

Uygun, S., & Gürel, A. (2018). *Processing of compounds in native and nonnative speakers of Turkish*. Paper presented at the 2nd Conference on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Linguistic Theory (CIALT-2), Berlin, Germany. 25 - 27 October.

## **Processing of Compounds in Native and Nonnative Speakers of Turkish**

Serkan Uygun and Ayşe Gürel

*Potsdam University and Boğaziçi University*

Compound processing has a particular place in the psycholinguistic literature since it contributes to our understanding of the mental representation/processing of multimorphemic words – an issue that has not yet been completely resolved. Compounds allow researchers to examine whether constituency, frequency and semantic transparency play a fundamental role in the processing of multimorphemic words [1]. Studies on compound processing revealed that semantic transparency and headedness are two factors influencing constituent morpheme activation in different languages [4,6]. In the context of second language (L2) acquisition, a proficiency-based reliance on semantic transparency and headedness was observed [7]. Previous research on processing of Turkish is limited and the findings are inconclusive as to the extent of decomposition in accessing inflected and derived forms [2,3,5].

The present study investigates the processing of noun-noun compounds in L2 Turkish, a language with right-headed and productive compounding. In a masked priming experiment, 71 L1-English learners of Turkish (35 advanced and 36 intermediate-level learners) and 73 Turkish monolinguals were tested. The stimuli consisted of 10 transparent-transparent, ‘*kuzeydoğu*’ (northeast) (*kuzey*=north, *doğu*=east); 10 partially-opaque, ‘*büyükelçi*’ (ambassador) (*büyük*=big, *elçi*=delegate), 10 pseudocompounds (‘*fesleğen*’, ‘*basil*’, *fes*=fez; *leğen*=bowl/pelvis), and 60 monomorphemic words, ‘*kaplumbağa*’ (turtle), together with 90 nonwords. The prime-target pairs were presented in three conditions: (i) Constituent 1 (*kuzey*–*KUZEYDOĞU*), (ii) Constituent 2 (*doğu*–*KUZEYDOĞU*), and (iii) Unrelated (*çanta* ‘bag’–*KUZEYDOĞU*). All items were matched on length and frequency. The test had three versions so that no participant saw the same target more than once.

A 2 x 3 x 3 Mixed ANOVA for the RTs revealed a significant main effect of word type ( $F=239.016$ ;  $p<.001$ ), prime type ( $F=5.402$ ;  $p<.006$ ), group ( $F=252.449$ ;  $p<.001$ ), the interactions between word type and group ( $F=78.103$ ;  $p<.001$ ) and word type and prime type ( $F=3.277$ ;  $p<.043$ ). The native speakers of Turkish processed the words significantly faster than intermediate and advanced L2 groups ( $p<.001$ ); and the advanced group was significantly faster than the intermediate group ( $p<.001$ ). Compound words were processed significantly more slowly than noncompounds ( $p<.001$ ) by all groups. A further analysis of compounds revealed a significant difference only between Constituent 2 and Unrelated Prime ( $p<.003$ ), suggesting the facilitative role of Constituent 2 in all groups; however, for noncompounds, no priming effect was observed.

A second 2 x 3 x 3 Mixed ANOVA was conducted only for compound words and the results revealed a significant main effect of word type ( $F=11.798$ ;  $p<.002$ ), prime type ( $F=6.445$ ;  $p<.003$ ), group ( $F=228.578$ ;  $p<.001$ ) and the interaction between word type and group ( $F=4.964$ ;  $p<.009$ ). Partially-opaque compounds were processed significantly more slowly than transparent-transparent compounds ( $p<.002$ ), but this difference was only significant for intermediate level learners ( $p<.001$ ). A pairwise comparison among prime types revealed a significant difference only between Constituent 2 and Unrelated Prime ( $p<.001$ ), indicating that Constituent 2 facilitated lexical access for both partially-opaque and transparent-transparent compounds for all groups.

Overall, findings reveal that Constituent 2 (the head) facilitated lexical access in Turkish compounds not only in native but also in nonnative speakers of Turkish. In addition, the findings suggest that semantic transparency does not play a significant role in processing Turkish compounds.

Uygun, S., & Gürel, A. (2018). *Processing of compounds in native and nonnative speakers of Turkish*. Paper presented at the 2nd Conference on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Linguistic Theory (CIALT-2), Berlin, Germany. 25 - 27 October.

Word Count: 507

## References

1. Fiorentino, R. (2006). *Lexical structure and the nature of linguistic representations*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Maryland.
2. Gürel, A. (1999). Decomposition: To what extent? The case of Turkish. *Brain and Language*, 68, 218-224.
3. Gürel, A., & Uygun, S. (2013). Representation of multimorphemic words in the mental lexicon: Implications for second language acquisition of morphology. In S. Baiz, N. Goldman & R. Hawkes (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th annual conference on language development* (pp. 122-133). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
4. Jarema, G., Busson, C., Nikolova, R., Tsapkini, K., & Libben, G. (1999). Processing compounds: A cross-linguistic study. *Brain and Language*, 68, 362-369.
5. Kırkıcı, B., & Clahsen, H. (2013). Inflection and derivation in native and non-native language processing: Masked priming experiments on Turkish. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 16, 776-791.
6. Libben, G., Gibson, M., Yoon, Y. B., & Sandra, D. (2003). Compound fracture: The role of semantic transparency and morphological headedness. *Brain and Language*, 84, 50-64.
7. Wang, M. (2010) Bilingual compound processing: The effects of constituent frequency and semantic transparency. *Writing Systems Research* 2:2, 117-137.