

The effectiveness of the provision of input on verb patterns to native Chinese undergraduates

Gareth Morgan^{1*}

¹Shanghai University, Shanghai, China; garmogs@yahoo.co.uk (G.M.).

Abstract: The study's aim was to determine if, as has been widely claimed, including for native Mandarin speakers, there should be input on the grammatical issue of verb patterns in the language classroom to prevent errors being generated when using this potentially problematic feature. Consequently, native Chinese undergraduate learners were provided with extensive supplementary input to promote linguistic competence and communicative effectiveness. This took the form of an authentic text, which included numerous examples of the target language, to illustrate how language operates in the real world, and how grammar works at the textual level, to maximise the probability of acquisition taking place. In the input, elicitation was used to promote the internalisation and retention of the language, and, therefore, accurate future use, with production, an integral stage, taking the form of a peer interaction task. The result was an ability to produce written language with greater accuracy than peers who had not received such input, including learners who had received language input for an academic year longer. Consequently, to improve learners' accuracy, the provision of input on this grammatical feature is recommended.

Keywords: *Accuracy, Affective engagement, Gerunds, Grammatical issues, Infinitives, Native Mandarin speakers, Undergraduates, Verb patterns.*

1. Introduction

Research on the provision of input on verb patterns has resulted in some academics reaching the conclusion that it is effective, while, on the other hand, some are of the belief that such a focus has provided no discernible improvement. Therefore, research was conducted to determine whether explicitly focussing on this language feature, with the provision of material aimed at creating affective engagement, had been worthwhile, and should, therefore, become a feature of the syllabus in order to help negate the claim that grammatical research has had limited influence on what takes place in the classroom (Larsen-Freeman, 2015).

2. Focus

It was decided to focus on this ubiquitous language feature, which has been shown to be the cause of numerous errors, adversely affecting learners' accuracy and fluency, as unfortunately, choosing the inappropriate form can be a common occurrence (Römer & Berger, 2019).

This includes the language produced by native Chinese speakers. Regarding it being a source of concern, Chang (2007) for example, comments on patterns of complementation being an issue, particularly differentiating between the use of the infinitive form, with or without to, a present participle, a past participle and a gerund. Examples provided include *I'm sorry I forgot bringing your book*.

As well as this, Chen and Liang (2022) reported that the development of an automatic-checking tool for native Chinese language speakers, based on the work of Sleator and Temperley (1991) revealed verb form errors in writing, such as the inability to follow prepositions with gerunds. These are of the word grammar kind (Turton, 1995).

In another study undertaken by Zhan (2015) the classification of errors included those of *Particular Words and Phrases*, which was the second most common type in the written work analysed, such as *We shouldn't afraid of help...* and *After graduated from the primary school...*. Similarly, Xia (2012) discovered common errors to include using a gerund instead of a base verb, and the overuse of the infinitive form, without to, when a gerund should be used.

Unfortunately, while there has been development of general academic word and phrase lists (Coxhead, 2000; Gardner & Davies, 2014) and discipline-specific word lists (Lei & Liu, 2018) there is no specific vocabulary list for parts of speech, except for the grammar pattern list for the most used academic verbs (AVL) (Ma & Qian, 2020). However, even this only contains 115 of the 554 verbs in Gardner and Davies (2014) and is simply a general academic verb list, having no discipline-specific information. Also, there is no data on distribution and usage patterns across academic disciplines, hence the aim to develop a list with all the verbs, and their distribution and usage information in 9 academic disciplines (Deng, Liu, & Wu, 2022).

Therefore, this grammatical feature was chosen for research as it has been reported that the provision of input on problematic issues should be focussed on (Richards & Reppen, 2014) with exposure to numerous examples, as it is an effective way to learn (Chodorow, Gamon, & Tetreault, 2010). For example, the effect of grammatical input for students of English as a foreign language (EFL) at the high, intermediate, and low proficiency levels was analysed. Regarding the treatment group of first-year undergraduates who learned grammar, the results showed a significant improvement across the levels, and in the post-test, they outperformed their control group counterparts who had received no such input (Lin, 2021).

With reference to input, development activities need to be an integral part of the procedure, as they allow the production of target language, which Tomlinson (2013) states can be in a meaningful and original way. Moreover, it should be based on the meaning derived from the text provided as, in theory, it connects with the learners' lives. Such productive activities allow for cognitive and affective engagement with the text, as well as focussing on meaningful and purposeful communication in the target language (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2018).

Furthermore, an authentic text as a source of input illustrates how language operates in the real world (Nunan, 1998) and exposure to such language raises awareness of how grammar works at the textual level (Richards & Reppen, 2014). This is more likely to result in acquisition as it can stimulate and provide enjoyment, pleasure, empathy, amusement, or excitement. Having said that, even the creation of negative emotions is more useful than ones which provoke no feeling (Tomlinson, 2010b).

A multi-dimensional representation of a text is needed to give it meaning, which should result in a durable impression being left (Masuhara, 2000). To become meaningful and memorable, learners can connect it to previous experiences, and relate it to their own interests, views and needs. Tomlinson (2000) states that achieving this is attainable by the provision of, for example, language production activities which involve interpreting the writer's intentions, or awareness activities focussing on salient linguistic, pragmatic or stylistic text features. Hence, the provision of Du Pont De Bie (2004) as shown in Appendix A.

Moreover, extensive reading provides rich exposure to language in use (Tomlinson, 2010a) which should then become the focus, as, potentially speaking, it makes learners more aware in their post-input communication. The more extensive this is, the better, as it is more likely that it can facilitate language learners in terms of mastering the target language effectively (Lien, 2021). This view is supported by Ellis (2005) who is of the belief that extensive input is vital in developing linguistic competence and communicative effectiveness, as well as background knowledge for language production during target language tasks. The belief is that production is an integral stage of this procedure. Moreover, the most complex use of the target language is said to occur during information exchange, which is why this was employed in the input.

When providing input, elicitation was used to draw out language, as opposed to simply providing information, as it is a technique which helps make the procedure more student-centred and interactive.

It's an approach which promotes language being internalised and retained, as the learners become part of the procedure, not simply passive recipients of knowledge. In addition, such active engagement promotes the likelihood of the accurate future use of the language presented (O'Donoghue, 2025).

The lesson in its entirety is included in Appendix A. It shows that the interpersonal learner was catered for, with activities conducted in pairs or small groups. The student-centred approach of peer interaction was utilised, as proficiency stems from meaningful interaction (Cives-Enriques, 2003) with, post-input, learners possessing a greater sense of language awareness, which enhances communicative competence (Sinha, 2014) and is an integral aspect of acquisition (Storch & Tapper, 2009). Consequently, the learners were encouraged to collaborate in a grammar task, with the participants having been provided with input, which had been adapted, to provide an activity focussing on the target language.

Following this, a homework activity (Appendix B) was provided in an attempt to promote learner autonomy, with the learners encouraged to research and develop a list of verb patterns. Then, in a follow up activity, the learners were asked to decide if a set of sentences contained the correct or incorrect grammatical form, and were asked to correct the erroneous examples. The input is provided in Appendix C, and it provided the data to determine the effectiveness of such a grammatical focus.

It should be stressed that detailed feedback also needs to be provided, as it strongly correlates with improved output, as the provision of many examples is the best way to learn (Lipnevich & Smith, 2009) with Ferris (2004) stating that teachers providing feedback on errors prevents fossilization. This is in contrast to Polio and Fleck (1998) who claim that those receiving error correction do not produce more accurate texts than those who receive no such input.

Unfortunately, Deng et al. (2022) state that, though this is an important language feature, it is one which is difficult to comprehend and learn. This is seconded by Petrovitz (2001) while Alsuhaibani (2022) states that particularly problematic issues are a result of the need to memorize the structures. This is easier said than done, as, according to Schwartz and Causarano (2007) the cognitive demands may be overwhelming.

Choi and Yoo (2012) comment on the fact that many errors are due to students erroneously using the gerund, while Kim and Yoo (2015) state that to-infinitive errors are common for Korean college freshmen. Yet another problematic feature is the fact that some verbs can take both a gerund and a to-infinitive as complements, which results in little or no difference in meaning, such as *start* (Cowan, 2008) while for other verbs, such as *remember*, a difference does exist.

Unsurprisingly, then, it is not an issue constrained to Chinese learners as the analysis of forty narrative essays composed by Thai university students revealed that errors featured the incorrect use of infinitives and gerunds (Phuket & Othman, 2015).

Furthermore, Rodríguez-Fuentes and Swatek (2022) concluded that Colombian learners who received corpus-informed materials outperformed the group who had not received such input during a focus on gerunds and infinitives.

Similarly, in another project conducted on native Spanish speakers, Schwartz and Causarano (2007) analysed infinitive and gerund constructions, with there being a significant difference in frequency of use, which is said to play an important role in acquisition. The ratio of such errors decreased as language proficiency increased. While advanced learners made 1.3 times more errors in gerunds than in infinitives, those at the intermediate level made almost 3 times more. This is a consequence, the authors state, which may be due to language interference, frequency of exposure to the target structures and more errors being generated with low frequency constructions, as gerunds are of low-frequency in English and non-existent in Spanish, generally speaking. In contrast, infinitives are high-frequency constructions in both languages.

However, it has been found that input can be effective, as Alsuhaibani (2022) comments on the success experienced when using corpora to teach gerunds and infinitives to EFL sophomore students. The results of the research undertaken revealed a statistically significant difference between the control

and experimental groups, in favour of the one which had received corpus-based instruction on this, revealing corpus-based instruction to be an effective means of learning the patterns.

Regarding the effect of the direct implementation of corpora in the language classroom, limited research has been conducted (Boulton & Cobb, 2017) probably as such corpora have not been widely implemented (Chambers, 2019). This is despite the provision of more diversified information compared to dictionaries or reference grammar books (Braun, 2005) as well as the provision of real language which provides a more vivid language picture than in reference books with their contrived examples (Granath, 2009). Such perception has been said to be due to the frequency of their appearance in the real, authentic data in corpora, which can help raise learners' awareness of how language is used, giving learners the chance to practice, thereby cognitively processing and internalizing the grammatical patterns (O'Keeffe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007). In this process, motivation is enhanced (Bernardini, 2002; Liu & Jiang, 2009) as are learner autonomy and learner-centeredness through corpora use. Frequencies help learners consciously notice the differences in gerund and infinitive use, which raise their awareness, helping the input become intake (Schmidt, 2001).

On top of this, the corpus-based teaching of grammar has proved useful for promoting inductive learning and acquiring grammar by self-discovery (Hunston, 2002) while integrating corpora and contextualized lexicogrammar in language teaching has been found to be effective in increasing the critical understanding of grammar, as well as enhancing discovery learning (Liu & Jiang, 2009).

The same is true in the work of Rodríguez-Fuentes and Swatek (2022) and Elsherbini and Ali (2017). Their learners, having received corpus-based instruction when learning grammar, including the use of infinitives and gerunds, outperformed the students who had not been provided with such input. Similarly, Lin (2021) comments on their effectiveness in teaching grammar in general, as well as verb patterns in particular, with experimental groups of EFL students' grammatical competence at all levels of proficiency outperforming the learners in all equivalent control groups.

Unsurprisingly, then, such input has been reported as having been positively received, being deemed to be helpful due to the preponderance of examples of the target language presented in an interesting, innovative, and motivating manner (Lin, 2016). Consequently, both forms of input are preferable to the undertaking of discrete item grammar testing in isolation.

3. Results

Storch and Tapper (2009) comment on the unfeasibility of the provision of input on all the grammatical problems which learners have. However, I am of a similar mindset to Chodorow et al. (2010) who, in contrast, are of the belief that exposure to problematic features is the best way to increase accuracy in production, and that focussing on this, post-input, can be rewarding (Morgan, 2014; Nassaji & Fotos, 2004). Hence the reason for supplementing the Shanghai University undergraduates' syllabus, a decision which was rewarded by the data generated.

To begin with, it should be stated that having been incorrectly completed, statistics from a number of papers could not be processed. These totalled 17, with the issues being only allocating a tick to one of the two sentences in each pair, and an apparent randomness, or a lack of consistency in their allocation. The large majority were from the learners I had not taught, which was due to the changing schedule, meaning the inability to ensure that they were monitored as the activity was undertaken to avoid the issue arising, or rectifying the situation once it had occurred.

Furthermore, the original intention had been to determine if the meanings were the same or different when both sentences in a pair were correct. However, the lack of completion of this part, on top of the usage of the incorrect form, such as choosing one of the options when one of the sentences was incorrect, meant that this was discontinued.

Regarding the valid data, on average, the number of errors made by the learners who had not received input was significantly higher. This included more errors being made for 20 of the 28 verb patterns, while 2 of them were of the same percentage. Moreover, 3 of the 6 patterns which were higher for the learners who had received input was by, on average, a mere 1.96%.

The results in their entirety are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Error production

Learners Without Input (Maximum = 40)			Verb Pattern	Learners With Input (Maximum = 60)		
%	% Combined	**Total		Total	% Combined	%
37.5	28.75	7+8=15	Remember + gerund	5	14.15	8.3
20		2+6=8	Remember + object + gerund	12		20
22.5	37.50	3+6=9	Hear + object + gerund	9	25.85	15
52.5		9+12=21	Hear + object + infinitive	22		36.7
30	42.5	7+5=12	Regret + gerund	4	9.20	6.7
55		16+6=22	Regret + to + infinitive	7		11.7
42.5	26.25	6+11=17	Watch + pronoun + infinitive	24	25.85	40
10		0+4=4	Watch + pronoun + gerund	7		11.7
47.5	33.75	7+12=19	Enjoy + infinitive	48	41.65	80
20		6+2=8	Enjoy + gerund	2		3.3
7.5	11.25	2+1=3	Need + to + be + past participle	2	9.15	3.3
15		2+4=6	Need + gerund	9		15
17.5	23.75	2+5=7	Look forward to + gerund	1	3.35	1.7
30		2+10=12	Look forward to + infinitive	3		5
37.5	45	9+6=15	Stop + gerund	21	37.50	35
52.5		17+4=21	Stop + to + infinitive	12		20
40	45	11+5=16	Remember + to + infinitive	5	10.00	8.3
50		13+7=20	Remember + gerund	7		11.7
27.5	61.25	4+7=11	Intend + to + infinitive	2	23.30	3.3
95		24+14=38	Intend + gerund	26		43.3
32.5	42.5	6+7=13	Advise + gerund	31	64.15	51.7
52.5		5+16=21	Advise + to + infinitive	46		76.6
15	16.25	3+3=6	Love + gerund	2	6.65	3.3
17.5		4+ 3=7	Love + to + infinitive	6		10
10	22.5	0+ 4=4	Criticizing (starting a sentence)	15	30.85	25
35		5+9=14	To criticize (starting a sentence)	22		36.7
30	31.25	7+5=12	Suggest + subject	3	20.00	5
32.5		6+7=13	Suggest + infinitive (without to)	21		35
Total Averages						
	33.39				21.90	

Note: **Of the 40 learners without input, 24 (60%) had been studying for an academic year longer, while the remaining 16 (40%) had not. The figures for the former are on the left of this column.

An unpaired t-test was undertaken to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the two independent groups. As the p-value was greater than 0.05, being 0.0762, the result is not considered to be statistically significant. Though, as the observed difference is deemed to be borderline, it is said to be *not quite significant*. Therefore, it is possible that the cause of the small margin of difference is the small sample size, so, if it had been larger, the result might have been significant. Alternatively, it is plausible that the observed difference is due to random chance, or sampling variability.

However, the overall trend suggests that input has resulted in improved performance in almost all of the tested patterns, thus improving learners' language accuracy with regard to this extremely common grammatical feature.

Also, the results have been exacerbated by the fact that though both cohorts entered the university at approximately the same level, a large number of the learners who had not received input had been studying Academic English for a whole year longer. Therefore, in theory, they were at a higher level than those who had.

With regard to the learners who had received input on this grammatical feature, a total of 374 errors were made, averaging 6.23 for each of the 60 students. In comparison, though, coincidentally, a total of 374 errors were also made, the corresponding figure was 9.35 for each of the 40 students who had not received input.

Regarding the source of errors, for those who had received input, *enjoy* plus infinitive was the cause of the highest number of errors, though, cumulatively, *advise* was by far the most problematic verb. In contrast, *intend* stood out as being particularly problematic for the recipients of input.

According to Oxford 3000 (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, 2005) which is a list of the 3000 most important words to learn, *enjoy* ranks as an A1 word, signifying the beginner level, with both the others being at the intermediate B1 level. This suggests that there needs to be a provision of input on this when teaching verbs to undergraduates, particularly as none of those covered were in Coxhead (2000) which featured the 570 most commonly used, non-subject specific words in academic texts.

Finally, on top of these statistics, analysis of essays written by 142 learners at the same level as those who had not received input in this research project, but had been studying longer, contextualised the level of proficiency. This is due to their production of a total of only 118 such errors. Furthermore, a solitary learner generated 15 of them, 2 were repeated and 17 were in lists following the phrase, *such as*.

It should be noted that errors were categorised as being relevant, even if alternative corrections were available. Therefore, ...*due to irrelevant to the topic...*, was regarded as such, as a possible correction is *due to being irrelevant*, even though *due to irrelevance* is another acceptable form.

20 essays' number of words totalled 26,484 words. With the titles and bibliographies excluded, and all compounds, phrasal verbs and idioms, for example, not being counted as single words, this came to, on average, 1341 words per essay, which calculates as an error being generated in slightly less than every essay, or, for every 224 words.

4. Conclusion

As the results of the research reveal that the input on verb patterns has made a noticeable difference for the better, if not statistically speaking, I will continue focussing on this language feature due to the far fewer number made by the learners who had received input, compared to those who had not. This is despite the fact that many of these learners, who had not received the grammatical input, had received far more language instruction, generally speaking. Also, when covering this, the provision of positive feedback will be provided, as simply focussing on errors can result in demotivation (Ellis, 2009).

Transparency:

The author confirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Acknowledgement:

I'd like to thank Anthony Withers for help with the statistics.

Copyright:

© 2025 by the author. This open-access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- Alsuhailbani, Z. (2022). Corpus-based instruction of gerunds and infinitives: The case of EFL learners. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 28(4), 82-94.
- Bernardini, S. (2002). *Exploring new directions for discovery learning*. In B. Kettemann & G. Marko (Eds.), *Teaching and learning by doing corpus analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Boulton, A., & Cobb, T. (2017). Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 67(2), 348-393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12224>
- Braun, S. (2005). From pedagogically relevant corpora to authentic language learning contents. *ReCALL*, 17(1), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344005000510>
- Chambers, A. (2019). Towards the corpus revolution? Bridging the research-practice gap. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 460-475. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000089>
- Chang, J. (2007). *Chinese speakers*. In M. Swan & B. Smith (Eds.), *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, G., & Liang, M. (2022). Verb form error detection in written English of Chinese EFL learners: A study based on Link Grammar and Pattern Grammar. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 27(2), 139-165. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.19107.che>
- Chodorow, M., Gamon, M., & Tetreault, J. (2010). The utility of article and preposition error correction systems for English language learners: Feedback and assessment. *Language Testing*, 27(3), 419-436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532210364391>
- Choi, Y., & Yoo, I. (2012). A corpus-based error analysis of V-ing forms in Korean college freshmen's essays. *English Teaching*, 67(4), 311-335.
- Cives-Enriques, R.-M. (2003). *Materials for adults: 'I am no good at languages!' – Inspiring and motivating L2 adult learners of beginner's Spanish*. In B. Tomlinson. (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.
- Cowan, R. (2008). *The teacher's grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>
- Deng, Y., Liu, D., & Wu, S. (2022). Academic English verbs across disciplines: A corpus study and its implications. *Ampersand*, 9, 100093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2022.100093>
- Du Pont De Bie, N. (2004). *Ant egg soup: The adventures of a food tourist in Laos*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33(2), 209-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal: An Open Access Refereed Journal for World Language Educators*, 1(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Elsherbini, S. A. H., & Ali, A. D. (2017). The effects of corpus-based activities on EFL University students' grammar and vocabulary and their attitudes toward corpus. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, 3(1), 133-161.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here?(and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 305-327. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt015>
- Granath, S. (2009). *Who benefits from learning how to use corpora?* In K. Aijmer (Ed.), *Corpora and language teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, J. E., & Yoo, I. W. (2015). A corpus-based study of to-infinitive errors in Korean college freshmen's writing. *The Journal of Asia Tefl*, 12(4), 37-60.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Research into practice: Grammar learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 48(2), 263-280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408>
- Lei, L., & Liu, D. (2018). The academic English collocation list: A corpus-driven study. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 23(2), 216-243. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.16135.lei>
- Lien, T. T. (2021). The roles of language input and output in second language acquisition: Discussions and pedagogical implications for EFL teachers. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 5(9), 289-293.
- Lin, M. H. (2016). Effects of corpus-aided language learning in the EFL grammar classroom: A case study of students' learning attitudes and teachers' perceptions in Taiwan. *Tesol Quarterly*, 50(4), 871-893. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.250>
- Lin, M. H. (2021). Effects of data-driven learning on college students of different grammar proficiencies: A preliminary empirical assessment in EFL classes. *Sage Open*, 11(3), 21582440211029936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211029936>
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). Effects of differential feedback on students' examination performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 15(4), 319-333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017841>
- Liu, D., & Jiang, P. (2009). Using a corpus-based lexicogrammatical approach to grammar instruction in EFL and ESL contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 61-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00828.x>
- Ma, H., & Qian, M. (2020). The creation and evaluation of a grammar pattern list for the most frequent academic verbs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 58, 155-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.01.002>
- Masuhara, H. (2000). Is reading difficulty a language problem? Implications of neuro-scientific research findings for reading pedagogy and materials development. *The Language Teacher*, 24(2), 15-21.

- Morgan, G. (2014). The effect of overt prepositional input on students' written accuracy. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(5), 202-212.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). 6. Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000066>
- Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, 52(2), 101-109. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.2.101>
- O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donoghue, C. (2025). *Eliciting: A key technique in language teaching*. DC Teacher Training. Retrieved from <https://www.dcteachertraining.com/post/eliciting-techniques-elt-classroom>
- Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (2005). *The Oxford 3000™*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petrovitz, W. (2001). The sequencing of verbal-complement structures. *ELT journal*, 55(2), 172-177.
- Phuket, P. R. N., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(32), 99-106.
- Polio, C., & Fleck, C. (1998). "If I only had more time:" ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 43-68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90005-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90005-4)
- Richards, J. C., & Reppen, R. (2014). Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction. *Relc Journal*, 45(1), 5-25.
- Rodríguez-Fuentes, R. A., & Swatek, A. M. (2022). Exploring the effect of corpus-informed and conventional homework materials on fostering EFL students' grammatical construction learning. *System*, 104, 102676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102676>
- Römer, U., & Berger, C. M. (2019). Observing the emergence of constructional knowledge: Verb patterns in German and Spanish learners of English at different proficiency levels. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(5), 1089-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S02722263119000202>
- Schmidt, R. W. (2001). *Attention*. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartz, M., & Causarano, P.-n. L. (2007). The role of frequency in SLA: An analysis of gerunds and infinitives in ESL written discourse. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 14, 43-57.
- Sinha, T. S. (2014). Acquisition of the Non-generic Uses of English Definite Article by the Adult ESL Learners. *Language in India*, 14(2), 224-245.
- Sleator, D. D., & Temperley, D. (1991). *Parsing English with a link grammar*. Technical Report CMU-CS-91-196, Carnegie Mellon University, School of Computer Science. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220482445>
- Storch, N., & Tapper, J. (2009). The impact of an EAP course on postgraduate writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(3), 207-223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.03.001>
- Tomlinson, B. (2000). A multi-dimensional approach. *The Language Teacher*, 23, 25-27.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010a). Principles and procedures for self-access materials. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 1(2), 72-86.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010b). *Principles of effective materials development*. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Second language acquisition and materials development*. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics and Materials Development*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2018). *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning*. Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Turton, N. D. (1995). *ABC of common grammatical errors: For learners and teachers of English*. London: Macmillan Education Limited.
- Xia, L. (2012). A corpus-based study of the infinitive errors made by Chinese college students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(6), 154-157.
- Zhan, H. (2015). Frequent errors in Chinese EFL learners' topic-based writings. *English Language Teaching*, 8(5), 72-81.

Appendices

Appendix A

Travelling and Tourism in China.

Speaking:

With a partner, ask and answer the following:

1. China: Choose *four questions*.

- 1) Where should tourists go sightseeing?
- 2) What activities should they do?
- 3) Where would you recommend they stay?
- 4) What food and drink do you think they should try? Why?

- 5) What souvenirs should they buy?
- 6) What should they avoid?
- 7) Where have you been to?
- 8) Where would you like to visit? Why?

2. The World: *Ask and answer the following:*

- a) Which countries have you been to?
- b) Which countries would you like to visit? Why? Do you have any plans to go to any of these?
- c) Have you been to Laos? Would you like to? Why (not)?

Reading:

1. Read the text and then ask and answer the questions which follow.

Student A) Ant Egg Soup: The Adventures of a Food Tourist in Laos by Natacha Du Pont De Bie

Introduction: How I Became a Food Tourist

I adore looking at, smelling, and tasting food, as well as reading and talk about it. As long as it tastes good I'll tuck into anything from tinned food to squid. I love discovering new tastes and ideas because it fills me with happiness. Also, I like to travel, so I've become a food tourist.

While friends relax on the beach, I'll be asking people where to find the best restaurants. I'll get up at six o'clock to photograph fruit while snacking on local food, and I'll travel hours for a good lunch.

I started young. I was born in Paris, the gastronomical capital of the world. My family lived in the village of Mountainville and my first memories are of the kitchen. I remember sit in my chair whilst being fed, so I was happy as my mother skinned a rabbit or added herbs to a soup. Dreaming of to eat outdoors in France on a warm evening is still something I often do, even now.

Laos is still a very poor country, but at least it has been unaffected by polluting industries or Western culture. As the country had managed keep its food culture and traditions, despite globalisation, as a food lover, I had go there. That's when I found myself sit on the banks of the Mekong, drinking Lao beer and eating spicy food, ready to start my favourite hobby. I was a person who wanted to finding out more.

1. Are you a food lover?
2. Have you ever eaten squid or rabbit? Are they eaten in China? What food do Chinese people eat that isn't eaten in other countries?
3. Do you like spicy food?
4. Do you add herbs to your meals?
5. Do you sit on the banks of the rivers in Shanghai, drinking beer? Why (not)?
6. What's your favourite fruit?
7. What advantages and disadvantages are mentioned about life in Laos?

Reading:

1. Read the text and then ask and answer the questions which follow.

Student B) Ant Egg Soup: The Adventures of a Food Tourist in Laos

by Natacha Du Pont De Bie

Introduction: How I Became a Food Tourist

I adore looking at, smelling, and tasting food, as well as reading and talking about it. As long as it tastes good. I'll tuck into anything from tinned food to squid. I love to discover new tastes and ideas because it fills me with happiness. Also, I like travelling, so I've become a food tourist.

While friends relax on the beach, I'll be asking people where finding the best restaurants. I'll get up at six o'clock to photograph fruit while to snack on local food, and I'll travel hours for a good lunch.

I started young. I was born in Paris, the gastronomical capital of the world. My family lived in the village of Mountainville and my first memories are of the kitchen. I remember sitting in my chair whilst

being fed, so I was happy as my mother skinned a rabbit or added herbs to a soup. Dream of eat outdoors in France on a warm evening is still something I often do, even now.

Laos is still a very poor country, but at least it has been unaffected by pollute industries or Western culture. As the country had managed to keep its food culture and traditions, despite globalisation, as a food lover, I had going there. That's when I found myself sitting on the banks of the Mekong, drinking Lao beer and eating spicy food, ready start my favourite hobby. I was a person who wanted to find out more.

1. Are you a food lover?
2. Have you ever eaten squid or rabbit? Are they eaten in China? What food do Chinese people eat that isn't eaten in other countries?
3. Do you like spicy food?
4. Do you add herbs to your meals?
5. Do you sit on the banks of the rivers in Shanghai, drinking beer?
6. What's your favourite fruit?
7. What advantages and disadvantages are mentioned about life in Laos?

2. Find the grammar differences between texts **A** and **B**.

For example, the first difference is on the first line:

A: ...as well as reading and talk about it.

B: ...as well as reading and talking about it.

Which one is correct? Are both correct? Are neither correct?

There are 14 more:

2 in the first paragraph, 3 in the second, 3 in the third and 6 in the final one.

Be ready to say which are correct.

3. Ask and answer these questions with a partner:

- a. What do you like doing in your free time?
- b. What do you hate doing?
- c. Do you regret anything you've (not) done?
- d. Are you looking forward to doing any travelling soon?
- e. Is there anything you have to do this week?
- f. Do you think you'll pass this course with flying colours?
- g. Have you ever been punished for copying or handing in your work late?
- h. Are you prepared to stay behind after class to do extra work if you don't understand anything?
- i. Daydreaming in class is common. Have you ever been accused of doing this?

4. Choose one of the following and make some notes Then, begin speaking.

- a. My favourite restaurant.
- b. My favourite meal.
- c. The best hotel in China/Shanghai/my city/I've ever stayed in.

5. Try to write at least 100 words on what you talked about.

Answers

ANT EGG SOUP: The Adventures of a Food Tourist in Laos

by Natacha Du Pont De Bie

Introduction: How I Became a Food Tourist

I adore looking at, smelling, and tasting food, as well as reading and talking about it. As long as it tastes good I'll tuck into anything from tinned food to squid. I love discovering/to discover new tastes and ideas...Also, I like travelling/to travel, so I've become a food tourist.

While friends relax on the beach, I'll be asking people where to find the best restaurants. I'll get up at six o'clock to photograph fruit while snacking on local food, and I'll travel hours...

...I remember sitting in my chair whilst being fed, so I was happy as my mother skinned a rabbit or added herbs to a soup. Dreaming of eating outdoors in France...is still something I often do...

...it has been unaffected by polluting industries or Western culture. As the country had managed to keep its food culture and traditions, despite globalisation, as a food lover, I had to go there. That's when I found myself sitting on the banks of the Mekong, drinking Lao beer and eating spicy food, ready to start my favourite hobby. I was a person who wanted to find out more.

Appendix B

Homework: From today's input, add to the table below, and keep adding to it when you come across other patterns in future reading and listening. Remember to use a good dictionary to check if there is more than one pattern for a verb, such as Oxford Learner's Dictionaries: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>

Verbs with more than one pattern

Verb + verb + ing

Verb + to + infinitive

Verb + infinitive (without to)

Verb + object + verb + ing

Verb + object + to + infinitive

Adjective + to + infinitive

-ing form as the subject of a sentence

Preposition + verb + ing

Interrogative conjunction (how, what, where, who, when, whether) + to + infinitive

Appendix C

Verb Patterns Activity

Read the sentences. Are both A and B correct? If they are, do they mean the same, or do they have different meanings?

1A) I remember staying there.

1B) I remember you staying there.

2A) Did you hear her explaining the reason?

2B) Did you hear her explain the reason?

3A) I regret moving you.

3B) I regret to move you.

4A) I watched him cook.

4B) I watched him cooking.

5A) I enjoy travel.

5B) I enjoy travelling.

6A) Your room needs to be cleaned.

6B) Your room needs cleaning.

7A) I look forward to coming here again.

7B) I look forward to come here again.

8A) The manager's stopped being rude to her guests.

8B) The manager stopped to be rude to her guests.

- 9A) Remember to write down the number.
 9B) Do you remember writing down the number?
 10A) I intend to stay.
 10B) I intend staying.
 11A) I advise making a reservation.
 11B) I advise to make a reservation.
 12A) I love swimming.
 12B) I love to swim in the evenings after a hard day's work.
 13A) Criticizing is easy.
 13B) To criticize is easy.
 14A) I suggest that you move to a hotel nearer to the sea.
 14B) I suggest you move to a hotel nearer to the sea.

Answers

I remember staying there. (*I stayed*)

I remember you staying there. (*You stayed*) *Both are possible*

Did you hear her explaining the reason? (*Repeated or over a period of time*)

Did you hear her explain the reason? (*Action happened once only*) *Both are possible*

I regret moving you. (*Completed action*).

I regret to move you. (*Action about to happen*) *Both are possible*

I watched him cook. (*The whole action, from start to end*)

I watched him cooking. (*Not from start to finish, part of the action*) *Both are possible*

I enjoy travel.

I enjoy travelling. (*The same meaning*)

Both are possible

Your room needs to be cleaned.

Your room needs cleaning. (*The same meaning*)

Both are possible

I look forward to coming here again.

Correct (Verb + adverb + preposition)

I look forward to come here again.

Incorrect

The manager's stopped speaking to her guests.

(*The action has stopped; she's no longer rude*)

The manager stopped (*working*) to speak to her guests.

(*Why an action (working) has stopped*)

Both are possible

Remember to write down the number.

(*Remembering comes before the action described. The reference is to the present or future*)

Do you remember writing down the number?

(*Remembering comes after the action described. The reference is to the past*)

Both are possible

I intend to stay.

I intend staying. (*The same meaning*)

Both are possible

I advise making a reservation.

Correct

~~I advise to make a reservation.~~

Incorrect

(Advise + object + to + infinitive is also possible)

I love swimming.

Both are possible

I love to swim in the evenings after a hard day's work. *(The same meaning, though the former refers to a general liking, while the latter refers to a particular experience)*

Criticizing is easy.

To criticize is easy. *(The same meaning)*

Both are possible

I suggest that you move to a hotel nearer to the sea.

Correct

~~I suggest move to a hotel nearer to the sea.~~

Incorrect

(Suggest + verb + ing is also possible)