



## THE INVESTIGATION OF PREPARATORY CLASS STUDENTS' USE OF SUBJECT PRONOUNS AND POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES

Inst. Orhan Ataman  
Düzce University  
Düzce- Turkey  
[orhanataman@duzce.edu.tr](mailto:orhanataman@duzce.edu.tr)

Instr Gökhan Çetinkaya  
Düzce University  
Düzce- Turkey  
[gokhancetinkaya@duzce.edu.tr](mailto:gokhancetinkaya@duzce.edu.tr)

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate English learners' use of pronouns and possessive adjectives in speaking in an "English as Foreign Language" (EFL) context. Participants of this study were preparatory class students who were from different levels and who studied at Duzce University in 2015-2016 academic year. To collect the data, 43 students' speaking exams records, which were recorded at different times of the academic year, were transcribed and analyzed by the researchers. As a result of the analysis, it was found out that students use first person singular subject pronoun "I" and possessive adjective "my" appropriately and much more frequently than other Subject Pronouns (SP) and Possessive Adjectives (PA). In addition to that, from a progressive perspective, it was found out that ELT students use all the pronouns and possessive adjectives appropriately, so it is concluded variety in use of SP and PA correlates with students' levels.

**Keywords:** English, speaking, pronouns, possessive adjectives.

### INTRODUCTION

How languages are learned and what affects or not this process of acquisition has attracted researchers not only in the field of first language acquisition but also in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Hulstijn, Ellis, & Eskildsen (2015) summarize the issue clearly as follows:

"One of the central issues in understanding phenomena of second language acquisition (SLA) concerns the question of whether, and to what extent, universal stages can be identified in the route along which the morphosyntactic structures of second languages (L2s) are acquired, regardless of learners' first language (L1), the learning setting (e.g., tutored vs. untutored acquisition), or learner characteristics such as age, literacy, or motivation" (p. 1).

Pieneman (2015) claims that "L2 systems develop in an orderly manner (while allowing for a degree of variability)" (p. 125), and the programmed nature of languages are shown as an evidence for such kind of orders (Lowie & Verspoor, 2015). There are many studies that have shown that learners go through a series of predictable stages in their L2 development, even the learners who speak different L1s follow similar patterns when they acquire the features of the L2 (Cancino, Rosansky, & Schumann, 1978; Lightbown, 1980; Meisel, Clahsen, & Pienemann, 1981; Ortega, 2009). VanPatten and Williams (2007) support these studies claiming that learners' speech often follows predictable paths with predictable stages in the acquisition of a given structure. Similarly, Long (1990) suggests that learners of different ages, with or without instruction, in foreign and second language settings, follow similar developmental sequences for such items as English negation. Some other research has also shown that learners who study L2 as a course go through the same developmental stages as children learn their L1 in respect of spontaneous language use, rather than metalinguistic knowledge (Ellis, 1989; Weinert, 1994).



On the other hand, it may be difficult for learners to acquire some properties of L2, which are different from L1, especially in a foreign language environment in which L2 is not the medium of communication. One of different features of languages is the pro-drop parameter (or null-subject parameter) which was proposed by some researchers such as Chomsky (1981), Jaeggli (1982), and Rizzi (1982). Pro-drop languages allow subject pronouns to be omitted. These languages like Japanese, Spanish and Turkish exhibit the [+pro-drop] value of the parameter. Some other languages -such as English and French- which do not allow pronominal subjects to be dropped off in finite clauses have [-pro-drop] value. That is to say, subject position in English cannot be empty, whereas it may in Turkish as shown in the following example:

English: She is a hardworking student

Turkish: Çalışkan bir öğrencidir . \*(she) is very hardworking' (Kuru-Gönen,2010).

Similarly, in Turkish there is no need to state an explicit PA necessarily because Turkish is an agglutinative language and the possessive meaning can be obtained by adding suffixes. Since Turkish and English have different features in these senses, in this study it is aimed to investigate the emergence and developmental stages of Turkish learners' use of Subject Pronouns (SP) and Possessive Adjectives (PA) in speaking in an English as Foreign Language (EFL) context. The research questions can be stated as follows:

What are the developmental stages of Turkish EFL learners in speaking in terms of their use of SP and PA?

What are the frequencies of use of SP of Turkish EFL learners with different proficiency levels?

What are the frequencies of use of PA of Turkish EFL learners with different proficiency levels?

What are the wrong and missing uses of SP and PA of Turkish EFL learners with different proficiency levels?

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

In this study, qualitative research methods were employed, and the study design is a case study which aims to perform in-depth analysis of a group in a case (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). In this study, 43 students' speaking exams, which were recorded during the oral exams, were transcribed and analyzed by the researchers in terms of students' use of "Subject Pronouns and Possessive Adjectives."

### **Participants**

Participants of this study were preparatory class students who studied at Düzce University in 2015-2016 academic year. Maximum variation sampling method was used in order to gather information from students who were at different proficiency levels. So, participants' proficiency levels could be classified under four categories according to criteria stated in the speaking exam rubric as follows; poor, average, good and advanced.

13 of the participants could be labeled as "poor" students since some of them responded only to personal information questions in phrases hesitantly, the others had difficulty in understating the questions, they mostly answered in simple phrases with a limited range of grammar and vocabulary or they sometimes tried to make full sentences. 12 of the students could be labeled as "average" students. Those students could understand most of the questions and they tried to convey messages with an effort to make full sentences displaying some control over simple tenses, and also they had enough vocabulary to convey messages. Another group of students, which included 12 of them, could be labeled as students with "good/satisfactory" proficiency level. Students in this group could answer the questions and expressed themselves satisfactorily mostly at sentence level using a variety of tenses with occasional grammar errors, they could provide justifications and explanations on familiar and unfamiliar topics.

Finally, the fourth group of students, who were labeled as “advanced” learners, were actually students of English Language Teaching (ELT) department. There were 6 students in this group, and it should be noted that they had studied English for three years at high school before they became university students. They were really good at English compared to other participants of this study, but they failed in the proficiency exam to go on their major, so they had to take one-year English preparatory class.

### **Data Collection Tool**

It is important to note that data was not gathered from only one speaking exam, but rather with a progressive aspect, it was obtained from three different exams, the first of which was given in December 4, 2015; the second was given in January 15, 2016; and the last one was given in April 1, 2016. As for the number of the recordings with regard to exams; there were 20 students’ oral exam records from the first speaking exam, 11 students’ oral exam records from the second speaking exam, and finally 12 students’ oral exam records from the third speaking exam. As a result, it can be stated that the data obtained from three different exams increased the validity and reliability of the data and provided the richness and variation of sampling. As for the process of oral exams, students took two pieces of paper from a box, and they chose one of the questions after reading them. Then, they had some time to consider and to get ready to talk about the topic. Students were expected to make as many sentences as possible at the beginning, and then to answer the questions addressed by the instructors.

### **Data Analysis**

Data was analyzed using descriptive analysis and considering different perspectives. First, students’ English proficiency levels (except for ELT students) were determined by both analyzing all the transcriptions according to the criteria explained above and taking students’ oral exam scores into consideration. In addition to that, researchers formed an opinion and set ground about the research subject in this first stage for the following stages. Then, frequencies of the use of Subject Pronouns and Possessive Adjectives were determined separately for all groups. Also, missing and correct / wrong use of SP and PA were noted and coded in. After that, these frequencies and codes were used to determine the common usage patterns of SP and PA belonging to the participants of the same group. Finally, after determining the shared tendencies within the same group, the similarities and differences between different groups were analyzed to establish connections among the findings pertaining to different groups.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

In this part, firstly findings about the use of every SP are presented and discussed one by one with frequencies and quotations regarding the students’ English proficiency levels. Then, findings belonging to PA are presented and discussed on the basis of frequencies. Finally, findings about the students’ mistakes are presented and discussed on the basis of quotations.

Table 1: Frequencies of Subject Pronouns

|      | POOR (13) | AVERAGE (12) | GOOD (12) | ELT (6) | TOTAL (43) |
|------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------|------------|
| I    | 129       | 221          | 380       | 170     | 900        |
| HE   | 20        | 19           | 19        | 1       | 59         |
| SHE  | -         | 7            | 10        | 14      | 31         |
| IT   | 22        | 32           | 75        | 38      | 167        |
| WE   | 10        | 7            | 28        | 39      | 84         |
| YOU  | 22        | 22           | 30        | 22      | 96         |
| THEY | 2         | 4            | 12        | 49      | 67         |



As can be seen in Table 1, in the oral exams by far the most frequently used SP by the students is first person singular "I". It should be noted that there is a huge difference between the frequencies of the most frequently used SP "I" ( $f=900$ ) and the second most frequently used SP "it" ( $f =167$ ). That mostly stems from the large number of the questions which somehow required personal information; such as, students' own life experiences or preferences about the topics. Here are some sample questions addressed to the students in the exams;

What do you do to stay healthy? (1<sup>st</sup> mid-term)

What is your dream neighborhood like? (1<sup>st</sup> mid-term)

What activities did you do when you were a child? What games did you play? (2<sup>nd</sup> mid-term)

What places would you like to see? Why? (3<sup>rd</sup> mid-term)

How do you choose your food? (3<sup>rd</sup> mid-term)

Since many of the questions inquire personal information, it is quite natural to get such a high frequency of first person singular SP. In addition, analysis of the transcriptions revealed that nearly all of the students used first person singular SP "I" appropriately when they really used it, which means they neither got confused nor made mistakes in choosing appropriate Subject Pronoun when they wanted to talk about themselves. The below quotations which belong to a poor level student show that he used "I" appropriately when he talked about himself even if some of the questions did not directly address him using second person singular "you".

Student: (Reads the question) Which country would you like to visit? Why? What can you do there? I would you like to visit Germany. Because I like cold place. And I like weather.

Instructor2: What else do like about Germany? Is it just the weather?

Student: I don't understand you.

Instructor2: Is it just weather that you want to visit Germany? What else? Which cities are famous?

Student: I can see my cousin.

Instructor2: Uh-huh.

Student: I can see Roseberg.

Instructor1: What is it?

Student: Roseberg is a neighborhood.

Instructor1: Why do you want to see it? Is it a famous neighborhood?

Student: I don't all know.

...

Instructor2: What's your plan in Erasmus? If you go?

Student: I go Erasmus, hmm, I can see other culture and I can see new place and new peoples, people.

Instructor2: What about education?

Student: I can learn all related language.

Instructor2: Or do you want to go with Erasmus just to travel other countries?

Student: (laughs.)

Instructor2: What's your plan for holiday?

Student: I going to İstanbul and I hang out with my friends.

However, it must be stated that, as can be seen in Table 1, frequencies of use of "I" (Poor  $f =129$ , Average  $f =221$ , Good  $f = 380$ ) increase as the students' proficiency levels go higher excluding ELT students since the number of the students in this group is half as many as the number of students in other groups. In other words; students in the poor group used "I" less frequently than other students did, and students in the average group used "I" less frequently than good students did. Examination of transcriptions reveals that there can be two possible reasons for this issue. Firstly, some of the poor students finished the exam in a very short time because they stated they did not have anything to say about the topic or they just could not speak during the exams. As a result, they formed less sentences and they had shorter conversations than students in other groups did. Secondly, many poor students responded to questions in phrases without making full sentences and using subject pronouns. So, it is thought to be another factor that can cause the differences between the groups in respect of use of



first person singular SP "I". The below quotations which belong to a poor level student show that he had difficulty in understanding some of the questions and he mostly gave just one-word answers, then he also wanted to end the conversation.

Instructor 2: OK, what is your topic?

Student: Twenty-seven.

Instructor 2: Could you please read it for me?

Student: ...

Instructor 2: Could you please read it?

Student: What is the best way to travel to another city/country? Why?

Paris. Because very nice city. My friend... I like very love a city.

Instructor 1: How do you go there? How? How can you go? What is the best way to travel?

Student: Best way?

Instructor 2: Can you go Paris on foot?

Student: Yes.

Instructor 2: On foot. Really?

Student: Yes.

Instructor 1: What is the best way? By bus; plane, train, biking?

Student: Airplane.

Instructor 1: Why? Why not bus?

Student: Very short, most... very nice.

Instructor 1: But it is very expensive

Student: Yes, I know. But...

Instructor 1: What is bad about train?

Student: ...

Instructor 1: What is bad about train or good about train? Or bus, or airplane?

Student: Bicycle. Because, you can see a everywhere. It is easy.

Instructor 2: By bicycle?

Student: Yes, very cheap. That is all.

Instructor 2: What about bus?

Student: I think... That is all.

The second most frequently used SP in the oral exams is "it" ( $f = 167$ ) as can be seen in Table 1. Students usually used "it" in the warm-up part of the oral exams. At the beginning of the oral exams, instructors sometimes asked about the written part of the exam or they talked about the weather as warm-up. And that is the most probable reason for its high frequency of use. Students responded to these questions by using "it" appropriately. In addition, most of the students used "it" to refer things and concepts when they needed to do so. On the other hand, just as in the case of use of "I", frequencies of use of "it" (Poor  $f = 22$ , Average  $f = 32$ , Good  $f = 75$ ) increase as the students' proficiency levels go higher. In addition, examination of the transcriptions revealed that many students used it just a few times but two ELT students and two good students most often used "it". Their use of "it" is seen in the quotations below.

(ELT) Student: ...for example; when teacher give us very much homework, it can cause problem because... students will not do homeworks and if they do homework, it is not willingness it is unwilling we will do... and we do unwilling this homework it is not us ... it doesn't support us ... and it is harmful for us but teachers don't give us very much homework.

(Good) Student: Sometimes people talk on the phone loudly and it is noisy. I think it is mostly about education and it is about family.

(Good) Student: I think New York is the best town in the world because it is never sleeps. I want to see Times Square because it is colorful. It is light all, every time.

As for the use of "you" which has the total frequency of 96, it is seen that frequencies do not differ according to students' English proficiency levels (Poor  $f = 22$ , Average  $f = 22$ , Good  $f = 30$ , ELT  $f = 22$ ). Analysis of transcriptions revealed that, students mostly used "you" in phrases like "thank you, see you, you're welcome, how about you?, can you repeat that, please?". Among all the students, only one ELT student used "you" in order to make her speech more formal and to avoid talking about her own personal preference, which is seen in the quotations below.

ELT Student: Disadvantages of distance learning. Firstly, distance learning refers to online learning as far as I know. If I... a student of online learning, first I get insufficient feedback because you only watch monitor one tutor in this lesson and you... you'll be able to haven't any friends because of it is not school area, only in the Internet and you, you can't contact with their, their students only you talk about your tutor. ... on the internet you cannot ask all over the things, only you ask, um you send email about you ask, about your question.

As can be seen in Table 1, the frequencies of "we" are quite low in poor and average groups (Poor  $f = 10$ , Average  $f = 7$ ), and just a little higher in other groups (Good  $f = 28$ , ELT  $f = 39$ ), and total frequency is 84. When the transcriptions were analyzed, it was seen that only one student in poor group used "we" when he described his neighborhood in his hometown and talked about the people living there. As for the average group students, again, just one student used "we", and she talked about the activities that she did with her friends. A few of the students in the good group used "we" several times, but again only one student used it one after another to talk about the activities he did with his friends. Finally, two ELT students used "we" for 35 times, while the total frequency of use of "we" in this group was 39. Both poor and ELT students' use of "we" can be seen in the excerpts below.

Poor Student: We have a lot of park. We ... we are playing football match. We are playing football. And, erm... We have a lot of dogs and...

ELT student: I like doing homework because if we don't... if we don't do homework, we don't know and we can't know anything very well. And it can cause some problems about our lessons and about exams. For example, teachers do not give us homework, we can't do exams and maybe we fall, we will not pass the exam and it cause problems. Homework is really benefit because teachers want to reinforce items and if we do not do homework, we can't learn really well. For example, if we know vocabularies very well we will understand units very well, and we will not face any problems. But if we don't learn these vocabularies it can cause problems not only on these exams but also our learning places. For example, we go to abroad and if we don't know vocabularies, it can cause problems. We can't speak.

The total frequency of use of "they" is 67, and it was hardly ever used by poor and average students (Poor  $f = 2$ , Average  $f = 4$ , Good  $f = 12$ ) and good students used "they" 12 times in the oral exams. Many of them were used to refer to families in the warm-up part of the oral exam. Therefore, it is seen that most of them were uttered by ELT students (ELT  $f = 49$ ). Examination of the transcriptions revealed that three ELT students used "they" 43 times, while the other three ELT students used only 6 times. One of the students who used "they" quite frequently talked about people with sleep disorders and the other one talked about people who have disabilities. In the excerpt below, it is seen that the student used "they" appropriately to refer to people who have disabilities.

ELT Student: People who have disabilities, they can feel themselves set because their disabilities... Because they are not normal people. They have always challenge, they have always a struggle because this make them hopeless and they feel themselves liveness. But... this way they cannot walk as we do. So, they can't maybe see but I think this not an obstacle for them. Because, they have big dreams with disabilities. Because, they are I think they are more eager for doing, for achieving something than us. Because they have big dreams.

As for the use of "he" which has the total frequency of 59, it is seen that frequencies do not correlate with students' English proficiency levels (Poor  $f = 20$ , Average  $f = 19$ , Good  $f = 19$ , ELT  $f = 1$ ). Analysis of transcriptions revealed that, one student from poor group used "he" 17 times when he talked about a hero, and another student used "he" 3 times to refer to an author. Several students in the average and good groups used "he" to talk about their favorite singer, teacher, friend or hero. Both average and good students' use of "he" can be seen in the excerpts below.

(Average) Student: ... he is short and black hair. He is short and fat. He is from Kars. He is generous and he is listen to rap and listen to - I listen to rap.

(Good) Student: He say something, I understand him. I enjoyed his class  
Instructor 1: What does he do in the class? What does he do in the class?  
Student: He is tells stories, erm and he can talk a lot.  
Instructor 1: Does he speak in Turkish too?  
Student: No, he speaks English. He understands Turkish huh?

Finally, the least frequently used SP is "she" which has the total frequency of 31. The frequencies in respect of the group levels are as follows: Poor  $f = 0$ , Average  $f = 7$ , Good  $f = 10$ , ELT  $f = 14$ . One student from the average group used "she" to talk about her favorite movie star, two students from good group used "she" to refer to their friends. One ELT student used "she" 13 times to give an example while she was talking about people with disabilities. So, this is the same student who used "they" frequently, as well. Göksel and Kerlake (2005) suggest that "the third person pronouns (he/she/it) are not used as frequently as other SP since they do not often give clear identification and a more explicit SP is used more often" (p. 273). Both average and ELT students' use of "she" can be seen in the excerpts below.

Average Student: My favorite movie star is, ermm, she is beautiful, she is... She is honest, she never lies. Erm, she is outgoing.

ELT Student: For example, a blind girl maybe more hardworking than me. Because, she want to try... She want to try something overcome. She has dream, she has hopes, she has goal and...  
... Yes, she needs help. However, she is so cheerful and she has big hope. But, she needs help.

When it comes to students' use of possessive adjectives (PA), as can be seen in Table 2, the most frequently used PA is "my" in all groups (Poor  $f = 27$ , Average  $f = 45$ , Good  $f = 108$ , ELT  $f = 20$ , Total  $f = 200$ ). In addition, it should be noted that frequencies of use of "my" increase as the students' proficiency levels go higher excluding ELT students. These findings are remarkable in that they are quite similar to the findings of the use of first person singular SP "I", which also had the highest frequency and increasing tendency with respect to groups' proficiency levels.

Table 2: Frequencies of Possessive Adjectives

|       | POOR (13) | AVERAGE (12) | GOOD (12) | ELT (6) | TOTAL (43) |
|-------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------|------------|
| MY    | 27        | 45           | 108       | 20      | 200        |
| HIS   | 2         | 3            | 7         | 0       | 12         |
| HER   | 0         | 1            | 2         | 5       | 8          |
| ITS   | 0         | 0            | 0         | 1       | 1          |
| OUR   | 0         | 0            | 0         | 10      | 10         |
| YOUR  | 0         | 0            | 3         | 3       | 6          |
| THEIR | 0         | 0            | 0         | 8       | 8          |



It is also quite notable that there is a great difference between the frequencies of use of "my" and other possessive adjectives. Even, it can be said that the students in poor, average and good groups either hardly ever or literally never used the other PA. For instance, poor students did not use "her, its, our, your, their" even for once in their speech during the oral exams. They used "his" just for twice. Students in average group never used "its, our, your, their" and they used "his" just for three times and "her" only for once. Students in good group never used "its, our, their". They used "his" for seven times, "her" twice and "your" three times. As for the ELT students, analysis of the findings shows that their use of PA (except "my") frequencies are both higher and varied than other groups. For example, ELT students used "our" ten times and "their" eight times, whereas students in other groups never used them.

Another issue that is investigated in this study is the wrong or missing uses of SP and PA. When the transcriptions were examined in this respect, it was seen that good and ELT students used all the SP and PA correctly, whereas few students in poor and average groups made several mistakes. In some cases, these students did not use the required SP or PA. In other cases, these students got confused about choosing the correct one between "I" and "my". Such confusion was not observed for other PA because, as can be seen in Table 2, they did not attempt to use other PA. In the quotations below, all the wrong and missing uses of SP and PA are presented.

#### **Poor Students**

Instructor: Do you have a girlfriend?

Student (9): ... Don't have girlfriend.

Instructor: Why do you want to visit USA?

Student (9): Because ... very big school.

Instructor: OK. So, what is your plan after the exam?

Student (22): I'm plan is. .... (speaks in Turkish: bir şey yok)

Instructor: You are from Bursa and your family?

Student (28): Erm, family is living Bursa.

Instructor: We are OK. Mustafa, how was the exam yesterday?

Student (30): Good. I work. I work but, come questions my not study, my not understand.

Instructor: What is your major?

Student (37): Major? I'm major is Tourism management.

Instructor: So, your family is?

Student (39): Live, lives in Ankara.

Instructor: Your major is?

Student (39): Major is kitchen.

#### **Average Students**

Instructor: OK. Do you remember your teacher, your literature teacher at high school?

Student (1): I remember. He name is ...

Instructor: Do you read poems?

Student (1): Yes. Love poems.

Instructor: You have a troubled life?

Student (5): Sometimes have troubles.

Instructor: Do you have any favorite place to eat in Düzce?

Student (6): I favorite eat place Pastacı and Gani.



Instructor: So your major is Tourism?  
Student (10): I'm major is International Trade.

Instructor: Do you like your classroom? Your class? Your friends?  
Student (40): Yes, I like class and class friends.  
Instructor: OK. So, how is your level? How do you think is your level?  
Student (40): Level, erm, beginner, elementary.  
Instructor: Your level is?  
Student (40): Your level is,erm, I level is elementary.

## **CONCLUSION**

As a result of this study, it was seen that first person singular SP "I" is by far the most frequently used one, and its counterpart "my" is the most frequently used PA during the oral exams. It is thought that this is partly because of the question types that required personal information from the students (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Another similarity in the use of "I" and "my" is that; frequencies of both "I" and "my" increase as the students' proficiency levels go higher. At this point, it can be suggested that the higher the students' levels get, the more sentences they make and the longer conversations they have with the instructors during the exams. In addition to that, as the students' proficiency levels go higher, they can express themselves better by making full sentences more often rather than respond in phrases.

Students often used "it" to refer to written part of the exam and to talk about weather. As for the use of "you" it is usually used in phrases such as like "thank you, see you, you're welcome, how about you?". The other SP were used quite less frequently. Some of the students in almost every group used them several times when they needed. Nonetheless, it is important to note that a few good students and ELT students used them one after another to explain a topic or to give an example. (There is only exception for this in the transcriptions, and it is for the use of "he" which was used frequently by one of the poor students. However, his speech only consisted of responding to questions that already included "he".) Therefore, it can be claimed that there is a common use of SP pattern for students with high level of proficiency. That is to say, when they start to explain a topic by using any SP, they usually keep using the same SP throughout the conversation. And, this is again related to the capability of expressing himself or herself and being able make full grammatical sentences including SP.

Finally, it can be suggested that students in poor and average groups seldom get confused about the use of "I" and "my" and they seldom ignore using SP in their sentences. These mistakes are quite rare in these groups, it is notable that good students and ELT students have not made such kinds of mistakes in their speeches. Therefore, as an answer to the research question, it can be concluded that students whose L1 (Turkish) allows subject pronouns to be omitted are aware of [-pro-drop] value of English which does not allow omission of SP. This suggests that L1 does not have an effect on L2 acquisition. As Lightbown and Spada (2006) explain, the transfer from L1 cannot explain the accuracy order of L2 since research reveals that learners from different L1 backgrounds follows a similar order and even similar to the acquisition of the same language as L1. Another characteristic of high-level students' speech with respect to use of SP is that they use various SP for varied reasons; such as, they may make their speech more formal and avoid talking about their own personal preference by using "you", even when talking about themselves they may use "we" instead of "I" to make their speech sound more general. Similarly, when it comes to the use of PA, students with high level of proficiency again show more variety in the use of PA in their speeches. As a result, it can be suggested that use of SP and PA emerge at the beginning of language learning process, however, variety in use correlates with students' levels.



**WJEIS's Note:** This article was presented at 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on New Trends in Education - ICONTE, 18- 20 May, 2017, Antalya-Turkey and was selected for publication for Volume 7 Number 3 of WJEIS 2017 by ICONTE Scientific Committee.

## REFERENCES

- Cancino, H., Rosansky, E., & Schumann, J. (1978). The acquisition of English negatives and interrogatives by Spanish speakers. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 207–230). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht:Forris.
- Ellis, R. (1989). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? A study of the classroom acquisition of German word order rules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 305–328.
- Göksel, A. and C. Kerslake. (2010). *Turkish, A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Hulstijn, J. H., Ellis, R., & Eskildsen, S. W. (2015). Orders and Sequences in the Acquisition of L2 Morphosyntax, 40 Years On: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Language Learning*, 65(1), 1–5.
- Jaeggli, O. (1982). *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Forris.
- Kuru-Gönen, S. İ. (2010). Pro-Drop Parameter and L1 Transfer: A Study on Turkish Speakers of English. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 115-133
- Lightbown, P. M. (1980). The acquisition and use of questions by French L2 learners. In S. Felix (Ed.), *Second language development: Trends and issues* (pp. 151–175). Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Lightbrown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed). Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 649–66.
- Lowie, W. & Verspoor, M. (2015). Variability and Variation in Second Language Acquisition Orders: A Dynamic Reevaluation. *Language Learning*, 65(1), 63-88.
- Meisel, J., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3, 109–135.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder.
- Pienemann, M. (2015). An Outline of Processability Theory and Its Relationship to Other Approaches to SLA. *Language Learning*, 65(1), 123-151.
- Rizzi, Luigi. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Foris.
- VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weinert, R. (1994). Some effects of a foreign language classroom on the development of German negation. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 76–101.



White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]*. Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Yayınevi.