness of the participants with the help of multilingual teaching- and assessment tools developed by the researcher.

3. The study

In the focus of the pilot study stands L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness of Hungarian primary school pupils. This study investigates how certain factors (like age, L2 knowledge, order of acquisition) influence L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness.

The research questions have been formulated based on the holistic way of multicompetence as presented in the literature review and the questions are framed from a dynamic point of view (DMM).

The study addresses the following research questions:

(1) Do prior language knowledge (L2) and age have an impact on L3 achievement?

(2) Do more experienced language learners have a higher level of L3 proficiency and a heightened level of multilingual awareness?

(3) Does the order of language acquisition influence the learners' L3 proficiency and the level of multilingual awareness?

3.1 Venue and timing

The pilot was carried out at two primary schools in the Transdanubian region of Hungary. Schools were selected based on their curriculum, first and second foreign language. English as L3 and German as L3 were investigated at two primary schools with a normal curriculum. The study lasted between the end of May and the beginning of June 2021 as the planned time of the pilot had been delayed one year due to COVID-19.

3.2. Sampling

The current research includes two primary schools where pupils started to acquire two foreign languages (English and or German). Convenience sampling was employed and 44 primary school pupils could be recruited for the study. Length of L2 exposure is calculated based on the age of onset of the participants. They have classes in the first foreign language (English or German) 4 times a week. They can learn a second foreign language (English or German) twice a week. Pupils are divided into 4 different groups based on their school years and order of language acquisition in the current study. The EG group refers to the pupils who start their learning process with English and after that German. Their

name is the "EG" (starting with English) (N=22). 7th graders are labelled as "7EG" (N=11) meanwhile 8th graders were named "8EG" (N=11). The other group acquired German before English therefore they gained the designation of "GE" (N=22). 7th graders of the "GE group" (N=11) are called "7GE" meanwhile 8th graders carry the contracted form "8GE" (N=11).

3.3. Tools

Data were gathered from multiple sources at one time during the spring term of 2021. In the current study, the C-tests and the Multilingual Competence Test (MCT) were employed. Students were asked to fill in a German and English C-test both in their L2 and in their L3. Then, an MCT was distributed to the participants. The tools are described in the next subsections.

3.3.1. The C-test

C-test is the developed form of the cloze-test (Sigott, 2004; Baghaei&Grotjahn, 2014; Babaii, 2014) and the original idea comes from Klein-Braley&Raatz (1982). According to Khoshdel-Niyat (2017), the C-Test is a gap-filling test belonging to the family of reduced redundancy tests which is used as an overall measure of general language proficiency in a second or a native language. Katona&Dörnyei (1991) also used the C-test amongst Hungarian EFL learners. The C-test aims to measure the overall proficiency of primary school pupils. The mutilation of the tests was adjusted to the classical C-test theory so every second word was deleted from the created texts. Each C-test included 5 texts altogether and every text contained 20 mutilated words. Pupils have 5 minutes for each text so they needed to complete the task in 25 minutes. In reality, 25 minutes were not enough to solve the 100 items. English and German C-tests were constructed to measure students' first (L2) or second foreign language (L3). Students' coursebooks were used to create the C-tests. "Project" and "English Plus" series were used to compile English as L2 and L3 tests for both age groups. "BesteFreunde", "Pass auf!" and "Ping Pong neu" were implemented to generate German as L2 and L3 tests. The content of the C-tests is based on the course books of the participants. Students came from different schools so the decision was to create a test which is doable for each of the participants. The level of proficiency is followed by The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The C-tests are varied from A1 level to B1 level as the instrument measures 7th and 8th graders' L2 and L3 written proficiency.

3.3.2. The Multilingual Competence Test

A version of the multilingual competence test (henceforth MCT) by Hofer and Jessner (2019) was adapted for the Hungarian context. The test measures pupils' level of metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness. The first part of the

original test was composed for the German-speaking South Tyrolean school context and it includes the already known languages by the student like German, Italian, and English. The second part of the test contains unknown languages like French, Spanish, Dutch, Ladin, Swedish, and Danish. The supportive language is German in the tasks. The aim of the Hungarian multilingual competence test is also twofold. The tasks explore multilingual operations of cross-linguistic influence (MLX) and metalinguistic awareness (MLA) (Hofer, 2023).

The Hungarian version contains three known languages – Hungarian, English, and German – by the students. The second part of the test consists of unknown languages like Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Spanish but Ladin was eliminated from the adapted test as this language is especially spoken in South Tyrol. The language of instruction is Hungarian in the adapted test. The Hungarian version contains 11 tasks altogether. A maximum of 116 points could be obtained in the test. The first one is a vocabulary task based on English-German cognates. The second task is an odd-one-out task that assesses grammatical knowledge in the three languages. The participants need to choose 2 correct sentences out of the three and then they need to formulate their choice in Hungarian. The third task is connected to accuracy which requires them to correct the false sentences in all three languages and then they need to explain how they proceeded in the task. The fourth task includes two subtasks (parts A and B). In Part A, pupils are required to translate the German words into English. After that, they need to find the Hungarian equivalent of the words. Those words included in the task can be completed by A1-level speakers of English or German because the test is for every participant (English L3, German L3).

The second main part of the test contains the unknown languages. As far as the unknown languages are concerned, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, French, and Spanish languages remain in the adapted test. The Ladin language needed to be eliminated from the second part of the test because it could be only understood by the South Tyrolean speakers. The 6th task refers to the Dutch language and pupils should translate Dutch sentences into Hungarian. Tasks 7 and 8 belong to matching exercises. Task 7 applies to the word matching exercise, and it requires respondents to draw a parallel between German and Swedish/Dutch words. Participants needed to use the German language to recognize the meaning of the sentences and to find a link between German and Danish sentences. Task 9 incorporated a translation task and the languages included were Spanish, French and Ladin languages. Tasks 10 and 11 involve the Spanish language in the form of a translation and matching exercise.

3.4 Data collection and analysis

Data of two research tools were presented which had been employed in the pilot process between May and June 2021.

English and German C-tests were distributed to the students in two different lessons. 8 C-tests were created to assess pupils' L2 and L3. Pupils had 5 minutes for each part so they needed to fill in the test in 25 minutes. Pupils completed the English and German tests in two different lessons guided by their teachers. Students were asked to fill the two parts of the MCT in two separate lessons. Pupils could reach a maximum of 116 points and it took 80 minutes to complete. Quantitative methods were used to collect and analyse the data. The test of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) was utilized to investigate whether there is a normal distribution amongst the population. Non-parametric independent samples T-tests were used to compare the independent groups of pupils (7EG, 8EG, 7GE, 8GE) based on different variables. Mann-Whitney tests were used to investigate the effect size and statistical significance. The statistical tool 'Jamovi' (similar to SPSS) was used for the data analysis. This software predicts the effect size of the data analysis besides the description of mean, significance (p-value) and standard deviation.

3.5 Ethical considerations

Two schools participated in the study. First, a written request was sent by the head of the doctoral school to the headmasters. After the headmasters of the institutions agreed to participate in the study, teachers gained a letter of consent. Form- teachers distributed the parental consent to the chosen applicants. Only pupils having parental consent took part in the pilot. As schools asked for anonymity, the names of the schools and students have to remain unknown in the study.

4. Results

In this section, the findings of the data collection is presented. The test of normal distribution is discussed in the first subchapter (4.1). Then this chapter is divided into three more subsections, each of which presents the results relating to one of the research questions. (4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

4.1 Test of normality

Shapiro-Wilk test was used to check the normal distribution of the sample (N=44). According to the literature„ the Shapiro–Wilk test is a more appropriate method for small sample sizes (<50 samples) although it can

also be handling on larger sample size while Kolmogorov–Smirnov test is used for n ≥50. Table 1 illustrates the lack of normality as the significance level is not bigger than 0.05 in each case. (p=0.009, p=0,012, p=0,000). 4 main constructs have been investigated in the pilot study: the first foreign language of the students (henceforth L2), the second foreign language of the participants (henceforth L3), and multilingual operations in cross-linguistic awareness (MLX) and metalinguistic awareness (MLA). L2, L3, MLX and MLA were involved in testing the normal distribution since these variables play an integrative role in the data analysis.

As a next step, histograms were created using the Jamovi statistical tool. Creating histograms is essential to visualize the normality or the lack of normality in the data. No Bell shape curve could be observed in the case of histograms therefore normal distribution was out of consideration. Histograms showed us that no normal distribution could be detected in the L2 and L3 proficiency. Unfortunately, the data showed us that the data is not normally distributed concerning the multilingual operations of cross-linguistic awareness (MLX) and metalinguistic awareness (MLA).

4.2. Prior language knowledge (L2) and age on L3 proficiency

The first research question investigates the role of prior language knowledge (L2) and age factor in terms of L3 achievement. It draws attention to the comparison between the EG and the GE groups in terms of language exposure and proficiency. There is one year difference amongst the age groups namely between 7^{th} and 8^{th} graders. Tables 2A and 2B show the findings of the first part of the hypothesis, namely students start to learn English (L2) and German (L3).Group 1 denotes 7EG and group 2 refers to the 8EG. The findings summarized in Table 2A suggested that the 7EG group (M: 86.2) outperformed 8EG (M: 69.4) in terms of only the L2 proficiency. According the Cohen's D, the L2 proficiency has got a large effect size (d=0.7) between the 2 variables (7EG and 8EG). Moreover, a marginally significant difference could be found in L2 proficiency (p<0.006).Independent samples T-test showed that 8EG (M=43.2) outperformed the 7EG (M=30.5) in the case of L3 proficiency. The results of the Mann Whitney U-test are presented in Table 2B. No statistical significance was found in L3 between the groups of 7th and 8th graders in terms of language proficiency. (L3: p = 0.122). Table 2B illustrates that a small effect size could be seen in the case of L3 (d= 0.39) meanwhile a large effect size could be detected in L2 proficiency (d=0.7). There is a medium effect size which implies that the finding is practical enough and it could work with a larger sample, as well.

Table 2A. The role of L2 knowledge on L3. EG groups.

Variables	Group	Participants (N)	Mean
Ctest_L2	7EG	11	86.2
	8EG	11	69.4
Ctest_L3	7EG	11	30.5
	8EG	11	43.2

Table 2B. Level of significance and effect size. EG groups.

Variables	p	Effect size
Ctest_L2	0.006	0.702
Ctest_L3	0.122	0.397

As the research question refers to the L3 construct, the GE group (L2: German, L3: English) should also be investigated. The results, as shown in Table 3A, indicated that a marginally significant difference could be found in terms of L3 proficiency (p = 0.01). A medium effect size was found between GE 7 and GE 8 in terms of L3 proficiency (d = 0.43). The larger the effect size, the larger the difference between the average individual in each group. Table 3B described that 8th graders (M = 85.6) outperformed the 7th graders (M = 77.6) both in terms of L2 and L3 even though they acquire languages in the opposite way as the first group (EG).

Table 3A. Significance and effect size of L2 and L3

Variables	p	Effect size
Ctest_L2	0.742	0.0909
Ctest_ L3	0.094	0.4298

Table 3B. L2 knowledge on L3 proficiency.

Variable	Group	Participants (N)	Mean
Ctest_L2	7GE	11	74.1
	8GE	11	75.9
Ctest_L3	7GE	11	77.6
	8GE	11	85.6

4.2 L2 experience on L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness

The second question explores whether the more experienced language learners have a higher level of L3 knowledge and a heightened level of multilingual awareness. Table 4A presented the descriptive statistics that were computed to discover the differences between the 2 groups. L3 scores of the EG group revealed that 8th graders (M = 43.2) outperformed 7th graders (M = 30.5). The 8EG group achieved better results (M = 7) than 7EG (M=6.82) although there is only a slight difference. The results of significance and the effect size are summarized in Table 4B. A lack of significant difference could be seen either in the results of L3 proficiency ($p<0.05$) or in the case of metalinguistic awareness ($p<0.05$). As far as the multilingual operations of the cross-linguistic awareness (MLX) are concerned, the 8EG group (MLX, M: 63. 3) overachieved the 7EG group (MLX, M: 60.6).

Table 4A. L2 experience on L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness. EG groups.

Variables	Group	Participants (N)	Mean
MLX	7EG	11	60.64
	8EG	11	63.32
MLA	7EG	11	6.82
	8EG	11	7.00
Ctest_L3	7EG	11	30.5
	8EG	11	43.2

Table 4B. Level of significance and effect size. EG groups.

Variables	p (Sig.)	effect size
MLX	0.36	0.2397
MLA	0.92	0.0331
Ctest_L3	0.12	0.397

The second part of the second research question refers to the GE groups. Tables 5A and 5B provide an overview of the descriptive statistics and the results of the Mann Whitney test of the GE groups. The 8GE group (M: 85.6) overachieved the 7GE group (M: 77.6) in terms of L3 proficiency. However, the 7GE group achieved better results (M = 14.9) than the 8 GE group (M = 14.5) in terms of MLA scores. No significant difference was found that a higher level of L3 proficiency can correlate with a higher level of metalinguistic awareness. The effect size suggested that a small effect size could be found in terms of metalinguistic awareness

(d=0.33). There is a weak relationship between the GE groups in terms of metalinguistic awareness. The last variable is the cross linguistic awareness (MLX) which is the first part of the multilingual competence test. The MLX scores showed that 8th graders (M: 77.0) outperformed the 7th graders (M: 78.2).

Table 5A. L2 experience on L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness. GE groups.

Variables	Group	Participants	Mean
Ctest_L3_percent	7GE	11	77.6
	8GE	11	85.6
MLX	7GE	11	77.0
	8GE	11	78.2
MLA	7GE	11	14.9
	8GE	11	14.5

Table 5B. Significance level and effect size. GE groups.

Variables	p	Effect size
Ctest_L3	0.094	0.0331
MLX	0.921	0.0826
MLA	0.766	0.4298

4.4. The role of order of language acquisition on L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness

The last research question seeks to answer whether the order of language acquisition can have an impact on multilingual awareness and L3 proficiency.
Tables 6A and 6B show the differences between the EG/GE groups in terms of L3 proficiency, and multilingual operations of metalinguistic awareness (MLA) and cross-linguistic influence (MLX). We investigated whether learners of German (L2) outperformed English (L2) in acquiring a third language. Distinctions were made based on the order of acquisition (ENG/GER and GER/ENG). The 2 groups were divided into Group 1(EG) and Group 2 (GE). Three variables were the focus of our investigations to answer the third research question. L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness are divided into cross-linguistic awareness (MLX) and metalinguistic awareness (MLA).

Table 6A. Order of language acquisition.7th graders.

Variables	Group	Participants (N)	Mean
Ctest_L3	7EG	11	30.5
	7GE	11	77.6
MLX	7EG	11	60.64
	7GE	11	76.95
MLA	7EG	11	6.82
	7GE	11	14.91

Table 6B. Significance and effect size.7th graders.

Variables	P(Sig.)	Effect size
Ctest_L3	< .001	0.942
MLX	0.002	0.793
MLA	< .001	1.000

The findings showed that pupils learning German as their L2 achieved better results both in L3 (M = 77.6; M = 85.6). What is more, both 7 and 8 GE groups performed better both in metalinguistic- and cross-linguistic awareness tasks (MLX, M = 76.95; MLA, M = 14.9 and MS, M=78.2; MV, M = 14.54) than the EG groups. Results suggested that the complexity of the German language as an L2 can positively impact the L3 achievement and both MLA and MLX of the GE group.

Table 7A. Order of language acquisition. 8th graders.

Variables	Group	N	Mean
Ctest_L3	8EG	11	43.2
	8GE	11	85.6
MLX	8EG	11	63.32
	8GE	11	78.18
MLA	8EG	11	7.00
	8GE	11	14.54

Table 7B. Level of significance and effect size. 8th graders.

Variables	P(Sig.)	Effect size
Ctest_L3	< .001	1.000
MLX	< .001	1.000
MLA	< .001	0.926

5. Discussion

Returning to the first research question posed at the beginning of this article, it is possible to state that 8th graders outperformed 7th graders in L3 proficiency but only in the GE groups. Moreover, prior language knowledge (L2) had an influence on L3 proficiency in the GE groups. However, the Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the 7th graders with the 8th graders in L3 proficiency. 8th graders outperformed 7th graders in both English and German as L3 but no significant difference was observed in terms of L3 proficiency. The 8GE group outperformed the 7GE in terms of L2 proficiency. L2 proficiency and L2 exposure are examined together as connected factors in the study of Tremblay (2006). She investigated language shifts in the L3 German production of thirteen L1 English young adults, who had different levels of proficiency and different amounts of exposure in their L2 French. For learners obtaining a higher level of L2 proficiency, the L2 has a higher influence on creating learning strategies in L3. Those Pupils –who have had more L2 exposure- tend to be more capable of using their L2 knowledge in the process of L3 learning. Furthermore, our findings are partly correlated with Hofer's (2019) earlier study. Her research investigated the role of multilingual education programmes on pupils' achievement in their languages (German L2 and English L3). She found that earlier and more extensive contact with an L2 language can have a positive influence on additional language learning (L3). The present findings seemed to be consistent with other research which found that age could be an influencing factor in the L3 acquisition process. The study of Cenoz et al. (2001) examined age as an influencing factor in English as an L3. They found that older learners achieved better results than youngsters. Singleton & Ryan (2004) also observed the age factor in foreign language learning in elementary school. Their results showed that early starters outperformed later starters because of longer instruction and exposure which is in agreement with our findings. Munoz (2020) examined 7 and 9-year-old pupils and the focus of the investigation was the role of age and exposure in the cognate recognition task. The outcome of the research showed that older participants outperformed their younger peers.

The second research question investigated whether the more experienced learners can have a higher level of L3 proficiency and a heightened level of multilingual awareness. Both 8th-grader groups obtained higher scores in the L3 proficiency and cross-linguistic awareness tasks than their 7th-grader peers. The level of L3 proficiency did not always correlate with the level of metalinguistic awareness. However, the findings of the current study do not support the previous research carried out by de Angelis (2007). She hypothesised that learners' knowledge of the target

language is still weak at the beginners' level so they need to fill in the gaps with the source language. Less proficient learners could have a higher level of cross-linguistic interaction between the language systems. Furthermore, the study by Sanchéz (2014) examined the relationship between L3 proficiency and cross-linguistic influence. She explored the influence of German L2 on English L3 in the case of Spanish subjects. The findings are not in agreement with our results. Sanchez found that a lower level of proficiency could lead to more frequent use of non-target language which influences cross-linguistic influence. The findings are in line with the results of the EG group in the case of cross-linguistic influence. Horvath and Jessner (2023) investigated the cross-linguistic influence between English and German. They found that cross-linguistic lexical and structural similarities between English (L2) and German (L3) could provide teaching German as an L3 in the classroom.

The second part of the question is related to the connection between L3 proficiency and metalinguistic awareness. As for MLA and L3 proficiency, 7^{th} graders achieved better results than 8^{th} graders but only in the GE groups. The findings observed in this study mirror the previous study that examined the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and L3 proficiency. Hofer (2015) tested multilingual learners in the South Tyrolean context with the languages of German (L2) and English (L3). Hofer's study supported the idea that students could benefit from early trilingual acquisition (German L2, English L3). Moreover, Hofer and Jessner (2019) found facilitative effects of L3 learning on pupils' meta- and cross-linguistic awareness in their later study. Early and more extensive contact with a second and/or third language can have a positive effect on young learners' cognitive and linguistic performance.

The third question was whether pupils learning German as an L2 achieve better results in their L3 and whether they have a higher level of multilingual awareness due to the complexity of the second language. The findings suggested that students learning German as an L2 outperformed students learning English as an L2. This finding is in agreement with Berkes and Flynn's (2012) Hungarian evidence which showed that the German language has a stricter and more complex structure in syntax, especially in relative clauses. They stated that „the feature setup of the Hungarian and the English Complementizer Phrase (CP) show some structural similarities which might be beneficial for subsequent language acquisition" (Berkes& Flynn, 2012, p.2). The presented results are in line with the findings of Tápai-Balla (2008) who observed two groups of Hungarian students who acquired English (L3) or German (L3). This Hungarian research indicates that the ideal order of

language acquisition is German (L2) and then English (L3). The results suggest that factors like typological relatedness and proficiency in the target language and source language also play an integrative role in further language learning. Penner (2007) supports the idea of the beneficial role of German (L2) in her qualitative study as students admitted that the German language is more complex than English and they enjoyed acquiring English as L3 after German L2 in the Hungarian school context.

Several limitations to this pilot study need to be acknowledged. Firstly, the project used a convenience sampling. Secondly, the marginal difference could be explained owing to the one-year difference between the two age groups. Thirdly, the findings cannot be generalised due to the low sample size. Eventually, the current study has only examined L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness from a quantitative point of view.

6. Conclusion

The pilot study aimed to scrutinize whether certain factors (age, prior language knowledge, multilingual awareness) influence third language acquisition. The pilot was utilized at two primary schools in the Transdanubian region of Hungary. Pupils learning English as an L3 were compared to students acquiring German as an L3. 7^{th} and 8^{th} grader participants took part in the current research.

This study produced results that corroborate the findings of previous work in the field of third language acquisition. The following conclusions can be drawn from the present study:

1) 8^{th} graders outperformed the 7^{th} graders in L3 proficiency therefore age can play a role in third language acquisition. Prior language knowledge has had an influence on L3 but only in the GE group in the current study.

2) 8^{th} grader participants have a higher level of L3 proficiency and cross-linguistic awareness than the 7^{th} graders in both groups (EG, GE). However, only the 8EG group achieved better results in the metalinguistic awareness task than the 7EG group. A higher level of L3 proficiency carries a higher level of cross-linguistic interaction.

3) Both 7^{th} and 8^{th} participants performed better, whose L2 was German and L3 was English. Findings suggested that starting with German as L2 could contribute to better L3 results and a higher level of multilingual awareness (including metalinguistic awareness and cross-linguistic awareness).

References

1. Aronin, L. &Jessner U. (2015) Understanding current multilingualism: What can the butterfly tell us? In The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives (271-291). Ed. Ulrike Jessner und Claire Kramsch. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter
2. Bacsa, É. (2012). "AzIdegennyelv-Tanulással Kapcsolatos Középiskolás Tanulók Körében," 167–93.
3. Babaii, E. &Fatahi-Majd, M. (2014). Failed Restoration in the C-test: Types, sources, and implications for C-test processing. In book: Der C-Test: AktuelleTendenzen/The C-Test: Current trends.Publisher: Peter Lang.Editors: R. Grotjahn
4. Baker, C. and Wright (2017). Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. Bristol: Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
5. Baghaei, P. &Grotjahn, R.. (2014). The validity of C-Tests as measures of academic and everyday language proficiency: A multidimensional item response modelling study. In book: Der C-Test: AktuelleTendenzen/The C-Test: Current trends. Chapter: The Validity of C-Tests as measures of academic and everyday language proficiency: A multidimensional item response modelling study. Publisher: Peter LangEditors: RuedigerGrotjahn
6. Bardel, C. (2020). Third language acquisition: Age, proficiency and multilingualism. In Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism (Vol. 3, Issue 1).
7. Bardel, C., & Falk, Y. (2007). The Role of the Second Language in Third Language Acquisition: The Case of Germanic Syntax. Second Language Research, 23, 459-484. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0267658307080557
8. Berkes, E., & Flynn, S. (2012). Enhanced L3...Ln Acquisition and its Implications for Language Teaching.
9. Boócz-Barna K. (2007). Formen des Sprachwechsels im Unterricht des Deutschen als L2 und L3, ELTE Germanisztikai Intézet.
10. Cenoz, J.&Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*. 2020; 39: 300– 311. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462
11. Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., &Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Bilingual education and bilingualism: Vol. 31. Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*. Clevedon, UK, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
12. Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *7*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/-10.1177/13670069030070010501
13. Cenoz, J. &Jessner, U. (eds.) (2000). English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language. Clevedon – Buf- falo – Toronto – Sydney: Multilingual Matters
14. Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. Lan- guage Teaching, Volume 46, Issue 1, pp. 71–86.
15. Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B. &Jessner, U. (eds.) (2003). The Multilingual Lexicon. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers
16. Cenoz, J.(2009). Towards Multilingual Education: Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective, Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691941

17. Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) Research Methods in Education. 5th Edition, Routledge Falmer, London. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203224342
18. Cook, V.(2016): Premises of Multicompetence. Draft of background chapter for Cook, V. & Li Wei (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistics Multi-Competence (2016). http://www.viviancook.uk/Writings/Papers/MC16Premises.html
19. Cronbach, L.J. and Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin* 52, 281-302.
20. Crocker, L., &Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group/Thomson Learning
21. Cromdal, J. 1999. Childhood bilingualism and metalinguistic skills: analysis and control in young Swedish-English bilinguals. Applied Psycholinguistics 20: 1–20.
22. Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for Transfer: Challenging the Two Solitudes Assumption in Bilingual Education. In: Hornberger, N.H. (eds) Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_116
23. Csizér, K., & Öveges, E. (2018). Vizsgálat A KöznevelésbenFolyóidegennyelv-OktatásKereteirőlÉsHatékonyságáról. Kutatási Jelentés.
24. De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. *Second language acquisition: Vol. 24*. Clevedon, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
25. Dornyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Dörnyei, Z., &Katona, L. (1992). Validation of the C-test amongst Hungarian EFL learners. Language Testing, 9(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229200900206
27. Drackert, A., &Timukova, A. (2020). What does the analysis of C-test gaps tell us about the construct of a C-test? A comparison of foreign and heritage language learners' performance. Language Testing, 37(1), 107–132. https://doi.org/-10.1177/0265532219861042
28. Eckes, T., &Grotjahn, R. (2006). A closer look at the construct validity of C-tests. Language Testing, 23(3), 290–325. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532206lt3300a
29. Fouser, R. J. (1995). *Problems and Prospects in Third Language Acquisition Research*. *31*(2), 387–414.
30. Grosjean, F. (2010). Bilingual: Life and reality. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674056459
31. Hammarberg, B. (2018). *L3, the tertiary language*. 127–150. https://doi.org/-10.1075/hsld.7.06ham
32. Heltai, P. (2013). Cross-Linguistic Influences in the Acquisition of Nominal Compounds. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, *10*(3), 19–46.
33. Herdina, P. & U. Jessner (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
34. Hofer, Barbara. (2015). On the Dynamics of Early Multilingualism: A Psycholinguistic Study. 10.1515/9781614518679.
35. Hofer, B. (2017) Emergent multicompetence at the primary level: a dynamic conception of multicompetence, Language Awareness, 26:2, 96-112, DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2017.1351981

36. Hofer, B. & Jessner, U. (2019a): Mehr-Sprachig-Kompetent, MSK 9-12, Mehrsprachige Kompetenzen fördern und evaluieren. Studia Verlag, Innsbruck.
37. Hofer, B.&Jessner,U.(2019b). Assessing components of multi-(lingual) competence in young learners, Lingua, Volume 232,2019,102747, ISSN 0024 3841,https://-doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.102747.
38. Hofer, B.(2023) A Multilingual Development Framework for Young Learners: Early Multi-Competence in South Tyrol, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111106601
39. Horvath, L. &Jessner U. (2020). Becoming multilingual in Hungary. In Batyi, S. (ed.) *Kétnyelvűség: magyar és nem magyar kontextus. Tanulmányok Navracsics Judit köszöntésére. Bilingualism: Hungarian and Non-Hungarian Context. Studies in Honor of Judit Navracsics* (pp. 143-160).Veszprém: Pannon Egyetem (University of Pannonia).
40. Horvath, L. ;,&Jessner, U. (2023). Multilingual awareness-raising as a pedagogicaltool in theinitialstage of L3 teachingForeignlanguageeducation in Hungary : language policy vs .reality. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány*, *XXIII*.(1), 73–96.
41. Jessner,U. (1999). Metalinguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: Cognitive Aspects of Third Language Learning, Language Awareness, 8:3-4, 201-209, DOI: 10.1080/09658419908667129
42. Jessner, U. (2003). A dynamic approach to language attrition in multilingual systems. 10.21832/9781853596346-014
43. Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic Awareness in Multilingual Learners. English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
44. Jessner, U. (2008 a). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, *41*(1), 15–56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004739
45. Jessner, U. (2008 b) A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *The Modern Language Journal, 92,* 270-283.
46. Jessner, U., Allgäuer-Hackl, E., & Hofer, B. (2016). Emerging Multilingual Awareness in Educational Contexts: From Theory to Practice. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(2), 157–182. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.274600
47. Jessner, U. and V. Török 2016. Strategies in multilingual learning: opening new research avenues. In Implications for the Future: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics Today, ed. J. Navrascics and S. Pfenninger. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
48. Katona, L., &Dörnyei, Z. (1991). Az idegen nyelvtudás mérésének új módja - a C-teszt. Iskolakultúra, 1(4), 42–51. https://ojs.bibl.u-szeged.hu/index.php/iskolakultura/-article/view/28320
49. Kecskés, I., & Papp, T. (2000). Foreign language and mother tongue. Mahwah, N.J., London: Erlbaum.
50. Kecskés, I. (2008). The effect of the second language on the first language. (2), 30–34. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291082110_The_effect_-of_the_second_language_on_the_first_language/citation/download
51. Kecskes, I. (2015). The state of L1 knowledge in foreign language learners. <*i*>*WORD*</*i*>, *49*(3), 321–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1998.11432476

52. Klein-Braley, C. and Raatz, U. (1982). Der C.- Test: Ein neuer Ansatz zur Messung von allgemeiner Sprachbeherrschung. *AKS Rundbrief* 4, 23—37.00108
53. Khoshdel, Fahimeh. (2017). The C-Test: A Valid Measure to Test Second Language Proficiency? DOI: 10.31219/osf.io/c7sy5
54. Kramsch, C.& Whiteside, A. (2007). Three Fundamental Concepts in Second Language Acquisition and Their Relevance in Multilingual Contexts. The Modern Language Journal, 91: 907-922. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00677
55. Magyar Közlöny (2020).National Core Curriculum. https://magyarkozlony.-hu/dokumentumok/3288b6548a740b9c8daf918a399a0bed1985db0f/megtekintes
56. Medgyes, P. &Nikolov, A.M. (2014). Research in foreign language education in Hungary (2006–2012). *Language Teaching*, 504–537.
57. Montanari, Simona. "14. Facilitated Language Learning in Multilinguals". *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Multilingualism: The Fundamentals*, edited by Simona Montanari and Suzanne Quay, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019, pp. 299-324. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501507984-014
58. Ministry of Education (2002-3). Language Education Policy Profile: Hungary. https://rm.coe.int/language-education-policy-profile-hungary/16807b3c2d
59. Ministry of Education and Culture. Education in Hungary. Past, Present and Future. - an overview. (2008) https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000188804
60. McCowan, R. J. R., McCowan, S. S. C., Center for Development of, H. S., & State University of, N. Y. (1999). Item Analysis for Criterion-Referenced Tests. Online Submission, 39. http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED50171
61. Munoz, C.(2020): Cognate recognition by young multilingual language learners: The role of age and exposure. In: Sanchez and Bardel: Third language acquisition: Age, proficiency and multilingualism. (EuroSLA Studies 3). Berlin: Language Science Press.
62. Nagy, K. (2009). *English language teaching in Hungarian primary schools with special reference to the teacher's mother tongue use* (Doctoral Thesis). University of Sterling, United Kingdom.
63. Navracsics, J. (2009). The emergence of the L3 lexicon – the onset. In Lengyel, Zs. & Navracsics, J., eds., Studies on the Mental Lexicon: Language Acquisition – Speech Production – Speech Perception. Budapest: TintaKiadó, pp. 119–34.
64. Nshiwi, D. &Jessner, U. (2021). The Effect of Metalinguistic Awareness and the Previously Learned Foreign Languages on Fourth Language Acquisition by Adult Learners. XXI. 1-17. 10.18460/ANY.2021.1.001.
65. OFI. 2012. "Kerettantervek." Hungary. https://www.oktatas.hu/kozneveles/-kerettantervek/2012_nat
66. Penner, O. (2007): Nyelvi interakciók megjelenése egy idegennyelvitanítási gyakorlaton. ModernNyelvoktatás.
67. Petneki, K.(2009).Teaching Foreign Languages. Magyar nyelvű Kutatási jelentés (közzétett) (Egyéb) Tudományos, Megjelent: 2009 https://ofi.oh.gov.hu/teaching-and-learning-090617 retrieved 05.02.2023
68. Plonsky, L. & Oswald, F. (2014). How Big Is "Big"? Interpreting Effect Sizes in L2 Research. Language Learning.64. 878-912. 10.1111/lang.12079.

69. Ricciardelli, L.A. 1992. Bilingualism and cognitive development in relationtothresholdtheory. Journal of PsycholinguisticResearch 21, no. 4: 301–16.
70. Saeedi, M. &Tavakoli, M. &Kazerooni, S.R. &Parvareshs, V. (2011). Do C-test and Cloze procedure measure what they purport to be measuring? A case of criterion-related validity. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology. 74. 1043-1052.
71. Safont Jordà, M.P. (2015). Third Language Acquisition in Multilingual Contexts. In: Cenoz, J., Gorter, D., May, S. (eds) Language Awareness and Multilingualism. Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/-10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0_10-1.
72. Sánchez, Laura. (2014). L2 activation and blending in third language acquisition: Evidence of crosslinguistic influence from the L2 in a longitudinal study on the acquisition of L3 English. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition. 18. 1-18. DOI: 10.1017/S1366728914000091.
73. Sigott, G. (2004). Towards Identifying the C-Test Construct. Publisher: Peter Lang International Publishers Frankfurt/Main Germany. ISBN: 3-631-52062-X
74. Singleton, D. & Ryan, L. (2004). Language Acquisition: The Age Factor. 10.21832/9781853597596.
75. Szabó, I. (2008). Foreign language teaching in Primary Education in Hungary. *Encuentro*. (17), 23–27. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/58908925.pdf
76. Szabó, N. &Failasofah, F. (2022). *English and German teachers' language awareness in the Hungarian school context*. *15*(1).
77. T. Balla, Á. (2012). *The role of second language English in the process of learning third language German*. 212.
78. Tremblay, Marie-Claude. (2006). Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: The Role of L2 Proficiency and L2 Exposure. CLO/OPL. 34.
79. Vetter, E. &Jessner, U. (2016). *Multilingual Education Volume 35 Series Editors*. Retrieved from http://www.springer.com/series/8836

Multilingual Assessment of Primary School Pupils in the Hungarian Context

Noémi Szabó. University of Pannonia, Multilingualism Doctoral School, PhD student. szabonoemi@almos.uni-pannon.hu

Ulrike Jessner, PhD. University of Innsbruck, associate university professor. University of Pannonia, university professor. ulrike.jessner@uibk@ac.at, ORCID: 0000-0002-3015-3281.

Multilingual approaches to teaching and learning are linked to significant benefits at the linguistic and metalinguistic levels in the European context. The study is based on the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. Multilingualism research is considered to be a neglected area in the Hungarian context, however a handful of studies have appeared on third language acquisition and multilingual awareness recently. 44 subjects took part in the investigation. This study aims to investigate certain factors influencing third language acquisition. The following research questions have been formulated. The first question seeks to answer whether L2 knowledge and age have an impact on L3

achievement. The second question examines whether L2 experience has an impact on L3 proficiency and on multilingual awareness. The third question seeks to determine whether the order of language acquisition influences L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness? Data were collected using self-constructed C-tests and a Multilingual Competence Test. Mann-Whitney tests showed that L2 knowledge supported a higher level of L3 proficiency but only in the GE groups. Age played an integrative role in L3 proficiency in EG and GE groups although there was one year difference amongst the groups. The results suggested that a higher level of L3 knowledge could contribute to a higher level of cross-linguistic awareness but not a higher level of metalinguistic awareness in each group. Learning German as an L2 can lead to a higher level of L3 proficiency and multilingual awareness.

Keywords: *multilingual awareness, L2 knowledge, L3 proficiency, English, German*

Az általános iskolai diákok többnyelvű nyelvi mérése a magyar oktatási környezetben

Noémi Szabó, Pannon Egyetem, Többnyelvűségi Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola, doktorandusz. szabonoemi@almos.uni-pannon.hu

Ulrike Jessner, egyetemi docens, Innsbrucki Egyetem, egyetemi tanár, Pannon Egyetem. ulrike.jessner@uibk@ac.at, ORCID: 0000-0002-3015-3281.

A tanítás és tanulás többnyelvű megközelítése jelentős előnyöket mutat a nyelvi és a metanyelvi szinten az európai kontextusban. A tanulmány a többnyelvűség dinamikus modelljén alapul. A többnyelvűség kutatása magyar viszonylatban elhanyagolt területnek számít, azonban a harmadik nyelv elsajátításáról és a metanyelvi tudatosságról folyamatosan jelennek meg az utóbbi időben. A vizsgálatban 44 személy vett részt, amelynek egyik fele 7. évfolyamos (N=22) és másik fele pedig 8. évfolyamos (N=22).

A tanulmány célja, hogy megvizsgáljon különböző tényezőket, amelyek bizonyítottan befolyásolják a harmadik nyelv elsajátítását. A következő kutatási kérdések fogalmazódtak meg a releváns szakirodalom alátámasztásával. Az első kérdés arra keresi a választ, hogy az előzetes nyelvi tudás és az életkor hatással vannak-e a harmadik nyelvtudás eredményeire. A második kérdés azt vizsgálja, hogy a második nyelvben szerzett tapasztalat hatással van-e a harmadik nyelvi jártasságra és a többnyelvűségre. A harmadik kérdés azt a felvetést járja körbe, hogy a nyelvelsajátítás sorrendje befolyásolja-e a nyelvtudást és a többnyelvű tudatosságot. Az adatokat saját készítésű C-tesztekkel és egy többnyelvűségi kompetenciát mérő teszttel gyűjtöttük. A Mann-Whitney tesztek eredményei azt mutatták, hogy az L2 tudás magasabb szintű L3 jártassághoz vezetett, de csak azokban a csoportokban, ahol a németet tanulják, mint L2-t. Az életkor meghatározó szerepet játszott az L3 jártasságban, mindkettő csoportban: a német és az angol, mint második idegen nyelvi (L3) csoportokban. Csupán egy év korkülönbség volt a csoportok között. Az eredmények azt sugallták, hogy a magasabb szintű L3 tudás együtt

jár, a nyelvek közti tudatosság magasabb szintjével viszont nem minden csoport esetében vonja magával automatikusan a metanyelvi tudatosság magasabb szintjét is. A német nyelv, mint első idegen nyelv elsajátítása magasabb szintű nyelvtudáshoz és többnyelvű nyelvi tudatossághoz vezethet.

Kulcsszavak: *többnyelvű nyelvi tudatosság, második idegennyelvtudás, harmadik nyelvbeli jártasság, angol, német*

Оцінювання рівня багатомовності школярів Угорщини в початковій школі

Ноемі Сабо, здобувачка ступеня доктора філософії Докторської школи з багатомовності Університету Паннонія, szabonoemi@almos.uni-pannon.hu

Ульріке Йесснер, доцент Університету Інсбрука, професор Університету Паннонія, ulrike.jessner@uibk@ac.at, ORCID: 0000-0002-3015-3281.

В європейському просторі багатомовні підходи до викладання та навчання асоціюються зі значними перевагами на лінгвістичному та металінгвістичному рівнях. Дослідження ґрунтується на основі динамічної моделі багатомовності. В угорському контексті тема багатомовності є малодослідженою сферою, проте останнім часом з'явилося кілька досліджень, у яких розглянуто питання засвоєння третьої мови та усвідомлення металінгвістики. У дослідженні взяли участь 44 учасники, з яких 22 учні (з них 11 учнів 7-го класу, 11 – 8-го класу) вивчають англійську як другу іноземну мову. Решта 22 учні (з них 11 учнів 7-го класу, 11 – 8-го класу) вивчають німецьку як другу іноземну мову. Маємо на меті розкрити фактори, що впливають на вивчення третьої іноземної мови. Спробуємо дати відповіді на такі запитання: (1) Чи впливають попередні знання з мови та вік на рівень володіння другою іноземною мовою? (2) Чи впливає рівень володіння мовою на рівень багатомовної свідомості? (3) Чи впливає порядок вивчення мов на рівень володіння другою іноземною мовою та на рівень багатомовної свідомості учнів? Дані зібрано за допомогою самостійно розроблених C-тестів та тесту з багатомовної компетентності. Результати тестів показали, що рівень знань в учнів, які вже попередньо володіли іноземною мовою, був вищим, однак лише в групах з англійською мовою навчання. Вік учнів відіграв вирішальну роль у формуванні рівня володіння мовою на професійному рівні в обох групах, хоча між групами була різниця в один рік. Результати свідчать про те, що вищий рівень володіння мовою може сприяти вищому рівню міжмовної обізнаності, але не вищому рівню металінгвістичної обізнаності в кожній групі. Вивчення німецької мови може привести до вищого рівня володіння мовою та багатомовної обізнаності.

Ключові слова: *багатомовність, володіння іноземними мовами, англійська мова, німецька мова*