

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v8i4.2294

Citation: Sorokin, S. V. & Timkova, T. (2019). Problems and Difficulties in Teaching Turkish Grammar to Ukrainian Students at University Level. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 8(4), 90-114. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v8i4.2294>

Problems and Difficulties in Teaching Turkish Grammar to Ukrainian Students at University Level

Sergii V. Sorokin¹, Tetiana Timkova²

Abstract

The subject of this research paper is the teaching of Turkish as a foreign language. The authors' more than twenty-year experience in teaching Turkish to university students constitutes the empirical foundation of this investigation. This research paper relies on several methodological approaches including the source criticism, the experimental approach, and conducting survey and interviews. Within this scope, 258 students, who study/studied Turkish at Kyiv National Linguistic University between 2007–2018, were surveyed. In addition, eleven lecturers who had experience of teaching Turkish at university not less than 5 years participated the survey. The history of foreign languages teaching methods is analyzed, and special attention is paid to the approaches of teaching grammar, discussed in methodological works. Implicit and explicit approaches to the teaching of grammar are especially examined in this paper. The subject of this research is oriented at teaching Turkish as a major and training future specialists in Turkish interpreting/ translation and future teachers/ lecturers in Turkish, therefore, the authors of this paper stress upon the necessity of teaching grammar on the basis of conscious perception principle as a separate subject of study in strict integrity with the communicational approach. The list of problems and difficulties in learning Turkish grammar by Ukrainian students at university level was established as a result of this research as well as the sources of these difficulties are deduced which mostly originate in genetic and typological differences between the Ukrainian language, native for Ukrainian students, and Turkish, which is the language of their future professional activities. The mentioned difficulties are grouped on two levels which are morphology and syntax according to the level of difficulty for Ukrainian students in terms of the conscious perception of grammatical facts and phenomena and their subsequent application in actual practice. The ways of overcoming the problems and difficulties in teaching and learning Turkish grammar are also offered in this paper. At the same time textbooks and grammar manuals published in Turkey, Ukraine, and European countries are examined in terms of grammar teaching. The grammatical subjects to be investigated in detail for increasing the level of mastering Turkish by Ukrainian students at universities are listed.

Keywords: Teaching Turkish as a foreign language, foreign language teaching methods, teaching grammar, grammatical difficulties in Turkish.

¹ Ph.D., Professor, Dean of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Kyiv National Linguistic University, E-mail: sorokin@knlu.edu.ua

² Ph.D., Associate Professor, Head of Turkic Philology Department, Faculty of Oriental Studies, Kyiv National Linguistic University, E-mail: ttimkova@hotmail.com

Üniversite Düzeyinde Ukraynalı Öğrencilere Türkçe Dilbilgisi Öğretiminde Yaşanan Sorun ve Zorluklar

Öz

Makalenin konusu, üniversite düzeyinde yabancı dil olarak Türkçenin öğretimidir. Bu makalenin yazarları Ukraynalı öğrencilere yirmi yılı aşkın bir süredir Türkçe öğretmektedirler. Makalenin temelini de bu öğretim hayatı boyunca elde edilen tecrübeler oluşturmaktadır. Makalenin yazımı sırasında kaynak inceleme, gözlem, eleştirel bakış, anket ve mülakat uygulaması gibi farklı araştırma yöntemlerinden faydalanılmıştır. Bu kapsamda Kyiv Ulusal Dil Bilimleri Üniversitesi'nde 2007-2018 yılları arasında Türkçe konusunda eğitim alan 258 öğrencinin katılımıyla anket uygulaması yapılmıştır. Öğrenciler üzerinde ön-test ve son-test uygulamaları yapılarak dil becerisi değişim süreçleri tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bunun yanında üniversitede en az 5 yıllık Türkçe öğretimi konusunda tecrübesi olan 11 öğretim görevlisinin katılımıyla bir anket gerçekleştirilmiştir. Makalede yabancı dil öğretim yöntemlerinin tarihi incelenmiş, özellikle değişik metodik çalışmalarda tartışılan dil bilgisi öğretim yaklaşımlarına dikkat edilmiş, ayrıca gizli ve açık dahil olmak üzere iki dil bilgisi öğretim eğilimi üzerinde durulmuştur. Bu çalışmada Türkçenin esas uzmanlık alanı olarak öğretilmesi ve müstakbel çevirmen/öğretmen olmak üzere Türkçe uzmanlarının yetiştirilmesi söz konusu olduğundan makalede Türkçe dilbilgisinin bilinçli algılama prensibi üzerinde ayrı bir öğretim disiplini olarak ve aynı zamanda iletişimsel yaklaşım ile sıkı bir bütünlük halinde öğretilmesi gerektiği görüşü savunulmaktadır. Makale Ukraynalı öğrencilerin Türkçe dil bilgisi öğrenimi sırasında karşılaştıkları zorlukları listeleterek bu zorlukların kaynağı ile ilgili bilgiler sunmaktadır. Zorlanılan konular biçimbilim ve sözdizimi olmak üzere iki grup halinde ele alınarak bilinçli algılama ve pratikte uygulama açısından zorluk derecelerine göre sınıflandırılmış, öğretimde daha olumlu sonuçlara ulaşmak amacıyla zorlukların aşılması için tavsiyelerde bulunulmuştur. Bu arada Ukrayna'da, Türkiye'de ve Avrupa ülkelerinde yayımlanmış ders kitapları, dil bilgisi öğretimi açısından incelenmiş, Ukraynalı öğrencilerin Türkçeyi öğrenim kalitesini artırmak üzere daha detaylı olarak irdelenmesi gereken dilbilgisi konuları listelenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi, yabancı dil öğretim yöntemleri, dil bilgisi öğretimi, Türkçe dilbilgisi zorlukları, yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi.

Introduction

Turkology (Turkic Studies) in Ukraine: an outline

The teaching of Turkish as a foreign language in Ukraine's universities started in 1993 after Ukraine had renewed its independence in 1991. However, Ukrainian Turkology school which had developed within Turkology in the Russian Empire, then in the Soviet Union extends over a hundred years. Ukrainian Turkology scholars, mostly historians, had contributed a lot to Soviet Turkology which considered to be one of the strongest in the world; Ukrainian Turkology school achieved tangible results in the period of independence as well. It would be appropriate to refer to the works of an outstanding Ukrainian orientalist A. Krymskyi regarding the Turkish language and the history of Turkey (Krymskyi, 1996, 2007, 2010), academic writings of his disciple Pritsak (1952, 1970, 1973), research works on the Turkish language, literature and culture of T. Hrunin (1930, 1929, 1953, 1955), V. Zummer, A. Kovalivskiy, Y. Dashkevich, Y. Kochubei, I. Chernikov, H. Khalymonenko (Khalymonenko 1985, 1987, 1997, 2001, 2002), A. Hanusets, A. Harkavets, N. Ksiondzyk (Ksiondzyk 1991, 1987, 2001, 2002, 2004), Panashenko (1989), Halenko, Mhitaryan, Prorochenko (Prorochenko

2005), I. Pokrovska (2010, 2012, 2013), I. Prushkovska (2010, 2015, 2016) and other scholars (for detailed information see (Chernikov 2003, 2005; Khalymonenko 2004)).

Regrettably, Turkological and, in general, Oriental tradition in Ukraine had been interrupted for the period of more than 50 years due to the repressions of 1930–1940s in the Soviet Union (Vasilkov, Grishina, & Perchenok, 1990). And it was only in 1991 after the renewal of Ukraine's independence when Turkology and Oriental studies in Ukraine were revived with the efforts of academician O. Pritsak and his academic fellows. The Institute for Oriental Studies, which had been established in the structure of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences 73 years before, was reconstructed (for more details see (Krevetskyi, 1922; Artemskyi, 1931; Vetukhiv, 1962; Nemoshkalenko, Novikov, Pelykh, 1970; Vernadsky, 1970)), and the Turkish language as well as 10 years afterwards the Uzbek, Azerbaijani, Crimean-Tatar and Gagauz languages started to be taught in many Ukrainian universities, particularly in Kyiv National Linguistic University (since 1993) and Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (since 1994).

The teaching of Turkish started from scratch in early 1990s: there were critical gaps in class-books, bilingual dictionaries, and qualified lecturers. Over the past 25 years Ukrainian Turkologists made headway, inter alia, with the help of lecturers from different Turkish universities and educational organizations. Over 450 Turkology students graduated from the two mentioned universities as lecturers in Turkish as a foreign language and many of them continue working at Ukrainian universities and secondary schools as lecturers/ teachers of Turkish to Ukrainian students. During the mentioned period over 20 Ukrainian Turkology scholars took their doctorate and got Ph.D. degree in Turkic philology, more than 10 scholars became associate professors and professors. Several books and manuals concerning different aspects of the Turkish language were issued by Ukrainian Turkology specialists (Khalymonenko, 1997; 2001; 2002; Sorokin, 2010; 2019; Pokrovska, 2010; 2010; 2012; 2013; Prushkovska, 2010; Nikitiuk & Prushkovska, 2012). Cooperation within Erasmus+ and Mevlana programs was established between Ukrainian and Turkish universities. Experience of teaching Turkish as a foreign language to Ukrainian students during the period of over 20 years provides a framework to take stock of difficulties in learning Turkish by Ukrainian students and to suggest ways of their overcoming.

Sociolinguistic situation in present-day Ukraine

The sociolinguistic situation in present-day Ukraine is rather complicated which stems from the fact that during a long period of time different regions of Ukraine had been parts of different states such as the Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Romania, Poland and later the Soviet Union (from 1939 in its present-day borders). In different parts of Ukraine dominant languages are Ukrainian (in the West and the Centre of Ukraine) and Russian (in the East and the South of Ukraine), partly Hungarian (in Transcarpathian region of Ukraine), Romanian (in the region of Bukovyna), Crimean-Tatar (in the Crimea). The situation of bilingualism can be seen across large areas in the Centre, East and South of Ukraine when citizens use the two languages in their everyday life: Ukrainian and Russian with dominating of one of them in some regions or spheres of activities (Matvieieva, 2017). The Ukrainian language is generally used in public authorities' activities and in the educational sphere. Consequently, the Ukrainian and/ or Russian languages (one or both) turn out to be the mother tongue(s) for Ukrainian students who begin learning Turkish at Ukrainian universities.

Turkish, on the one hand, and Ukrainian (Russian), on the other hand, are genetically unrelated languages. They also have different typological systems: Turkish is an agglutinative language; Ukrainian and Russian are fusional languages. Differences in the ways of the realization of grammatical meaning as well as important differences on the grammatical level between Ukrainian (Russian), native for Ukrainian students, and Turkish, which is the language of their major, prioritize the problem of teaching grammar. Undoubtedly, the problem of teaching grammar separately in foreign language teaching methodology is largely controversial and we will mention about it in detail

below, however, the fact is that the insufficient teaching of grammar to foreign students who will become specialists in Turkish (teachers/ lecturers or translators/ interpreters) in the not-too-distant future, result in illiteracy, grammatically impoverished speech, disability in the use of all the grammar toolkit of Turkish which is indeed affluent and diverse.

The aim

Proceeding from the above mentioned points we define the aim of this paper as identifying the difficulties in mastering grammatical phenomena of the Turkish language by Ukrainian students at university level and detecting the ways of overcoming these difficulties in order that the students gain more efficiency in learning Turkish and be more successful in using this language in their future professional activities. It should be reiterated that the issue discussed in this paper is teaching grammar to the students of specialized departments who study Turkish as their major and prepare themselves for the career of a lecturer/ teacher or translator/ interpreter of Turkish. It is obvious that teaching Turkish at non-special departments (including LSP) or general foreign language training courses has a different purpose and demands other theoretical and methodological approaches.

The statement of the problem

Foreign languages teaching methods and teaching grammar

The discussion on the issue of this paper should be started with a general outline of the necessity of separate teaching grammar in the process of learning a foreign language. We believe that it would be helpful if we delve deeper into the history and current state of foreign languages teaching methods and mention in some words about the approaches which prevail in present-day methodology.

The teaching of foreign languages as a field of science had passed through several stages (Kabakova, 2010). The grammar-translation method was dominant in Europe (its heyday is 18-19th centuries). The grammatical system formed the basis of foreign language teaching and special attention was paid to the grammatical analysis of the text, memorizing grammatical rules and translation. The domination of this method over a long period of time can be explained by traditions inherited from the Latin schools and formal purposes of the study (Husevskaia, 2013). The textual translation method which is directly linked with the previous method aims at the general development of learners by means of reading authentic literature. This method is based on an authentic text in a foreign language and is characterized by the scholastic approach being detached from actual practice. This method nevertheless became part of further methodological approaches (Husevskaia, 2013).

The grammar translation and textual translation methods were replaced by the natural method which was inspired by social need namely by an upsurge in capitalist relations causing the growth of translator/ interpreter demand. The aim of this method was the development of oral speech which was to be realized in a similar way to children's acquisition of their native language in natural way. Grammar was excluded from teaching; lessons were conducted in the form of the imitation of a teacher's speaking and the building of skills and competences was provided as a result of reiterating speech samples and using them in different situations of everyday communication (Husevskaia, 2013). We can see the use of this method in classical Russian literature of 18-19th centuries in the period of the domination of the French language in Russian culture when Russian landowners invited governesses for their children from France (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richard, Roger, 2014).

The natural method is related to the direct method which is however scientifically based on principles developed by linguists and psychologists. The supporters of this method postulated the necessity of the link of a foreign word with the denominated object bypassing the intermediary i.e. the native language. So, the main principle of the direct method is excluding the native language and

translation; words should be learnt in context and grammar should be comprehended by means of induction (Husevskaia, 2013).

In the reference to the natural and direct methods, mention must be made of the so called “army” method of accelerated training in a foreign language (within 6–8 months), which was developed in the years of World War II. The authors of this method were guided by the principles of behaviorism with their focus on practical language training as a result of the direct perception and repetition of speech samples learnt intuitively. Success was ensured by a considerable number of academic hours (up to 25 hours per a week), immersion in linguistic environment, careful forming of classes, a limited number of learners in the class (5–7 persons) and high motivation of the learners (Husevskaia, 2013).

The ideas of the “army” method were further developed in 1950–1960s in the concept of audiolingual method which was theoretically based on the works of an outstanding American linguist L. Bloomfield who believed that there is no connection between linguistic knowledge and the practical use of a language. The features of this method are the intuitive perception of language material and the extensive use of lots of actual information about the country (Husevskaia, 2013). The audiovisual method, related to the audiolingual method, was widely used in France. According to this method the semantization of language material was provided by visual means and not only by ear as it could be seen in the previous method (Husevskaia, 2013). There is no doubt that the biggest flaw of all the “direct” methods is the focus on forming “automatic speech” and not on the development of skills and competences as well as the predominance of intuitive work over consciousness.

The conscious-comparative method of teaching foreign languages was developed in the end of 1940s in the Soviet Union and was based on the linguistic concept of L. Scherba and the principles of communicative linguistics. The activity theory (Leontiev, 1981) and the theory of gradual development of mental activities formed the psychological basis of this method. According to the mentioned psychological theories the conscious perception of language units with their subsequent use in practice (the so-called “automation”) is believed to be the shortest and the most effective way of learning foreign languages (Husevskaia, 2013). It should be noted that the conscious-comparative method is still used at universities in the post-Soviet states being implemented in overwhelming majority of class-books including those of the Turkish language.

In contrast to universities, especially departments of linguistics/ philology where the conscious method prevails, in secondary/ high school preference is given to the communicative method which aims to bring the process of teaching a foreign language to real communication as close as possible. The basic principle of this method is the focus on speaking which implies active involving the pupils in the process of communication and the use of exercises simulating the situations of real communication as much as possible. In doing so it is very important to realize that the teaching of a foreign language is the process of transmitting foreign culture and this principle underpins the linguo-cultural trend in teaching foreign languages which is widespread in the post-Soviet area (Husevskaia, 2013; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Elizabeth, Rao, 2007; Richard & Roger, 2010).

Undoubtedly, each of the mentioned methods has its advantages and disadvantages. Neither of them disappeared completely from foreign languages teaching methodology at the present stage and each method has value under certain circumstances (Husevskaia, 2013). The predomination of one or some of these methods or their components stems from the characteristics of target audience and the purpose of teaching in certain circumstances.

Thus, if we train translators/ interpreters it is logically that we resort to some extent to translation or textual translation methods in the process of teaching a foreign language; in a class (group) in which all the learners (students) speak the same native language as well as when we aim at training professional translators/ interpreters or lecturers/ teachers of a foreign language and/ or when we are guided by wide educational goals, the use of comparative method is well justified. However, these methodological approaches can hardly be accepted when it comes to the teaching

of a foreign language at general language courses; here the communicative approach should prevail, and grammar material should be reduced to a minimum. And when it comes to the teaching of foreign languages for special purposes (LSP) at non-linguistic departments the study process should be oriented at specialized professional communication and training the skill to extract professionally relevant information from authentic sources.

At secondary/ high school the priority is meeting the challenges of communication. The goal of developing communicative skills is often achieved to the detriment of grammar competence and as a result many school-leavers make mistakes both in speaking and writing. This situation is acceptable for a school-leaver since grammar mistakes do not always impede the process of communication, but it is completely inappropriate in professional training at universities (Zverhovskaia, 2013). Therefore at special linguistic departments it is useful to teach foreign language grammar separately with the involvement of comparative/ contrastive analyses with the facts and phenomena of the language native for students since the lack of comparative parallels leads to the so-called negative transfer i.e. language interference from the native language and as a result the level of spontaneous speech, reading and listening skills turns out much higher than the level of real knowledge and skills in the field of grammar (Zverhovskaia, 2013). A special attention should be paid to the role of grammar as the basis for developing the fundamentals of communicative skills and its important place in training specialists in the field of foreign languages and culture (Zverhovskaia, 2013).

One of the most important prerequisites for learning a foreign language is the development of grammar competence because grammar competence as an indispensable component of the ability to communicate permeates all the language skills and ensures grammatically correct and communicatively relevant organization of oral speech and written texts (Ovchinnikova, 2012). Establishing a theoretical system of grammar with elements of explaining students the structural and functional principles of grammatical constructions through the native language in the process of teaching a foreign language has many advantages: first, grammar of the native language is reviewed while learning a foreign language, when two languages are compared similarities and differences are analyzed and the comprehension of them provides additional motivation; second, the learner can see the grammar system in an integrated, not dispersed manner which allows not only to automatically use the memorized constructions but also to build them independently (Molodykh-Nagaieva, 2015).

It should be noted that the wrong choice of methods in teaching a foreign language results in dismal consequences. Focusing on the development of fluent speaking skills to the detriment of grammatically correct speech leads to difficulties in professional training students at special linguistic departments as a future translator/ interpreter/ teacher/ lecturer for whom grammar skills are an important component of their professional competence (Zverhovskaia, 2013). So, in the process of professional training students in a foreign language much more attention should be paid to the development of grammatically correct speech which is essential for their future professional competence (Zverhovskaia, 2013). Nevertheless, it is obvious that the organization of foreign language training in practice is perceived very ambiguously in works of researchers in different countries (Molodykh-Nagaieva, 2015) and constitutes a really challenging task. The artistry of presenting grammar material is exercised in the ability to simply explain grammar forms and constructions in theory, to demonstrate how the native speakers use them, to suggest practical exercises which will train not only grammar but also communicative skills (Molodykh-Nagaieva, 2015).

As is known there are two basic approaches to teaching grammar; these are explicit and implicit which differ depending on whether grammar rules are represented and explained separately, or they are not (Soloviova, 2005). The explicit approach provides developing grammar skills stage by stage from representing a grammar rule till doing exercises containing the learnt structure and the implicit one is oriented at communication without the conscious comprehension of grammar rules and without the use of any special linguistic terms. In actual practice none of them

is used separately and they vary depending on the learner's age, initial level of knowledge and the purposes of study which ensures the differentiated approach, the combination of different teaching techniques depending on the circumstances of study (Ovchinnikova, 2012). In modern foreign languages teaching methodology, however, the tradition to teach and to learn grammar and structure of a foreign language from the standpoint of a person who perceives the speech in this language, i.e. a listening or reading person still dominates in the post-Soviet area (Chirko, 2002). In this tradition, dating back centuries, teachers make exclusive focus on grammatical categories that have formal morphological manifestation and do not take into consideration the functional and contextual specifics of this form and the fact that there is a big gap between the controlled language activities and the real practice of communication (Ovchinnikova, 2012). It is for this reason that present-day linguistics work to build a grammar of active type (the so called "grammar for a speaker") in order to overcome the difficulties of traditional approach to developing grammar competence. The active grammar aims at developing the learner's skill to easily construct relevant communicative units and provides for the inclusion in the range of grammar tools of those which are used in speech production, the information concerning the mechanisms and patterns of the use and compatibility of words and peculiarities of language units' functioning (Ovchinnikova, 2012).

In conclusion of the short review of foreign languages teaching methods it should be noted again that we support the necessity of separate teaching of Turkish grammar provided that it is directly connected with the communicative aspect and taking into consideration functional and communicative characteristics of the taught grammar phenomena.

Methods

For the specifying of difficulties in learning Turkish grammar we, above all, relied on the questionnaire method of data collection, interviewing the students who study or studied Turkish at Kyiv National Linguistic University between 2007–2018; 258 students were involved in the survey; the students were interviewed twice: after finishing the second year of study for the first time (the practical grammar course covers the period of two academic years) and after graduating from bachelor's program (4 academic years). The questionnaires were structured according to the dual principle: in one of them a list of grammar phenomena was offered to the students for them to mark the difficulty level of each phenomenon on the scale out of ten; in the other the students were asked to choose from five to ten grammar phenomena which were the most difficult for them while learning Turkish and explain shortly the cause of these difficulties. Furthermore, eleven lecturers who had experience of teaching Turkish at university not less than 5 years responded to the survey; they also answered the question about the grammar phenomena of Turkish which are, in their view, the most difficult for teaching to university student and for learning by university students.

We also resorted to the source criticism method for analyzing grammar manuals and class-books (student-books) in Turkish published in Ukraine (Khalymonenko, 1997; Prushkovska, 2005; Miniakhmetova, 2011); Russia (Kuznetsov, 2000; Shcheka, 1996; 2007; Dudina, 2006; Genish, 2008; Guziev, 2014; Kononov, 1956;), Turkey (Demir, Yılmaz, & Gencan, 2013; Dilaçar, 1989; Emine, 2003; Hengirmen, 1998; Karahan, 2010; Korkmaz, 2009; Gencan, 2001; Ergin, 2019) and some other countries (first, Great Britain) (Kornfilt, 1997; Lewis, 2001; Underhill, 1985; Göksel & Kerslake, 2006; Hieber, 2007). In the analysis of sources, we tried to ascertain what was the level of clarity and granularity (detailing) in the description, characterization and specification of those grammar phenomena which were considered the most difficult by Ukrainian students and lecturers.

At the same time we used the experimental method for detecting the feasibility of separate teaching Turkish grammar versus its integral teaching together with speech practice: between 2004 and 2014 Turkish had been taught on the basis of the integrated approach (when grammar is not taught as a separate discipline and all the aspects such as phonetics, grammar, speech practice etc. are taught together); since 2014 Turkish is taught in aspects which includes a separate course of grammar. During all the period of experiment knowledge, skills and competence acquired by the

students as well as their performance in different study and non-curricular activities connected with Turkish were constantly controlled and evaluated on the statistical method.

Results

As a result of the research undertaken on the basis of the mentioned above methods we identified a range of problems on morphological and syntactical levels of Turkish grammar which present difficulties for Ukrainian students whose mother tongue is Ukrainian (Russian); we listed these difficulties, determined the causes of these difficulties and offered the ways of their overcoming in the process of teaching Turkish. We mentioned above that one of the most important problems are typological (systemic) differences between the languages namely different means of the realization of grammatical meaning. The following constitutes the biggest difficulties in Turkish for Ukrainian student:

1) diversity in Turkish morphology and intra-language synonymy, when there are a lot of grammatical means which have the same or similar meanings and differ in subtle grammatical nuances or do not differ at all within a certain grammatical system or subsystem;

2) a set of the so-called non-evidential tense (and sometimes not only tense) forms which denominate an action or a situation according to words (telling) of some other person or persons; this grammatical situation is completely impossible in Ukrainian or Russian;

3) an extended system of the realization of time and aspect relations with their modal and aspectual modifications which differs substantially from what we can see in Ukrainian or Russian;

4) the causative voice when it has the meaning of involving in the action some other person besides the real actor; there is no such a grammar phenomenon in Ukrainian (Russian);

5) the passive voice when it comes to the denomination of impersonal relations, particularly the derivation of passive verb forms from intransitive verbs which is completely impossible in Ukrainian or Russian;

6) the system of *converbs* (adverbial participles and morpho-syntactical complexes) which has, besides a considerable variety of adverbial participle forms, personal forms which cannot occur in Ukrainian/ Russian;

7) the system of verbal nouns which differs a lot from the use of verbal nouns in Ukrainian or Russian; we can note that verbal nouns system is the basis of the verbal system in Turkish;

8) inclusive syntactical constructions which stem from the system of verbal nouns and which are one of the most specific and the most difficult phenomena in the Turkish language. These constructions are included in the simple sentence and constitute an "extended part of a sentence" integrated on the base of an infinite form (such as participle, adverbial participle or verbal noun). They are equal to the subordinate clause in Indo-European languages according to their meaning but do not constitute a sentence in general linguistic interpretation (we call them the clause versus the sentence which contains a finite verb or finite verbal form i.e. a predicative suffix);

9) one more difficulty on the syntactical level is the word order in the sentence namely the final position of the predicate as well as the preposition of the attribute and any subordinate element in any syntactical structure both in word-groups and in sentences;

10) the difference between nominal and verbal negation which are realized in the same way in Ukrainian and Russian;

11) a very big problem for Ukrainian student (and not only for Ukrainian) is the marking of the direct object with the accusative suffix which depends on a number of factors such as definiteness/ indefiniteness of the denominated object; this problem is akin to the problem of definite/ indefinite article in English which presents a considerable linguistic challenge for those learners who speak a language with no category of article as Ukrainian or Russian;

12) the *izafet* construction and especially the so-called relative (or one-suffixed) *izafet* which realizes those types of semantic relations which are generally realized with relative adjectives in Ukrainian or Russian;

13) in connection with the *izafet* undoubtedly the mention should be made of the genitive case in those clauses (i.e. specific Turkic inclusive syntactical constructions) which are bases on personal participles, adverbial participles (converbs) and verbal nouns because their predicate is connected with the subject according to the *izafet* principle: either possessive *izafet* (with adding the genitive suffix to the subject) or relative *izafet* (with no such suffix);

14) another difficulty which goes beyond intra-linguistic factors is the modal and stylistic parameters of a significant number of grammatical forms (for example we can speak about the forms which are used mostly in oral speech and which cannot be found in scientific and technical texts). The so-called “human factor in the language” plays a big role in Turkish against the background of the variety of morphological forms. This implies the situations when the use of one of the synonymic or partly-synonymic forms (first of all tense or converb forms) is preferred to the other form(s) according to the speaker’s interpretation of the denominated situation (we will illustrate this and above statements in the discussion part of this paper).

The mentioned characteristics are the key difficulties of Turkish grammar for Ukrainian students because they constitute linguistic and extralinguistic phenomena which cannot be found in native for the students Ukrainian or Russian languages. It should be reiterated that the described difficulties stem from objective reasons which are the genetic and typological differences between the native and learnt languages. However there are some subjective causes as well which can be explained by the fact that many problems of grammar of Turkish as a foreign language are not investigated on the sufficient level and this makes it impossible to give the students explanations of difficult grammatical phenomena in detail; the lack of special grammar manuals which would be focused on the teaching of the most difficult phenomena of Turkish to Ukrainian students as a foreign language including the contrastive and functional aspects; the lack of a tailor-made set of exercises oriented at the automation of grammar forms usage skills. There are also some causes which are not connected directly with Turkish grammar, but which influence in some way the results of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. These are the over-fixation of lecturers at Ukrainian universities on the grammatical and textual translation methods with the apparent lack of communication-oriented approach as well as the inability of lecturers to increase the level of students’ motivation in learning Turkish at special departments.

Based on the foregoing, it should be noted that the main ways for the overcoming of these difficulties are: the detailed investigation of actual problems of Turkish grammar with the focus on its relationship with corresponding phenomena of Ukrainian grammar based on comparative aspect; the production of books (class-books, text-books, student-books, grammar manual, monographs etc.) on Turkish grammar guided by the comparative and functional approaches i.e. with paying special attention to the functioning of grammar categories and forms in communication and taking into account the mentioned above human factor; increasing professional pedagogical skills of Ukrainian lecturers/ teachers particularly within exchange programs such as Erasmus+ or Mevlana with a special focus on developing the skills of teaching Turkish as a foreign language guided by the communicative approach with separate teaching of grammar as well as the development of their psychological skills to increase the motivation of students in learning Turkish as major.

Discussion

Above we mentioned about the necessity of the use of differentiated approaches to teaching Turkish as a foreign language depending on the purpose of study. Teaching Turkish at special departments for training future lecturers or translators should be guided by other methods than teaching it in language courses or at non-linguistic faculties for special purposes (LSP). Proceeding from the results of our research we postulate that grammar of Turkish should be taught

to Ukrainian students separately and systematically on the basis of the conscious perception method with the involving of the comparative approach when the most difficult and specific phenomena of Turkish is compared with the corresponding material of the Ukrainian language native for students. We planned to develop a grammar manual for Ukrainian university students based on the mentioned methodological principles; the first part of this manual is published as a preprint (Sorokin, 2018), and the second part is in progress.

The university system of teaching Turkish as a foreign language in Ukraine had passed through several stages in its development. As it was seen in general methodology of teaching foreign languages, Turkology scholars at Ukrainian universities discussed a lot about the main approach to teaching Turkish; the integrated approach when all the aspects of the language are taught together was replaced by the aspect approach when different aspects of the language such as phonetics, grammar, speaking practice are taught as separate disciplines.

Undoubtedly, the major purpose of the integrated teaching of a foreign language, ideally, should be the communicative approach i.e. all the process of foreign language teaching must be focused on speaking (producing and perceiving the oral speech) while all the other types of language activities (reading and writing) are considered to be secondary. We should point out, in fairness, that in the eyes of an average person the foreign language proficiency level is determined by speaking skill. Consequently, we can admit the importance of speaking but reducing the process of teaching at special departments only to teaching the oral speech cannot be considered appropriate since a future lecturer/ teacher must be able not only to say something in a foreign language but also to provide explanations regarding certain linguistic phenomena (phonetical, morphological, syntactical etc.) to his (her) students especially when it comes to typologically specific phenomena of Turkish which fundamentally differ this language from Ukrainian or Russian. And a future lecturer/ teacher, to be able to explain or to demonstrate the use of a certain linguistic phenomenon, must *consciously* acquire the knowledge of this phenomenon on a certain stage of his (her) study. Moreover, each of the language phenomena must be tied together as a system in his (her) head and that is what ensures his (her) ability to form the same knowledge and the same system in his future students.

The main argument of the followers of the separate teaching of grammar is the necessity of *conscious* mastering grammar which is the recipe for grammatically correct speech of a foreign language learner. It should be added that our experience in teaching typologically different languages (from the example of such language pairs as Turkish – Ukrainian, Azerbaijani – Ukrainian, Arabic – Ukrainian, Chinese – Ukrainian) demonstrates that the lack of the conscious study of grammar leads to a number of negative results, first of all, failure in the learners' systematic comprehension of grammar material, disability to understand the causal links between the elements of the grammatical system, and as a consequence grammatically "dirty" speech which is a venial sin for a non-specialist in a foreign language but, undoubtedly, unacceptable for a lecturer or a translator/ interpreter. The results of the integrated teaching of Turkish with no separate course of grammar, implemented in Kyiv National Linguistic University about 15 years ago, had not demonstrated the improvement of students' communicative skills but it had caused the decrease of the general level of their linguistic knowledge and perfunctory comprehension of language phenomena which would not allow to be engaged in professional teaching or translating activity on an appropriate quality level in the future. We can state that according to the results of the final evaluation of the bachelor's program (four-year program, 240 ECTS credits) the percentage of graduates who were engaged in the integrated study and who got the highest grade on Turkish graduation exam reduced from 50 to 15. It was a considerable number of grammatical mistakes than caused the mentioned reduction.

Consequently, the university returned to the system of separate teaching grammar of Turkish and other languages typologically different from Ukrainian. We should point out that when it comes to typologically similar or/ and genetically related languages or a language "devoid" of morphology (as Chinese) the teaching may be carried out on the basis of the integrated approach, however, the teaching of typologically and/ or genetically different language requires paying

attention to grammar aspect with special emphasis on conscious comprehension of the importance of the detailed study of grammatical phenomena for the development of oral speech and writing skills. In doing so, theoretical and conceptual generalizations must play a large part in teaching grammar though many lecturers try to avoid them or to follow the path of oversimplification.

The simplification of grammatical rules and avoiding general theoretical descriptions is completely reasonable at secondary school or language courses; it is not a secret that “over-theorized” study results in the losing of interest by learners because theory is mostly boring. Teaching foreign languages at school or courses must be aimed at communication with achieving a fast result in speaking and understanding oral speech which increases learners’ motivation. Nevertheless, at university level we proceed from the fact that university students at special departments have (or at least must have) strong self-motivation and do not need any additional stimulus. The gaining of new knowledge must be enough motivation in itself. We, undoubtedly, realize that this understanding is idealistic in some degree since real practice demonstrates that not all the Ukrainian students intentionally come to learning Turkish as their future profession and have self-motivation.

Now it is time to turn to the question what grammatical phenomena of the Turkish language constitute the greatest difficulties in teaching Turkish to Ukrainian students. Obviously, the discussion should be started with prerequisites: we mentioned about the motivation, however, the basic so to say “after-school” knowledge play a big role (the duration of study at secondary school in Ukraine is 11 years and it is only after graduation from secondary school a person can enter a university, with preliminary evaluation in the form of the so-called “external independent testing” in basic school disciplines such as the Ukrainian language, a foreign language largely English, history of Ukraine, mathematics, geography etc.). Unfortunately, we must acknowledge that the major part of school-graduates is basically unprepared to acquire any theoretical, in particular grammatical knowledge. University lecturers are compelled to fill in school lacunae in elementary concepts for instance what the sentence is, what parts of a sentence are (subject, predicate, object etc.). As was stated above the comparative approach plays a great part in conscious learning a foreign language, so it is critically important that the students understand phenomena, facts and processes in their native language. Because, basically speaking, if a student does not know what a word-group is and what the mechanisms of its forming are in his native language it is extremely complicated to provide his comprehension and use in practice of this grammar phenomena in the foreign language he learns.

Before turning specifically to grammar, we will refer briefly to Turkish phonetics. The Turkish phoneme system does not present any difficulty for a person who speaks Russian and especially Ukrainian as his mother tongue (Ukrainian phoneme system is a little closer to Turkish than that one of Russian) as well as Turkish graphics in contrast to Arabic script or Chinese hieroglyphics is familiar to Ukrainian students because any child learns English (sometimes German, French or Spanish) at Ukrainian secondary school.

Turkish phonetics do not have any specific elements difficult for articulation by Ukrainian students as compared to emphatic or plosive consonants in Arabic or tones in Chinese or Vietnamese, extended system of vowels in Danish or combinations of consonants in Northwest Caucasian languages which can terrify any layman (for example, the Kabardian language which has the largest amount of consonants among all the languages in the world (Colarusso, 2006; Kuipers, 1960); it is not a secret that Turkish is not the Basque language which you should only be born with; the possibility of mastering Turkish is quite high.

The articulation of Turkish phonemes does not create an impasse for a Ukrainian student if he/ she articulates them separately; however in speech stream several phonemes as (k), (s), (t), (d) and some others become so specific in their sounding that differ significantly from what a Ukrainian or Russian speaker is used to. In this situation even special phonetical training (for example such a training was conducted in 2018 on the base of Kyiv Yunus Emre Institute) does not improve the

situation. Many years of observation indicate that only about 10 % of Ukrainian learners demonstrate correct articulation of Turkish phonemes in the end of the study at university; accent is heard to some extent in the speech of 90 % of students but it cannot be considered critical and does not influence the process of communication or professional activity. It should be mentioned that in mixed Turkish – Ukrainian or Turkish – Russian families children acquire both languages with the same success including the phonetical level. So, phonetical problems can be solved to some degree in conditions of long-term full immersion in the language environment. Undoubtedly, the only way of at list partial overcoming phonetical difficulties is, ideally, the immersion in the language environment for as long period as possible or hearing foreign speech as much as possible, fortunately, present-day techniques, first of all the Internet, provide broad scope of opportunities for that.

As was mentioned above, Turkish and Ukrainian are typologically and genetically different languages. Despite similarities in the principles of deriving words and grammar forms (formants such as suffixes, endings etc. are added to a word stem), the mechanism of the realization of this principle is completely different. The flexion in Ukrainian can contain one or some grammatical meanings which vary depending on many factors (for example belonging to a semantical or formal group/class/ type such as word declination/ conjugation type), moreover, these variations are so diverse that a foreigner learning Ukrainian or Russian perceives them as non-systemic. Fusional phenomena are widespread in Ukrainian (Russian) which means that it is difficult to find morpheme joints in a word i.e. to understand where a word root ends and a derivational (grammatical) morpheme begins; the fusion exists in the majority of Slavonic languages and it is what makes the learning of Ukrainian or Russian so difficult for a foreigner whose native language is not-fusional. Turkish agglutinativity is realized in the form of suffixes (the term “suffix” is used in English Turkology sources (Lewis, 2001), in Soviet/ Russian/ Ukrainian sources the term “affix” is used (Kononov, 1965; Shcheka, 1996; Kuznetsov, 2000 etc.) which always have the only meaning and are restricted in their variations. These variations are based on the principle of vowel harmony: palatal (big) harmony and labial (little) harmony and consonant assimilation. In our view, the fusional system is much more complex which may be supported empirically by the fact that it is more difficult for a foreigner to learn Ukrainian or Russian than Turkish and it takes more time and the most significant complexity is the system of fusional derivation.

The Turkish phonetical harmony and the system of suffixation does not constitute a substantial problem for a Ukrainian learner and in the process of study the main challenge is motivation: the morphology of Turkish, despite a simple principle of forming, however, is very diverse. And the challenge of mastering it is reduced to a simple algorithm: after the comprehension of the harmony principle (each suffix according to big or little harmony can have either two or four variants; vowels in two- or four variant-suffixes are always the same but consonants differ) one should memorize each suffix and its meaning and then automatize it in a system of exercises and in real communicative situations. This task is simplified by the fact that Turkish morphology hardly has any exceptions (in contrast to many languages of Western Europe).

Despite the simplicity of the mechanism the real challenge is enormous variations in the system of morphology and an average student after reaching a certain breaking point can hardly find the strength to move further, leaving beyond his (her) attention a significant part of Turkish morphological forms. In doing so, the students in general have a very rough idea of the system of participles, much less about the system of adverbial participles and linked with them morphological forms and constructions, the system of analytical verbs, the system of compound tenses etc. The diversity of morphological forms and intra-language synonymy requires much patience, much endeavor and much time for learning them. But the road is made by walking and you just have to keep putting one foot in front of the other; the teaching practice demonstrates that two years is enough for conscious mastering Turkish grammar provided that four academic hours are allocated for grammar lessons per week with 30 weeks in an academic year. Regrettably, not any learner is ready to spend two years for learning grammar. It is naturally that the most complex phenomena of

Turkish are those which have no semantic parallels in Ukrainian (or Russian) such as: a set of evident forms, the causative voice, the system of *converbs*, the extended system of tenses with their modal and aspectual modifications, differences in nominal and verbal negation, the passive voice and non-personal relations (some of them will be characterized below in detail).

It should be emphasized once again that neither phonetical nor morphological systems of Turkish constitute difficulty for a Ukrainian student. It is the syntactic level where the major complexities lurk, because the major typological differences between agglutinative Turkic and the languages that belong to other types (fusional Indo-European with external flexion, fusional Semitic with internal flexion) lie on syntactical level. Nevertheless, the cause of the difficulties in learning Turkish syntax is not only its complexity but also the fact that this system is not investigated sufficiently with the focus on its optimization for teaching and conscious perceiving by the students who speak Eastern-Slavonic languages as native languages.

It is appropriate here to make a brief exertion to the history of the research of Turkish syntax as well as Turkish grammar in general. A few books and research articles regarding Turkish grammar is issued regularly in Turkey; among them there are student sets many of which are oriented at foreign learners of Turkish (Hitit; Adım Adım Türkçe; Türkçe Öğreniyoruz; Yedi İklim Türkçe; Yabancılar için Türkçe; Gazi Üniversitesi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe; Ebru Türkçe Öğretim Seti and some others), grammar manuals either academic or oriented at foreign learners (for example Ergin, 2019; Gencan, 2001; Hengirmen, 1998), innumerable amount of research papers concerning different aspect of Turkish (it is impossible to mention all of them). Meanwhile all of them are completely meaningless from the point of view of a foreign student who studies beyond the language environment. Their main problem is that Turkish authors, which is not a reproach, consider all the facts and phenomena of Turkish as their mother tongue. Thus many language facts, which seem completely natural for a native speaker, constitute major difficulties for those people who try to learn this language and these facts are described superficially if described at all. Furthermore several complex grammar phenomena are not even denoted with special terms whereas we can find special linguistic terms for them in English grammar issues, for example in (Lewis, 2001; Underhill, 1985; Göksel & Kerlake, 2006); as well as Russian ones (Kuznetsov, 2001; Shcheka, 2007), though both English and Russian terminology sometimes proves insufficient. It will be appropriate to note that Turkish syntax is not developed sufficiently in Russian and Ukrainian Turkological sources. The vast majority of Turkish issues, in particular grammar issues which are considered to be oriented at university students, are used at the advanced level of teaching Turkish at Ukrainian universities with the aim to deepen students' skills of Turkish but they are completely unhelpful at the elementary and intermediate levels of teaching grammar. To understand them a foreign student must have relatively high level of Turkish knowledge and skills including special theoretical knowledge of grammar and linguistic terminology. Here the so called *sets* should be deprived outside the discussion since they are focused on the development of basic speaking skills in typical communicative situations; they are used with success as an additional source for training speaking at any level from starter till advanced but they do not form the basis for grammatical competence of the students (in fact they do not aim at this). At the same time the mention should be made of the utility of those authentic sources which provide grammar exercises; such issues are unrivalled and are used actively at Ukrainian universities for developing grammatical competence (Özsoy, 2002; Sebüktekin, 2015).

Another matter is the specifics of the national interpretation and description of grammar facts and phenomena peculiar to different countries. Even though the world science demonstrates a trend to convergence, every national scientific and research school is guided by traditional practice in the comprehension and description of linguistic phenomena therefore there are significant divergences in the terminological apparatus and scientific discourse in different countries. For example, when it comes to syntax the Soviet and post-Soviet Turkology School had discussed for a long time (and re-opens discussions from time to time) concerning the theoretical interpretations of *inclusive syntactical constructions* in terms of their acceptance as a sentence. It should be reminded

that the mentioned constructions are equivalent to the sentence by their structure (for example they have principal and secondary elements); however, they do not contain a verb in finite form and they are linked to the predicate or another part of a sentence as *an expanded principal or secondary part of a sentence* (according to the Soviet terminology (Ailiarov, 1974)). Some researchers considered them a sentence (Kuznetsov, 2001), but the majority of scholars accepted them as a word-group or expanded part of a sentence (Ailiarov, 1974; Kononov, 1956; Shcheka, 2007) since in Soviet and in generally European linguistics the main principle of the organizational structure of the sentence is a verb in finite form. Similar discussions were held in France where a famous French Turkologist J. Deny defined these constructions as a specific type of a sentence intrinsic to Turkic languages and called them *“the quasi-sentence”* (Deny, 1995). Conversely, discussion like this was impossible in English research literature because the English term *“clause”* implies the possibility of the existing of a *finite clause* and *non-finite clause*; in present-day Ukrainian Turkology the term *clause* is used for defining *the non-finite clause* (i.e. inclusive syntactical structures of the mentioned above type) in contrast to *the sentence* which is always based on a finite verb form.

As for Turkish grammarians they ignore this problem; we see the term *side-sentence (yan tümce)* in Turkish sources but they do not traditionally discuss the problem of finiteness or non-finiteness of the Turkish sentence/ clause as against that one in other languages. These traditional national interpretations, particularly in terminology, complicate the process of interaction between scholars of different countries as well as the process of teaching grammar. For example, the term *“a complex sentence” (birleşik cümle)* implies completely different syntactical notions in the view of Ukrainian and Turkish Turkology scholars.

It should be mentioned that the forming, functioning and using of the mentioned inclusive syntactical constructions are the largest problem of Turkish grammar for Ukrainian students. Syntactical principles of the sentence in the Ukrainian (or Russian) languages are based on great representation of complex/ compound sentences which include two or more simple clauses (principal clause and subordinate clause) linked by a subordinating conjunction (we can see the same situation in English and other Indo-European languages). The fundamental requirement for a sentence or a clause in Ukrainian/ Russian is its being based on a predicate in finite form; the principal clause is most commonly followed by the subordinate clause, but the reverse order is not impossible.

Participle and adverbial participle groups are common in Ukrainian/ Russian and they are relatively movable in the sentence; their position depends on the type of the syntactical construction, and they can precede their dependent member (*determinatum*) or follow it. The situation of a dependent member's following its principal member in a word group is completely impossible in Turkish (for example we can say either *the mentioned above forms* or *the forms mentioned above* in English as well as in Ukrainian or Russian but we can only use the first construction in Turkish: *yukarıda sözü geçen biçimler* and the second syntactical position is impossible).

There are few subordinating conjunctions in Turkish, which are not of Turkic origin and borrowed from Arabic or Persian; their use is very limited. Complex sentences including two clauses with predicate in finite form are very seldom in Turkish and they are only used regularly in expressing condition. The principle of *finiteness* is a little bit different than in Indo-European languages. For example, when we say *I know that he will come tomorrow* in English (we see the same structure in Ukrainian and Russian) in Turkish we have to say *Yarın geleceğini biliyorum* which can be translated word by word as *Tomorrow coming-his(future + possessive + accusative) know-I*.

The predicate and the sentence itself are formed in the only way by means of *the predicative suffixes* (or *personal suffixes* according to another terminology system) in Turkish; in the example above we can see the personal suffix in the predicate which is always the last word in the sentence – the suffix *-um* is one of the four phonetical variants of the 1st person predicative suffix which means *I am*; and the first part of this sentence *Yarın geleceğini...* is a non-finite clause which does not have a

finite-form predicate; indeed its predicate is non-finite verbal noun – *the gerund* which ends with the accusative suffix (-i) so this clause is *an expanded complex object* at the same time. A sentence without predicative suffixes is completely impossible in Turkish. Any Turkish clause of the mentioned type is based on one of the three non-finite verb kinds: *participles, converbs (adverbial participles) or verbal nouns*. They are considered non-finite in that sense that they do not contain a personal (or predicative) suffix but at the same time they can contain possessive suffixes which indicate the person of a doer; so we have some kind of “non-predicative predicates” and “non-finite finiteness” in Turkish inclusive constructions. Thus, it is the mentioned system that constitutes the largest difficulty for Ukrainian (and “Indo-European”) students.

It is not a secret that the language does not exist on its own; it reflects the way of thinking and, on the other hand, it forms the way of thinking of the men and women who speak the same language. We think exactly so and not in another way due to our language, because it is our language which “imposed” our worldview upon us. When learning a foreign language, we experience another way of thinking and another worldview. It is much easier to master a genetically related language than a genetically different one because of similarities or, on the contrary, divergencies in the principles of linguistic thinking. The more distant a foreign language is from the native language, the more difficult it is for learning. Mentioned above typological characteristics of Turkish, which differ it from Ukrainian and Russian, overlay completely another system of linguistic thinking and it is quite complicated for comprehension by Ukrainian students. The predicate which contains the main judgment is placed in the end of the sentence (or clause) in Turkish while its regular position in Ukrainian is directly after the subject; the secondary (subordinate) component in any syntactic construction always precede the main component in Turkish while the situation is dual in Ukrainian and Russian and depends on many factors (we mentioned about it above).

Besides the word order in the sentence a significant difficulty is the use of the accusative case which can be marked or unmarked with the suffix depending on the principle of definiteness of the nominated object and sometimes several formal factors. Marking the accusative as well as the genitive cases is not only difficult in practice but also constitutes a very interesting theoretical problem regarding which consensus was not reached by Turkology scholars till the present day. Much of the Turkologists consider *the theory of unmarked cases* groundless and even flimsy being guided by the formal criterion; they claim if there is no suffix there is no case, consequently, it is about the nominative (or absolute, according to Lewis (2001), as the case of the object and substantive attribute in *izafet* when they are not marked with the accusative/ genitive suffix.

Some scholars accept the theory of unmarked accusative/ genitive cases (Kuznetsov, 2001; Sorokin & Pilyk, 2009–2010) according to the semantic and functional criterion: when there is meaning/ function there is a case but only in the situation when an unmarked form is opposed by a marked form of the same function (*marked accusative – unmarked accusative*); it is not appropriate to search a case where it does not exist at all. That is why we accept the unmarked accusative in Turkish but cannot do it in English: there is no marked accusative so there is no opposite unmarked form. Let us give some examples: *a) I saw a dog in the street; b) I must take this dog to a vet*. There is a direct object in both sentences, but it is used for an indefinite object in sentence *a*, and for a definite object in sentence *b*. So, when translating into Turkish, we should mark the object with the accusative suffix *-(y)i* in the second sentence and use the unmarked accusative in the first sentence: *a) Sokakta bir köpek gördüm; b) Bu köpeği veterinerine götürmem gerekiyor*.

In any case the marking of the direct object with the genitive suffix is a big problem in actual practice even for upper-intermediate or advanced students. In the context of the accusative case it is relevant to make a mention of its some similarities with the functioning of the article in English and consequently its direct connection with the category of definiteness/ indefiniteness as we can see from the examples above. In the situation of the direct object’s being definite we use the definite article in English and correspondingly the marked accusative in Turkish. As a speaker of a “non-article” language faces difficulties in using articles in English, a Ukrainian/ Russian speaker have difficulties in marking the direct object with the accusative suffix in Turkish.

In connection with the so-called “unmarked cases” we should mention about another complexity on the syntactical level, *izafet*, which is a noun group with possessive or relative semantics; there are two types of *izafet* which differ formally and semantically. Possessive constructions exist in Ukrainian and Russian that is why noun groups as *the house of my father = my father’s house (babamın evi)*, *the car of your friend = your friend’s car (senin arkadaşının aracı)*, which convey the reference to specific possession (i.e. the belonging of an object to a specific subject), do not constitute any difficulty for Ukrainian students and the equivalent in the form of the *possessive izafet* can be easily found.

Difficulties arise when it comes to the *relative izafet*, which covers all possible types of semantic interaction between substantial referents. These difficulties are caused, first of all, by the fact that Turkish contains a small number of relative adjectives which are widely used in Russian and Ukrainian (for example English word groups as *a stone bridge* are very close to Turkish *relative izafet*, but they are completely impossible in Ukrainian/ Russian and we should use a relative adjective like *stony* in meaning *made of stone*). Thus Ukrainian (Russian) word groups which contain this type of adjectives have their Turkish equivalents in the form of noun groups i.e. *the relative izafet*.

The same situation is seen in Ukrainian (Russian) word groups with prepositions; they are not represented in Turkish at all. There are some *postpositions* in Turkish which can be equivalent to Indo-European prepositions, but their use is limited by several factors and they are mostly used in verbal groups whereas Ukrainian (Russian) noun groups with prepositions are translated into Turkish in the form of *izafet*. For example, word groups like *a copybook of a student (or a student copybook)* regarding the *classifying attribute* (it can be seen from the article in English, but in Ukrainian and Russian where there is no category of article word groups *a copybook of a student* and *a copybook of the student* and even *a student copybook* are the same so, with no context it is impossible to understand where it comes to the classifying or individualizing attribute); *a tractor factory* (in Ukrainian/ Russian we have an adjective, something like “*tractoral*”) and, for example, *a war of independence* are conveyed into Turkish with the same type of a noun group – *relative izafet (öğrenci defteri, traktör fabrikası, bağımsızlık savaşı)*; but in word group *a copybook of the student*, which conveys the *individualizing semantics*, we must use *the possessive izafet (öğrencinin defteri)*, where the first (subordinate) component is marked with the genitive suffix.

It should be noted once more that challenges in mastering the *izafet* system are caused not only by specifics on syntactical level, but also by its being insufficiently investigated and described in widely used books (for example Kuznetsov, 2001); not every student, especially on the beginner’s level of learning Turkish, can resort to scientific or research sources as (Maizel, 1957) in order to clarify some complex aspects of forming or functioning of *izafets*. Specific situations in the use of marked and unmarked accusative are described in detail in books and manuals, however, the semantics and functioning of *izafets* are presented very superficially. And if we add *appositional noun groups* (as is seen in example above: *stone bridge – taş köprü*; components of an appositional group does not have any suffix, the appositional group mostly conveys the meaning of a material which an object is made of or vocatives, titles etc.; sometimes they are defined as *non-suffixed izafet*) to the mentioned *izafet* types it becomes really easy for a learner to get confused among all these word groups which are made of two or more nouns. It is very difficult for a Ukrainian student to understand at once why, for example, *Prince Volodymyr* and *iron gate* is the same type of noun groups (apposition: *Prens Volodymyr, demir kapı*) and *pea soup* is another type (relative *izafet: nohut çorbası*) since in word groups *iron gate* and *pea soup* in Ukrainian and Russian we have adjectives as the dependent component (we mentioned about it above) so, it would be logical, in the view of a Ukrainian student, if we group them in another way (*noun + noun; adjective + noun*).

There is one more complexity in Turkish syntax which is the possibility of a separate subject in those non-finite verb forms which cannot be *personal* in Ukrainian and Russian in any case; it is about participles and adverbial participles which in Ukrainian/ Russian sentences are always linked to a subject (or doer) in the principal part of a sentence.

Participles in Turkish are divided into two parts: *impersonal* and *personal*; first of them function in the same way as in Russian (they are widely used both in Turkish and Russian, more rarely in Ukrainian since active participles are represented in Ukrainian in a small amount in contrast to Russian and Turkish) whereas *impersonal* participles are used in a different way and can have a separate subject. The same situation is valid for adverbial participles derived from personal adjectives. And it is completely unusual for a Ukrainian student that the reference to a doer of a secondary (dependent) action is made by means of the system of the genitive case and possessive suffixes i.e. the *izafet* which corresponds to the logics of Turkish since the *izafet* conveys not only the meaning of possession but also a broad spectrum of relations between the denominated objects; nevertheless this system constitutes difficulty for learners. Let us give some examples: a) *a car of my father*; b) *the car which my father bought yesterday*. Formally in Turkish we have the same syntactical construction in both situations: a) the word which refers to the subject of possession (*father*) takes the genitive case suffix and the word which refers to the object of possession (*car*) takes the 3rd person possessive suffix (*babamın arabası*) thus we have the construction of *possessive izafet*; b) in this example we have a clause (...*which my father bought yesterday*) based on a personal participle, as was seen in the *possessive izafet* the subject/ doer (*father*) takes the genitive case suffix and the predicate of the clause (*bought*), which is presented by a personal participle, takes the 3rd person possessive suffix and clause itself is an attribute of the word *car* (*babamın dün aldığı araç* – “*my father’s yesterday buying-his car*). Certainly, this syntactic system is strange for any speaker of an Indo-European language.

As was mentioned above all the possible types of subordinate finite clauses as well as participle/ adverbial participle constructions in Ukrainian/ Russian are conveyed in Turkish by means of the system of non-finite clauses based on participles, converbs and verbal nouns (these three are non-finite verb forms in contrast to finite verb forms presented by the system of moods which are five). We noted that this “non-finiteness” is relative since the majority of participles, converbs (adverbial participles) and verbal nouns can have a separate subject (here we can mention once more about terminological divergencies: in Ukrainian and Russian linguistical terminology the logical subject and the subject in a sentence are denoted by two different terms, whereas there is no terminological difference between a sentence and a clause so, for Soviet and post-Soviet Turkology discussions regarding the qualification and terminological nomination of the *doer* in a non-finite clause are relevant till nowadays, however, they are not topical in English-language Turkology). They also can contain a possessive suffix (some Turkology scholars consider it *an inclusion suffix* coreferential to the possessive suffixes (Nasılov, 1985)), which indicates the person of a subject and is connected to its predicate with the construction of the relative or possessive *izafet* while the marking of the genitive case of the subject constitutes a significant problem. Let us give some sentences for example: *When Ahmet came everyone rejoiced* – *Ahmet gelince herkes sevindi* (verbatim: *Ahmet coming, everyone rejoiced*). *I know that my friend did not come to school yesterday* – *Arkadaşımın dün okula gelmediğini biliyorum* (verbatim: *My friend’s yesterday school-to coming-his know-I*). *Untill the night has come you cannot see the stars* – *Gece olmadıkça yıldızlar görünmez* (verbatim: *Night coming-not, stars seen-are-not*). *In the house, where a doctor did not come, everyone fell ill* (verbatim: *Doctor’s coming-not-his house-in everyone fell-ill* – *Doktorun gelmediği evde herkes hastalandı*). The vast majority of Turkish inclusive syntactic constructions (clauses) are of such form and characteristics so, they have a very “clumsy” look especially in the view of a person speaking an Indo-European language.

It is relevant to resume in few words the discussion about the formal connection of the clause subject to its predicate which we mentioned of in previous paragraph; this problem is one of the most difficult in Turkish grammar. We noted above that a clause is based on one of the non-finite verb forms which are three types; non-finite verb forms are semantically and syntactically hybrid: 1) verbal nouns which combine the characteristics of a verb and a noun; 2) participles which combine the characteristics of a verb and an adjective; 3) converbs which combine the characteristics of a verb and an adverb. In terms of the connection of the clause subject to its

predicate they are divided into three types: 1) those which cannot or mostly cannot have a separate subject; 2) those which can have an analytically connected separate subject; 3) those which can have a separate subject which is connected according to *izafet* principle either possessive or relative. The last one is divided into three groups: 1) those in which the subject is definitely marked with the genitive suffix (personal participles, for example, *Bu yazarın yazdığı roman satış rekorları kırdı* – *The novel, which this author wrote, broke the sales record* (verbatim: *This author's writing-his novel sales record broke*); 2) those in which the subject is never marked with the genitive suffix (all the personal converbs, for example, *Arkadaşım İstanbul'a geldiğinde beni aradı* – *When my friend came to Istanbul he called me* (verbatim: *Friend-my Istanbul-to coming-his-on me called*); 3) those in which the marking of the subject with the genitive suffix is optional (the gerund, for example, *Bu romanın Orhan Pamuk tarafından yazıldığını biliyorum* – *I know that this novel was written by Orhan Pamuk* (verbatim: *This novel's Orhan Pamuk by (postposition) writing-passiv-its(possessive)-accusative know-I*). *Kanında adrenalin arttığını hisetti* – *She felt as adrenaline in her blood arose* (verbatim: *Blood-her-in adrenaline arising-its(possessive)-accusative felt*). And it is the third group which presents the largest difficulty for Ukrainian students (for more details see Sorokin, 2019); the students are always confused whether it is necessary or not to mark the subject of a clause with the genitive suffix.

One more complexity is significant variations of formal grammatical means in the system of converbs; over eleven converb groups can be distinguished according to the semantical criterion in Turkish such as: modifiers of manner, preceding secondary action, simultaneous principal and secondary actions, following secondary action, purpose, condition, limit and conditional limit, comparison, substitution, allocation, gradation, descriptive etc. All these types of converbs are considered separately in Turkish grammar manuals and a complete, holistic theory of converb as well as the theory of clause in Turkish remains undeveloped. It is very difficult for a student to comprehend the fact that the Turkish converb system contains a significant amount of linguistic units and their combinations which convey the same or close meaning i.e. they should be considered synonymic or partly synonymic. For example a sentence like *When he came home (on his coming home) I put the cattle to boil* (a secondary action precedes the principal action) can be translated into Turkish by means of several converbs: *O eve gelince/ geldiğinde/ geldiği zaman/ gelir gelmez/ geldi mi/ geldiği gibi ocağa su koydum*. It should be noted that Ukrainian/ Russian grammar precludes other variant of conveying this situation, however, sometimes one grammatical form or combination can be replaced by another form or combination (for example a subordinate clause can be replaced by a verbal noun with a preposition as in the sentence above *when he came = on his coming*) but these situations are not so diverse as is seen in Turkish and the morphological diversity of Turkish is much richer than that one of Ukrainian or Russian and intra-linguistic synonymy constitutes great difficulties for Ukrainian learners.

The human brain tends to the systematization of facts and phenomena and is not ready to percept easily formal variations of language units in a foreign language along with the functional asymmetry under the line “meaning – language unit”, which means that a certain meaning can be conveyed by several or even many language units and a certain language unit can convey several or even many meanings. It is what distinguishes the language as a natural system from man-made systems in which everything is systematized and does not depend on factors external in relations to the system. It should be mentioned again that synonymous variations in different systems of Turkish has never become a subject of special holistic research.

Verbal nouns constitute great complexity in the view of an “Indo-European speaker”. They are three in Turkish: 1) the infinitive (verbal noun *-mak/-mek*); 2) the “truncated” infinitive (according to the terminology traditional for Soviet and post-Soviet Turkology, a different approach is followed in Turkic sources in English (verbal noun *-ma/-me* (Lewis, 2001) and in Turkish sources (Ergin, 2019; Gencan, 2001)); 3) the gerund (verbal noun *-dığı/ -acağı*). The last one is formed from the personal pronoun (*-dığı/ -acağı*) by means of contextual or formal grammatical substantiation (for example by adding a case suffix); the gerund constitutes one of the most specific grammar phenomena in Turkish. In grammar manuals or research works by Turkish authors this form is not

distinguished and not described (see any university grammar, for example (Gencan, 2001; Ergin, 2019); among all the verbal nouns Turkish researchers only distinguish *the infinitive* and *the verbal noun -ış* which is defined as *eylemlik* or *mastar*); in Soviet and post-Soviet Turkology it is described as amorphous set of grammar units called as *form -dik/ -acak* (all the disparate grammatical phenomena formed with suffix *-dik/ -acak* are included in this group (Pidvoyniy, Chubrikova, 1999). However, it is the gerund, its functioning and interaction with other non-finite verbal units, first of all the infinitive and the verbal noun *-ma/ -me*, which are the most complex syntactical phenomena for those learners who speak one of Indo-European language as their mother tongue (as Russian or Ukrainian) or mostly isolated language as English. It should be noted once more that the problem of the whole, complex study of verbal nouns as well as the holistic theory of clause focused on semantic and functional aspect still waits for its researcher (in this context it is useful to make a mention of a monograph (Ailiarov, 1974) which is focused on the so called “expanded parts of a sentence” i.e. clauses in Turkish mostly in structural aspect).

Along with the mentioned specifics the tense and, more widely, the temporal system in Turkish constitute great complexity for learners: verbal moods, verbal tenses, analytical verbal forms etc. The amount of tense forms varies in different grammar manuals which is caused by different theoretical approaches to what should be qualified as a tense form. It should be noted that despite formal similarities between the tense forms in Turkish and English, for example several present and several past tenses, their conceptual basis is completely different. English tense forms are differentiated according to the aspectual parameter: the character of the realization of an action, its connection with the moment of speech or some other moment on time scale as a result of some past action or its continuing regarding the moment of speech or another time moment. Aspectual characteristics are intrinsic to a Turkish tense form as well (for example simple or continuous past tenses) but the basic parameters in the differentiation of Turkish tense forms are modal and stylistic.

The use of a certain tense form is due to a speaker’s interpretation of the denoted situation, for example in the use of present tense forms the speaker can interpret the situation as actual and he resorts to the present simple (*Şu an kitap okuyorum – I am reading a book at the moment*) or he can represent it in progress and he resorts to the present progressive (*O konu kamuoyunda geniş olarak tartışılmaktadır – This problem is widely discussed in the community*) and he may interpret it as an objectively caused individual habit and he uses the aorist (*Arkadaşım çok sigara içer – My friend smokes a lot*) but in contrast to English all these tenses can be replaced by each other if the speaker’s interpretation differs, for example we can say: *Çok sigara icıyor* or *O konu geniş olarak tartışılıyor* (in both sentences the present simple used instead of the aorist and the present progressive correspondingly). The same situation is actual for the past or future tenses. This confirms the most outstanding feature of Turkish which is called “the human factor in language” in many Soviet and post-Soviet scientific works (Kubriakova, Shakhnarovich, Sakharnyi, 1991).

The idea that a human’s understanding the denominated situation plays a key role in the functioning of language units and influences the use of language units is not new for the linguistics of last several decades. And if we tried to find a certain language which amply demonstrates the reliance on the human factor, the Turkish would be a vivid example of a language of such a type. As was mentioned above there are significant variations in grammatical units and their combinations in different systems and subsystems in Turkish and the choice between these units is greatly motivated by the subjective factor. For example, when making a choice between the three tense forms which denote a present action a speaker should evaluate the situation he is talking about and represent the situation as an individual habit or a tradition of a collective using the aorist, or an action presented in progress (so to say in the process of its “pictorial” realization) and then he uses the present progressive (Turkish grammarians do not distinguish this form as a separate tense), eventually he can just represent an action as present without any specific nuances as being realized in the moment of speech or in some period of present time and then he resorts to the present simple: *otururlar – oturmaktadırlar – oturuyorlar*. It should be mentioned that for a person whose

native language is Ukrainian or Russian all these meanings are conveyed through the only form, the Present Tense.

It is, obviously, insufficient to know the system, grammatical structure and rules of a language to use a language in a meaningful way. Hypothetically, a person can know all the grammatical system of a certain language and even can have a certain word stock but be unable to use this language in actual practice. For correct using grammatical units one should take into account valent potency of the words, the context, the conditions of communication including extra-lingual factors, stylistical parameters of the discourse etc.

Undoubtedly, "classical" i.e. structural or "passive" grammar manuals and study book used in teaching Turkish based on structural, formal grammatical and textual translation approach pay no attention to the problem of functioning grammatical units in real communication process and ignore the human factor. Nevertheless, there were few attempts to approach to the description of Turkish grammar according to functional and communicative principles (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005); in our opinion this attempt cannot not be recognized as successful at least in terms of teaching Turkish but the direction of the research and description of grammar in the view of a speaker (i.e. the production of speech) based on communicational factors, is set properly.

So, awareness of the importance of a speaker's role in the use of grammatical units, the connection between his perception and comprehension of a situation and his choosing one of a few formal language units should be the cornerstone in the organization of the process of teaching Turkish as a foreign language to university students. And let us note again that it is of great importance to balance the separate teaching of grammar with the communicative approach in general, for example, if we give four academic hours per week for the separate study of grammar (one academic hour is 40 minutes in Ukrainian education system; practice demonstrates that it is this number of academic hours that allows to reach the desired result), communicative teaching Turkish beyond grammar lessons must cover a number of academic hours four or five times more than the time devoted to grammar. Otherwise, i.e. if we allocate less time for communicative practice than for the separate learning of grammar by Ukrainian student, it is completely logical that this results in the fact that by the middle of the second course the student begin to perceive Turkish grammar not as means of communication but as a mathematical system which consist of scheme, formulas, models. A learner sees the Turkish language as a purely mathematical problem which every time demands long thinking and seeking an appropriate formula or model for solution. In doing so, it is a very complicated task to instill communicative skills in students. It should be added, on this occasion, that a satisfactory solution has not been found yet for the development and implementation of the communicative approach to teaching Turkish as a problem of foreign languages teaching methodology in present-day teaching issues.

Among the other complexities of Turkish grammar, we can mention those which are unusual for the people speaking Indo-European languages; they are listed below:

a) the causative voice which in Turkish conveys the meaning of the inclusion of another person(s) into the process of the realization of an action. Thus, phrases like *I got my hair cut* or *I got my tooth pulled out* are said in Ukrainian or Russian *I cut my hair* and *I pulled out my tooth* so, for a Ukrainian speaker it is irrelevant weather I did this action myself or asked somebody else to realize it whereas in Turkish it is considerably weather a certain second or third (etc.) person was involved in the action which is conveyed by means of the causative suffix (underlined): *Saçımı kestim* (I did it myself) and *Saçımı kestirdim* (I asked somebody else to do it). *Dişimi çektim* and *Dişimi çektiirdim*;

b) differences between the verbal and nominal negation (particle *değil* for the nouns and suffix *-ma/-me* for the verbs) which are the same in Ukrainian or Russian. At the same time there is a possibility of the use of the nominal negation with a verb in a certain situation (as in the example *Bunu anlamamış değilim* – *I can't say that I didn't understand it*). It should be noted that Turkish tends to nominal forms and units and even "pure" verbal forms, for example finite verbs, can historically be reduced to participles which are nominal forms. Nevertheless, many Turkish

grammarians do not accept the nominal nature of the majority of verbal forms and units but if we compared Turkish with the languages in which verbal forms prevail (for example, incorporated languages like the Chukchi language) we would see the nominal nature of Turkish more evidently;

c) the passive voice and impersonal (indefinite-personal) constructions. It is very unusual for Ukrainian/ Russian speakers that passive verb forms can be derived from intransitive verbs, for example: *gitmek – gidilmek (to go), gelmek – gelinmek (to come)*. Impersonal or indefinite-personal semantics is conveyed with the help of passive forms of this type which is realized through pronouns in many Indo-European languages (as pronouns *you, one* or *they* in English). In this connection the mention should be made of impersonal forms non-standard even for present-day Turkish such as impersonal future or impersonal obligative mood: *Yapacak işim yok – I have nothing to do* (verbatim: *There is no work for me to be able to do*). *Gidecek yerimiz kalmadı – We have no place to go* (verbatim: *There is no place for us to be able to go*). *Bu işi bir an önce bitirmeli – This work must be finished as soon as possible* (the word *work* is in accusative, so the doer of the action is not known).

Before concluding it should be noted that despite a lot of grammatical phenomena in Turkish which are unusual for Ukrainian students and constitute significant difficulties in their learning Turkish, there are several phenomena which simplify the learning of Turkish grammar as compared to Ukrainian or Russian. These phenomena are:

1) the absence of the grammatical category of gender. Category of gender constitutes one of the greatest difficulties for foreigners who learn Ukrainian or Russian. In these languages any noun belongs to one of the three genders and adjective and several other parts of speech are coordinated in gender with a noun within a certain syntactic structure. In Turkish almost all the words, except several which denominate some domestic animals and human beings and convey gender meaning in their lexical semantics, are indifferent in terms of gender and do not need the coordination in gender within word groups;

2) in contrast to more popular in Ukraine foreign languages as English, French, Spanish or Italian there are little exceptions on grammatical level in Turkish. These are sixteen verbs which form the aorist in non-standard way as well as several word which take suffixes in irregular way in contradiction with the vowel harmony (these phenomena is mostly motivated not by grammatical but by phonetical specificity). For example several words with a back vowel in final position or in final syllable can take suffixes with a front vowel (*saat, menfaat*), several words ending with a vowel can take a suffix beginning with a vowel (*menşe, memba, cami*), the last voiceless consonant is not subject to alternation of consonant in several words (*at, top*), the last consonant can be doubled (*üs, af*). These specific situation cannot be considered very complex for a learner in contrast to significant amount of exceptions in the listed above Western European languages;

3) we mentioned about the marking of the accusative case in Turkish which constitutes significant complexity for learners but in contrast to it the absence of the article substantially simplifies the task of mastering Turkish (in several grammar works the numeral *bir* is referred to the indefinite article but this thought is subject to discussion). When there is no definite article, there is no contradistinction between the definite/ indefinite/ zero articles as can be seen, for example, in English which is a great challenge for those learners who speak non-article language as their mother tongue.

Conclusion

Main details and nuances which constitute significant difficulties in the comprehension of Turkish grammar by Ukrainian students who speak Ukrainian or Russian as their mother tongue are described in this paper; these are equally true for those people whose native languages are other non-Turkic languages. Proceeding from above we conclude that the main way of overcoming difficulties in teaching Turkish is, first of all, more detailed research and development of grammar problems with focus on the communicative and comparative approaches. Among these problems which need to be investigated in detail are: structural and functional theory of clause, the holistic

theory of converbs, problems of grammatical synonymy and intra-linguistic translation. The attention should also be paid to the development and issue of a grammar manual of Turkish in Ukrainian as well as special books for teaching Turkish grammar to Ukrainian students.

In addition to the above it should be emphasized once again that communication ally oriented methods of teaching Turkish must be implemented to teaching practice at Ukrainian universities in parallel with in-depth teaching of the theory and practice of grammar based on the comparison with facts and phenomena of the native language. For doing this it is necessary to issue books and manuals for the development of communicative skills with appropriate exercise system based on communicative approach in contrast to the books widely used in present-day teaching practice at Ukrainian universities which are based on structure oriented and textual translation methods. The mentioned tasks are priority activities and perspectives of Ukrainian Turkic studies for the nearest future.

References

- Ailiarov, Sh. S. (1974). *Extended Parts of a Sentence in Modern Turkish*. Moscow: MSU Publishing House.
- Artemyskiy, A. (1931). *What is the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (AUAC)*. Kyiv.
- Chernikov, I. F. (2003). *From the History of the Formation and Development of Turkology in Ukraine to the Mid-1930s*. *Oriental World*, 4, 5-25.
- Chernikov, I. F. (2005). *Prior to the Development of the Topic of the Revival of Turkology in Ukraine after the 1930s*. *Oriental World*, 4, 72-96.
- Chirko, T. M. (2002). *Grammar of Active Type: The Scope and Content of the Concept. Actual Problems of Teaching Foreign Languages at School and University: a Course of Lectures for Students of Foreign Languages Faculties. (Part 2)*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 135-144.
- Colarusso, J. (2006). *Kabardian (East Circassian)*. LINCOM GmbH.
- Demir, N., Yılmaz, E., & Gencan, T. N. (2013). *Türkçe Biçim Bilgisi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Deny, J. (1995). *Türk Dili Gramerinin Temel Kuralları (Türkiye Türkçesi)*. Ankara: Bizim Büro.
- Dilaçar, A. (1989). *Gramer: Tanımı, Adı, Kapsamı, Türleri, Yöntemi, Eğitimdeki Yeri ve Tarihçesi. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi, Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı*. Ankara. 83-145.
- Dudina, L. N. (2006). *Turkish Language. Practical Course*. Moscow: KomKniga.
- Elizabeth, M. E. S., & Rao, D. B. (2007). *Methods of Teaching English*. Discovery Publishing House.
- Emine, H. (2003). *Biçim Bilgisi ve Tümce Bilgisi*. Sumen.
- Ergin, M. (2019). *Yeni Türk Dil Bilgisi*. İstanbul. Boğaziçi Yayınları.
- Gencan, T. N. (2001). *Dilbilgisi*. Ayraç Yayınları.
- Genish, E. (2008). *Grammar of the Turkish Language*. St. Petersburg: LCI.
- Geoffrey, L. (2001) *Turkish Grammar (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005) *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge. Taylor and Francis Group.
- Guziev, V. G. (2014). *Theoretical Grammar of the Turkish Language. Monograph*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg. State Un.
- Hengirmen, M. (1998). *Türkçe Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Engin Yayınevi.

- Hieber, D. W. (2007). *A Grammar of Turkish*. The College of William & Mary in Virginia.
- Hrunin, T. (1929). New Alphabet in Turkey. *The Oriental World*, 1-2(7-8), 339-346.
- Hrunin, T. (1930). Turkish. Elementary Grammar and New Alphabet. Skhidnyi Svit.
- Hrunin, T. (1935). Stages of the Development of Turkish Literary Language. *Linguistics*, 3-4, 113-135.
- Hrunin, T. (1955). Adjectives in Turkic Languages (on Materials of the Turkish Language). *Linguistics*, 4, 55-64.
- Husievskaya, N. Y. (2013). The Evolution of Foreign Language Teaching Methods. *Scientific Notes of ZabSU*, 6(53), 168.
- Kabakova, Y. N. (2010). Features of the Formation of System Grammatical Representations in the Conditions of Various Methodical Approaches in Language Teaching. *Bulletin of N.A. Nekrasov KSU*. (Issue 16), 26-29.
- Karahan, L. (2010). *Türkçede Söz Dizimi* (15. baskı). Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (1985). Turkish Proverbs and Sayings. Arranging, Translating from Turkish and Introductory Words. Kyiv.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (1987). Turkish Folk Tales. Arranging, Introductory Word and Turkish Translation. Kyiv.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (2001). History of Turkish Literature (XIV–XVI Centuries). Textbook. Kyiv.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (2002). History of Turkish Literature (XVII–XVIII Centuries). Textbook. Kyiv.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (2004). The Development of Turkology in Ukraine in the Years of Independence. Ukraine – Turkey: Past, Present and Future. Collection of Scientific Works. Compiler Turanly F.H. Kyiv: Deneb, 310-311.
- Khalymonenko, H. I. (1997). Turkish: Tutorial. Kyiv: RVC "Kyiv University".
- Kononov, A. N. (1956). *Grammar of the Modern Turkish Literary Language*. Moscow-Leningrad: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Korkmaz, Z. (2009). *Türkiye Türkçesi Grameri Şekil Bilgisi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). Turkish. Descriptive Grammar. London and New York: Routledge.
- Krevetskyi, I. I. (1922). Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. Literary and Scientific Bulletin. V–VIII. Lviv.
- Krymskyi, A. (1996). History of Turkey. From where the Ottoman State Began, How it Grew and Developed, and How it Reached the Height of its Glory and Power. Kyiv, Lviv: OLIR.
- Krymskyi, A. (2007). Selected Oriental Researches. *Turkology*. (Volume 3). Kyiv: Ahatangel Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Krymskyi, A. (2010). Selected Oriental Researches. *Turkology*. (Volume 3). Kyiv: Ahatangel Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Ksiondzyk, N. M. (1987). The Main Directions of Scientific and Technical Policy of Modern Turkey. *Scientific and Technical Policy of Foreign Countries*. (Issue 3. Developing Countries). Kyiv, 165-178.
- Ksiondzyk, N. M. (1991). Turkish Labour Immigration in Western Europe (70–80 years). Kyiv.
- Ksiondzyk, N. M. (2001). The Kurdish Question in Modern Turkey. *Researches on World Politics*, 14, Kyiv, 96-105.
- Ksiondzyk, N. M. (2002). Afghan Factor in Turkey's Foreign Policy. *Researches on World Politics*, 21, 46-55.

- Ksiondzyk, N. M. (2004). Turkey in the Context of Major Domestic and International Activities. *Researches on World Politics*, 28, 95-113.
- Kubriakova, Y. S., Shakhnarovich, A. M., & Sakharnyi, L. V. (1991) The Human Factor in Language: Language and Speech Generation. Moscow.
- Kuipers, H. A. (1960). Phoneme and Morpheme in Kabardian (Eastern Adyghe). (Janua Linguarum. Studia Memoriae Nicolai Van Wijk dedicata. Nr. VIII.) Hague: Mouton & Co. Printers.
- Kuznetsov, P. I. (2000). The Manual-book of the Turkish Language. Beginner's Course. Moscow: Muravei-Haid.
- Kuznetsov, P. I. (2000). The Manual-book of the Turkish Language. Final Course. Moscow: Muravei-Haid.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.
- Leont'ev, A. (1981). Problems of the Development of Mind. English Translation, Progress Press. Moscow.
- Lewis, G. L. (2001). Turkish Grammar. Oxford University Press.
- Maizel, S. S. (1957). Izafet in Turkish. Moscow-Leningrad: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Matvieieva, N. (2017). Current Linguistic Situation (Based on the 2017 Mass Survey Material). *Language: Classical – Modern – Postmodern: a Collection of Scientific Works*. (Issue 3). Nat. Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Kyiv: Dukh I Literatura, 52-59.
- Miniakhmetova, E. Kh. (2011). Turkish Language. Tutorial. Book 1. Odessa: BMB.
- Miniakhmetova, E. Kh. (2011). Turkish Language. Tutorial. Book 2. Odessa: BMB.
- Miniakhmetova, E. Kh. (2011). Turkish Language. Tutorial. Book 3. Odessa: BMB.
- Miniakhmetova, E. Kh. (2011). Turkish Language. Tutorial. Book 4. Odessa: BMB.
- Molodykh-Nagaeva, Y. G. (2015). Foreign Language Training: Grammar. *Theory and Practice of Social Development*, 21, 274-276.
- Nasilov, V. M. (1985) Inclusion Affixes. *Soviet Turkology*, 3, 86-89.
- Nemoshkalenko, V., Novikov, M., & Pelykh, V. (1970). Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Kyiv.
- Nikitiuk, T., & Prushkovska, I. (2012). Communicative Grammar of the Turkish Language (for First-year Turkology Students). Tutorial. Kyiv: Assistant-promo-reklama.
- Ovchinnikova, N. I. (2012). Modern Trends in Teaching the Grammatical Side of Foreign Speech. *Bulletin of the VSU. Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*, 2, 194-197.
- Özsoy, A. S. (2002). Türkçe. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Dil Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi.
- Panashenko, V. V. (1989). Crimean Khanate in the XV-XVIII Centuries. *UIJ*, 1, 54-64.
- Pidvoynyi, V. M., & Chubrikova, O. O. (1999) Interpretation of the -dik Form in Ukrainian and Turkish Linguistics. *Bulletin of T. Shevchenko KNU. Oriental Languages and Literature Series*, 1, 28-34.
- Pokrovskaya, I. L. (2010). Turkish: Texts and Tasks for the Development of Oral Speech (for Master Students). Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliya.
- Pokrovskaya, I. L. (2010). Tutorial. Business Turkish. Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliya.
- Pokrovskaya, I. L. (2012). Phonetics of Turkish. Tutorial. Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliya.

- Pokrovska, I. L. (2012). Tutorial. Phonetics of Turkish. Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliia.
- Pokrovska, I. L. (2013). Tutorial. Turkish for First Year Bachelor Students. (Part I). Kyiv: Yuston.
- Pritsak, O. (1952). The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu. *The Annals of Ukrainian Academy of the Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, 2(4), 279-292.
- Pritsak, O. (1970). The Pechenegs. *A Ukrainian historian*, 01-03, 25-27.
- Pritsak, O. (1973). The Cumans. *A Ukrainian historian*, 01-02, 37-38.
- Prorochenko, N. O. (2005). Turkey: History, Culture, Geography. Kyiv: Svit Znan.
- Prushkovska, I. V. (2005). Turkish Language Tutorial for First and Second Year Students. Kyiv: Biblioteky Ukrayintsia.
- Prushkovska, I. V. (2010). History of Turkish Literature (18th century) Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliia.
- Prushkovska, I. V. (2010). Workshop on Ukrainian-Turkish Translation (for 4th Year Students). Kyiv: Chetverta Khvyliia.
- Prushkovska, I. V. (2015). The Openness of the Canon: the poetics of Turkish Dramaturgy. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi Pysmennyk.
- Prushkovska, I. V. (2016). Reflections on Artistic Translation on the Material of Turkish Literary Works: A Scientific and Publicist Monograph. Kyiv: Ukr. propileyi.
- Richard, J., & Roger, T. (2014). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. https://www.academia.edu/9863136/Approaches_and_Methods_in_Language_Teaching_-_Approaches_and_Methods_in_Language_Teaching_Second_Edition
- Sebüktekin, H. (2015). Turkish for Foreigners. Volume 1. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Shcheka, Yu. V. (1996). Intensive Course of Turkish. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
- Shcheka, Yu. V. (2007). Practical Grammar of the Turkish Language. Moscow: AST: Vostok-Zapad.
- Solovieva, Y. N. (2005). Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages: a Basic Course of Lectures: a Manual for Students of Ped. Universities and Teachers (3rd ed.). Moscow: Prosvescheniye.
- Sorokin, S. V. (2010). Practical Translation Course: Educ. Manual. (Part 1.) Translation of Newspaper Texts. Kyiv: Publishing Centre of KNLU.
- Sorokin, S. V. (2019). Practical Grammar of Turkish. (Part One). Educ. Manual. Kyiv: Publishing Centre of KNLU.
- Sorokin, S. V., & Pilyk, V. V. (2009–2010) Prior to the Problem of Functional Realization of the Accusative Case in the Turkish Language. *Ukrainian Oriental Studies*. Compilation of Scientific Researches of Teachers and Students of Oriental Languages Institute of KNLU and NAUKMA, 4-5, 83-86.
- Underhill, R. (1985). Turkish Grammar. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Vasilkov, Y. V., Hryshyna, A. M., & Perchenok, F. F. (1990). Oppressed Oriental Studies. Orientalists Who Were Subjected to Repression in the 20's and 50's. *The people of Asia and Africa*, 4, 113-125.
- Vernadskyi, V. (1970). The First Year of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (1918-1919). New York.
- Vetukhiv, M. (1962). The Main Stages of the Development of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Lit.-Sciences. The Collection of UVAN, (I). New York.
- Zverkhovskaia, Y. V. & Kosichenko, Y. F. (2013). Formation of Grammatical Competence: in Search of New Approaches. *Bulletin of MSLU*, 19(679), 84-92.