
Research Article

Do ELF users construe a motion event differently when addressing a native and a non-native speaker?

Katarzyna Piątkowska
Nicolaus Copernicus University

Ariadna Strugielska
Nicolaus Copernicus University

Received Mars, 2024; accepted September, 2024;
published online December, 2024

Abstract: Previous research (Strugielska & Piątkowska, 2021) on English as a lingua franca (ELF) from the perspective of Talmy’s typological distinction between S- and V-languages has demonstrated that ELF reveals characteristics of both S- and V-languages. In the present paper we extend this research and examine whether ELF users construe a motion event differently when addressing a native speaker and a non-native speaker of English, a context not discussed before (Hall, 2018). Furthermore, the latest research (Montero-Melis, 2021) on motion events encourages investigation into differences in the construal of motion events across speakers of different languages. Basing on the findings of a qualitative pilot study among Polish users of English, we show that in the narratives addressed to both a native and a non-native speaker of English we may detect features typical of S- and V-languages. However, the results reveal that the nature of V-type framing is slightly different in the two types of texts.

Keywords: English as a lingua franca, motion event, Talmy’s typology, construal, addressing native and non-native speakers

1 Construal in Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive Linguistics is a collection of approaches unified by the assumption that language is a symbolic system based in general mental capacities (Taylor, 2018)¹. In other words, language is an inventory of form-meaning pairings, with form encompassing spoken, signed, or written representations and meaning involving conceptualization. Conceptualization, in turn, is composed of “conceptual content and a particular way of construing that content” (Langacker, 2008, p. 43). While conceptual content is essentially a set of cognitive domains evoked by a particular form, construal is “defined as our ability to conceive and portray the same situation in alternate ways” (Langacker, 2014, p. 34). To put it differently, and more metaphorically, “content is likened to a scene and construal to a particular way of viewing it” (Langacker, 2008, p. 55). Importantly, what is seen depends on the distance adopted, the portions of conceptual content accessed, the amount of attention paid, and the vantage point assumed. Langacker (2008, p. 55) labels these dimensions of construal: specificity, focusing, prominence, and perspective, respectively. In the present paper we devote most attention to prominence as this phenomenon is central to construing motion events, which are the core of the study presented below.

*Corresponding author: Katarzyna Piątkowska, E-mail: kapia@umk.pl

Copyright: © 2024 Author. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing third parties to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format and to remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially, provided the original work is properly cited and states its license.

Elaborating on the scene metaphor introduced above, Langacker (2019, p. 148) distinguishes between onstage and offstage prominence, with the former related to the object and the latter to the subject of conception. In a canonical situation, the subject of conception, i.e. the speaker, is not mentioned, and thus remains non-salient, as in *She lives across the hall*. As Langacker (2019, p. 149) further elucidates, “[t]he semantic contrast with *She lives across the hall from me* – less canonical because the speaker is construed objectively – nicely illustrates the distinction between offstage and onstage prominence”. This distinction is in fact tantamount to implicit vs. explicit mention. As Langacker (2019, p. 150) puts it, “[t]o be mentioned explicitly is to be profiled by some expression. An essential factor in onstage prominence, profiling is the intersubjective focusing of attention induced by symbolization: through the directive force of symbolic expression, the interlocutors momentarily attend to the same entity in the objective scene. An expression’s profile is thus its conceptual referent – the entity it designates or refers to within the array of content invoked”.

Expressions refer to either things or relationships, with things profiled by nouns and relationships by verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and prepositions. The main difference between the two types of profiling rests in the fact that, unlike things, relationships entail “an additional sort of focal prominence pertaining to participants” (Langacker, 2019, p. 151). To be more specific, every relationship involves at least one salient participant, the trajector, which is evaluated with reference to its location, properties or activity. If this reference is explicitly mentioned, the second focal participant, the landmark, comes to the fore. Thus, relationships can feature either the trajector alone, as in the case of adjectives or intransitive verbs, or accompanied by the landmark, as in the case of prepositions and transitive verbs (Langacker 1991).

Both profiling and trajector/landmark asymmetry feature prominently in Talmy’s (2000a, 2017) conceptualization of motion events.

1.1 Motion events from Talmy’s perspective

Examining the encoding of conceptual structure across languages, Talmy (2000a, 2017) suggests that speakers of various languages refer to motion events in different ways. On a more specific note, a motion event is a situation which contains motion and “the continuation of stationary location alike” (Talmy 2000a, p. 25), which means that there are two types of a motion event, i.e. dynamic (represented as MOVE) and static (coded as BELOC).

In the conceptualization of a motion event, Talmy (2000a, 2017) distinguishes between two types of components, i.e. motion event components and co-events. Motion event components involve four categories, i.e. Figure, Ground, Motion and Path. The Figure is a moving or a stationary object; the Ground is an object with reference to which the Figure moves or is located; Motion refers to the presence of motion or the presence of locatedness (i.e. Motion relates to either the occurrence (MOVE) or the non-occurrence (BELOC) of motion); and Path relates to the path that the Figure follows or occupies with respect to the Ground. In addition to these components a motion event can include a co-event, which is usually associated with two components: Manner (referring to the manner in which a motion event takes place) and Cause (pertaining to the cause of the occurrence of a motion event). To illustrate the components, Talmy (2000a, p. 26) gives examples of four sentences: *The pencil rolled off the table*; *The pencil blew off the table*; *The pencil lay on the table*; *The pencil stuck on the table (after I glued it)*. In all four sentences *the pencil* stands for the Figure and *the table* for the Ground. The particles *off* and *on* encode Path. The verbs in the first two sentences (*rolled* and *blew*) express motion (MOVE) and the verbs in the last two sentences (*lay* and *stuck*) express locatedness

(BELOC). Furthermore, the verbs *rolled* and *lay* express the Manner of motion while the verbs *blew* and *stuck* encode the Cause of motion.

Talmy (2000a, 2017) suggests that different languages construe movement in different ways, focusing either on the Manner or the Path of movement. Consequently, Talmy (2000a, 2017) identifies two main typological patterns, i.e. satellite-framed languages (S-languages) and verb-framed languages (V-languages). In S-languages, which include the Indo-European family except Romance languages, Finno-Ugric, Chinese, Ojibwa and Warlpiri, Motion and a co-event are mapped onto a verb root, with Path coded in a verb-sister slot, i.e. “either a satellite (i.e. a verb particle) or a prepositional phrase” (Berthele, 2004, p. 95). The following example, where the verb expresses the MOVE+MANNER conflation, illustrates the S-type framing: *The rock slid/rolled/bounced down the hall* (Talmy, 2000a, p. 28). Thus, in S-languages, e.g. English, Manner is construed as highly prominent since it is mapped onto the central element of the clause – the verb (Littlemore, 2009, p. 17).

In V-languages such as Romance and Semitic languages, as well as Japanese, Korean, Turkish, Tamil, Polynesian, Nez Perce and Caddo, Motion and Path are both coded in the verb, with co-events, e.g. Manner, mapped onto separate constituents, such as adverbials or gerunds (Cadierno, 2008). This type of framing can be illustrated by the following Spanish example: *La botella entró a la cueva (flotando)* (The bottle MOVED-in to the cave (floating)) (Talmy, 2000a, p. 49). The MOVE+PATH conflation indicates that speakers of V-languages construe Path as a highly prominent element of the clause.

While the two conflation patterns, i.e. MOVE+MANNER and MOVE+PATH neatly illustrate the basic difference between S- and V-languages, the patterns should not be viewed as absolute indicators of membership in Talmy’s typological categories. In fact, as Talmy (2000a) himself observes, while English is predominantly an S-language, it does exhibit selected features of V-languages, such as the use of Latin verbs which conflate Motion and Path in the verb.

Related research (Slobin, 2000; Cadierno, 2008; Han & Cadierno, 2010; Lewandowski & Mateu, 2016; Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2017; Ji, 2019) highlights further fine-grained differences in the conceptualization of motion events. For example, compared to users of V-languages, users of S-languages employ manner of motion verbs and a higher variety of these verbs more frequently. As a result, Manner is not only a more frequent but also a more salient co-event in S-languages than in V-languages. In addition, while speakers of S-languages focus on the description of Path, which may result in different components of Path being expressed in a single sentence, speakers of V-languages pay more attention to static aspects of scenes, which entails focusing on Goals or endstates of motion (Berman & Slobin, 1994, p. 119). Importantly, in either case the distribution of attention over a given event leads to the emergence of a particular attentional pattern. In Talmy’s (2000b) terms, attentional patterns involve either foregrounding parts of a scene, which are thus explicitly mentioned, or backgrounding elements of an onstage region, i.e. omitting them at the linguistic level. To put it differently, foregrounding and backgrounding, a.k.a. windowing and gapping (Talmy, 2000b), describe “the degree to which a component of meaning, due to its type of linguistic representation, emerges into the foreground of attention or, on the contrary, forms part of the semantic background where it attracts little direct attention” (Talmy 2000a, p.128).

Consequently, Cadierno (2008) suggests that S- and V-languages present information differently, i.e. while S-languages use background elements to encode Manner and Path, V-languages use these elements to express only Path. In other words, S- and V-languages construe the world in a different way. At the same time, though, both similarities and differences between S- and V-languages should be viewed as gradual rather than categorical. For instance, while

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

both English and Polish are, predominantly, S-languages since they tend to conflate Motion and Manner, English is, on the one hand, a better example of S-construal since it exhibits a greater variety of manner conceptualizations than Polish (see Kopecka-Piech, 2010 for details). On the other hand, though, English seems a poorer example of S-framing than Polish since it features far more verbs conflating Motion and Path, e.g. approach, arrive, come, enter, or exit (Fortis, 2010), which is typical of V-languages.

1.2 Talmy's perspective on motion events and English as a lingua franca

Apparently, the neat distinction into S- and V-languages, which underlies Talmy's (2000a, 2000b) typology, becomes particularly challenging in the case of non-standard languages. For instance, in his study involving the Muotathal dialect, i.e. a variety emerging from contact between Swiss German and German, Berthele (2004) demonstrates that although both Swiss German and German are S-languages, the dialect does not show manner-salient framing. In other words, although Muotathal derives from two S-languages it does not merely replicate the construal of motion events characteristic of the S-type.

Relatedly, Strugielska and Piątkowska (2021) show that English used as a lingua franca (ELF), i.e. a contact language between English and (at least) one other language, does not simply re-create construals of motion events characteristic of the languages which founded its emergence. Taking as their testing ground the area of contact between two S-languages, i.e. English and Polish, and assuming Mauranen's (2018) broad analogy between a dialect and ELF, the authors subscribe to the view that the idiolects of speakers who share a first language, i.e. Polish, and learn a particular second language, i.e. English, display similarities in, for instance, pronunciation, lexis and syntax, which leads to the emergence of a similect. Importantly, while a similect, such as Polish English, has a clear social dimension it also shows features of learner language.

The unique nature of a similect is succinctly explained by Kecskes (2019, p. 96), who first of all notices that the most essential differences between languages are at the conceptual level while key similarities can be observed at the linguistic level. When referred to ELF, this claim entails that the linguistic knowledge of English, i.e. the knowledge of the language system, is shared by, for instance, users of Polish, Bulgarian and Turkish English, and thus treated as a common ground in intercultural communication. Simultaneously, while linguistic knowledge can be easily accessed by ELF speakers, conceptual knowledge, which contains information about the peculiarities of language use, cannot. For example, while probably all ELF users know the semantics of the word 'music', not all of them may know the conceptual association of the collocation 'to face the music'. Therefore, Kecskes (2019) argues that ELF users establish a common ground at the linguistic level, as opposed to L1 users who establish a common ground at the conceptual level.

In the context of Talmy's typology of motion events, the distinction into the linguistic common ground and ELF speakers, on the one hand, and the conceptual common ground and L1, or native, speakers, on the other hand, means that communication between ELF speakers alone and meaning-making involving ELF users and native speakers of English may exhibit dissimilar patterns of construals. Thus, the question arises: to what extent are ELF users' patterns of construal conditioned by interlocutors?

In the following section, we examine whether ELF users construe a motion event differently when addressing a native speaker and a non-native speaker, which is the context not tapped by

previous studies (Hall, 2018), which have primarily concentrated on transfer emerging from typological differences. In contrast, the present study goes beyond investigating two typologically different languages, assuming that a learner's language develops as a result of situated experience and thus shows "no evidence of a journey along the interlanguage continuum toward structural completion and increasingly native-like conformity" (Eskildsen, 2008, p. 352). Furthermore, the latest research (Montero-Melis, 2021) on motion events demonstrates that some languages have a more entrenched pattern than others, which may lead to the differences in the way speakers of different languages construe motion events. These findings encourage further research into the way ELF users construe motion events.

2 The Research

In order to examine whether ELF users construe movement differently when addressing a native speaker and a non-native speaker, we conducted a pilot study. Taking into consideration the fact that the number of the subjects was small (32) and that our goal was both to expand knowledge about the way the subjects construe motion events and to obtain in-depth information about their conceptualizations, we relied on a qualitative rather than a quantitative analysis.

2.1 Subjects

The subjects were 32 students of English philology in Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. They were 21 years old and all of them were native speakers of Polish (an S-language). The respondents were speakers of ELF who used English (an S-language) within and outside the university setting, i.e. for academic and social purposes.

2.2 Methodology

The methodology of this study was based on the methodology employed in previous research on motion events (Strugielska & Piątkowska, 2021; Stem, 2010; Fortis, 2010), i.e. it used a narrative approach.

2.3 Procedure

The participants were shown an excerpt from a Tom and Jerry cartoon, *The Dog House* (1952), which lasts 71 seconds and can be divided into 9 scenes:

- 1 - Tom chases Jerry in a garden, trying to run him over;
- 2 - Tom destroys the kennel and knocks down the dog;
- 3 - Jerry runs away from Tom into a hole;
- 4 - Tom puts a dynamite into Jerry's hideout;
- 5 - Jerry throws the dynamite into the kennel;
- 6 - Tom tries to take out the dynamite but the dog sees Tom coming into his kennel and gets angry;
- 7 - The dog puts his head into the kennel and the dynamite explodes;

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

8 - Jerry climbs an electric pole;

9 - Tom hews the electric pole.

The research was carried out during an online class. The students were provided with a link to the cartoon and were asked to watch and narrate it to two different listeners: a native speaker of English and a non-native speaker of English. The participants were not told that motion events were the focus of the study. They were given 30 minutes to complete the task. Carrying out the study online allowed the subjects to manage the cartoon in their own way. More specifically, they could stop the video or watch certain scenes several times, which means they could distribute their attention over the cartoon according to their individual preferences.

It is worth mentioning at this point that when narrating the story, the respondents mentioned some scenes and omitted others. In other words, they foregrounded certain aspects of the cartoon by including them in their narratives and backgrounded others by excluding them at the linguistic level, which shows that attention windowing played a significant role in the students' narratives. To be more specific, the attentional patterns the students formed captured the 9 scenes into the following 3 windows of attention:

Window 1 (initial) – scenes 1 and 2,

Window 2 (medial) – scenes 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7,

Window 3 (final) – scenes 8 and 9.

Thus, these 3 windows correspond to 3 major episodes in the cartoon in the following way: episode 1: scenes 1 and 2, episode 2: scenes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, episode 3: scenes 8 and 9. The salience of each episode is taken as proportional to the number of scenes distinguished within it while the salience of each scene is taken as proportional to the number of sentences used to describe it.

2.4 Data Analysis

In what follows we analyze and discuss the results of the study based on the following assumptions (Strugielska & Piątkowska, 2021):

- we examine the data with reference to the 3 windows of attention, focusing on features typical of S- and V-languages;
- we discuss only those examples which contain Path in either the verb slot or the verb-sister slot, e.g. the sentence *Jerry is running away from Tom* is taken into consideration as Path is included in the verb-sister slot (*away*) while the sentence *Tom chases Jerry* is not analyzed as Path is not present in either the verb slot or the verb-sister slot; as a result, in the narratives addressed to a native speaker as well as those addressed to a non-native speaker we classify 152 and 175 examples respectively as containing the Path component;
- we analyze every verb etymologically using www.etymonline.com to check if it contains the Path component (Sachs, 2010);
- following Langacker (2008), we treat complex verb structures (e.g. *is trying to escape*) as containing the Path component and classify the infinitive marker as expressing Purpose (Talmy, 2000a);
- we treat the passive voice as associated with location (Talmy, 2000a).

2.5 Findings

Using the features typical of S- and V-languages, we discuss the students' narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker with respect to the three windows of attention mentioned above. The analysis is encapsulated in six tables which present linguistic examples (the first column), conceptual elements of Motion (the second column), co-events in the verb slot (the third column), and the meaning expressed in the verb-sister slot (the fourth column). In our analysis of the narratives we focus on the expression of Motion in the verb slot, i.e. we investigate the configuration of Motion, Path, Ground and Manner formed as a consequence of the Figure following the Path or occupying a site.

2.5.1 Narratives addressed to a native speaker

Window 1

Looking at the data presented in Table 1 below, we may notice that the first window includes only 2 scenes, which reflects its relatively low salience. We may also conclude that the respondents paid equal attention to both scenes, with the first event receiving 15 and the second 20 responses.

In most cases (22 examples out of 35) the conceptual elements contain four typical elements of a motion event, i.e. Figure, Path, Motion, Ground configured as Figure/Motion/Path/Ground. There are also minor instances of caused motion where the configuration assumes Cause/Motion/Manner/Path/Figure, Cause/Motion/Path/Figure or Cause/Motion/Figure/Path/Ground patterns. Therefore, the configurations in this window demonstrate that the patterns are not varied and there is no difference in the way the conceptual elements in the two scenes are configured. The expressions of Manner are limited to only three verbs (*run*, *chase* and *roll*), which clearly demonstrates that Manner in this window is not salient.

Looking at the third column, we may notice that Manner is the usual co-event (14 examples) included in the verb slot. However, it is worth mentioning that there are also clauses (12 examples) where there is zero conflation, i.e. the verb slot does not contain any co-event. Furthermore, in 4 clauses Path is mapped onto a verb.

An intriguing tendency emerging from the analysis of window 1 is that Path is encoded in the verb-sister slot in 32 clauses, which, in the majority of examples, express either Purpose (16 clauses) or Goal (12 clauses). We may thus conclude that the respondents paid attention to the description of Path. Another interesting observation is that this window contains three examples of redundancy as in sentences: *The cat (Tom) wants to catch a mouse (Jerry)* and *He got knocked down by them* Path is expressed in both the verb slot and the verb-sister slot.

To conclude the analysis of window 1, we notice the following features of S-languages: 1) Path is mapped onto a verb-sister slot, 2) Manner is the most frequent co-event in the verb slot, 3) there is a clear focus on Path and its segments. Simultaneously, the following features of V-languages can be detected: 1) expressions of Manner are not varied, 2) there are minor instances where Path is encoded in the verb slot, 3) there are examples of zero conflation. Thus, the window displays features typical of both S- and V-languages.

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

Table 1

The analysis of Window 1

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 1			
Tom runs around the garden with a roller chasing Jerry. (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
Tom chases after Jerry.	CAUSE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/ FIGURE	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Jerry is trying to escape Tom. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH /GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Jerry is running away from Tom.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	SOURCE
Tom was trying to catch Jerry. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH /GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
The cat (Tom) wants ¹ to catch a mouse (Jerry).	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH /GROUND	MOVE+PATH	PURPOSE
Tom, is trying hard to catch a mouse, Jerry, by constantly chasing Jerry.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
... the cat runs after the mouse with a roller (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Tom tries to crush Jerry.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
... he manages to escape.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
He tries to run over her with a sheepsfoot...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH /GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Scene 2			
Tom runs into the bulldog's doghouse.	FIGURE/MOTION/MANNER/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
He knocks down the bulldog, before destroying the doghouse, flattening both into a thin arrow.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
(He) (...) accidentally runs over the dog and its kennel. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/MANNER /PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
He got knocked down by them. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ AGENT	BELOC	GOAL
Tom runs both the dog and the house over. (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PURPOSE
They run through a dog.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL

¹ Want: from PIE *weno-, suffixed form of root *eue- "to leave, abandon, give out".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

He runs over a resting dog.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PURPOSE
He does not notice the dog that is inside the kennel, and razes him to the ground.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
(He) gets run over by the roller.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ AGENT	MOVE+MANNER	PURPOSE
Tom squashes ² the dog with the roller.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	
... which results in the dog being squashed by the roller.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ AGENT	BELOC+PATH	
The kennel is rolled over.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH	BELOC+MANNER	PURPOSE
They run over a kennel.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
...they do not notice him and ride over it	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
... he completely destroys ³ a dog's kennel.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	
...the cat (...) causing the dog house to be smashed to the ground.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	GOAL

Window 2

Analyzing the data of window 2 (see Table 2), we may easily notice that, compared to window 1, window 2 is more salient as it is represented by as many as 5 scenes. Another important observation is the fact that the respondents paid unequal attention to the five scenes. To be more specific, scenes 5, 4 and 7, which received 23, 21 and 19 responses respectively, attracted most attention while scene 6, with only 9 responses, seemed least prominent.

Looking at how the verb slots were filled in this window, we may conclude that in contrast to window 1, Manner is not a typical co-event as it is present in only 7 out of 87 clauses. The most common element conflated in the verb slot is Cause since there are 50 clauses where Cause is a co-event. Furthermore, there are 17 examples of zero conflation while Path is mapped onto a verb in 16 clauses. It is also worth mentioning that 15 clauses contain redundancy as Path can be detected in both the verb slot and the verb-sister slot.

Compared to window 1, where one pattern of configuring conceptual elements dominates, the patterns in window 2 are more diverse. We may also notice more diversity within the second window. To be more precise, although in scenes 3 and 7 the conceptual elements are configured in almost the same way, i.e. Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, scenes 4, 5 and 6 are conceptualized as caused motion and the most common pattern is Cause/Motion/Figure/Path/Ground. Similarly to window 1, the verbs of Manner are not diverse as they are limited to *dash*, *run*, *detonate* and *chase*.

The verb-sister slots in window 2 are filled in 84 clauses and concentrate either on Purpose or Goal, which is similar to window 1.

² Squash: from Latin *ex* "out"+ *quassare* "to shatter".

³ Destroy: from Latin *destruere* "tear down, demolish," literally "un-build," from *de* "un-, down" + *struere* "to pile, build".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

To conclude the analysis of window 2, we may state that the following features speak to the fact that the window was expressed through a V-type framing: 1) zero conflation, 2) Path encoded in the verb slot, 3) unvaried expressions of Manner, 4) focus on the endstates of Path. At the same time, in many examples Path is expressed in the verb-sister slot, which is typical of S-languages.

Table 2

The analysis of Window 2

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 3			
Jerry tries to hide in a little hole in a house (...) (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Jerry hides in a mousehole (...) (7)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
Jerry escapes ⁴ to his safe hole.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	GOAL
Jerry tries to run away from Tom (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Jerry, on the other hand, dashes to his den.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Jerry runs and hides in the mouse's burrow.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Tom chases Jerry into his mouse hole (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry ran to his tiny hideout. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Scene 4			
Tom places petard in the mouse hole (...) (2)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Tom uses a dynamite stick to lure Jerry out of his hiding spot. (2)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Tom puts a dynamite into Jerry's house. (2)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	
Tom decides to use a dynamite stick in order to dispose of Jerry.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom puts a dynamite in this whole. (5)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE /PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Tom inserts ⁵ a dynamite bundle inside.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE+ PATH	GOAL
Tom throws a dynamite into it. (3)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE /PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Tom places dynamite inside.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL

4 Escape: from Latin *ex*- "out of"+ Late Latin *cappa* "mantle".

5 Insert: "to set in, put or place in".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

Tom decided to put a dynamite into Jerry's hiding place.	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
He then attempts ⁶ to chase the mouse out of his hole with a dynamite stick.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH /GROUND	MOVE+PATH	PURPOSE
Tom throws a lit bomb into a mouse hole.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
He tries to blow Jerry up with dynamite (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE
Scene 5			
... the mouse throws it away... (6)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry throws the dynamite stick into the dog house (5)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry grabs the dynamite and tosses it away.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
Jerry is dropping the stick into a dog house.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
...the bomb has been removed by the mouse and thrown away...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ AGENT	MOVE	PATH
Jerry launches it into the air.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
The mouse throws a stick of dynamite to a doghouse.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry manages to throw it away from his shelter.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Jerry tosses it into the dog's kennel.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER +CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry throws it at the dog.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry quickly notices and throws it towards Spike's house.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry was acting fast enough to throw the explosive away, right into the doghouse.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
The mouse throws it out...	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry manages to throw the bomb out of the hole and into the dog house	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Scene 6			
He tries to retrieve the dynamite...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE

⁶ Attempt: from assimilated form of *ad* "to, toward"+ *temptare* "to try".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

Tom tries to remove it from there... (2)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	SOURCE
Tom tries to take it out... (4)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE +CAUSE	GOAL
The cat desperately tries to extinguish it.	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom (...) tried to take it back	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Scene 7			
... the bomb exploded ⁷ in front of the dog's face. (12)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	PATH
...the explosive unfortunately (...) blows it up. (2)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
...the dog puts his head inside the structure which soon explodes.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
The doghouse explodes...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH	MOVE+PATH	
The dynamite detonates in the face of the dog...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
... the whole thing blows up.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH	MOVE	GOAL

Window 3

If we compare window 3 (see Table 3) with windows 1 and 2, we may conclude that, similarly to window 1, window 3 is not salient as it includes only 2 scenes. Scenes 8 and 9 received 18 and 13 responses, which leads us to the conclusion that the subjects paid equal attention to the two scenes.

With reference to the configuration of conceptual elements, the data reveals that there is a difference between the two scenes of the window. While in scene 8 the elements are arranged in almost the same way, i.e. Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, in scene 9 the pattern is more diverse, i.e. Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, Cause/Motion/Figure/Path, Cause/Motion/Figure/Ground or Cause/Motion/Figure/Path/Ground. Thus, the majority of clauses (10 out of 13) in this scene are expressed through caused motion. The verbs of Manner are not varied, i.e. they are limited to only two verbs – *climb* and *collapse*.

This window also differs from windows 1 and 2 with respect to how the verb slots were filled. Namely, in this window Path is a typical co-event (included in 17 out of 30 clauses), followed by Manner mapped onto 14 clauses and Cause, which is encoded in 9 clauses. Furthermore, the window contains 3 instances of zero conflation. Interestingly, similarly to windows 1 and 2, Path is included in the verb and the verb-sister slot in 8 clauses, which means these examples contain redundancy.

Looking at the fourth column, it can be observed that the participants decided to encode Path in the verb-sister slot in 21 clauses. We may also notice that the students focused on particular segments of Path, i.e. Path (13 clauses), Goal (5 clauses) or Purpose (3), which is similar to windows 1 and 2.

⁷ Explode: from *ex* "out"+ *plaudere* "to clap the hands, applaud".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

To sum up the analysis of window 3, we may state that it displays the following features of V-languages: 1) frequent encoding of Path by the verb, 2) unvaried expressions of Manner, 3) infrequent instances of zero conflation. The window also reveals one feature of S-languages, i.e. Manner is a relatively frequent co-event in the verb slot.

Table 3

The analysis of Window 3

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 8			
Jerry climbs ⁸ up the electric pole. (5)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER/ PATH	PATH
...the mouse escapes to the pole...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	GOAL
Jerry climbs on a tree.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH
Jerry is seen climbing the power pole.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	BELOC+PATH	
...the mouse (...) climbs the pole (7)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	
The mouse jumps on the electric pole...	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PATH
Jerry gets on the tree as well.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PATH
Scene 9			
... the pole collapses right at the bulldog repaired doghouse.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
...the pole which Tom tries to cut down, causing him to destroy the dog's kennel once again.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Tom uses an axe to make the electric pole fall.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
The cat (...) cuts it down with an ax. (3)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
Jerry tries to climb up a pole, which is then brought down by the cat, thus leading to the pole falling on the dog's house.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
Tom uses a hammer to destroy a electricity pole (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE	PURPOSE
(...) the cat hits ⁹ it with an ax (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH	MOVE+PATH	

8 Climb: Old English *climban* "raise oneself using hands and feet; rise gradually, ascend; make an ascent of".

9 Hit: late Old English *hyttan*, *hittan* "come upon, meet with, fall in with, 'hit' upon.

The pole lands ¹⁰ on the doghouse (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+PATH	GOAL
Tom uses an ax to knock over a power line crossing (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Tom uses the axe to cut it down.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom decides to cut down a power line (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL

2.5.2 Narratives addressed to a non-native speaker

Window 1

The first striking observation from the analysis of the first window (see Table 4) is the fact that there is a discrepancy in the number of responses in the first and the second scene, i.e. while the first scene has 32 responses, the second one has 19, which may suggest that the respondents paid more attention to the first scene of this window. There is also a considerable difference in the amount of attention paid by the students to the first scene if we compare the narratives addressed to a native speaker and to a non-native speaker. Namely, in the case of the former, we may notice 14 responses to the first scene while in the case of the latter there are as many as 32 responses.

If we compare the arrangement of conceptual elements triggered by native and non-native addressees, respectively, we will notice that the configurations are more diverse in the case of the latter. First, there are more instances of caused motion and their patterns are more varied, i.e. they are configured as Cause/Motion/Path/Figure, Cause/Motion/Figure/Path/Ground or Cause/Motion/Path. Second, other configurations are also more diverse, which can be exemplified by the following patterns: Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, Figure/Motion/Path/Agent and Figure/Motion/Path. At the same time, though, similarly to the narratives addressed to a native speaker, the verbs of motion are limited to three, i.e. *chase*, *run* and *squash*, which may suggest that Manner is not altogether salient in this window.

However, in contrast to the texts addressed to a native speaker, Manner in the case of non-native recipients is not the only typical co-event encoded in the verb slot (33 clauses) as Cause is another common co-event (21 instances) and Path is also frequently mapped onto the verb (10 clauses). Similarly to window 1 discussed in the previous section, there are also instances of zero conflation (9) documented in Table 4.

All in all, when ways of instantiating verb-sister slots are juxtaposed, the texts addressed to both native and non-native speakers focus on the description of Path as it is included in 41 examples. However, unlike the narratives addressed to a native recipient, where the endstate of Path is profiled, in the case of non-native addressees Purpose is encoded in just 7 and Goal in only 8 clauses. In other words, when relating events to non-native speakers, the subjects focused primarily on Path since there are 26 relevant examples in Table 4.

To summarize the analysis of window 1, we may state that it displays the following features of V-languages: 1) Manner is not salient as its expressions are unvaried, 2) Path is encoded by the verb, 3) there are instances of zero conflation. However, there are also characteristics of S-languages: 1) Path is mapped onto a verb-sister slot, 2) Manner is conflated in a verb but it is not the only typical co-event.

¹⁰ Land: Old English *lendan* "to bring to land".

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

Table 4

The analysis of Window 1

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 1			
Tom (the cat) chases Jerry (the mouse) around the garden with a roller. (18)	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE	PATH
At the beginning Jerry runs away from Tom... (4)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
Tom is trying to catch Jerry. (7)	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE	MOVE	PURPOSE
Tom is running after Jerry with a lawn roller. (3)	CAUSE/FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
Scene 2			
Tom (...) destroys his doghouse. (6)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+PATH	
He runs over the dog and its house.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE	GOAL
The dog house is destroyed by Tom. (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/AGENT	BELOC+PATH	
Tom runs him over with his roller.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE	GOAL
... the dog (...) was knocked down by them as a result.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/AGENT	BELOC	GOAL
Dog (...) is run over by the lawn roller	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	BELOC+MANNER	GOAL
Tom runs over the dog. (4)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Tom squashes the dog with the roller.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE+PATH	
They head towards the house and crush it.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PATH

Window 2

To begin with, it has to be mentioned that window 2 (see Table 5) of the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker is similar to window 2 of the narratives addressed to a native speaker in terms of the distribution of attention. Namely, the students paid most attention to scenes 5, 7 and 4, which have 23, 22 and 21 responses respectively whereas scene 6 has only 6 responses.

If we next analyze the patterns of conceptual elements, we will come to the conclusion that they are more diverse than arrangements characterizing texts addressed to a native speaker, i.e. the following configurations can be discerned: Cause/Motion/Figure/Path/Ground, Cause/Motion/Path/Figure, Cause/Motion/Path/Figure/Ground, Figure/Motion/Agent, Figure/Motion/Path/Ground and Figure/Motion/Path. If we analyze the window in detail, we will notice that in many clauses (41 out of 90) the scenes are conceptualized as caused motion. We may also state that the expressions of manner are limited to only two verbs (*run* and *explode*).

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

The analysis of the verb slots reveals that, analogically to narratives addressed to a native speaker, Cause is also a typical co-event (41 clauses). Another very frequent co-event is Path. There are 24 instances of Path encoded by the verb, which is more than in the case of the texts addressed to a native speaker, where there are 16 such clauses. The window also contains numerous examples of zero conflation (20). Manner is the least frequent co-event as it is mapped onto only 18 verbs.

The examination of the verb-sister slots demonstrates that Path is encoded in 69 slots and that the students paid special attention to the endstates of Path as the focus is on Goal (41 clauses) and Purpose (11 clauses). Interestingly, and similarly to the narratives addressed to a native speaker, 12 sentences contain redundancy since Path is mapped onto a verb and a verb-sister slot.

To summarize the analysis of window 2, we can state that it demonstrates the following features of V-languages: 1) Manner is not salient as its expressions are unvaried, 2) Path is frequently mapped onto a verb, 3) there are many instances of zero conflation, 4) the focus in the verb-sister slot is on the endstates of Path. However, the window also contains some characteristics of S-languages: 1) Path is encoded in the verb-sister slot, 2) there are infrequent instances of Manner mapped onto a verb.

Table 5

The analysis of Window 2

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 3			
Jerry hides from Tom in there. (11)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
Jerry runs away from Tom.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
Jerry runs to his den (2).	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	GOAL
Jerry escapes. (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+PATH	
Jerry managed to hide.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE	PURPOSE
Scene 4			
Tom puts petard (explosive material) inside the hole (11).	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
(...) the cat planted a bomb in it.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
Tom is trying to detonate Jerry's mousehole with dynamite.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom throws a dynamite into Jerry's hole. (5)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	GOAL
Tom wants to blow up Jerry with dynamite (...) (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE	PURPOSE
Scene 5			
Jerry takes it out and throws it.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

(...) the mouse throws it away. (11)	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
Jerry finds it and throws away into the doghouse. (7)	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
(...) the bomb was removed ¹¹ by the mouse and thrown away.	FIGURE/MOTION/ AGENT	BELOC+PATH	
Jerry moves it into the dog's kennel.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
(...) this throws him back towards the dog's house.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Jerry throws the bomb out of the hole and into the dog house.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	GOAL
Scene 6			
Tom wants to find the dynamite (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+PATH	PURPOSE
Tom tries to take the dynamite (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE	PURPOSE
Tom tries to stop the bulldog from coming into his home.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
He tries to prevent the dog from going there (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom wants to take it out.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+PATH+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom tries to get it out of it (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE/ GROUND	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Scene 7			
The dynamite explodes (...) (15)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+PATH+ MANNER	
(...) the house blows up (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE	PATH
The dynamite (...) destroys it.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE+PATH	
Tom (...) blows up the doghouse instead. (3)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
(...) the dog's house is destroyed. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	BELOC+PATH	

Window 3

As illustrated in Table 6, similarly to window 3 (see Table 6), the narratives addressed to a native speaker, the respondents paid equal attention to the two scenes of the window as scene 8 and 9 received 20 and 13 responses, respectively.

If we analyze the data with reference to the configuration of conceptual elements we may notice that the patterns resemble those detected in the case of texts addressed to a native speaker.

¹¹ Remove: from Latin *removere* "move back or away, take away, put out of view, subtract," from *re-* "back, away"+ *movere* "to move" (from PIE root [*meue-](#) "to push away").

How do ELF users construe a motion event?

While the clauses in scene 8 were configured in only one way, i.e. Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, the patterns in scene 9 are more diverse, i.e. Cause/Motion/Figure/Path, Cause/Motion/Path/Figure, Figure/Motion/Path and Figure/Motion/Path/Ground. Therefore, the majority of clauses (12 out of 14) in scene 9 were conceptualized as caused motion. The expressions of Manner are not varied as they are limited to *run*, *escape*, *climb*, *use*, and *fall*.

The examination of the verb slots demonstrates that they were filled in almost the same way as in the case of the narratives addressed to a native speaker, i.e. Path is the most typical co-event as it is encoded in 21 verbs. Another frequent co-event is Manner, mapped onto 20 verbs. Cause is included in 12 verb slots. There are also 3 instances of zero conflation.

Referring to the semantics of the verb-sister slots, the focus appears to be on particular segments of Path, i.e. Path (17 clauses) and Purpose (5 clauses). It is also worth mentioning that, similarly to the narratives addressed to a native speaker, 8 clauses contain redundancy as Path is included in the verb slot and the verb-sister slot.

Consequently, window 3 includes the following characteristics of V-languages: 1) Path is a typical co-event in the verb slot, 2) expressions of Manner are not varied, 3) there are infrequent instances of zero conflation. However, apart from Path, Manner is also a typical co-event in the verb slot, which is typical of S-languages.

Table 6

The analysis of Window 3

Example	Conceptual elements	Verb slot	Verb-sister slot
Scene 8			
Jerry runs away and climbs up the electric pole. (3)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH
(...) the mouse escapes to the pole (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH
Jerry climbs on a tree (...)(2)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH
Jerry is climbing the electric pole (...)(10)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	
The mouse jumps on the electric pole (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PATH
He gets on the tree (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE	PATH
Jerry climbs onto a wooden object (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH
Jerry runs up the high voltage pole.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER	PATH
Scene 9			
Tom uses the ax to cut down the electric pole.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+MANNER+ CAUSE	PURPOSE
(...) the pole that Tom is trying to cut down (...)	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH	MOVE	PURPOSE
Tom uses an axe to make the electric pole fall.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom cuts down the tree (...)(5)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH

Tom destroys an electricity pole (...)	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+PATH+CAUSE	
Tom is cutting it down.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PATH
(...) the cat destroys it to reach his victim.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/FIGURE	MOVE+PATH+CAUSE	PURPOSE
Tom uses an ax to get the mouse off from the power cable.	CAUSE/MOTION/ FIGURE/PATH	MOVE+CAUSE	PURPOSE
A pole falls ¹² down on the house.	FIGURE/MOTION/ PATH/GROUND	MOVE+MANNER+ PATH	PATH

3 Conclusions

In the preceding two sections expressions of motion events in the narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker were analyzed with reference to the features of S- and V-languages with a view to establishing if ELF users construe motion events differently when addressing these two types of speakers. Aspects of Talmy's (2000a) typology were taken into consideration in the analysis.

If we compare the analyses of window 1 in the narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker, we will conclude that there are similarities as well as differences in the way the subjects construed the scenes. Typically for S-languages in both narratives Path is mapped onto a verb-sister slot. In both types of texts Manner is conflated in a verb. However, while in the narratives addressed to a native speaker Manner is a typical co-event, in the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker it is not. Furthermore, in the texts addressed to a native speaker there is a focus on Path and its segments while in the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker there is no such focus. As far as features of V-languages are concerned, we may notice that both types of narratives display the following characteristics: 1) Manner is not salient as its expressions are not varied, 2) there are instances of zero conflation. Yet, the window also shows a difference, i.e. the texts addressed to a native speaker contain more examples of Path encoded by the verb. Consequently, we may assume that it is difficult to conclude which type of framing is dominant in the narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker as in both cases we may find approximately the same number of features of S- and V-languages.

Comparing the analyses of window 2, we may notice that while the texts addressed to a native speaker display only one feature of S-languages (Path is expressed in the verb-sister slot), the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker show two such features, i.e. apart from the fact that Path is encoded in the verb-sister slot, Manner is a co-event in some clauses. If we examine V-type features, we will notice that both types of texts contain unvaried expressions of Manner, which speaks to the fact that in both types of narratives Manner is not salient. Moreover, in both cases there are instances of zero conflation. However, Path is more frequently mapped onto a verb slot in the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker (34 clauses) as opposed to those addressed to a native speaker (16). Additionally, the texts addressed to a native speaker focus on the endstates of Path, which is not the case in the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker. As a result, we may conclude that window 2 in both types of texts displays more features of V-languages. However, the nature of this framing is slightly different in the two types of narratives.

¹² Fall: meaning "come suddenly to the ground" from late Old English.

Window 3 of the narratives addressed to both groups of recipients demonstrates the same feature of S-languages, i.e. Manner is a typical co-event in the verb slot. Simultaneously, if we analyze the characteristics of V-languages expressed in the window in both types of texts, we will notice the same regularity as in the case of S-languages features, i.e. both types of texts demonstrate the same features of V-languages: 1) frequent encoding of Path by the verb, 2) unvaried expressions of Manner, 3) infrequent instances of zero conflation.

Consequently, the results of the study reveal that in both the narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker we may detect features typical of S- and V-languages. Thus, all the three windows in the narratives addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker share the following feature of S-languages: Path is conflated with Motion in a verb-sister slot. There are also three characteristics of V-languages which are common to the three windows in the texts addressed to a native speaker and a non-native speaker: 1) expressions of Manner are not varied, 2) Path is encoded in a verb slot, 3) there are instances of zero conflation. We may also notice that window 2, which is the most salient out of the three windows analyzed as it contains the largest number of clauses, is the most varied as far as expressions of motion events in ELF are concerned, especially with reference to the features of V-languages. It is also worth mentioning at this point that the research demonstrates that the configurations of conceptual elements are more varied in the narratives addressed to a non-native speaker. On a more general note, the findings of the study seem to confirm that in the case of ELF Talmy's typological distinction between S- and V-languages is a cline rather than a binary division. The results of the study may therefore suggest that a wide variety in the construction of narratives addressed to a non-native speaker can be explained by the fact that non-native speakers' construals may differ among users and depend on their L1, which requires from ELF users to reconstrue, adapt and reshape. Obviously, this overall tentative conclusion requires further research, possibly along the lines sketched in the present article.

References

- Berman, R. & Slobin, D. (1994). *Relating events in a narrative. A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berthele, R. (2004). The typology of motion and posture verbs: A variationist account. In B. Kortmann (Ed.), *Dialectology meets typology. Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 93–126). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cadierno, T. (2008). Learning to talk about motion in a foreign language. In P. Robinson & N.C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 239–275). Routledge.
- Eskildsen, S. (2008). Constructing another language – Usage-based linguistics in second language acquisition, *Applied Linguistics* 30(3), 335–357.
- Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fortis, J-M. (2010). *Space in language*. Leipzig Summer School.
- Hall, Ch. (2018). Cognitive perspectives on English as a lingua franca. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 74–84). Routledge.
- Han, Z. & Cadierno, T. (Eds.) (2010). *Linguistic relativity in second language acquisition: Thinking-for-speaking*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2017). Motion and semantic typology: A hot old topic with exciting caveats. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (Ed.), *Motion and space across languages: Theory and applications* (pp. 13–18). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Ji, Y. (2019). Linguistic and mental representations of caused motion in Chinese and English children. In D. Shu, H. Zhang & L. Zhang (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics and the study of Chinese* (pp. 285–308). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kecskes, I. (2019). *English as a lingua franca. The pragmatic perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kopecka-Piech, K. (2010). Convergent landscape. 39 and half as a (multi) promotional intertext, *Journal of Education Culture and Society* 2, 139–155.
- Langacker, R. (1991). *Concept, image, and symbol. The cognitive basis of grammar*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (2014). Subordination in a dynamic account of grammar. In L. Visapää, J. Kalliokoski & H. Sorva (Eds.), *Contexts of subordination. Cognitive, typological and discourse perspectives* (pp. 17–72). John Benjamins.
- Langacker, R. (2019). Construal. In E. Dąbrowska & D. Divjak (Eds.), *cognitive linguistics – foundations of language* (pp. 140–166). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Lewandowski, W. & Mateu, J. (2016). Thinking for translating and intra-typological variation in satellite-framed languages, *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 14(1), 185–208.
- Littlemore, J. (2009). *Applying cognitive linguistics to second language learning and teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mauranen, A. (2018). Conceptualising ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*, (pp. 7–24). Routledge.
- Montero-Melis, G. (2021). Consistency in motion event encoding across languages. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.625153>
- Sachs, A. (2010). *Motion events in Seri: Applying Talmy's typologies*. Unpublished MA thesis.
- Slobin, D. I. (2000). Verbalized events. A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Evidence for linguistic relativity* (pp. 108–138). John Benjamins.
- Stam, G. (2010). Can an L2 speaker's patterns of thinking for speaking change? In Z. Han & T. Cadierno (Eds.), *Linguistic Relativity in SLA* (pp. 59–83). Multilingual Matters.
- Strugielska, A. & Piątkowska, K. (2021). Satellite-framed or verb-framed? Towards a typology of motion events in English as a lingua franca, *Socjolingwistyka* 35, 23–40.
- Talmy, L. (2017). Past, present and future of motion research. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (Ed.), *Motion and space across languages: Theory and applications* (pp. 13–38). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Talmy, L. (2000a). *Toward a cognitive semantics, vol. 2: Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, L. (2000b). *Toward a cognitive semantics, vol. 1: concept structuring systems*. Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, J. (2018). *Ten lectures on applied cognitive linguistics*. Brill.
- Tom and Jerry. (1952). *The dog house*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rf3lcSb4cdA>