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ABSTRACT

This study applies mathematical linguistics to explore how language distance plays an essential role in third language acquisition in terms of a morphosyntactic module. Data were drawn from 3410 essays written in Japanese by low, middle and high levels of learners from 12 first-language (L1) backgrounds who acquire English as a second language (L2)-interlanguage and Japanese as a third language (L3). The findings indicate that (a) mean dependency distance is an efficient indicator for syntactic complexity of writing proficiency. In both elementary and intermediate groups, learners of highly agglutinative languages are likely to show higher dependency distance than learners from isolated-language and fusion-language backgrounds. (b) The frequency and dependency distance are distributed in Power Law Function. Fitting Right truncated Good to the dependency distances indicates that the values of the parameter p ascend as the degree of agglutination of learners’ mother tongue increases. (c) The syntactic complexity in multi-background Japanese learners’ essays highlights that no matter how diverse the learners’ native and target languages are, the syntax is always constrained by universal law, namely, minimising dependency distance. This is in accordance with existing findings in second language acquisition of inflectional languages.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Typological distance and learning order have been deemed the most essential factors in language acquisition. Many scholars from different camps have attempted to determine which factor is more important and to what extent transfer from previously acquired languages happens (wholesale or piecemeal). Existing assumptions fall into three groups: (a) the second language (L2) has a significant influence at the early stage regarding phonological and syntactic acquisition (Hammarberg and Hammarberg 1993; Marx 2002; Tremblay 2007; Williams and Hammarberg 1998; Onishi 2016; Bardel and Falk 2007; Falk and Bardel 2011; Forsyth 2014; Archibald 2019; Dziubalska-Kołaczyk and Wrembel 2017; Onishi 2016; Wrembel 2015), (b) typological distance plays an essential role in lexis learning (Cenoz 2001; Rossi et al. 2006; Rothman 2010; Singleton 1987), and (c) the Cumulative-Enhancement Model (Flynn et al. 2004), Scalpel Model (Slabakova 2016) and Linguistic Proximity Model (Westergaard et al. 2017) show that language transfer is selective.

Owing to the development of natural language processing, another line of notable research contributes a great deal to the field; the quantitative approach (Hunt 1965; Lu 2011; Jiang et al. 2019). Quyang and Jiang (2018) examined the syntactic complexity of Chinese L2 English writing and arrived at regularity: with increased learners’ grades, writing quality improves. Jiang et al. (2019) explored writing development across beginner and intermediate L2 English learners.
finding that the mean T-unit length, mean sentence length, and dependent clauses per clause are effective measures of writing quality. In line with the research on the quantitative approach, however, there remains room for further investigation. First, the target language of previous work seems to be limited to English, a (relatively) morphologically isolated language for which writing proficiency appears to be better captured at the syntactic level (e.g., relative, coordinate, and subordinate clauses). Furthermore, existing studies tend to focus on second language acquisition (SLA) more than third language acquisition (TLA). To our knowledge, the only study to explore third-language (L3) Japanese writing quality is that of Komori et al. (2019), which deemed the mean hierarchical distance an efficient index of Japanese learners’ writing. Based on Quyang and Jiang’s (2018) insights, Li and Yan (2021) examined three levels of Japanese English learners and demonstrated that interlanguage follows certain linguistic laws regardless of the learner’s native language. This inspires us to consider the role a learner’s first language plays in learning Japanese as a third language. Moreover, thus far, the metrics in measuring learning proficiency include the mean sentence length, mean clause length (Hunt 1965), T-unit length (Hunt 1970), noun phrases (Biber et al. 2011), number of coordinate/subordinate clauses (Bulte and Housen 2012), degree of sophistication (Ai and Lu 2013), mean dependency distance (MDD) (e.g., Liu 2008, 2017; Quyang and Jiang 2018), and mean hierarchical distance (Jing and Liu 2015; Komori et al. 2019).

Given that Japanese is morphologically agglutinative, one or more suffixes (causative, negation, voice, tense, or honorification) are added to a verb/adjective stem to create complex predicates. The dependency direction at the lexical level is thus head-initial, contrary to syntactic structure (head-final). Incorporating this, it would be necessary to consider lexical complexity when indexing the writing proficiency of agglutinative languages (e.g., Altaic, Korean, Indonesian, Hungarian). For instance, the verb 返す [kaesu_plain_form], its honorific form おかえしininaru [kaesu_honorific form], and its humble form おかえしるる [kaesu_humble_form] have the same semantic meaning “to return sth” but different pragmatic functions. Word type-token ratio has a great deal to do with the degree of honorification and, thus, should be considered a crucial candidate for indexing spoken and written quality.

The present study investigates 360 essays written by L3 Japanese learners from 12 L1 language backgrounds (Vietnamese, Thai, Chinese, English, Russian, Indonesian, French, Turkish, German, Spanish, Hungarian, and Korean). By calculating the differences in lexical and syntactic complexity between writings at different levels and learners’ mother tongues, this study aims to understand the association between L1-L3 language distance and L3 acquisition proficiency. The following questions are addressed:

**Question 1:** Can mean dynamic mean dependency distance, type-token ratio, and the distribution of long dependency relationship types indicate L3 writing proficiency?

**Question 2:** While Japanese is agglutinative and has an SOV word order, the research target in this study (i.e., Japanese learners from 12 L1 backgrounds) bears different morphosyntactic features (see Table 1). Is there an indicator in the probability distribution of L3 proficiency? If so, is it the morphological distance (distance between mother tongue and L3 language: agglutination/fusion/isolation) that suggests a trend in learning level?

**Question 3:** It has been explicated that the power law function may reflect the probability distribution of the dependency distance of second language learners’ language proficiency (e.g., Quyang et al. 2018). Does L3 Japanese acquisition across diverse L1 backgrounds follow a similar regularity? Are there parameters suggesting a trend in learning quality?
Table 1. Japanese learners from multiple backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Family</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Adjective Noun</th>
<th>Adposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHG Uralic</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Highly agglutinative</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTR Altaic</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Highly agglutinative</td>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRS Slavic</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Inflectional</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IID Austronesian</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Agglutinative</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Noun-Adj</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTH Kra-Dai language</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Isolating</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Noun-Adj</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVN Austroasiatic</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Isolating</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Noun-Adj</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCH Sino-Tibetan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Isolating</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUS Indo-European (Germanic)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Relatively isolating</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAT Indo-European (Germanic)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Inflectional</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFR Indo-European (Italic)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Inflectional</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Noun-Adj</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Indo-European (Italic)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Inflectional</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Noun-Adj</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKR unknown</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Agglutinative</td>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJJ unknown</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Agglutinative</td>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Adj-Noun</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. DATA AND METHODS

2.1. Data

Data were drawn from the International Cross-Sectional Corpus of Japanese as a Second Language. Following the scores of Japanese Computerized Adaptive Test, this study extracts 1705 low, middle and high learners from Hungary, Russia, Indonesia, Thai, Vietnam, Chinese, England, Germany, France, Spain Korea and Turk. A totally of 3410 compositions written in Japanese titled “Our Eating Life: Fast Food and Home-Made Food” was extracted (1705 learners × 2 tasks). The tokens of these essays amount to 633,000 words. 100 essays by native Japanese were collected for reference.

2.2. Procedures

The present study is designed to examine third language acquisition proficiency with a focus on the morphosyntactic module. To this end, writing proficiency is measured via syntactic complexity. Essays written by Japanese learners across different L1 backgrounds are classified into two levels: primary and intermediate. The classification is made by the “Learner Text Evaluation System”. By looking into the writing proficiency of different levels, we may understand whether language distance plays a role in learning quality. Moreover, considering conjunction might be missing in compositions, leading to an undetected dependency relationship (e.g., the run-on sentence “ringo ga suki, hoshii” [apple-NOM-like, want]; I like apples, so I want [apples])—sentence length alone may not be sufficient to represent syntactic complexities. This

---

1 Sakoda (2020:10) points out that SLA refers to learning a language other than the first language.
2 https://j-cat.jalesa.org/?page_id=168
study thus delves into the distribution of MDD for determining the level of writing proficiency. The following procedures were carried out:

**Step 1**: Draw raw data from the corpora

**Step 2**: Classify the writings into two levels: elementary and intermediate via the Learner Text Evaluator

**Step 3**: Parse each sentence via the GiNZA v4 Parser

**Step 4**: Produce a computer program to calculate the dynamic MDD from the parsed outputs

**Step 5**: Explore the probability distribution and the parameters that index writing proficiency

**Step 6**: Produce a computer program to verify the Spearman correlation and Euclidean distance clustering between the essays written by Japanese natives and learners from different L1 backgrounds

### 2.3. Data Analysis

As previously noted, this study employs dependency distance to indicate the syntactic complexity of essays written in Japanese. The framework is Dependency Grammar (Tesnière 1959; Hudson 2007; Liu 2009b), which contains three concepts: dependency relationship, dependency direction, and dependency distance. A dependency relationship is characterized by being binary and asymmetrical. Among syntactic structures, the verb is the GOVERNOR, and all elements are connected via a ‘governor-dependent’ relationship. For instance, in *Taroo ga Jiroo ni ringo o ageta* [Taroo-NOM-Jiroo-DAT-apple-ACC-give.PAST], the verb *ageta* ‘gave’ behaves as the governor on which the subject *Taroo*, the direction object *ringo* ‘apple,’ and the indirect object *Jiroo* depend. The straight arrow is directed from the governor to the dependent, as shown in (1).

(1) Dependency structure of ‘*Taroo ga Jiroo ni ringo o ageta*.’

Dependency direction is a means of word-order typology (Liu 2010). Regarding the research targets of the present study, as Liu (2010) suggests, Chinese, English, Hungarian, Japanese, and Turkish tend to favor a head-final structure, while German and Spanish generally prefer a head-initial structure. Dependency distance refers to the linear distance between governor and dependent. This concept was initially proposed by Yngve (1960) and developed by Hudson (1995). Liu, Hudson, and Feng (2009) proposed measuring the mean dependency distance for a sentence in terms of dependency direction. The calculation procedure is as follows: subtract the position numbers of the governor and the dependent, and assume words in a sentence are assigned in a string, that is, \( W_1 \ldots W_i \ldots W_n \). In any dependency relationship between words \( W_a \) and \( W_b \), \( W_a \) is a governor, and \( W_b \) is its dependent. When \( W_a \) and \( W_b \) are adjacent, the distance between them is \( |1| \). To put it another way, the dependency distance (DD) between the two words is \(|\text{governor} – \text{dependent}|\) (the absolute value), and the MDD of the whole sentence would be

\[
\text{MDD} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\text{DD}_i|.
\]

In this formula, \( n \) is the number of words in the sentence, and DD\(_i\) is the dependency distance of the \( i \)th dependency relationship of a sentence. Building on this, the annotation of sentence (1) was:

[Diagram of dependency structure]
Incorporating this, the MDD of sentence (1) would be 2. Theoretical and empirical studies from different camps have confirmed that dependency distance is a metric of language production and comprehension (Gibson 1998, 2000; Temperley 2007; Liu 2008; Gibson et al. 2013; Scontras et al. 2015; Rispens and De Amesti 2017; Fang and Liu 2018; Wang and Liu 2019): the longer a dependency distance is, the harder this dependency is to access (input and output). Inspired by these contributions, a general law of human language is proposed: minimising dependency distance (Liu 2008; Temperley 2007; Futrell et al. 2015). Against this background, this study wishes to determine whether there is a trend for Japanese learners with a subject-object-verb (SOV) language background to create a longer dependency distance while learners from a subject-verb-object (SVO) language background are likely to produce a shorter dependency distance. There are about 14 levels of dependency relationships in Japanese (Table 2). The following long-distance relationships will be targeted: ccomp (object subclause), advcl (adverbial clause), conj (conjunction), and acl (adjectival clause).

Table 2. Selected dependency relationships in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause level</th>
<th>Dependency relations</th>
<th>Grammatical structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nsubj</td>
<td>Subject of noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ccomp</td>
<td>Complementizer of object clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obl</td>
<td>Oblique element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advcl</td>
<td>Adverbial clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advmod</td>
<td>Adverbial modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cop</td>
<td>Copular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrase level</td>
<td>nmod</td>
<td>Noun modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>acl</td>
<td>Adjectival clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The Reliability of MDD

This section examines whether MDD could index the syntactic complexity of writing quality. A Spearman rank correlation test between MDD and score of J-CAT score was conducted. A scatterplot with a regression line was plotted in Figure 1.
As indicated, MDD and learners’ acquisition proficiency well fitted the regression line. The low, middle and high proficiency groups show extremely harmonic correlations, with $\rho = 0.9992$, $p = 0.024$. Given this, we contend that MDD is efficient for indexing Japanese writing proficiency. Research question 1 was, thus, answered.

### 3.2. Associations of Language Distance and Acquisition Proficiency

With the metrics MDD in place, now we are in the position of exploring how L1’s morphological features might affect Japanese acquisition proficiency. Figures 2 present the boxplots of MDDs of proficiency low, middle and high.
Figure 2 indicates that (a), in early acquisition stage, agglutinative-L1 learners’ essay (Turkish, Indonesian, Korean, Hungarian) presents a higher MDD value than inflectional-and isolating-L1 learners’ essay (Chinese, Vietnamese, Thai, French, German, Russian, Spanish, English). (b), this advantage retains in middle learning level. By high learning level, learners’ essay achieved similar MDD. Since MDD is an index of discriminating writing proficiency, we deduce that non-native Japanese learning quality at the early learning stage was influenced by the mother tongues. Euclidean-distance clustering based on MDD of two levels (elementary and intermediate) was carried out. The results further suggested variations within inflectional languages. The Slavic- and Romance-L1 learners produce a higher MDD than Germanic-L1 learners; Germanic-L1 learners are more close to isolating-L1 learners, as seen in low learning level, the essays written by French, Spanish, Turkish and Russian learners are clustered together; the essays written by Indonesian and Hungarian are clustered together; the essays written by Vietnamese, Thai, English, Chinese, German learners are clustered together.

(2) Euclidean-distance clustering
Altmann-Fitter is further employed to fit the distribution of MDD, and it was found that the data of the isolating, agglutinative, and inflectional groups were fitted to Right truncated Good, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Fitting the Right truncated Good to the dependency distances of Japanese learners from different L1 backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P (X²)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolating group</td>
<td>-0.6229</td>
<td>0.8404</td>
<td>0.1380</td>
<td>0.9869</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>0.8462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflectional group</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>1.0237</td>
<td>0.0735</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.9584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglutinative group</td>
<td>-0.0279</td>
<td>1.0346</td>
<td>0.0834</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.9778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parameters in Right truncated Good are a and p. The values of the parameter p increase as the degree of agglutination of learners’ mother tongue increases, that is, from isolating to inflectional to agglutinative. The MDD results further clarify that the minimizing dependency distance shown in the Japanese writings (Liu 2008; Temperley 2007; Futrell et al. 2015) reflects that of the learner’s mother tongue. Research question 3 is, thus, answered.

3.3. The Probability Distribution of L3 Learning Proficiency

Previous sections have shown that MDD is a good indicator of writing proficiency. A further step forward in the relationship between MDD and frequency is attempted. A Python program is produced to fit the MDD-frequency by learners across different L1 backgrounds to the Power Law Function (y = ae⁻ᵇx). The finding suggests that apart from essays written by Hungarian Japanese learners, the MDD-frequency of essays written by the rest 11 L1-language learners fit appear to fit the power law function, with 0.7992 as the lowest value of the determination coefficient $R^2$ and 0.9621 as the highest ($R^2 > 0.90$, very good; $R^2 > 0.80$, good; $R^2 > 0.75$, acceptable; $R^2 < 0.75$, unacceptable). Figure 3 demonstrates the fitting outcomes of MDD-frequency.
Figure 3. Fitting Power Law Function to MDD-frequency relationship of essays
Table 4 presents the variation of the parameters that contribute to the power law function. As suggested by the fitting results, the learning proficiency is predictable via \( y = ae^{-bx} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Fitting results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>275.41</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.9086</td>
<td>( y = 275.41e^{-0.53x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>172.62</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.8204</td>
<td>( y = 172.62e^{-0.29x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>251044.02</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>0.9621</td>
<td>( y = 25104.02e^{-0.89x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16544.49</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.8312</td>
<td>( y = 1654.49e^{-0.63x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>14733.02</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.9246</td>
<td>( y = 14733.02e^{-1.14x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>6488.04</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>0.7992</td>
<td>( y = 6488.04e^{-1.51x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5423.72</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.8902</td>
<td>( y = 5423.72e^{-0.63x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>29845.57</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.9267</td>
<td>( y = 29845.57e^{-0.97x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>24274.01</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.9095</td>
<td>( y = 24274.01e^{-0.91x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>18811.50</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>0.9561</td>
<td>( y = 18811.50e^{-1.69x} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study explores how the language distance between L1 and L3 influences L3’s writing proficiency. The data comprised 3410 essays produced by learners from 12 mother tongues. Mathematical linguistic approach is incorporated. Statistical analysis revealed that mean dependency distance is an efficient indicator for syntactic complexity. The finding also revealed that learners of highly agglutinative languages are likely to show higher MDD values than learners from isolated-language and fusion-language backgrounds at initial learning stages. Syntactic distance, that is, word order, also facilitates a distinction in MDD: the learners from SOV language backgrounds show longer MDD and more dependency relationship types than the learners from SVO language backgrounds. A Python program was used for fitting the probability distribution of writing proficiency in Japanese learners from different L1 backgrounds. The results indicated that the frequency and dependency distance is distributed in the Power Law function. Building on this, we employed the Altmann-Fitter software to verify the indicator in the probability distribution of L3 proficiency. Fitting Right truncated Good to the dependency distances of Japanese learners from different L1 backgrounds shows that the values of the parameter \( p \) increase as the degree of agglutination of learners’ mother tongue increases. That is, L3 Japanese writing proficiency is influenced by language distance. Specifically, the typologically closer the learner’s previously known languages are to the third language, the better the learner can perform in L3 acquisition. This is in accordance with the Zipf Principle of Least Effort (Zipf, 1949), which suggests that any human action aims to lighten the processing load. In this study, with the degree of agglutination of native language being higher, accessibility to the learner’s knowledge of their previously known language is quicker, leading to a strong transfer from native language to subsequent language. The syntactic complexity in multi-background Japanese learners’ essays highlights that no matter how diverse the learners’ native and target languages are, the syntax is always constrained by universal law, minimizing dependency distance. This is in accordance with existing findings (i.e., SLA in English (Quyang et al. 2018; Lu and Liu 2016)).

While our findings could provide deeper insight into Japanese education, much remains to be explored in the future. First, the present study only examined narrative essays. To draw a more unified picture of how language distance may influence learning proficiency, other writing genres, such as emails, should be examined in more detail. Second, a further look into the role of interlanguage English in L3 Japanese acquisition is necessary (positive/negative transfer). Finally,
the speaking proficiency of learners across diverse L1 backgrounds could shed more light on the link between L1–L3 distance and acquiring proficiency.
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