

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

**An Analytic Approach to Language Learning Problems:  
Preserving L1 Structure**

Jon Ayter  
2012, Ankara

## Abstract

The term SLA is frequently used to refer to the learning of another language (2nd, 3rd) after acquisition of one's mother tongue is complete, the term is also used to refer to the study of how people learn a second language (Ellis and Barkhuizen, 2005). The process of second language acquisition has been studied by several researchers. (Krashen 1987; Doughty & Williams 1998; Ellis 2001; Gass 2001) For instance, Bley-Vroman and Joo (2001) uses a sentence-picture matching test to measure the comprehension of the participants and Gass (2001) measures the learner's reaction time to stimuli to determine the status of learner's L2 knowledge.

This study aims to exhibit the difficulties of native English speakers in translating into Turkish. Acquired structures and phonological inventory profoundly affect translation process in terms of basic structural differences between mother tongue and second language (Campell, 1998). The meaning of 'language' and which interpretation of 'second' that you choose dictates what you call learning – the appropriate learning theory and the research design (Cook, 2006). In total, thirty sentences are assembled which have salient the characteristics of Turkish language are presented to the participants in English. It is seen that native speakers who have acquired English as a mother tongue confront with difficulties in terms of tense aspects, vowel harmony and embedded clauses within the sentences owing to the typological classification and the parameters in respect to word order. All models of language processing assume processing limits (Caplan, 1992; Gernsbacher, 1990; Just & Carpenter, 1992; Martin, 1993). In order to display these challenges thirty sentences are distributed equally to investigate each of these linguistic problems that entail phonological and grammatical competence.

*Keywords:* Applied linguistics, language learning, learning Turkish as a second language, comparative typology.

## **Table of Contents**

Abstract	i
Content	ii
1) Introduction	1
Literature Review	1
Background Information	2
Outcomes	6
2) Research Questions	7
3) Methodology	8
Data collection	8
Data analysis	14
Limitations	17
4) Conclusion	18
5) References	19

## 1) Introduction

Applied linguistics is an umbrella term which covers a huge variety of areas focusing on the language and language use in actual life. “Whenever knowledge about language is used to solve a basic language-related problem, one may say that A[pplied] L[inguistics] is being practiced. AL is a technology which makes the abstract ideas and research findings accessible and relevant to the real world; it mediates between theory and practice.” (Kaplan and Widdowson 1992:76) We have stated above that AL is an interdisciplinary field which covers many subfields beneath it. These areas are; second language acquisition, forensic linguistics, language testing, corpus linguistics, lexicography, dictionary making, language translation and second language writing research. Though these areas do not regard themselves as applied linguistics, it is an undeniable fact that their work clearly addresses practical language issues. Our study is based on second language acquisition. We all know that this area has been one of the central fields in applied linguistics history. There are certain stages in language acquisition whether it is first language or second. (Lightbown & Spada, 2001). None of the languages in the world are exactly same with each other, however; there are both similarities and differences in terms of grammar rules which affect the acquisition of second language in a negative way. In this study, we have exhibited the difficulties of Native Americans in terms of speaking Turkish as a second language. It is seen that native speaker who have acquired English as a mother tongue confront with difficulties in terms of tense aspects, vowel harmony and embedded clauses within the sentence owing to the typological classification and the parameters in respect to word order.

### 1.a) Literature Review

Second language acquisition is a type of study that how learners create a new language system only limited exposure to a second language. (Gass&Selinker,2001) Second language acquisition is generally examined in this study regarding the effects of mother tongue on foreign language. SLA is a considerably new interdisciplinary field when compared to the other disciplines. Theoretical Linguistics, education, pedagogy, psychology, neurolinguistics, intercultural communication, and many other fields contribute to the field of SLA at different rates. The developments in SLA research have been of several kinds. While many researchers

focus their attention on how L2 learners develop the ability to perform speech acts, and explain the psycholinguistic processes which underlie L2 acquisition and use other researchers have given attention to the social factors which effects the L2 development. The studies on SLA are variable and also L2 process has been studied by many researchers (Krashen 1987; Doughty & Williams 1998 ; Ellis 2001; Gass 2001) For instance, Bley-Vroman and Joo (2001) uses a sentence-picture matching test to measure the comprehension of the participants and Gass (2001) measures the learner's reaction time to stimuli to determine the status of learner's L2 knowledge. The studies on this area of course not limited to these ones we have stated above. There are many studies working in the area of native language interference on the target language. Dulay et al (1982) define interference as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. Lott (1983: 256) defines interference as 'errors in the learner's use of the foreign language that can be traced back to the mother tongue'. Ellis (1997: 51) refers to interference as 'transfer', which he says is 'the influence that the learner's L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2'. In learning a target language, learners construct their own interim rules (Selinker, 1971, Seligar, 1988 and Ellis, 1997) with the use of their L1 knowledge, but only when they believe it will help them in the learning task or when they have become sufficiently proficient in the L2 for transfer to be possible.

## **1.b) Background Information**

### **1.b.a) Vowel Harmony**

Vowel harmony is basically a co-occurrence restriction on vowel features in successive syllables. (Crothers, 1980)

In simple terms, vowel harmony is a law which governs co-occurrence of vowels within a span of utterance, nearly always the word. Thus, vowels are classified into separate harmonic sets. In this most general form, vowel harmony dictates that the vowels of a word must belong to the same harmonic set. Which set is chosen is determined by a particular morpheme in the word.

Thus vowel harmony is something that Turkish has that Hungarian and Mongolian as well as Finnish, also have; we have probably heard that some African languages have a form of it, and maybe some African Indian languages, of which Nez Perce is probably the most notorious (at least for readers of the Sound Pattern of English). (Vago, 1980)

Vowel harmony represents a cluster of consistent properties that go together, such that if we were to find certain criterial ones in a new language, we could expect to find the other, consequential, ones as well. (Crothers, 1980)

Turkish has eight vowels, paired along three phonetic dimensions. As shown above within a Turkish word the vowel harmonizes along the dimensions of palatality and labiality.

- sekiz ‘eight’
- çocuk ‘child’
- güzel ‘beautiful’
- oda ‘room’
- ev-ler-in ‘of the houses’
- göl-ün ‘of the lake’
- kız-lar-ın ‘of the girls’
- kutu-lar-in ‘of the houses’

The rules can be informally given as follows:

- Palatally harmonic:
  1. The vowels the vowels in a word agree in palatality.
- Labiality harmony:
  1. A high vowel must agree with a preceding vowel in labiality.
  2. a low vowel in a non-initial syllable may not be labial. (Vago, 1980)

### **1.b.b) Embedding Clause**

One clause may be embedded within another, that is, it may be used as a constituent part of another clause. Such a clause is called an embedded clause (or a subordinate clause) and the clause within which it is embedded is called the matrix clause. The embedded clause is a

constituent of the matrix clause. A clause that could occur on its own as a sentence is called a main clause.

In the following examples the embedded clauses are given in boldface; each of the matrix clauses is also a main clause:

- The boy **who came** is his cousin.
- I told him **that I would go**.
- He left **when the bell rang**.

The three kinds of embedded clauses illustrated here are a relative clause (who came), a noun clause (that I would go), and an adverb clause (when the bell rang). Note that embedded clauses are usually marked in some way, e.g., by the initial who, that, and when in the above sentences." (Ronald Wardhaugh, *Understanding English Grammar*. Wiley, 2002)

In a nutshell, hypotaxis is characterized as a relationship between clauses, an interdependency relationship in which neither of the clauses is a constituent part of another, whereas embedding is a nominalizing device, a mechanism of rank shift in which a clause comes to function as a constituent part of another (Halliday 1987: 73, 1994: 242). For example, the subordinate clauses in the sentences I couldn't come because I was sick and John thought that Alice wouldn't come are in a hypotactic relation to the main clause; they are dependent on it but not constituents of it. Embedded clauses, on the other hand, have undergone a shift in rank from clause level to group level; they function as groups or parts of groups, 3 in the following functions only (Halliday 1994: 242)

- head of a nominal group (e.g. It is obvious that Jeff wrecked the car)
- post-modifier in a nominal group (I saw the car that Jeff wrecked)
- post-modifier in an adverbial group (He came earlier than we had expected)

### 1.b.c) Present Tense and Progressive Aspect

The present tense is used in following situations:

1. To make general statements:
  - Water boils at 100 degrees. – Su 100 derecede kaynar.
2. To mention things which are done regularly:
  - I go out every Friday. – Her Cuma dışarı çıkarım.

The suffix for constructing the present simple tense of a verb is not always the same. The suffix is sometimes -ir, sometimes -er. This is the only tense with this irregularity, but there are certain rules that will tell you which one to choose most of the time.

1. If the verb ends with a vowel, the vowel of the suffix falls and you add only -r.
  - ara-r --> arar --> he calls
  - oku-r --> okur --> he reads
2. If the verb has more than one syllable, use -ir
  - kapat-ir --> kapatır --> he closes
  - konuş-ir --> konuşur --> he talks
3. If the verb has only one syllable:
  1. If the vowel of this syllable is 'a' or 'e' and if the verb ends with 'l', 'n' or 'r' then use -ir
    - gel-ir --> gelir --> he comes
    - ver-ir --> verir --> he gives
  2. Use -er for the other single syllable cases
    - git-er --> gider --> he goes
    - koş-ar --> koşar --> he runs

In Turkish, progressive meaning can be given by using present simple tense structure. The verbs which have progressive meaning are stative verbs such as understand, agree, promise, prefer. Sentences below are further examples:

- You look fine. – İyi görünüyorsun. (Instead of saying ‘You are looking fine.’)
- It smells like a rotten egg. - Çürük yumurta gibi kokuyor. (Instead of saying ‘It is smelling like a rotten egg.’)
- I don’t deserve this – Bunu haketmiyorum (Instead of saying ‘I am not deserving this.’)

### **1.c) Outcomes**

In this study, our main target is to indicate the obstacles of native English speakers in Turkish learning process and to show how the grammatical competence of the native language affects second language learning.

Transfer of rules from one language to the other is not a new hypothesis put forth here. It was first proposed under the name of ‘interference’ constituting a basis for grounds of contrastive analysis, and later new theorists, some of whom, being involved in the language teaching themselves, have renamed the process calling it ‘ language transfer’. (Bada, 1989)

## **2) Research Questions**

1. What sort of impacts do the grammatical baselines of the primary language (English in this case) have on the second or secondary language (Turkish in this case) that the individual learns?
2. If so, on what occasions do such impacts occur?

### 3) Methodology

#### a) Data Collection

A significant amount of the data for this analysis is gathered from the provided translation questionnaire for the participants. The underlying purpose of this method is to observe the translation preference of the participants without any possible interference that may cause the participant to be either unsure about what the first thing that springs to the mind and provide a biased output information, or may, in simple terms, confuse the participant in the process of decision making on the translation.

A total of fourteen participants were asked to fill the provided questionnaire. The most predominant parameter in choosing the participants is that the participants should have acquired English as primary or as native tongue and should be in the process of learning Turkish as a second or secondary language. The period of learning process is also taken in consideration in order to classify and provide a rationale analysis outcome, and only those who have been learning Turkish for 1 to 2 years are chosen.

Other essential information regarding the participants that is necessary to state on behalf of the baseline of the analyzing the research are, among the fourteen: a) as regards to the conveying of the data from participants to the observers; three of the participants handed in the questionnaire by hand whereas eleven conveyed their questionnaire via internet. b) as regards to the educational degree of the participants; all participants at least either have a Bachelor of Arts degree on Economic Studies, or on Humanities, or is currently continuing education. c) as regards to the range of age of the participants; participants are among the age of 19-28. d) as regards of the gender of the participants; six participants are males whereas eight participants are females.

In the provided questionnaire, participants are asked to translate the English utterances that are formed by bearing in mind the tense aspects, vowel harmony and embedded clauses may cause the participants to rely on their linguistic competence on structure of language of their primary language during the translation process.

Total of thirty sentences were asked to be translated by the participants. Among the thirty sentences, ten was picked in an attempt to observe the translation preferences on the present tense aspect in Turkish language, ten for the observation of the compliance to the vowel harmony of Turkish language and ten for the embedded clause formation with agglutinating structure of the Turkish language. Sentences were intentionally formed as beginner levels in order to be able specifically focus on what the research aims onto.

In the vowel harmony division of this research, participants are expected not to obey to the vowel harmony criteria as their native language does not imply such a phonologic constraint in their native tongue.

In the embedded clause formation division of this research, participants are expected to form sentences that are embedded by using free morpheme subordinators such as ‘ki’ instead of participle ‘-DIK’, as the morpho-syntactic alignment of Turkish and English differ in the sense of inflections and agglutinations.

In the tense aspect division of this research, participants are expected to form sentences relying on their native tongue criterion, regardless of the Turkish aspects. Participants are expected to form sentences in simple present tense instead of progressive aspect.

The following ten sentences were formed in order to observe the translation preferences of the participants on the vowel harmony criteria

- (1a) There are apples in the basket.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’, or not. Since the Turkish equivalence of the word apple is ‘elma’, which contains a back and front vowel, it is expected for the participant to be unsure about the suffix formation regarding the vowel harmony.*

- (1b) Can you see the fruits in the basket?

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in both the plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’ or in the locative case suffix ‘-DA’.*

- (1c) I have got books.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’, or not.*

- (1d) There are cars on the street.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in both the plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’ or in the locative case suffix ‘-DA’.*

- (1e) Are your parents coming from the USA?

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in both the plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’ or in the abblative case suffix ‘-DAn’.*

- (1f) I have got pens.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’, or not. Since the Turkish equivalence of the word pen is ‘kalem’, which contains a back and front vowel, it is expected for the participant to be unsure about the suffix formation regarding the vowel harmony.*

- (1g) Traffic lights are broken.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’, or not.*

- (1h) My children are coming.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’, or not.*

- (1i) Students are walking on the sidewalk.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in both the plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’ or in the locative case suffix ‘-DA’.*

- (1j) My furniture is coming from Turkey.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is obeying to the vowel harmony criteria in both the plural marker formation with the suffix ‘-lAr’ or in the abblative case suffix ‘-DAn’.*

The following ten sentences were formed in order to observe the translation preferences of the participants on the embedded clause formation criteria. Complement clauses are formed specifically in order to analyze a specific participle suffix ‘-DIK’.

- (2a) I learned that Gökçe had come.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2b) Ali stated that Tolga had worked hard.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2c) Hakan said that Alperen had studied for the exam.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2d) I knew that he would lie.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2e) I felt that the storm was coming.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to*

*translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2f) I learned that you have moved here.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2g) It seems that it's going to rain soon.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2h) I think that she's not coming.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2i) It seems that he's buying a car.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

- (2j) I learned that it is forbidden to smoke here.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant is tending to translate this sentence by keeping the subordinator in Turkish as well, or not, by using a participle suffix instead.*

The following ten sentences were formed in order to observe the tense or aspect preference of the participants in the translations.

- (3a) My children feel like stars.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3b) She reminds me of my wife.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3c) He always annoys me.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3d) These guys look dangerous.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3e) The house looks like expensive.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3f) The pie looks delicious.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3g) The children seem happy now.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect. A time implication has been added in order to specify the results.*

- (3h) He feels sick.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3i) It seems like sunny.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

- (3j) The curtain feels like silk.

*This sentence is formed in order to analyze whether the participant has comprehended the sentence as a statement given in simple past tense or a progressive aspect.*

## b) Data Analysis

When examined the output provided by the participants via the questionnaire, the logical inferences below can be considered:

### b.1) Compliance to the vowel harmony criteria in translation

Compliance to the vowel harmony criteria in translation											%
	(1a)	(1b)* <sup>1</sup>	(1c)	(1d)	(1e)	(1f)	(1g)	(1h)	(1i)	(1j)	(P)
P01	-	-/+	+	-/+	-/-	-	+	+	-/+	-/+	46,6%
P02	-	-/+	+	-/+	-/+	-	+	+	-/+	-/+	53,3%
P03	-	-/+	-	+/+	+/-	-	+	+	-/+	+/+	60,0%
P04	+	+/+	+	+/+	+/+	-	-	-	-/+	-/+	66,6%
P05	+	-/+	+	+/+	+/+	-	+	+	-/+	-/+	73,3%
P06	+	-/+	+	+/+	+/-	+	+	+	-/+	+/+	80,0%
P07	-	+/+	+	+/+	+/-	-	-	-	-/+	-/+	53,3%
P08	-	-/+	-	+/+	+/-	-	+	+	-/+	+/+	60,0%
P09	-	-/+	+	+/+	+/+	-	+	+	-/+	-/+	66,6%
P10	+	-/+	+	+/+	+/+	+	+	+	+/+	+/+	93,3%
P11	-	-/+	-	+/+	+/-	+	+	+	-/+	+/+	66,6%
P12	-	+/+	-	+/+	+/-	-	+	+	-/+	+/+	66,6%
P13	-	-/+	-	+/+	+/+	-	-	-	-/+	-/+	46,6%
P14	+	-/+	-	+/+	+/+	+	+	+	+/+	+/+	86,6%
%(1)	35,7%	21,4%	57,1%	85,7%	85,7%	28,5%	78,5%	78,5%	14,2%	50,0%	

\* - Higher percentage indicates higher compliance.

\*<sup>1</sup> - In observation of the translation of the word 'in basket', it has been observed that participants did not obey the lenis/fortis harmony instead of the vowel harmony. ('sepette' instead of 'sepette')

It has been observed in the output that Turkish learning Americans tend to comply with the phonological baselines of the Turkish language.

This output contradicts the presupposition of this research, which claimed that Turkish learning Americans would heavily contravene with the vowel harmony criteria of the phonological baselines of the Turkish language. However, it can also be observed that the compliance lowers drastically on the words that have both a front and a back vowel in it, a phonological condition that seems to have confused the participants.

Further limitation on given input should be taken into consideration. Detailed information about the limitations will be provided at the end of the methodology section of this research.

**b.2) Preference of forming embedded complement clauses by using participle suffixes**

<b>Preference of forming embedded complement clauses by using participle suffixes</b>											<b>%</b>
	(2a)	(2b)	(2c)	(2d)	(2e)	(2f)	(2g)	(2h)	(2i)	(2j)	(P)
P01	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,6%
P02	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,6%
P03	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	20,0%
P04	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,6%
P05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	6,6%
P06	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	26,6%
P07	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	6,6%
P09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	6,6%
P10	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,3%
P11	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,3%
P12	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100,0%
P13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P14	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	20,0%
%(2)	35,7%	57,1%	7,1%	57,1%	14,2%	7,1%	7,1%	35,7%	14,2%	7,1%	

\* - Higher percentage indicates higher compliance.

By examining the output above, it can be said that Turkish learning Americans tend to form embedded clauses not by using participle suffixes but by using subordinators. This inference can be interpreted as Turkish learning Americans are more likely to depend on their linguistic competence or constraints that implies the usage of subordinators when forming embedded

clauses and ignoring the agglutinative structure on most occasions, thus countersigns one of the presuppositions of this research.

**b.3) Differentiating the use of past simple tense from the present progressive aspect**

Differentiating the use of past simple tense from the present progressive aspect											% (P)
	(3a)	(3b)	(3c)	(3d)	(3e)	(3f)	(3g)	(3h)	(3i)	(3j)	
P01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P04	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20,0%
P05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P06	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,6%
P07	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P10	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,6%
P11	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,3%
P12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0%
P14	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,3%
%(3)	0,0%	21,4%	28,5%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	7,1%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	

\* - Higher percentage indicates higher compliance.

By examining the last output table above, the research makes its point clear on that Turkish learning Americans most likely to translate the simple past tense sentences without regarding the present progressive aspect, and thus profess a glide in modality of the tense.

Even though the sentence (3g) is marked with a time impeccant, participants ignored the aspect modality of the utterance. This shows the research has the right point to claim that Turkish learning Americans tend to ignore the specific aspects related to Turkish language and stay dependent on their structure of own language.

As a result of the investigation;

- Mean of 53,5% of the participants conveyed the vowel harmony criteria,
- Mean of 24,2% of the participants preferred the use of suffix participles in embedding clause formation,

- Mean of 5,7% of the participants differentiated the simple past tense from the progressive simple aspect.

### **c) Limitations**

In spite of the fact that the research was carried out by thirty sentences separated into three in regards of the three different sections that the analyze covers, a more accurate analyze report could be given by consulting numerous participants. Participants could be of: a) speaking different languages rather than English or Turkish as their native tongue, so that what the other structural differences of languages have impact on language learning could be investigated, b) yet more, so that the percentages could reflect a more real state of affair pertaining to the language learning domain.

In addition to that, with more time for the analyze, a deeper analyze on the differences of impacts that grammatical features of certain languages have in language learning could be provided.

As regards of the vowel harmony criteria, various words that have more complex phonologic and phonetic structure could be given in the questionnaire in order to give a more definite and accurate analyze report on the issue.

#### 4) Conclusion

In this study, it is stated that native English speakers face with challenges that can be subtle or clear and this situation is related to their competence in respect to grammar and phonology.

Considering the vowel harmony, it is expected to be observed overgeneralization which is based upon the accustomed phonological inventory of Americans. However, statistics exhibits that it is not possible to get through a definite result through this assessment as mentioned in the limitations. Consequently, further researches are possibly focused on the validity of previous presuppositions about this vagueness.

Next, embedded clauses are consistent with the expected results that show us English speakers prefer explaining the meaning of the sentences by more words to add suffixes that indicates the significant influence of typological differences between English language and Turkish language.

Finally, the data that confirms our suppositions in terms of present tense shows that English speakers translate state verbs into Turkish language directly regardless of frequently used Turkish aspects.

It is anticipated prospective studies that entail translation, language education within the frame of linguistics will reveal more information based upon the parameters between Turkish and English languages.

## 5) References

- Anderson, Stephen R. (1980). Problems and perspectives in the description of vowel harmony. In R. Vago (ed.), *Issues in Vowel harmony*, pp 1-48. John Benjamins, Amsterdam
- Bada, E (1989). Çukurova University Interference: Turkish Case-markers Transfer to English Prepositional Utterances
- Campell, S (1998), *Translation into Second Language*. Vol: 3, New York: Addison Wesley Longman
- Crothers, J and Shibatani, M. (1980). "Issues in the Description of Turkish Vowel Harmony". In *Issues in Vowel Harmony*, 63
- Connor, U (1989). Review of Juliane House, and Shoshana Blum-Kulka 'Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp 337-338
- Cook, V.J. (2006), 'Interlanguage, multi-competence and the problem of the "second" language', *Rivista di Psicolinguistica Applicata* VI, 3, 39-52
- Cook, V.J. (2007), 'The nature of the L2 user', in L. Roberts, A. Gurel, S. Tatar & L. Marti (eds.) *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 7, 205-220
- Cook, V.J. (2008), 'Linguistic contributions to bilingualism', in J. Altarriba & R. Heredia (eds), *An Introduction to Bilingualism: Principles and Practice*, Erlbaum, 245-264
- Kern, Richard G. (1994). The Role of Mental Translation in Second Language Reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, pp 441-461.
- Vago, Robert M. (1980). *Issues in Vowel Harmony*