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Abstract

As in the case of other non-English languages, the study of the acquisition of Turkish has mostly focused on aspects of grammatical morphology and syntax, largely neglecting the study of the effect of interactional factors on child morphosyntax. This paper reviews indications from past research that studying input and adult-child discourse can facilitate the study of the acquisition of morphosyntax in the Turkish language. It also provides some recent studies of Turkish child language on the relationship of child-directed speech to the early acquisition of morphosyntax, and on the pragmatic features of a certain kind of discourse form in child-directed speech called variation sets.
come to the foreground of the field (see Slobin 1985 for a lucid discussion of the rise of cross-linguistic acquisition studies). Thus, especially in fields such as Turkish child language, which is relatively recent and which involves a language with salient morphosyntactic properties, research on topics such as child-directed speech and discursive interaction remains to be developed. This paper will review indications from past research that studying input and adult-child discourse can facilitate the study of the acquisition of morphosyntax in the Turkish language. It will also provide some recent examples from Turkish child language on the relationship of child-directed speech to the early acquisition of morphosyntax, and on the pragmatic features of a certain kind of discourse form in child-directed speech.

Lessons from Past Research

The first important chapter in the area of Turkish child language development was that of Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1985), providing a summary of the empirical data available at the time and a theoretical discussion of important language-specific features that pose interesting acquisition problems for the native learner. Apart from several parental diary studies conducted in the seventies, the monograph summarized the experimental studies carried out by Aksu-Koç, Slobin, and their associates, supplemented by tape-recorded naturalistic data, covering the range of 2 to 5 years. Verhoeven (1991) and Küntay and Slobin (1999) provided more recent overviews of selected research in Turkish language acquisition, the latter focusing on first-language acquisition by monolingual Turkish children while the former included discussion of the large literature on the language of bilingual Turkish children in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden.

Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1985) have a section titled ‘Input and Adult-Child Interaction’ where they briefly discuss variable word order, types of inflections, discourse scaffolding, and politeness norms in adult-child discourse. They propose that the input offers ample opportunity for the child to read off pragmatic word order rules, the discovery of inflectional paradigms, “leading the child to linguistic structures from surface cues…” (p. 868). As a clear example of discourse scaffolding, the authors mention the acquisition of causal connectives, where they emerge first as a response to adult questioning and only later in self-constructed utterances (Aksu, 1975). Norms and rules about polite forms such as the usage of second person plural and lexical markers such as lütfen ‘please’ were also found to involve explicit modeling and reinforcement on the part of adult interactants of child language learners. These empirical observations aside, both at the beginning (p. 844) and at the end of their chapter (p. 876), Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1985) identify adult input as one of the crucial gaps in studying the acquisition of Turkish.

Variation Sets

Küntay and Slobin (1995, 1996, 2001) have recently examined parental speech by two Turkish mothers directed to their daughters during the very early stages of language production. Child-directed speech in Turkish, evidently in other languages as well (Slobin, Küntay, and Hoiting, 2001), present the child with variation sets that are characterized by a sequence of utterances with a constant intention but varying form. Variation sets are identified by three types of phenomena: (1) lexical substitution and rephrasing, (2) addition and deletion of specific referential terms, and (3) reordering of constituents. The Turkish language presents the learner with a richly inflected language, with much variation in word order, and substantial ellipsis of nominal arguments. Consequently, in Turkish child-directed speech there are rich possibilities for ellipsis and reordering, as well as a broad range of morphological variation. As a result, we find many variation sets that keep communicative intent constant but vary morphosyntax across successive utterance in Turkish mothers’ speech directed to their very young children. Examples 1 and 2 are two variation sets coming from two Turkish mothers, the former speaking to a 19-month-old girl, the latter to a 21-month-old girl:
In studying Turkish child-directed speech, Küntay and Slobin (1996) point out that the language learner needs to pay attention to variation across successive adult utterances in extended discourse to figure out the circumstances of repositioning and morphological alternations in lexical forms. This, the authors later suggested, will allow differentiation of the lexical categories of nouns and verbs, which are subject to different patterns of agglutinated morphology, ellipsis, and reordering in variation sets (Küntay & Slobin, 2001).

In sum, in previous work in child-directed discourse, Küntay and Slobin speculated on how variation sets might trigger morphological, lexical, and syntactic advances in the child. Most of the previous research of adult recasts in child-directed speech in other languages have also dealt with adults’ reformulations of the child’s utterances and how these trigger morphological and syntactic

---

1 The following abbreviations are used in glosses: abl [= ablative]; acc [= accusative]; aor [= aorist]; dat [= dative]; evid [= evidential]; gen [= genitive]; indef [= indefinite numeral]; ins [= instrumental]; loc [= locative]; mod [= modality]; neg [= negation]; opt [= optative]; pas [= passive]; poss [= possessive]; pro [= pronoun]; prog [= present progressive]; yn [= yes-no question marker]; 1s [= first-person singular]; 2s [= second-person singular]; 1pl [= first-person plural]; 3pl [= third-person plural].
advances in young children (Baker & Nelson, 1984; Farrar, 1990; Hoff-Ginsberg, 1990, Nelson, 1977; Nelson et al., 1989). Yet, the grammatical cues in variation sets are obviously provided as a result of the conglomeration of certain pragmatic intentions on the part of the speaker. The caregiver does not vary the utterance position of a constituent with the intention of modeling for the child the subtleties of Turkish word-order principles, but to render the interaction more effective. The interactive function of most variation sets seems to be to repeat the same content in order to maximize the chance of comprehension and/or compliance on the part of the hearer. Fernald (1993) finds that Japanese mothers make use of successively different terms until the child gives an overt response, in order to achieve the goal of getting the child to carry out an action. Similarly, in Turkish, in repeating the same communicative content, but by deleting some elements and reintroducing others, the speaker appears to conduct an “event analysis” for the benefit of the child. For example, in Example 2, the mother initially provides a complex event sequence in which the child is told to go to the bathroom and pour out the water that she is currently playing with. In the second utterance of the variation set, the mother only specifies the first component of the event complex, git ‘go.’ This is followed by the next event segment, banyoya götür ‘take (it) to the bath(tub)’. Finally the culminating subevent of pouring the water into the bathtub is mentioned in banyoya götür dök ‘take (it) to the bath(tub) (and) pour’. In the final constituent of the variation set, the mother reexpands the event complex to include all the subevents—getting up, taking the water, and pouring the water—in the extent of one utterance. Such an event segmentation, where the communicative intent is divided up into its components, most likely eases the comprehension of a young child, facilitating the effectiveness of the communicative act.

Thus, cues for grammatical analysis in child-directed speech are not encountered directly by the child, but come in a discourse-mediated package. It is highly plausible that the child is primarily working on understanding the structure of interpersonal action. Simultaneously, as part and parcel of attempting to achieve social coordination, the child conducts the task of deciphering the linguistic structure.

The question, then, is whether variation sets appear in definable pragmatic contexts. To answer the question, we conducted a speech-act analysis of a third corpus of a mother’s speech, directed to a child called Deniz at ages 1;3 years and 2;0. (Ketrez [1999] characterizes the former stage as a premorphological stage for Deniz, while the latter stage is when she masters the whole inflectional system for both nouns and verbs.) The primary questions of interest were: (1) In what kinds of communicative functions are variation sets used by caregivers? (2) Can we document any changes in the nature of variation sets as the child gets older and linguistically more competent?

Communicative Functions of Variation Sets

To begin with, it is evident that the interactional function of variation sets is to attract and hold the child’s attention until some kind of desired response is produced—either an action or a verbalization. The analysis of the interactional functions of variation sets in Deniz’s mother’s speech indicates that three functions summarize the illocutionary forces of all the sets: (1) control-oriented variation sets that call for an action on the part of the child, serving a function of a control act (Ervin-Tripp, 1989), (2) ideational variation sets that merely serve the function of information provision, performing merely on the plane of ideation, and (3) information-querying variation sets that prompt the child to answer a question with information. These three types of variation sets are exemplified in (3), (4), and (5) respectively. (According to Schiffrin [1987], discourse structures involve several planes of coherence simultaneously: the level of ideas or propositional content (ideational level), the instrumental level of speech acts or conversational moves (action level), and the mechanical level of turn-taking (exchange level). Variation sets, by definition, mostly keep the exchange level constant.)

(3) Control-oriented variation set

hayır ayakkabı el-len-me-z
no shoe touch-pas-neg-aor
‘no, shoe(s) (is/are) not touched’
on-un-la sokak-ta gez-iyor-uz
it-gen-ins street-loc walk-around-prog-1pl
‘we walk around with it on the street’

pis o gel
dirty that come
‘that’s dirty, come over here’

(4) **Ideational variation set**

Deniz bak bi(r) tane gemi resm-i yap-iyor-um ben.
Deniz look indef boat picture-poss do-prog-1sg I
‘Deniz, look, I am doing a drawing of a boat’

gemi:!
Boat
‘Boa:t’

(5) **Information-querying variation set**

ne var-mu$ bur(a)-da?
what exist-evid here-loc
‘What is in here?’

var mi bi(r)$eyler ?
exist yn something
‘Is there anything?’

The following table provides (a) a breakdown of all the variation sets used by Deniz’s mother when Deniz was 1;3 and then again when she was 2;0 with respect to the interactional function of variation sets, as represented in the boldfaced and centralized rows, and (b) the types of variations found in each of these types of sets, as represented in normal-font rows.

**Table 1:** Interactive functions and types of variations in variation sets of Deniz’s mother at 1;3 and 2;0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variation Set</th>
<th>Deniz at 1;3</th>
<th>Deniz at 2;0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information-querying</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make-more-specific-question</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide-answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute-words</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change-suffix</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change-minimally</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideational</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand-information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute-words</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce-information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce-and-expand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control-oriented</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate/Lead-around/Decompose</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following figure indicates the changes in functions of variation sets as a function of the child’s age.

![Figure 1. Change in functions of mother’s variation sets according to age of child](image)

It seems that most variation sets perform either information querying or control acts, the ratio of the latter increasing in the later stage. In control-oriented variation sets, the mother leads the child through different components of the activity, often elaborating, adding justifications, explanations and other associated information to the central control act. In ideational and information-querying variation sets, the mother makes the information or the question more specific in successive utterances, often providing reordering of original constituents, summarized information, or answers to her own questions.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Child language is almost always produced in reality through mediation of discursive interaction. Although extracting linguistic forms through powerful computerized searches is convenient and useful, we must not lose sight of the fact that these forms are produced to achieve effectiveness in interpersonal communication, rather than to emphasize grammatical appropriateness.

This paper proposes that studies of discursive interaction in Turkish child language are long overdue, having been pointed out as both sparsely studied and crucial from the early days of the field (Aksu-Koç and Slobin, 1985). The paper also reviews a feature of adult-child interaction in Turkish—variation sets—that display interesting morphosyntactic properties while facilitating effective...
interaction between the caregiver and the child. As the child develops language and cognitive skills, so does the parent change the nature of child-directed language. In the process, the child learns about the structure of the language, the semantics of words and constructions, and conversational pragmatics.

The study of variation sets is still preliminary, but it hints at the advantages “putting interaction back into child language”. We can see that word-order changes, substitution of the past tense marker with the evidential marker, use of relative clauses in segmenting events for the child, and change of verbal morphology all occur in real-time interaction with specific pragmatic intentions on the part of the speaker. As analysts, we need to “regain sight” of those intentions and their relation to morphosyntax.
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