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1. Introduction

This study is an application to examine interlanguage of Turkish speakers of English in terms of auxiliary verb usages. Using Construction Grammar as a framework, it investigates how similar or how appropriately Turkish speakers of English can produce the auxiliary verb constructions in regard to tense, aspect and voice usages. To be able to provide complete and precise information, native speakers of American English were also involved in the study as a base line. The data were collected by a questionnaire which was designed to encourage the participants to license the auxiliary verb constructions.

Auxiliary verbs were chosen as the subject of the study, due to their high incidence in normal, everyday speech. In addition, not all auxiliary verb constructions have a particular correspondence in Turkish grammar which might cause Turkish learners of English to use the auxiliary verb constructions inappropriately.

Construction Grammar was chosen as the framework because, the cross language character of this study made it necessary to be supported by a system that would cover all aspects of the languages, and Construction Grammars’ holistic character was very suitable for study. Construction Grammar is a rapidly growing and pioneering theory which describes language concepts with all dimensions, and its great scope provides a useful frame for first language and second language studies.
Initially, the theoretical underpinnings of Construction Grammar will be described in order to provide the reader with background to understand the study. Also, because of its great link to Cognitive Grammar, Construction Grammar and Cognitive Grammar theories will be explained in terms of their common features. Since this study is concerned with second language acquisition, interlanguage theory and transfer theory will be explained in terms of their relation to Construction Grammar. In addition to these theoretical explanations, notation devices of Construction Grammar will be introduced and how the constructions can be represented in box diagrams and attribute value matrices will be explained in the following section. As the last theoretical information, auxiliary verbs will be explained in terms of Construction Grammar. The Turkish equivalents of auxiliary verb constructions will be introduced in this section as well. After the theoretical background of the study, the design of the study will be explained in the methods section. In the succeeding section, results for finite verb type usages, and tense, aspect and voice usages among auxiliary verb constructions will be provided. Then a discussion section will follow and provide detailed information about the findings of the study.
2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Construction Grammar

Construction Grammar theory was developed in the 1980’s by linguists Paul Kay, George Lakoff and Charles Fillmore. It attempts to describe how speakers can use a given language successfully, what the speakers need to know in order to be successful, and how this knowledge helps them figure out the rules of that language. Kay (1995, p. 171), defines the model this way: “The Construction Grammar is a non-modular, generative, non-derivational, mono-stratal, and unification based grammatical approach, which aims at full coverage of facts of any study without loss of linguistic generalizations within and across languages”. In other words, the non-modular feature of Construction Grammar (Const-G) does not allow us to detect grammatical structures as separable form-meaning units. The unification based theory in Construction Grammar looks at the grammatical units in terms of their characteristic structures, and describes how they match or unify with the other characteristics of other units. When Croft (2005, p. 273), was describing Const-G, he intentionally pointed out the relationship of Const-G with Cognitive Linguistics stating that “Construction Grammar is a term that describes a family of theories of syntactic representations found in Cognitive Linguistics and which has attracted considerable interest outside Cognitive Linguistics as well.” With the development of Cognitive Semantics, which investigates word meaning and the sentence
meaning in terms of structure of concepts, in 1975 the idea of Construction Grammar was prompted, because both Const-G and Cognitive Linguistics seek to understand what is going on in a speakers’ mind as s/he produces language. Also, another common feature of these studies is that semantics takes an important place in both of the studies. Thus, Const-G and Cognitive Linguistics are greatly linked to each other.

2.2. Construction Grammar and Cognitive Grammar

Cognitive Grammar (Cog-G) and Construction Grammar (Const-G) are two theories which have many characteristics in common. As Langacker (1991, p. 8) states that “…anything statable in construction grammar has a direct analog in cognitive grammar.” Croft (2005, p. 275) demonstrates the shared concepts of the two theories and claims that the two share many theoretical concepts that cannot be found in any arbitrarily chosen theory of language, even though different labels are given to the same concepts in each theory (See Chart1).

Chart 1, Terminological Correspondences between Const-G and Cog-G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Grammar</th>
<th>Cognitive Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical construction</td>
<td>Grammatical construction; (constructional) schema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>Sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantiation</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Composite structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before explaining how these terms correspond, the relationship between Const-G and Cognitive Grammar will be explained here. Cognitive Linguistics tries to account for how people comprehend, recognize, organize and acquire the knowledge of language, whereas Const-G investigates how language might be represented in the speakers’ mind for the purpose of giving an accurate picture of the psycholinguistic reality of language (Brodal, 2001, p. 2). In Const-G, grammatical constructions are abstract form-meaning units in the speakers’ mind and constructs are concrete representations of constructions. For example, knowledge of an idiom and its meaning is in an abstract template form in the speakers’ mind and the concrete expression of that certain meaning in a particular structure is called construct. With respect to Cognitive Grammar, Langacker (1991, p. 532) asserts that schemas conceive the rules of languages as a plausible connectionist interpretation which is readily envisaged. Also, a composite structure in Cognitive Grammar reflects an integrated system formed by coordinating its components in a specific, often elaborate (expanded) manner (Langacker, 1987, p. 489). Construction Grammar uses the term licensing to express using knowledge of an abstract entity (construction) to produce a concrete language expression, whereas, Cognitive Grammar uses the term sanction to express the motivation afforded a novel structure by the conventional unit of abstract units of a grammar (Langacker, 1987, p. 492). Finally, Instantiation is used in Const-G as a particular realization of an abstraction or function of an element, as if using and abstract element as a model to recognize the new element, whereas according to Langacker (1987, p. 71) “Elaboration in Cognitive Grammar is simply a special (though perhaps privileged) type of transformation, an adjustment: in the
level of specificity at which a structure is characterized.” For example, *dog* elaborates *animal* and *a* elaborates *vowel* as a group in the speaker’s mind.

In the introductory chapter of their book *Cognitive Grounding of Construction Grammar*, Ostman and Fried (2004, p. 1) introduced the original tenets of Const-G, which had been developed by Fillmore. According to Fillmore, there are four bases of construction grammar.

I) It should be generative and thus formalizable; (which means a particular system can explain how all possible language rules are formed.) (*Explanations are mine.*)

II) It should integrate different domains or components of grammar; (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics, especially semantics and syntax need to collaborate very well)

III) It should be grammar with universal impact, (which means a grammar which is legitimate for all languages)

IV) It should be consistent about what we know about cognition and social interaction; (construction grammar and cognitive grammar are in a strong association especially in terms of semantics)

As it has been proposed by the tenets, and in many other scholarly articles, Construction Grammar has to be consistent with Cognitive Grammar. The inventory of constructions, which includes morphemes or words, idioms, partially lexically filled and fully abstract phrasal patterns, is understood to be learned on the basis of the input together with general cognitive mechanisms (Goldberg, 2003, p. 5). Analyzing language
in terms of constructions enhances our understanding of cognitive linguistic features in general.

Previous studies are devoted to the development of construction grammar as a system in which we can describe, examine and generate all linguistic constructs of languages in a single grammatical system. In cognitive linguistics, the grammatical construction is defined as a conventional symbolic structure involving a syntagmatic combination of morphemes or larger expressions (Lungacker, 1987, p. 82). In Construction Grammar, although it seems that Const-G focused on form (syntax) and content (semantic) aspects of units, the form covers more than just syntax because it also accounts for phonological components, such as prosody and intonation. Also, the content covers semantic as well as pragmatic meaning. Therefore, form and meaning pairs have fundamental functions in Const-G studies.

2.3. Form and Meaning Pairs in Construction Grammar

A construction consists of a form and a meaning, or a function, connected with that form (Brodal, 2001, p. 2). Also, as mentioned before, one of the original tenets of Const-G is that it should incorporate components of grammar; and both Const-G and Cognitive Grammar suggest that constructions are incorporated in both syntax and semantics. Therefore, constructions have two sides; forms and meanings. The relationship between form and meaning, between what formal approaches differentiate as syntactic and semantic ‘components,’ is taken as basic and inherent in any grammatical
unit (Ostman & Fried, 2005, p. 4). When a person is learning a language, s/he acquires the concepts of the grammar of the language through a form-meaning mapping process which is very much linked to frequency of happening of that structure to express the same meaning (Robinson, & Ellis, 2008: 517). If there is an agreement in a language community on this idiosyncratic form-meaning pairing, then that pairing has become a convention of the language community (Brodal, 2001, p. 2). Everybody agrees that the liquid that we use to rinse or wash things is water, or the idiom *piece of cake* expresses easiness of something. So basically, there are conventional structures in languages, and people use them to express specific meanings. Thus, Const-G equally assigns both the syntactic and the semantic features of constructions, as Ostman and Fried (2005, p. 5) explained, the weight of syntax’ and semantics’ role on Const-G by proposing that “Const-G did not elevate syntactic form to being a backbone of grammar, nor did it relegate semantics to a waste-paper basket status.”

Languages are not just oral and written communication tools; they are representation agencies of worlds of speakers’ minds, and these agencies are more likely to present similarities among people who share the same language. Still, the agencies can present similarities across languages as well. According to Kay & Fillmore (1999: 1), “Cross-language generalizations are captured by the architecture of the representation and by the sharing of abstract constructions across languages.” This explains that there are two kinds of sharing: one is a grammatical system, and the other is a cognitive sharing. For example, the fact that all languages appear to have noun and verb (and, possibly, adjective) categories may be explained by the existence of corresponding basic semantic
categories (Goldberg, 2003, p. 4). The feature of Construction Grammar being tightly linked to Cognitive Grammar sets ground for first language acquisition and second language acquisition (SLA) studies, and recently, this has been a popular and rapidly growing study area. Parallel to the condition, the current study is also devoted to combining the SLA studies with the Construction Grammar Theory. Therefore, before presenting the cross language constructions of auxiliary verbs in Turkish and English, two SLA theories, transfer theory and interlanguage theory, related to the study, will be explained.

2.4. Construction Grammar and Interlanguage and Transfer Theory

In this section, to be able to understand what is happening in the second language (L2) learners’ mind, in terms of acquiring a foreign language, interlanguage theory will be explained firstly, and then transfer theory will be described in relation to speakers’ usage of a foreign language. Interlanguage is a term coined by Larry Selinker in 1972. Lexically the term interlanguage corresponds to ‘interim language’ which means temporary language. The interlanguage is a system which has been developed by a learner of a second language who is not fully proficient yet, but who is getting closer to the native like proficiency level in the target language. When an adult starts learning a new language, all the linguistic knowledge of the learner needs to be modified according to the new knowledge of target language. Thus an interface, between the notion of first language (L1) and the target language (TL), is developed in the speaker’s mind. In this interface, the learner not only preserves features of his/her L1 but also perceives the
target language rules and tries to absorb them. According to Slobin (1993, p. 242), “For the adult, construction of grammar often requires a revision of semantic/pragmatic concepts, along with what may well be a more difficult task of perceptual identification of the relevant morphological elements.” Selinker (1972, p. 210) claimed “… in a given situation the utterances produced by learners are different from those the native speakers would produce had they attempted to convey the same meaning.”

Two possible reasons for the deviations from native-like norms might be 1) a learner’s proficiency level or 2) interference resulting from features of the learners’ first language (L1). When the variation appears to be derived from the learner’s first language, this is often called negative transfer in second language acquisition studies. The development of transfer theory started with memory studies in the 1950s and 1960s. Since then, the role of transfer has taken a specific place in interlanguage studies and received constant attention in interlanguage pragmatics thus it took its place in the second language acquisition research, too (Kasper, & Schmidt 1996, p. 150). “Transfer refers to a form of crosslinguistic influence found in SLA and involves “carrying over of mother tongue patterns into a target language” (Siegel, 2003, p. 187). Basically the theory explains how the mother tongue (L1) of learners might affect their learning and using a second language. As Corder (1983, p. 29) proposed, “ the part played by the mother tongue in the acquisition of second language is a good deal more pervasive and subtle than has been traditionally believed.” However transfer does not just refer to inappropriate usage of L2, it also refers appropriate usages of L2 which derive from L1 of the learner. So, there are two kinds of transfer, negative transfer and positive transfer.
Negative transfer refers to misusages or different usages of new language properties not because of learners’ lack of competence but because of effects of their L1 pattern differences from the L2 patterns. Positive transfer refers to learners’ correct usages which occur not because of their high level of competence but because of similarities between their L1 and L2 patterns. In the light of transfer theory and interlanguage theory, Construction Grammar has been investigating how second language learners license the new language’s constructions. For example, because Turkish grammar does not contain articles (i.e., a, an, the), it is conceivable that a Turkish speaker might produce the following mistake in an attempt to say or write Mom fed baby (The mom fed the baby.)

From the perspective of Standard English, this is a grammatically incorrect usage lacking definite or indefinite articles, and “Construction grammar accepts a sentence as belonging to a language only if that language has a set of constructions that are combined in the same way as the sentence is represented” (Albi, 2008, p. 12). Further, Brodal (2001, p. 40) expressed the view that “Construction Grammar treats all linguistic entities alike, i.e. linguistic entities ranging from the abstract schematic complex construction, traditionally called sentences, to smallest morphological units, traditionally called morphemes”, and parallel to this explanation, the current study attempts to examine the usage of Turkish learners of English auxiliary verbs in terms of Const-G.

2.5. Notation Devices in Construction Grammar

Construction Grammar is a sign based grammatical model that is organized around the grammatical construction as the basic unit of analysis and representation
(Fried & Ostman, 2004, p. 12). As it was defined above, Const-G represents the constructions by signs and the most common way of representation is box diagrams. In the representation of constructions, each box corresponds to a construction and contains an attribute-value matrix (AVM), which provides detailed grammatical information about syntactic and semantic attributes of constructions. If a construct is composed of other constructs, each component is represented in an inner box diagram. The topmost attribute-value matrix of the construct gives detailed grammatical information about syntactic and semantic specifications of the construction and the other attribute-value matrices in the inner boxes give detailed information about the smaller constituents that the construct consists of.

In the attribute-value matrices, certain attributes may have certain specifications. For example, lexical category can be noun, adjective, verb, determiner, etc. and a lexical item can be a maximal expression or not.

As it is explained in the book, *Construction Grammars, Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions* (Ostman & Fried, 2005, p. 52) maximality is a lexical feature, and if a lexical item cannot be expanded more it means that the item in its maximal expression. If a lexical noun or pronoun unifies directly with a verb phrase construction, it must either have a lexical feature [+ maximal] or have no value for the maximal feature. In addition to that if they are mass type nouns they are not marked for maximality. The following examples show maximality and lexicality features of the verb *sing*. (Example is extracted from Fried and Ostman, 2004, p. 31. Explanation is mine).

a) [max +, lex +] maximal lexical predicate, e.g. *sang*
b) [max -, lex +] lexical predicate that must be expanded sung

c) [max +, lex -] maximal phrase predicate can sing

d) [max -, lex -] phrasal predicate that must be expanded been singing

Here, the specification [max +] signifies that the expression sang and can sing may not be expanded more because it is not possible to use them as –He has sang or -He will can sing; [max -] signifies that the element requires a phrasal companion because it is not possible to use them as – He sung or He been singing; [lex +] represent a lexical component while the [lex -] represents a phrasal component.

**Boundedness** is another attribute value which is specified according to certain properties shared by mass and plural count nouns, and **configuration** is specified based on the contrast between mass and countable nouns. The diagrams can also have some other values such as [ ], which means that the value was not specified for the attribute, and […] means the value was specified but not expressed. Also, when the attribute values of the components match, it is called co-indexication and that means the constituents unify.

Geeraerts and Cuyckens (2007, p. 485) show a simplified example of unification of a pronominal construction she and a predicate construction sing-s that has a valence requirement for a noun phrase construction.

a) she: [gf sbj] 

b) [NP sing-s]:[gf sbj] 

[person 3rd] 

[person 3rd] 

[number sg] 

[number sg] 

[gender fem] 

In the example, the verb requires a noun phrase construction whose grammatical
function is subject and is a 3rd person singular pronoun. Also, the pronoun construction shows that it has all the proper specifications to unify with the verb. If a speaker decides to use a plural pronoun that does not match with the valence requirements of the verb, there will be an inappropriately produced construction which does not belong to its own language system. Therefore, each construction must unify with the other constructions in terms of their attribute values requirements. Figure 1 shows a representation of a noun phrase construct, *a book*, which consists of an indefinite determiner and a noun.

![Box diagram for an indefinite determination of a noun phrase construct.](image)

As it was explained before, in Figure 1, the construct was represented by a box diagram. Since, the construct consists of two other constructs, there are two other boxes
in the outer box that represent the noun phrase construct. The first inner box represents the indefinite article *a* and the second inner box represents a noun. While the topmost attribute value matrix represents the noun phrase construct, the other attribute value matrices in the inner boxes indicate their attribute values. These attribute values match with each other.

In this example, the attribute value specifications show syntactic values of the noun phrase construct as *noun* for the lexical category (cat), and as a *maximal expression* for its maximality which means the phrase is in its maximal form and cannot be expanded more. Semantic values of the noun phrase indicate that it is a bounded, countable and a singular noun phrase. In the right inner box that shows attribute values for the indefinite article *a*, the article’s syntactic values are defined as determiner for its lexical category (cat), and specifier for its function. In this construct, the indefinite article has a valence requirement calling for specific values. The figure shows the noun should not be a maximal expression because the noun can still be expanded, and should be bounded, countable and singular. Thus, as it is indicated in the other inner box, the noun that constructs a noun phrase with the indefinite article has all required attributes of the indefinite article. It is denoted as the head of the phrase, not maximal, bounded, countable and as a singular noun.

In the following section, auxiliary verb constructions will be explained grammatically.
2.6. Auxiliary Verbs Constructions

Auxiliary verbs can have different meanings for different languages. For example, in English, Auxiliary Verbs (AV) provide more information about the following main verb both syntactically and semantically. They can be used to contribute progressive, perfect or passive meaning to the main verb, or to reflect the mood of the utterance. In Turkish, functions of AVs are fairly different. They are used to formulate a noun into a verb by coming after the noun or sometimes converting a transitive verb into an intransitive verb when there is no direct object. Therefore, the grammatical definition of auxiliary verbs is somewhat ambiguous. As Anderson (2006, p. 5) concluded in her study, there is no, and probably cannot be, any specific language-independent formal criteria that can be used to determine the characterization of any given element as a lexical verb or an auxiliary verb. Although the definition of auxiliary verbs is not the same for all languages, Anderson (2006, p. 7) defines auxiliary verb construction as “a mono-clausal structure minimally consisting of a lexical verb element that contributes lexical content to the construction, and an auxiliary verb element that contributes some grammatical or functional content to the construction.” For example, $X$ is $Ving$ $Y$ construction is an example of a present progressive construction. In English, construction $is$ $Ving$ functions as the verb phrase of the sentence. $Is$ and $–ing$ contribute a grammatical meaning to the construction. Although their own meaning is ambiguous, when they combine with a lexical verb ($V$), the meaning that they contribute to the verb phrase is not ambiguous anymore. $Is$ reflects that the subject is a 3sg pronoun, and when $is$ composes with $Ving$, the construction reflects that the situation or the action is current
and continuing. So it can be said that auxiliary verbs are usually functional and grammatical elements that provide functional and grammatical meaning to the lexical verb element. As Bybee (1998, p. 3) describes, “the grammatical constructions include variables that can range over smaller or larger classes of items.” For example, the AV *be* is used in AVCs such as *be*+*Ving* or *be*+*Ved*, and it can have inflections according to the number of subject, tense, aspect and voice of the sentence. Each inflection contributes another meaning and another function to constructions so that, in terms of Const-G, each particular form has a particular meaning and particular components that contribute to the construction. For example, from a grammatical perspective the *X is Ving Y* construction can be separated in parts. When *be* is alone, it might have different meanings and different functions in different forms, and when *Ving* is alone it might have different meanings and functions, too. However, Construction Grammar does not see the form and meaning units as separable, and from the perspective of the Const-G the *X is Ving Y* construction reflects that there is an action taking place at that moment, not in the past, not in the future, and the agent or the doer is 3rd singular pronoun (3rd SG), but the occurrence of the *Y* depends on the verb phrase and construction meaning. For example, the verb *sneeze* is defined as an intransitive verb in dictionaries, so it is used without an object, e.g. *She sneezed*. However, the situation changes according to the construction that the verb is used in, e.g. *She sneezed the napkin off the table*. (*The example was taken from the study of A. Goldberg, 1995, p. 6*) In the first sentence construction *X Ved* expresses an action that was performed by a 3rd SG pronoun, but had no effect on anything other than the doer; however, in the second sentence construction, *X Ved Y*
Prep. Phrase expresses that the action caused an object to move in a direction.

Also, some constructions proceed to other constructions, for example, *When I was making dinner, you came.* The *when/while X was/were Ving Y, X V ed Y* construction expresses a meaning that two actions happened simultaneously in the past. When the listener hears the first part of the construction, s/he expects that rest of the construction is built in past tense because the auxiliary verbs *was/were Ving* verb phrase refers to past time, and when they are combined with the adverbial particle, the rest of the construction is built in the past tense, too. Since auxiliary verbs are inflected according to time, aspect and voice, almost all tense constructions contain auxiliary verbs in English.

However, there are some restrictions based on semantic properties of lexical items, or the construction that the AVC occurs in, that might require a different formation of the AVC. For example, in English be+Ving usually can be applied to verbs that have an action meaning but the construction cannot be applied to stative verbs which have a situational and static meaning. For instance, “I love you”. Although the sentence has a continuous meaning, it reflects a situation because *love* is a stative verb. Therefore, AVCs with progressive aspect are not used with the verb *love*. As the numbers of AVCs differ across languages, their form and function also differ. By contrast the same example, “I love you” is formed in Turkish as “Seni seviyorum.” (Eq: I am loving you.) If the sentence is used in simple present form it means “I like you.”, so different languages use different tense and aspect to express the same meaning depending on the semantic interpretations of the verb in that language.

In Turkish, tense, aspect and voice are reflected by affixes, not by auxiliary verb
constructions. Turkish AVs are combined with nouns to create verb phrases. For example, the word *yardım* (Eq: help) is a noun and in order to use it as a verb the AV *etmek* is combined with the word *yardım* and together they produce the verb *yardım etmek* thus, *N + AV* functions as a verb in Turkish.

Also, an example of another type of restriction on AVCs comes from Turkish auxiliaries. The selection of dummy auxiliaries (the auxiliary verbs that actually do not have a real meaning but are used as a placeholder for a functional element or work as an expletive verb) by deriving verb stems based on the transitivity of the resulting predicate are seen in such phenomena as the distribution of *etmek* (transitive) and *olmak* (intransitive, reflexive, passive, ditransitive) in standard Turkish (e.g. *teslim etmek* ‘hand over, surrender sthg’ vs. *teslim olmak* ‘surrender self, capitulate’) (Anderson, 2006, p. 8).

The AV *olmak* is usually used as an intransitive verb or as a copula verb in Turkish. For example, Dileklerimi *kabul ettiler* (Eq: They accepted my wishes). Dileklerim *kabul oldu* (Eq: My wishes came true). Ben *zengin olacakım* (I will be rich.) Ben *zengin ettim onları* (I made them rich.)

### 2.6.1. Auxiliary Verbs in English

#### Primary Auxiliary Verbs

As Biber, Conrad & Leech (2004, p. 28) outline in their book, *Student Grammar Spoken and Written English*, English has three primary auxiliary verbs, *be, have* and *do*. They are used to reflect the tense, aspect and voice of the sentences and they take inflections according to the tense, aspect and subjects of the sentences. In Table 1,
inflected forms of the auxiliary verb *be* are illustrated.

Table 1

**Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb *be***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>Past tense</th>
<th>Progres. aspect</th>
<th>Perfect aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td>Was</td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You, we, they</td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>Were</td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He, she, it</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Was</td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb *be*.

In English grammar, the auxiliary verb *be* occurs in progressive sentences and in passive voice sentences. In progressive sentences, it comes before the main verb and the -ing suffix is added to the main verb. Thus, the verb phrase is formed as *be* *V*ing. In passive voice sentences, the auxiliary verb *be* is placed before the main verb and the main verb is used in its past participle form, so the verb phrase is formed as *be* + *V* past participle (*be* + *Ved*). Also, in both structures, the auxiliary verb *be* is inflected according to the subject of the sentence and the tense of the sentence. For example, progressive aspect: *I am eating* a hamburger. Passive voice: *I was given* a hamburger.

From the perspective of Const-G, these two sentences are considered as two different constructions, two different form-meaning pairings because Construction Grammar considers sentences as unique form-meaning units. In terms of the attribute values of progressive *be* construction, according to Paul Kay’s lecture notes (http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~kay/bConst-G/lec04.html), the progressive *be* is accepted.

---

1 In the rest of the study *Ved* represents the past and past participle form of verbs.
as a lexical item and its *lexical category* is defined as verb. It can function as an auxiliary verb. In addition to that, as it was illustrated in the previous example, the progressive *be* construction requires a complement verb in its present participle form (*am eating*), and the progressive *be* is inflected according to subject-verb agreement. In addition, the verb phrase is in its maximal expression, so it does not need any other verb components to function as a verb phrase of a sentence. On the other hand, in terms of semantic features, the construction is defined as not-stative. In the light of these attributes of the progressive *be* construction, in the example, the composition of *am* and *-Ving* particle reflects that the doer of the action is 1*st* SG, the speaker is the doer of the action, the action is present and it is continuous.

According to Kay’s lecture notes, that the verb *be* is followed by a verb in the past participle form, and can be inflected, according to subject-verb agreement of the construction. The verb phrase is defined as a maximal expression because *be*+*Ved* can be used as a verb of a sentence construction without another verb component. As exemplified in the previous passive voice example, the *was* + *Ved* composition contributed to the meaning that the subject was singular, the action took place in the past, and the subject was not the doer of the action, but it was the effected element by the action.
Table 2

*Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb* *have*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>Past tense</th>
<th>Present perfect progressive</th>
<th>Past Perfect progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, you, we, they</td>
<td>Have</td>
<td>Had</td>
<td>have been Ving</td>
<td>had been Ving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He, she, it</td>
<td>Has</td>
<td>Had</td>
<td>has been Ving</td>
<td>had been Ving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2, Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb *have*.

The auxiliary verb *have* is used to express the perfect aspect. It reflects the meaning that a process started in the past and it either has just finished or it still affects the present time. When the subject of the sentence is one of the 3rd singular pronouns, *has* takes place of *have*. Also, when the auxiliary verb *have* is used in the past tense, *had* takes place of *have*. Lastly, *have* occurs in both active and passive voice structures. For example,

In active voice: *I have made a hamburger.*

In passive voice: *The hamburger has been made by the worker.*

In past tense and passive voice: *The hamburger had been eaten by the dog when I came to table.*

In English, the perfect aspect and progressive aspect can occur together. When they occur together, *been* (the participle form of *be*) follows the auxiliary verb *have* and the main verb takes the progressive inflection *-ing*. For example, *I have been writing a book.*
When looked at from the perspective of Const-G, the construction that is licensed with the composition of auxiliary verb *have* and *Ved* reflects that the subject is not 3rd SG, that the action has started in the past, and is still effective or continuing. So, although the action started in the past, it still indicates a present meaning and a time span that starts in the past but continues to the present time. When the composition of *had* and *Ved* are used in a construction, they contribute to the meaning that the action happened in the past before another past event and it has no effect on the present time anymore. According to Kay (http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~kay/bConst-G/lec04.html), attribute values of the auxiliary verb *have* show that the auxiliary verb *have* syntactically has value of being a lexical item, and the lexical category of the construction is defined as verb, and it can function as an auxiliary verb. Besides that, it requires a complement verb in its past participle form, and the verb phrase construction has attribute of being a maximal expression.

Table 3

**Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb *do***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>Past tense</th>
<th>Progres. aspect</th>
<th>Perfect aspect²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, you, we, they</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Did</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He, she, it</td>
<td>Does</td>
<td>Did</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3, Inflected Forms of Auxiliary Verb *do*.

Grammatically, the auxiliary verb *do* occurs in simple present and simple past

---

² In African American Vernacular English the auxiliary verb *do* can be inflected for perfect aspect. For example, *She done gone* reflects the meaning of *She has left*. 
tense with the interrogative and negative forms of the sentences. If the subject of the sentence is 3\(^{rd}\) singular person, and the sentence tense is present, \textit{do} is inflected, and \textit{does} takes the place of \textit{do}. For example,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Do you like hamburgers?}
  \item \textit{No, I do not.}
  \item \textit{Does she like hamburgers?}
  \item \textit{No, she does not.}
\end{itemize}

In the past tense, when a negative or interrogative sentence is formed, \textit{did} (the inflected form \textit{do}) takes place. However, it does not take inflections according to subject of the sentence. For example,

\begin{itemize}
  \item In a negative sentence: \textit{I did not eat the hamburger.}
  \item In an interrogative sentence: \textit{Did you eat the hamburger?}
\end{itemize}

Since in positive simple past tense sentences, the auxiliary verb \textit{did} is not used, the tense is reflected by the main verb. If the main verb is an irregular verb, it is used in its idiosyncratic past form. If the main verb is a regular verb, it needs to be inflected by the suffix \textit{–ed}.

The attribute values of the auxiliary verb \textit{do} show that \textit{do} is a lexical item and its \textit{lexical category} is defined as a verb, and it can function as an auxiliary verb. The auxiliary verb \textit{do} also requires to be followed by complement verb which is in its base form, and also it cannot be followed by another auxiliary verb. The verb phrase which is licensed with \textit{do+V} is defined as a maximal expression. Thus it can function as a verb in a sentence construction. Also, like the other primary auxiliary verbs, \textit{do} also need to be
inflected according to subject-verb agreement of the sentence.

In the preceding section, primary auxiliary verbs, *be, do* and *have* were explained and exemplified in terms of their grammatical features and their constructional attribute values, and in the following section, modal auxiliary verbs will be explained and exemplified in terms of their grammatical features and constructional attribute values.

*Modal Auxiliary Verbs*

According to Biber (2004, p. 28), in English, there are nine modal auxiliaries, *will, can, shall, may, must, would, could, should, might*. They express possibility, necessity, prediction, ability, obligation, volition and permission, and they occur in all forms of the sentences, positive, negative and interrogative. Like the primary auxiliary verbs, modal auxiliaries take place before the main verb. Although they can combine with tense, aspect and voice, they are occupied differently from the primary auxiliary verbs, because modals also contribute modality to the meaning. For example, the modal *can* provides meaning of ability, possibility and permission, and the past form of the modal *can (could)* provides a past ability, possibility and permission besides being used to express the same meanings as *can* in a more polite way. Therefore, each modal has a particular meaning according to what construction they take place in.

As modals can take inflections according to tense, they can also take inflections according to aspect and voice of constructions. In terms of aspect, when they are used with perfect aspect, they give the sentence past meaning, as illustrated by Biber (2004, p. 183) In the following sentence: *Papa should have done it long before.*

In this sentence, the perfect aspect provides a meaning that the necessity of the event
occurred at some point in the past. Also, when modal auxiliary verbs are used with progressive aspect, they express modality or probability of an action which is in the progress at that time, as in: *He must be running* (Biber, 2004, p. 184).

Modals can be used in passive voice constructions in addition to in active voice constructions. In modal passive voice constructions, after the modal, the primary auxiliary verb *be* and past participle form of the verb (*Ved*) take place. For example: *The thieves must be caught*.

In addition to these grammatical explanations, Construction Grammar explains that the auxiliary verb *be* that follows a modal is used without any inflection, because in modal constructions, modals require to be followed by a verb complement which is in its base form. According to Kay (http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~kay/bConst-G/lec04.html), attribute values of modals show that they are lexical items and their lexical category is defined as verb, and they function as auxiliary verbs.

In English, in addition to modal auxiliary verbs, there are also semi-modal auxiliary verbs. Semi-modals are used differently than modal auxiliary verbs. When they are used in their positive forms they act like modals, but when they are used in negative or question forms they are used with auxiliary verbs according to their time meaning. For example, *used to – didn’t use to – did you use to…?*, *… is going to - isn’t going to – is she going to…?*, *have to – don’t have to – do you have to…?*, *had to – did not have to – did you have to*. The verb that comes after semi-modals is always used in zero infinitive form which is the simple form of the verb as it is used in modal constructions as in, I can swim. (*X modal Vpresent*) or I used to swim (*X semi-modal Vzero inf.*).
The semi-modals are constructed in active voice as $X$ semi-modal $V_{zero \text{ infinitive}} (Y)$, and in passive voice as $X$ semi-modal be $V_{pp} (Y)$.

To have a general idea of grammatical attributes of Turkish tense, aspect, voice and modality, the following section will explain how tense, aspect, voice and modality are expressed in Turkish.

### 2.6.2. Tense, aspect, voice and modality in Turkish

In Turkish, tense, aspect, voice and modality are expressed through grammatical morphemes. Particular suffixes or infixes are attached to verbs to signify the tense, aspect, voice and modality.

**Tense suffixes in Turkish**

- `-r`: Denotes the things always true or timeless. It also denotes habitual activity.
- `-di`: Denotes definite witnessed past.
- `-mis`: Denotes reportive, inferential or evaluative past.
- `-acak`: Denotes future tense.

Aspect suffixes:

- `-yor`: Expresses continuity and progressive aspect. It also can reflect a habitual activity or a truth.
- `-di / -mis`: Expresses perfect aspect.

**Passive Voice Infixes in Turkish**

In Turkish, the passive voice is reflected by adding one of the infixes `-il, -n, -in` to the verb stem. The passive voice infixes precede tense and personal pronoun suffixes.
-il: if the verb stem ends with a consonant.

-in: if the verb stem ends with ‘l’.

-n: if the verb stem ends with a vowel.

Modal suffixes in Turkish

-ebil / -abil: Expresses ability, possibility and permission, prediction, obligation and volition.

-meli / -mali: Expresses necessity, obligation

As it is introduced above, the past tense particle and the perfect tense particles are the same affixes. Therefore, in the following section, the two different usages of the affixes will be defined and exemplified.

Turkish past tense suffixes –di and -mis and their usage

-di

The suffix -di is used to denote definite witnessed past, present perfect or present with psychological verbs. Sezer (2001, p. 10) shows in the examples that although the forms of the affix -di is the same, its function is not the same every time.

Examples:

a) (past)   Dun  saat  beste  gel-di-m. (Italics are for emphasis.)

   *Yesterday*  clock  5-at  come-past-1SG

   Eq: I came at five yesterday.

b) (present perfect)   Yeni  gel-di-m.

   *Just*  come-past-1SG
Eq: I have just come.

c) (present)  Simdi  çok  üzül-du-m.

Now  very  sadden-past-1SG

Eq: I am very saddened right now.

In the examples, although -di is the past tense suffix in Turkish, when the suffix is used with physical and psychological states it functions as present (c). When it is used to express past tense which is close to that present time, it functions as present perfect tense. Also, the adverbs play a major role on how the affix is interpreted as past, present or present perfect. When it is used two times in verb, it functions as pluperfect. For example:

Gel  -di-(y)di-m.

Come  -past-past-1SG

Eq: I had come.

-mis

According to Taylan (2001, p. 344), -mis can encode resultative aspect, perfect aspect or reportive / inferential / evaluative past.” It occurs when the speaker did not see the action and did not witness what had happened or was said, but heard it from somewhere or figured it out through hearsay, perception or inference. To be able to reflect that s/he is not the first source of the news, but the news is accurate enough to believe, s/he uses –mis as an inferential past or reportive past. In the following example it also reflects a perfect aspect according to context.

For example:
a) The speaker infers or s/he learns via hearsay that the person came.

Gel-mis

Come-past inferential/reportive

Eq: He has obviously come / obviously came

b) When it is followed by –di (past suffix) it functions as past perfect (pluperfect), but this form does not necessarily function as inferential. The speaker can be the one who experienced the situation.

Gel-mis-ti-m

Come-mis-past suff-1SG

Eq: I had come

Thus the Turkish inflectional suffix -miş, which mainly displays directive uses, is opposed to an unmarked simple direct past in -di, which negates the notion of indirectivity but also displays neutral uses. Since Turkish lacks a competing pure postterminal (see below), this item covers both perfect and preterite functions, e.g. geldi <come-PAST> ‘has come / came’ (Johanson, 2006, p. 5).

The next part shows how the sentences with English auxiliary verbs correspond with Turkish sentences with an exemplification of the sentence I break it.

2.7. Auxiliary Verb Constructions in English and Their Equivalences in Turkish

The constructions will be represented in two main sections as active voice and passive voice constructions, and each section will be divided in three subsections as present tense, past tense, and future time sections.
Active Voice Constructions

Present Tense

1) \( X \, \text{V} \, Y \) / \( X \, \text{do not} \, V \, Y \)\(^3\) (I break/don’t break it.)

\[ \text{I break / do not break it.} \]

1SG verb / aux.v. neg.comp. verb obj.

\( X \, Y \, \text{V-r-per.prn.suf.} \) / \( X \, Y \, \text{V-neg.-per.prn.suf.} \) (Ben onu kirarim / kirmam.)

\[ \text{Ben onu kir -(a)r -im / kir - ma -m.} \]


2) \( X \, \text{be} \, \text{Ving} \, Y \)\(^4\) (I am breaking it.)

\[ \text{I am break -ing it.} \]

1SG aux.verb verb -prog.suf. obj.

\( X \, Y \, \text{V-(i)yor-per.prn.suf.} \) (Ben onu kiriyorum.)

\[ \text{Ben onu kir -(i)yor -um} \]

1SG obj. break -prog. suf. -1SG suf.

3) \( X \, \text{have/has} \, \text{Ved} \, Y \)\(^5\) (I have broken it.)

\[ \text{I have broken it.} \]

1SG aux.v. Ved obj.

---

\(^3\) According to whether the verb is transitive or intransitive, Y is optional
\(^4\) Ving represents inflected form of the verb with –ing
\(^5\) When the Ved used for the constructions that has perfect aspect, it represents the past participle form of the verb.
When the *Ved* used for the constructions that has simple aspect, it represents the past form of the verb.
3) **X had Ved Y (I had broken it.)**

I had broken it.

1SG aux.v. Ved obj.

4) **X had been Ving Y (I had been breaking it.)**

I had been breaking it.

1SG aux.v. verb -prog.suf. obj.

**Future Tense**

1) **X will V Y / X wil not V Y (I will break it. / I will not break it.)**

I will break / will not break it.

1SG aux.v. verb / aux.v. neg.comp. verb obj.
X Y V-acak-per. prn. suf. / V-neg-(y)acak-per. prn. suf. (Ben onu kiracagim / kirmayacagim.)

Ben onu kir -acag -im / kir -m -(y)acag -im.
1SG obj. verb -fut.tns.suf. -1SG suf. / verb -neg.suf.-fut. tns.suf.-1SGsuf.

2) X will be Ving Y (I will be breaking it.)

I will be break -ing it.
1SG aux.v. verb -prog.suf. obj.

X Y V-(i)yor ol(aux. verb)-acak-per.prn.suf. (Ben onu kiriyorum olacagim.)

Ben onu kir -(i)yor ol -acag (-acag) -im.
1SG obj. verb -prog.suf. aux.v. -fut.tns.suf. -1SG suf.

3) X will have Ved Y (I will have broken it.)

I will have broken it.
1SG aux.v. Ved obj.

X Y V-mis ol(aux. verb)-acak-per.prn.suf. (Ben onu kirmis olacagim.)

Ben onu kir -mis ol -acag -im.
1SG obj. verb -past perfect suf. aux.v. -fut.tns.suf. -1SG suf.

4) X will have been Ving Y (I will have been breaking it.)

I will have been break -ing it.
1SG aux.v. verb -prog.suf. obj.
Passive Voice Constructions

Present Tense

1) \( X \) be \( Ved \) by \( Y \) / \( X \) be not \( Ved \) by \( Y \)

\((It \ is \ broken \ by \ officers. / \ It \ is \ not \ broken \ by \ officers. )\)

It is broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. \( Ved \) by agent (doer).

\( X \ Y \ tarafından \ V\text{-passive inf.-r} \) \((O \ gørevliler \ tarafından \ kirilir.)\)

\( O \ gørevliler \ tarafından \ kir \ -(i)r. \)

3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -pres.tns.suf.

2) \( X \) be being \( Ved \) by \( Y \) \((It \ is \ being \ broken \ by \ officers.)\)

It is being broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. \( Ved \) by agent(doer)

---

\(^1\) This construction does not have an exact equivalence in Turkish.
3) \textit{X have/has been Ved by Y (It has been broken by officers.)}

\begin{tabular}{l}
It has been broken by officers. \\
3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer) \\
\end{tabular}

4) \textit{X have/has been being Ved by Y (It has been being broken by officers.)}

\begin{tabular}{l}
It has been being broken by officers. \\
3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer) \\
\end{tabular}
Past Tense

1) X was/were Ved by Y (It was broken by officers.)

It was broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

X Y tarafindan V-passive infix-past tense. (O gorevliler tarafindan kirildi.)

O gorevliler tarafindan kir -il -di.

3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -past tns.suf.

2) X was/were being Ved by Y (It was being broken by officers.)

It was being broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

X Y tarafindan V-passive infix-(i)yor-du. (O gorevliler tarafindan kiriliyordu.)

O gorevliler tarafindan kir -il -(i)y or -du.

3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -prog.suf. –past tns.suf.

3) X had been Ved by Y. (It had been broken by officers.)

It had been broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

X Y tarafindan V-passive infix-mis-ti. (O gorevliler tarafindan kirilmisti.)
O gorevliler tarafından kir -il -mis -ti.
3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -past perfect suf. -past tns.suf.

4) *X had been being Ved by Y (It had been being broken by officers.)*

It had been being broken by officers.
3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

*X Y tarafından V-passive infix-(i)yor-du. (O gorevliler tarafindan kiriliyordu.)*

O gorevliler tarafından kir -il -iyor -du.
3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -prog.suf. -perfect suf.

**Future Tense**

1) *X will be Ved by Y. (It will be broken by officers.)*

It will be broken by officers.
3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

*X Y tarafından V-passive infix-acak. (O gorevliler tarafından kirilacak.)*

O gorevliler tarafından kir -il -acak.
3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -fut.tns.suf.

2) *X will be being Ved by Y. (It will be being broken by officers.)*

It will be being broken by officers.
3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

\[ \text{X Y tarafından V-passive infix-(i)yör olacak.} \]

(\text{O göreviler tarafindan kiriliyor olacak.})

\[ \text{O göreviler tarafından kir -il -(i)yör ol -acak.} \]

3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -prog.suf. aux.v. -fut.tns.suf.

3) \text{X will have been broken by Y. (It will have been broken by officers.)}

It will have been broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

\[ \text{X Y tarafından V-passive infix-mis ol-acak.} \]

(\text{O göreviler tarafindan kırılmış olacak.})

\[ \text{O göreviler tarafından kır -il -mis ol -acak.} \]

3SG agent(doer) by verb -passive inf. -past perfect suf. aux.v. -fut.suf.

4) \text{X will have been being broken by Y. (It will have been being broken by officers.)}

It will have been being broken by officers.

3SG aux.v. Ved by agent(doer)

\[ \text{X Y tarafından V-passive infix-(i)yör ol-mus ol-acak.} \]

(\text{O göreviler tarafindan kırılıyor olmış olacak.})

---

8 This construction does not have an exact equivalence in Turkish.
O görevliler tarafindan kir-il-iyor ol-mus ol-acak.


In sentence constructions, Y is optional, and it can be in different forms depending on the verb type of the sentence. The reason for that is some verbs syntactically take objects after them while some of them do not. Furthermore, according to the verb type, Y might be an adjective or pronoun. As Biber, Conrad & Leech (2004, p. 103) express, the variations in the verb phrase are related to many differences in meanings. However, it is not easy to figured out the meaning merely by looking at the form. Rather, a single form can be used to express several meanings, and the same meaning can be expressed by more than one form. However, some of the constructs are not frequently used, and some of them don’t have an exact equivalence or have the same equivalence with another construct. For example, simple past tense and present perfect tense have the same equivalence in Turkish, *was broken* and *has been broken* have the same correspondence, *kirildi*. Therefore, Turkish learners of English need to decide which one to use according to context. Past continuous tense, past perfect continuous tense and present perfect continuous tense can have the same equivalence, “kiriliyordu”, also future continuous and future perfect continuous tense (kiriliyor olacak) can be expressed with the same structures in Turkish. Consequently, there might be some confusion about choosing which tense to use to express the meaning for Turkish learners of English. Therefore, when the sentences are being analyzed, firstly the correct form of Auxiliary Verb Construction (AVC) will be provided and explained, and then the participant’s licensing
will be analyzed in terms of appropriateness in terms of tense, aspect and voice.

English auxiliary verbs do not have correspondences that also function as auxiliary verbs in Turkish; however, Turkish has grammatical morphemes that function as the tense, aspect and voice particles.

Besides all these constructions, there is also the *copula be* verb construction. It is basically formed by inflecting the verb *be* according to tense, aspect and person. For example,

\[
X \text{ am/is/are } Y, \ X \text{ was/were } Y, \ X \text{ be being } Y, \ X \text{ have/has been } Y, \ X \text{ had been } Y, \ X \text{ have/has/had been being } Y.
\]
3. Methods

3.1. Research Questions

The main goal of this study was to investigate how auxiliary verb constructions are used in the interlanguage of Turkish speakers of English. As previously explained, in the two languages, auxiliary verbs have different functions and these two languages have different systems to reflect the tense, aspect and voice. Therefore, the study investigates Turkish speaking learners’ use of English auxiliary verb constructions in terms of tense, aspect and voice, and tries to answer for the following questions:

1) Are there any different patterns between the usages of auxiliary verb constructions by Turkish learners of English and native speakers of English?
2) Are there any occurrences of inappropriate usages of auxiliary verb constructions?
3) What might be the reason for the inappropriateness? Is there any possible influence of the first language of the learners on the usage of the auxiliary verb constructions, such as negative transfer or overgeneralization?

For the purpose of the first research question, the data will be analyzed in two sections. In the first section, quantitative results will be introduced for the licensed constructions by native speakers and Turkish speakers of English, and in the second section, a combined analysis will provide a comparison of results for each question. For the purpose of the second and third research questions, a qualitative analysis will attempt
to investigate the inappropriate constructions produced by Turkish speakers in terms of deviation types that they fall in.

3.2. Participants

Eleven native speakers of American English and 34 Turkish speakers of English participated in the study. The native speakers consisted of eight female and three male participants. Their ages varied between 18 years and 55 years. In terms of educational level, three of the native speakers had a PhD degree, seven of the native speakers had a master’s degree and one of the native speakers had a bachelor degree. They all lived in a Midwest state in the US. The Turkish speakers of English consisted of 23 female and 11 male participants. Their ages varied between 18 years and 55 years. In terms of educational level, three Turkish participants had a PhD degree, six participants a master’s degree, 15 participants a bachelor’s degree and seven a high school diploma. Sixteen of the Turkish participants have been living in the US for an average of 5.7 years; however, 18 Turkish participants have not lived in an English speaking country. The average length of learning English is 10.9 years for the Turkish speakers of English participants.

3.3. Materials

For the purpose of the study, a questionnaire was designed and implemented as online and paper based. The questions were identical for online and paper based questionnaires. In the questionnaire, other than the demographic information section,
there were two sections. The first section included 10 open-ended questions, and the second section included a gap-filling exercise. The questions were designed to encourage participants to license certain English auxiliary verb constructions. For the gap-filling exercise, the participants were asked to fill in 13 spaces with correct forms of the verbs given in the parentheses. The questions, sample expected responses and rationale for including the questions are presented below beginning with Part I, open-ended questions in which participants were instructed to answer with full sentences.

Part I: Open-ended Questions

Question 1

What was the worst thing that happened to you? For example, have you ever been bitten by a snake, had a car accident or injured? Please explain how it happened and what has happened since then? And, please write at least three sentences or a paragraph.

Sample responses 1

Construction a: Present perfect construction (X have/has Ved Y):

The worst thing that has happened to me was that I fell from stairs and broke my ankle. Since then, I have made sure that I can see the steps well. (The sample responses are mine.)

Construction b: Simple past construction ((X Ved Y / X did not V Y):

The worst thing that happened to me was that I fell from stairs and broke my ankle. Since then, I make sure that I can see the steps well.

Question 1 was designed to see if the participants would prefer to use simple past tense construction (X Ved Y / X did not V Y) or present perfect tense construction (X have/has Ved Y) to express an event which occurred in the past. Therefore, the first part of the question was formed in simple past tense construction and the second part of the
The question was formed in the present perfect tense construction. The reason why the usage of these two constructions is combined and compared in the same question is that in Turkish, the present perfect construction and past simple construction correspond with one construction (\(X Y V-di-per.prn.suf; / V-neg.-di-per. prn.suffix\)), and this might affect the use of these constructions by Turkish speakers of English.

Question 2

Do you know what was invented or discovered after you were born? Do you take advantage of them/it in your daily life? Please give some examples?

Sample response 2

Construction: Passive voice past simple construction (\((X \text{ was/were Ved by } Y)\):

After I was born, the cell phone was invented. It is very useful for communication especially when I am not at home; I need it to keep in touch with my family.

Question 2 was designed to encourage participants to use passive voice constructions in past tense constructions. The expected and investigated construction for this question was the passive voice past simple construction (\(X \text{ was/were Ved by } Y\)).

Question 3

Had you ever promised somebody to do something really important, but couldn’t keep your promise for some reason or forgot it?

Sample response 3

Construction: Past perfect Construction (\(X \text{ had Ved}\)):

I had promised my sister to teach her how to drive but I had to move another city and could not keep my promise.

Question 3 was designed to examine how Turkish learners of English would
license the perfect aspect in past tense constructions ($X$ had $V$). In Turkey, it is taught that the past perfect construction is used to express an event that happened before another past event. Therefore, forgetting the promise was considered as the past event and making the promise was considered as the event happened before that past event.

Question 4

*Do you think nuclear power is useful? Should Turkey build a nuclear power plant?*

Sample response 4

Construction: Modal auxiliary verb construction ($X$ modal-past $V$):\(^9\)

*I don’t think nuclear power is useful. Turkey should not build a nuclear power plant.*

The Question 4 was designed to encourage participants to use the modal auxiliary verb construction, $X$ should $V$, with simple present tense construction.

Question 5

*Will Turkey have been accepted to European Union by 2020? What is your opinion?*

Sample response 5

Construction: Passive voice future perfect construction ($X$ modal have been $V$):

*I think Turkey will not have been accepted to the EU by 2020 because they need more time to do the changes according to EU’s criteria.*

This question was designed to examine how appropriate the Turkish learners of English could license the future time constructions in the passive voice and with the perfect aspect ($X$ modal have been $V$).

Question 6

\(^9\) In constructions modal-past stands for past tense modals
If you had Aladdin’s magic lamp what would you want from the genie to do for you and for the world and humanity?

Sample response 6

Construction: Modal auxiliary verb construction (X Modal-past V Y):

I would want from the genie to make me a very successful businessman and also to stop all the war in the world.

The Question 6 was also designed with the verb want and modal would in a conditional sentence construction to examine if the Turkish participant would use the verb want with progressive aspect as they do in Turkish and if they would be comfortable using modals with conditional construction.

Question 7

What kind of vegetables, fruit and grain are grown or what kind of products and goods are produced in your country? Please give some examples.

Sample response 7

Construction: Passive voice present simple construction (X be Ved by Y):

Apples, pears, olives, tea, hazelnuts, walnuts and many other things are grown in my country. Also, many products are produced in my country such as textile, automobile, etc.

Question 7 was designed to encourage the participants to use passive voice construction in present tense constructions.

Question 8

What was the most exciting game that you have watched so far? Please give some details.

Sample response 8

Construction: Present perfect construction (X have/has Ved Y):
The most exciting game that *I have watched* was a basketball game, Turkey vs. Ukraine. Turkey scored at the last second and they needed to apply tiebreakers.

Question 8 was designed to examine how Turkish learners of English would use the simple past constructions and present perfect constructions to report about a game that took place in past. This question and the Question 1 have a very similar pattern; however, for this question, simple past construction and present perfect construction were used in the same sentence to examine if it would make any difference in the use of these two constructions by the Turkish participants.

Question 9

*Have you been following a TV show or a soap opera recently? Can you tell us what it is about?*

Sample response 9

Construction: Present perfect continuous construction (X have/has been Ving Y):

*I have been following a TV show named Kurtlar Vadisi. It is about mafia and government relationships.*

Question 9 was designed to see if the learners could apply the progressive and perfect aspects together in present tense (*X have/has been Ving Y*), how they would license it, and whether they would prefer to use it or not.

Question 10

*What do you expect to be doing in 2020?*

Sample responses 10

Construction a: Present simple construction (X V Y):

*I expect to be teaching English at a high school.*
Construction b: Future continuous construction (X will be Ving Y):

*I will be teaching English at a high school.*

Question 10 was created to see which constructions the participants would prefer to use to express their future plans and expectations. Although the expected construction was *X will be Ving Y*, the future tense modal *will* was intentionally not used so as not to prompt the learners to use one type of future tense construction.

Part II: Gap-filling Exercise

A few days ago, while I ___(a)(sleep) at my house, I ___(b)(rob). It ___(c)(be) around 3 am. I ___(d)(hear) a noise in the living room, and I ___(e)(take) my gun out of the drawer. As I ___(f)(get) closer to the living room, I ___(g)(understand) that there was more than one person. Suddenly, I ___(h)(see) two men running out the door. I ___(i)(try) to follow them but they were fast. When I looked at the living room, I realized that one of the antique vases that I had in my collection ___(j)(miss). I called the police immediately and told them my antique vase ___(k)(steal). The police ___(l)(investigate) for four days, but they could not find any clue yet. I am really upset because according to what the police told me, the thieves ___(m)(might never catch).

The gap filling exercise was designed to obtain precise results for a comparison between native speakers’ and Turkish participants’ responses. The question provides the same context for all participants and expects identical answers for the gaps. This feature of the question provides more precise results for the comparison. Also, native speakers’ responses considered as the answer key for this question, and the answers will be provided in the Appendix A.

3.4. Procedures

Since some of the participants live outside of the US, the same questionnaire was implemented in two ways; as an online based questionnaire and as a paper based
questionnaire. After the participants’ contribution, a very broad dataset was obtained by
the open-ended questions and the gap-filling exercise. To be able to organize every
construct that the participants produced, the collected data was transferred into a
Microsoft Access database program. In this program, two major tables were created. The
first created table is the QAll table and it has all the demographic information about the
participants and their full responses for the open-ended questions and gap-filling exercise.
(An illustration of the QAll Table is provided in Appendix A.) The second created table
is OpenEndedQuestions Table. In this table, participants’ responses were broken into
constructs (sentences) for detailed analysis. Since some constructs consisted of complex
sentences, they had more than one sentence in a construct. Therefore, as the first analysis,
each construct counted in terms of how many finite verbs it had, and each finite verb was
considered as a verb phrase of a simple sentence construct. Then each construct was
analyzed in terms of which tense, which aspect, which voice and which type of finite
verb it had. In terms of tenses, the constructs were classified as present, future or past
tense; in terms of aspects, the constructs were classified as simple, continuous, perfect
and perfect continuous aspects; and in terms of voice, the constructs were classified as
active or passive voice. In terms of finite verb type, the constructs were classified as
lexical verb, copula verb, primary auxiliary verb and modal auxiliary verb. Furthermore,
among the responses of Turkish speakers of English, auxiliary verb constructs were
analyzed in terms of appropriateness, and during the analysis of appropriateness of the
constructs, two native speakers of English provided their assistance. In the following
step, each inappropriate construct was analyzed in terms of the deviation type that it
contained. The deviation types included syntactic deviations, semantic deviations and unification based deviations. (An illustration of the OpenEndedQuestions Table and illustrations of examples of analyses for the constructs of native speakers and Turkish speakers of English were provided in Appendix A.) After each construct was verified according to its grammatical attributes and appropriateness, the data was ready for a quantitative analysis. All the necessary information had been entered to the database program for 1,445 constructs.

Also, there were advantages of using the MS Access Database program. For example, the program made it possible to do a detailed analysis in many different ways, and for the quantitative analysis, all necessary calculations were made by the program in a fast and reliable way.

After the obtained results were organized for the study, necessary calculations were made for the auxiliary verb constructions, tense, aspect and voice usages in terms of frequency of their occurrences, and the results were introduced in the results section. In the following section, analysis of the results was provided in two sections; as a combined analysis and a qualitative analysis sections. As explained before, each question has specific features to look into. Therefore, in the combined analysis section quantitative analyses and discussions were provided together for each question, and they were scrutinized according to obtained constructions’ tense, aspect and voice usages. Also, in this section, a comparison was provided between native speakers’ constructs and Turkish participants’ constructs. In the qualitative analysis section, inappropriate constructs were analyzed in terms of the three major deviation types that they fall in: as syntactic,
semantic and unification based deviations. During the analysis of the deviation types, how these constructs violated the construction attributes and values was defined. Also, the deviations were accounted for if there was a possible reason derived from the first language of the learners. After these analyses, the findings of the study were summarized in the conclusion section.

In addition to these sections, in the Appendix A, the questionnaire, an answer key for the gap-filling exercise, and some explanatory illustrations of the MS Access Database Program were provided.

3.5. Inter-rater Reliability

For the inter-rater reliability of the study, auxiliary verb constructs which were produced by non-native speakers were analyzed with two native speakers of English, and determined as appropriately or inappropriately used constructs. The native speakers who helped with analysis of the appropriateness of the constructs have been students in a Teaching English as a Second Language master program. Also, to minimize the errors of counting, all the data was entered to a Microsoft Access Database program and the calculations were made by the program.
4. Results

In total, participants produced 1,445 finite verb constructions, 474 being licensed by native speakers of English and 971 by Turkish speakers of English.

According to results, there are differences and similarities in terms of usages of auxiliary verb constructions between native speakers and non-native speakers. In this section, the common features of the data will be introduced, and in the next section a more detailed comparison of the results will be provided.

In English, there are four types of verbs such as lexical verbs, copula verbs, primary auxiliary verbs and modal auxiliary verbs. Since the current study tries to investigate auxiliary verb construction usage, to understand the distribution of the auxiliary verbs in general, the verbs in the data were counted and the distribution of verb types for the dataset was illustrated in the Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and Percentages of Finite Verb Types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Copula</th>
<th>Modal Auxiliary</th>
<th>Primary Auxiliary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this distribution, the modal auxiliaries were the least used finite verbs while the lexical verbs were the most used finite verbs in the data. Copula verbs...
and primary auxiliary verbs showed similar distributions. However, it should be taken into consideration that the questionnaire was created to encourage the participants to produce auxiliary verb constructions. Therefore, this distribution might not reflect a precise picture of real distribution of the finite verb types of English.

Besides finite verb types, auxiliary verb constructions were also counted in terms of used tense, aspect and voice types. In Table 5, the distribution of percentages of tense, aspect and voice preferences illustrates a broad picture of native speaker participants’ and Turkish speaking participants’ use of auxiliary verb constructions with which tense, aspect and voice.
Table 5

Distribution of Tense, Aspect and Voice Preferences of NNS and NS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages of tense usages among auxiliary verb constructions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages of aspect choice among auxiliary verb constructions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect progressive</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages of voice choice among auxiliary verb constructions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the percentages, Turkish speakers of English use the present tense auxiliary verb constructions less than native speakers, and use the future tense auxiliary verb constructions more than native speakers do. Also, the table shows that auxiliary verb constructions were used the most with simple aspect and the least with progressive perfect aspect by the native speakers and non-native speakers. Apparently, Turkish speakers of English used the auxiliary verbs with progressive aspect almost two times
more frequently than the native speakers did, and used the perfect aspect relatively less than the native speakers.

For a detailed analysis of these results, in the following section, a combined analysis about the most used construction types will be provided.
5. Discussions of Results

Discussions are arranged in two sections. The first section refers to the first research question and investigates occurrences of any different patterns between native speakers’ and Turkish participants’ responses. It provides a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis, and explains constructions’ meanings and frequency of their occurrences for each question with a comparison of findings according to native and non-native speakers’ results. The second section refers to the second and third research questions and focuses on the inappropriate constructions. It analyzes the deviation types which occurred in the responses of Turkish speakers of English qualitatively.

For the purpose of the study, the data was extracted via certain questions and each question was designed to examine certain constructions which were the combinations of certain tense, aspect and voice types. Therefore, the findings should be discussed in the realm of each question’s characteristics. However, some questions had common features such as being an active or passive voice construction, and to be able to compare and analyze the common findings in an organized way, the questions and related findings are grouped according to their common features.

5.1. Combined Analysis of Constructions’ Meanings and Occurrences

In the questionnaire, there were four questions, Questions 1, 3, 8 and 9, designed
to examine constructions’ aspect usages, three questions, Questions 2, 5 and 7, designed
to examine constructions’ voice usages, and three questions, Questions 4, 6 and 10,
designed to examine constructions’ modal usages. According to the common features of
the questions, the data will be analyzed in three sections: simple aspect constructions vs.
perfect and progressive aspect constructions, active voice constructions vs. passive voice
constructions, and modal auxiliaries vs. primary auxiliaries. Each question will be
introduced and analyzed in the related sections. Also, the findings will be discussed and
compared in terms of similarities and differences between native speakers and Turkish
speakers of English.

During the analysis of each question, initially relative question and the most
expected constructions used for that question will be introduced and the meaning of the
target constructions will be described. Obtained constructions will be illustrated in a
table, and the most obtained constructions and the constructions that deviate according to
native and non-native speakers’ usage will be discussed.

5.1.1. Simple Aspect Constructions vs. Perfect and Progressive Aspect
Constructions

Questions 1, 3, 8 and 9 were four questions designed to examine aspect choices
and usages of non-native speakers.

Q1) What was the worst thing that happened to you? For example, have you ever
been bitten by a snake, had a car accident or injured? Please explain how it happened
and what has happened since then.
As mentioned in the methods section, this question was designed to investigate the use of simple past tense construction and present perfect tense construction.

In English, simple past tense construction is used to express a situation or an event that took place in the past and it is not current in the present time. The $X \text{ Ved } Y$ means that the action that the verb represents happened in the past and finished. However, when the verb phrase is used in present form and preceded by $did$ $not$, the construction reflects a meaning of non-occurrence of an event or situation, and if the construction is licensed as $Did \ X \ V \ Y$, the construction reflects that the speaker conveys a question and seeks an answer about the $X$.

The other construction that the Question 1 investigates is the present perfect tense construction ($X$ $have$/has $Ved$ $Y$). When a verb phrase is used with $have$/has and its past participle form, it reflects a meaning that the action happened in the past, but the time span that the action affects is still present. The interrogative construction of the present perfect tense is licensed as $Have$/has $X$ $Ved$ $Y$, while the negative construction is licensed as $X$ $have$/has $not$ $Ved$ $Y$. Table 6 shows the most common produced constructions for Question 1.
Table 6

*Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Ved } Y / X \text{ did not Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ lived with my mom.}$)(^{10})</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ was/were Ved } Y$ ($The \text{ cell phone was invented.}$)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ was/were Ving } Y$ ($I \text{ was going into the second grade.}$)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ had Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ had promised myself that...}$)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ V } Y / X \text{ do not Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ don't like to watch games on tv.}$)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ have/has Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ have recorded CDs.}$)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal-past Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ could not do that alone.}$)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal Ved } Y$ ($I \text{ can't think of any exciting games.}$)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results, the table shows that the past simple was the most preferred and used construction for this question. The table also shows that Turkish speakers of English used the past simple tense more than native speakers, and they used the present perfect construction less than native speakers. In addition to these constructions, the present simple tense constructions, the past continuous tense constructions, and the past perfect tense constructions were the other constructions that were commonly used by the participants.

As mentioned, in Turkish, the present perfect construction is licensed in the same

---

\(^{10}\) The example sentences of the constructions were taken from the native speakers’ responses.

\(^{11}\) If percentage of occurrence of a construction was smaller than 1%, that construction was not demonstrated in the tables.
way that the past simple tense construction is licensed, and perfect aspect meaning is contributed by adverbials. This feature of Turkish grammar might explain why Turkish speakers of English prefer to use the present perfect construction less, and this deviation can be labeled as negative transfer. Since there is not an individual correspondence of the present perfect construction in Turkish grammar, the construction might not have a clear reflection in the interlanguage of Turkish speakers of English, and this can make it less preferable in their usage. Furthermore, when the constructions are compared, in the simple past tense, the speaker simply expresses what has happened in the past; however, in present perfect, the speakers need to figure out the happening time of the action and continuity of the effect of the action, and then use the appropriately inflected construction according to the subject (with have or has). This might also prevent non-native speakers from using present perfect construction.

Q3) Had you ever promised somebody to do something really important, but could not keep your promise or forgot it?

Question 3 was also designed to examine if Turkish learners of English could license the perfect aspect with past tense constructions (X had Ved) appropriately, and if they would prefer to use it.

In the construction, X had Ved, a composition of had with the past participle form of the verb phrase (Ved) reflects a meaning of an action that happened in the past before another past event.

Table 7 shows the most obtained constructions for Question 3.
Table 7

Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Ved Y / X did not V Y (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X had Ved Y (I had promised myself that...)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X V Y / X do not V Y (I don't like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X have/has Ved Y (I have recorded CDs.)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X will V Y (They will usually remind me.)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past V Y (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past have Ved Y (I wouldn't have forgotten it.)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal V Y (I can't think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 3.

The table shows that although the question was asked in the past perfect tense, the participants did not prefer to use the past perfect tense construction in their answers; the past simple tense, present simple tense and present perfect tense constructions were the most used ones among the responses of the participants.

When the results are compared according to across groups, it can be seen that the Turkish participants used the past perfect tense more frequently than the native speakers. Although, the data is not large enough to make a generalization for a language, a possible reason why Turkish speakers of English use the present perfect tense constructions less, and past perfect tense constructions more than the native speakers, can be explained by
having a particular correspondence of the past perfect tense constructions but not having particular correspondence for present perfect construction. This also supports one of the most important claims of Const-G that language acquisition starts in construction levels, not in single word or component levels. As can be seen from the data, the present perfect construction and past perfect tense constructions do not have very different features in terms of structure other than using had instead of have/has, but one of them can not be used comfortably, while the other can be used even more than the native speakers do. So, if the learners of a foreign language are encountered with a construction for which they already have the semantic information from their own language, they can replace the form of the pairing easily.

Q8) What was the most exciting game that you have watched so far? Please give some details.

Question 8 has a very similar design to the Question 1, and the distribution of the results is also parallel to the first question’s results. The expected constructions for this question were also present perfect tense and past simple tense constructions. Since the results showed that present simple tense construction was used frequently in the responses of this question, this construction will be explained semantically.

In the present simple tense construction, the verb phrase is used in its simple form or with an –s suffix, and it reflects that there is a present situation, a habit or a scientific reality. When the construction is licensed as Does/Do X V Y, it directs a question about a general situation, and when it is licensed as X do/does not V Y, the construction reflects non-existence of a general situation. Also, the –s suffix or does reflects that the subject is
a 3rd singular pronoun.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Ved Y / X did not V Y (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X was/were Ving Y (I was going into the second grade.)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X V Y / X do not V Y (I don't like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X am/is/are Ved by Y (The other one is called Fringe)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X have/has Ved Y (I have recorded CDs.)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X am/is/are Ving Y (They are acting like a bunch of children.)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past V Y (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal V Y (I can't think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 8.

As the table shows, the present simple (X V Y / X do not V Y) and past simple constructions (X Ved Y / X did not V Y) are the most common constructions. Also, although they are not as common as the other constructions, present perfect, past progressive, present progressive and modal constructions are the other used constructions.

Although the question nested in past tense and present perfect tense construction, present simple tense construction was the most used construction by participants, and
Turkish participants used present simple tense construction more than native speakers. Especially when they are describing the most exciting game, they preferred to use present simple tense. This can be considered as a usage based issue, because in order to reflect the exciting atmosphere of the game, participants preferred to use present simple tense. For example,

\textit{E.1) Turkey against check republic football game. Last 5 minutes turkey scores 2 goals and win the game 3-2.}^{12}

As formerly mentioned, the game was reported in present tense, and the first finite verb \textit{scores} was used correctly, but the second finite verb \textit{win} was missing the 3\textsuperscript{rd} SG suffix. \textit{I think} was the other common construction licensed in present simple tense.

\textit{Q9) Have you been following a TV show or a soap opera recently? Can you tell what it is about?}

Question #9 was designed to see if the learners could apply the progressive and perfect aspects together in present tense (\textit{X have/has been Ving Y}), how they would license it, and/or whether they would prefer to use it or not.

The \textit{X have/has been Ving Y} construction reflects that the action started in the past, continued until the current time or just ended in the time of the utterance. The semantic definition of the construction is similar to past progressive construction; however, past progressive construction (\textit{X was/were Ving Y}) reflects an event that started in the past, continued for a while, and then the time span finished in the past. Therefore, when the perfect particles \textit{have/has} are used with \textit{been Ving}, it combines past meaning

\footnote{The example was taken from non-native speakers responses, and no correction was made.}
with a current action, and adds a duration meaning.

### Table 9

*Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Ved } Y / X \text{ did not Ved } Y$ (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Ved } Y / X \text{ do not Ved } Y$ (I don't like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ am/is/are Ved by } Y$ (The other one is called Fringe)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ am/is/are Ving } Y$ (I was going into the second grade.)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ have/has Ved } Y$ (I have recorded CDs.)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ have/has been Ving } Y$ (I have not been following anything on TV.)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal-past Ved } Y$ (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal Ving } Y$ (I can't think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 9

As the table indicates, although the participants were encouraged to use present perfect progressive tense construction, they did not use it frequently. Instead, most frequently, they used present simple construction, present continuous and modal constructions. As noted, this question examines perfect and progressive aspects in one construction. Apparently, instead of this construction, participants preferred to use present simple, present continuous and present perfect constructions. A possible reason for these results is that since the $X \text{ have/has been Ving } Y$ construction is more complex
than the simple present or present progressive constructions, so the participants might have preferred to not use this construction.

5.1.2. Active Constructions vs. Passive Constructions

Questions 2, 5 and 7 were designed to investigate the voice usage of the participants.

Q2) Do you know what was invented or discovered after you were born? Do you take advantage of it/them in your daily life? Please give some examples.

The expected and investigated construction for this question was the passive voice past simple construction (X was/were Ved by Y).

The passive voice constructions can only be licensed with transitive verb constructions (which requires being followed by an object), because the object takes place of the subject of the construction. The verb phrase construction is composed with a passive be and a complement verb. In the past simple passive voice construction, the verb phrase is composed of the past form of the passive be and past participle form of the complement verb (was/were Ved). The construction reflects that the action happened in the past and affected the X. It also reflects a meaning that result of the action and the affected object are more important than the doer of the action or it may reflect that the doer is unknown.

Table 10 shows the distribution of the active and passive constructions for Question 2.
### Table 10

*Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Ved Y / X did not V Y (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X was/were Ved by Y (The cell phone was invented.)</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X V Y / X do not V Y (I don’t like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X am/is/are Ving Y (They are acting like a bunch of children.)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X have/has Ved Y (I have recorded CDs.)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X have/has been Ved by Y (I have been affected by terrible things.)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past V Y (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal V Y (I can't think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of active and passive voice constructions for the Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 2.

The results show that passive voice constructions are less used constructions and non-native speakers use the passive voice constructions less than native speakers do, even though they were encouraged to use passive voice constructions, and even though the given constructions had certain equivalences in Turkish. When the passive voice
constructions are considered in terms of complexity, they are apparently more complex than active voice constructions, because in a passive voice construction, the way of thinking and licensing of constructions are opposite of the active voice constructions, which are the most common constructions in daily language. Therefore, the passive voice constructions might be confusing for non-native speakers.

Among all inappropriate constructs, the percentage of inappropriate auxiliary verb constructs was counted as 50.4% for all of data, and this ratio was 46.4% for the results of Question 2. Also, among the all inappropriate auxiliary verb constructs, the percentage of inappropriate passive voice constructs was 11.6%, and this ratio was 21.4% for the results of Question 2. So that, compare to results of whole dataset, the percentage of inappropriately licensed constructions was lower for the Question 2, and the percentage of inappropriately licensed passive voice constructions was higher for the Question 2.

When the results of the whole dataset and results of Question 2 are compared, it can be seen that, although the question has a lower percentage than the other questions in terms of the inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions, it has a higher percentage of the inappropriate passive voice constructions. Thus, it can be proposed that licensing of passive voice constructions is harder than licensing of active voice constructions for the Turkish learners of English.

Parallel to this question, Question 7 and Question 5 also combine passive voice construction with present tense constructions. The results of Question 7 are pretty parallel to the results of Question 2. The most used construction is present simple active voice construction, and passive voice is the less preferred construction for the non-native
speakers. However, a different aspect of Question 7 was that it was licensed in only passive voice construction, whereas Question 2 was licensed in both active and passive voice constructions. Furthermore, questions being asked only with passive voice construction or being asked with active and passive voice constructions did not affect the voice preference of the speakers. However, Question 5 combined the passive voice construction with perfect aspect and it affected participants’ use of passive voice constructions. In the next section, table 9 shows the distribution of obtained constructions for the Question 5.

**Q5)** *Will Turkey have been accepted to European Union by 2020? What is your opinion?*

As discussed above, this question was designed to examine how appropriate the Turkish learners of English could license the future time constructions in the passive voice with the perfect aspect.

The construction, *X will have/has been Ved by Y* has a verb phrase which is composed of by four components. The verb phrase *will + have/has Ved* reflects a meaning that there is a certain point in the future time and the action that the verb conveys will end sometime before that certain point, and in passive voice, the verb phrase is licensed as *will have/has been Ved* by placing the passive *be* with its past participle form (been) before the past participle verb. In addition to this, the passive *be* is formed in its past participle form because it follows the auxiliary verb *have*, and attribute values of auxiliary verb *have* requires being followed by a complement verb in its past participle form. Table 11 illustrates the distribution of obtained constructs from Question 5.
### Table 11

**Distribution of Obtained Constructs from the Question 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Ved Y / X did not V Y (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X V Y / X do not V Y (I don’t like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X am/is/are Ving Y (They are acting like a bunch of children.)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X have/has Ved Y (I have recorded CDs.)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X will have/has been Ved by Y (Turkey will have been accepted to European Union.)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X will V Y (They will usually remind me.)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X will be Ved by Y (My published book will be made into a movie.)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past V Y (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal V Y (I can't think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal be Ved by Y (…that can be used instead.)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution shows that the present simple construction and the future simple passive construction were the most frequently used in the responses of the participants. However, the expected construction X will have/has been Ved by Y was used only by 2% of native speakers and by 1% of non-native speakers. Participants usually preferred to
license present simple tense active voice construction, while some of them used the future tense passive voice without a perfect aspect. Both of the alternative constructions were reasonable for the answer of this question; however, the meaning that the question reflected and directed was not the same that the participants reflected. It is a strong possibility that this deviation occurred because passive constructions were already rarely used constructions, and a combination of passive voice + will (modal) + perfect aspect was a complex construction for the non-native speakers, and was not preferable for the native speakers.

For a general comparison of the passive voice usage for the questions 2, 5 and 7, Table 12 demonstrates the distribution of percentages of obtained active and passive voice constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Num.</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>83.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12, Voice Preferences of Participants for Questions 2, 5 and 7.

As the table illustrates, for questions 2, 5 and 7, passive voice was always less
preferred voice for both native speakers and non-native speakers, and Turkish speakers of English used the passive voice less than native speakers did.

5.1.3. Modal Auxiliary vs. Primary Auxiliary

In addition to the primary auxiliary verb constructions, three modal auxiliary verb constructions were investigated in the study. One of the modal constructions was combined with a present tense construction, one was combined with a conditional past tense construction and the other was combined with future tense modal will and progressive aspect particle -ing. As the first modal construction, the future tense modal will will be discussed in respect to Question 10, the modal would will be discussed for Question 6, and the modal should will be discussed for Question 4.

Q10) What do you expect to be doing in 2020?

Question 10 was created to see which constructions the participants would prefer to use to express their future plans and expectations. Although the expected construction was X will be Ving Y, the future tense modal will was intentionally withheld in the question, so as not to prompt the learners to use one specific type of future tense construction.

As noted on page 27, modals can carry tenses, can take aspects, and can be used in passive voice constructions. As a time marker, will is the future tense modal. When the verb phrase is licensed as will+V it reflects a planned action that will take place in the future. In addition to this, when will is licensed with be Ving, it reflects a future time that starts before a certain point in the future and continues at that point. However, it does not reflect when the action will end. Table 13 shows the distribution of the most used
constructions by the participants for Question 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \( X \ V \ Y \ /
X do not V Y \) (I don’t like to watch games on tv.)                         | 51.8%| 70.6%|
| \( X \ am/is/are Ved by Y \) (The other one is called Fringe)                  | 1.8% | 0.0% |
| \( X \ am/is/are Ving Y \) (They are acting like a bunch of children.)         | 5.4% | 0.0% |
| \( X \ have/has Ved Y \) (I have recorded CDs.)                               | 0.0% | 17.6%|
| \( X \ will V Y \) (They will usually remind me.)                            | 26.8%| 0.0% |
| \( X \ will be Ved by Y \) (My published book will be made into a movie.)    | 0.0% | 5.9% |
| \( X \ will be Ving Y \) (I will be celebrating the signing…)                 | 7.1% | 5.9% |
| \( X \ Modal V Y \) (I can't think of any exciting games.)                   | 7.1% | 0.0% |

Table 13, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from Question 10

According to the table, the most used constructions are present simple tense, present perfect tense and future simple tense constructions. The table shows relatively different distributions for native and non-native speakers. Although the present simple tense is the most frequently used construction for both of the groups, non-native speakers used future simple tense construction with a percentage of 26.8, while the native speakers did not use that construction at all. Native speaker used the present perfect construction with a percentage of 17.6, while the non-native speakers did not use that construction at
Another deviation that the table illustrates is non-native participants used progressive aspect relatively more than native speakers. This was also the case in the construction distribution of the Question 1.

The $X \textit{will} V Y$ and $X \textit{will be} Ving Y$ constructions have exact equivalences in Turkish, and the Turkish participants used these two constructions more than native speakers did. Another progressive construction that Turkish participants used and native speakers did not use was present progressive tense construction ($X \textit{am/is/are} Ving Y$). As explained on page 19, this construction reflects a current and continuous event. A possible reason why the Turkish speakers used progressive aspect is that in Turkish, hopes and wishes are usually conveyed via the Turkish equivalence of present progressive tense construction as in:

\begin{quote}
E.2) I am hoping our children can have much more peace and beautiful place.
\end{quote}

Although, this is not very common and not the case for advanced learners, this is an issue for beginners, because the same verbs can have different attribute value elements across the languages. For example, $\textit{hope}$ and $\textit{want}$ can be used and ‘mostly used’ with progressive aspect in Turkish whereas; they cannot in English. Especially if the verb $\textit{want}$ is used in the equivalence of present simple tense construction in Turkish, it expresses a general intent, but not willingness or a certain wish, and it reflects a meaning that corresponds to $\textit{would want}$. Thus, $\textit{would want}$ does not reflect the same meaning as $\textit{want}$. This confirms that if a language lacks the construction in its repertoire, it accepts that the construction is ill-formed and does not belong to the language.
Q6) If you had Aladdin's magic lamp, what would you want from the genie to do for you and for the world and humanity?

Question 6 was also designed with the verb want and modal would in a conditional sentence construction to examine if Turkish participants would use the verb want with progressive aspect as they do in Turkish or if they would be comfortable using modals with conditional constructions. Table 14 shows the distribution of the produced constructions by the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Ved Y / X did not V Y (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X was/were Ved by Y (The cell phone was invented.)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X V Y / X do not V Y (I don’t like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X am/is/are Ving Y (They are acting like a bunch of children.)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal-past V Y (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Modal V Y (I can’t think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from Question 6

According to the table, even though the question was designed in past tense constructions, simple past tense was not used as much as it was used in the other questions. However, the past tense modal construction would + V was used 34.1% by the
native speakers and 18.4% by the non-native speakers. When the table is analyzed carefully, this difference can be explained by the usage of present simple tense construction. Non-native speakers licensed the verb *want* in present simple tense construction relatively more than native speakers did. This could be a result of negative transfer. As explained in the previous question, *want* is usually used with progressive aspect in Turkish, and when it is used in present tense and with the simple aspect, the meaning corresponds to *would want*. Since the question asked for their general intent and hopes in an unrealistic conditional construction, the Turkish participants neither preferred to use progressive aspect, nor preferred to use past-modal X *would V Y* construction because *want* was able to correspond with the meaning of *would want*.

**Q4) Do you think nuclear power is useful? Should Turkey build a nuclear power plant?**

For Question 4, one of the expected constructions was X *Modal-past V Y*, (because the modal *should* is accepted as the past form of the modal *shall*), and the other expected construction was X *V Y / X do not V Y*. Table 15 shows the distribution of obtained constructions from the participants.
Table 15, Distribution of Obtained Constructs from Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>NNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Ved } Y / X \text{ did not } V Y$ (I lived with my mom.)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ V } Y / X \text{ do not } V Y$ (I don’t like to watch games on tv.)</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ am/is/are } Ved \text{ by } Y$ (The other one is called Fringe)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ have/has been } Ved \text{ by } Y$ (I have been affected by terrible things.)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ will } V Y$ (They will usually remind me.)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal-past } V Y$ (I could not do that alone.)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal-past } be \text{ Ved by } Y$  ($\ldots$nuclear power plants should not be built.)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal } V Y$ (I can’t think of any exciting games.)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ Modal be Ved by } Y$ ($\ldots$that can be used instead.)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table, the most used construction was present simple tense construction $X \text{ V } Y / X \text{ do not } V Y$, and as the table shows, non-native participants used this construction 11% more than the native speakers. Also, $X \text{ modal-past } V Y$ construction was the second most used construction, but it did not show a high percentage of difference between the native and non-native speakers’ usage.

The percentages show that non-native speakers focused on two constructions: $X \text{ V}$
Y/X do not V Y (I think, nuclear power is useful) + X Modal-past V Y (Turkey should build nuclear power plants). However, native speakers used X Ved Y / X did not V Y and X Modal-past be Ved by Y constructions besides the other constructions. Since English was the native speakers’ first language, they used a variety of constructions to explain their ideas about the nuclear power.

Also, in terms of appropriateness, the responses of non-native speakers contain some incorrect usages of modal constructions. For example,

E.3) No, I think shouldn't Turkey build a nuclear power plant.
E.4) No nuclear power plant shouldn't in Turkey.
E.5) Turkey have not build a nuclear plan.
E.6) Turkey must use its solar energy, water energy etc.

According to the results of Question 4, the percentage of inappropriate modal auxiliary verb constructions was calculated as 77.7% among the inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions. Across the data, the percentage of inappropriate modal auxiliary verb constructions among the inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions was 37.8%. Thus, it indicates that 37.8% of the inappropriate auxiliary verb constructs is modal and 72.2% is the primary auxiliary verb constructs. The reason for this difference is that the Question 4 was designed with a modal auxiliary verb; the responses were mostly licensed with the modal auxiliary verbs.

In addition to the open-ended questions, a gap-filling exercise was also implemented in the questionnaire. It was designed to examine if the participants could appropriately license verb phrase constructions of sentence constructions according to the
attribute value requirements. For the purpose of the study, the constructions were
licensed in different aspects and voices; however, for the textual unity of the text, most of
the constructions were licensed in past tense. The gap-filling style of the question
provided precise results for comparisons because the content was the same for all the
participants, In other words, although unlike the open-ended questions, which have the
advantage of gathering “real-language”, the gap filling exercise, with its single-choice
responses enables more precise speaker-to-speaker comparisons. Thus the instrument
provides a complement to the open-ended questions and gives us more complete picture
of native and non-native speakers’ licensing of modals and auxiliaries.

5.1.4. Gap Filling Exercise

As explained in the methods section, Gap Filling Exercise contained 13 gaps to be
filled. According to results of the gap filling exercise, there are three findings that can be
generalized.

The first finding is that licensing of passive voice constructions for Turkish
speakers of English was difficult because 54 constructions were licensed inappropriately
among 81 passive voice constructions indicating that 66.7% of passive constructions
were licensed inappropriately. Also, it was realized that passive voice modal construction
(might never be caught) was the most difficult construction to license because out of
27 constructions, just 1 construction was appropriately licensed indicating that 96.3% of
the modal passive construction was inappropriate. Compare to that, none of the native
speakers incorrectly licensed this construction. However, it should be mentioned that, the
gap m (might never be caught) might have contained a limitation because unlike the other
gaps, in parenthesis of the gap \( m \), a modal construction was provided in the parenthesis with the main verb.

The second finding is that the place of present perfect construction is not very clear in the interlanguage of the Turkish participants because the Turkish participants erroneously used present perfect construction in five places to correspond with the simple past tense construction meaning. Also, for the choice \( l \) (investigate), while all the native speakers (10 participants) used past simple tense construction, out of 27 Turkish participants, 10 participants used present perfect construction and 13 of them used simple past tense constructions, which indicated the 37% of the Turkish participants used present perfect construction.

The third finding is that some Turkish participants could not license the past form of the verb constructions in simple past tense appropriately. Among 270 licensed past tense verb constructions, 71 constructions were licensed incorrectly, which indicated that 26.3% of the total past tense constructions were licensed inappropriately.

Overall, the combined analysis of the open-ended questions and the gap-filling exercise provided detailed information about the patterns between the constructs licensed by native speakers and Turkish speakers of English. Two of the hypotheses that we proposed during the open-ended questions analysis were also supported by the gap-filling exercise’s results; licensing of passive voice constructions with modal auxiliary verbs was hard for Turkish speakers of English, and the place of present perfect tense construction was not very clear in the interlanguage of Turkish speakers of English.
5.2. Qualitative Analysis of Learners’ Interlanguage

This section mainly focuses on the second and third research questions, because in this section, inappropriate constructs that were licensed by the Turkish speakers of English will be explained and exemplified according to type of deviations that they fall in. In addition to this, the reason why these constructions were licensed inappropriately will be investigated in terms of transfer and interlanguage theories.

The inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions were determined in terms of three deviation types; syntactic, semantic and unification. Each type of deviation and the ill-formed constructions those which fall in the respective deviation type will be explained under the related sections.

5.2.1. Types of Deviations

According to the results, the most common deviation types can be listed in the order of syntactic violations, semantic violations and unification based violations. Additionally, some responses contained multiple violations. Therefore, order of syntactic violations, semantic violations and unification based violations, some of the violations were counted more than one time. The combination of unification and syntactic based deviations, and the combination of semantic and syntactic based deviations were especially common. These combined deviations will be exemplified in the following section with the definitions of most common deviation types. Since the spelling mistakes are not related to the study, they will be disregarded. The distribution of deviation types across the data is shown in the Table 16.
Table 16, Percents of Deviation Types among Inappropriate Auxiliary Verb Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>Unification</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.72%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16, Percents of Deviation Types among Inappropriate Auxiliary Verb Constructs

**Syntactic Deviations**

Across the data, 106 auxiliary verb constructs were licensed with syntactic deviations by far the most common type of deviation. Syntax is the way of putting the linguistic elements together to form linguistic structures, and syntactic deviations include inappropriate word orders, missing constituents, and maximality violations. Some violations such as missing constituents and maximality violations may contain both syntactic deviation and unification deviations. However, combined syntactic and unification deviations were common, and some deviations were not combined. Therefore, they will be explained separately.

The most common syntactic violation occurred with the licensing of passive voice constructs. Many participants could not license the passive voice constructions appropriately. The passive modal constructions especially showed a common type of violation; some constructs were missing construction components.

*E.7) [ ] Just tropical fruits cannot grown. (R-4632)*

---

13 In the examples, redundant parts of the texts were represented with the empty brackets, and the four digit numbers starting with the R- are the last four digits of the participants’ responder id in the access database.
E.8) I think Turkey should accepted European Union by 2020. [ ] (R-4579)

E.9) I think Turkiye won’t accepted European Union. [ ] (R-8053)

E.10) [ ] No nuclear power plant shouldn't in Turkey. (R-3657)

In the examples E.7 to E.10, above, participants licensed the passive voice modal constructions without the constituent passive be. Modal verbs must be followed by a complement verb in their base form. In Examples 7, 8 and 9, participants used the past participle form of the complement verb after the modal verb. Past participle verbs are required to follow passive be construction, but not modal constructions. Therefore, the participants should have placed the verb be after the modal, then placed the past participle form after the be, and licensed the construction as X modal be Y Ved Y.

These violations likewise can be considered as unification based violations, because licensing the past participle form of the complement verb after a modal construction violates the unification requirements of modal constructions with the following verb complement. For instance, in Example 10, the participant failed to produce both the passive be and the past participle form of the complement verb, and this example also includes another violation of the negation structures in English by containing two negation components, no and not.

There are two possible explanations for these violations. First, the violations might be due to the complexity of the passive voice constructions. Alternatively, negative transfer from the L1 might have caused the violations. The constructions should be looked at in detail to examine which possibility is stronger. Therefore, at this point, the English modal passive construction and Turkish equivalences of the components were
exemplified with an application to construction *It will be broken by officers.*

\[ S \text{ Future suf.} \quad \text{Verb passive} \quad \text{by} \quad \text{agent} \]

When the constructions are matched syntactically, it can be seen that there is not a particular component that might cause the violations. Moreover, Turkish equivalents of these constructions do not have a particular usage in terms of pragmatics, and semantics, either. Therefore, it might be explained that in the interlanguage of the Turkish learners of English these constructions have not been fully acquired yet because the passive voice constructions might be difficult to license for learners of English. Besides passive voice modal constructions, the passive voice primary auxiliary verb constructions also display missing constituent violations. For example, E.11 and E.12 are also missing the *passive be* constituent of the constructs.

*E.11* Internet discovered after I was born. [ ] (R-4632)

*E.12* Not exactly, but I remember that Chernobly disaster happened before the year of I born. [ ] (R-3887)

In terms of syntactic deviations, another type of common violation was word order violation. The following constructs exemplify some participants’ licensing of construction components in inappropriate order.

*E.13* In my country grown hazelnut, tea and olive. (R- 7215)

*E.14* Was invented TV, telephone, computer after I were born. [ ] (R-4559)

*E.15* When I was a child, I fell down garden wall and I was broken my left arm. (R-
In Turkish, sentences are licensed in the SOV structure, subject + object + verb. When examples 13, 14 and 15 are compared, they do not show a similarity with the Turkish sentence construction, but they show a pattern. In these three examples, the objects which were supposed to be in the subject position of the passive voice construction are still in their object position as if the constructions were in active voice. Therefore, the participants failed to move the objects that were affected by the action to the subject position of the passive voice constructions. It is possible that in the interlanguage of the participants, the word order of English sentence construction is acquired as subject + verb + object, and this knowledge prevented the participants to move the objects to the subject position in an English sentence. Similarly, E.16 exemplifies an incorrect placing of an adjective in an active voice construction. Although subject predicative adjectives cannot be placed before the verb in English sentence construction, in Turkish, they can be placed before the verb: Bence faydali degil nuclear enrji. / I think useful not nuclear power.

However, since this is an individual case, it is not strong enough to make a generalization about it.

Another type of syntactic deviation occurred in subject sharing sentence constructions.

E.17) I have had three car accident, not injured from one of them. (R-7488)

E.18) I was operated and were put platinum nail in my arm. (R-0062)
In Turkish, each verb takes a pronoun suffix that reflects the subject of the action; therefore, the subject is usually omitted. However, in the examples, the situation is slightly different.

In E.17, the subject I and the auxiliary verb have inherited for the second construction. However the first construction is in active voice and the second construction is in passive voice. Although the auxiliary verb have is appropriate for both of the constructions, the second construction needs a passive be component before the complement verb. Therefore, it violates the attribute value requirements of the passive voice construction. In addition to this, the participant also failed to use the object with plural –s, and in the second sentence, s/he used the preposition phrase from one of them to express the meaning even from one of them or from any of them. It is a possibility that both of these deviations were derived from the participants’ L1, because in the Turkish equivalence of the sentences, accident is used as a singular noun and one of them would express the meaning that the participant has not been injured from any of them.

E.18 is also an example of subject sharing constructions. In this example, both of the constructs were licensed in passive voice, and they shared the subject I. However, the subject I could not compensate for the subject of the second construct, because the object of the second construct, a platinum nail was subject of the second verb. In addition to this violation, even if the subject I could inherit for the second construction, the form of the passive be was also inappropriate for the subject I. Moreover, for native speakers, using a passive voice construction for these expressions is not common and it sounds odd to them.
These violations can be considered as products of speakers’ current interlanguage which is not able to combine two sentence constructions have the same subjects appropriately. The reason why the form of the passive be varies for these subject sharing constructs might be that maybe, the participant recognized that the subjects were not the same for the two constructions and thought of another subject but failed to produce the constructions with two different subjects. In addition to this, the reason why the sentence was used in passive voice might be explained by a cross linguistic approach. When the Turkish equivalence of the sentence is looked into, it can be seen that the participant translated the construction directly from Turkish. In Turkish, the equivalence of the word operation is either used in passive voice with Turkish auxiliary verb etmek or in active voice with Turkish auxiliary verb olmak (be). Neither of these constructions occupies doctors as subject. When it is used in active voice with the subject doctors, it sounds odd because usually it is perceived that there is no other authority to operate on a person other than doctors, and if it is not a specific doctor being talked about, it is known information for the listener. When it is used as Doctors operated on me it sounds more like a ‘child talk’. Therefore, the subject doctor is usually avoided by Turkish speakers of English. There are two common ways for this expression. For example,

1) Ameliyat ed-il-di-m. / Operation aux.v.etmek –pass.voice inf.-past suf.-1SG (I was operated.)

2) Ameliyat ol-du-m. / Operation become-past-1SG. (I had an operation.)

Among syntactic deviations, another common type of violation was attribute value violations of the required complement verbs. Some participants failed to license the
constructions with the appropriate form of the complement verbs. Therefore these violations show both syntactic and unification based deviations.

E.19) I didn’t experience such a case. (R-5097)

E.20) I didn’t broke any of my bone but my nervous system was affected so badly. (R-8053)

E.21) Turkey will never been accepted to European Union. Also in 2020 European Union going will want to join Turkish Union. (R-0249)

E.22) Some scientist are invent cellphone. (R-0817)

E.23) Since that time I have never look a snake even in photo or tv. R-7215(G3)

E.24) Turkey have not build a nuclear plant. R-5042(G3)

The attribute value requirements of the auxiliary verb *do* are violated in Examples 19 and 20. The auxiliary verb *do* requires a base form complement verb to follow it, and in these examples both the verb *experience* and the verb *break* were used in their past form not base form.

Example 21 shows two different violations. The first sentence construction violates the attribute value requirements of modal auxiliary verb. Since modal auxiliary verbs require a complement verb in their base form, and in this construction *will* was followed by *been*. This violates both syntactic requirements and unification requirements of the construction. In the second construction, *going* and *will*, two finite verbs were used in one construction, and violated English sentence structure norms. Similar to this, also in the example 22, the construction was licensed with two finite verbs. In the examples 23 and 24, auxiliary verb *have* was followed by a base form complement verb, and as it was
explained on page 24, *have* requires a complement verb in its past participle form; in these examples, participants failed to license the construction with the proper complement verb forms, and violated syntactic and unification requirements of the constructions.

Another example of combined deviations was a combination of syntactic and semantic deviations. The data contained a particular example of this type of deviation. In the second question of the questionnaire, it was asked what had been invented or discovered after the participants had been born. As the following examples indicate, when the Turkish participants were listing what had been invented, they usually wrote the name of the invention in its singular form and without a definite article. However, in English, the name of the invention either should be licensed with a definite article or in its plural form, otherwise the subject (name of the invention) refers to a particular one. Thus, the omission of definite article or plural suffix results in a semantic deviation, and this type of usage is accepted as inappropriate by the native speakers.

E.25) Cellular phone was invented. (R-1148)

E.26) After I was born, computer and cell phone were invented. (R-4579)

E.27) Many years later cell phone was invented. (R-4216)

E.28) After I was born. Computer was invented. [ ] (R-0249)

E.29) Cellular phone was invented. [ ] (R-1148)

E.30) Internet and cel phone were invented after I was born. [ ] (R-9531)

When Turkish equivalences of these constructions are analyzed, it can be seen that neither a definite article nor plural form of the invention is used in the constructions
because Turkish grammar does not contain any articles. Moreover, in Turkish, the meaning of the verb *invention* usually refers to the first invented one. Thus, some participants failed to license the constructions in plural forms or with the definite article *the*.

**Unification Deviations**

Unification deals with the agreements of linguistic construction components with each other at morphological or lexical level. Among inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions, unification deviations were the second most frequent deviation type. 57 inappropriate auxiliary verb constructions were determined as violations of unification agreements. The most common violation type was adverb - construction’s tense agreement and subordinate clause - main clause tense agreements. There were also occasions of subject-verb agreement violations, too.

E.31) [ ] I could not realize that the car is going to touch my car before i pass. (R- 8428)

E. 32) [ ] Another accident was when I had made sport exercises. [ ] (R-7488)

E. 33) it was worst thing that is taking discipline. (R-6104)

E. 34) [ ] Me and my mom were guests and my mom said later that she expected them to take me to a hospital but they did not. [ ] From then on, I never go and stay at someone else's house for more than 1-2 days, unless I know that person well. (P –7202)

E.35) When my grandmother died I was only six years old. The woman who always very dear to me is dead. It was very difficult for me to understand what death is. [ ] (R-4159)

E.36) Nevertheless, I think sometime illnesses that I contracted is chance to erase my sins. (R-3887)
The worst thing that happened to me is that I had an accident.

The examples E.31 to E.37 illustrate violations of tense agreement between subordinate clauses and main clauses. This is one of the most common types of unification deviation. For the participants, it was usually problematic to license complex constructions appropriately, and most of these constructions include more than one type of deviation. For example, in the example 31, the complex construction contains two subordinate constructions as noun clause and adverb clause constructions. According to unification agreements, if the main construction is licensed in past tense it requires that the subordinate constructions be licensed in past tense, too. However, the participant failed to license the constructions in the correct tense, and both the noun clause construction (…that the car is going to…) and adverb clause construction (…before I pass.) were produced in present tense. When the Turkish equivalents of constructions are taken into consideration, the Turkish equivalents of constructions demonstrate that the first subordinate construction was licensed as it should be in Turkish. However, the second subordinate construction also violates its Turkish equivalence, too, because in Turkish, it also should be licensed in past tense as it was supposed to be in this construct.

Araba-nin    ben gec-me -den  once dokun-acag-ini farked-e-me-di-m.

Car-demons. I  pass-neg.-past before touch-fut.-acc  realize-abil-neg.-past-1SG

The Turkish equivalence of the construction the verb pass is licensed in past tense whereas the verb touch is licensed in future tense because in Turkish, the construction X was going to Y is used to express non-occurring or non-realistic plans and situations that were supposed to happen in the past but haven’t ever happened.
Another odd usage in the example is using the modal verb *could* with the verb *realize* instead of primary auxiliary verb *did*. The native speakers who determined auxiliary verb constructions as appropriate or inappropriate mentioned that *could* was not appropriate to use in this case. “I could not realize…” reflects a meaning that the participant was not capable enough to realize the other car, whereas the participant wanted to mean that she had not realized the other car. However, the Turkish equivalence of the verb *realize* is usually used with a suffix that reflects capability of doing something. Therefore, this semantic deviation can be derived from participant’s L1.

Example 32 has the same type of violation as the example 31. Although the main construction and the subordinate construction occur at the same time, the main construction was licensed in past tense and the subordinate construction was licensed in past perfect tense, whereas both of the constructions were supposed to be licensed in past simple tense. When the Turkish equivalence of the construction is analyzed, it can be seen that both the main construction and the subordinate construction are licensed in past simple tense as it is in English, so there is not a possibility of negative transfer. Also, the construction contains a semantic violation. The verb phrase *make sport exercise* (*spor antremani yapmak*) is a direct translation from Turkish, and native speakers do not accept it as appropriate.

E.33 also indicates a combined violation of unification and semantics deviations. In this example, the main construct was licensed in past tense, while the subordinate construction was licensed in present tense, so that violated the unification agreements of main clause and subordinate clause. As the semantic deviation, a Turkish idiom *taking*
discipline, a punishment type which is imposed at schools and usually recorded on the pupil’s personal education file, was used instead of its English equivalence, disciplinary punishment.

E.34 also contains a tense agreement violation of subordinate construction - main construction, and also an adverb phrase and tense agreement violation. In this construction, the subordinate construction was a reported speech construction which had stated in the past, and the participant failed to license the construction in past perfect tense. Also, the other violation occurred with the agreement between adverb of the construction and tense of the construction. Although the adverb phrase from then on requires being used in a present perfect construction, the participant licensed the construction in present simple construction. However, when it is translated into Turkish, the sentence is perfectly appropriate because of the meaning of the adverb phrase, and the present simple tense id more suitable than the present perfect tense because, in Turkish, the present perfect tense and the past simple tense are licensed with the same suffixes, -di and –mis (see p. 28). Therefore, for Turkish learners of English, present perfect tense usually provides a past meaning more than a present meaning.

Examples 35, 36 and 37 do not contain auxiliary verb constructions; however, they indicate the same type of unification violations. This shows that the licensing of subordinate clause constructions and main clause constructions according to their tense agreements is difficult for Turkish learners of English.

Similar to these deviations, the following examples illustrate the deviation of adverb phrase-tense agreement. This deviation was found in many constructions, but the
most frequently occurring type of deviation was the licensing of present perfect construction according to the adverb used.

E.38) I am not following a TV show or a soap opera recently. (R-5297)

E.39) I am more careful since then. (R-9531)

E.40) Up to now it makes our lives easier in communication. (R-3343)

E.41) I can't predict so far :) (R-8231)

E.42) I never broke my promise. (R-4216)

E.43) I did not watch an exciting game for a long time. (R-7202)

E.44) Nothing changed after 2000 so Turkey may be accepted to European Union in 50 years (R-9362)

E.45) Thanks God, nothing has happened but I was really scared. (R-8231)

E.46) The worst thing that happened to me was [ ] I havent got so much friends from the high school at the university. [ ] I have been to another university after the graduation from that university. (R-5297)

In the examples 38, 39, 40 and 41, although the constructions included adverb phrases that need to be nested in present perfect constructions, the participants constructed them in present continuous and present simple. As discussed before, the present perfect construction indicates a time span which starts in the past and stays current, and all of these examples reflect the time span of a present perfect construction. However, the participants preferred to use constructions that reflect the current time. This is because the Turkish equivalence of the present perfect construction is usually perceived as past tense. On the other hand, the adverbs and the tenses they nested in are
perfectly unified in the Turkish equivalences of the examples. Therefore, the examples suggest negative transfer from the L1 of the participants.

In examples 42, 43 and 44, the adverbs contributed a meaning of a time span which started in the past and is still current. Hence, the time span that the construction meaning reflected required the present perfect tense construction. However, participants preferred to license the constructions in past simple tense. As illustrated below, when the adverb meanings and constructions are taken into consideration, these constructions are absolutely fine in Turkish.

Asla sozumu boz-ma-di-m.
Never my promise break-neg-past-1SG
Uzun suredir heyecanli bir mac izle-me-di-m.
For a long time exciting a game watch-neg-past-1SG

In opposition to previous examples, examples 45 and 46 show that participants used the present perfect tense to express past events that actually needed to be licensed in past simple tense. Example 46 shows that the participant uses the present perfect construction as if it covers the role of the past simple construction, and shows an overgeneralization of the semantic interpretation of the present perfect construction.

All these examples indicate that the place of present perfect construction is not very clear in the interlanguage of Turkish learners of English, and the construction is preferred to express past meanings rather than present meanings because the present perfect construction and the simple past construction share the same form in Turkish.

In the following section, semantic violations will be exemplified and the most
frequently occurred semantic deviations will be illustrated.

*Semantic Deviations*

In linguistics, semantics is the study of meanings of linguistic signs, and deals with frames which describe situations of element relationships. Thus, semantic violations cause misunderstandings or odd-sounding expressions. Across the data, 60 auxiliary verb constructions were determined as semantically deviated. They were usually derived from semantic misinterpretation of the constructions and violations of frame element requirements of the constructions. Some of the semantic deviations lead to strong misunderstandings, while some of them just sounded odd by violating construction collocability which is when words select each other based on their meaning and frequency of usage. Among these violations, while there were a lot of individual semantic violations of constructions, there were also other violations repeated by more than one participant.

As the first example, the verb *remember* was used in past tense to express a current situation.

*E.47* I did not remember any promises that couldn't keep my promise. R-7488(G2)

*E.48* Most probably I did, but I couldn't remember. R-0169(G2)

In Turkish, the verb *remember* (*hatıralamak*) is usually licensed with past simple construction or present progressive construction unless it is not a general habit of the speaker. In the following examples, the usage of the Turkish verb *hatıralamak* (*remember*) is given in different constructions.

Hatırala-ma-di-m. / Remember-neg.- past-1SG (I don’t remember, current time)
Hatirla-mi-yor-um. / Remember-neg.-prog.-1SG (I am not remembering, current time)

Hatirla-ma-m. / Remember-neg.-1SG (As a general habit, in general)

As it is exemplified above, E.47 and E.48 also can be considered as negative transfer from L1, because in Turkish it is common to use the verb remember in past tense.

In addition to these examples, one of the most common semantic deviations occurred with the construction my arm was broken. In the first question of the questionnaire, participants were asked to explain what the worst thing was that happened to them, and interestingly many participants talked about how they had broken a bone on their bodies, and to convey this experience, all the participants used past simple passive voice construction. The native speakers of English who determined the auxiliary verb constructions as appropriate or inappropriate did not accept these constructions as appropriate. According to the native speakers, the constructions either must be used with past simple active construction (I broke my arm), or must be used with past perfect passive construction (My arm had been broken). The way the participants licensed the constructions provided a meaning as if the arm was always broken, so that for a native speaker broken was perceived as an adjective not as a verb. For example,

E.49) My arm was broken when I was a kid. I was running and playing with friends, I fell down and I felt a big pain in my arm. I didn't know that it was broken at that time. [ ] (R-0169)

E.50) [ ] My left foot wrist was broken and got an operation. (R-7488)

E.51) [ ] I fell down garden wall and I was broken my left arm. [ ] (R- 0062)
E.52) When I was a children fall in the garden and my nose was broken. [ ] (R- 4559)

As the examples show, this is a very common deviation that occurred among Turkish participants’ licensing. An analysis of Turkish correspondence of these constructions shows that the construction is negatively transferred form Turkish because in Turkish, this construction is always used in passive voice. When it is licensed with active voice (Kolu-m-u kir-di-m. / Arm-1SG possessive-acc break-past-1S), it reflects a meaning that it was not an accident; however, when it is licensed with passive voice (Kolu-um kir-il-di. / Arm-1SG possessive break-passive-past), it reflects that it was an accident. Therefore, in Turkish, this construction is licensed with passive voice and usually in simple past tense construction.

Another semantic deviation was the occurrence of present progressive construction in a different manner than it usually occurs. In the following examples, the odd sounding or inappropriately used present progressive constructions were illustrated.

E. 53) So many technological invention had been discovered after my born. For example I am driving my car with new car technology, also computer technology. (R-7488)

E. 54) In the world everything changes so fast. I am hooping our children can have much more peace and beautiful place. (R-8448)

E. 55) It is showing us what is happening behind the scenes that we, as normal citizens, are not able to see. (R-7202)

E. 56) Everyday I am looking TV shows. (R-7488)

As the examples show, among the Turkish speakers of English, it is common to use present progressive constructions to reflect the meaning of present simple
construction, so that it adds an emphasis to the meaning.

In addition to these semantic deviations, there were also some other semantic deviations of idiomatic expressions such as *give promise, dirty hand-clean hand*, etc.

**Idiomatic Deviations**

Some participants used direct translation of Turkish idioms in their responses. For example, in the questionnaire, the Question 3 was about making a promise and not being able to keep the promise, and some of the participants directly translated the equivalence of verb *promise* from Turkish, and used it as *give promise*.

E.57) *Yes, like everybody I also gave someone some promises. (R-7488)*

E.58) *Yes, last summer I gave promise to my younger sister. [ ] (R-7215)*

As mentioned above, the verb phrase *giving promise* is a direct translation form the Turkish equivalence of the verb *promise*. In Turkish, the equivalence of the verb *promise (soz)* is a noun and the helping verb *give (vermek)* is added to make it a verb (see p.19). In these examples, the participants used direct translation of the verb. In addition to that, they also used the verb with one object (as monotransitive), whereas it was supposed to be used with two objects (as ditransitive), because the verb requires two objects, *promise + somebody + to do something*. However, the usage of this verb in Turkish does not have an effect on this violation because the verb *soz vermek* is also a ditransitive verb in Turkish.

Some other examples of idiomatic violations were found in the responses to Question 7 and Question 4. To be able to understand what the speakers implied the questions were also given with the examples.
E. 59) Q7: What kind of vegetables, fruit and grain are grown or what kind of products and goods are produced in your country?
- If I write here I don’t have enough area. (R-0817)

E. 60) Q: Do you think nuclear power is useful? Should Turkey build a nuclear power plant?
- It can be used by "clean "hands or "dirty" hands. (R-7488)

In these examples, the participants translated Turkish idioms into English. Their meanings can be clear for Turkish listeners; however, they might not provide a clear meaning to a person who does not know Turkish language and its background culture.

In the example 59, the participant wanted to express that if she had written everything that was produced in Turkey, the given text box would not provide enough space to write her response. Thus, she means that so many things can be listed about the subject. Also, in the example 60, another participant used another Turkish idiom, clean hand or dirty hand. By this idiom, the participant meant that the nuclear power could be managed by well intentioned people or by ill intentioned people. Both of these examples show that participants’ first language has an important effect on their interlanguage.
6. Conclusion

The main goal of the study was to investigate how Turkish learners of English use the auxiliary verb constructions in English and how they occupy the auxiliary verbs to express tense, aspect and voice. In this context, there were three research questions that were particularly focused on: the first research question of the study was investigating if there were any different patterns between the usages of auxiliary verb constructions by Turkish learners of English and native speakers of English the second research question was investigating if there were any occurrences of inappropriate usages of the auxiliary verb constructions, and lastly the third was investigating what might have been the reason of the inappropriateness, and if there was any possible influence of the first language of the learners on the usage of the auxiliary verb constructions, such as negative transfer or overgeneralization.

Also, throughout the study, Construction Grammar served both as a template for the form and meanings of the constructions and as a theoretical assistant to analyze the violations of constructions. Thus, this study sets an example of an application of Construction Grammar to a second language acquisition study, and it shows that Construction Grammar’s great scope also covers second language acquisition studies.

Therefore, in order to understand how the learners handle the grammatical differences of Turkish and English, the auxiliary verb constructions licensed by Turkish learners of English were analyzed in terms of tense, aspect, and voice usages. In the
results section, all results were provided for a quantitative analysis. Following this section, combined analysis of each question was provided, and meaning of the constructions that the questions were licensed in and meaning of the most frequently occurred constructions were analyzed and discussed in regard to the first research question.

The analysis of the questions showed both similarities and differences between usage of English sentence constructions by native speakers and usage of them by Turkish learners of English. For example, the simple present active voice constructions and the simple past active voice constructions were the most frequently used constructions for Turkish speakers of English and native speakers. However, Turkish speakers of English used the present perfect active voice construction relatively less than the native speakers, and this was explained as a result of negative transfer of L1. Another usage based difference was that Turkish speakers of English used the progressive constructions more than the native speakers. Although the difference was not very big this was the only point that Turkish participant used that aspect more than native speakers. This situation was also explained as the result of the L1 because in Turkish, the progressive aspect has a higher incidence, and it can also be used in the place of present simple construction. In addition to these differences, it was also observed that the Turkish speakers of English used the passive voice constructions less than the native speakers, and the constructions that were licensed by Turkish participants had a high incidence of violations. However, this type of violation could not be related with Turkish grammar, and it was considered a result of the Turkish participants’ interlanguage proficiency. The results also indicated
that the Turkish participants used the modal verb constructions less than the native speakers. This was also not related to the features of Turkish grammar. Moreover, the passive voice modal constructions were one of the most ill-formed constructions. These violations indicated that in the interlanguage of the Turkish participants, modal passive constructions were not fully and appropriately acquired yet.

In addition to these analyses, in regard to the second and third research questions, and to be able to discuss the ill-formed constructions in an organized way; the constructions were determined according to the deviation types that they fall in. This analysis provided more detailed information and made it possible to apprehend what the reasons might have been that caused the deviations.

Syntactic type deviations were the most frequently occurred deviations. However, they were usually combined with semantic or unification type deviations. Although, it was possible to encounter examples of syntactic violation in many constructions and in different shapes, some violations showed common features. Passive voice auxiliary verb constructions contained similar violations. Although some of the violations were related to the L1 influence, learners’ language proficiency was considered a more effective factor for other violations.

Like the syntactic violations, the unification violations also occurred frequently, and there were some types of deviations that showed similarity with the Turkish grammar. The ill-formed present perfect tense constructions especially showed similarity with its Turkish equivalence. This violation indicated a strong possibility of being influenced by L1 of the speakers. However, some occurrences did not show a sign of
negative transfer.

In terms of semantic deviations, there were also some similar violations, and many of them were considered as transfers of the way of thinking from learners’ first language. These violations showed that some Turkish speakers of English tried to express the Turkish meaning of the constructions with their direct translations. For example, the word *remember* was licensed in past tense constructions, as it is used in Turkish, or the construct, *my arm was broken*, was a direct translation from Turkish, and it was used to express that the participant had broken his/her arm. However, for the native speakers, the construction *was broken* was perceived as if the *broken* was an adjective and described a feature of the speaker’s arm. In addition to these violations, among the semantic deviations, there were also deviations of idiomatic expressions. Some participants directly translated the Turkish idioms into English. The meanings of these expressions were clear for Turkish readers, but they were not clear for the reader who did not know how to speak Turkish or about the Turkish culture.

Other than the syntactic, semantic and unification violations, there were occurrences of violations which do not fall into areas of one of these deviations types. These were combined under the other deviation types and they were analyzed in detail. For further study, the data can be investigated in terms of many other type of violations, such as pragmatic violations, textual violations, mood violations, etc.

Overall, in the light of this study, we can propose that while the tense preferences of Turkish speakers of English and native speakers do not show a high percentage of differences, the situation is different for aspect usages. The perfect aspect is relatively
less preferred by the Turkish speakers of English. Also, in terms of voice usages, Turkish
speakers of English tend to use passive voice constructions less than native speakers, and
the examples show a number of passive voice construction violations. In addition to that,
in the interlanguage of the Turkish participants, the place of present perfect tense
construction is not very clear because of its grammatical feature in Turkish, and as
another aspect type, for this data, the progressive aspect shows an over usage by the
Turkish participants. It is a result of semantic interpretations of the progressive aspect in
Turkish. Thus, it results in usage based negative transfer in the interlanguage of Turkish
speakers of English. Besides the aforementioned general insights, there were some other
particular constructions that were inappropriately licensed by individual participants as a
result of negative transfer.

In the light of these analyses, it can be stated that in the interlanguage of the
second language learners, the first language of the learners plays a major role. During the
learning process, form-meaning pairs of the first language can be switched successfully
with the new language’s pairs. However, some forms or meanings of the first language
can be paired erroneously with the second language’s forms or meanings, and this study
demonstrated the examples of inappropriate matching of form and meaning units.

**Limitations**

During the study, some unexpected incidences were encountered. For example, in
the questionnaire, since the Turkish participants were not just students, they were asked
to determine their own English proficiency levels. However, the participants indicated
some misjudgments about their proficiency levels, and the level that they determined for
themselves and the percentage of inappropriate usages did not match. Therefore, in the study, the inappropriate usages could not be supported by the learners’ proficiency levels. Also, some questions could not extract the expected constructions from native and non-native participants. Another encountered limitation was dividing the participants into groups. At the beginning of the study, the questionnaires were implemented to four different groups of Turkish speakers of English. The groups were organized according to their English education and length of living in an English speaking country. Although, the groups showed reasonable differences in terms of using the auxiliary verb constructions appropriately, when the results were analyzed for each question, the number of produced constructions for each group was not enough to make comparison in percentages. For example, if one group had licensed 10 constructions for one question, 1 construction corresponded to 10% of the group’s all production for the respective question. However, if another group had licensed 30 constructions, 3 constructions corresponded the 10% of the group’s production. Therefore, in order to not to mislead the comparison of the frequency of the constructions, the Turkish participants were aggregated in one group. All these unexpected occurrences showed that for a cross linguistic study, before implementing a questionnaire, it should be piloted on a native and non-native group. Thus, most of the possible unexpected incidences could be prevented.
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8. APPENDIX

8.1. The Auxiliary Verb questionnaire

Demographic Information Sheet

1) How old are you?
18-25_____ 26-35_____ 36-45_____ 46-55_____ 55- +_____ 

2) What is your gender? Female______ Male______

3) What is your first language?

4) How long have you been learning English?

5) How old were you when you started learning English?

6) Why did you start learning English?

7) Have you ever been to USA or another English speaking country? How long?

8) What is your educational level?
PhD___ Master___ Bachelor___ High School___ Middle School___ Primary School ___

9) What do you think your English proficiency level is on the scale?
1 (not good) _____ 2_____ 3____ 4____ 5 (perfect) ____
Questions:

Part I

*Please answer the questions with full sentences.*

1. What was the worst thing that happened to you? For example, have you ever been bitten by a snake, had a car accident or injured? Please explain how it happened and what has happened since then? And, please write at least three sentences or a paragraph.

2. Do you know what was invented or discovered after you were born? Do you take advantage of them/it in your daily life? Please give some examples?

3. Had you ever promised somebody to do something really important, but couldn’t keep your promise for some reason or forgot it?

4. Do you think nuclear power is useful? Should Turkey build a nuclear power plant?

5. Will Turkey have been accepted to European Union by 2020? What is your opinion?

6. If you had Aladdin’s magic lamp what would you want the genie to do for you and for the world and humanity?

7. What kind of vegetables, fruit and grain are grown or what kind of products and goods are produced in your country? Please give some examples.

8. What was the most exciting game that you have watched so far? Please give some details.

9. Have you been following a TV show or a soap opera recently? Can you tell us what it is about?

10. What do you expect to be doing in 2020?
Part II

Please fill the gaps with appropriate forms of the verbs given in the parentheses.

A few days ago, while I ___(a)(sleep) at my house, I ___(b)(rob). It ___ (c)(be) around 3 am. I ___ (d)(hear) a noise in the living room, and I ___ (e)(take) my gun out of the drawer. As I ___ (f)(get) closer to the living room, I ___ (g)(understand) that there was more than one person. Suddenly, I ___ (h)(see) two men running out the door. I ___ (i)(try) to follow them but they were fast. When I looked at the living room, I realized that one of the antique vases that I had in my collection ___ (j)(miss). I called the police immediately and told them my antique vase ___ (k)(steal). The police ___ (l)(investigate) for four days, but they could not find any clue yet. I am really upset because according to what the police told me, the thieves ___ (m)(might never catch).
### 8.2. Answer Key for the Gap-filling Exercise

**Table 17**

*Native Speakers’ Answers for the Gap-filling Exercise*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb Phrases in the Parentheses</th>
<th>Native Speakers’ Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) (sleep)</td>
<td>was sleeping, slept, asleep, sleeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) (rob)</td>
<td>was robbed, got robbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) (be)</td>
<td>Was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) (hear)</td>
<td>Heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) (take)</td>
<td>Took</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) (get)</td>
<td>got, was getting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) (understand)</td>
<td>Understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) (see)</td>
<td>Saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) (try)</td>
<td>Tried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) (miss)</td>
<td>was missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) (steal)</td>
<td>was stolen, had been stolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) (investigate)</td>
<td>Investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) (might never catch)</td>
<td>might never be caught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17, Native Speakers’ Answers for the Gap-filling Exercise
8.3. Illustrations from the Microsoft Access Database Program

In the QAll Table, each row represents a participant and each column represents a question from the questionnaire. This table has all the demographic information about the participants and all responses of the participants for the open-ended questions and gap-filling question.

Fig. 2, Illustration of the QAll Table in the MS Database Program
In the OpenEndedQuestions Table each row represents a sentence and each column represents a type of analysis. For example, after the finite verb count, the first analysis was named as construction name and it reflects the tense and aspect of the construction. For example, the Figure 4 shows an example of analysis of construction tense and aspect under the analysis type of ConstructionName.
Fig. 4, Illustration of Tense & Aspect Analysis of Constructs in MS Database Program

Fig. 5, Illustration of Analysis of Constructs of Native Speakers of English
Fig. 6, Illustration of Analysis of Constructs of Turkish Speakers of English