Bilingualism: Language and Cognition

cambridge.org/bil

Words in the non-native mind: Developing lexical representations in the L2

Jubin Abutalebi[1] and Harald Clahsen[2]

[1]University Vita-Salute San Raffaele, Milan, Italy and [2]Potsdam Research Institute for Multilingualism, Potsdam, Germany

Editorial

Cite this article: Abutalebi J, Clahsen H (2022). Words in the non-native mind: Developing lexical representations in the L2. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* **25**, 183–184. https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672892200013X

Received: 1 February 2022
Accepted: 1 February 2022
First published online: 16 February 2022

Author for correspondence:
Harald Clahsen,
E-mail: harald.clahsen@uni-potsdam.de

A large body of bilingualism research has dealt with the lexicon. Topics such as vocabulary acquisition and the representation of words in the bilingual lexicon have been highly popular in bilingualism journals. There are also prominent models of the bilingual mental lexicon (e.g. De Groot, 1992; Dijkstra et al., 2019; Kroll & Stewart, 1994) that can account for many empirical findings from vocabulary studies with bilingual speakers and listeners. However, what has been missing in previous research is a framework for understanding the properties of lexical units in a non-native second language (L2) and how these properties develop. Bordag, Gor and Opitz (2022a) outline such a framework in their Keynote article. In their model, lexical units consist of orthographic, phonological, and semantic representations which are interconnected. The authors' Ontogenesis Model (OM) seeks to describe how a word's orthographic, phonological, and semantic representations and their interconnections develop in the L2 mental lexicon. The authors argue that many L2 lexical representations are 'fuzzy' and that, while learners seek to attain optima over time, L2 lexical acquisition does not often reach the ultimate stage of attainment with optimal encoding. The consolidation of L2 lexical representations over time is argued to differ for the three dimensions of lexical units. Whilst new phonological representations and connections have to be created for L2 lexical units, the acquisition of L2 semantic representations may benefit from pre-existing representations from the learners' L1. Consequently, phonological form representations may remain fuzzy in the L2, particularly when the L2 is not closely related to the L1, whereas semantic representations are more robust and may even end up achieving the optimum.

Seventeen commentaries from well-known experts in mental lexicon and bilingualism research accompany the Keynote article. Several commentators (Darcy, 2022; Ellis, 2022; Escudero & Hayes-Harb, 2022; Gyllstad, 2022; Kroll, Vargas Fuentes & Torres, 2022; Lemhöfer, 2022) praise the Keynote article for bringing together different strands of research on the L2 lexicon that have rarely been considered together before – namely, (i) psycholinguistic studies on L2 word processing and (ii) acquisition studies of L2 word learning. In addition, Baxter, Leoné and Dijkstra (2022) highlight the potential usefulness of the model proposed by Bordag et al. as a valuable theoretical underpinning for vocabulary teaching and educational research more generally – a topic the Keynote article briefly mentions. Some non-trivial criticism of the proposed model has also been raised and a number of limitations noted. A number of commentators pointed out that the notion of 'fuzzy' lexical representations and other critical concepts are only vaguely defined, and that the proposed model remains purely verbal rather than being properly implemented in an explicit computational model (Jamieson, Johns, Taler & Jones, 2022; Lemhöfer, 2022; Meara, 2022; Nicol, 2022; Ellis, 2022; Li & Zhao, 2022). Other commentators point out that the OM's focus on *L2* lexical representations does not do justice to the role of cross-linguistic influence and potential links between the L1 and the L2 lexicon (Ecke & Hall, 2022; Kroll et al., 2022; van Hell, 2022; Wolter, 2022). Furthermore, commentators raise additional dimensions of the current topic that (in their view) were not covered in sufficient detail by the Keynote article. Mishra (2022), for example, notes that the OM lacks a neuro-cognitive component and does not address the question of which brain structures are involved in L2 lexical processing. Calabria (2022) notes that the OM does not specify a control system for accessing lexical representations. Gass (2022) observes that the empirical studies considered by the Keynote authors are largely based on samples of educated – and specifically, literate – individuals and that research on L2 lexical representations needs to be extended to include data from non-literate speakers.

In their response, Bordag, Gor and Opitz (2022b) address the concerns raised by their commentators and clarify a number of controversial points. In particular, Bordag et al. use their authors' response to compare their OM to other models of the bilingual mental lexicon. They also further explain the notion of 'fuzzy' lexical representations and question implemented computational models as the gold standard of theory in this domain (contrary to some commentators' views). What perhaps Bordag, Gor and Opitz as well as most commentators can agree upon is that the current Keynote article presents a unique synthesis of different research on the bilingual lexicon, and a framework for future research on the development and processing of lexical representations in non-native speakers.

We hope our readers will enjoy the Keynote article together with the commentaries and the authors' response, as well as the interesting regular research articles presented in the current issue.

References

Baxter P, Leoné F and Dijkstra T (2022) Helping busy Suzy fight fuzzy in foreign language learning. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000651

Bordag D, Gor K and Opitz A (2022a) Ontogenesis Model of the L2 lexical representation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–17. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000250

Bordag D, Gor K and Opitz A (2022b) Refining key concepts of the Ontogenesis Model of L2 lexical representation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–6. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000894

Calabria M (2022) On the semantic optimum and contexts. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000419

Darcy I (2022) From fuzzy to fine-grained representations in the developing lexicon. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000572

De Groot AMB (1992) Bilingual lexical representation: A closer look at conceptual representations. In Frost R and Katz L (eds), *Orthography, phonology, morphology, and meaning*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers, pp. 389–412.

Dijkstra T, Wahl A, Buytenhuijs F, Van Halem N, Al-Jibouri Z, De Korte M and Rekké S (2019) Multilink: A computational model for bilingual word recognition and word translation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* **22**, 657–679. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728918000287

Ecke P and Hall C (2022) Bilingual aspects of the Ontogenesis Model: Parasitic connections at all levels of representation? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000675

Ellis N (2022) Fuzzy representations. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000638

Escudero P and Hayes-Harb R (2022) The Ontogenesis Model may provide a useful guiding framework, but lacks explanatory power for the nature and development of L2 lexical representation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000602

Gass S (2022) Use it or lose it? Spell it? Sign it?: Reaching the optimum. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S136672892100064X

Gyllstad H (2022) The Ontogenesis Model: How do multiword units fit in, and are most lexical representations in the L1 really at their optima? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000730

Jamieson R, Johns B, Taler V and Jones M (2022) The importance of formal modelling for the development of cognitive theory. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000420

Kroll JF and Stewart E (1994) Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language* **33**, 149–174. doi:10.1006/jmla.1994.1008

Kroll J, Vargas Fuentes N and Torres J (2022) Representing words in a second language: Can the L2 dance on its own? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000626

Lemhöfer K (2022) What is fuzziness, and how much does it explain? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000596

Li P and Zhao X (2022) Computational mechanisms of development? Connectionism and bilingual lexical representation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000432

Meara P (2022) Modelling L2 vocabulary acquisition: The devil is in the detail. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000407

Mishra R (2022) The limits to 'fuzziness' in the L2 learner. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000729

Nicol J (2022) How fuzzy are L2 phonological representations? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000614

Van Hell J (2022) Ontogenenis model of L2 lexical representation: Cross-language links to account for bilingual lexical processing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000663

Wolter B (2022) Refining optimum levels of acquisition and L1 semantic influences in the Ontogenesis Model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–2. doi:10.1017/S1366728921000584

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672892200013X Published online by Cambridge University Press