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I Introduction

This paper is a first step to estimate and consider different peculiarities between first language (L1) and second language (L2) based upon cross-linguistic judgment tests,¹ which involve reflexives, Null prep., quantifiers, negative polarity items, wh-phrases, etc., showing evidence as to how Universal Grammar (UG) can play a role in adult L2 acquisition or not.

With the development of recent acquisition theories, lots of linguists have argued that the concept of UG can be an essential factor in acquiring a language or not. Indeed, speakers of some language can acquire innate structure-based concept in mind. We recognize that there are opposed theories of L2 acquisition, which differ from the extent how UG can constrain the L2 acquisition. The typical theories of acquisition are the Full Access hypothesis²,³,⁴,⁵ and No Parameter Resetting hypothesis.⁶ In Section II, these two hypotheses will be shown to manifest the different concepts from each other, in comparison with the dubious concepts of attainment and acquirability in adult L2 learners.⁷ In Section III, the items for judgment tests will be shown clearly. In Section IV, the procedures and results of judgment tests reflecting adult L2 speakers will be analyzed based upon the concept of UG. In Section V, more research will be required to manifest the evidence as the closing remarks in this paper.

¹ The form of the judgment test has been shown in the Appendix at the end of this paper.
II Recent Survey of Adult L2 Acquisition Theories

1 The concept of ‘fossilization’

Concerning the ultimate attainment of some natural language, the abrupt decision seems to define the attainment is ‘success’ or ‘failure’ for the limited period. Below the critical period, all humans can fully acquire any natural language. However, concerning the proficiency of adult L2 acquisition, some different hypothesis might be stipulated.

Concerning the attainment, Lardiere claims as follows: 8

When the editors of Second Language Research first inquired about the possibility of my guest-editing the special thematic issue of this volume, the topic they had in mind was ‘fossilization’. This theme, however, with its underlying focus on ultimate failure in second language acquisition (SLA), eventually came to feel too limiting. It is undeniable that many (if not most) adult second language (L2) acquirers ‘fail’ if ‘success’ is loosely defined as acquiring native-like competence and performance in the target language in all respects. Nor is it the case that such ‘failures’ are uninteresting: arriving at an adequate explanation for the differences we observe between native and non-native language acquisition has long been a goal of SLA research and can also be expected to contribute to be a deeper understanding of human cognition in general.

As mentioned above, concerning L2 acquisition, the approach towards fossilization has to be avoided. Based upon the concept of I-language suggested by Chomsky, 9 Lardiere claims that L2 acquisition can be considered to understand the nature of the system with prior knowledge of another I-language, applying the concept of Chomsky, even though the theory of Chomsky chiefly refers to the idealized speakers of L1. Concerning the significance of L2 acquisition, Lardiere claims as follows: 10

The study of ultimate attainment is potentially more illuminating in regard to a central goal of modern linguistic inquiry (following Chomsky, 1986): determining what properties must be attributable to the human mind/brain that could account for the nature of the complex system of knowledge that has actually been attained. In other words, we can only hope to understand the nature of the system by first examining what has actually been acquired (or not), given a particular linguistic environment and – for SLA – prior knowledge of another I-language, and then ‘working backwards’ to figure out how such a system could have possibly been acquired.

On the hopeless proposal of ‘fossilization’ recently named Representational Deficit Hypothesis,

8 Ibid., 239.
where L2 speakers cannot acquire features or functional categories that are absent in their first language, ‘fossilization’ is inevitable. However, we have to explore the acquirability of L2 in the same way as L1 speakers, partially or totally.

Too much emphasis on the Critical Period Hypothesis might lead to invalid results in L2 acquisition, which defines on age limit for acquisition. Above the critical period, if we can establish a natural environment for resetting our innate knowledge of language in mind, L2 acquisition might be fruitful. With effective application of the concept of the “sensitive period,” instead of the critical period, L2 acquisition might be completely possible with abundant knowledge on the basis of an L1 background.

2 The Full Access Hypothesis vs. the No Parameter Resetting Hypothesis

Linguists who claim that L2 learners still have full access to UG are White, Conradie,11 Schwartz and Spouse, Vainikka and Young-Scholten,12 etc. On the Full Access hypothesis, parameter resetting is possible even though L1 and L2 are completely different in parameter values. On the contrary, linguists who claim that L2 learners only access to those aspects of UG in their L1 grammar, which is to say that L2 learners cannot reset their mental parameters are Hawkins and Yuet-Chan,13 Smith and Tsimpli,14 etc. It is interesting to note that the Full Access hypothesis predicts that necessary positive evidence would be available in the input, when the resetting of parameter might be possible.

In the following sections, the possibility of parameter resetting will be completely different between L1 and L2, based upon judgment tests.

III Judgment Tests—Methods

The judgment tests involve my tentative approach to seek the different shades of judgment among L2 speakers of English, cross-linguistically. The participants, who kindly answered a questionnaire, live in various countries: Argentina, South Africa, Venezuela, Pakistan, India, and

Indonesia. Considering the effects of different language backgrounds, we hope to examine the universal phenomena on language acquisition in the mind. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Part 1 is meant to determine the language background of the participants including their L1, L2, or experience of foreign languages, and the other is to ask them to choose ‘grammatical’ or ‘ungrammatical,’ and ‘acceptable’ or ‘unacceptable’ for each sentence. On the questionnaire, the participants answered 100-130 English sentences with various linguistic items; reflexives, Null prep, quantifiers, negative polarity items, wh-phrases, etc. This huge amount of data should assist me in examining a potential or underlying mental parameter of L2 speakers of English as related to UG.

Generally speaking, concerning such a judgment test, only the concept of grammaticality seems to be adopted, but as this experiment intends to explore mental parameter of L2 speakers of English, the troublesome concept of acceptability has been examined. On the questionnaire, these concepts were explained to the participants; ‘Grammatical’ means that the sentence is based upon the rules of English, while ‘ungrammatical’ means that the sentence is not based upon the rules of English. In the same way, ‘Acceptable’ means that the sentence is meaningful, even if it seems deviant in some respect, while ‘unacceptable’ means that the sentence is not meaningful at all.

Within the wide range of the participants’ mother tongues, some underlying features might be explored. Concerning the traditional distinction between competence and performance, the concept of ‘grammaticality’ seems to be closely related to competence, and the concept of ‘acceptability’ seems to be closely related to performance. Indeed, these distinctions have been applied to the L1 speakers. But these distinctions might be applied to explore the underlying peculiarities of L2 speakers of English under the wide range of L1 influence.

Indeed, the fundamental distinction between Internalized language (I-language) and Externalized language (E-language) as suggested by Chomsky has to be mentioned. The orthodox linguistics has been focused on I-language with the concept of I-linguistics, I-sounds, I-meaning, for Chomsky presumed the idealized speakers of native language. Based upon the formulation of linguistic principles, idealized speakers could be presumed, but concerning the research on L2 acquisition, various factors of E-language might influence their process, which leads to the assumption that interlanguage with UG might play a very important role in transferring to L2 speakers of English.

---

15 I really appreciate the fact that Toshiro Nomura handed my questionnaire sheets to inhabitants of various countries on his research tour in August and September, 2006.


Furthermore, it is interesting to take a look at the Hagstrom’s attempt\textsuperscript{18} which involves numerous factors of L2 acquisition as humans.

\textbf{IV Judgment Tests—Procedures and Results}

1 Reflexives

Given the participants’ language backgrounds, the following sentences with reflexives might be differently interpreted in accordance with their presumed interlanguage or L1 influence. As the participants are exposed to different speaking environments, it is interesting to note how they have recognized the following sentences. (Sentence (1),(2),(3), White,2003)

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(1)] Mary\textsubscript{i} blamed herself.
  \item[(2)] *Mary\textsubscript{i} thought that Susan\textsubscript{j} blamed herself.
  \item[(3)] Mary\textsubscript{i} thought that Susan\textsubscript{j} blamed herself.
\end{itemize}

Concerning the sentences with reflexives; X-self, reflexive anaphor, the perceived grammaticality or acceptability seems to be determined on the basis of whether the reflexives can be interpreted as phrasal or as head. In English, the reflexive anaphor must be bound within its governing category, so English reflexives require their antecedents within the same clause. Indeed, English is a language with overt pronouns [-null subject]. On the contrary, Spanish and Japanese are languages with null pronouns [+null subject]:null subject parameter or pro-drop parameter. The parameter of pro-drop can be described as follows:
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\caption{Figure 1}
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As shown in Table 1’, all Argentine participants are L1 speakers of Spanish. Figure 1, which

---
shows pro-drop might have an influence on L2 speakers of English. Some interlanguage grammar closely related to UG might influence the English responses. Table 1 shows that most participants recognized Sentence (1) as having reflexive anaphors with herself having a referential index to Mary. The differences between grammaticality and acceptability were not recognized among L1 speakers of Spanish. They have a pro-drop mental parameter, so that in Sentence (2), even though the reflexive anaphor, herself, cannot be interpreted as Mary, the pro-drop parameter might have influence the recognition of acceptability.

Table 1 Responses by 11 Argentines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 10 Argentines chose as “grammatical,” and 1 Argentine chose as “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 10 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while no Argentines chose “unacceptable”. All the participants were required to assess the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, and as acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same. Their responses show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same among L1 speakers of Spanish.

Table 1 shows that most participants recognized Sentence (1) as reflexive anaphors, with herself having a referential index to Mary. The differences between grammaticality and acceptability were not clearly distinguished by L1 speakers of Spanish.

Concerning Sentence (2), 6 Argentines chose “grammatical,” and 4 Argentines, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 11 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while no Argentines chose “unacceptable.” They have pro-drop mental parameter, so that in Sentence (2), even though the reflexive anaphor herself cannot be interpreted as Mary, pro-drop parameter might have influenced their judging it to be acceptable. For L2 speakers of English with Spanish as L1, the reflexive binding might be widely interpreted.

Concerning Sentence (3), 4 Argentines chose “grammatical,” while 4 Argentines “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while no Argentines chose “unacceptable.” For L1 speakers of English, the judgment of Sentence (2) is completely different from that of Sentence (3), as English reflexives constrain its antecedent in the same clause.

In addition, the language background of 11 Argentine participants was explored in detail. As shown in Table 1’, all the participants have Spanish as their L1 language. There might be some
abstract transfer between L1 and L2; motivating UG except pro-drop parameter. In Spanish, these three sentences can be translated as follows:

(1') Maryi se cupló.
(2') *Maryi pensó que Susanj se cupló.
(3') Maryi pensó que Susanj se cupló.

Table 1’ Language Backgrounds of 11 Argentines (Responses of Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Career</td>
<td>20yrs-, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-19yrs, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9yrs, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40-49, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30-39 ,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1’ shows the various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 11 Argentines (all participants) are L1 speakers of Spanish; 5 Argentines are L2 speakers of English, one is an L3 speaker of English, and 3 Argentines have studied English as a foreign language.

As shown above, the L2 speakers of English with Spanish as an L1, including participants L3 and FL, interpreted the domain or reflexive anaphors, long-distance anaphors as well as local anaphors, widely.

Table 2 shows the responses of 7 South Africans. All the participants are L1 speakers of English, and 5 participants are L2 speakers of Afrikaans, which can be identified as a variety of English-speakers; in Afrikaans, the phonemes differ slightly in that they lack the phoneme /θ/. Concerning the different parameters in L2 Afrikaans, it is interesting to note that there are different Split-IP parameter in the V2 parameters as suggested by S. Conradie.19

These hypotheses are tested in a study examining whether English speaking learners of

Afrikaans can reset the Split-IP parameter (SIP) and the V2 parameter from their L1 ([-SIP], [-V2]) to their L2 ([+SIP], [+V2]) values.

Table (2) shows how 7 South Africans have judged the sentences with reflexives, involving the governing category parameter and proper antecedent parameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 5 South Africans chose “grammatical,” and 1, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 4 South Africans chose “acceptable”. All the participants were required to identity the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, and acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same. Concerning local antecedents, most South Africans seem to judge them as native speakers.

Concerning Sentence (2), 4 South Africans chose “grammatical,” and 2 South Africans “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 3 South Africans chose “acceptable.” Among L2 speakers of Afrikaans, the long-distance anaphors seemed to be distinguished as L1 speakers of English distinguish them, so that only 2 participants deemed Sentence (2) to be ungrammatical. No participants identified the sentences as being unacceptable. Among L2 speakers of Afrikaans, the proper antecedent parameters could not be recognized as distinct values.

Concerning Sentence (3), 5 South Africans chose “grammatical,” and 2, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 4 South Africans marked “acceptable.” For L1 speakers of English, who assume that the anaphors which allow a non-subject antecedent to be local, they might judge Sentence (3) as being grammatical. Concerning acceptability, all participants interpreted the reflexives widely.
Table 2' Language Backgrounds of 7 South Africans (Responses of Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Zulu</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2' shows various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 7 South Africans (all participants) are L1 speakers of English. 5 South Africans are L2 speakers of Afrikaans, one is an L3 speaker of Zulu, one South African studied Portuguese as a foreign language. Concerning various distinct values of Afrikaans, more research will be required, but the responses have partly shown that L2 speakers of Afrikaans might acquire the same mental values, or some kind of mental interlanguage with common features.

Table (3) shows how 10 Venezuelans have judged the sentences with reflexives, involving the governing category parameter and proper antecedent parameter.

Table 3 Responses by 10 Venezuelans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 9 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” and 1, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” and 1, “unacceptable.” All the participants were required to assess all the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same.

Concerning Sentence (2), 10 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” while no participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” while no participants chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (3), 7 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” while 1, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Venezuelans marked it as acceptable, and no participants as unacceptable.

It is interesting to note that Sentence (2) was judged differently by Argentines as shown in Table (1), despite their common Spanish language background. Since English reflexives require their antecedents to appear in the same clause, the proper antecedent parameter might recognize Sentence (2) as ungrammatical; all participants believed it to be grammatical. These responses
support the hypothesis that Venezuelan L2 speakers of English cannot acquire the governing category parameter as well as the proper mental antecedent parameter. In other words, they have some different mental values possibly as a consequence of being in other languages, e.g. Italian or German. Among the participants, there are 2 L2 speakers of Italian, which different language backgrounds may have in their judgments. However, it is difficult to determine which language has influenced new perceptions. In Italian, these three sentences can be translated as follows: the Italian reflexive, inherent reflexive, and ergative might be assigned identical analyses; the reflexive si is an object clitic, bearing \( \theta \)-role, and both the eargative and inherent reflexive si are affixes with no other syntactic function.

(1)" Mary\_i sì. biasimò.
(2)" *Mary\_i pensò che Susanna\_i sì biasimò.
(3)" Mary\_i pensò che Susanna\_i sì biasimò.

| Table 3' Language Backgrounds of 10 Venezuelans (Responses of Part 1) |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | Spanish | English | Italian | German |
| L1                | 6       | 1       |         |        |
| L2                | 2       | 3       | 2       |        |
| L3                |         | 2       |         | 2      |
| Other FL          |         |         |         |        |
| Eng. Career       | 20yrs-, 0| 10-19yrs, 4| 5-9yrs, 4|         |
| Age               | 40-49, 3| 30-39, 2| 20-29, 4|         |

Table 3' shows various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 6 Venezuelans are L1 speakers of Spanish and 2 Venezuelans are L2 speakers of Spanish. 3 Venezuelans are L2 speakers of English, one is an L1 speaker of English, and 2 Venezuelans are L3 speakers of English. Moreover, 2 Venezuelans are L2 speakers of Italian, and 2 Venezuelans are L3 speakers of German.

Table (4) shows how 11 Pakistanis have judged the sentences containing reflexives, involving the governing category parameter and proper antecedent parameter.
Table 4 Responses by 11 Pakistanis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 8 Pakistanis chose “grammatical,” and no participants, “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Pakistanis chose “acceptable,” while no participants “unacceptable.” All the participants were required to identify all the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, and acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same.

Concerning Sentence (2), 6 Pakistanis chose “grammatical,” and 2 Pakistanis “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Pakistanis chose “acceptable,” while 2 Pakistanis “unacceptable.” English reflexives constrain their antecedents in the same clause, but most Pakistanis did not recognize the proper antecedent parameter or the governing category parameter.

Concerning Sentence (3), 3 Pakistanis chose “grammatical,” and 4, “ungrammatical.” Moreover 6 Pakistanis chose “acceptable,” while 1, “unacceptable.” Sentence (3) contains the proper antecedent, but half of the participants did not recognize as grammatical. As shown below, their L1 Urdu or Punjabi might influence on their judgments of grammaticality and acceptability. Otherwise, there might be some kind of interlanguage grammar closely related to UG in L1 speakers of Urdu or Punjabi.

On the recent hypothesis suggested by H. Ura,20 in Hindi or Urdu, nominative cases are differently assigned from most languages; subjects in Hindi or Urdu are not uniquely identified by nominative case and agreement, which shows the crucial differences in the nominative case occur only in arguments. In Hindi or Urdu, reflexives have only subject antecedents, while pronouns may not be coindexed with a local subject. This unique understanding of L1 speakers of Urdu might block their recognition of the proper antecedent parameter as L1 speakers of English. Furthermore, such a property might lead us to postulate one existence of an interlanguage closely related to UG. With advanced research on Urdu or Hindi, there might be a peculiar concept that reflexives can be different concept, which is reflexives, X-self, can be coindexed only with the subject, but the pronoun is disjointed from the local subject.

---

### Table 4’ Language Backgrounds of 11 Pakistanis (Responses of Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urdu</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Punjabi</th>
<th>Sindhi</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gujrati 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese 2 Arabic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Career</td>
<td>20yrs-. 1</td>
<td>10-19yrs, 8</td>
<td>5-9yrs, 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40-49, 2</td>
<td>30-39, 7</td>
<td>20-29, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4’ shows various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 9 Pakistanis (most participants) are L1 speakers of Urdu, and 2 Pakistanis are L1 speakers of Punjabi, 7 Pakistanis are L2 speakers of English, 3 Pakistanis are L2 speakers of Urdu. 1 Pakistani is an L3 speaker of Urdu, 1 Pakistani is an L3 speaker of Punjabi, and 1 Pakistani is an L3 speaker of Sindhi, and 2 Pakistanis studied English as a foreign language.

As explained above, since the proper antecedents have identified differently by Urdu or Hindi L1 speakers, English reflexives might not be recognized correctly as ungrammatical, particularly in Sentence (2) and (3). More research will be required to postulate the different properties in Urdu or Hindi.

Table (5) shows how 10 Indians have judged the sentences containing reflexives, involving the governing category parameter and proper antecedent parameter.

### Table 5  Responses by 10 Indians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 7 Indians chose “grammatical,” and 2 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Indians chose “acceptable,” while 1 Indian chose “unacceptable.” All the participants were required to assess the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, and as acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same.
Concerning Sentence (2), 5 Indians chose “grammatical,” and 5 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Indians chose “acceptable,” while 1 Indian chose “unacceptable.” Concerning Sentence (3), 5 Indians chose “grammatical,” and 5 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Indians chose “acceptable,” and 1 Indian chose “unacceptable.”

As shown below, the Indian participants have Kannada, Malayalam, Hindi, Konkani etc. as their mother tongue, which reflects language policies in India. Concerning English, most participants have acquired it as an L2.

However, it is interesting to note that the participants showed the same judgments concerning grammaticality or ungrammaticality in Sentence (2) and Sentence (3). Their L1 backgrounds might influence on their assessments of proper antecedents in English. However, it is difficult to determine which factor might have influenced the assessments. Indeed, most mother tongues can be recognized as being local, so that more research will be required on the particular values within each language.

Concerning the acceptability judgments, the L2 can play a role in distinguishing which sentence is acceptable or not. It might be considered that the degree of acceptability judgments gives evidence of proficiency in English.

Table 5’ Language Backgrounds of 10 Indians (Responses of Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kannada</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>Malayalam</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bengali 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Konkani 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepali 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Career</td>
<td>20yrs-, 3</td>
<td>10-19yrs, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9yrs, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40-49, 2</td>
<td>30-39, 7</td>
<td>20-29, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5’ shows various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 2 Indians are L1 speakers of Kannada, 2 Indians are L1 speakers of Malayalam, 1 Indian is an L1 speaker of Hindi.
In addition, the participants have different L1 languages; Bengali, Konkani, Nepali, Tamil, and Telugu. 7 Indians are L2 speakers of English, 2 Indians are L2 speakers of Kannada, and 1 Indian is an L2 speaker of Telugu. 2 Indians are L3 speakers of English, 2 Indians are L3 speakers of Kannada, and 4 Indians are L3 speakers of Hindi. Moreover, 2 Indians had studied Japanese as a foreign language.

Table 6 Responses by 10 Indonesians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (1), 7 Indonesians chose “grammatical,” and 3 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while 1 Indonesian chose “unacceptable.” All the participants were required to assess the sentences as being grammatical or ungrammatical, and as acceptable or unacceptable, but some did not check all the items, so the total number was not the same.

Concerning Sentence (2), 2 Indonesians chose grammatical, and 8 participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 1 Indonesian chose “acceptable,” while 9 Indonesians chose “unacceptable.” Indonesian participants seem to judge Sentence (2) with the violation of English reflexives as ungrammatical. Most of them have acquired the proper antecedent parameter and governing category parameter. Besides, concerning the acceptability, the results might show the opposite judgments; namely, the rate of acceptability is extremely low in comparison with that of other cases. Their language backgrounds as shown Table 6 might have a crucial factor to consider the difference of their acceptability. The participants of L1 speakers of Indonesian might have different judgments because Indonesian reflexive involves the stem diri in one word. Gil David\(^\text{21}\) has proposed the hypothesis on Indonesian reflexives. More research will be required on cross-linguistic viewpoints.

Concerning Sentence (3), 6 Indonesians chose “grammatical,” and 4 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” 9 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while 1 Indonesian chose “unacceptable.” In Indonesian, the following sentences with reflexives can be translated as follows:

KUKITA: Tentative Approach to Relations between First Language and Second Language (1)

(1)"" Maryı menyalahkan sendiri.
(2)"" *Maryı kira Susanı menyalahkan sendiri.
(3)"" Maryı kira Susanı menyalahkan sendiri

Table 6’ Language Backgrounds of 10 Indonesians (Responses of Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Career</td>
<td>20yrs-, 0</td>
<td>10-19yrs, 5</td>
<td>1-9yrs, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40-49, 1</td>
<td>30-39, 2</td>
<td>20-29, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6’ shows various language backgrounds as required by Questionnaire Part 1. 9 Indonesians (most participants) are L1 speakers of Indonesian, and 1 Indonesian is an L1 speaker of Chinese. 3 Indonesians are L2 speakers of English, 2 Indonesians are L2 speakers of Indonesian, and 1 Indonesian is an L2 speaker of Chinese. In addition, 2 Indonesians are L3 speakers of Indonesian, 2 participants are L3 speakers of Japanese, and 1 participant is an L3 speaker of Dutch. Finally, 5 Indonesians had studied English as a foreign language.

2 Null Prep

It is interesting to examine how the following sentences with Null prep22 have been judged by English speakers with various language backgrounds. (Sentence (4) -(16), White, 2003) The phenomena of Null prep might show that there are some kinds of wild interlanguage grammar. In English, there are lots of prepositional verbs, which take prepositional complements obligatory. However, Null prep can be recognized in other languages in several dialects of Spanish and French as Klein suggested. This phenomenon might lead to explain that L2 speakers of English tend to

---

accept Null prep. On the different viewpoints, this phenomenon might lead to estimate their proficiency of English.

(4) The student is worrying about the exam.
(5) *The student is worrying the exam.
(6) Which exam is the student worrying about?
(7) About which exam is the student worrying?
(8) Here’s the exam that the student is worrying about.
(9) Here’s the exam about which the student is worrying.
(10) *Which exam is the student worrying?
(11) *Here’s the exam that the student is worrying.
(12) *The delivery boy applied a new job last week.
(13) *This is the job which the delivery boy applied last week.
(14) *This is the job that the delivery boy applied last week.
(15) *This is the job the delivery boy applied last week.
(16) *Which job did the delivery boy applied last week?

Based upon the hypothesis suggested by Klein, White has claimed as follows: 23

Klein observes that relative clause in languages allowing null prep show characteristics which suggest that they are not derived by syntactic movement: (i) in a lieu of a null prep, relative clauses can contain an overt resumptive PP, consisting of a pronoun with a preposition cliticized to it—resumptives in general are characteristic of lack of movement; (ii) relative clauses are introduced by complementizers rather than relative pronouns...

Klein analyses null-prep relatives as containing a null resumptive PP, which alters with an overt resumptive PP. Null prep is not permitted in wh-questions or relative clauses derived by movement (as in English), on the other hand, because this would constitute an ECP violation: the null preposition would be unable to properly govern the empty category resulting from wh-movement.

Given such restrictions, if null prep were to be found in interlanguage grammars either in relative clauses derived by movement or in wh-questions, this would constitute evidence of a wild grammar, violating the ECP. Previous research has reported sporadic use of null prep in L2...

Concerning the phenomena Null prep, it seems to be interesting to examine how the participants

---

have judged the deviant sentences lacking the preposition in English.

Table 7 shows how Argentines have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage. All results of each sentence have to be analyzed clearly, but in this paper some typical results have been shown roughly. In the following paper, more detailed analyses have to be explored.

Table 7 Responses by 11 Argentines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(14)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(16)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning Sentence (5), all the participants chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could recognize the lacking of preposition *about*, and that they have acquired a knowledge of the verb *apply*. Moreover, one Argentine chose it “acceptable,” while 10 Argentines chose “unacceptable.” These responses can show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same, and most L2 speakers of English have acquired the same parameter as that of native speakers of English, for Null prep in this case cannot be permitted in English.

Concerning Sentence (10), all the participants chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could also recognize the lacking of preposition *about*. Moreover, 4 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while 7 Argentines chose “unacceptable.” The scope of acceptability can be recognized widely in comparison with that of grammaticality, which means most participants might interpret with a wild grammar.

Concerning Sentence (11), all the participants chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they
could recognize the lacking of preposition about. Moreover, 6 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while 5 Argentines chose “unacceptable.” Concerning the number of acceptability, as recognized in Sentence (10), the scope can be recognized widely in comparison with that of grammaticality, which means most participants might interpret with a wild grammar.

Concerning Sentence (12), 5 Argentines chose “grammatical” and 6 Argentines chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while 2 Argentines chose “unacceptable.” These results might show that the participants have acquired the verb apply: intransitive or transitive.

Concerning Sentence (13), one Argentine chose “grammatical” and 10 Argentines chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while 3 Argentines chose “unacceptable.” The big differences between grammaticality and acceptability were recognized, which might show that relative clauses have to involve Null prep, but the sentence lacking prep can have a wild grammar.

Concerning Sentence (16), 4 Argentines chose “grammatical” and 7 Argentines chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Argentines chose “acceptable,” while 3 Argentines “unacceptable.”

Table 8 shows how South Africans have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 Responses by 7 South Africans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning Sentence (5), all the participants chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could recognize the lacking of preposition about. Moreover, one South African chose “acceptable,” while 7 South Africans chose “unacceptable.” These responses can show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same, and most L2 speakers of English have acquired the same parameter as that of native speakers of English, for Null prep cannot be permitted in English.

Concerning Sentence (10), one South African chose “grammatical,” and 4 South Africans chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could also recognize the lacking of preposition about. Moreover, one South Africans chose “acceptable,” while 6 South Africans chose as “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (11), one South African chose “grammatical,” and 4 South Africans chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could recognize the lacking of preposition about. Moreover, one South African chose “acceptable,” while 6 South Africans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (12), all the participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, all South Africans chose “unacceptable.” These responses can show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same, and most L2 speakers of English have acquired the same parameter as that of native speakers of English, for Null prep cannot be permitted in English.

Concerning Sentence (13), all the numbers are the same as Sentence (12).

Concerning Sentence (16), all the participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, one South African chose “acceptable,” while 5 South Africans chose “unacceptable.”

Table 9 shows how Venezuelans have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(12)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(13)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning Sentence (5), 4 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” and 6 Venezuelans chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (10), 3 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” and 6 Venezuelans chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 2 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” while 7 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (11), 3 Venezuelans chose “grammatical,” and 5 Venezuelans chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 4 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” while 6 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (12), all the participants chose “grammatical,” which might show the evidence that all the participants have acquired a wild grammar. Moreover, 5 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” and 4 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (13), 7 Venezuelans chose “grammatical” and 3 Venezuelans chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 3 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” while 6 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (16), 6 Venezuelans chose “grammatical” and 4 Venezuelans chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 4 Venezuelans chose “acceptable,” while 4 Venezuelans chose “unacceptable.”

Table 10 shows how Pakistanis have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage.

Table 10 Responses by 10 Pakistanis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence *(5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (6)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence*(10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence*(11)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning Sentence (5), 2 Pakistanis chose “grammatical” and 9 Pakistanis chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, all the participants chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (10), 3 Pakistanis chose “grammatical” and 7 Pakistanis chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 5 Pakistanis chose “acceptable” and 5 Pakistanis chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (11), 2 Pakistanis chose “grammatical” and 9 Pakistanis chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 6 Pakistanis chose “acceptable” and 4 Pakistanis chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (12), 4 Pakistani chose “grammatical” and 7 Pakistani chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Pakistani chose “acceptable” and 3 Pakistani chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (13), all the participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 6 Pakistanis chose “acceptable” and 4 Pakistanis chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (16), one Pakistani chose “grammatical” and 9 Pakistanis chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 5 Pakistanis chose “acceptable” and 3 Pakistanis chose “unacceptable.”

Table 11 shows how Indians have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence*</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Responses by 10 Indians
Concerning Sentence (5), all the participants chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could recognize the lacking of preposition about. Moreover, one Indian chose “acceptable,” and 9 Indians chose “unacceptable.” These responses can show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same, and most L2 speakers of English have acquired the same parameter as that of native speakers of English, for Null prep cannot be permitted in English.

Concerning Sentence (10), 4 Indians chose “grammatical” and 5 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 6 Indians chose “acceptable,” and 4 Indians chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (11), 3 Indians chose “grammatical” and 6 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Indians chose “acceptable,” while 2 Indians chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (12), all the participants chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Indians chose “grammatical” and 3 Indians chose “ungrammatical.”

Concerning Sentence (13), 4 Indians chose “grammatical” and 5 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 9 Indians chose “acceptable,” and one Indian chose “unacceptable.”

Concerning Sentence (16), 4 Indians chose “grammatical” and 6 Indians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 7 Indians chose “acceptable,” while 3 Indians chose “unacceptable.”

Table 12 shows how Indonesians have judged the sentences with Null prep, presuming a wild grammar in interlanguage.

Table 12 Responses by 10 Indonesians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Ungrammatical</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(11)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(13)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning Sentence (5), 9 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and one chose “ungrammatical,” which might show that they could accept Null prep as some kind of interlanguage grammar. Moreover, 9 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while one chose “unacceptable.” These responses can show that grammaticality judgments and acceptability judgments are almost the same, and most L2 speakers of English have acquired the parameter completely different from that of native speakers of English, for Null prep can be permitted in their recognition.

Concerning Sentence (10), 7 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and 3 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical,” which shows they could partly recognize the lack of preposition about. Moreover, all the participants chose “acceptable,” which might show that Null prep can be accepted as L2 or internal language grammar.

Concerning Sentence (11), 4 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and 6 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while 2 Indonesians chose “unacceptable,” which might also show that Null prep can be accepted as some kind of their interlanguage or L2.

Concerning Sentence (12), 4 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and 6 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while 2 Indonesians chose “unacceptable,” which might also show that Null prep can be accepted as some kind of their interlanguage or L2.

Concerning Sentence (13), 6 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and 4 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, 8 Indonesians chose “acceptable,” while 2 Indonesians chose “unacceptable,” which might also show that Null prep can be accepted as some kind of their interlanguage or L2.

Concerning Sentence (16), 7 Indonesians chose “grammatical” and 3 Indonesians chose “ungrammatical.” Moreover, all the participants chose “acceptable,” which might also show that Null prep can be accepted as some kind of their interlanguage or L2. These results might well show that Indonesians might have a wild grammar as L2 speakers of English, which permits the lack of preposition.

As shown briefly above, the difference between grammaticality and acceptability might lead to explore some kind of wild grammar among L2 speakers of various language backgrounds.
IV Closing Remarks

As shown in the introduction, this is just a first attempt to explore the peculiarities based upon the judgment test, but more linguistic hypothesis seems to be formulated to prove the validity of UG or some kinds of mental parameters.

Indeed this paper has focused on the participants’ responses on the judgment test involving reflexives and Null prep, but much more research will be required to examine the sentences with quantifiers, negative polarity items, wh-phrases etc. in the following papers.
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Appendix

**Questionnaire**

Aug. 2006
Mieko KUKITA
Kagoshima Pref. College
Japan

I really appreciate your kindness to fill out the following items. The data you have shown will be used only for my academic research.

**PART 1**

I’d like to know your language background in your brain.

1. Your mother tongue (your 1st language) 

2. Your second (2nd) language, if you have (the language in the same proficiency as your mother tongue)

3. Your 3rd language, if you have

4. Other foreign languages you have mastered.

5. If your 1st language is not English, how many years have you studied English?

**PART 2**

I’d like you to check the following sentences; grammatical or ungrammatical, and acceptable or unacceptable.

*Grammatical* means the sentence is based upon the rules of English. *Ungrammatical* means the sentence is not based upon the rules of English.

*Acceptable* means the sentence is meaningful, even if with deviant expressions *Unacceptable* means the sentence is not meaningful at all.

**SENTENCES**

1. Mary, blamed herself,  (herself = Mary)
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

2. Mary, thought that Susan, blamed herself,  (herself = Mary)
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

3. Mary, thought that Susan, blamed herself,  (herself = Susan)
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

4. The student is worrying about the exam.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

5. The student is worrying the exam.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

6. Which exam is the student worrying about?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

7. About which exam is the student worrying?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

8. Here’s the exam that the student is worrying about.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

9. Here’s the exam about which the student is worrying.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

10. Which exam is the student worrying?
    ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

11. Here’s the exam that the student is worrying.
    ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
12. The delivery boy applied a new job last week.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
13. This is the job which the delivery boy applied last week.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
14. This is the job that the delivery boy applied last week.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
15. This is the job the delivery boy apply last week.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
16. Which job did the delivery boy apply
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
17. The nervous doctor wanted a new lawyer in the office.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
18. The happy janitor does not want the new television.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
19. The little girl can see a tiny flower in the picture.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
20. Which secret message does the young girl find in the basket?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
21. Breakfast, the wealthy business man prepares in the kitchen.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
22. The lawyer slices the vegetables which the father eats.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
23. Cats catch mice.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
25. Cats catch not dogs.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
26. Cats often catch mice.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
27. Cats often often mice.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
28. Do they catch mice?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
29. Catch they mice?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
30. Like you pepperoni pizza?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
31. Do you like pepperoni pizza?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
32. The boys like not the girls.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
33. The boys do not like the girls.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
34. Linda takes always the metro.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
35. Linda always take the metro.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
36. What did you eat and drink beer?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
37. What did you eat fish and drink?
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
38. The students were all sick.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
39. All the students were sick.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
40. I want to win the game and Jeff to lose the title.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
41. I want Jeff to work hard and to take a rest.
   Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
43. John reads often books.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
44. They have often all skipped the class.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
45. I didn't talk with fathers of many children.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
46. I didn't talk with fathers of many children.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
47. I couldn't understand the proofs of all of the theorems.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
48. We didn't see pictures with all of the children painted on them.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
49. Not many people arrived.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
50. Not often do I cut astronomy class.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
51. Not always do I attend the class.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
52. Not many boys did the doctor examine.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
53. The doctor examined not many of the boys.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
54. I have seen not much snow.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
55. The target was hit by not all of the arrows.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
56. John saw not every play.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
57. I not often cut astronomy class.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
58. I cut astronomy class not often..
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
59. Anyone did not attend the party..
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
60. John did not eat anything.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
61. Pictures of anyone did not seem to be available.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
62. A good solution to any of these problems does not exist.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
63. What can who do about it?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
64. What can who do about it when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
65. What can who do about it, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
66. What can you do about it, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
67. What did who buy?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
68. What did who buy where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
69. What did who buy, and where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
70. What did you buy, and where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
71. What will who contribute?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
72. What did who contribute when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
73. What did who contribute, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

74. What did you contribute, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

75. What will who paint?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

76. What will who paint where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

77. What will who paint, and where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

78. What will you paint, and where?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

79. What will who promote?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

80. What will who promote when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

81. What will who promote, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

82. What will you promote, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

83. What will who photograph?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

84. What will who photograph when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

85. What will who photograph, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

86. What will you photograph, and when?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

87. What did who write?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

88. What did who write to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

89. What did who write, and to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

90. What did who write, and to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

91. What will who sing?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

92. What will who sing to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

93. What will who sing, to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

94. What will you sing, and to whom?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

95. Who can do what about it?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

96. Who bought what?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

97. Who contributed what?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

98. Who will paint what?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

99. Who will promote what?
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

100. Who will photograph what?
    ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

101. I have any
    ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

102. I haven’t any
    ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
103. Anyone can do that. I don't ever see him.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
104. I ever see him.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
105. I don't ever see him.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
106. He would budge.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
107. He wouldn't budge.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
108. He did have a red cent.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
109. He didn't have a red cent.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
110. He has been here.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
111. He hasn't been here.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
112. He may arrive until noon.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
113. He may not arrive until noon.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
114. I have much time left.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
115. I don't have much time left.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
116. I have many days left.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
117. I don't have many days left.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
118. He has arrived yet.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
119. He hasn't arrived yet.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
120. He did know anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
121. He didn't know anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
122. He did claim that he knew anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
123. He didn't claim that he knew anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
124. He did think that he knew anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
125. He didn't think that he knew anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
126. I doubt that he knows anybody.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
127. He dislikes anybody reminding him.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
128. Only Bill did any of the homework.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
129. Few people see any use for it.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable
130. A few people see any use for it.
   ( ) Grammatical ( ) Ungrammatical ( ) Acceptable ( ) Unacceptable

Many thanks for your troublesome work.
Please write your profession and age.
Profession ( ) Age ( )
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