２０２６年度大学院入試問題（２０２５年９月１０日実施）

言語科学　研究科　言語学　専攻（博士前期・日本語教育学コース）

試験科目：（　専門科目　）　試験時間：（　９０分　）

1．終助詞「ね」と「よ」の使用について、その使い方の違いがわかるように例をあげて説明しなさい。

（受験番号　　）

言語科学 研究科 言語学 専攻（ 博士前期・日本語教育学コース ）

試験科目：（ 専門科目 ） 試験時間：（ ９０分 ）

2. タスクベースの言語指導（TBLT）とはどんな教授法か、また Focus on Form とどのような関係があるかを、以下のキーワードを含めて論じなさい。

キーワード: 暗示的学習、インターアクション、ニーズ分析、ペアワーク、目標タスク

（受験番号 ）

言語科学　研究科　言語学　専攻（博士前期・日本語教育学コース）

試験科目：（　専門科目　）　試験時間：（　９０分　）

3.

問 1. 次の a~c の「~てあげる」文について、それぞれどのような点で不適切であるかを説明しなさい。

a. 友達は私に本を貸してあげました。

b. 田中さんは木村さんに銀行へ連れて行ってあげました。

c. 先生、かばんを持ってあげましょうか。

問 2. 日本語学習者にとって授受表現はどのような点が難しいか、例をあげて論じなさい。

（受験番号　）

２０２６年度大学院入試問題（２０２５年９月１０日実施）

言語科学　研究科　言語学　専攻（博士前期・日本語教育学コース）

試験科目：（　英語　）　試験時間：（　６０分　）

次の英文は、米国移住者の到着年齢（Age of Arrival: AoA）と言語能力との関係について論じたものです。日本語 600～800 字で要約しなさい。（研究者の人名は英語のまま使用可。ひとマスにアルファベット 2 文字。）

Johnson and Newport examined the correlation between AoA and grammaticality judgement task score in participants in their sample whose AoA was at or below age fifteen (n=23) and those whose AoA was seventeen and above (n=23). If AoA has a simple linear effect on performance, it would be expected that the older a person is when they are first exposed to the L2, the lower their score on the grammatical judgement task would be: a 'negative correlation'. They found a significant negative correlation for the group whose AoA was at or below fifteen, but no correlation between AoA and test score in those who had arrived aged seventeen or older. They interpret this finding as providing evidence for a 'sensitive' or 'critical period' for the full acquisition of an L2 that lasts up to around the age of seven. The argument runs as follows.

Table 10.7 shows that the L2 speakers in their sample whose AoA was between three and seven performed within the same range as the native speaker control group. For speakers who first started learning English between the ages of eight and fifteen, there is a linear decline: the older a learner is at first encounter with English, the lower their performance in the judgement of grammaticality across a range of morpho-syntactic phenomena. However, this tendency to decline flattens out once learners are over sixteen. L2 learners whose first encounter with the target language is in their thirties are no less likely to acquire knowledge of the morphological and syntactic properties of the target language than learners whose first encounter is in their late teens or early twenties. This pattern of results is consistent with the idea that people have innate linguistic knowledge that fully guides the construction of mental grammars up to the age of about seven, but then progressively fades in influence over the next ten years, whatever language-learning capacities individuals have access to remain stable, at least for the next twenty years. What these language-learning capacities are is an empirical question. They might involve residual innate linguistic knowledge (that is, only some aspects of innate linguistic knowledge fade at the end of the sensitive period). Or completely different mental capacities might take over the learning task as innate linguistic knowledge fades.

While Spadaro's results on the effect of AoA on lexical knowledge in highly proficient L2 speakers are consistent with an early sensitive period for acquisition that begins to fade after the age of six to seven. DeKeyser's results show that AoA does not influence the performance of his L1 Hungarian participants on a grammaticality judgement task until after sixteen, suggesting that if there is a sensitive period during which innate linguistic knowledge is available to guide acquisition, it begins to face at a much later age than claimed by Johnson and Newport.

TABLE 10.7 Mean accuracy scores of native and non-native speakers of English on an aurally-presented grammaticality judgement task (based on Johnson and Newport, 1989: 78)

AoA	Natives	3-7	8-10	11-15	17-39
	(n=23)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=8)	(n=23)
Mean	268.8	269.3	256.0	235.9	210.3
Range	275-265	272-264	263-247	251-212	254-163

（受験番号　　）

DeKeyser also examined the correlation between AoA and performance on the judgement task. He found no negative correlation between AoA and test performance in those whose AoA was post-sixteen. In other words, a learner whose AoA was thirty was as likely to achieve the same score on the test as a learner whose AoA was twenty. This is consistent with Johnson and Newport's findings for participants whose AoA was seventeen or above. However, there was also no negative correlation in the group whose AoA was pre-sixteen. This is inconsistent with the findings of Johnson and Newport and Spadaro. DeKeyser concludes that seven to sixteen years is a period of transition during which some change occurs in the ability to fully acquire an L2: 'Somewhere between the ages of six to seven and sixteen to seventeen, everybody loses the mental equipment required for the implicit induction of the abstract patterns underlying a human language' (DeKeyser, 2000: 518).

Not everyone believes that age effects are the consequence of a sensitive period for the application of innate linguistic knowledge to the learning task. Some researchers argue that there is no specifically linguistic innate knowledge, and that language is 'under the control of cognitive processes that are not unique to a language learning module' (Bialystok and Hakuta, 1999: 172). Age effects are simply the result of the general cognitive decline that humans undergo as they age. Their ability to learn languages suffers as a result. If age-related changes in the ability to acquire L2s are attributable to cognitive changes over the lifespan, the prediction should be that decline in ultimate proficiency will be gradual and constant.

Bialystok and Hakuta support this claim with evidence from a study based on census data collected in 1990 from two groups of non-English speakers in New York State: L1 speakers of Chinese and Spanish. Only informants who had been resident in the US for ten years or more were included. This yielded 24,903 Chinese speakers and 28,787 Spanish speakers. The factor that Bialystok and Hakuta correlated with AoA was self-reported proficiency. Informants had been asked on the census form to say how well they speak English on the scale: 1 not at all; 2 not well; 3 well; 4 very well; 5 speak only English. The results show a steady decline in self-rating of proficiency from the earliest arrivals, whose rating was around 4, to the oldest arrivals (aged sixty or over) whose rating was around 1. The pattern was the same in both the Chinese and Spanish groups, consistent with a gradual and constant decline in L2 proficiency the older learners are on first arrival.

The problem with these results, however, is that self-rating of proficiency is a very coarse measure of the linguistic knowledge that speakers have. Individuals may over-rate or under-rate their actual ability for various reasons. For example, an L2 speaker may have knowledge of the target language that fails within the native range, but self-rate as speaking 'not very well' because they are rather introvert by nature and feel that they are poor conversational partners. Similarly, suppose that older people are generally more modest in assessing their abilities than younger people. The results of the census data would then reflect changes in people's self-assessment of their abilities, not the actual abilities themselves. Studies that look at changes in the use of linguistic properties are considerably more reliable as an indicator of possible AoA effects on the acquisition of L2s.

A different counter-argument to the claims that there is a sensitive period for the application of innate linguistic knowledge in the L2 acquisition process proposes that learners do indeed have access to such knowledge, and the access remains fully available throughout life. Changes in performance with a later AoA are the result of other factors, but not the ability in principle to establish target-like mental grammar.

Birdsong and Molis (2001) conducted an exact replication of the methodology used by Johnson and Newport (1989), but this time with sixty-one immigrants to the US whose L1 was Spanish. AoA ranged from three to forty-four. Length of residence in the US was on average over ten years. As in the Johnson and Newport study, all

participants were university-educated and were either students or employees of universities at the time of testing. The results from the study are presented in table 10.8. (A pair of grammatically ambiguous test items in the Johnson and Newport study was eliminated, giving a total possible score of 274 rather than 276.)

TABLE 10.8 Mean accuracy scores of L1 Spanish speakers of L2 English on an aurally-presented grammaticality judgement task (based on Birdsong and Molis, 2001, Table 1)

AoA	3-7	8-10	11-16	17-44
	(n=14)	(n=6)	(n=9)	(n=32)
Mean	266.7	256.8	262.3	234.5
Range	273-261	268-244	267-257	268-161

In contrast to the Johnson and Newport study, Birdson and Molis found no negative correlation between AoA and accuracy on the grammaticality judgement task in the twenty-nine participants whose AoA was sixteen or below. But there was such a correlation in the group whose AoA was seventeen or older. The latter finding also contrasts with that of DeKeyser, who found no correlation between AoA and performance on the grammaticality judgement task in his post-sixteen arrival group. Birdsong and Molis cautiously conclude that the evidence from their study could be construed as falsification of the claim that there is a sensitive period for the application of innately-determine linguistic knowledge in the acquisition of L2s.

An alternative view is that discrepancies in the findings across three studies (Johnson and Newport 1989, DeKeyser 2000 and Birdson and Molis 2001) are consistent with a sensitive period for L2 acquisition early in life, since in all three studies young starters with long exposure to the target L2 in a naturalistic setting perform, as a group, within the native range on the measure used (a grammaticality judgement task). The point at which the sensitive period ends, and innate linguistic knowledge begins to fade, is less clear. However, when it does fade L2 learners unconsciously recruit other cognitive processes in the acquisition task to compensate. One source of compensation is grammatical processes present in the L1. Where learners identify similarities between the L1 and the L2, they map L2 forms onto L1 grammatical processes. Strikingly, a number of properties tested in Johnson and Newport's grammaticality judgement task have similar realizations in English and Spanish, but are quite different in Chinese and Korean. Chinese, for example, lacks subject-verb agreement, does not mark verbs for past tense, does not have definite and indefinite articles, and does not have an obligatory plural affix for nouns. Spanish, like English, has all of these properties. One possible reason why Spanish speakers in the Birdsong and Molis study with later AoAs appear to show higher levels of accuracy on the task that Johnson and Newport's Chinese and Korean speakers could be that they are drawing on the grammar of their L1 to model the distribution of forms in the L2 in the absence of guidance from innate linguistic knowledge. This is a view taken by DeKyerser (2000: 502-3): 'the more closely related the L1 and L2 are, the fewer structures have to be acquired from scratch, and the fewer structures, therefore, are eligible to show an age effect'.

(*"How second languages are learned: An introduction"* by Rodger Hawkins, Cambridge University Press)