

Crosslinguistic Influence and Second Language Learning

Kevin McManus. New York and London: Routledge. 2022. Pp. i + 164.

The multilingual turn in second language acquisition (SLA) research signals an epistemic reorientation of the field (Ortega, 2014). It manifests the move away from the monolingual bias that measures learner language with the idealized competence of native speakers as the yardstick. In so doing, the focus has shifted to disentangling the cognitive, linguistic, and psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in multilinguals' language acquisition processes. Crosslinguistic influence (CLI) has been a prominent object of research since the 1980s, and new perspectives have been requested to reflect this multilingual turn (Odlin & Yu, 2016). McManus's (2022) book, *Crosslinguistic influence and second language learning*, aims to advance new avenues of theorization and empirical research in CLI to answer the multilingual turn's call.

Before embarking on an in-depth discussion, Chapter 1 begins with definitions of a set of fundamental concepts in the broad field of CLI. McManus takes a functionalist perspective on language, which identifies language as conventions of form-meaning mappings in the service of communication functions. Through the functionalist lens, language is socially shaped by ample exposure to language use. Despite the exposure, language learning employs domain-general cognitive mechanisms such as categorization, memory storage, and analogy. Adult learners' prior knowledge and experience complicate this process as they engage in their learning with an established system fabricated by their L1 knowledge and experience. A large body of research has reported that previously acquired language could play a facilitative role or trigger learning difficulties depending on the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2. In the field of SLA, the term *transfer* is widely used to refer to this effect. However, McManus points out that transfer was traditionally seen as a result of linguistic differences and similarities. Transfer usually refers to the unidirectional impact of the L1 on the L2 and, therefore, suggests the L1 system would remain intact. This book takes an alternative perspective on transfer, which views transfer as a learning process and CLI as the product of that learning process. CLI research focuses on to what extent the learner's L1 and L2 are connected and in what ways. McManus sets out to search for answers to the following questions: How do adults build knowledge of an additional language; does learning a new language lead to broader changes in a speaker's existing language system, or do the systems of L1 and L2 knowledge appear to be unconnected; might connections among different languages emerge and change over time; and can instruction help L2 learners overcome some of the negative effects of crosslinguistic influence?

Chapter 2 introduces four theoretical models for L1 and L2 relations: The Unified Competition Model, the Associate-Cognitive CREED, Processing Determinism, and the Inhibitory Control Model. These models all adhere to the functionalist perspective of language, and their differences lie in their interpretations of the role that prior knowledge and experience play in language acquisition. The Unified Competition Model proposes that the accumulation of L2 evidence in learners' repertoire would compete or converge with the preexisting meaning-form mappings shaped by the L1. The Associate-Cognitive CREED model holds a domain-general perspective regarding language acquisition and predicts transfer from the speaker's prior linguistic knowledge and the learning mechanism, which is shaped by the language use

experience. The Processing Determinism model takes a different vantage point with a focus on the process of language comprehension and production. It predicts that “deliberate and systematic practice that rehearses the same processing operations would promote routinization and facilitate L2 development” (p. 38). The Inhibitory Control Model looks at the other side of processing, that is L2 acquisition requires the ability to constrain the L1 knowledge base and L1 use habits. Introduction of these four models laid the theoretical foundation for further discussion on empirical undertakings in the following chapter.

Chapter 3 synthesizes empirical studies on the impact of prior linguistic knowledge and experience on L2 development by zooming in on morphosyntax, vocabulary, and phonology. Studies on morphosyntax show persistent L1 influence on L2 development due to learned attention and blocking effects, which impact beginner learners to a greater extent than more advanced learners. L2 vocabulary development studies report a similar persistence of CLI on the lexicalization of motion expressions. CLI effects are evident on L2 phonological development such that learners’ perception of the L2 consonants and vowels positively correlates to their inhibitory control of the L1. The converging finding from the three areas of research is that learning a new language can lead to changes in the speaker’s L1 system, which therefore calls for a holistic perspective on the multilingual language system. In conclusion, studies in this chapter reported bidirectional and non-static CLI effects across linguistic domains.

Chapter 4 reports on interventional studies informed by the CLI models and empirical findings on CLI. This chapter shows that research-grounded language instruction can drive L2 development in comprehension and production tasks. McManus addresses two critical questions for instructed L2 research. The first is what qualifies an instructional method as effective, and the second is if any specific components of instruction are tied to its effectiveness. Studies reporting on the effectiveness of explicit instruction also indicated the impact of contextual and learner factors on instruction validity. However, this chapter also calls attention to the question, “to what extent can instruction address the negative effects of CLI?” (p. 89). According to this chapter, explicit instruction could raise learners’ awareness of the learning difficulties bound to negative CLI and motivate L2 acquisition from there.

The instructional studies reported in the second half of Chapter 4 complement the empirical studies reviewed in Chapter 3. Convergent findings from studies investigating morphosyntactic development show that “input alone appeared insufficient,” and attention-raising techniques play a positive role in improving L2 performance (p. 95). Investigation of L2 vocabulary development indicates that drawing on learners’ existing language knowledge and experience can facilitate the learning of both abstract and concrete words and collocations. Studies on L2 phonological development found a non-differential impact of implicit and explicit instruction, but both types of instruction motivate more accurate phonological production. An overarching conclusion from instructional studies is that comparisons between L1 and L2 on different linguistic aspects through explicit instruction are beneficial for L2 development.

In Chapter 5, McManus critically reflects on the empirical investigations reported in the previous chapters to offer new directions for SLA research on CLI. He argues that despite ample description of CLI effects, little is known about the mechanism behind the surface language changes. To date, it remains a question whether L2 learners manipulate the L1 and L2 conceptualization systems or whether L1 and L2 are tightly interwoven into a single system of language knowledge. This chapter identifies three directions for future research to better understand CLI and L2 learning. First, the author notes that much needs to be investigated into how the L2 learning experience influences a speaker’s knowledge and use of their L1. Second, a

longitudinal design should be incorporated into CLI studies. Lastly, more studies on various aspects of cognitive processing concerning language use are needed, such as categorization and chunking.

This book contributes to the field of SLA by answering the call for a “multilingual turn” (Ortega, 2014). Unlike traditional studies on the unidirectional transfer from the first language to the second language, this book sheds light on bilingual minds by noting the changes to learners’ native language and its processing. Additionally, this book bridges the gap between theoretical work and instructional implementation. Over the past six decades, SLA has expanded tremendously with theoretical advancement (VanPatten et al., 2020). However, instructed SLA studies that concern authentic pedagogical challenges have been largely under-researched (Han & Nassaji, 2019). This book offers a valuable synthesis of instructional studies on CLI and, therefore, affords implications for pedagogy. Consequently, this book serves as an exceptional guide for researchers and practitioners who are interested in applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, and language education.

SHAN AN

Teachers College, Columbia University

REFERENCES

- Han, Z., & Nassaji, H. (2019). Introduction: A snapshot of thirty-five years of instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 393–402.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818776992>
- Odlin, T. & Yu, L. (2016). Introduction. In L. Yu & T. Odlin (Eds.), *New perspectives on transfer in second language learning* (pp. 1–16). Multilingual Matters.
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32-53). Routledge.
- VanPatten, B., Keating, G. D., & Wulff, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Routledge.