

# L1 Influence on the Use of English Deictic Motion Verbs for Chinese EFL Learners and French EFL Learners

Xu Ziyang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Institute of Technology, China

Correspondence: Xu Ziyang, School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Institute of Technology, No. 5 South Zhongguancun Street, Haidian District, Beijing, 100081, China. E-mail: xuziyang@sina.com

Received: June 8, 2013 Accepted: July 8, 2013 Online Published: September 4, 2013

doi:10.5539/elt.v6n10p219 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n10p219>

## Abstract

Based on Slobin's (1996b) thinking for speaking approach, the study examines L1 influence on the use of English deictic Motion verbs for Chinese EFL learners and French EFL learners. The aim is to find out whether language learners will be influenced by the particular Thinking for Speaking acquired in L1 in the process of L2 acquisition. It is revealed that there is an overuse of English deictic Motion verbs among French EFL learners due to boundary crossing constraint in French, which results from L1 transfer. On the other hand, Chinese EFL learners benefit from positive transfer due to the similarity between L1 and L2 and their overuse of English deictic Motion verbs results from simplification. Whereas L1 influence exists among Chinese EFL learners in the use of *go* rather than the more target like *come*.

**Keywords:** thinking for speaking, deictic motion verb, boundary crossing constraint

## 1. Theoretical Background

### 1.1 Slobin's (1996b) "Thinking for Speaking" Hypothesis

Rather than taking the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in its strong, extreme, or deterministic form, many now accept a weak, more moderate Whorfianism, that is, people's thinking is influenced rather than determined by language. For example, Slobin (1996b: 75) claims that "there is a special kind of thinking that is intimately tied to language, namely the thinking that is carried out, on-line, in the process of speaking." He suggests that languages influence speakers' thinking in the process of speaking, but does not claim language has any further effects on the mind beyond the moment of speaking. Slobin (1996b: 91) further proposes that a child learns particular ways of Thinking for Speaking in acquiring a native language and that "if our minds have been trained in taking particular points of view for the purposes of speaking, it is exceptionally difficult for us to be retrained."

Slobin (1996b: 76) claims that "Thinking for Speaking" involves picking those characteristics of objects and events that (a) fit some conceptualisation of the event, and (b) are readily encodable in the language. For the first point, it means, when we present events or experiences in any language, we have to take a lexicalised point of view in order to fit these to the structure of the language. Since each language has its own particular grammar structure, people who speak different languages must take different lexicalised points of view.

A comparison of lexical items and the concepts they represent in Chinese and English can help to illustrate that not all concepts are equally codable in all languages. For example, the English word *cousin* does not reveal whether the person in question is paternal or maternal, younger or older, female or male, etc, while Chinese has a fine-grained system of kinship terms. So this information cannot easily be encoded in English, even though one can add adjectives such as "older," "younger," "female" or "male" to make these characteristics clear. Chinese people need to pay attention to such information when talking about kinship relationships because they need to select the right lexical item in the process of Thinking for Speaking. This example illustrates that languages are subjective instead of objective systems which affect our way of thinking while speaking. In other words, speakers are biased when they encode objects or events. This implies that when we verbalise our experience, we have to filter our experience through the set of options available in the particular language we speak (Berman and Slobin 1994: 611).

### 1.2 Evidence of Thinking for Speaking

Slobin's (1996b) Thinking for Speaking approach is largely based upon the expression of Motion events in

typologically different languages—systematic and detailed comparisons of Motion event expressions in satellite-framed languages and verb-framed languages. He analyses Spanish–English translations, Spanish and English narrations elicited by the same set of pictures, and the mental images associated with narrations in each language. The distinction between verb-framed languages and satellite-framed languages exerts an influence on rhetorical styles (Slobin 1996a, 1997) and habitual patterns of language use (Slobin 2004). In written texts as well as orally elicited narratives, “the form and content of descriptions of journeys are heavily shaped by the typology of lexicalisation patterns” (Slobin 1996a: 195).

Some researches provide evidence for Slobin’s (1996b) thinking for speaking. For example Allen et al. (2007) claim that influences in children’s syntactic packaging of Manner and Path are both language-specific and universal. Gopnik and Choi (1990: 199) posit that children’s cognitive development is influenced and motivated by their linguistic development. Özyürek and Özçaliskan (2000) support Slobin’s (1996b) view and claim that English and Turkish speaking children are sensitive to the typological characteristics of the native language. This sensitivity is displayed in linguistic encodings of Motion events as well as in gestures. Similarly, Hickmann and Hendriks (2006) find the strong influence of language-specific factors on speakers in talking about location. While there are still research which question Slobin’s (1996b) Thinking for Speaking. For example, Pourcel (2004) concludes that language does not play a role in the conceptualisation of Manner salience or Path salience. Gennari et al.’s (2002) findings provide evidence that linguistic descriptions guide subjects’ attention to certain aspects, which affects their future judgments. On the other hand, there is no language effect after the non-linguistic encoding. In addition, there is no language effect for the memory task either after linguistic encoding or after non-linguistic encoding. A study of Motion descriptions in Japanese-English bilinguals suggests that two kinds of Thinking for Speaking tend to operate concurrently rather than separately (Tatsumi 1997). Daller et al. (2011) analyse the Motion event expressions by Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany and Turkey. The result provides evidence for the typological differences between Turkish, a verb-framed language and German, a satellite-framed language. There is a boundary-crossing constraint in Turkish while the constraint does not exist in German.

To sum up, there is still no agreement on the relationship between language and thought and on Slobin’s (1996b) thinking for speaking. In some cases the same author (e.g., Pourcel 2004, Pourcel 2005) reaches different conclusions in different studies.

### 1.3 Chinese Motion Verb 来 *Lai2* “Come” and 去 *Qu4* “Go”

来 *lai2* “come” is a good example of a polysemous verb. The use of this deictic Motion verb can be categorised into three subgroups (Lee 2008). Firstly, it can be an independent single verb. Secondly, it can be used in serial verb constructions. Thirdly, it may function as a grammatical marker without Motional or deictic features, such as in (1). It is a grammatical marker because it is ungrammatical to change it into the other deictic Motion verb 去 *qu4* “go”, which expresses the Motion away from the speaker. By contrast, the two deictic Motion verbs are interchangeable in (2a) and (2b). 下来 *xia4lai2* “descend come” and 下去 *xia4qu4* “descend go” are used interchangeably with opposite meanings. 下来 *xia4lai2* “descend come” is used after a verb to indicate the Figure’s coming from a distant place to a nearer place. And 下去 *xia4qu4* “descend go” means to move from a near place to a distant place.

(1) 儿子大哭了起来。(HC 208 (Note 1))

*Er2 zi0 da4 kul le0 qi3 lai2.*

Son loudly cry PFV begin

“The son began to cry loudly.”

(2a) 结果一不小心它从窗户上掉下去了。(HC 228)

*Jie1 guo3 yi1 bu1 xiao3 xin1 ta1 cong2 chuang1 hu4 shang4 diao4 xia4 qu4 le0.*

As a result once not careful it from window on fall descend go PFV

“As a result, it fell down from the window because of carelessness.”

(2b) 这时小狗从窗户上掉了下来。(HC 229)

*Zhe4 shi2 xiao3 gou3 cong2 chuang1 hu4 shang4 diao4 le0 xia4 lai2.*

This time small dog from window on fall PFV descend come

“At this time, the small dog fell down from the window.”

The use in serial verb constructions can be further divided two subgroups: those with Manner verbs or Path verbs

and those without. When 来 *lai2* “come” is used as the main verb, the syntactic structure may be either 来 *lai2* “come” + NP like in (3a) or NP + 来 *lai2* “come” as in (3b) (Lee 2008, examples are from the present study).

(3a) 这时候来了一个老伯. (IC 103)

*Zhe4 shi2 hou4 lai2 le0 yi1 ge2 lao3 bo2.*

This time come PFV one CL old man

“At this time, an old man came.”

(3b) 最后警察来了. (IC 103)

*Zui4 hou4 jing3 cha2 lai2 le0.*

Finally policeman come PFV

“The policeman came finally.”

来 *lai2* “come” may proceed or follow other verbs, namely, they can either take the first slot as in (4a), the second slot in (4b) or the third slot in (4c) in serial verb constructions.

(4a) 于是小明领着他的爸爸就来到了银行里面. (IC 101)

*Yu2 shi4 Xiao3 Ming2 ling3 zhe0 ta1 de0 ba4 ba0 jiu4 lai2 dao4 le0 yin2 hang2 li3 mian4.*

So Xiao Ming lead DUR his daddy then come arrive PFV bank in

“So Xiao Ming led his father and they arrived at the bank.”

(4b) 那个凶狠狠的实际上就是进来抢银行的. (IC 107)

*Na4 ge4 xiong1 hen3 hen3 de0 shi2 ji4 shang4 jiu4 shi4 jin4 lai2 qiang3 yin2 hang2 de0.*

That CL cruel Nom in fact actually is enter come rob bank NOM

“In fact, that cruel man came into the bank and took a robbery.”

(4c) 这时, 警察和银行人员都冲上来帮助他. (HC 209)

*Zhe4 shi2, jing3 cha2 he2 yin2 hang2 ren2 yuan2 dou1 chong1 shang4 lai2 bang1 zhu4 ta1.*

This time policeman and bank staff all dash approach come help him

“At this time, both the policeman and the bank staff dashed to help him.”

来 *lai2* “come” may immediately follow other verbs as in (4c) or alternatively be interrupted by NP/P as in (5a) or aspect markers 了 *le0*, 着 *zhe0*, 过 *guo4* as in (5b).

(5a) 爸爸冲下楼来. (IC 105)

*Ba4 ba4 chong1 xia4 lou2 lai2.*

Daddy dash descend storied building come

“Daddy dashed downstairs from the storied building.”

(5b) 一个庞然大物一下子冲了过来. (IC 101)

*Yi1 ge4 pang2 ran2 da4 wu4 yi1 xia4 zi0 chong1 le0 guo4 lai2.*

One CL huge object quickly dash PFV pass come

“A huge object dashed (towards him) quickly.”

Gao (2001: 62) points out that different from the satellites in English, satellites in Chinese can also function as independent verbs themselves. The same with 来 *lai2* “come”, 去 *qu4* “go” can also perform three functions: Motion function, deictic function, and grammatical function. 去 *qu4* “go” in (6) is used as a grammatical marker since it does not possess Motional meaning or deictic meaning. It is used after a verb to indicate an action that will start.

(6) 然后这个爸爸很生气地带着自己的儿子去评理去. (HC 203)

*Ran2 hou4 zhe4 ge4 ba4 ba0 hen3 sheng1 qi4 de0 dai4 zhe0 zi4 ji3 de0 er2 zi0 qu4 ping2 li3 qu4.*

Then this daddy very angrily AdvM lead own son go get even with Qu

“Then the father led his son to get even with the man angrily.”

#### 1.4 L1 Influence on the Use of Deictic Motion Verbs in Chinese

Deictic Motion verbs express the direction of Motion, either towards the speaker or away from the speaker. Therefore, following Talmy (2000) and other researchers (Treffers-Daller and Tidball, 2012), deictic Motion verbs are treated separately as a specific subcategory of Path verbs in an independent subsection from non-deictic Path verbs. There are deictic Motion verbs in all these three languages under study, that is, *come* and *go* in English, 来 *lai2* “come” and 去 *qu4* “go” in Chinese and *aller* “go” and *venir* “come” in French. Deictic Motion verbs *come*, 来, and *venir* express Motion toward the speaker and *go*, 去 and *daller* express Motion away from the speaker. The use of deictic Motion verbs is interesting because Ho and Platt (1993) provide evidence of transfer from Chinese to Singaporean English in the use of English deictic Motion verbs. In their study of Singaporean English, Ho and Platt (1993) provide evidence for transfer of Chinese on Singaporean English in a range of structures, including serial verb constructions and the use of Motion verbs like *come/go*, *bring/take/fetch*, e.g., such a sentence in Singaporean English “We will be *going* to your house at six...” (Note 2) should be “We will be *coming* to your house at six...” in standard British English. The use of *going* rather than *coming* shows the transfer from Chinese to English in that in Chinese the action is “viewed from the position of the person who will initiate the action” (Ho and Platt 1993: 160-162). That is, viewed from the speakers’ position, the speaker will *go away from* his position to the addressee’s house in Chinese. But in English, the action is viewed from the position of the *house*, that is, the speaker will *come* to the house in this sentence. Ho and Platt (1993) emphasise the different perspectives of viewing an action by Chinese speakers and English speakers. Similarly, Treffers-Daller and Tidball (2012) find evidence of overuse of *aller* and *venir* for British learners of French. The present chapter aims to compare the use of deictic Motion verbs in Chinese L1, English L1, and learners’ English.

## 2. The Present Study

### 2.1 Subjects (Note 3)

The subjects fall into four groups. The first group includes 30 native Chinese EFL learners of non-English majors with intermediate English proficiency (IC, mean age 19). The second group consists of 30 native Chinese EFL learners of English majors with high English proficiency (HC, mean age 22). The third group is 29 native English speakers as the control group (NS, mean age 23). The fourth group is 24 French EFL learners (F, mean age 22). All subjects majoring in different subjects except HC group. Data from HC and IC were collected in China. Those from NS were collected in UK. 14 F group’s data were collected in UK and the other ten subjects’ data were collected in France (Note 4).

### 2.2 Materials and Tasks (Note 5)

The material used is *Frog goes to dinner* (Mayer 1969). It is a wordless picture book of twenty-two pages full of interactions between people and the little frog. It is about a boy who goes to dinner with his family, but he does not realise that his pet frog is in his pocket. So the frog causes a lot of trouble at the restaurant. It is a book which depicts a lot of movements of the frog in the restaurant so that it provides an excellent material for the description of Motion events for every subject.

Each subject was presented with a task explanation written in English to ensure every student obtained exactly the same instructions. The subjects were informed that they were going to tell stories based on materials from Mayer (1969), and that these would be tape-recorded. The subjects were expected to tell the stories in as much detail as possible. NS and F tell the story in English. Fifteen students in HC and IC are chosen randomly to tell the story in English. Therefore, there are 28 English stories from NS (one recording is inaudible due to recording quality), 15 from HC and IC respectively and 24 from F.

### 2.3 Transcriptions and Coding

The stories were first tape-recorded and then transcribed by the investigator. To ensure the accuracy of the transcriptions, all these transcriptions were checked by three other native or fluent speakers of both French and English (Note 6). Then the data were transformed into CHAT format, the transcription and coding format developed by MacWhinney (2000). The results were subsequently analysed with the help of statistical tools.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Use of Deictic Motion Verbs in EE3 (English Stories of NS)

*Come* is used as a Motion verb with a very low frequency of six in EE3. Four subjects use it to state that the waiter *comes* over to deal with the problem caused by the frog in the restaurant. Two subjects state that the frog *comes* to the restaurant with the family. No subject uses *come* to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant,

where the typical way a frog moves is expressed and emphasised. Concerning the description of the scene that the whole family and the little boy go to/arrive at the restaurant, the Path verb *arrive* is the most common word, with a frequency of eight followed by six tokens of *go*, four tokens of *get* and one *reach*. In two cases the Manner verb *walk* is used to describe this scene.

The total frequency of *go* in EE3 is 175, most of which cases are an auxiliary verb. It is a deictic Motion verb in 29 cases. When it is a deictic Motion verb, it is overwhelmingly used to express such scenes as the boy/family *go* out to the restaurant, the boy/family *go* to the waiter, the family *go* home, the boy *goes* to his room, etc. There is only one case that *go* is used to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant, as in (7). In fact, the Manner verb *leap* precedes it in the former clause, so that Manner is already indicated in this sentence. Similarly, in (8), Manner is expressed by the Manner adjunct *flying*, even though the deictic Motion verb *go* is used as the main verb. No subject uses *go* to describe the Motion of the frog into the boy's pocket.

(7) She screamed when she saw this frog and the frog leapt for it and *went* straight into someone's drinking glass. (NS 319)

(8) The salad *went flying*, the fork *went flying*, the glass turned over, and the lady fell over too. (NS 303)

### 3.2 Use of Deictic Motion Verbs in EHC3 (English Stories of HC)

The total number of tokens of *come* in EHC3 is twenty-two. In twelve cases it is used to describe the scene in which the waiter approaches or that the family/boy *come(s)* to the waiter to explain the situation, where Manner is not necessarily relevant, as in (9).

(9) And the waiter *came* in and wanted to throw this frog out. (HC 230)

In addition to this, in five cases *come* is used to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant, for example, the frog *comes* out of the saxophone/salad/glass, etc, as in (10a) and (10b). In (10a), the frog's Motion is described by a deictic Motion verb *come* and a Manner verb *jump*, and in (10b), the frog's Motion is described by the deictic verb *come* and a Path verb *fall*.

(10a) Suddenly the frog *came* out of the horn and *jumped* right onto the man's hat. (HC 222)

(10b) When the player was wondering why he cannot play the instrument, the frog *came* out and he directly *fell* onto the face of the player. (HC 228)

There are five non-targetlike uses of *come* in EHC3, as the examples in (11) illustrate, where native English speakers would use *go* rather than *come*. This shows that there is an overuse of *come* rather than *go* by high level Chinese EFL learners. As is stated in Chapter one, Ho and Platt (1113: 160-162) claim that there is a transfer effect from Chinese on Singaporean English in that the action is "viewed from the position of the person who will initiate the action" in Chinese. In the present study, like they do in their native language, Chinese EFL learners take the perspective of the position of the protagonist who has just initiated the action and who is at the goal (*his room*) after his movement. It can be understood that the speaker takes the perspective of the goal, rather than the source. In (11c), the subject intends to express *chase the frog* in this situation, therefore *go after* is the targetlike choice.

(11a) Again when the boy *come* into his own room and again he is playing happily with his animals again. (HC 227)

(11b) Everyone didn't say anything on the road until they *come* back home. (HC 222)

(11c) The waiter *came* after the frog. (HC 222)

The frequency of *go* is 47 in EHC3. Chinese EFL learners of high level overwhelmingly use *go* in the following situations, such as the family/boy/frog *go* out to have dinner, the boy/family *go* to the waiter to explain, the waiter *goes* to the fire exit to throw out the frog, etc, which is 17 out of 47. In six cases *go* is used to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant, as in (12), in which the Manner verb *jump* and the deictic Motion verb *go* are used in different clauses of one sentence to describe the frog's Motion. Three subjects use *go* to describe the frog's movement into the boy's pocket, as in (13).

(12) So he quickly jumps and then went into the hole of the saxophone. (HC 227)

(13) Just because the little boy didn't pay attention to the frog, then the frog quickly went into the pocket of his clothes. (HC 227)

*Come* is used in five cases and *go* in six cases to describe the frog's Motion in the restaurant. Three subjects use *go* to describe the frog's Motion into the boy's pocket. There are five non-targetlike use of *come*, where native speakers would use *go*.

There are eleven Motion events of the family/frog going to the restaurant described by *go*. In six cases *go* describes the scene that the boy *goes* to his room and in four cases it is used in *the family go back home*.

### 3.3 Use of Deictic Motion Verbs in EIC (English Stories of IC)

The total number of tokens of *come* is 19 in EIC3. Subjects use it to describe mother or the restaurant owner's Motion after the frog causes trouble in the restaurant in two cases, as in (14).

(14) Neal's father was very angry with him and his mother *came* out. (IC 122)

In addition to this, in eight cases *come* is used to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant, for example, the frog *comes* out of/into the saxophone/salad/glass, etc, as in (15a) and (15b). *Come* is most frequently used as the single Motion verb in the whole sentence, as in (15a) or occasionally there is a Manner verb in the other clauses of the same sentence, as in (15b).

(15a) When he uses his fork to had the food, a frog *came* out of his food. (IC 130)

(15b) Suddenly a frog *came* out and jumped onto his face. (IC 118)

The other nine examples involve the non-targetlike use of *come*, where native English speakers would use *go* rather than *come*, as are illustrated in examples in (16). So there is overuse of *come* in both groups of Chinese learners (see section 3.3.4).

(16a) *Hecome* to the restaurant and the restaurant was beautiful. (IC 130)

(16b) Then the little boy and his frog *come* back to their room. (IC 120)

(16c) And then Tony and his parents and his other sister *came* home in their car. (IC 127)

The frequency of *go* used as a deictic Motion verb is 25 in EIC3. Chinese EFL learners of intermediate level use *go* ten times to express such ideas as *go out of the restaurant*, *go to the fire exit*, *go to the manager/waiter*, etc. *Go* is only used twice to describe the frog's Motion in the restaurant as in the following examples (17) and (18). In both cases, there are Manner verbs in other clauses of the same sentences. More subjects use *go* correctly to describe the scenes such as the family/boy/frog *go* to the restaurant, the family *go* home, and the boy *goes* to his room, etc, whose frequencies are four, five and four respectively.

(17) Then the frog *went* away and jumped into a tray. (IC 119)

(18) The frog jumped out of the tray hurriedly and unfortunately it *went* into a husband's cup. (IC 116)

With respect to the use of deictic Motion verb *come*, in eight cases it describes the frog's Motion in the restaurant. In nine cases the subjects use *come* rather than the targetlikeword *go*. There are only two cases that *go* is used to describe the frog's Motion in the restaurant.

### 3.4 Use of Deictic Motion Verbs in EF (English Stories of F)

*Come* is used to describe that the waiter *comes* into the scene in three cases, in which situation Manner is not necessarily relevant. In six cases *come* is used to describe the Motion of the frog in the restaurant, such as the frog *come* to a plate, it *comes* out of/into the saxophone, it *comes* onto the saxophonist's face, etc. One subject expresses that the frog *comes* with the family to the restaurant. There are seven examples that subjects use *come* (back) home rather than *go* (back) home.

The frequency of *go* is 67 in EF3, which is the most frequently used Motion verb in this story. It is used 32 times to describe the frog's Motion in the restaurant. Four subjects use *go* to describe the frog's movement into the boy's pocket. Other uses of *go* are in the following expressions such as family/frog *go* (es) to the restaurant, family *go* back home, and the boy *goes* to his room, etc, which are 21, three and seven cases respectively in frequency.

## 4. Analysis and Discussion

The French EFL learners overuse the deictic Motion verb *goes*, while Chinese EFL learners do not have this tendency. But it should be noticed that Chinese EFL learners overuse *come* where the native English speakers would use *go* because Chinese EFL learners take the perspective of the goal of movement, rather than the source of movement as they do in their L1.

There is an overuse of *go* by intermediate level Chinese EFL learners and French learners. Similar overuse of deictic Motion verbs by Anglophone learners of French is found in Treffers-Daller and Tidball's research (2012), which is considered to be the result of simplification. We consider the overuse of *go* by Chinese EFL learners results from simplification while that of French learners is caused by transfer. The transfer can be explained by boundary-crossing constraint in French. Slobin and Hoiting (1994) propose that a "boundary-crossing

constraint” exists in verb-framed languages. In Motion events, when the Figure moves from one place to another and the initial location and the final location are in two different spaces, the Figure needs to cross a boundary to get from the initial to the final location. If the Figure in motion is considered to cross a boundary, a Path verb is required to express the Figure’s movement rather than a Manner verb. Since there is no boundary-crossing constraint in Chinese, Chinese speakers can express boundary crossings freely with Manner verbs. As is expected, French EFL learners use deictic Motion verbs to avoid the use of Manner verbs because Manner verbs cannot be used in French in this context. This is this fact that leads to their overuse of deictic Motion verbs in *Frog goes to dinner*.

There are some details that need to be taken into consideration. There are some cases that Chinese EFL learners of both high level and intermediate level use deictic Motion verbs. But the frequency of the use of deictic Motion verbs by Chinese EFL learners is much lower than that of French EFL learners. Therefore, the use of deictic Motion verbs in boundary crossing expressions by Chinese EFL learners L2 productions cannot be explained by transfer because there is no such characteristic in L1 productions. It can only be explained as simplification. But the French EFL learners’ use of deictic Motion verbs can be attributed to negative transfer. It can be concluded that even if there is simplification for French EFL learners, negative transfer plays a role for them. As Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 192) point out, most language users with different L1 backgrounds may simplify a form, pattern, or characteristic in L2, they may do this with different frequencies.

On the one hand, we find that French EFL learners’ overuse of deictic Motion verbs results from the boundary constraint in L1 while the Chinese EFL learners’ overuse of deictic Motion verbs result from simplification. On the other hand, we find the overuse of *go* rather than *come*, which shows the transfer from Chinese to English. This finding is in accordance with Ho and Platt (1993). The L1 influence on the use of English deictic Motion verbs for Chinese EFL learners and French EFL learners is due to the Thinking for Speaking effect as is proposed by Slobin (1996b).

## 5. Conclusion

This study provides evidence that the French EFL learners rely more on Path verbs, especially deictic Motion verbs than Chinese EFL learners, which is due to L1 influence. On the other hand, Chinese EFL learners benefit from positive transfer due to the similarity between L1 and L2 and their overuse of English deictic Motion verbs results from simplification. Whereas L1 influence exists among Chinese EFL learners in the use of *go* rather than the more target like *come*. It can be concluded that concerning the use of deictic Motion verbs, both Chinese EFL learners and French EFL learners are influenced by the Thinking for Speaking in L1 which is acquired in their childhood and it is hard to be restrained in the process of L2 acquisition. The pedagogical meaning is that language learners are reminded of the similarities and differences between L1 and L2 explicitly in classroom teaching. The awareness that Thinking for Speaking in L2 is exceptionally important helps language learners to be more target-like in L2 expressions.

## References

- Allen, S., Özyürek, A., Kita, S., Brown, A., Furman, R., Ishizuka, T., & Fujii, M. (2007). Language-specific and universal influences in children’s syntactic packaging of manner and path: A comparison of English, Japanese, and Turkish. *Cognition*, 102(1), 16-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2005.12.006>
- Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A cross-linguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Daller, H., Van Hout, R., & Treffers-Daller, J. (2003). Lexical richness in spontaneous speech of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 197-222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.2.197>
- Daller, M. H., Treffers-Daller, J., & Furman, R. (2011). Transfer of conceptualisation patterns in bilinguals: The construal of motion events in Turkish and German. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 14(1), 95-119. ISSN 1469-1841. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1366728910000106>
- Gennari, S. P., Sloman, S. A., Malt, B. C., & Fitch, W. T. (2002). Motion events in language and cognition. *Cognition*, 83, 49-79. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(01\)00166-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(01)00166-4)
- Gopnik, A., & Choi, S. (1990). Do linguistic differences lead to cognitive differences? A cross-linguistic study of semantic and cognitive development. *First language*, 10, 199-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014272379001003002>
- Hickmann, M., & Hendriks, H. (2006). Static and dynamic location in French and in English. *First Language*, 26(1), 103-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0142723706060743>

- Ho, M. L., & Platt, J. T. (1993). *Dynamics of a contact continuum Singaporean English*. Clarendon.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Mayer, M. (1969). Frog Goes to Dinner.
- Lee, T. K. (2008). The semantic behaviour of mandarin LAI in serial verb constructions. Retrieved from <http://hss.fullerton.edu/linguistics/CLN/Sp%2008%20pdf/Lee-Mandarin%20Chinese%20LA I-Rev.pdf>
- Özyürek, A., & Özçalıflkan, F. (2000). How do children learn to conflate Manner and Path in their speech and gestures? Differences in English and Turkish. In Clark, E. V. (Ed.), *The Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Child Language Research Forum* (pp. 77-85). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publication.
- Pourcel, S. (2004). Rethinking 'Thinking for Speaking'. *Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 349-358).
- Pourcel, S. (2005). Linguistic relativity in cognitive processes. Draft based on talk given at the 1st UK Cognitive Linguistics Conference: New Directions in Cognitive Linguistics. University of Sussex.
- Slobin, D. I. (1996a). Two ways to travel: Verbs of Motion in English and Spanish. In Shibatani, M., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning* (pp. 195-217). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slobin, D. I. (1996b). From "thought and language" to "thinking for speaking." In Gumperz, J. J., & Levinson, S. C. (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 70-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, D. I. (1997). Mind, code, and text. In Bybee, J., Haiman, J., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.), *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón* (pp. 437-467). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 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: Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 219-257). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Slobin, D. I., & Hoiting, N. (1994). Reference to movement in spoken and signed languages: Typological considerations. *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 487-505).
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics, 2*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Tatsumi, T. (1997). The bilingual's thinking for speaking: Adaptation of slobin's frog story experiment to Japanese-English bilinguals. Unpublished bachelor dissertation. Sophia University.
- Treffers-Daller, J., & Tidball, F. (2012). Can L2 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*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol (In Press).

## Author

Xu Ziyan works as a lecturer in the School of Foreign Languages in Beijing Institute of Technology, teaching English as a foreign language to university students. She obtained her Ph. D from the University of the West of England in 2010. Her main study interests include Second Language Acquisition, transfer, Language teaching methodology, and Motion Event conceptualisation.

## Notes

Note 1. This is the anonymous number of the subjects.

Note 2. The sentence is 我们今天晚上六点去你家 in Chinese. Chinese speakers use 去 *qu4* regardless of the speaker's position, no matter s/he is at her/his own home or in a third place other than the addresser's home.

Note 3. I would also extend my appreciation to the staff in UWE and BIT who helped me with the recruitment of the subjects. They are Jeanine Treffers-Daller (currently working in University of Reading), Michael Daller, Annie Lewis, Maria Greany, David Phelan, Leonie Christian, Sue Scott, Gong Jun, Li Xiaozhong, and Lai Luning.

Note 4. Jeanine Treffers-Daller and Michael Daller are kind and generous to allow me to use their data collected in France, which enables me to possess a wider range of data.

Note 5. The original experiment employed four materials. For the purpose of the present article, only the relevant part is reported.

Note 6. I am especially grateful to Francoise Tidball, John Tidball, and Jeanine Treffers-Daller for the checking of the data transcriptions. Their priority in both English and French guarantees the accuracy of the data and lay a solid foundation for the data analysis of the dissertation.

### **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).