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Abstract:
Being distinct from other languages, Turkish has two different reflexive markers “kendi” and “kendisi”. Although both markers refer to third person singular, they cannot be used interchangeably. Especially ‘kendisi’ attracted so much attention because of its dual nature as it can be used both locally and non-locally. Nevertheless, there has not been much emphasis on ‘kendi’ since it has been assumed that ‘kendi’ can only be locally bound. Furthermore, although the issue of psychological distance (intimacy) between the speaker and the referent has been claimed to have an effect on reflexive selections, there has not been an experimental study designed before to prove this assumption. By taking all of these into consideration, this research aims to test two main issues: whether the anaphor ‘kendi’ is perceived as a strict local anaphor by native Turkish speakers and how the psychological distance (intimacy) between speaker and referent influences the way Turkish native speakers use anaphors.

Within the frame of these research targets, a two-phased experimental design has been developed and applied to 65 participants in total. The age of participants differed between 17-27 years old. The first experiment was a Translation Task, whereas the second experiment was a Forced-Choice Task. After analysis of the first part, it has been concluded that although strict local anaphors are used in English sentences, the participants did not stick to the use of ‘kendi’ which is supposedly a strict local anaphor. According to the data of the second task, the results did not comply with the literature. Whereas it was expected to see ‘kendi’ in informal situations and ‘kendisi’ in formal situations, we concluded that there was no significant difference between the preferences made between ‘kendi’ and ‘kendisi’ depending on the T-test analysis.
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1. Introduction

In Turkish, two different reflexive types exist which are kendi and kendisi, and large number discussions are going on concerning the use of these reflexives in Turkish. The most famous one is that while *kendi* is a strict local anaphor, *kendisi* can be employed both in local and non-local domains. However, a change has been observed especially in the view on the *kendi* use in recent studies. Recent studies suggest that it is possible to use *kendi* as a non-local anaphor, as well. On the other hand, a pragmatic distinction in their uses has also been emphasized in some resources claiming that the intimacy relation between the speaker and antecedent may have an influence on reflexive decision. However, there has not been an experimental study on this issue to test the subject before. Similarly, most of the studies and speculations about the use of reflexives in Turkish are mainly based on either the intuition of researcher as a native speaker or observations. Moreover, again most researchers preferred focusing on *kendisi* in previous studies because of its dual nature such as the ability to be used both as a local and non-local anaphor. For this reason, this research mainly focuses on *kendi* as a local anaphor and it aims to test the perception of native speakers related to the locality of *kendi* by adopting an experimental approach. Another purpose of this research is also to check whether psychological distance (intimacy) between the speaker and the antecedent affects the selection of reflexive type.

Within the light of these aims, this paper is going to follow a format as in the following: Some background information related to Turkish reflexives is shared in Section 2. In Section 3, the objectives and the research questions are provided. In Section 4, more detailed information about the methodology of study, data collection tools and the procedure of research are explained. In Section 5 and Section 6, the results of the collected data are presented and the evaluation of results is performed respectively. Finally, the study is summarized and concluded with some final remarks and suggestions in Section 7.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Binding Theory in Principles and Parameters

Binding Theory was first proposed by Noam Chomsky (1981) under the Principles and Parameters Theory of Syntax. It is a grammatical module that arranges the referential relations between noun phrases as in the following sentence.

(1) John\(i\) thinks that Bill\(j\) hit himself\(i,j\).

(2) John\(i\) thinks that Bill\(j\) saw him\(i,j\).

(3) He\(i\) thinks that John\(i,j\) is a student.

As can be understood from the sentences above, *himself* can only be co-referential with the subject of embedded clause which is Bill in (1). As opposed to himself, the pronoun *him* in (2), cannot be co-referential with the subject of embedded clause (Bill). Instead, it is co-
referential with the subject of matrix clause (John). In final example (3), the proper name John is not co referential with another NP in this complex sentence. Depending on this information, NPs are grouped according to their feature-values such as [±anaphoric] and [±pronominal]:

- Anaphors [+anaphoric, -pronominal]: himself, herself, each other, one another, etc.
- Pronominals [- anaphoric, +pronominal]: he, she, him, her, etc.
- R-expressions [-anaphoric, -pronominal]: Bill, John, etc.

According to classical Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981), the distribution of the NPs above is governed by three universal Binding Principles as declared below:

- Principle A: An anaphor must be bound in its governing category.
- Principle B: A pronoun must be free in its governing category.
- Principle C: An R-expression must be free.

According to the hypotheses above, the governing category is defined as:

- $\alpha$ is the governing category for $\beta$ if and only if $\alpha$ is the minimal category containing $\beta$ and a governor of $\beta$, where $\alpha=$NP or S.  
  \hspace{1cm} (Chomsky, 1981, p. 188)

Additionally, the binding is specified as:

- $\alpha$ is X-bound by $\beta$ if and only if $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are co indexed, $\beta$ c-commands $\alpha$, and $\beta$ is in an X-position.  
  \hspace{1cm} (Chomsky, 1981, p. 184)

### 2.2. Problems about with the Binding Theory

Although BT is supposed to be universal for the anaphors in all languages, it has been observed that there are some other anaphors that do not comply with the rules such as *zibun* in Japanese, (Enç, 1989) *zich* in Dutch, *seg* in Norwegian, *sè* in Italian (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993), *sebja* in Russian (Testelets & Toldova, 1998), *sig* in Icelandic (Wexler & Manzini, 1987) and finally *kendisi* in Turkish (Kornfilt, 2001).

The main reason for why they do not correspond with the BT is the locality condition that BT requires. According to locality condition, reflexives in other words anaphors should refer to the closest antecedent to them. However, these languages are known to have long distance anaphors (Rudnev, 2008, p.2), which means that anaphors can refer to either a local or a non-local antecedent. In some examples, they can even be a discourse antecedent, which means that the referent may not necessarily be in the same sentence together with the anaphor. In the following section, the core properties of the long distance reflexives in these languages will be discussed.
2.3. Long Distance Reflexives

The first property defined by Cole & Hermon (1998), and Testelets & Toldova (1998) is that LDRs are morphologically simplex such as single-morpheme reflexive sebja in Russian (as opposed to strictly local sam sebja), seg in Norwegian (vs. seg selv), and ziji vs. taziji in Mandarin Chinese.

Second property is that their positions in sentences are mostly quite strict. For instance, the reflexives in Russian are used in infinitive clauses as demonstrated in the example below (Padučeva, 1985):

\[
\text{Ona, pozvoljala emu [PRO sebja] obmanyvat'}
\]
\[
\text{She, let-PAST him PRO self-ACC deceive}
\]
\[
\text{'She, let him, deceive her/himself'}
\]

Thirdly, LDRs are naturally non-locally bound as illustrated below from Norwegian (Testelets & Toldova, 1998). However, it is good to note that there are some other reflexive examples as well that are bound both by locally and non-locally such as kendisi in Turkish.

Moreover, in most languages they are subject-oriented as in the example below (Rudnev, 2008, p.3):

\[
\text{On ne razreśaet mne PRO proizvodit opyty nad soboj}
\]
\[
\text{He-NOM not permit me-DAT to-perform experiments on self}
\]
\[
\text{'He doesn't allow me to perform experiments on himself/myself'}
\quad \text{(Rappaport (1983))}
\]

Finally, there is no complementary distribution between either local and LDRs or LDRs and plain pronouns as exemplified below (Rudnev, 2008, p.3):

\[
\text{Oni vidit sebja Sam sebja */ego}
\]
\[
\text{He sees himself/him}
\]
\[
\text{'He, sees himself/*him'}
\]

2.4. Reflexives in Turkish

The reflexives in Turkish have been an interesting topic to be studied over years. One of the main reasons for that, the third person singular form is shown in two different variations one of which is the bare form ‘kendi’ and the inflected form ‘kendisi’ (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005).

We cannot be certainly sure about why there are two separate forms in Turkish for third person singular antecedent. However, the answer might be related to the evolution of the reflexive form in the language within years. According to a study conducted by Schladt
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(2000) on 150 different languages to find the origin and evolution of reflexive markers, the order of lexical elements that are most preferred to be exploited as reflexives in a language over time is listed below:

- body part names such as ‘head’, ‘arm’;
- nominal sources denoting something like ‘person’, ‘self’, ‘owner’;
- emphatic pronouns;
- object personal pronouns;
- verbs such as ‘to return’, ‘to come back’;
- the noun ‘reflection’; and
- locative prepositions.

Depending on this order, as the reflexive *kendi* in Turkish has the meaning of ‘self’ or ‘essence’, Schladt (2000) claims that the bare form of this reflexive may not be kendi, but could be something like ‘kend’ or ‘kent’. In time, this bare form evolved into reflexive pronoun *kendi* by taking the third person singular marker. However, kendi was not present in its bare form anymore and it started to gain other uses as well in a sentence such as an adjective meaning ‘own’ as illustrated below:

(8)

(Ben-im) kendi kitab-im
I-Gen own book-1SgPoss
'My own book'

(9)

(O-nun) kendi kitab-i
She/he-Gen own book-1SgPoss
'Her/his own book'

As a result of gaining other uses, *kendi* might have lost its function over time and the speaker might have had the need to mark it once again with a third person singular marker (by creating *kendisi*) to be able to use it in reflexive pronoun function. Nevertheless, all of this information has remained as assumptions. They have not been able to be proved so far.

Although *kendi* is said to have lost large extent of its reflexive function, both reflexive forms have been treated as anaphors recently and they are reported to show different properties depending on context. For example, while they both can refer to a local antecedent in a minimal clause, ‘’kendisi’’ can also refer to a non-local or even a discourse antecedent (Enç, 1989; Gürel, 2002, 2004; Kornfilt, 1997). Some examples to clarify the situation of these reflexives are shared below:

As a result of gaining other uses, *kendi* might have lost its function over time and the speaker might have had the need to mark it once again with a third person singular marker (by creating *kendisi*) to be able to use it in reflexive pronoun function. Nevertheless, all of this information has remained as assumptions. They have not been able to be proved so far.

Although *kendi* is said to have lost large extent of its reflexive function, both reflexive forms have been treated as anaphors recently and they are reported to show different properties depending on context. For example, while they both can refer to a local antecedent in a minimal clause, ‘’kendisi’’ can also refer to a non-local or even a discourse antecedent (Enç, 1989; Gürel, 2002, 2004; Kornfilt, 1997). Some examples to clarify the situation of these reflexives are shared below:
According to the examples above, we can easily deduce that the first one is completely compatible with the principles of BT. On the other hand; the second one does not seem to show a similar consistency. We can see that kendisi can refer to 3 different antecedents within local (Ayşe), non-local and discourse domain which is an antecedent outside this sentence.

An example of where to use reflexive kendisi as a discourse marker and where we cannot use them interchangeably is shared below:

\[(\text{Dinçtopal, n.d., p. 7})\]

As it can be seen from the sentences above, Dinçtopal (n.d.) states that the bare form kendi is ungrammatical in such contexts since we talk about a referent outside of its local domain again, but this referent is in the discourse. Therefore, in this type of situations, long distance reflexive kendisi is chosen (p. 7). More detailed information on the features of both kendi and LDRs will be discussed in the following section.

### 2.4.1. “Kendisi” as a Long Distance Marker in Turkish

As a long distance reflexive, we expect kendisi to comply with the general properties of other canonical long distance reflexives such as Norwegian seg or sebjæ in Russian as mentioned in the previous part. Nevertheless, kendisi differ from these reflexives in many ways.

To start with, as opposed to many canonical LDRs, kendisi is not morphologically simplex. On the contrary, it is a complex element as shown below (Rudnev, 2008, p.3):

\[(\text{Rudnev, 2008, p.3})\]
Secondly, kendisi can behave both like an anaphor and pronominal in the same clause. It can also appear in complementary distribution and free variation with the plain pronouns in a sentence.

Ali kendisine kızdı.
‘Ali got angry at himself’

a. O geldi
he/she-NOM came
‘He/she came’

b. Kendisi geldi.
Self-NOM came
‘He/she came’

Ali-NOM Ayaşé-GEN he/she-DAT be-angry-DAT was-surprised
‘Ali was surprised that Ayaşé was angry at him/her/’

Ali-NOM Ayaşé-GEN self-DAT be-angry-DAT was-surprised
‘Ali was surprised that Ayaşé was angry at himself/him/her’

(Rudnev, 2008, pp.3-4)

According to the samples between (12a) and (12d), it can be concluded that kendisi is in complementary distribution with the personal pronoun ‘o’ in local contexts, but is in free variation with it in non-local contexts.

Final difference of kendisi from other canonical LDRs is that kendisi is not always necessarily subject oriented. It and its antecedent can be utilized as the object of either matrix or embedded clauses in Turkish.

A. Ali hakkında Ahmet ne düşün-yüyor?
Ali about Ahmet what think-Progr.
‘What does Ahmet think of Ali?’

B. Ahmet kendisin-i çok beğen-yiyor-muş
‘(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e., Ali) very much’

(Rudnev, 2008, p. 4)

2.4.2. Previous Studies and Views on Reflexivization in Turkish

Although kendi is interpreted as a strict local anaphor in most resources, there were other researchers as well who support that there are situations where kendi can be exploited as a non-local anaphor. All of these discussions have lead to formation of two separate groups as the ones who support that kendi must be a strict local- anaphor and the others who claim that
kendi can also refer to its antecedents both locally and non-locally. In this section, the views and the experimental studies on this topic will be reported very briefly.

To start with, Sezer (1980) comes up with a unique idea when explaining the difference between kendi and kendisi. He asserts that they differ from each other mainly because of empathy, which means the speaker’s attitude towards the person that is referred to. He clarifies that kendi is mostly used in situations when the speaker and the referent has an intimate relationship; however, kendisi is mostly appear in situations when the speaker wants to put a barrier between the antecedent and themselves. However, no experimental study has been conducted so far to prove this approach. There are some researchers as well who agree with the idea such as Kornfilt (2001) by also emphasizing that it can refer to the matrix subject only in narrative contexts.

Having a different perspective from others, Aydın (1998) conducted an experimental study on reflexivization in Turkish. He tried to conduct the study with second language learners of Turkish and he tried to test the acquisition of kendi and kendisi structures. He also used Turkish native speakers as a control group and asked them to find the referents of reflexives in sentences. At the end of the study, he interestingly concluded that kendi also can be interpreted as non-local anaphor.

As opposed Kornfilt (2001), Yakut (2015) argued that kendi has a stronger logophoric feature than the one Kornfilt (2001) points out, which means that kendi can refer to the matrix subject not only in narrative contexts, but in more common contexts as well. In the study, Yakut worked with 15 native speakers of Turkish and concluded that kendi in an embedded object position can refer to the matrix subject, or, in some instances, to the matrix indirect object. Additionally, the binding domain of the kendi can be extended by logophoricity. However, her methodology and data collection tools were not defined clearly. Furthermore, the participant number is also inadequate to sustain its reliability.

Finally, Özbek and Kahraman (2016) tried to test whether the morphological formation of the embedded subject and pragmatical biases are effective in deciding on the antecedents of kendi and kendisi. Based on this aim, they designed 2 different forced-choice tasks. In one of these tasks, the subjects of embedded sentences are used in either nominative or genitive forms. In the other one, they designed pragmatically biased items including male and female-specific objects and so that they can have a look at whether these objects will have an influence on their choices of antecedents. The tasks were applied to 64 Turkish native participants and the results showed that kendi is indeed much freer than kendisi in Turkish, which is not an expected conclusion.

3. Aims and Objectives

As can be understood from the previous section, although kendi has been defined as a strict local anaphor, there are some conflicting situations that show us that it can also be exploited non-locally. There is still an ongoing discussion on this topic and we can observe that some studies contradict with the literature with their results. Additionally, there are many analyses and experimental studies concerning ‘kendisi’ because of its dual nature; however, we can...
rarely meet a study related to ‘kendi’ because of its simplicity. As a result, we believe that ‘kendi’ also deserves some extra attention.

Another issue about ‘kendi’ is that although most studies report that kendi can be used non-locally, they lack the explanation of why and in what type situations Turkish native speakers tend to choose kendi instead of kendisi.

Final thing that motivates us to conduct this study is the explanation made by Sezer (1980) related to the relation between empathy and reflexivization. At the end of this study, we aim to be able to explain how the psychological distance (in other words intimacy) between the speaker and the antecedent has an effect on the selection of reflexive pronoun.

Within the light of previous studies and within the frame of these concerns in our mind, in this study the following research questions are aimed to be answered:
1. Which one of the reflexive pronouns in Turkish (kendi or kendisi) has a higher rate of preference as a local anaphor?
   a. Is ‘kendi’ interpreted only as a strict local anaphor by native speakers of Turkish? Or can it also be preferred as a non-local anaphor as kendisi?
2. Does the psychological distance, in other words intimacy, between the speaker and the referent have an effect on the choice of Turkish native speakers between ‘kendi’ and ‘kendisi’?
   a. If so, when do they prefer ‘kendi’?
   b. When do they prefer ‘kendisi’?

4. Methodology

4.1. Participants
The data were collected from 65 participants in total. Three of the participants were teaching English at the Department of Basic English of a private university. One of them was a Master’s degree student at a university where the medium of instruction is English only. These four participants have advanced level English language proficiency. They use it actively at school. The other 61 participants were all preparatory school students. However, the participants were especially chosen from intermediate and upper-intermediate classes so that we can get the best results and correct translations.

The age range differed between 17 and 27. Additionally, we did not pay much attention to keep male and female participant numbers equal since we did not assume that the results or selections would change depending on gender.

4.2. Data Collection Tools
To collect the data two main tasks were prepared for the students. One of them was a translation task, whereas the other one was a forced-choice task.
4.2.1. Translation Task (Appendix A)
In this part, the participants are provided 12 English sentences including strict local reflexive only (himself or herself) to be translated. All the structures used in the sentences are checked from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) so that they can be compatible with the language itself. Only the subjects of sentences were changed so as not to confuse the students with unknown proper names.

By applying this task, our first aim was to be able to observe how we, as Turkish native speakers, exploit ‘kendi’ and ‘kendisi’ in natural writing. Normally, most previous studies applied a forced-choice task which was composed of made-up sentences where the speakers needed to decide the antecedent of ‘kendi’ and ‘kendisi’, which might lead to biased results. To be able to avoid this kind of researcher interference and also to give more freedom to the participant, we preferred a task based on production in this part. A sample set of sentences are shared below:

Ayşe thought that Neşe is laughing at herself. (17)
Hasan assumed that Emin was talking to himself. (18)
Batuhan doesn’t want Merve to have pity on herself. (19)
Ayşe is sad about the fact that Can constantly gets angry with himself after that certain event. (20)

As can be seen from the examples, only local anaphors (himself and herself) in English are used in the sentences above. By doing that, our second intention was to test whether the speakers will select only “kendi” which is supposedly a strict local anaphor in Turkish when translating sentences.

4.2.2. Forced-Choice Task (Appendix B)
In this part, the participants are given 10 different situations, five of which are formal and the other five of which are informal. Within the frame of the experiment, the participants are required to choose between kendi and kendisi to complete the sentences provided below for each situation. The main aim here was to test whether “intimacy or psychological distance” has an influence on the selection of anaphor type. Furthermore, the sub-aim was to see whether ‘kendi’ can be used as a discourse anaphor as ‘kendisi’ depending on the pragmatic conditions. A set of examples from both informal and formal situations are shared below:

İş yerinde patronunuzla bir organizasyon düzenleneyeceksiniz; ancak organizasyonun nerede olacağını dair bir fikir birliğine varamadınız. Bu durumda sınırlı hipi şuunu dediniz:

Kendi / Kendisi karar versin o halde. (21)
Çok yakın bir akrabanızın bir konuda yardımcı var; ancak kendisi gurur yapıp sizden yardımcı almayı reddediyor. Birçok çabanıza rağmen onu bir türlü ikna edemiyoruz. Kendi kendinize bu duruma söyleyorsunuz:

* Eğer yalnız yapabileceğini düşündüğsün bu durumu kendi / kendisi çözsün o zaman.*

### 4.3. Procedure

The data collection tools were distributed in the classrooms and the students completed the forms given to them under the surveillance of their teachers. In this way, they were not able to copy the answers from each other. The students were also warned that in case they could not answer the questions, or they were not sure about the answer, especially in translations, they could leave them blank. In this way, we aimed to face less distracting and irrelevant answers.

### 4.4. Data Analysis

The analysis of data was made with the help of Excel program. For the first experiment analysis, a code was assigned for every possible type of situation that we might face. In total, we came up with 4 different possibilities:

1. The participant preferred ‘kendi’ as a reflexive
2. The participant preferred ‘kendisi’ as a reflexive
3. The answer was irrelevant to what is expected
4. The item was left blank.

By using the codes above, we calculated the frequencies of each reflexive that was used in the Experiment 1.

In the second experiment, we assigned codes for each reflexive again as illustrated above; however, since the second experiment was a Forced-Choice Task, we had two possible outcomes:

1. Kendi
2. Kendisi

This time the items were separated into two groups as informal situations and formal situations. And the distribution of each reflexive within these two different groups was analyzed separately this time by using Excel program again.

At the end of analysis, we applied a T-test for the findings of each experiment to be able to test the statistical significance of the values that we encountered.

### 5. Results

Within the frame of our research questions, the results will be presented in 2 main categories: the results of translation task and the results of forced-choice task.
5.1. The Results of Translation Task

As can be seen from the graph above, 4 main categories were specified at the end of the translation task. The total number of answers collected for this experiment was 780. From these answers, kendi is preferred 255 times. On the other hand, kendisi is preferred in 309 answers. This graph conflicts with our expectations since we were expecting that ‘kendi’ will be preferred more than kendisi in local anaphoric situations. However, the production data show that kendisi interestingly has a higher number of preference rate than kendi, which means that kendisi is perceived as a local anaphor more widely than kendi as opposed to what literature suggests. As for irrelevant sentences category, the participants tried some other alternative ways in 133 answers to communicate the meaning of English sentences. Some examples for these alternative ways are also shared below:

1) Some participants brought kendi and kendisi together to make an emphasis:

Ayşe, Neşe’nin kendi kendisine güldüğünü düşünü.
Ayşe Neşe-GEN self self-3SgPoss-DAT laugh-Nom-Poss-Acc think-Past
‘Ayşe thought that Neşe laughed at herself.’

2) Some other participants did not even use any reflexive pronouns:

Ayşe, Ali’nin yaptığından sonra utanması gerektiğini iddia ediyor.
‘Ayşe claims that Ali should be ashamed of himself after what he did’

Elif, Hakan’ın turnuvayı kazanmasıyla gurur duyduğunu biliyor.
Elif Hakan-GEN tournament-ACC win-Nom-Poss-withproud listen-Nom-ACC know-Prog
‘Elif knows that Hakan is proud of himself upon winning the tournament.

3) Finally, the participants sometimes chose the wrong pronoun (third person singular) “o” instead of a reflexive pronouns “kendi / kendisi”.

Ayşe, Neşe’nin ona güldüğünü düşündü.
Ayşe Neşe-GEN 3rd sg laugh-Nom-3rd sgPoss-Acc think-Past
‘Ayşe thought that Neşe is laughing at her.’

Buse, Fatma’nın onu hafife aldığını düşünüyor.
Buse Fatma-GEN 3rd sg underestimate-Nom-3rd SgPoss-ACC think-Prog
‘Buse thinks that Fatma underestimates her.’

We think these deviations from target structure may stem from exhaustion or level differences since translation generally requires patience and the ability to focus for a long time. Additionally, the learners come from different language level backgrounds. Therefore, they might have found it difficult both to interpret and translate the sentences.

Finally, the participants did not want to translate the sentences and left them blank in 83 answers.

5.2. The Results of Forced-Choice Task
When analyzing the reflexive selections in the forced-choice task, we separated the items into two main categories called formal and informal contexts. The distribution of these reflexive categories were shown with the help of column charts and after the analysis of each result, their scientific significance value was calculated by utilizing a T-Test.

![Chart 2: Distribution of Reflexive Preferences in Informal Contexts]
To start with, the analysis of reflexives in informal contexts, we can say that the results were quite astonishing and did not match our expectations. According to the graph above, 324 answers were elicited from the participants in total. Among these 324 answers, *kendisi* again seems to be preferred in 168 of them, which is a slightly higher number than the one of *kendi* use in informal situations. This was an astonishing result for us as we were expecting *kendi* to be much more widespread in informal situations compared to *kendisi*. Additionally, 3 questions were left blank out of 324 answers given by the participants.

![Chart 3: Distribution of Reflexive Preferences in Formal Contexts](image)

Besides informal context, we also checked the distribution of reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* in formal contexts. As can be deduced from the chart above, the results again contradicted our expectations since we were expecting *kendisi* to be more dominant than *kendi* in situations where there is no intimate relationship between the speaker and the referent. However, we see that our participants preferred *kendisi* in 144 answers, whereas they chose *kendi* in 161 answers. In addition, 4 situations in total were left blank.

In addition to the distributions above, we also would like to check whether this minor difference between the distributions of these two reflexives has any scientific significance. Therefore, we preferred to apply a T-test and the results of this test are shared below:

**Table 1: T-test Analysis for the comparison of “kendi” use in formal and informal situations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>“p” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.353846</td>
<td>1.280024</td>
<td>0.293322*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.476923</td>
<td>1.091268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

**Table 2: T-test Analysis for the comparison of “kendisi” use in formal and informal situations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>“p” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.584615</td>
<td>1.22337</td>
<td>0.28969*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.461538</td>
<td>1.090827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
According to the results of T-test analyses that we have performed both for *kendi* and *kendisi*, we observed that there is no scientifically significant difference between the use of *kendi* and *kendisi* in either formal or informal situations since the ‘p’ value in a T-test should be maximum 0.05 or below to be able to have a scientific significance. However, when we check our p value, we come up with the conclusion that Turkish speakers do not differ between *kendi* and *kendisi* depending on formality or intimacy conditions as suggested by Sezer (1980). This p value also proves that we can use either *kendi* or *kendisi* by approximately 50% chance for each condition because the confidence level of the p values between 0.25 and 0.30 is approximately 50% according to the t-table.

The last thing that we can deduce from both the graphs and the T-test results above is that *kendi* is not interpreted as a strict local anaphor by Turkish native speakers because especially in forced-choice task, we can see that *kendi* can also be used as a discourse anaphor. Even though the referent is not even mentioned in the sentence, the speakers can choose *kendi* as an anaphor again by the same probability percentage as *kendisi*, which interestingly shows us that *kendi* may not be as strict as we think in terms of being a local anaphor. It can be exploited as a long-distance anaphor as well.

### 6. Discussion

Towards the end of this study, we believe that the outcome of this research is valuable for future studies because it is one of the rare experimental approaches to the issue of *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish and the results do not seem to be compatible with the literature.

To start with, the implications for the results of the translation task, we have observed that *kendisi* is preferred more widely than *kendi* although we emphasized the locality of the referent in English sentences by using himself or herself. Although the speakers were aware of the fact that they needed to choose a strict local anaphor, they insisted on using *kendisi*. Additionally, this tendency was not subject to change in proficient English speakers, either. This demonstrates us that *kendi* may not be evaluated as such a strict local anaphor as stated by Underhill (1976), Enç (1989), Göksel and Kerslake (2005) and Kornfilt (2001). According to their classical syntactic approach, *kendi* is subject to Condition A in Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981) and it must only be bound in its governing category. Although Binding Theory is an important contribution to organize anaphor-antecedent relationship in most languages, our study proves that it is a bit inadequate to explain the condition of *kendi* in Turkish. Some more recent studies also support our claim by sharing similar findings with ours. For instance, a study which was applied to foreign language learners of Turkish by Aydın (1998) concluded that it is possible to use *kendi* as a non-local anaphor in certain contexts. Moreover, the results of a study conducted by Özbebek and Kahraman (2016) indicate that the interpretations of *kendi* and *kendisi* differ in Turkish compared to himself/herself in English and *kendi* is much freer than *kendisi*.

To continue with the implications for the second part of our research, which was a forced-choice task, we can mainly indicate that its results were also quite interesting and unexpected. In the task, the main aim was to figure out whether the psychological distance
has any influence on the decision of reflexive pronoun type. By considering the comments of Sezer (1980) about the issue, we were expecting *kendi* to be more common in informal situations, whereas *kendisi* will be mostly used in formal situations. As Sezer (1980) points out *kendi* expresses more internal feelings, while *kendisi* is preferred to put some psychological distance between the speaker and the referents. However, the results astonished us when they appeared to be in opposite direction. *Kendi* was mostly preferred in formal contexts. On the other hand, *kendisi* seemed to be more often in informal contexts. Another researcher who agrees on the emphatic side of *kendi* is Kornfilt (2001). She claims that *kendi* can refer to the subject of a matrix clause only in narrative contexts. However, this claim also is open to questioning based on our data because we have observed that *kendi* can be selected as a discourse anaphor without a narrative context. Therefore, the use of *kendi* as non-local anaphor might be more wide-ranging than we think.

Although we cannot be certain about the exact reasons for this type of different behaviors of reflexives in Turkish, we would like to spare some more place for different speculations related to the issue in the following paragraphs. Indeed, the interpretation of the reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* may be dependent mainly on two things in Turkish: pragmatics (Demirci, 2001, p. 758) and properties of the null pronoun preceding the reflexives (Dinçtopal, 2009, pp. 21-25).

Demirci (2001) defends that pragmatics can easily interfere with the interpretation procedure of reflexives in Turkish. To clarify, Turkish speakers, mostly rely on inference, context, and knowledge about the world in order to choose an antecedent between several possible ones as opposed to English speakers who rely on syntactic co-indexation of reflexives (p. 758). To be able to illuminate the situation in Turkish, an example is shared below:

> The president ordered his bodyguard to protect himself during the speech.  (23)

In the example above, when a person is asked about the antecedent of “himself”, this person will automatically tell “the president” due to their world knowledge even though they know that the sentence will be ungrammatical since an opposite situation will be illogical.

As for the second explanation for his dual behavior of kendisi, in most resources *kendisi* is presented as a problematic anaphor; however, Dinçtopal (2009) does not agree with this idea by proposing that *kendisi* does not indeed pose a challenge the BT proposed in the GB Theory. The true anaphor for third person singular in Turkish is *kendi*, which complies with the BT. *Kendisi*, marked with third person singular agreement, is preceded by a null pronoun as a common noun possessed by pro. Therefore, *kendisi* is not a problematic reflexive. Instead, its distribution is influenced by pro as its possessor as far as she suggests (p.39).
7. Conclusion

Binding domain of the reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* has been discussed for long time and many answers and explanations have been proposed in the end. Whereas some researchers stayed liable to classical approach which states that the binding domain of *kendi* is restricted with the local subject (Underhill, 1976; Enç, 1989; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001), there were some others who objected the classical approach and said that *kendi* can function as a non-local anaphor, as well (Aydın, 1998; Özpek and Kahraman, 2016).

Within the frame of these discussions, our research was aiming to test native speaker perception about the local use of *kendi* and also to figure out whether there would be any effects of psychological distance (intimacy) on the selection between *kendi* and *kendisi*.

After applying two different tasks related to the issue, it was surprisingly found out that the tendency of Turkish native speakers was much more different than our expectations. In the first part, although all of the reflexives that are used in English are strict local ones, the Turkish speakers preferred to choose *kendisi* when translating the sentences, which leads us to question the locality of ‘*kendi*’ since it was not even perceived and preferred as a local anaphor by native speakers. The results of the second task were also conflicting with our expectations as we were expecting to see *kendi* in informal situations and *kendisi* in formal situations more widespread. However, the speakers of Turkish showed an opposite way of tendency in our research tasks. There was a minor difference between *kendi* and *kendisi* use depending on the formality of situation. We would like to test whether this difference has any scientific significance by applying an additional T-test, but the results did not prove to be significant and it also demonstrated that the speakers of Turkish can choose between each reflexive by 50% chance.

The findings of this research is really important since there have been very few experimental studies conducted on Turkish and as opposed to English. Most studies in the field were either based on the writer’s own language competency or observation. However, this could be tricky as we have seen that the real perception of native speakers and the real use of a language structure may show some differences from the literature. Therefore, this study carries importance in terms of reflecting the real data and the real use of reflexives collected from 65 native speakers of Turkish. Furthermore, this research may have brought a new perspective to the use of *kendi* because it was proven in this research that *kendi* is not a strict local anaphor as it was considered to be according to classical approach.

Although this study is important in some ways, we cannot still deny the fact that we have come up with some certain types of limitations. One of the limitations was participant number. The participant number could have been raised since the more participant means the more realistic data. Additionally, we cannot ignore the possibility of distraction. To clarify, the participants might have got distracted or bored while doing the tasks and this may have also lead to some distortions in the results. To prevent this, the task could have been given in different time periods.

Before we conclude, we would like to emphasize that the issue of *kendi* and *kendisi* is very broad to study and there were still some aspects that we intended to work on this
research but could not do due to the time limitation. One of these aspects was the effect of pragmatic factors on the choice of the antecedent. These factors could be the association of action verbs with gender or it could be the context itself. To wrap up, Turkish certainly has a different system of reflexive utilization; therefore, we believe that besides their syntactic aspects, their pragmatic aspects should also be studied in the following studies.
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Appendices

Appendix A
Task 1

Aşağıda verilmiş olan İngilizce cümleleri en yakın anlama gelecek şekilde Türkçe’ye çeviriniz. (Please translate the English sentences below into Turkish as similarly as you can.)

1. Ayşe thought that Neşe is laughing at herself.
2. Buse thinks that Fatma underestimates herself.
3. Mete said that Ahmet couldn’t even hear himself talk because of the noise.
4. Hasan assumed that Emin was talking to himself.
5. Bora thinks that Sefa is making fool of himself.
6. Furkan thinks that Ece is afraid of herself.
7. Ayşe is sad about the fact that Can constantly gets angry with himself after that certain event.
8. Mustafa knows that Yasemin admires herself a lot.
9. Elif knows that Hakan is proud of himself upon winning the tournament.
10. Serhat is pleased that Alara rewarded herself with a king size hamburger.
11. Aysel claims that Ali should be ashamed of himself after what he did.
12. Batuhan doesn’t want Merve to have pity on herself.
Appendix B
Task 2

Aşağıda verilmiş olan durumlara göre ‘kendi’ veya ‘kendisi’ zamirlerinden size en uygun olanı seçiniz. (Please try to choose between “kendi” or “kendisi” in the sentences depending on the situation provided for each of them and based on your intuition.)

1) Bir arkadaşın ile bir konu üzerinde anlaşmazlığa düştünüz; fakat o geri adım atmak istemedi ve kendi yolundan gitmeyi tercih etti. Bu durumda şunu söylediniz:

Kendi / kendisi bilir.

2) İş yerinde patronunuzla bir organizasyon düzenleyeceksiniz; ancak organizasyonun nerede olacağına dair bir fikir birliğe varamadınız. Bu durumda sinirlenip şunu dediniz:

Kendi / Kendisi karar versin o halde.

3) Uzaktan ve çok da iyi bilmediğiniz bir akrabanız aşırı yaptığı alışverişi dolayısıyla çok borç girmiş ve çok zor durumda kalmış. Bir tanıdık size onun durumu hakkında bilgi veriyor ve siz de diyorsunuz ki:

Bu sorunu kendi / kendisi halletsin.

4) Hep beraber tüm arkadaşlar bir partiye davetlisiniz. Çok yakın bir arkadaşınızın ise bu davete gelemeyeceği öğrenip şunu diyorsunuz:

Kendi de / Kendisi de bize katılsaydı iyi olurdu.

5) Kardeşiniz sevgilisinden ayrılmış ve intikam alma yolları arıyor. Siz de bu durumu kardeşinizin bir arkadaşından duyup şaçma buluyorsunuz ve şuını söyleyorsunuz:

Kendini / Kendisini zor duruma sokacak bir şey yapmasın.

6) Üniversiteden çok da yakın olmadınız bir tanıdığınızın eğitim amacı yurt dışına çıktığını öğrenip şunu söyleyorsunuz:

Gitsin tabi.. Gitsin de kendini / kendisini kurtarsın.

7) Akademik bir dergide güven ve motivasyon üzerine bir yazınızın yayınlanması istiyor musunuz. Başlangıç olarak ise şöyle başlıyorsunuz:

İnsan öncelikle kendine / kendisine güvenerek işe başlamalı.
8) Çok yakın bir akrabanızın bir konuda yardıma ihtiyacı var; ancak kendisi gurur yapip sizden yardım almayı reddediyor. Birçok çabanıza rağmen onu bir türlü ikna edemiyorsunuz. Kendi kendinize bu duruma söyleniyorsunuz:

*Eğer yalnız yapabileceğini düşünüyorsa bu durumu kendi / kendisi çözün o zaman.*

9) Kardeşiniz üniversite sınavına hazırlanıyor ve hangi mesleği yapmak istediğini konusunda kararsız. Siz de bu konuda şöyle düşünüyorsunuz:

*Öncelikle ne istediğini ve neler yapmaktan hoşlandığını kendine / kendisine sorarak işe başlamalı.*

10) Patronunuz şirket sorunları ile ilgili sizin fikrinizi dinlemedi ve çalışanlar üzerinde baskı kurmaya son sürat devam etti. Bunun üzerine siz de şunu söylediınız:

*Yarın çalışanlar bir bir istifa etmeye başlarlarsa ne olacağını da kendi / kendisi düşünsün artık.*
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