

The Teachability of Entering and Exiting in L2 English

Anthony Attwood

The patterns used to express how a figure moves from one place to another may vary from language to language. These patterns are acquired early in childhood and are often resistant to restructuring. As a result, making the switch from L1 motion event patterns to a typologically different L2 pattern tends to be particularly difficult for language learners. Despite the evident challenges for learners, this area has been thus far neglected in language teaching. Taking a cognitive semantic approach, based on the theoretical framework for the typology of satellite-framed and verb-framed languages developed by Talmy (1985, 1991, 2000) and Slobin (1987, 1996, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006), this paper presents an overview of the challenges faced both by learners and their teachers in the L2 motion domain and proposes as a possible way forward the use of teaching materials which employ alternative forms of input enhancement.

1. Introduction

The expression of motion events represents a substantial challenge for language learners particularly when the L2 differs typologically from the learner's L1 (e.g. Cadierno & Ruiz 2006; Antonijevic & Berthaud 2009). Motion events are situations involving movement of a figure from one place to another (Talmy 1985). Importantly for this study, the patterns used in how these events are expressed may vary from language to language. Talmy's (1985, 1991, 2000) typology describes languages in terms of two main patterns: satellite-framed (S-framed) and verb-framed (V-framed). Whereas S-framed languages (e.g. English, German, Swedish) may conflate Motion and Manner in the verb, and use a satellite to express Path, V-framed languages (e.g. Spanish, Japanese, Korean) typically conflate Motion and Path in the verb, and express Manner in a separate expression. In other words, an S-framed language such as English can use a motion verb like *go* to express general movement away from a starting point and a *satellite*, such as *forth*, to express the specific trajectory or Path.

A 'satellite' (e.g. *go forth*) is Talmy's (2000: 222) term for "any constituent other than a noun phrase or prepositional phrase complement that is in a sister relation to the verb root". Talmy's original definition has been extended to include satellite + preposition constructions (SPCs), such as *into* and *out of* (Croft et al. 2010) which are the focus of this study. 'Manner-of-motion' refers to giving additional information regarding the kind of movement that takes place. In an S-framed language like English, the motion verb *go* can be replaced by a manner-of-motion verb such as *run*, which tells us more about how the action is performed, i.e. on two legs (or more) moving quickly. In V-framed languages, information regarding the specific nature of the movement can be added as a subordinate element after the main verb. Whereas in S-framed English a person would generally say *he ran into the room*, in Spanish this would usually be expressed as *he entered the room running* although in both languages there are alternative options which are used less frequently.

As highlighted above, making the switch from these L1 motion event patterns to the typologically different L2 pattern may be particularly difficult for language learners. However, in language teaching this area has been thus far neglected. Indeed while some research has drawn attention to these difficulties, theories of Second Language Acquisition

(SLA) have yet to explain how learners deal with the challenges of L2 motion event construal. It has been suggested (Cadierno 2004; Cadierno & Lund 2004) that this domain may be fruitful for SLA research providing insight into how adult language learners cope with the L2 patterns used for the expression of motion events as well as the role of L1 transfer.

While keeping in mind the problems learners face, the current study focuses on the teachability of L2 motion event patterns for *entering* and *exiting* and seeks to gain insight into the challenges instructors may face when attempting to present this language feature in an effective manner. With the benefit of the insight this line of inquiry may bring, it is hoped that recommendations can be made to improve a relatively neglected area in L2 instruction.

A preliminary review of 35 textbooks in current use for the teaching of L2 English revealed that manner-of-motion verbs and SPCs often receive scant attention. Where they do appear, the overwhelming tendency is to place emphasis on the lexical meaning of the manner verb with little or no engagement with the challenges involved in the construal or processing of an entire motion event, in particular the mapping of semantic features such as the Figure, Path, Ground and Manner onto surface features of an L2 (nouns, verbs, adverbial expressions etc.). Table 1 shows an example of this kind of approach.

<i>Word</i>	<i>Example</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
stagger	Despite his injury, he <u>staggered</u> to the nearest house for help.	Walk with difficulty, being almost unable to stand up.
hike	They <u>hiked</u> across the countryside.	Walk long distances in the country.
dash	I <u>dashed</u> across the road for the bus.	Run quickly and suddenly.
creep	I <u>crept</u> up the stairs, so that I wouldn't wake anyone.	Move slowly and quietly so you are not seen or heard.

Table 1. Traditional approach to manner-of-motion verbs and SPCs (Gairns & Redman 2008: 32).

As can be seen, the manner verbs have been made more salient to the learner through textual/typographical input enhancement (TTIE) with the aim of directing the learner to the target form (Sharwood Smith 1991, 1993). Such examples are typically followed by sentences where the learner is asked to fill in gaps by selecting the appropriate verb. However, as was found throughout the materials examined, while the manner-of-motion verb is made more salient, attention is not drawn to SPCs or to the intricacies of how these grammatical features fit together within English argument structure. These are important points that even experienced instructors may be unaware of, or unsure how to present in an effective way. As a result L2 learners may receive only incidental exposure to this type of input either through exercises like those described above, or while communicating with others such as their language instructors or with native speakers in naturalistic situations. However, given the critical role of awareness in learning (Schmidt 1990), incidental exposure may not be enough in itself to process the input effectively or to prompt target-like use in production. Indeed it is particularly evident with motion event cognition that comprehensible input (Krashen 1985) may not be enough.

A number of researchers (e.g. Inagaki 2001; Cadierno 2004; Antonijevic & Berthaud 2009) have drawn attention to the often complex relationship between motion verbs and SPCs and the challenges in terms of both interpretation and production for those learning to express motion events in an L2 that is typologically different from their L1. There is a suggestion that where a partial fit exists between the L1 and the L2 (Adjemian 1983) this may lead to erroneous interpretation and the production of target-deviant forms (Antonijevic & Berthaud 2009). A possible cause for the production of these target-deviant forms in the expression of L2 motion events is L1 transfer. With the term *transfer* I refer to the effect of a person's first language on the use of a newly acquired language. For example (cf. Treffers-

Daller & Tidball, in press) in the domain of motion, a speaker from a V-framed L1 may continue to map *Path* onto the verb in English, which results in more unconventional ways of talking about motion:

- (1) He entered the bank (running).
PATH MANNER

In addition to these typological variations, another area of potential difficulty (Slobin & Hoiting 1994), particularly for L1 speakers of Romance languages such as Spanish and French, is the expression of a motion event which involves a boundary-crossing. Example (2) shows the typical S-framed pattern for expressing an event which involves a manner-of-motion verb (*ran*) and the crossing of a boundary (*into the bank*).

- (2) He ran into the bank.
MANNER PATH

In contrast, the previous example (1) shows how the same boundary-crossing event may be expressed by an L2 speaker from a V-framed background where the change of state from *outside* the bank *into* the bank is expressed by a Path verb with the possible addition of Manner as a subordinate element (*running*).

These different patterns were also evident in Slobin's (2006) study of typological variations in elicited narratives of Mayer's (1969) *Frog Stories*. Slobin found that speakers of languages such as Turkish, Hebrew, Spanish, French and Italian generally omitted Manner information when describing the owl's emergence from the tree and focussed on Path:

- (3) The owl exited the hole (flying)
PATH MANNER (optional)

As Slobin's research has shown in many V-framed languages, a manner-of-motion verb such as *fly* can be used with an SPC to express motion which stops short of a change of state. Put more simply, in languages such as Spanish, Turkish and Hebrew, one may *fly up to* or *from* a tree to another point but not *fly into* or *out of* a tree (Slobin 2006).

In sum, it would appear that L1 transfer leads to difficulties for learners in the production and interpretation of L2 motion events and particularly when the event involves some kind of boundary crossing (Treffers-Daller & Tidball, in press; Larrañaga et al. 2012). Furthermore, instructors who have identified the description of motion as an area of difficulty for learners may find there is a lack of suitable resources available to aid instruction.

Current research would seem to offer very little guidance for teachers regarding how best to approach the L2 motion domain. Indeed, Inagaki (2002) is one of the few researchers to make recommendations regarding difficulties in this area. From a study which compared the performance of English L1 learners of Japanese and Japanese L1 learners of English in the use of motion verbs, Inagaki concludes that positive evidence of a target structure may not be enough for it to be acquired and that some type of input enhancement would perhaps be more effective (Inagaki 2002:23).

Input enhancement (IE) was first proposed by Sharwood Smith (1991, 1993) and refers to a process by which input becomes salient to the learner. Regarding the specific kind of IE that could be used, Treffers-Daller (2012) has suggested that for the teaching/learning of L2 motion event construal, VanPatten's (1996) input processing (IP) theory may be a useful starting point. For VanPatten (2003: 25), input can be defined as language where something is being communicated. According to this model, incoming linguistic data is at first processed and converted to intake which can then be accommodated and incorporated into the developing system. Finally, this newly incorporated language may become available for the learner and can be accessed during production. Where IP differs from other input theories (e.g. Krashen & Terrell 1983) is in its emphasis on the sub-processes of making form-

meaning connections (FMCs) and parsing. For VanPatten (1996), comprehension alone is not enough to guarantee acquisition. Instead what is needed is for the learner to make connections during the act of comprehension.

The practical application of the IP model described above is Processing Instruction (PI), which is an approach aimed at enhancing learner intake extracted from the input through a series of Structured Input (SI) activities. SI activities are designed to guide learners away from default processing strategies (VanPatten 1993). Importantly, during the SI phase learners focus on input and are not required to produce the target structure prematurely. Production of the target structures only occurs after substantial engagement with the input and its meaning. According to VanPatten (2009: 54), this focused engagement does more than raising awareness, learners are pushed to make appropriate FMCs by prompting a disruption at the parsing stage which forces the learner to make a readjustment in how a sentence is decoded. A typical PI lesson includes the following three stages:

- a. Explicit instruction where the learners are provided with both explicit information about the target form and made aware of potential problems with processing strategies.
- b. Referential Structured input activities, which are activities that require right or wrong answers and where learners are forced to process the target structure for the appropriate form-meaning connection.
- c. Affective Structured input activities, which do not have right or wrong answers, involve the expression of opinions or beliefs about the real world through guided tasks.

Furthermore, when designing a PI treatment, practitioners follow guidelines such as (Lee & VanPatten 2003: 168): present one thing at a time; keep meaning in focus; move from sentences to connected discourse; use both oral and written input; have the learner do something with the input; keep the learner's processing strategies in mind.

Agiasophiti (2011) has recently compared the effectiveness of PI with Textual/Typographical Input Enhancement (TTIE) for the teaching of German object pronouns. Both TTIE and PI involve the manipulation of input in different ways in order to draw a learner's attention to the target linguistic form. While for TTIE the objective is to make particular points in the input salient to increase the likelihood of these being processed (Sharwood Smith 1991, 1993), PI aims to force learners to process the target form in order to ensure an appropriate FMC (VanPatten 1996, 2004). While these findings may be somewhat inconclusive, there is the suggestion that the combination of PI and TTIE may be more effective than the sole application of the two approaches (Agiasophiti 2011).

1.1. Implicit/explicit learning

In addition to comparing different IE techniques, the present study is situated within the implicit/explicit learning debate in SLA. *Implicit learning* has been described as a natural unconscious process whereas *explicit learning* is said to take place on a more conscious level where hypotheses may be formed and tested (Ellis 1994). This paper compares varying levels of explicitness and learning outcomes. While TTIE can be regarded as a more implicit attention-focusing device, PI contains explicit rule explanation and is therefore relatively more obtrusive. What is more, these approaches are compared against a control group who receive no overt instruction in the target forms. Although the control group will not be instructed in the expression of motion events in English, like all the participants in the study, they will be residing in the UK and enrolled on an English language study course.

Data from participant questionnaires will be used to compare variables such as language background, language habits, date of arrival in the UK and duration of residence at the time of the study. This data may allow for a comparison of the effect of cultural immersion on terms of acquisition of the target forms prior to participation in the study.

2. Talmy's typology

This study draws on the theoretical framework for the typology of satellite-framed and verb-framed languages developed by Talmy (1985, 1991, 2000) and Slobin (1987, 1996, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006). A motion event has been described (Talmy 1985: 61) as a situation “containing movement or the maintenance of a stationary location” and is made up of four basic internal components: Figure, Ground, Path and Motion.

- (4) The bottle floated into the cave.
 FIGURE MOTION PATH GROUND

The Figure is the object that moves or is located. The Motion component is the actual presence of motion or non-motion. The Ground is the reference object with regard to which the Figure moves or is located and Path represents the course followed or location occupied by the Figure with respect to the Ground. However, to these internal components an external Co-event such as Manner which describes how a Figure moves, can be added.

Regarding language typology, Talmy posits the existence of two basic types: V-framed languages like Spanish which tend to lexicalize *Path* in the verb, with the potential for *Manner* of motion to be expressed by adding an adverbial phrase; and S-framed languages like English, where the Path or directional component is expressed outside the verb, in a satellite (Talmy 1985, 1991, 2000). The typological differences between V-framed and S-framed languages which are illustrated in Talmy's (1985: 69) example of a motion event:

- (5) Verb-framed language (e.g. Spanish):
La botella entró en la cueva flotando [The bottle entered the cave floating]
- (6) Satellite-framed language (e.g. English):
 The bottle floated into the cave.

A key difference between an S-framed language like English and a V-framed language like Spanish is the way in which S-framed languages can easily incorporate the co-event of manner of motion. For example in sentence (6), Path is expressed outside the verb with the SPC *into* which then allows the verb slot to express both *manner* and *motion* without the need for additional lexical items (Slobin 2005). Conversely, in V-framed languages, *manner* must be expressed through the addition of a gerund or an adverb:

- (7) In Spanish (Talmy 1985: 69):
La botella entró en la cueva flotando [The bottle entered the cave floating]
- (8) In Italian (Folli & Ramchand 2005: 82):
La barca passò sotto il ponte (galleggiando) [The boat passed under the bridge (floating)]

The main differences between V-framed and S-framed languages are summarized below:

<i>S-framed</i>	<i>V-framed</i>
Less frequent verb-framed options.	Fewer instances of S-framed patterns.
Able to combine Manner with all Path phrases including boundary-crossing.	Able to combine Manner with some Path phrases. Boundary-crossing constraint.
High-frequency of Manner verbs in speaking and writing.	High-frequency of Path verbs with little use of Manner verbs.
Richer lexicon of Manner verbs.	Fewer Manner verbs.
Manner of motion salient in mental imagery.	More Path verbs.

Table 2. Summary of typological differences between languages.

3. The boundary-crossing constraint

A further difference between S-framed and V-framed languages is the way in which the crossing of a boundary is expressed. In Romance languages like Spanish and French it is only possible to use a Manner verb followed by a path phrase if no boundary-crossing is involved (Slobin 1996). Indeed generally speaking in V-framed languages, a figure may *fly to/from the tree* where there is no crossing of a boundary but not *fly into/out of the hole* which would entail crossing a boundary or changing state. This change of state from one location *to* or *into* another would usually be expressed by a Motion verb, rather than a Manner-of-motion verb (e.g. *exit the hole flying*) (Aske 1989; Talmy 2000). In the examples below the prepositions *hasta* and *jusqu* (=until) are used to describe directed-motion constructions involving Manner verbs which arrive at but do not cross a boundary:

- (9) In Spanish (Aske 1989: 3):
Juan bailó hasta la puerta [John danced up to the door]
Not boundary-crossing
- (10) In French (Cummins 1996: 40):
La cire coule jusqu'au bord de la table [The wax flowed to the edge of the table]
Not boundary-crossing

The Manner verbs *bailó* and *coule* are used here with a preposition which delimits an endpoint without a boundary-crossing.

An exception to this boundary-crossing constraint (Slobin & Hoiting 1994) can be seen with verbs which are used to describe instantaneous acts of limited duration. These are what Naigles et al. (1998) have called 'punctual events' (e.g. *throw oneself into the pool*), where the expression of a boundary crossing by using a manner of motion verb and a path phrase is possible:

- (11) He dived into the swimming pool.
Boundary-crossing
- (12) *Se tiró a la pileta* (Spanish).
Boundary-crossing

However this is not possible with manner of motion as an activity that is extended in time/space while crossing a boundary (Kita 1999). The effect of this combination with expressions of extended activity while clearly directional in English lead to locative interpretations in some languages like Spanish (Aske 1989):

- (13) He crawled into the room.
Directional, boundary-crossing
- (14) *Se arrastró dentro la pieza* (Spanish).
Locative, not boundary-crossing

4. Difficulties with Talmy's typology

While Talmy's classification of motion-event typology has been influential in many areas of linguistic and psycholinguistic research (Croft et al. 2010), there is a growing body of research which suggests limitations to the original classification. It has been argued that most languages demonstrate some features of both verb-framing and satellite-framing and cannot be regarded as polar opposites (see, among others, Aske 1989; Berman & Slobin 1994; Slobin & Hoiting 1994; Gennari et al. 2002; Slobin 2004; Beavers et al. 2010). There are

cases where an S-framed language may behave like a V-framed language and vice-versa, for example English has intransitive verbs such as *enter* and *exit* which express Path without the need for an additional path expression outside the verb:

(15) The man entered the room.

In addition, in a V-framed language like Spanish some manner verbs may be used with an SPC to express directed motion (Martínez Vázquez 2001: 52):

(16) *Volaron a Mar del Plata* [They flew to Mar del Plata]

Regarding these possible variations, Slobin argues that it is possible to rank languages on a cline of ‘Manner salience’ with language typologies not polarized but rather situated at different points on a continuum. Slobin (2006: 64) has described Manner salience as “the level of attention paid to manner in describing events” and it is a feature of language which can be measured by comparing descriptions of motion events across languages and genres.

More recently, the existence of a third group of Equipollently-framed languages such as Mandarin Chinese has been proposed (Slobin 2004), where Path and Manner are lexicalized by a series of verbs (Chen & Guo 2009) with neither the Path nor the Manner constituent regarded as the main verb. While keeping in mind, alternative models (e.g. Beavers et al. 2010; Croft et al. 2010), the present study follows previous L2 Motion Event studies (e.g. Inagaki 2002; Cadierno 2004; Cadierno & Lund 2004) and uses Talmy’s framework as an entry point to the classification of cross-linguistic differences in motion event construal.

5. Thinking-for-speaking and conceptual transfer

As discussed above, certain languages tend to favour certain frames in the expression of motion events. While interesting in terms of contrastive grammar, these typological differences do little to explain the challenges for language learners in the acquisition of L2 motion events. More promising in terms of understanding these challenges is the suggestion that the surface variations may be related to differences in the way the events are actually construed in the first place at the preverbal stage. Indeed the current study posits a relationship between a person’s L1 linguistic typology and the focus of attention to specific features of an event. In other words, it is assumed that before producing an utterance, speakers of a particular language are trained to make choices regarding the elements required for verbalization which can be mapped more readily onto the linguistic patterns available for encoding (Levelt 1989). There may then be conceptual and cross-linguistic differences during the ‘thinking-for-speaking stage’, when attempting to verbalize a motion event in a new language (Slobin 1996).

According to Slobin’s Thinking-for-Speaking Hypothesis (TFSH), it is during the online thinking that takes place prior to speaking where choices are made regarding the conceptualization of an event and how it may be coded. Slobin (2003) suggests that by learning to think to speak in their native language, children learn to attend to specific features of an event which may be readily encoded within the grammatical parameters of their language. Importantly for this study, TFSH (Slobin 1996: 89) states that this attention to specific features is “learned in childhood”, “resistant to restructuring in adult second-language acquisition” and “likely to be transferred to a second language”.

Indeed Slobin posits the likelihood of L1 transfer to the L2 motion domain which may result in some degree of ‘conceptual transfer’. Conceptual transfer refers to the use of L1 concepts and patterns of conceptualization in a newly acquired language and has given rise to the Conceptual Transfer Hypothesis (CTH) (Jarvis 2007). Here Jarvis makes an important distinction between *concept transfer* and *conceptualization transfer*, both of which are

considered in CTH. Concept transfer is transfer stemming from cross-linguistic differences stored in the L2 user's L1 conceptual inventory. Conceptualization transfer arises from cross-linguistic differences in the ways L2 users process conceptual knowledge and form temporary representations in working memory. The main difference between these two types of transfer, is that concept transfer is related to the inventory of concepts stored in long-term memory, whereas conceptualization transfer occurs during the selection of these stored concepts which are then brought into working memory and combined in different ways to construct temporary representations (Jarvis 2007). For the study of transfer in the expression of L2 motion events the notion of conceptualization transfer is particularly relevant as it suggests that learners may choose the features of an event for verbalization following a blueprint of conceptualization patterns belonging to their native language (Daller et al. 2011). This means that learners whose L1 is S-framed may continue to rely on this conceptualization pattern when using a V-framed L2 or vice-versa, therefore producing or accepting deviant forms.

In conclusion, learners may face challenges when attempting to describe a motion event in a typologically distinct L2. Current research, although by no means conclusive, seems to suggest that these challenges may be the result of transfer of L1 conceptualization patterns which are carried over to the L2. It would also seem that instructors wishing to aid learners in this particular area may be hindered by the lack of teaching materials currently available. Finally, it is suggested that instructional materials which employ different kinds of input enhancement such as TTIE, PI or a combination of both TTIE and PI may aid L2 English learners to make a shift away from their default L1 Verb-framed patterns towards the use of more Satellite-framed expressions.

References

- Adjemian, C. (1983). The transferability of lexical properties. In Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (eds) *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 250-268.
- Agiasophiti, Z. (2011). An Empirical Psycholinguistic Investigation of Input Processing and Input Enhancement in L1 English/L2 German: The Acquisition of V2 and Accusative Case Marking. [Doctoral dissertation]. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.
- Antonijevic, S., & Berthaud, S. (2009). Verbs of motion and sentence production in second language. In Elliott, M.A., Antonijevic, S., Berthaud, S., Mulcahy, P., Bargary, B., Martyn, C., & Schmidt, H. (eds) *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the International Society for Psychophysics*. Galway: The International Society for Psychophysics.
- Aske, J. (1989). Path predicates in English and Spanish: a closer look. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 15*, 1-14.
- Beavers, J., Levin, B., & Tham, S.W. (2010). The typology of motion expressions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics 46*, 331-377.
- Berman, R.A., & Slobin, D.I. (1994). *Relating Events in Narrative: A Cross-Linguistic Developmental Study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cadierno, T. (2004). Expressing motion events in a second language: a cognitive typological perspective. In Achard, M., & Niemeier, S. (eds) *Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Pedagogy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 14-49.
- Cadierno, T., & Lund, K. (2004). Cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition: motion events in a typological framework. In VanPatten, B., Williams, J., Rott, S., & Overstreet, M. (eds) *Form-Meaning Connections in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 139-154.
- Cadierno, T., & Ruiz, L. (2006) Motion events in Spanish L2 acquisition. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics 4*, 183-216.
- Chen, L., & Guo, J. (2009). Motion events in Chinese novels: evidence for an equipollently-framed language. *Journal of Pragmatics 41*, 1749-1766.
- Croft, W., Baral, J., Hollmann, W., Sotirova and Taoka, C. (2010). Revising Talmy's typological classification of complex events. In Boas, H.C. (ed.) *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 201-236.
- Cummins, S. (1996). Movement and Direction in French and English. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics 15*, 31-54.

- Daller, M.H., Treffers-Daller, J., & Furman, R. (2011). Transfer of conceptualization patterns in bilinguals: the construal of motion events in Turkish and German. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14, 95-119.
- Ellis, N.C. (1994). Implicit and explicit language learning – an overview. In Ellis, N.C. (ed.) *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. New York: Academic Press, 1-31.
- Folli, R., & Ramchand, G. (2005). Prepositions and results in Italian and English: an analysis from event decomposition. In Verkuyl, H., De Swart, H., & van Hout, A. (eds.) *Perspectives on Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 81-105.
- Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (2008). *Oxford Word Skills Advanced*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gennari, S.P., Sloman, S.A., Malt, B.C., & Tecumseh, F.W. (2002). Motion events in language and cognition. *Cognition* 83, 49-79.
- Inagaki, S. (2001). Motion verbs with goal PPs in the L2 acquisition of English and Japanese. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 23, 153-170.
- Inagaki, S. (2002). Japanese learners' acquisition of English manner-of-motion verbs with locational/directional PPs. *Second Language Research* 18, 3-27.
- Jarvis, S. (2007). Theoretical and methodological issues in the investigation of conceptual transfer. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4, 43-71.
- Kita, S. (1999). Japanese Enter/Exit verbs without motion semantics. *Studies in Language* 23, 317-340.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S.D., & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. San Francisco: The Alemany Press.
- Larrañaga, P., Treffers-Daller, J., Tidball, F., & Gil Ortega, M.-C. (2012)- L1 transfer in the acquisition of manner and path in Spanish by native speakers of English. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16, 117-138.
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Levelt, W. (1989). *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Martinez Vázquez, M. (2001). Delimited events in English and Spanish. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 9, 31-59.
- Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog Where Are You?* New York: Dial Books.
- Naigles, L.R., Eisenberg, A.R., Kako, E.T., Highter, M., & McGraw, N. (1998). Speaking of motion: verb use in English and Spanish. *Language and Cognition Processes* 13, 521-549.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 129-158.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: on the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research* 7, 118-132.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 165-179.
- Slobin, D.I. (1987). Thinking for speaking. In Aske, J., Beery, N., Michaelis, L., & Filip, H. (eds) *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 435-444.
- Slobin, D.I. (1996). From “thought and language” to “thinking to speaking”. In Gumperz, J.J., & Levinson, S.C. (eds) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70-96.
- Slobin, D. I. (2003). Language and thought online: cognitive consequence of linguistic relativity. In Gentner, D., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (eds) *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 157-192.
- Slobin, D.I. (2004). The many ways to search for a frog: linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In Strömquist, S., & Verhoeven, L. (eds) *Relating Events in Narrative*. Vol 2 (*Typological and Contextual Perspectives*). New York: Erlbaum, 219-257.
- Slobin, D.I. (2005). Relating events in translation. In Ravid, D., & Shyldkrot, H.B. (eds) *Perspectives on Language and Language Development: Essays in Honor of Ruth A. Berman*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 115-129.
- Slobin, D.I. (2006). What makes manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse and cognition. In Hickman, M., & Robert, S. (eds) *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59-81.
- Slobin, D.I., & Hoiting, N. (1994). Reference to movement in spoken and signed languages: typological considerations. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20, 487-505.
- Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language Typology and Semantic Description*. Vol 3 (*Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 36-149.
- Talmy, L. (1991). Path to realization via aspect and result. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 17, 480-519.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Vol. 2 (*Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2012) Thinking for speaking and linguistic relativity among bilinguals: towards a new research agenda. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition* 3, 288-300.

- Treffers-Daller, J., & Tidball, F. (in press). Can learners learn new ways to conceptualise events? Evidence from motion event construal among English-speaking learners of French. In Schmitz, K., Guijarro-Fuentes, P., & Müller, N. (eds) *The Acquisition of French in Its Different Constellations*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- VanPatten, B. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 26, 435-450.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction: Theory and Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- VanPatten, B. (2003). *From Input to Output: A Teacher's Guide to Second Language Acquisition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- VanPatten, B. (ed.) (2004). *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research, and Commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- VanPatten, B. (2009). Processing matters in input enhancement. In Piske, T., & Young-Scholten, M. (eds) *Input Matters in SLA*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 47-61.
-

Anthony Attwood has been an EFL teacher for 25 years and is now in the second year of his PhD at the Institute of Education, Reading. His research focuses on cross-linguistic influence in instructed second language acquisition and cognitive approaches to learning. Email: a.attwood@pgr.reading.ac.uk.