■ **BAR**kod, bar**KOD** or **BARKOD**?
BULGARIAN SPEAKERS AND THEIR PRODUCTION OF STRESS

NIKOLETA STOYKOVA[1]
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"
Sofia, Bulgaria

Cilj ovog rada jeste ispitivanje mesta naglaska u bugarskim složenicama tipa imenica+imenica (dužine 2, 3, 4 i 5 slogova) koje su pozajmljene iz engleskog. Korišćene su dve grupe govornika: prvu čini 20 studenata prve godine Engleskih i američkih studija na univerzitetu Sv. Kliment Ohridski u Sofiji; drugu grupu čini 20 govornika bugarskog koji ne govore engleski jezik. U radu dajemo analizu akcenatskih obrazaca koji bugarski učenici engleskog koriste u domaćim složenicama naspram pozajmljenica tipa imenica+imenica, i pokušavamo da damo odgovor na pitanje da li na to utiče poznavanje engleskog jezika. Potom poredimo te rezultate sa odgovorima druge grupe ispitanika, čini članovi ne govore engleski. Eksperiment se sastoji iz dva testa, testa produkcije i testa percepcije.

Ključne reči: naglasak, pozajmljenice, složenice imenica+imenica, engleski, bugarski, produkcija.

1. INTRODUCTION

Contact between languages is among the crucial factors of language change. One of its most recognizable manifestations is the process of borrowing, which is also one of the most productive types of language change. This paper will specifically look at the process of borrowing lexical items from one language into another, and more precisely at one type of borrowings, namely N+N constructions. The source language of those borrowings is English, and the host language is Bulgarian. It will look into the phonetic adaptation of these borrowings in terms of stress, the representation of stress in Bulgarian dictionaries, and stress production by Bulgarian speakers. The aim of the current research will thus be to try to explore what the actual language reality in

---

1   Kontakt podaci (Email): n.stoykova@uni-sofia.bg

present-day Bulgaria is – i.e. what stress patterns Bulgarian speakers actually produce in native and borrowed N+N constructions, as well as whether the presence or lack of knowledge of English exerts any influence on their production of N+N constructions borrowed from English. The hypotheses are two: all Bulgarian speakers will conform to the stress pattern typical for native Bulgarian N+N constructions, irrespective of their knowledge of English; and Bulgarian speakers with no knowledge of English will have problems in the production of stress in borrowed English N+N constructions into Bulgarian.

When it comes to borrowing words from another language, there are periods of heavy, moderate, and light borrowing. What is more, lexemes can be borrowed not only from one language, but from different languages simultaneously. The fields into which those new lexemes are borrowed vary as well, e.g. communications and technology, marketing, sports, as well as foods and drinks, to name but a few. What is important, however, is that a word enters the host language mainly in order to satisfy some of its needs – be it the need to fill in a linguistic gap by introducing a new, previously lacking word or concept, or the need to acquire prestige – i.e. when a new word replaces an existing, native word. Whenever a word is borrowed into a language, however, it usually undergoes a process of adaptation. There are a few types of adaptation that take place, namely graphic, phonetic, morphological, semantic, and syntactic (**Krumova-Tsvetkova** *et al.* 2013: 189). The process of phonetic adaptation entails adapting the borrowed word to the specific features of the host language (**Krumova-Tsvetkova** *et al.* 2013: 314), which usually involves transliteration and transcription, with the latter being the preferred approach in recent years in Bulgarian (Zidarova 2011: 47). Another important aspect of the process of phonetic adaptation concerns the stress pattern of the borrowed word, and is usually referred to as "stress adaptation" (Patseva 2017: 135). During it the original stress pattern of the borrowed word is either preserved or altered, in order to comply with the phonetic and phonological rules of the host language. Since stress is one of the problematic areas for learners and speakers of many languages, the use of stress patterns by language users has been the basis of a great deal of research and is a relevant area of study (Kunter 2011; Patseva 2017; Duběda 2018).

In order to proceed with the phonetic adaptation in terms of stress of borrowings, it would be useful to first take a brief look at the rules and regularities of stress placement in N+N constructions in the host and source languages, Bulgarian and English, respectively. Based on the *Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Language vol. 2 Morphology* (Boyadzhiev *et al.* 1993: 97), the stress patterns Bulgarian N+N constructions can have are the following:

- one primary stress, or
- one primary and one (or more) secondary stress(es), or
- two primary stresses, where there is no distinction between primary and secondary stress.

In contrast, the stress of English compounds tends to be different. For constructions of the type N+N Roach (Roach 2009: 85) gives a rather concise and straightforward definition – the compound has either one primary stress usually on the first element,

or one primary and one secondary stress. Naturally, there are exceptions to the rule, in which primary stress falls on the second element but they are not going to be discussed in the current paper.

When it comes to borrowed words into Bulgarian and their stress patterns, however, literature on the matter remains rather vague and does not provide hard and fast rules. Boyadzhiev *et al.* in *Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Language. Phonetics* claim that:

> It is a basic rule in the Bulgarian language that in the pronunciation of borrowed words the stress pattern remains the same as the one in the original pronunciation of the word from the source language. However, there is a widespread phenomenon of nativisation of those borrowed words, i.e. their pronunciation is being adjusted following the characteristic phonetic and stress patterns in the Bulgarian language. (1998, vol. 1: 212)

In sum, this passage claims that regardless of their source language, some borrowings into Bulgarian undergo stress adaptation, while others do not. Yet, it remains rather unclear what the exact mechanism is and which borrowings undergo nativisation. Dictionaries seem to be the only possible reference source in this case because they provide the necessary data, namely borrowed words with their stress patterns, and any endeavor for further analyses could be made starting from consulting them as a primary source[2]. On the one hand, relying on dictionaries would firstly entail looking at every borrowed word separately, and on the other hand, would be beneficial only if a specific type of dictionary is used, namely "a dictionary of borrowed words". Turning to dictionaries for a plethora of examples rather than to grammar books for vague rules with few examples seems to be a promising approach. Unfortunately, it proves to be rather unsuccessful due to the fact that one and the same word is assigned different stress patterns in different dictionaries. Such discrepancies are most likely due to a lack of consistency or agreement among the editorial staff of the different dictionaries, but more importantly, they explicitly show that there is a need for clearer rules and guidance regarding the adaptation of the stress pattern of borrowed words.

For the sake of conducting the current experiment, however, it was decided that only one of the specific dictionaries should be referenced as a standard (Pernishka *et al.* 2010), so that any inconsistencies in the stress patterns could be avoided.

---

2   It needs to be noted that dictionaries are cited as the primary source because they provide a model, a standard. In order to obtain reliable results it was decided that I should compare my data to such a standard and see whether there is deviation from it or not, as well as establish the real language picture – which is provided by the real-life speech of native speakers of the language.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment consisted of a production and a perception (judgement) task.

2.1 PRODUCTION TASK

Two groups of speakers, each consisting of twenty respondents, took part in the production task. The first group was composed of twenty young Bulgarian native speakers with knowledge of English. All of them were first-year students in English and American Studies at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" at the time. The mean age of the group is 19.75, and there were 11 female and 9 male participants. This "imperfect" ratio was due to the fact that there was a low turnout after the process of recruitment of participants. All of the participants are native speakers of Bulgarian with five or more years of English language learning experience, being at B2/C1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The second group of speakers was composed of twenty middle-aged Bulgarians who have not studied or do not speak English. The mean age of the group was 55.15, and there were 10 female and 10 male participants.

The items that both groups of participants were tested on were part of manually collected corpus (word lists) of N+N constructions. The sources used for the purposes of compiling them were seven different dictionaries – two English and five Bulgarian ones. The first word list contained twenty-five English constructions of the type N+N (hereafter called "EN"), the second one contained their twenty-five borrowed equivalents in Bulgarian (hereafter called "BOR"), and the third word list contained twenty-five N+N constructions with a "traditional Bulgarian" stress pattern (hereafter called "BGTRAD"). It has to be noted that "traditional" here is used in the sense of the native established stress pattern for the certain group of words. Among the criteria used in the selection process were the type of the construction, the number of syllables in it, the number of stresses, and the different representations of those in different dictionaries. All of the items had to be of the type N+N; the number of syllables had to be 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 (6 only in the case of the BGTRAD presentation); a maximum of two stresses were permitted, and it was decided that no distinction would be made between primary and secondary stress due to expected wide variation. However, the distinction between the different levels of stress will be investigated in a separate, future study. The selected words from the three respective word lists were inserted into carrier sentences of the type "He repeated "N+N construction" (e.g. He repeated "barcode") for English, and "Той повтори "сложно съществително име от вида N+N" (Той повтори „баркод"/Toj povtori "barkod") for Bulgarian, respectively. The test items were enclosed in inverted commas, which were supposed to serve as an indicator that the words inside them should be pronounced in a more careful manner. Moreover, they were deliberately put in sentence final position due to the fact that when occupying the last sentence slot, the respective word is expected to receive nuclear stress and to be pronounced with its default stress pattern. The carrier sentences in all three PowerPoint presentations were shown on separate slides, and every respondent could change or go back to them at their own discretion. The

total number of test items was 75: 25 English words, 25 English borrowings, and 25 Traditional Bulgarian words.

The three PowerPoint presentations were the same for both groups of participants, yet there were six variants of the order of the carrier sentences inside them, as well as six possibilities of the order of the presentations. It was decided that having such a different order of the sentences and a different order of the presentations would lead to no order bias on the side of the respondents. Also, since the group of mature speakers did not have knowledge of English, they did not have to read out the presentation containing the English words, so they had only two presentations (EN & BOR). On the other hand, the members from the group of young speakers who speak English had to read out all three presentations (EN, BOR & BGTRAD) one after another in the respective order they were assigned by the researcher.

Due to restricted access, equipment and participant unavailability, the recordings were made in three venues on three different days. The members of the group of young speakers were recorded in two sessions: the first one took place in a Language laboratory at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", and the second session was hosted by the British and American Studies Resource Centre, who voluntarily provided their quietest and most secluded room, The Shakespeare Centre, for the purpose of conducting the experiment. The group of mature speakers was recorded in a small conference room on the premises of their workplace, which made it convenient for them to come during their breaks. The software used was Praat, and the microphone used was Samson Go Mic portable USB studio condenser. I also used a laptop (LENOVO Ideapad 320 for the recordings), and a tablet (Samsung Galaxy Tab A 2019). The latter was necessary so that the speakers could change the slides of the presentations at their own pace.

For the sake of the current paper, however, we will only look at the respondents' production of the N+N constructions borrowed from English and the traditional Bulgarian words, because these were the two presentations that were common to both groups of respondents.

2.2. PERCEPTION TASK

The productions of all participants, both from the group of mature and from the group of young speakers, served as the basis for a perceptual judgement experiment carried out by two trained English phoneticians from Sofia University. Both of them are Bulgarian native speakers highly proficient in English. Their task was to listen to each utterance as many times as they deemed necessary and determine the prominent syllable(s) of the N+N construction in question. Whenever they were not able to identify the stress pattern, or were hesitant, they would mark that item with a question mark. Subsequently, a process of data comparison took place where the judgements given by the two raters were compared. Every test item for which there was a difference in agreement between the two judges regarding the prominence of the N+N construction in question was noted down and a list of such items was created. Finally, all of the data, i.e. both the items the judges agreed and disagreed on were entered into an Excel sheet and were further processed.

3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The responses in the perception experiment given by the two judges were statistically analysed with JMP. The total number of recorded responses was 4996: 2498 test items * 2 judges. The first necessary step was to see if the judgements of the two raters were in agreement. Of the 2498 test items, the rating of the most prominent syllable was identical for 2372 (95%) items. The number of items for which the two raters had given different responses equalled to 126 items (5%). When we take into consideration all responses from rater 1 and rater 2, Fleiss' Kappa (k) = 0.94, which indicates almost perfect agreement between them according to Fleiss' classification (Fleiss *et al.* 2003). This is confirmed by the obtained p-value (p < 0.0001), indicating that our calculated kappa is significantly different from zero.

Linear mixed model (LLM) tests were run in order to see whether the group of mature speakers differed from the group of young speakers in terms of the assessments given by the two judges for the realisation of prominence patterns in the two types of N+N constructions: the traditional Bulgarian words, and the borrowed N+N constructions. As previously mentioned, the presentation containing English words is excluded from the present analysis because the group of mature speakers did not have it as part of their test. The linear mixed model tests were calculated with productions of the syllables labelled as "1" (stressed) and "0" (unstressed). For the purposes of this analysis we define "agreement" as the rate of agreement between rater 1 and rater 2, which represents the number of instances the two judges had shown agreement on regarding the stress patterns they had heard and which also concide with the standard (the given pronunciation of the word in question in the dictionary); "subject" as the respective speaker; "word" as the N+N construction, its syllable structure and stress pattern; "presentation" as the different types of N+N constructions included in the carrier sentences (BGTRAD or BOR); and gender (F or M). The factors that the current linear mixed model test had were as follows:

- – random factors: **SUBJECT** and **WORD**
- – fixed factor: **AGREEMENT**
- – dependent factors: **GROUP**, **PRESENTATION** and **GENDER.**

A total of 1913 items were analysed. Of them, 949 were produced by the younger group, and 964 were produced by the group of mature speakers. In terms of division of male and female production, 991 items were produced by female participants (515 from the group of mature speakers and 476 from the group of young speakers), and 922 items by male participants (434 from the group of mature speakers and 488 from the group of young speakers). In terms of the two presentations, the breakdown according to performance by group and gender is the following:

- • BGTRAD productions
  - – Young speakers – 254 female, 218 male
  - – Mature speakers – 243 female, 242 male

- BOR productions
  – Young speakers – 261 female, 216 male
  – Mature speakers – 233 female, 246 male.

From the linear mixed model tests that were run, it is clear that the factors Group (F [1, 36.15] = 25.84, p<0,001) and Presentation (F [1, 48.14] = 14.5, p< 0.01) have main effect, as do the interactions between Group*Gender (F [1, 36.15] = 6.18, p<0.05), and Group*Presentation (F [1, 1829] = 44, p<0.001). The analysis indicates that the different groups behave statistically differently regarding Gender and consequently statistically different regarding Presentation. Gender on its own does not have a main effect, as do the interactions between Gender*Presentation and Group*Gender*Presentation. Their values are too high, meaning the results are not systematic, and thus will not be considered relevant to the current analysis.

In terms of the first significant effect, Group, the analysis shows that the rate of agreeement between Judge 1 and Judge 2 regarding the prominence realisations of the group of young speakers is rather high and shows that 83% of their realisations are in tune with the standard. The group of mature speakers, on the other hand, have received 70% judge agreement, and this lower rate is indicative of more variation from the standard. All of this shows that the young group possessing knowledge of English produces prominence more consistently, i.e without much variation, and more in tune with the dictionary stress patterns, than their mature counterparts, regardless of the test items in the two presentations at hand.

A look at the other significant factor in the analysis, namely the interaction between Group and Gender also yields interesting findings. Younger females tend to show a higher rate of judge agreeement regarding their prominence placements – 84% out of all other participants (young males, mature females, and mature males), and are followed by young males with their score of 82%. Mature males come third with 75%, and mature females occupy the last spot with 65%. In other words, mature females differ from all young males and females, as well as from mature males, producing the lowest rate of agreed on prominence placements that are also in tune with the dictionary, whilst young females show the highest rate and are followed by young males and mature males.

The other two significant factors from the linear mixed model tests that were run were Presentation and the interaction between Group and Presentation (Group*Presentation). The results from the tests run on Presentation for both groups show, as expected, that the percentage with more agreement judgements in terms of prominence placements that also coincide with the dictionary belongs to the presentation containing traditional Bulgarian N+N constructions – 87%. This is an expected finding because this presentation contained words taken from the vocabulary stock of the participants' native language. The presentation containing borrowed N+N constructions has a moderate rate of 66% judge agreement on prominence placements that also coincide with the dictionary for both groups, yet the difference between the two presentations is quite striking. These results show that native Bulgarian speakers regardless of their knowledge of English place prominence more consistently and without much variation on N+N constructions that are part

of the vocabulary stock of their native language more often than in cases where the vocabulary items have been borrowed.

As to the last significant factor, i.e. the interaction between Group and Presentation, data show that the rate of agreement on the prominence placements that are in tune with the dictionary produced by both mature and young speakers is higher in presentation BGTRAD. However, the group of young speakers shows a slightly better rate of 89% judge agreement on realisations that also coincide with the standard, while the group of mature speakers comes quite near them with a rate of 86%. Nevertheless, it becomes clear that BGTRAD is the presentation containing N+N constructions with prominence patterns that Bulgarian native speakers find it easier to pronounce and do not produce much variation in. With regard to the instances of variation, however, results show that speakers tend to prefer using only one early stress, irrespective of the number of syllables a word has. Examples of such early placement of stress could be found in words such as "кинорежисьор" and "план-програма" produced as "КИнорежисьор" and "ПЛАН-програма", respectively.

When it comes to the other presentation included in the analysis – the one containing borrowed N+N constructions, BOR, the situation is quite different. The performance of the two groups of speakers differs substantially and shows that young speakers outdo their mature counterparts because the rate of agreement between judge 1 and judge 2 regarding their realisations, which also coincide with the dictionary, is 78 %, compared to 55 % for the mature speakers, who evidently produce a lot of variation. Yet, in both groups the instances where their realisations differ from the standard show a preference for early stress (young speakers) and fluctuation between one and two stresses in 2- and 3-syllable words (mature speakers). For example, mature speakers have realised „бодигард" as БОдигард (100) and БОДИгард (110) instead of the standard БОдиГАРД (101), while young speakers have realised the same word as БОдигард (100) and not as БОдиГАРД (101).

These results can lead to a number of interpretations: firstly, that young and mature speakers have little to no problem in producing prominence patterns in words that are familiar to them, while it appears that mature speakers find it challenging to produce stress patterns in words that are not so familiar, namely because they do not have knowledge of the language they have been borrowed from. It is also visible that young speakers do relatively better and conform to the dictionary pronunciation to a higher extent regarding the production of words belonging to the two presentations. What is more, their good performance regarding the presentation containing borrowed N+N constructions is most likely due to the fact that they have studied and speak English as a foreign language and are familiar with the original stress patterns of the English words, while this is not the case with the group of mature speakers. This is why the latter produces more and different variants of the prominence patterns of the respective words in the BOR presentation, making their performance not as compliant with the dictionary standard, hence not as good as the performance of their younger counterparts.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The research reported here had as its aim to answer the question what stress patterns Bulgarian speakers actually produce in native and borrowed words, as well as whether the presence or lack of knowledge of English exerts any influence on their production of N+N constructions borrowed from English.

With regard to the first part of the main question, native speakers of Bulgarian regardless of their knowledge of English tend to produce stress in their L1 mostly in accordance with the standard prominence pattern given in the dictionary. As to the instances in which there is deviation from it, results show that there is a preference for the placement of only one stress in words where there should be two stresses ("план-програма"). In this particular presentation, namely BGTRAD, the test items that show such deviations are not too many, but they are still of importance because they show a tendency for a preference of using only one early stress in N+N constructions regardless of the number of their syllables and hint at influence of the L2 on the L1 prominence pattern.

Turning to how Bulgarian speakers regardless of their knowledge of English produce prominence in N+N constructions borrowed from English, results are indicative of problems for both groups. The rate of judge agreement regarding prominence placements that are also in tune with the dictionary for the group of mature speakers is 55 %. The group of young speakers with knowledge of English have elicited a higher rate than their counterparts, namely 78 %. It is apparent that the performance of the group of mature participants without knowledge of English is poorer than the other group's due to the fact that there is a lot of variation in their productions. Having accepted the standard prominence pattern for these borrowed N+N constructions given in the reference dictionary, results show that mature speakers show a lot more variation in their realisations, and fluctuate between using one and two stresses in three-syllabic words, with a stronger preference for early stress ("БОдигард", „БИЗнесмен"). As to two-syllabic N+N constructions, most of the mature speakers show a preference for producing two stresses, where there should actually be one stress ("БАРКОД", "БЕЙЗБОЛ", "ЛАПТОП").

The situation with the group of speakers with knowledge of English regarding the borrowed N+N constructions seems to be rather intriguing in the sense that they once again show preference for one early stress in the test items from this particular presentation, regardless of the number of syllables the words are composed of. This is an interesting finding because it shows a discrepancy with what the dictionary states as a prominence pattern for the respective word, and the speakers show a higher degree of consistency in their preference for one early stress only. This leads us to the conclusion that there is a strong preference among young speakers with knowledge of English, regardless of their gender, to use only early stress in N+N constructions borrowed from English. Examples of this are "БАРкод", "НИКнейм", "ЛАЙФстайл". I suggest that this preference stems from their knowledge of English as a foreign language. As it was mentioned above, the default prominence pattern for the majority of the English N+N constructions is prominence on the left element, and these speakers tend to transplant that pattern to the borrowed N+N constructions, as well as to some

native N+N constructions. The results from all tests run for the performance of this group tentatively suggest that there is an influence of the L2 on the L1, and it is mostly visible in the realisations of the test items belonging to the presentation composed of borrowed N+N constructions, as well as of those belonging to the presentation containing native Bulgarian words.

This might not be the complete picture, though. The present experiment is small in scale, and additional follow-up experiments and further more in-depth analysis will be needed to verify the present results. However, the current investigation served its purpose in answering the question of what stress patterns Bulgarian speakers, both with and without knowledge of English, produce in native and borrowed N+N constructions, as well as in exploring whether the former's knowledge of English has any influence on those productions.

REFERENCES

Boyadzhiev, T., S. Stoyanov and K. Popov. 1993. *Gramatika na balgarskiya savremenen knizhoven ezik. Tom 2. Morfologiya* [Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Language. Volume 2. Morphology]. 3 vols. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Balgarskata akademiya na naukite.

Boyadzhiev, T. *et al.* 1998. *Gramatika na balgarskiya savremenen knizhoven ezik. Tom 1. Fonetika* [Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Language. Volume 1. Phonetics]. 3 vols. Veliko Tarnovo: Abagar.

Duběda, T. 2018. N+N Borrowings from English: A New Stress Pattern in Czech? In K. Klessa, J. Bachan, A. Wagner, M. Karpiński and D. Śledziński (eds.) *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Speech Prosody*, 90–93.

Fleiss, J., B. Levin and M. Cho Paik. 2003. *Statistical Methods for rates and Proportions*. 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Wiley.

Jones, D. 2011. *Cambridge English Pronouncing Dictionary* (eds. P. Roach, J. Setter, J. Esling). 18th Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krumova-Tsvetkova, L. *et al.* 2013. *Balgarska leksikologiya i frazeologiya. Tom 1. Balgarska leksikologiya* [Bulgarian lexicology and phraseology. Volume 1. Bulgarian lexicology]. 3 vols. Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov".

Kunter, G. 2011. *Compound Stress in English: The Phonetics and Phonology of Prosodic Prominence*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Patseva, M. 2017. Tendentsii pri aktsentnoto adaptirane na zaemki [Tendencies in the adaptation of stress in borrowings]. In *Novi napravleniya v sinhronnata i diahronnata fonetika i fonologiya. Sbornik s dokladi ot mezhdunarodna nauchna konferentsiya, 17 yuni 2016 g.* [New Directions in Synchronic and Diachronic Phonetics and Phonology]. Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 135–146.

Pernishka, E., D. Blagoeva and S. Kolkovska. 2010. *Rechnik na novite dumi v balgarskiya ezik (ot kraya na parvoto desetiletie na XXI v.)* [Dictionary of New Words in the Bulgarian Language (from the end of the first decade of the 21st century)]. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Roach, P. 2009. *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course.* 4th Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAS Institute. 2019. *JMP: Version 14.* Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

Zidarova, V. 2011. Nablyudeniya varhu novite angliyski zaemki i tyahnata adaptatsiya kam sistemata na balgarskiya knizhoven ezik [Observations on the New English Borrowings and Their Adaptation to the System of the Bulgarian Language]. In *Nauchni trudove – Filologiya, SB. A* (Scholarly Works Philology, SB. A). Plovdiv: UI "Paisii Hilendarski", 41–49.

SUMMARY

BARkod, bar**KOD** or **BARKOD**?
BULGARIAN SPEAKERS AND THEIR PRODUCTION OF STRESS

The aim of this paper is to investigate the production of stress in 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-syllable N+N constructions borrowed from English into Bulgarian by two groups of speakers. The first group consists of 20 Bulgarian learners of English, who are first-year university students in English and American Studies at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski". The second group consists of 20 Bulgarian speakers with no knowledge of English. I will try to determine what stress patterns Bulgarian learners of English produce in native and borrowed N+N constructions and will also explore whether their knowledge of English has any influence on their production. Then, I compare those results to the production of the speakers from the second group of respondents, who have no command of English. The experiment consists of two tests – a production, and a perception test (a judgement task).

APPENDIX

WORDS FROM THE PRESENTATIONS LISTED IN AN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

Presentation BOR

баркод (barcode)
бейзбол (baseball)
бизнесмен (businessman)
бийтбокс (beatbox)
билборд (billboard)
бодибилдинг (bodybuilding)
бодигард (bodyguard)
букмейкър (bookmaker)
кайтборд (kiteboard)
корнфлейкс (cornflakes)
лайфстайл (lifestyle)
чийзбургер (cheeseburger)
шоубизнес (show business)

лаптоп (laptop)
никнейм (nickname)
офис мениджър (office manager)
паникбутон (panic button)
плеймейкър (playmaker)
саундтрак (soundtrack)
телешопинг (teleshopping)
токшоу (talk show)
уикенд (weekend)
уъркшоп (workshop)
чатклуб (chat club)
шоурум (showroom)

Presentation BGTRAD

водоизточник (water source)
водопровод (water pipeline)
главорез (executioner)
деловодител (clerk)
животновъд (livestock farmer)
заместник-министър (deputy minister)
звукозапис (sound recording)
кандидат-студент (prospective student)
кандидат-член (candidate member)
кафе-сладкарница (coffee-pastry shop)
кинорежисьор (cinema director)
книгообмен (book exchange)
къща-музей (house museum)

мореплавател (seafarer)
началник-щаб (chief of staff)
небосвод (sky)
параход (steamboat)
план-програма (plan-programme)
плод-зеленчук (grocery shop)
покупко-продажба (buying and selling)
птицевъд (poultry-breeder)
пътепис (travel notes)
ръководител (leader)
хлебопекар (bread baker)
хотел-ресторант (hotel-restaurant)