

**ORTA OKUL ÇAĞINDAKİ TÜRK ÇOCUKLARININ GÜNLÜK
DİLLERİNDE KULLANDIKLARI SIFATLAR**

**QUALIFIERS USED IN THE DAILY LANGUAGE OF ADOLESCENT
TURKISH BOYS**

By

B. TOĞROL

Institute of Experimental Psychology, University of Istanbul.

Bu yazıda, Illinois Üniversitesi psikoloji profesörlerinden C. E. Osgood ve arkadaşlarının 20 değişik dil gurubuna mensup psikologların yardımlarıyla beynelmilel alanda inceledikleri duygusal mana sistemlerinin genelliğine dair araştırmanın ilk merhalesinden elde edilmiş olan neticeler incelenmektedir. Araştırmanın bu kısmında ortaokul seviyesindeki Türk Çocuklarının 100 isimden mürekkep isim listesinde kullandıkları sıfat miktarının % 9 civarında olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Teheyüci tona sahip olan kelimelerin karşısında ise, genellikle, çok ve çeşitli sıfatlar kullanılmaktadır. Durum nötr kelimelerde tamamen aksidir. Neticeler gerek sosyal psikologları ve gerekse Türk filologlarını ilgilendirir bir nitelik taşımaktadır.

The First Phase of Istanbul Studies of Osgood et. al. investigations on the generality of affective meaning systems yields highly interesting factors concerning the everyday use of words in the language of adolescent male Turks. To a stimulus list of 100 nouns the qualifier responses slightly exceed 9 %. For some emotionally-toned nouns there occurs a general reluctance in using single qualifiers, and also the frequency of diverse qualifiers is much higher for such nouns than for the neutral ones.

The study introduces some interesting problems for social psychologists as well as for Turkish philologists.

Problem : This paper deals with the study of qualifiers used in the daily language of adolescent Turkish boys. It is a by-product of the Turkish First Phase of a Research Project started by Professor C. E. Osgood and his friends in several different countries on the "Generality of Affective Meaning Systems".

Method : The stimulus list consisted of 100 standard nouns and this was used in every country taking part in this project. (U.S.A., Finland, Afghanistan, Holland, Poland, Iran, etc.) Our list was translated into Turkish by ten Turkish Professors who had very good knowledge of English. 70 per cent of agreement was accepted as a criterion for these translations, and some words which could not achieve this level were again given to some others efficient in English until this criterion was reached.

The subjects used in the experiments were 180 high school students between the ages of 13 and 17, and the data collected from 100 of these were used in the final analysis. Experiments were conducted in groups of about 30 students, the stimulus list being distributed to each subject with the following instructions given to them:

"Here is a list of 100 nouns. In front of every noun please write the adjective which best fits it according to your opinion. You can locate this adjective in a small and simple sentence, as;

This is a green leaf.

This is an expensive car."

The students were also told that they could work for a whole lecture period, and that there was no right or wrong answer to any of these nouns, and that they could use any adjective which they thought was appropriate for that noun.

Analysis of Results : The results were first analysed by tabulating different qualifiers used for every noun on a different sheet of paper. Thus we had 100 papers-full of adjectives to work with.

On table I the (M) and the (S.D.) of the qualifiers used by our subjects for every noun can be seen. On the average, the Ss have used about 32 different adjectives for every noun. 68% of the adjectives used are thus repetitive. Deviations from one noun to the other is considerable. The range is about 34, with 50 as the highest and 16 as the lowest frequency. The

(S. D.) is 6.7 and (SD_M) is .67. There are about 1.3 qualifiers extending on both sides of the mean with $P = .05$ ($32 \mp 1.96 \times .67 = 30.7 ; 33.3$).

The subjects had a tendency to use diverse adjectives with some nouns and almost similar adjectives with some others. This may be related to the qualitative values of the different nouns, a point which needs to be investigated in a more detailed manner. However, we may speculate on the fact that the most diverse responses were the ones given to the noun "thief" (50 different adjectives), and the least to the word "rope" (16 adjectives): the word "thief" is a highly emotionally loaded word and adolescents seem not to be able to label it with an homogeneous value. On the other hand, for a neutral word like "rope" 66% of the responses comprised only 3 qualifiers (39% of which is "long", 27% "thin", and "thick") the rest 34% being divided among 13 different qualifiers.

It should be very interesting from Social Psychological point of view to study the diversity in these responses to different words with emotional weights of seemingly different values.

Some subjects in spite of the rigidity of instructions to the students to use only qualifiers for nouns, still gave a number of words which could not be categorized as such. The interesting fact was not the occurrence of such impertinent responses but the diverse behavior for different nouns. The range of such non-adjective responses was 28 ($28 - 0 = 28$) and the SD was about 6. (Table 2).

The subjects have given only adjective responses to such words as "house", "meat", "colour" etc., whereas, such words as "trust" (28), "hope" (25), "progress" (22), "liberty" (21), "goal" (21) had on the average 25% of the responses as non-adjectives. It is interesting to note that the words with frequent non-adjective responses are, on the whole, socially loaded words.

Why should adolescents give diverse responses to such words? Does the abstract quality of such words make them hardly understandable? Or, is it the social responsibility of these words that causes such divergent behavior? According to our view, both factors are responsible for this attitude. Their respective effects should also be studied. However, some other factors not here-to-fore thought of could also have been responsible.

The 10.000 responses given by 100 Ss to the list of 100 nouns shows that about 975 of these responses are different adjectives, the rest being repetitive. This indicates that in the daily language of adolescent Turkish

boys the ratio of qualifiers to nouns is about 9 per cent. It is not yet known what the actual ratio is in the Turkish Language.

On Table 3 different adjectives with frequencies of 10% or more is shown. The number of these adjectives is about 52. The first ten adjectives with the most frequent occurrence is also shown on a different table (Table 4). From this table we can say that the adjectives that are most frequently found in the language of adolescents are "good" (7%), "large" (6.6%) and "beautiful" (6%).

We should like to draw attention to these most frequent 3 qualifiers. They are all of positive values. When we study this table we see that excepting "wicked" on the sixth rank, and "bad" on the ninth rank all of the other adjectives are of positive value. This seems an interesting fact in itself.

TABLE 1

Means and SD's of qualifiers given to a list of 100 nouns by a group of Ss (13 - 17 year old Turkish boys).

| Scores | X | f | x' | fx' | fx' ² |
|--------------------------------------|----|---------|------------|-----|------------------|
| 46 — 50 | 48 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 36 |
| 41 — 45 | 43 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 24 |
| 36 — 40 | 38 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 13 |
| | | | | +37 | |
| 31 — 35 | 33 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 — 30 | 28 | 26 | -1 | -26 | 26 |
| 21 — 25 | 23 | 13 | -2 | -26 | 52 |
| 16 — 20 | 18 | 4 | -3 | -12 | 36 |
| | | N = 100 | | -64 | 187 |
| T.M. = 33 | | | c = -.27 | | |
| ci = -1.35 | | | i = 5 | | |
| M = 31.65 = 32 | | | ci = -1.35 | | |
| SD = 5 √ 1.87 - .07 = 5 √ 1.80 = 6.7 | | | | | |

TABLE 2

The (M) and (SD) of non-adjective responses.

| Scores | X | f | x' | fx' | fx' ² |
|-----------------|----|---------|----|-----------|------------------|
| 27 — 29 | 28 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 72 |
| 24 — 26 | 25 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| 21 — 23 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 64 |
| 18 — 20 | 19 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| 15 — 17 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 40 |
| 12 — 14 | 13 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| | | | | +75 | |
| 9 — 11 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 — 8 | 7 | 22 | -1 | -22 | 22 |
| 3 — 5 | 4 | 11 | -2 | -22 | 44 |
| 0 — 2 | 1 | 10 | -3 | -30 | 90 |
| | | N = 100 | | -74 | 391 |
| T.M. = 10 | | | | c = +.01 | |
| ci = 0.03 | | | | i = 3 | |
| M = 10.03 | | | | ci = +.03 | |
| SD = <u>5.8</u> | | | | | |

TABLE 3

Frequent Qualifiers Used by the Ss.

N = 48

| | | | |
|---------------|-----|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Good | 550 | 26. Broken | 26 |
| 2. Beautiful | 392 | 27.5 Open | 24 |
| 3. Big | 351 | 27.5 Putrid | 24 |
| 4. Much | 188 | 29.5 Blind | 23 |
| 5. Long | 180 | 29.5 Green | 23 |
| 6. Wicked | 133 | 31. Fearful | 22 |
| 7. Sweet | 125 | 32. Rotten | 21 |
| 8. Bright | 120 | 33. Bloody | 17 |
| 9. Bad | 112 | 34.5 Poisonous | 15 |
| 10. White | 89 | 34.5 Deaf | 15 |
| 11. Dismal | 69 | 36. Slender | 14 |
| 12. Black | 60 | 37.5 Well-cooked | 13 |
| 13. Heavy | 49 | 37.5 Happy | 13 |
| 14.5 Yellow | 48 | 39. Watery | 12 |
| 14.5 Severe | 48 | 42. Pleasant | 11 |
| 16. Dark | 43 | 42. Heavy | 11 |
| 17. Excessive | 41 | 42. Hot | 11 |
| 18. Deep | 39 | 42. Untied | 11 |
| 19. Hard | 38 | 42. Limpid | 11 |
| 20. Small | 37 | 46.5 Stale | 10 |
| 21. Red | 35 | 46.5 Dry | 10 |
| 23. Fresh | 29 | 46.5 Furious | 10 |
| 23. Thick | 29 | 46.5 Compassionate | 10 |
| 23. Fast | 29 | | |
| 25. Blue | 27 | | |
| | | T = | 3227 |
| | | M = | 66.48 |

TABLE 4

10 Most Frequent Qualifiers Used by The Ss.

| <u>Qualifiers</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Good | 7.1 |
| 2. Beautiful | 6.6 |
| 3. Big | 6.0 |
| 4. Much | 3.6 |
| 5. Long | 2.9 |
| 6. Wicked | 2.6 |
| 7. Sweet | 2.5 |
| 8. Bright | 1.9 |
| 9. Bad | 1.6 |
| 10. White | 0.8 |
