

Acquisition of Pro drop by a Turkish-English Bilingual Child

Türkçe-İngilizce İki Dilli (Türkçe-İngilizce) Çocuklarda Adıl Düşümünün Edinimi

Kenan DİKİLİTAŞ*

• *Received:* 17.03.2015 • *Accepted:* 16.06.2016 • *Published:* 31.01.2017

ABSTRACT: This study investigates the use of null and overt subjects by a Turkish-English bilingual child and a Turkish monolingual child, aged 5;00 and 4;11, respectively, in order to reveal whether there is cross-linguistic influence from English to Turkish based on the hypothesis of Hulk and Müller (2000). Some previous research has shown that the morphosyntactic features of one language can influence the development of another, while others have found no evidence for cross-linguistic influence of one language on another. In this study, a Turkish and English language pair with quite different morphosyntactic structures was investigated, revealing monolingual-like use of null and overt subjects by the bilingual child. Research provides no evidence of cross-linguistic influence from English to Turkish.

Keywords: Pro drop, Turkish-English bilingual child, Turkish language acquisition, cross-linguistic influence, bilingualism

ÖZ: Bu çalışma Türkçe-İngilizce 5 yaşındaki iki dilli ve 4 yıl 11 ay yaşındaki tek dilli bir çocuğun adılı ve adısız cümleleri nasıl kullandıklarını araştırmaktadır. Amaç Hulk and Müller (2000) hipotezine göre İngilizceden Türkçeye doğru diller arası etkilenme olup olmadığını ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bazı araştırmalar bir dilin morfo sentaks özelliklerinin başka bir dilin gelişimini etkilediğini gösterirken, diğerleri ise böyle bir etkilenmenin olduğunu ortaya koymamaktadır. Bu çalışmada farklı morfo sentaks özelliklere sahip olan Türkçe ve İngilizce gibi iki dile sahip bir çocuk araştırılmış ve bu çocuğun adıl düşümü kullanımı açısından benzer yaşta tek dilli Türk bir çocuktan farklı olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Araştırma İngilizceden Türkçeye doğru herhangi bir diller arası etkilenme olduğuna dair bir kanıt ortaya koymamıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Adıl düşümü, Türkçe-İngilizce iki dilli çocuk, Türkçe dil edinimi, diller arası etkileşim, iki dillilik.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates the role of cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of the pro-drop parameter by a 4;11-year old Turkish-English bilingual child in comparison with a monolingual Turkish child of the same (5;00) age. A recent study investigating cross linguistic influence in early bilingualism (Hulk & Müller, 2000) proposes that cross-linguistic influence is likely to occur at the pragmatics/syntax interface, where the pragmatic context has an effect on the choice of the syntactic structure in production. In the study, Hulk and Müller came up with two conditions that lead to transfer. They claim that cross-linguistic influence may occur (1) if the syntax/pragmatics interface is involved, and, (2) if there is a surface overlap between the two target languages. In other words, if one language allows for more than one grammatical analysis; more specifically when a language allows the overt and covert use of subject pronouns, and the other language to which the bilingual is exposed contains positive evidence for one of these analyses, the language with more than one option for the grammatical analysis will likely be influenced by the other. In other words, English requires the overt use of subjects, while Turkish allows both null and overt use of subjects.

These conditions can well be investigated in Turkish-English bilingual children. English is strictly a non-pro-drop language, while Turkish is a pro-drop language in which overt and null

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi, İstanbul/Türkiye, e-posta: kenandikilitas@gmail.com

subjects are constrained by pragmatic rules and conditions. The overt subjects required by the English language are only one of the options in the Turkish language (Haznedar, 2007). This leads to the prediction that Turkish will be influenced by this grammatical characteristic of English. In order to test this hypothesis in Turkish-English child bilingualism, subject realization by an early bilingual child was examined in this study.

The main purpose of the study has been to either corroborate or disconfirm the cross linguistic influence in the acquisition of two first languages by a bilingual in the use of overt and null subject pronouns and to determine whether there is transfer from English. To achieve this purpose, two main research questions were posed:

- Are there qualitative and quantitative differences between the English-Turkish bilingual child and the Turkish monolingual child in the use of overt subjects?
- If so, can we identify English influence in the acquisition of the pro-drop properties of Turkish?

Prediction:

We predict that, due to the influence of English, the bilingual child will produce more incorrect subjects than the Turkish monolingual by employing overt subjects in contexts requiring null subjects.

1.1. L1 Acquisition of Subject Pronouns

Acquisition of subject pronouns differs depending on characteristics of the language in question. To acquire the language to which they are exposed, children are provided with input that reflects the principles and parameters suggested by Chomsky's theory of Universal Grammar. UG is claimed to be a component of the biologically endowed faculty possessing principles for all natural languages, and parameters that vary across languages (Chomsky, 1965). It is argued that it is these principles and parameters that make it possible to learn any language. Children would not be able to acquire language if deprived of these biologically endowed linguistic constraints, facilitating the acquisition of too subtle and complex properties of language (Cook, 2003; White, 2003b). This view is also supported by the fact that children simply exposed to the primary linguistic data (PLD) acquire complex knowledge of language (Cook, 2003; White, 2003a, 2003b; MacWhinney, 2004), positing that there needs to be an internal biological mechanism that contributes to the processing of the linguistic input provided in human communication. The pro-drop parameter is induced from the primary linguistic data by children in the initial stages of language acquisition. Such complex linguistic knowledge may actually be impossible to accurately and rapidly acquire without a human brain endowed with processing linguistic data. Japanese, Spanish and Turkish are categorized among the pro-drop languages which allow subject pronouns to be omitted, whereas English and French invariably require those pronouns. More specifically, subject position in an English sentence cannot be empty, while in Turkish it can. In Spanish, which is a pro-drop language with strong subject-verb agreement, lexical and pronominal subjects can be omitted because information about them can be interpreted from the rich person and number morphology on the verb by which null subjects are identified (Montrul 2004:175). A similar language is Turkish, which is also a pro-drop language that obligatorily marks the verb for subject agreement (Zimmer 1976). It also allows both null subjects and pronominal subjects (Enç 1986).

There have been some studies on the acquisition of Turkish subject pronouns. One was carried out by Slobin and Talay (1986) on the pragmatic differences between pre- and post-verbal subject pronouns. Slobin and Talay investigated speech samples collected from nine monolingual Turkish children between the ages of 2;0 and 4;8 recorded at intervals of 4 months. Research revealed that all children marked subject agreement correctly by 2;0 and the children

freely use null, preverbal and post-verbal pronouns. Slobin and Talay concluded that the choice of the subject pronoun is pragmatically communicative in Turkish because there is also the option to use the verb without it and that the children can understand the pragmatic functions of the pronouns in early childhood.

On the acquisition of subject pronouns, Ekmekçi and Sofu (1995) also investigated the development of subject pronouns observed in the language of four Turkish female children from different socio-economic backgrounds. They likewise concluded that children already make use of the pronouns in their null, and pre- and post-verbal positions when they are 2;0 years old. In addition, they found that singular subject pronouns are used to fulfill different pragmatic functions, but plural subject pronouns (“biz: we”, “siz: you ” and “onlar: they”) are acquired late and employed infrequently. With regard to the socio-economic factors, they concluded that there is hardly any difference in the use of subjects with different pragmatic functions.

1.2. L2 Acquisition of Subject Pronouns

There have also been many studies investigating cross-linguistic influence in bilingual children. One of them, carried out by Hacoen and Schaeffer (2007), examined subject realization in early Hebrew-English bilingual acquisition with seven bilingual participants whose ages ranged from 2;10 to 3;4 (mean 3;1) and whose MLU range was from 4.04 to 4.92 (mean 4.46). They found that bilingual children used subjects in the same manner and quality although they had quite a different profile from that of monolingual peers. Zwanziger et al. (2005) investigated Inuktitut and English, the former being a pro-drop language while the latter non-pro-drop in terms of subject omission in six English-Inuktitut simultaneous bilingual children, aged 1;8-3;9 and concluded that there is no evidence for cross-linguistic influence from English to Inuktitut or Inuktitut to English in terms of subject use, though the two languages have different characteristics in the pro-drop parameter. Similarly, Hinzelin (2003) investigated the question of whether Portuguese-German bilingual children differentiate the grammars of their languages depending on the Autonomous Development Hypothesis (Meisel, 2001). Hinzelin concluded that bilingual children can keep grammatical systems separate and exhibit no difficulties in setting the null subject parameter (i.e. from the non-pro-drop parameter in German to the pro-drop parameter in Portuguese). However, Haznedar (2007) investigated whether there is cross-linguistic influence in subject realization between one Turkish monolingual child (age 3;10, MLU 6;68) and one Turkish-English bilingual child (age 3;10, MLU 4;41). Haznedar found that the bilingual child demonstrated English influence on the acquisition of subject realization in Turkish. More specifically, the bilingual child, Ali-John, used inappropriate subjects in obligatorily null subject contexts.

There are other studies which investigate transfer from one language to another and the direction of the transfer. These studies also try to find out the reasons for the transfer. Müller (1998) regards transfer as a relief strategy used to cope with ambiguous input and views it as a predictable factor in bilingual language acquisition. Müller & Hulk (2001) argue that it is the grammatical phenomenon that helps us understand where and when influences occur and they found that the effect of cross-linguistic influence delayed setting the pro-drop parameter in bilingual children. They claim that cross linguistic influence may have a positive effect on language development.

1.3. The pro-drop (null subject) parameter in Principles and Parameters Theory

In the Principles and Parameters Theory (Chomsky 1957), there are parameters that indicate variations at the syntactical level. Among these is the pro-drop parameter, which postulates a phonologically empty subject only under certain conditions. The parameter is about whether a language allows the subject to be omitted in finite sentences, also known as null-

subject or subjectless sentences (Cook & Newson, 1997). Cross-linguistic differences can be exemplified as follows:

I am a teacher.

When the sentence above is translated into Turkish, it could be grammatical even without an overt subject.

pro Öğretmenim. (am a teacher)

However, in English, the null subject makes the sentence ungrammatical.

(3). *Am a teacher.

A pro-drop language such as Italian can have finite null-subject declarative sentences, but a non-pro drop language such as English cannot (Cook & Newson, 1997).

1.4. Subject marking in Turkish

Turkish subject pronouns are redundant from the truth functional point of view. This is obviously due to the fact that Turkish obligatorily marks the verb for subject agreement. This also leads to the observation that subject pronouns and null subjects have important communicative functions (Zimmer, 1976). Overt subject pronouns have functions such as contrast and topic change, while the employment of null subjects indicates the topic continuity representing the given/old information in the preceding context (see 2.3 and 2.4). There are three options by which a Turkish speaker can use a subject in a Turkish sentence (Slobin & Talay, 1986):

by verbal inflection alone

(4) *pro* Kapı-yı aç-ıyor-um.

- door-DAT open-PROG-1

by an explicit pre- or postverbal noun

(5) Bugün gel-eme-z Derin.

Today come-POT-NEG-3 Derin

(6) Derin bugün gelemez

Derin Today come-POT-NEG-3

by an explicit pre- or postverbal pronoun

(7) Bugün gel-eme-m ben. (post verbal)

Today come-POT-NEG-1- I

(8) Bugün ben gel-eme-m. (preverbal)

Today I come-POT-NEG-1

(9) Ben bugün gel-eme-m. (preverbal)

I Today come-POT-NEG-1

1.5. Overt Subjects in Turkish

The use of overt subjects in Turkish is actually redundant in terms of the truth conditions as observed by Zimmer (1976) and Enç (1986). However, in some contexts they serve three linguistic functions (Enç, 1986):

1. to contrast referents used in the previous context, as in (10) below:

(10)

Araba-yı **Ahmet** yıka-ma-dı
 Car-ACC AHMET wash-NEG-PF-3PSG
ben yıka-dı-m.
 I wash- PF-1

2. to contrast yes/no questions to emphasize the referent, as in sentences (11) and (12) below:

(11) **Herkes** Ali ile tanış-tı mı?
 Everyone Ali with meet-PF- INT

(12) **Ben** tanış-ma-dı-m.
 I meet-NEG-PF-1

3. to change the topic being discussed between two people.

When people start to communicate with language, the topic of the conversation must be agreed on at the beginning of the dialogue. This can be made clear by stating it directly with an explicit use of a lexical subject. However, to change the topic, one needs to use the pronoun that was obligatorily omitted in the previous context. For example, in Turkish this function is carried out with the use of overt subjects (Enç, 1986, 206). To understand how this occurs, let us have a look at the following situational context.

Situation 1: Ali and Zeynep have not been talking for some time. Ali walks into the room where Zeynep is and produces the following utterance with an overt subject: “Ben çarşıya gidiyorum”. *Ben* functions as a new topic.

(13) Ali: **Ben** çarşı-ya gid-iyor-um. (introducing a
 new topic to Zeynep)
 I downtown-DAT go-PROG-1

In addition, Enç (1986) argues that sentences with overt pronominal subjects convey extra pragmatic information beyond the proposition they express. She looks at the issue from the perspective of Grice’s Maxim of Quantity. This maxim indicates that a speaker does not provide more information than is needed in a conversation. According to Grice, if this maxim is violated, it creates conversational implicature. Here, overt subjects, as they seem to be semantically redundant, might be implying additional pragmatic information. However, as Enç claims, Turkish pronouns are used for contrast, so this extra pragmatic information is not a conversational implicature but a function that has to be learned by Turkish speakers. However, there are also studies (e.g. Amaral and Schwenter, 2005) which claim that contrastive contexts may pose obligation for the use of subject pronouns. This should be further investigated for Turkish with actual data collected from a large amount of samples.

1.6. Null subjects in Turkish

In Turkish grammatical elements such as ellipted pronouns can be recovered as in pro-drop subjects and objects. Just as an overt subject has the pragmatic function of introducing a new topic, so a null subject in a sentence makes it a comment on a previous topic. Once the topic of a discourse has been made clear, the following sentences without overt use of subject pronouns must comment on this. When a similar context to the one described above is contrived, it would be like the following:

Situation 2: If Zeynep walks into the room where Ali is putting on his jacket and asks “why are you putting on your jacket?” this time Ali will continue the topic and will make a comment on the topic of putting on a jacket and can utter “I am going to the market,” without an overt subject in the Turkish equivalent.

- (14) Zeynep:
 Neden ceket-in-i giy-iyor-sun?
 Why jacket-2SG-POSS-DAT wear-PROG-2
 Ali:
 Ø Çarşıya gid-iyor-um.
 Downtown-DAT go-PROG-1

In this context, Ali does not feel the need to use an overt subject because there is no need to start a new topic; it is a continuation of an interaction.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Participants

The study examines a Turkish-English bilingual girl (E), aged 5;00, and a Turkish monolingual girl (N) aged 4;11. E’s mother is Irish, born in Dublin, Ireland, whereas her father was born in Turkey. The mother studied geology at university, but she is now engaged in writing stories. The father works at a state university in the department of Economic Geology. E has been exposed to both English and Turkish since she was born. The parents follow the principle of *one person-one language*. Her mother speaks to her only in English and her father speaks to her only in Turkish. However, the parents communicate with each other in English. E attends a pre-school offering 40 hours of education per week where she is spoken to in Turkish. According to the answers in the Language Background questionnaire provided by E’s mother, E usually speaks English to her mother and Turkish to her father at home and she sometimes speaks Turkish to the mother, but rarely speaks English to the father. She usually speaks Turkish to the other people around, but she rarely speaks English to others. While speaking to her, the mother also says that E mixes both languages by substituting words. As the mother observes, E’s dominant language has been Turkish since she started pre-school.

The monolingual child, N, on the other hand, was born in Turkey and is one of two daughters of an academic member of a state university. She attends the same pre-school as E in the same class. She has never been exposed to any second-language education, though her mother is an English teacher at university. The father is a Turkish speaking academician who can speak English.

2.2. Tasks

The participants were given three different tasks. The first one was a picture description task that required describing 13 related pictures about a day in the life of Toby with his family (i.e. monkey characters). The second one was a story-telling task in which both children were expected to re-tell a story they had been told in class. The final task was talking about recent day’s activities, in the form of free conversation.

2.3. Data Collection

The data were collected through the techniques of storytelling, picture description and “spontaneous speech”. As the study intended to look at how overt and null subjects are employed, the children were expected to narrate something, during which they had to decide whether they needed to use subject pronouns to refer back to the mentioned lexical subjects.

Both children were tested in the same way through identical techniques and were asked to tell the same story and describe the same pictures and talk about the same topic. The Turkish data were recorded by the pre-school teacher during the routine activities carried out in the classroom in order to minimize possible stress on the children. For the same reason, the English data from the bilingual child were recorded by the bilingual's Irish mother at home. For all the data sets, the parents of the children were asked for permission. The children were not made to feel under stress, so they were ensured that they were going through normal language practices at school and at home.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed for the use of pro-drop appropriateness according to the context in which the bilingual and monolingual children used the pronominal subjects. The major criterion was whether there was a contrastive context or a comment on a previous topic as required by Turkish use of dropped subject pronoun. The data set was surveyed to identify uses of dropped and non-dropped uses of pronominal subjects and hand counted. Although Koban (2011) excluded the frequently used overt or null pronouns, the present study considered in the analysis process both obligatorily expressed and obligatorily absent pronominal subjects.

3. FINDINGS

All the recorded data were transcribed and each transcription of the different activity types was analyzed in two ways. First, the mean length of utterances (MLU) was calculated with reference to Brown's Rules for Counting Morphemes (1973), in which the total number of the morpheme types is divided by the total number of utterances. This calculation was done with each of the activities and then the total number of the morphemes and utterances of each participant was calculated. Then, each utterance was marked as appropriate or inappropriate in terms of null subject and overt subject use in Turkish and in English. However, only utterances containing finite verb forms were included in the calculation.

The MLU is based on the morphemes found in the utterances of the children. There are two kinds of morphemes: bound and free morphemes. The former needs to be attached to free morphemes to be meaningful, whereas the latter can stand alone in an utterance. Bound morphemes are of two kinds: derivational - those added to the free morphemes to create a new word in a different syntactic category- and inflectional - those added to the free morphemes to create a new word in the same category. However, the latter carries information on tense, aspect, modality, plurality, subject-verb agreement, etc. In the calculation of the total MLU of the participants, the MLUs of the three activities were each calculated and then added in order to obtain an average MLU number. The following tables provide values for each activity.

Table 1: MLU of the story-telling activity of the bilingual child and monolingual child

E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances
73	16	140	12	138	12
MLU		MLU		MLU	
4.56		11.66		11.50	

As can be seen in Table 1, in the story telling activity, E has a much lower MLU for English, but she has a slightly higher MLU for Turkish than N. However, it was also observed that N produced longer utterances compared to E and this may have reduced her MLU.

Table 2: MLU of the picture description activity of the bilingual child and monolingual child

E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances
229	50	250	35	222	19
MLU		MLU		MLU	
4.58		7.14		11.68	

Table 2 shows the MLUs of the participants in the picture description activity. In this activity, it should be noted that E's Turkish MLU is lower when compared to the previous activity and much lower than that of N this time. However, N's MLU is consistent with the previous one.

Table 3: MLU of the “talking about a recent day’s activity” of the bilingual child and monolingual child

E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances
275	35	204	24	331	30
MLU		MLU		MLU	
7.85		8.50		11.03	

Table 3 demonstrates the results of the talking about recent day's activity. E has a lower MLU than N in Turkish again.

Table 4: Total MLU of the bilingual child and monolingual child according to the activities

	E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
	Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances	Morphemes	Utterances
A recent day	275	35	204	24	331	30
Picture Description	229	50	250	35	222	19
Story-Telling	73	16	140	12	138	12
Total	577	101	594	71	691	61
MLU	5.71		8.36		11.32	

Table 4 gives a total MLU for each participant for all the activities. It seems that E has a lower MLU in Turkish compared to the MLU of N. This may suggest that N is more efficient in generating utterances with more morphemes. It can also be said that N produces more complex sentences in terms of use of morphemes than E.

As for the calculation of the obligatory null and overt subjects in the data collected and the proportion of this total number to the number of the incorrect uses of the null and overt subjects. The following tables include the proportions according to each type of activity.

Table 5: Null subjects in the “spontaneous speech” data

	E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context
A recent day	5/35 (14%)	0/20 (100%)	0/1 (100%)	0/25 (100%)	0/6 (100%)	0/25 (100%)

In this activity, E used 5 ellipted pronouns in the 35 overt obligatory contexts in English. On the other hand, in the Turkish data, E and N have similar rates of overt and null subjects.

Table 6: Null subjects in the picture description data

	E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
Picture description	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context
	2/23 (8.6%)	0/25 (100%)	0	0/20 (100%)	0/1 (100%)	

In this activity, E used 2 incorrect null subjects out of 23 obligatory overt contexts in English. However, in her Turkish data she was successful in all the null subject contexts, as was N.

Table 7: Null subjects in the story telling data

	E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
Story Telling	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context
	0/9 (100%)	0/11 (100%)	0/1 (100%)	0/13 (100%)	0/1 (100%)	

In this activity, E did not use any pro drop in the 9 overt obligatory contexts in English. On the other hand, out of the 11 obligatory null contexts, E did not use any incorrect null subjects, but N was successful in all of the 13 null obligatory contexts.

Table 8: Null subjects and overt subjects in the data collected

	E in English		E in Turkish		N in Turkish	
	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context	Overt Context	Null Context
Obligatory overt or null context	67	56	3	58	8	
Incorrect use of overt and null Subject	7	0	0	0	0	
Percentage of total performance	10,44%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Table 8 provides the total results regarding the use of overt and null subjects. In terms of general subject use, both N and E had the same percentage in the use of null and overt subjects in Turkish.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

This study has two research questions. The first one is on whether there are qualitative and quantitative differences between the English-Turkish bilingual child and the Turkish monolingual child in the use of overt subjects. In the attempt to answer this question, it can be said that there is not quantitative difference between the two participants, because both used overt and null subjects in the obligatory contexts in Turkish in a similar fashion. It was found that the bilingual child generated subject realizations similar to those of the monolingual child. This result does not support the cross-linguistic hypothesis of Müller and Hulk, which would

favor the incorrect use of overt subject instead of null subject in the pro-drop language (Turkish) by the influence of the non-pro-drop language being simultaneously acquired. The result is compatible with the studies of Zwanziger et al. (2005) and Hinzelin (2003). This lack of quantitative difference can be accounted for by the hypothesis of Sorrace (2005), who claimed that quantitative differences in the data collected may stem from few opportunities to interpret and produce correct subject realizations. During the data collection process of the present study, the children were asked to talk about different topics in a relaxed mode with their teachers and parents. However, they might have felt stressful and avoided using language as they would have in a natural communication setting.

Appropriate use of overt and null subject in Turkish by the bilingual child can be justified by the fact that the bilingual child had sufficient linguistic experience to acquire knowledge of how to use subjects or sufficient exposure to various communicative settings where better understanding can be grasped of how to integrate syntactic and pragmatic knowledge regarding using subjects correctly. Similarly, this study did not find any qualitative difference between the two participants, which can also be explained by Sorace (2005), who suggests that qualitative differences may result from insufficient evidence for interface mapping. In other words, especially in pro-drop languages like Turkish and Italian, correct use of null and overt subject requires understanding of the pragmatics-syntax interface where the syntactic structure interacts with the pragmatic system. The bilingual child E can be said to have acquired this knowledge as well.

4.1. Age factor

Another reason for the contradiction of the hypothesis of Müller and Hulk is that this study deals with a bilingual child participant aged 5. However, in the literature there are suggestions that bilingual children can differentiate between two languages as soon as they use syntactic means of expression (Meisel, 1989). This suggests that monolingual and bilingual children set the pro drop parameter at early ages. This leads the author to think that bilingual children may have generated deviant and unusual structures concerning overt and null subject use at an early age, which is not the case for the period when the data were collected. As Meisel (1989) claimed, unusual and deviant structures in the bilingual data may be temporary at early ages. If the study had been carried out when the participants were 3 years old or younger, English influence could have been observed on the use of Turkish null and overt subject. Hence, one of the reasons why this study did not favor Hulk and Müller's hypothesis may be the age of the bilingual participant of the present study. She was 5 years old, but the crosslinguistic influence of a non-pro-drop language on pro-drop languages in previous studies turned out to be found with participants aged 2;10, 3;09, 3;04 by Hinzelin (2003), Zwanziger et. al. (2005) and Hacothen and Schaeffer (2007) respectively.

4.2. Communicative dominance of Turkish

It was expected that Turkish, with more than one option for the use of the subject, would be influenced by English, which has only one option for the use of subject pronouns. However, this was not the case. This might be because E uses Turkish in her authentic setting more than she uses English for communication, which might enhance the possibility of understanding how to use null and overt subjects, thereby better understanding the pragmatic and discourse aspects of null and overt subjects.

The other research question was to find out whether there is an English influence in the acquisition of pro-drop characteristics of Turkish. This study did not find any evidence of such an influence. Rather, there are deviant subject uses in E's English data. Though she did not employ any incorrect null and overt subject in Turkish like the monolingual child, she used incorrect subject pronouns in English by 10.44 per cent (7 incorrect out of 67 subject uses).

Unlike the hypothesis of Hulk and Müller, there is Turkish influence on the use of subject pronouns in English, though it is a low percentage.

Implications for language teaching

Cross-linguistic influence between two diverse languages is inevitable in the process of acquiring two languages simultaneously. This influence and/or interaction between them may lead to transfer-related errors. As claimed by Meisel (2001), deviant structures in bilinguals could be developmental and tend to disappear once sufficient exposure to positive input in both languages is experienced or when children come to a certain age. Foreign language teachers especially those teaching bilingual young children could see these syntactical errors as to the use of null and overt subjects in one of these languages not as a fault but as a part of constructive development in the bilingual language acquisition process. Teachers should also be aware that pro-drop errors are done where the pragmatic context influences the types of the syntactic structure to be selectively produced. To be more specific, in Turkish, the use of lexical subjects is grammatically optional and it is the discourse-pragmatic context that determines whether to opt for a subject for the most part (Kornfilt, 1984; Özsoy, 1987). Therefore, the syntactic errors related to the choice of whether to use a lexical subject in Turkish are not due to a lack of grammatical knowledge but of discourse- pragmatic knowledge. Teachers should be (or made) aware of this interface where syntactic and pragmatic knowledge merge and has a bearing on the use of language. Learning two languages also leads to unpredictable errors in the bilingual language production, which necessitates teachers to be informed about the fact that such aspects other than core grammar in the universal grammar (UG) need to be learned as part of periphery grammar. Teaching children with any language pairs requires attention to subtle differences between the two languages where one is governed by pragmatic principles (Turkish) and the other syntactic ones (English). For the proper construction of knowledge of the two languages, children need time and experience in which syntactic knowledge is comprehensively contextualized and linguistic interaction is maximized.

The study also has an implication for the context of foreign language teaching. Exposing learners to authentic materials as much as possible may help them internalize differences at syntax and pragmatics interface. For example, for an English person who learns a pro-drop language such as Turkish, using subjects appropriately requires understanding pragmatic aspects, which cannot easily be taught through instruction but can well be acquired by the exposure to language use in authentic materials. Similarly, for a person whose first language is a pro-drop one such as Turkish, learning a non-pro-drop language such as English may lead to the underuse of pronoun subjects, which can be compensated for by the exposure to authentic language use.

5. REFERENCES

- Amaral, P. M., & Schwenter, S. A. (2005). Contrast and the (non-) occurrence of subject pronouns. In *Selected proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 116-127). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cook, V.J., & M. Newson (1997). *Chomsky's universal grammar: An introduction*. Blackwell.
- Cook, V. (2003). The poverty of the stimulus argument and structure dependency in L2 users of English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 41, 201-221.
- Ekmekçi, Ö. & H. Sofu (1995). Acquisition of subject pronouns in Turkish. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (10), 105-118.
- Enç, M. (1986). Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, 8, 195.
- Hacohen, A., & Schaeffer, J. (2007). Subject realization in early Hebrew/English bilingual acquisition: The role of cross linguistic influence. *Bilingualism Language and Cognition*, 10(3), 333 doi:10.1017/S1366728907003100

- Haznedar, B. (2007). Cross linguistic influence in Turkish-English bilingual first language acquisition: The overuse of subjects in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA)* (pp. 124-134).
- Hinzelin, M. O. (2003). The acquisition of subjects in bilingual children. *Invulnerable Domains in Multilingualism, 1*, 107.
- Hulk, A., & Müller, N. (2000). Bilingual first language acquisition at the interface between syntax and pragmatics. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 3*(03), 227-244.
- Koban, D. (2011). Continuity of reference and subject personal pronoun variation in the Turkish spoken in Turkey and in New York City. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 31*(3), 351-369.
- Kornfilt, J. (1984). *Case marking, agreement, and empty categories in Turkish*. Harvard University.
- MacWhinney, B. (2004). A multiple process solution to the logical problem of language acquisition. *Journal of child language, 31*(04), 883-914.
- Meisel, J. M. (2001). The simultaneous acquisition of two first languages. *Trends in bilingual acquisition, 1*, 11.
- Meisel, J. M. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Aspects of acquisition, maturity and loss*, 13-40.
- Montrul, S. A. (2004). *The acquisition of Spanish: Morphosyntactic development in monolingual and bilingual L1 acquisition and adult L2 acquisition* (Vol. 37). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Müller, N. (1998). Transfer in bilingual first language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 1*(03), 151-171.
- Müller, N., & Hulk, A. (2001). Cross-linguistic influence in bilingual first language acquisition: Italian and French as recipient languages. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 1*, 1-21.
- Özsoy, S. (1987). Null subject parameter and Turkish. *Studies on Modern Turkish*, 105-120.
- Slobin, D. I., & Talay, A. (1986). Development of pragmatic uses of subject pronouns in Turkish child language. In *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistic Conference* (pp. 207-228).
- Sorace, Sorace, A. (2005). Selective optionality in language development. *Syntax and variation: Reconciling the biological and the social*, 55-80.
- White, L. (2003a). On the nature of interlanguage representation: Universal grammar in the second language. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 19-42.
- White, L. (2003b). *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge: CUP
- Zimmer, K. (1984). On the function of post-predicate subject pronouns in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics conference* (pp. 195-206).
- Zimmer, K. (1976). Some constraints on Turkish causativization. In Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. New York: Academic Press.
- Zwanziger E, Shanley E. M., & F. Genesee (2005). Cross- linguistic influence in bilingual acquisition: subject omission in learners of Inuktitut and English. *Journal of Child Language, 32*, 893-909 doi:10.1017/S0305000905007129

Uzun Özet

Bu çalışma Türkçe-İngilizce 5 yaşındaki iki dilli ve 4 yıl 11 ay yaşındaki tek dilli bir çocuğun adilli ve adilsiz cümleleri nasıl kullandıklarını araştırmaktadır. Amaç Hulk ve Müller (2000) hipotezine göre İngilizceden Türkçeye doğru diller arası bir etkilenme olup olmadığını ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bazı araştırmalar bir dilin morfo sentaks özelliklerinin başka bir dilin gelişimini etkilediğini gösterirken, diğerleri ise böyle bir etkilenmenin olduğunu ortaya koyamamaktadır. Bu çalışmada farklı morfo sentaks özelliklere sahip olan Türkçe ve İngilizce gibi iki dile sahip bir çocuk araştırılmıştır. Çalışmaya katılan iki çocuğa da 3 farklı görev verilmiştir. Bunlardan ilki resim tasviridir. Bu aktivitede çocuklara bir kahramanın ailesiyle geçen bir gününe ilişkin 13 farklı resmi tasvir etmesi istenmiştir. İkincisinde ise öğrencilerden sınıflarında anlatılan bir hikâyeyi tekrar anlatmaları istenmiştir. Üçüncüsünde ise serbest diyalog formatında bir günlerine ilişkin konuşmalar kaydedilmiştir. Kayıtlar yazıya dökülerek, çocukların kullandıkları morfem sayısı Brown'ın morfem sayma kuralına göre (1973) belirlenmiştir. Daha sonra cümle başına düşen morfem sayısı belirlenerek, dil kullanımına yönelik saptamalar yapılmıştır. Tek dilli

çocuğun daha çok morfem içeren cümleler kullandığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Cümlelerde bağlama göre doğru şekilde adıl düşümleri hesaplanırken ise doğru olarak kullanılması ya da kullanılmaması gereken adıl sayısı yanlışlara oranlanarak bir değer bulunmuştur. Çalışmada ele alınan iki araştırma sorusu şu şekilde cevap bulmuştur. İki dilli ve tek dilli çocukların zorunlu özne konumunda adıl kullanmaları ve kullanmamaları arasında nitel olarak bir fark bulunmamıştır. İki dilli çocuğun, tek dilli çocuğa benzer şekilde adıl kullandığı verilerle ortaya konmuştur. Araştırma, Hulk ve Müller'in hipotezinin destekleyecek şekilde İngilizceden Türkçeye doğru herhangi bir diller arası etkilenme olduğuna dair bir kanıt ortaya koyamamıştır. Çalışmanın sonucu Zwanziger et al. (2005) ve Hinzelin (2003) çalışmalarıyla benzer olduğu ortaya konmuştur. İki dili çocuğun özne adillerini doğru şekilde atması ve kullanması bu çocuğun Türkiye'de gerçek iletişim alanlarında dile uzun süre maruz kalması ile açıklanabilir. Maruz kaldığı süre boyunca sentaktik ve pragmatik bilgiyi doğru şekilde kavramasını ve kullanmasını sağlayacak dilsel deneyimi yaşamıştır. Çalışma aynı zamanda nicel olarak ta iki dilli ve tek dilli çocuk arasında adıl kullanım açısından ortaya bir fark koymamıştır. Bu da Sorace (2005)'in yetersiz veriye maruz kalmadan kaynaklanabileceği iddiasıyla açıklanabilir. Ancak çalışma iki dilli çocuğun pragma-sentaks arasındaki ilişkiyi doğru şekilde kurduğunu ve dili edindiğini göstermiştir. İki dilli çocuk doğru bağlamda doğru adıl düşümü ve kullanımını başarılı şekilde yerine getirmiştir. Bulunan sonuçları, iki dilli ve tek dilli çocuğun yaşları ve Türkçenin iki dilli çocuk açısından maruz kalınan veride daha etkin rol oynamasına bağlamak mümkündür. Müller ve Hulk çalışmasında daha küçük yaşlarda çocuklar için geliştirilen hipotez yaşları yaklaşık 5 olan çocuklar için geçerli olmadığı görülmüştür. Bu durum Meisel (1989) tarafından şöyle açıklanmıştır. İki dilli çocukların ürettiği dilde gözlemlenen kural dışı yapılar erken yaşlarda mümkün olsa da bu durum ileri yaşlarda ortadan kaybolabilir. Bunu destekleyen çalışmalar ise bu çalışmadaki çocuklardan daha küçük olanlarıyla yapılmış olan çalışmalardır. Hinzelin (2003), Zwanziger ve ark.(2005) ve Hacohe & Schaeffer (2007) çalışmalarında sırasıyla 2;10, 3;09, 3;04 yaşlarında çocuklardan toplanan verilerin analiz sonuçlarında Hulk ve Müller'in hipotezini doğrulayacak sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra iki dilli çocuğun özne adillerini bağlamsal olarak doğru şekilde düşürüp ve kullanması otantik ortamda yaşıyor olmasından kaynaklandığı sonucu çıkarılmıştır. İki dilli çocuk okul ortamında İngilizceden çok Türkçeye maruz kalması edinimin hızlanmasını sağlamıştır. Türkçe'ye maruz kalması aynı zamanda pragmatik olarak iletişim dilini adillerin kullanımını ilerletmiştir.

Bilindiği üzere diller arası yapısal ve bağlamsal etkileşim iki dilin aynı anda ediniminde kaçınılmaz bir sonuçtur. Ancak Meisel'e (2001) göre iki dilli çocukların ürettikleri yapılar pozitif veriye yeterince maruz kalındığında ortadan kalkacaktır. Bu nedenle iki dilli eğitim esnasında adıl kullanımında yapılan hatalar öğretmenler tarafından doğru şekilde yorumlanmalıdır. İki dil edinim sürecinde yapılan adıl hataları gelişimin etkin bir parçası olarak görülmeli ve nihai hata olarak algılanmamalıdır. Türkçeden örnek verecek olursak, Kornfilt (1984) ve Özsoy (1987) özne kullanımını sınırlayan etmenler yapısal değildir; bağlamsaldır. Bu nedenle, iki dilli çocukların pozitif veriye maruz kalma süreleri ve kalitesi bu özelliğin edinimini direkt etkileyen faktördür. Bu özellik sınıfta öğretmenin direkt öğretimi ile öğrenilmesi neredeyse imkansızdır. Dil kullanımlarının otantik materyaller yardımı ile uygun şekilde sunulması ve öğrencilerin gerçek ortamlarda veya gerçek ortama yakın bağlamlarda dili kullanması mümkün kılınmalıdır. Adillerin yapısal ve bağlamsal olarak doğru kullanımın zaman alabileceği ve pozitif veriye maruz kalınarak öğrenilebileceğine dikkat çekmek gerekmektedir. İki dilli çocuklarla çalışan öğretmenlerin, öğrencilerin yapısal ve bağlamsal farklılıkları içselleştirmeleri için gerekli materyalleri kullanmalarının, bu farklılıkları sınıfta açıkça öğretmekten daha etkin olacağı ortaya çıkmıştır. Türkçe ve İngilizce gibi özne adıl kullanımı birbirinden farklı etmenlere göre değişen iki dillin aynı anda ediniminin ortaya çıkaracağı bu hatalar öğretmenler tarafından bilinçli şekilde ele alınmalıdır. Bu tür hataları düzeltmek için de etkin hata düzeltme yöntemleri geliştirilmeli ve öğrencilerin gelişmekte olan ara dil döneminde olduğu düşünülmalıdır.