Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies

Vol 13, No 2 (2017)

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies

Table of Contents

Articles

EFL teachers' conceptualizations of their roles through metaphor analysis — PDF 01-13
Mehmet AsmalÄ±, Handan Ã‡elik

Comparison of Chinese and Turkish EFL learners on the use of Compliment Responses — PDF 14-29
Ilknur Istifci

Investigating lifelong learning dispositions of faculty members who teach foreign languages — PDF 30-42
Åženel ElaldÄ±

The childrenâ€™s foreign language anxiety scale: Reliability and validity — PDF 43-52
Selami AydÄ±n, Leyla Harputlu, Ã–zgehan UÅŸtuk, Serhat GÃ¼zel, Åžeyda Savran Ã‡elik

The impact of contextual factors on English language teachersâ€™ beliefs — PDF 53-70
Ertan AltÄ±nsoy, Zuhal Okan

Teaching ELF as a motivation source for learners: An action research study — PDF 71-81
Emrah Muyan, Mehmet Tunaz

Investigating problems of English literature teaching to EFL high school students in Turkey with focus on language proficiency — PDF 82-95
Ceren IÅŸÄ±klÄ±, AslÄ± Ã–zlem Tarakcioglu

The role of academic motivation in predicting preservice EFL teachersâ€™ achievement — PDF 96-108
Åženay KÄ±rkaÄŸaÃ§, HÃ¼seyin Ã–z

Achievement attributions of preparatory class learners in learning English — PDF 109-135
Turan Paker, Alev Ã–zkardeÅŸ-DÃ¶ÄŸÃ¼ÅŸ

The impact of online reading tasks and reading strategies on EFL learnersâ€™ reading test scores — PDF 136-152
Ä°smail FÄ±rat Altay, AyÅŸe Altay

Investigating ESL/EFL studentsâ€™ approaches in response to feedback: A case study — PDF 153-181
Amerah Abdullah Alsharif, Hesham Suleiman Alyousef

Gender related differences in using intensive adverbs in Turkish — PDF 182-189
Engin Evrim Ã–nem

The role of L+ Turkish and English learning in resilience: A case of Syrian students at Gaziantep University — PDF 190-203
Emrah Cinkara

Autonomous language learning on Twitter: Performing affiliation with target language users through #hashtags — PDF 204-220
Osman Solmaz

Translating the metaphor in poetry: A cognitive approach to Le Bateau Ivre and its translation in Turkish — PDF 221-234
Ruhan GÃ¼Ã§lÃ¼

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies
Q2 Language and Linguistics
best quartil
SJR 2020
0.17
powered by scimagojr.cor

Student teachersâ€™ perceptions on the selection criteria of English language teachers in the Sultanate of Oman: Implications for policy reconsideration
Ali Al-Issa, Ali Al-Bulushi, Rima Al-Zadjali
PDF 235-259

/Ã¦/ versus /É™/: Vowel fossilization in the pronunciation of Turkish English majors: Rehabilitation 1
Mehmet Demirezen
PDF 260-284

A text world theory approach to the teaching of short stories in an EFL context: A pedagogical stylistic study
Behbood Mohammadzadeh
PDF 285-295

A constraint-based approach to acquisition of word-final consonant clusters in Turkish children
Burcu Gokgoz-Kurt
PDF 296-308

International studentsâ€™ challenges in academic writing: A case study from a prominent U.S. university
Nazmiye GÃ¼rel CennetkuÅŸu
PDF 309-323

Classroom assessment practices of English language instructors
Meryem Ã–zdemir YÄ±lmazer, Yonca Ã–zkan
PDF 324-345

Deontic modals in RP-US Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA): A corpus-based analysis
John Paul Obillos Dela Rosa
PDF 346-366

Comparison of speaking activities in Turkish and English language teaching coursebooks regarding self-assesment grid of CEFR
GÃ¼lden TÃ¼m, GÃ¼lÅŸah Emre-ParmaksÄ±z
PDF 367-378

Investigation of Turkish EFL learnersâ€™ attributions on success and failure in learning English
Aysun Yavuz, Devrim Hol
PDF 379-396

Factors affecting the use of the self-regulated L2 learning strategies in Turkish FLE context
DinÃ§ay KÃ¶ksal, Sinem DÃ¼ndar
PDF 397-425

The implementation of flipped education into Turkish EFL teaching context
Serkan Boyraz, GÃ¼rbÃ¼z Ocak
PDF 426-439

Effects of task planning and rhetorical mode of writing on lexical complexity, syntactic complexity, and overall writing quality of EFL writersâ€™ task performance
Mine YÄ±ldÄ±z, SavaÅŸ YeÅŸilyurt
PDF 440-464

Investigating collocational priming in Turkish
Hakan CangÄ±r, S. Nalan BÃ¼yÃ¼kkantarcÄ±oÄŸlu, Philip Durrant
PDF 465-486

Studentsâ€™ perceptions of â€˜Good Englishâ€™ and the underlying ideologies behind their perceptions
Ali KarakaÅŸ
PDF 487-509

Position of the translator as an agent in website localization: The case of Turkey
Sinem Canim Alkan
PDF 510-525

A study on metadiscoursive interaction in the MA theses of the native speakers of English and the Turkish speakers of English
Zehra KÃ¶roÄŸlu, GÃ¼lden TÃ¼m
PDF 526-534

Exploring EFL students' use of writing strategies and their attitudes towards reading-to-write and writing-only tasks
Azimeh Soltani, Shiela Kheirzadeh
PDF 535-560

Digital self-review and anonymous peer feedback in Turkish high school EFL writing
Ayten Kayacan, Salim RazÄ±
PDF 561-577

Factors impeding the learning of a second language in Spanish school system: Valladolid University Sample
Orhan Kocaman
PDF 578-592

Competence in lexical boosters and nativeness in academic writing of English: The possible relation
Cuneyt Demir
PDF 593-614

Variation in the status of the P and its effects on relative clause construction
Ager Gondra
PDF 615-631

Collaborative teaching from English language instructorsâ€™ perspectives
Hanife TaÅŸdemir, TuÄŸba YÄ±ldÄ±rÄ±m
PDF 632-642

ELT teacher education flipped classroom: An analysis of task challenge and student teachersâ€™ views and expectations
Hatice Karaaslan, Hatice Ã‡elebi
PDF 643-666

Foreign language anxiety: A study at Ufuk University Preparatory School
Ceyhun KarabÄ±yÄ±k, Neslihan Ã–zkan
PDF 667-680

Integrating cognitive linguistics insights into data-driven learning: Teaching vertical prepositions
Abdurrahman Kilimci
PDF 681-719

An analysis of Turkeyâ€™s Pisa 2015 results using two-level hierarchical linear modelling
DoÄŸu AtaÅŸ, Ã–zge KaradaÄŸ
PDF 720-727

A sample implementation of corpus integration through coursebook evaluation: Implications for language teacher education
Asuman AÅŸÄ±k
PDF 728-740

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies
ISSN 1305-578X (Online)
Copyright © 2005-2022 by Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies

Editorial Team

Associate Editors

GÃ¼lde TÃ¼m, Cukurova University, Turkey
Muhammad Sabri bin Sahrir, International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia
BurÃ§ak Yilmaz YakiÅŸik, Gazi University, Turkey
Amir Hamza Youssef Salama, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Editorial Board Members

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, India
Michael Owusu Tabiri, Ghana Communication Technology University and University of Education, Winneba, Department of Applied Linguistics, Ghana
Dr. D. Solomon Paul Raj, Karpagam Academy of Higher Education, India
Kutay Uzun, Trakya University, Turkey, Turkey
Hi Holi Ali, Rustaq College of Education, Sultanate of Oman, Oman
Dr Noraini Zulkepli, University Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia
Mr Aravind B R, Vellore Institute of Technology, Chennai, India
Mr yohannes - telaumbanua, Politeknik Negeri Padang, Indonesia
Dr Sunil Kumar Ravi, Shravana Institute of Speech and Hearing, Ballari, Karnataka, India, India
Assist. Prof. Dr. Meliha R. ÅžimÅŸek, University of Health Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages, Ä°stanbul, Turkey
Dr. Nidhi Sharma, Swami Keshvanand Institute of Technology, Jaipur, India
Dr. Yahya Mohammed Al-Marrani, Sana'a University, Yemen
Mr. Melaku Bayu Workie, Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia
Dr. Mohammad Hossein Yousefi, Department of English, Bonab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran, Iran, Islamic Republic of
Khalid Salim S. Al Zouâ€™bi, Jerash University, Jordan
Dr. Hatice G YÃ¼ksel, YÄ±ldÄ±z Technical University, Turkey
Dr. hameed Yahya Al-Zubeiry, Albaha University - Al-Baha, KSA, Saudi Arabia
Dr Shashikanta Tarai, National Institute of Technology Raipur, India, India

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies
ISSN 1305-578X (Online)

Copyright © 2005-2022 by Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies



Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies

Announcements

STEPS TO FOLLOW FOR SUBMISSION

SUBMISSION PROCESS

Posted: 2020-11-03 More...

JLLS Template

Authors are kindly asked to use theÂ JLLS Manuscript TemplateÂ to format their manuscript when their article is in **editing process**.

Posted: 2020-06-02

Submission Requirement

The authors to submit their papers in our journal are first strictly required to use the template file, the link of which is given in the announcement section. The papers which are not provided in our template file and/or do not follow the format will not be taken into account for editorial process.

Second, the authors are also required to fill out the Ethics Committee Approval Form,Â the link of which is given in this announcement section, too.

Lastly, each author should present their Turnitin or iThenticate reports during the submission process.

Â

Â

Â

Posted: 2020-03-30

Ethics Committee Approval - ULAKBÄ°M

Dear Author(s),

Please fill in theÂ Ethics Committee Approval form from the link provided below in order to publish your article and upload it as a supplementary file. Otherwise, the publication of your article will be postponed.Â
Â
Link

If you claim that your study does not require approval,Â you should clearly state it in the form as "NOT REQUIRED".

Best regards,

The Editorial Board

Posted: 2020-03-09

How to search your article indexed in Scopus

Scopus Title Evaluation SupportÂ
titlesuggestion@scopus.com

Visit www.scopus.com



CheckÂ Scopus source listÂ

Download the excel file in which you can search for our journal in the list.

Source record ID:

21100936532

To reach your article, you can browse your article in Scopus in the link below by typing your article title.

Link

Posted: 2019-08-17 More...

JLLS Publication Frequency

As of 2018 the publication frequency of our Journal has changed.

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies (JLLS) is now publishedÂ **quarterly, in March, June, September, and December.**

Posted: 2018-02-13 More...

ERIC - Education Resources Information Center

***Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies (JLLS)* is now indexed in ERIC - Education Resources Information Center by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) of the U.S. Department of Education.**

Posted: 2016-06-24 More...

1 - 7 of 7 Items

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies
ISSN 1305-578X (Online)
Copyright © 2005-2022 by Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies

Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13(2), 182-189; 2017

Gender related differences in using intensive adverbs in Turkish

Engin E. Önem [a] *

[a] *Erciyes University, 15 Temmuz Yerleskesi YDYO, Kayseri and 38280, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Önem, E., E. (2017). Gender related differences in using intensive adverbs in Turkish. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 182-189.

Submission Date:17/03/2017

Acceptance Date:25/07/2017

Abstract

This study aims to find out whether there is a gender based difference between male and female native speakers of Turkish in using intensive adverbs in Turkish. To achieve this, 182 voluntary native speakers of Turkish (89 female/93 male) with age ranging from 18 to 22 were asked to complete a photo description task. The task required choosing one of the statements in Turkish to describe twenty photos taken from International Affective Picture System (IAPS-Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 2008). Each set of statements were nominal affirmative sentences and they included a description of the photo with a normal adjective and another one re-written to include an intensive adverb to modify the adjective in the previous statement. Results revealed no statistically significant difference between male and female participants in total. Yet, female participants used intensive adverbs more for certain photos. Discussion of the results and suggestions for future research are presented.

© 2017 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Turkish; intensive adverbs; gender differences; photo description task

1. Introduction

It is now widely accepted that language use differs according to gender and much research provide findings to comply with this fact (see Sunderland, 2006 for a review of relevant studies). In addition to the differences from a macro level, there is a growing body of research focusing on more specific or micro aspects of language use such as the differences on the use of sentences or phrases (Mulac et al., 2001). For instance, as known, an adverb is the part of speech which "describes the circumstances of an action: where it is done (here, elsewhere, overhead), when it is done (tomorrow, often, rarely, never) or how it is done (fast, well, carefully, dramatically, resentfully)" (Trask, 1999: 3). Along with other uses of adverbs, intensive adverbs such as *very*, *really* and *quite* are used to denote stronger action and/or to modify adjectives and much research can be found to focus on the gender differences in the use of intensive adverbs in English (Crosby and Nyquist, 1977; Lapadat & Seesahai, 1978; McMillan et al., 1977; Mulac & Lundell, 1986; Mulac et al., 1986,; Mulac et al., 1988; Turner et al., 1995). Turkish utilizes adverbs in a similar fashion to that of English: to provide further specification of the meaning of a verb, an adjective, another adverb or a whole sentence (Göksel and Kerlslake, 2006: 51). However, although there are studies concerning the differences in gender related language

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +9-352-207 66 66
E-mail address: eonem@erciyes.edu.tr

use in Turkish (e.g. Bikmen and Martı, 2013; Tabar, 2012, etc.), to the best knowledge of the researcher, there has not been any research focusing on the gender based difference in the use of intensive adverbs in Turkish.

This study aims to reveal, if there is any, the gender related differences in native speakers of Turkish in terms of using intensive adverbs. Therefore, this paper seeks to answer whether a gender related difference is present or not in using intensive adverbs in Turkish. The outline of the paper is as follows: the theoretical framework and previous studies regarding the gender related differences in the use of intensive adverbs are presented in the next section. The participants, data collection methods and data analysis procedure is explained in the methodology section, which is followed by the section where the results are analyzed. The paper ends with a discussion and conclusion section in which the implications of the results with suggestions for future research are presented.

1.1. Literature review / Theoretical background

Adverbs have various roles. Apart from modifying verbs, adjectives and adverbs, intensive adverbs such as *very*, *really*, *quite* add another semantic level to an adjective and make it stronger and extraordinary (Demir, 2004) and much research reveal a gender based difference in intensive adverbs. For instance, in a study by Crosby and Nyquist (l977), it is seen that females show a tendency to use intensive adverbs more than males during dual conversations. Similarly, both Mulac et al. (1988) and Turner et al., (1995) show that women use more intensifiers than men in dyadic interactions. Parallel results are also seen in group discussions. For example, Lapadat and Seesahai (l978) report that women use intensifiers more than men in group discussions. McMillan et al. (l977) also point to a significant difference in the use of intensifiers in favor of women during group discussions, which can be regarded as a strategy to express feelings better. Gender related differences in the use of adverbs also seem to take place during monologues such as public speeches. For example, in one study, Mulac et al. (l986) focus on the use of intensifiers in male and female public speeches and find a significant difference as women use intensifiers more than men do. In another study, Mulac and Lundell (l986) analyze the speeches of men and women during describing photographs. The analysis shows that women use more intensifiers than man for depicting the photos.

In fact, depending on the listener/reader, the amount of intensive adverbs used seem to differ as well. For example, Thomson et al. (2001) report that when male and female participants in their study reply to written messages, they use more intensive adverbs if they write to the female-style written messages. In another study, Keikhai and Shirvani (2014) analyzed the written texts and find that women participants intensive adverbs more than men. This might also show that in a deeper level, speakers/writers are aware of the difference between male and female listeners/readers and may feel the urge to address to them accordingly.

Although the studies mentioned above seemed to focus more on specific linguistic aspects, the results seem to comply with presumed qualities of female and male speech. For instance, according to Haas (1979), women are more expressive about emotions and are more supportive in their speeches whereas men seem to be more directive. Similar to this notion of supportiveness seen in female speech, another feature of female speech is cooperativeness and being other oriented while male speech is more competitive and individualistic (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). In addition to these features, Önem (2016) reports findings of which women seem to have a tendency to include more details than men in their speeches, which also emphasizes being more expressive and cooperative in terms of language use since the reason for utilizing more details might the result of psychological and social processes women want to address to. The mental organization in women's language seems to be different from that of men's. For instance, in a research by Shirzad et al. (2013), it seen that the

structure of women's written language in texts are more complex than men's in terms of the level of syntactic complexity, means of integrating cited information, and organizing arguments. In other words, women use language in a more sophisticated manner than men and add more dimensions to their language. In fact, in a research conducted out of large corpora by Newman et al. (2008), it is found that women use words related to psychological and social processes, while men refer more to object properties and impersonal topics. Therefore, it can be argued that women use a more layered language and as mentioned above, intensive adverbs might be used to create one of those layers.

To categorize the linguistic variations between users of language with different genders, a framework which incorporates twenty one gender related language variables categorized under six main titles including sentences, clauses and phrases, verb phrases, modifiers, references and miscellaneous was found in the literature (see Mulac et al., 2001 for a review of the framework). In that framework, Mulac et al. (2001) present intensive adverbs, hedges and justifiers as subcategories of modifiers and this study is based on the analysis of the use of intensive adverbs under the light of this categorization.

1.2. Research questions

This study aims to find out whether there is a gender related difference in the use of intensive adverbs in Turkish present or not.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants

The aim of this study was to find out whether male and female native speakers' use of intensive adverbs in Turkish differed or not. To achieve this, 182 undergraduate students (89 female/93 male) studying at a state university in Turkey participated in the study. Their ages ranged from 18 to 22 and all of the participants were native speakers of Turkish.

2.2. Instrument

The participants voluntarily completed a photo description task, which was prepared by the researcher in Turkish. The task was composed of two sections: the first section included demographic information about the participants' age and gender and the second section included the questionnaire consisted of photos, which were taken from the International Affective Picture System (IAPS-Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 2008), and statements describing the photos.

As mentioned in the website of the Center for Emotion and Attention (CSEA) at the University of Florida, "IAPS is a set of normative emotional stimuli for experimental investigations of emotion and attention. The goal is to develop a large set of standardized, emotionally-evocative, internationally-accessible, color photographs that includes contents across a wide range of semantic categories."[†] In other words, IAPS includes a set of wide variety of photos used as visual stimuli for emotion and attention research. The photos do not have any special features and they are ordinary photos such as a baby smiling or a snake that can be found everywhere. However, the affective norms (ratings of pleasure, arousal and dominance) of each picture in IAPS have been rated and recorded as references for both male and female participants separately as well as in total. Therefore, twenty photos with highest arousal mean scores from IAPS among similar photos were used in data collection process of

[†] http://csea.phhp.ufl.edu/Media.html#topmedia

this study. Since IAPS is provided only upon request to researchers and because of copyright restrictions, photos are not allowed to be distributed. Yet, the specific IAPS picture numbers, the description of the objects in the photos as well as arousal mean and standard deviation scores are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Information related to the photos used in the study

IAPS picture numbers	Objects in the photo	Arousal mean and standard deviation scores
1463	kittens	4.76 (2.19)
1200	spider	6.03 (2.38)
2214	neutral man	3.46 (1.97)
1440	seal	4.61 (2.54)
1710	puppies	5.41 (2.34)
2311	mother	4.42 (2.28)
5950	lightning	6.79 (1.98)
5910	fireworks	5.59 (2.55)
2301	kid crying	4.57 (1.96)
6900	aircraft	5.64 (2.22)
7330	ice-cream	5.14 (2.58)
8260	motorcyclist	5.85 (2.18)
2458	crying baby	5.28 (1.88)
5010	flower	3.00 (2.25)
1931	shark	6.80 (2.02)
2040	baby	4.64 (2.54)
1303	dog	5.70 (2.04)
5600	mountains	5.19 (2.70)
2037	woman	3.35 (2.04)
2100	angry face	4.53 (2.57)

2.2.1. Questionnaire

Below each photo, two statements in Turkish describing the photos were included and the participants were asked to choose the statement they thought that described the photo best. All statements were nominal affirmative sentences only and statements for each photo included two versions. First version of the statements were nominal sentences such as "(onlar) güzel kediler" (*these are beautiful kittens*) or "(o) hızlı bir motorsiklet sürücüsü" (*that is a fast motorcyclist*). Second version of the statements for each photo were rewritten to consist Turkish intensive adverbs such as "çok" (*very*), "gerçekten" (*really*), etc. (Demir, 2004; Göksel and Kerlsake, 2006). As a result, second version of the statements included sentences such as "(onlar) çok güzel kediler" (*these are very beautiful kittens*) or "(o) gerçekten hızlı bir motorsiklet sürücüsü" (*that is a really fast motorcyclist*), etc.

2.3. Data collection procedures

All of the photos in IAPS are in color and as the best way to present them as they were to the participants would be on computers, the questionnaire was administered to the participants at the computer laboratory of the department of the university. Participants were asked to provide demographic information and choose the statement that they thought would describe the photo best. The data collection process took two months.

2.4. Data analysis

To see whether there was a difference in the use of intensive adverbs in Turkish between male and female participants, participants' selections of the statements to describe the photos were compared in respect with their gender via independent samples t-test on SPSS 22. Comparison of the scores involved both the total scores given for the all photos in the questionnaire and for each photo separately.

3. Results

When the statements chosen for the photos in total were compared, data analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference between male (M = 26.47, SD = 4.29) and female participants (M = 27.52, SD = 3.48) in terms of selection of the intensive adverbs in Turkish (t (180) = 1.80, p = .74), which meant both male and female participants in the study chose similar statements to describe the photos in general.

On the other hand, an interesting finding of the results revealed that in terms of some photos, the statements chosen differed significantly. For instance, a statistically significant difference was seen for the photo of a spider between male (M = 1.15, SD = .36) and female participants (M = 1.46, SD = .50, t (180) = 4.81, p = .000, r = .34). Similarly, the differences in the statement selection for the photo of a motorcyclist (male: M = 1.23, SD = .42, female: M = 1.46, SD = .50) and an aggressive dog (male: M = 1.40, SD = .49, female: M = 1.57, SD = .50) were also statistically significant (motorcyclist: t (180) = 3.43, p = .001, r = .25, aggressive dog: t (180) = 2.39, p = .018, r = .18).

To sum up, it can be said that male and female participants selected similar statements to describe the photos in the task in general. However, when the mean scores were examined, female participants had a tendency to choose the statements including intensive adverbs to describe photos of a spider, a motorcyclist and an aggressive dog.

4. Discussion

This research aimed to see whether there was a gender related difference in the use of intensive adverbs in Turkish and the results could be considered as interesting since the findings revealed both differences and similarities in comparison with the studies in the literature.

The results of photo description task showed that both male and female participants' choice of selection for the photos in the study did not reveal any difference in terms of all the statements for the photos compared together. In this sense, the results could be regarded to be different from most of the studies in the literature stating that women have a tendency to use intensive adverbs more than men (e.g. Crosby and Nyquist, l977; Keikhai & Shirvani, 2014; Lapadat & Seesahai, l978; McMillan et al., l977; Mulac & Lundell, l986; Mulac et al., 1988; Mulac et al., l986; Thomson et al., 2001; Turner et al., 1995). Also, most of the studies in the literature focused on English and studies in Turkish in terms of intensive adverbs were limited. Yet, the different result obtained in this study could not be based solely on the differences in languages' being English and Turkish. This was, in fact, an unexpected outcome. The reason for this might have two explanations: First, the results' being different from the literature may be related to the design of the present study since this study differed in the methodology to be a two choice questionnaire. For instance, instead of showing pictures on computers and asking the participants to choose between the statements, which differed in only the inclusion of intensive adverbs, they could have been asked to provide their own statements to describe the photos and then

their statements could have been compared in a more qualitative manner. Yet, due to the limitations of the study, such an approach was left for a future study. Secondly, the similarity in the age range of the participants might be another reason. Since all of the participants were of similar age and as "often a youth culture with identifiable youth norms is referred to as though young speakers formed a homogeneous group by virtue of their being 'young'" (Llamas, 2007: 71), the participants in this study might have displayed similar linguistic behaviors. This might have affected the similarity of the selection scores of intensive adverbs. In a future study, a wider range of participants from different age groups could be studied to see whether age plays a role or not.

On the other hand, as mentioned above, the selection of the statements regarding the description of the photos including a spider, a motorcyclist and an aggressive dog revealed a statistically significant difference and female participants selected intensive adverbs more than males. In this sense, although the difference was limited to only three photos among twenty, it might still signal a gender difference in using intensive adverbs and, in a way, Turkish might not be an exception to the results found in English. Apart from the reasons given for gender related linguistic differences in the literature such as attitudes towards directness or cooperativeness during language use (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Sunderland, 2006), another reason for women to use intensive adverbs more than men might be related with women's interest in details (Önem, 2016). By including more intensive adverbs in their language for description, women might think that a more lively description could be reflected. The photos including the spider and the aggressive dog were very vivid. The photo of the spider was taken close up and the aggressive dog photo was showing a German shepherd dog barking and showing its fangs. Therefore, female participants might have felt more intimidated and reflected this in their choice of selection.

However, this situation called for more interesting questions. For instance, as mentioned, the photos were selected from the IAPS database in respect to their arousal mean scores and the arousal mean scores of the spider and aggressive dog was high, as seen in Table 1. Yet, the mean score of the shark photo was even higher but such a statistically significant difference was not found. Another interesting result is related to the other photo, the motorcyclist, where female participants preferred to use intensive adverbs to describe the photo more than males do. Although the task included a photo of an aircraft (a fighter jet) with very close arousal mean score to that of the motorcyclist, no statistically significant difference was seen.

In a way, photos depicting everyday objects might have had an effect on the differences in gender in this study. For example, a spider, a barking dog or a motorcyclist might be a common object to be seen every day more than a fighter jet or a shark and this might have triggered a more negative reaction towards them resulting in a difference in terms of describing them with more intensive adverbs. As part of the limitations of the study, only twenty photos were included in the task but in a future study, more, related photos especially, could be used to see whether there is an internal similarity or difference among the photos and intensive adverbs. Similarly, in a future study, after a description task, participants can be asked to provide reasons for choosing intensive adverbs or they can be asked to think aloud during the selection process and answers can be compared to see whether there is a systematic pattern present in terms of selecting intensive adverbs more often. Therefore, a better understanding of the gender related linguistic differences not only for intensive adverbs but also language use in general can be reached.

References

Bikmen, A., & Martı, L. (2013). A study of complaint speech acts in Turkish learners of English. *Education and Science, 38*(170), 253-265.

Crosby, F., & Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff's hypothesis. *Language in Society, 6*, 313-322.

Demir, T. (2004). *Türkçe Dilbilgisi.* Ankara: Kurmay Yayınevi.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Haas, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(3), 616-626.

Keikhavi, Y., & Shirvani, J. (2014). A sociolinguistic study of gender differences in Persian written performance. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 4*(1), 209-227.

Lang, P.J., Bradley, M.M., & Cuthbert, B.N. (2008). International affective picture system (IAPS): Affective ratings of pictures and instruction manual. Technical Report A-8. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Lapadat, J., & Seeshahai, M. (1978). Male versus female codes in informal contexts. *Sociolinguistics Newsletter, 8*, 7-8.

Llamas, C. (2007). Age. In C. Llamas, L. Mullany, & P. Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics* (pp. 69-76). New York: Routledge.

McMillan, J. R., Clifton, A. K., McGrath, D., & Gale, W. S. (1977). Women's language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionality? *Sex Roles, 3*, 545-559.

Mulac, A., & Lundell, T. L. (1986). Linguistic contributors to the gender-linked language effect. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5*, 81-101.

Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). Empirical support for the gender-as-culture hypothesis: An ıntercultural analysis of male/female language differences language differences. *Human Communication Research, 27*(1), 121-152.

Mulac, A., Lundell, T. L., & Bradac, J. J. (1986). Male/female language differences and attributional consequences in a public speaking situation: Toward an explanation of the gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 53*, 115-129.

Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988). Male/female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads: The gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 315-335.

Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Hendelman, L. D., & Pennbaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes, 45*, 211-236.

Shirzad, F., Musavi, K., Atmani, S., Khanchobni Ahranjani, A., & Iraji, S. (2013). Gender differences in EFL academic writing. *International Journal of Academic Research, 5*(4), 79-87.

Sunderland, J. (2006). *Language and Gender - An Advanced Research Book.* Oxford: Routledge.

Önem, E.E. (2016). A study on gender differences in the length of requests in Turkish. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 12*(2), 13-21.

Tabar, M. S. (2012). Cross-cultural speech act realization: The case of requests in the Persian and Turkish speech of Iranian speakers. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(13), 237-243.

Thomson, R., Murachver, T., & Green, J. (2001). Where is the gender in gendered language? *Psychological Science, 12*(2), 171-175.

Trask, R. L. (1999). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics.* New York: Routledge.

Turner, L. H., Dindia, K., & Pearson, J. C. (1995). An investigation of female/male verbal behaviors in same-sex and mixed-sex conversations. *Communication Reports, 8*, 86-96.

Türkçe yoğunluk zarfları kullanımında cinsiyet ile ilişkili farklılıklar

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı ana dili olarak Türkçe konuşan erkek ve kadınların yoğunluk zarfları kullanımında farklılık olup olmadığını ortaya koymaktır. Bunun için yaşları 18 ile 22 arasında değişen toplam 182 (89 kadın/93 erkek) gönüllü ana dili konuşucusundan bir fotoğraf tanımlama görevi tamamlamaları istenmiştir. Görev, Uluslararası Duyuşsal Resim Sistemi (International Affective Picture System; Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 2008) veri tabanından alınan yirmi fotoğrafı tanımlamak için verilen birer set ifadelerden birini seçmek üzerine kurulmuştur. Her set ifadede sadece olumlu tümceler bulunmuştur ve tümcelerden biri ilgili fotoğrafın normal bir sıfat kullanılarak tanımlandığı bir tümceyken diğeri aynı tümcenin bir yoğunluk zarfı kullanılarak yeniden yazılmış halinden oluşmaktadır. Sonuçlar kadın ve erkeklerin yoğunluk zarfları kullanımında toplam tüm fotoğraflar bazında aralarında istatistiksel olarak farklılık olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, kadın katılımcılar belirli fotoğraflar için daha fazla yoğunluk zarfı kullanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonunda elde edilen sonuçlar ve ileriki çalışmalar için tavsiyeler sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Türkçe; yoğunluk zarfları; cinsiyet farklılıkları; fotoğraf tanımlama görevi

AUTHOR BIODATA

Engin Evrim Önem received his BA in 2001 at Erciyes University, Department of English Language and Literature. He worked as a visiting researcher at the Department of Linguistics, University of Connecticut as a PhD Dissertation Grantee of The Turkish Fulbright Commission and received his Ph.D. from Foreign Language Teaching program of Ankara University in 2011. He received his MA on Teaching English as a Foreign Language from Bilkent University as a grantee of The Turkish Fulbright Commission again in 2015 and is currently working on his second Ph.D. at English Linguistics Department of Hacettepe University. He has been working at Erciyes University since 2001 and has authored and presented many national and international articles and papers.