

**The Syntax and Pragmatics of English Tag Questions: A
Study of Adult Arabic Learners of English**

By

Imad Al-Nabtiti

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

in

Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

© 2012

Imad Al-Nabtiti



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-94618-3

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-94618-3

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Canonical Tag Questions are important hedging devices in the English language and are used very often by native speakers. Almost all languages have tag questions; however, Canonical Tag Questions are unique to the English language (Bublitz, 1979) and mastering them requires a high level of proficiency in English (Holmes, 1982). This study investigates the difficulties that adult Arabic-speaking ESL learners have in the formation and use of English canonical tag question. Two groups of participants were recruited: thirty-two adult Arabic-speaking participants and ten adult native speakers of English. The results of the study reveal that non-native speakers cannot use Canonical Tag Questions appropriately not because of the syntactic complexity of these kinds of questions, but because of their pragmatic requirements. The results also show the importance of incorporating a pragmatic theory and the social contexts in which discourses take place in ESL curricula.

Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have been completed without the highly appreciated support and involvement of a significant number of people.

My first debt of gratitude must be paid to the thirty-two Arabic-Speaking participants and to the ten Native Speakers of English who volunteered their time and effort as participants in this project.

I am also indebted to Ron Lavoie, the manager of the OCISO Schools in Ottawa, and the teaching staff at OCISO schools at Bank Street and Belfast Road for their sincere support and help in facilitating the involvement of Arabic-Speaking participants in this project.

I would also like to express my thanks to the native speaker judges who sincerely and willingly helped in designing the Pragmatic Tests for this thesis, especially Mike Barker who has always been available and supportive.

My special thanks also go to the SLALS faculty and staff especially Joan Grant for always having the answers to my administrative enquiries.

And of course my special thanks and sincere gratitude go to my supervisor Kumiko Murasugi for her motivation, guidance, encouragement, and thoughtful insights during all the phases of this project.

Table of Contents

Abstract	p. ii
Acknowledgement.....	p. iii
Table of contents	p. iv
List of Tables	p. vii
List of Appendices	p. ix
Chapter One: Introduction.....	p. 1
1.1 Tag Questions in English	p. 1
1.2 Research Questions.....	p. 4
Chapter Two: The Syntactic and Pragmatic Properties of Canonical Tag Questions.....	p. 8
2.1. Categorizing Tag Questions Syntactically.....	p. 9
2.2. The Syntactic Properties of Tag Questions	p. 10
2.3. The Meanings and Pragmatic Functions of Tag Question	p. 12
2.4. Intonation and Polarity of Tag Questions.....	p. 18

Chapter Three: Acquisition of Tag Questions.....	p. 20
3.1. Tag Questions and Second Language Learners	p. 21
3.2. Tag Questions and Native Children.....	p. 26
Chapter Four: Method of Study.....	p. 29
4.1. Design of the Study.....	p. 29
4.2. Participants.....	p. 30
4.2.1. Arabic Speakers (AS).....	p. 30
4.2.2. Native English Speakers (NS).....	p. 31
4.3. Study Tests.....	p. 31
4.3.1. Proficiency Tests.....	p. 31
4.3.1.1. Cloze Test	p. 32
4.3.1.2. Oral Proficiency Test	p. 32
4.3.2. Experimental Tests	p. 32
4.3.2.1. Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 33
4.3.2.2. Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 34
4.3.2.3. Pragmatic Test 1.....	p. 36
4.3.2.4. Pragmatic Test 2.....	p. 37
4.4. Procedure.....	p. 37
Chapter 5: Results.....	p. 40
5.1. Proficiency Tests	p. 40
5.1.1. Cloze Test.....	p. 40
5.1.2. Oral Proficiency Test	p. 41
5.2. Experimental Tests.....	p. 44

5.2.1. Tag Question Written Test	p. 44
5.2.2. Tag Question Oral Test	p. 48
5.2.3. Pragmatic Test 1.....	p. 51
5.2.4. Pragmatic Test 2.....	p. 53
5.3. Proficiency and Performance.....	p. 57
5.3.1. Cloze and Experimental Tests.....	p. 57
5.3.2. Proficiency Level and Performance	p. 58
5.3.2.1. Proficiency and Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 58
5.3.2.2. Proficiency and Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 59
5.3.2.3. Proficiency and Pragmatic Test 1.....	p. 59
5.3.2.4. Proficiency and Pragmatic Test 2.....	p. 60
 Chapter Six: Discussion.....	 p. 61
6.1. The Syntactic Properties of Tag Questions.....	p. 61
6.2. Pragmatics of Tag Questions.....	p. 63
6.3. Intonation of Tag Questions.....	p. 64
6.4. L2 Proficiency and Tag Questions.....	p. 64
6.5. Limitations and Recommendation.....	p. 73

List of Tables

Table 1: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Cloze Test	p. 40
Table 2: Mean scores of AS participants on the Cloze Test and the Oral Proficiency Test	p. 43
Table 3: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 45
Table 4: Mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 47
Table 5: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 48
Table 6: Mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 49
Table 7: Scores and mean number of errors made by AS and NS on TQ Written and Oral Tests	p. 50
Table 8: Mean number of intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic1 Test.....	p. 52
Table 9: Mean number of AS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 1 for rising and falling intonations.....	p. 53
Table 10: Mean number of NS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 1 for rising and falling intonations.....	p. 53
Table 11: Mean number of intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 2.....	p. 54
Table 12: Mean Number of AS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 2 that matched the target intonations.....	p. 55
Table 13: Mean number of NS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 2 compared to the target intonations.....	p. 55
Table 14: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the two Pragmatic tests.....	p. 56
Table 15: Cloze Test vs. Experimental Tests.....	p. 57
Table 16: Summary of the mean scores of AS participants on the experimental	

tests..... p. 58

Table 17: Summary of Errors made by AS participants on TQ Written and Oral Tests..... p. 62

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: The Demographic Information of the Arabic-Speaking Participants...	p. 76
Appendix 2: Demographic Information of the English Native Speakers.....	p. 77
Appendix 3: Cloze Test.....	p. 78
Appendix 4: Oral Proficiency Test Grading Rubrics.....	p. 80
Appendix 5: Tag Question Written Task.....	p. 81
Appendix 6: Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 82
Appendix 7.1: Pragmatic Test 1 Version 1.....	p. 84
Appendix 7.2: Pragmatic Test 1 Version 2.....	p. 85
Appendix 8: Pragmatic Test 2.....	p. 86
Appendix 9: The results and the mean scores of AS and NS on the Proficiency Tests	p. 88
Appendix 10: The results and the mean scores of AS and NS on the experimental tests.....	p. 89
Appendix 11: Error analysis of AS on the Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 90
Appendix 12: Error analysis of NS on the Tag Question Written Test.....	p. 91
Appendix 13: Error analysis of AS on the Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 92
Appendix 14: Error analysis of NS on the Tag Question Oral Test.....	p. 93
Appendix 15: Intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 1.....	p. 94

Appendix 16: Intonations provided by both NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 2	p. 95
Appendix 17: Samples of AS Tag Question Oral Test Transcription.....	p. 96
Appendix 18: Samples of NS Tag Question Oral Test Transcription.....	p. 97
References	p. 98

The Syntax and Pragmatics of English Tag Questions: A Study of Adult Arabic Learners of English

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Tag Questions in English

The tag question in the English language is a grammatical structure which can be added to the clause in conversation or in written representations of speech. The tag question is mainly added to a declarative sentence (see 1.a-c), but it can also be added to imperative sentences (see 1.d). In the case of adding a tag question to an imperative sentence, however, the formation rule may not follow the canonical convention.

- 1) a. The weather is hot today, isn't it?
- b. Mary will come tomorrow, won't she?
- c. The little boy doesn't like sleeping early, does he?
- d. Switch on the lights, could you?

Tag questions are important linguistic devices in the English language which require "considerable conversational skills" to be used and interpreted accurately (Holmes, 1982, p. 61). They are syntactically, prosodically and semantically complicated (Bennett, 1989; Holmes, 1982; Bublitz, 1979; Armagost, 1972). Tag questions vary in form and they serve different functions; in addition, intonation has a major role in

classifying them as tag questions (Bublitz, 1979). The level of acceptability of an utterance as a tag question also varies among native speakers.

The host sentence is used to express the speaker's view, while the tag question indicates that this view needs to be acknowledged. Most languages have tag questions that serve different purposes. However, canonical tag questions in the English language are complex and have a form that is unique to the English language (Bublitz, 1979; Algeo, 1988; Culicover, 1992)

The form of canonical tag questions requires the implementation of various syntactic and pragmatic rules. In spoken English these rules are implemented automatically and unconsciously by native speakers of English. Because of the complexity of English canonical tag questions, second language learners, on the other hand, tend to avoid using these tag questions when they speak English. They find it difficult to apply the syntactic rules of tag questions and keep the flow of their speech at the same time. Non-native speakers of English use them incorrectly, avoid using them, or replace the canonical form with stereotyped words, which are also called invariant tag questions, such as *right* and *okay*.

Canonical tag questions are unique to the English language and using them appropriately requires a high level of conversational skills. Bublitz (1979) argues that the English tag question is "a typical and characteristic feature of the English language differing from added questions in a number of related languages" (p. 5). Various studies have been conducted on the difficulties that speakers of other languages have in using English canonical tag questions when learning English as a second language (Beardsmore, 1979; Cheng, K., 1995; Cheng, W. & Warren, 2001). The results

of these studies show that ESL learners use tag questions far less frequently than native speakers.

Most languages have stereotyped tag words that go almost with every sentence. French, for example, uses *n'est-ce pas*, German favours *nicht wahr*, Spanish uses *no es verdad*, and Italian *non e' vero*. The Arabic language is similar to these languages in that it has one form of a fixed or stereotyped tag question, which is a form of constant or unchanging tag question that goes with almost every sentence in the Arabic language "*alaysa kathaleka*". Based on my observations as an adult ESL instructor, Arabic-speaking ESL learners have difficulties in forming and using English canonical tag questions appropriately because of the syntactic and pragmatic requirements of canonical tag questions.

Mastering and using tag questions requires a high level of proficiency in the English language and high level of proficiency doesn't only mean proficiency in English syntax and English grammar. Approaching tag questions in an ESL class from a syntactic point of view is not enough and will not help ESL students use them properly. Therefore, there should be an alternative approach to teach tag questions to adult ESL learners. This approach should include, besides syntax, a pragmatic theory that explains the real use of tag questions in social contexts (Bublitz, 1979).

This research study aims at investigating the difficulties in both the formation and the use of English canonical tag questions that adult Arabic-speakers who learn English as a second language have regardless of their level of proficiency in the English language. The findings of this study will help ESL instructors adopt new techniques and methods for handling tag questions in the ESL class. The findings also

show the importance of including the pragmatics of the language and the social contexts in which discourses take place in ESL curricula in order to improve the proficiency and the conversational abilities of ESL students. Learning a second language does not only mean learning its syntax. It is the pragmatics of the language and the social contexts that enable second language learners to use the target language appropriately.

1.2. Research Questions

Although tag questions appear to be simple and easy to form and use, adult Arabic-speaking ESL learners rarely use tag questions or they use them incorrectly. Based on my observation, even highly educated Arabic-speakers who have considerable command of English language avoid using tag questions in everyday conversational English, or they make mistakes when they attempt to use them. After examining some of the studies related to tag questions, it was found that not only adult Arabic-speaking ESL learners have difficulty in using English tag questions appropriately, but also adult learners who speak other languages have the same problem regardless of their level in the English language (Beardsmore, 1979; Cheng, K., 1995; Cheng, W. & Warren, 2001).

Using English canonical tag questions appropriately requires manipulating syntactic, pragmatic, and semantic knowledge of the English language which requires a high level of proficiency in the English language. Tag questions require considerable conversational skills because of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic requirements of forming and using tag questions adequately. The difficulty of tag questions, according to Beardsmore (1970), comes at three levels: form, meaning, and intonation and a fourth level might be that of the irregularities. A fifth level of difficulty

is also expected in regard to contrasting polarity, such as “He *is* your friend, *isn't* he?” and vice versa. The form or the syntactic properties of canonical tag questions cause difficulty for non-native speakers because they have to apply the three syntactic rules: auxiliary, pronominalization and polarity; in addition to using the right intonation. The meaning of the tag question depends mainly on its intonation. The intonation, whether rising or falling, determines the meaning of the tag questions as a real question that seeks information or as a polite way to invite the listener to agree with what the speaker has said and get engaged in the conversation. Irregularities refer to imperative sentences, such as “Open the door, please, could you?” or suggestions, such as “Let’s go shopping, shall we?”. These kinds of sentences do not follow the conventional rules of forming canonical tag questions and that is why non-native speakers are expected to have problems with them.

Therefore, we hypothesize adult Arabic-speakers who learn English as a second language have difficulties in the use and formation of English canonical tag questions regardless of their level of proficiency in English. More specifically, this research study aims to find answers to the following questions:

1. Syntax

What are the syntactic difficulties that adult Arabic-speakers have in the formation of canonical tag questions?

This study will test the participants’ abilities in the following syntactic aspects of tag questions:

1. Polarity: The host sentence and the tag question should have contrasting polarity.

If the host sentence is positive, then the tag question is negative and vice versa, e.g.,

"It is hot in here, isn't it?"

"It isn't hot in here, is it?"

2. Auxiliaries: the auxiliary in the tag question should match the auxiliary in the host sentence. If there is no auxiliary in the host sentence, then Do-support is implemented in the tag question, e.g.,

"She has left, hasn't she?"

"She left, didn't she?"

3. Tense: The tense of the tag question should match the tense of the host sentence, e.g.,

"She left, didn't she?"

"She gets up early, doesn't she?"

4. Pronominalization: The tag question always uses a pronoun that replaces the subject of the host sentence. The pronoun in the tag question agrees with the subject in person, number and gender, e.g.,

"The boy is happy, isn't he?"

"The little boys are having fun, aren't they?"

"Peter's sister is a student, isn't she?"

5. Imperative sentences: Forming canonical tag questions on imperative sentences does not follow the conventional rule which makes it a difficulty that Arabic-speaking ESL learners are expected to have, e.g.,

“Open the door, could you?”

2. Pragmatics

Can adult Arabic-speakers use the pragmatic functions of English canonical tag questions appropriately? Tag questions have many meanings and their pragmatic functions are complicated; however, this study focuses on two pragmatic functions: asking for information and seeking confirmation. Intonation, falling or rising, determines the pragmatic function of the tag question. El-Hassan (1988) argues that question intonations in English are different from question intonations in Arabic. Therefore, it is expected that there will be no variation in intonation and the flat intonation will be the dominant one. As a result, Arabic-speaking participants are expected to have many difficulties in the pragmatic functions of tag questions.

3. L2 Proficiency

Does the level of the learners' proficiency in the English language affect forming and using English canonical tag questions? Based on my observations, the level of proficiency may affect the learners' abilities to form correct canonical tag questions, but not the learners' abilities to use tag questions correctly.

Chapter Two: The Syntactic and Pragmatic Properties of Canonical Tag Questions

Section 2.1 will review some studies that define tag questions and how they are categorized. Categorizing tag question is difficult and a controversial issue among scholars who have investigated this topic. Then, section 2.2 will review the syntactic properties of canonical tag questions, e.g., the syntactic rules to be implemented in order to form a canonical tag questions. There is general agreement on the copying rule for forming tag questions; however, some irregularities may cause confusion to second language learners.

Section 2.3 will review the meanings and pragmatic functions of tag questions. There is a lot of debate and controversy in this area of tag questions and it is difficult to find agreement on the pragmatic functions of tag questions. The meanings of tag questions mainly depend on the social context in which the tag question is used. The different pragmatic functions and the different social contexts of tag questions make it difficult for adult ESL learners to use them appropriately or to decide the right pragmatic function and the right social context for using tag questions.

After that, section 2.4 will review some studies that investigate the intonation and the polarity of tag questions. Tag questions mainly have two different intonations: rising and falling. Using the right intonation determines the meaning and the pragmatic function of the tag question. If the intonation is rising, then the tag question is used to ask for information, but if the intonation is falling, then the tag question is used to seek confirmation. Polarity is another controversial issue. Some researchers believe the

polarity of the tag question should contrast the polarity of the host sentence. On the other hand, some other researchers believe it is possible to use tag questions with consistent positive polarity; however, the pragmatic function and the meaning of the tag question in such cases will be different.

These are some of the areas of tag questions that I expect adult ESL learners to have problems with. The studies revised in this chapter and chapter three will provide the theoretical background for this research study.

2.1. Categorizing Tag Questions Syntactically

The different varieties of tag questions make it difficult to set up a clear and systematic categorization of them; however, there is a sort of agreement among scholars who dealt with tag questions on dividing them into two categories: canonical tag questions and invariant tag questions.

Bublitz (1979) mentions that there are two kinds of tag questions in the English language: lexical tag questions such as “right, okay”; and the intonational tag “eh”. Cheng and Warren (2001), on the other hand, adopt a different definition that classifies tag questions into two categories: canonical tag questions, with both matching and contrasting polarity, e.g., “It is hot, is it?” and “It is hot, isn't it?” and invariant tag questions, e.g., “right”. The canonical tag question with contrastive polarity is referred to as a “checking tag” and the one with matching polarity is referred to as a copy tag. “Word tags”, according to Cheng and Warren (2001), refer to invariant tags.

Holmes (1982) also argues that tag questions in the English language can be classified into two categories. One is “the grammatically complex tag forms” (Holmes,

1982, p. 41) which also can be referred to as canonical tag questions, e.g., “It is going to rain tomorrow, *isn't* it?” and the other type is “grammatically simple tags” (Holmes, 1982, p. 41) which can be referred to as invariant tag questions such as “right and okay”.

The syntactic form of canonical tag questions involves an auxiliary verb that agrees with the host sentence in tense and number, a pronoun, and matching or contrasting polarity. The form of the canonical tag question should agree with the subject and the auxiliary of the preceding host sentence in number, gender and tense. On the other hand, the invariant tag question involves words, such as “right”, “eh”, “okay” and “yeah” and does not have to change its form to agree with gender, number or tense of the host sentence. The invariant tag question is less formal than the canonical tag question. Sometimes these invariant tag questions are referred to as response elicitors or response getters because they aim to elicit a response from the listener or promote interaction in the conversation (Biber et al., 2002).

This study adopts Holmes’s (1982) categorization of tag questions. So, in this study canonical tag question will be used to refer to the grammatically complex tag forms and invariant tag question will be used to refer to tag words such as “right and okay”.

2.2. The Syntactic Properties of Tag Questions

In order to form a canonical tag question, according to Quirk et al., (1985, p. 810) four rules have to be implemented:

- 2) a. The operator (auxiliary) of the statement is repeated in the tag; if there is no operator in the main clause, the dummy auxiliary *do* is used in the tag:

- i. “*She has gone, hasn’t she?*”
 - ii. “*They finished, didn’t they?*”
- b. Following the operator is the subject of the tag, which is a pronoun that repeats the subject of the host clause, if the subject is a pronoun (see b.i), or agrees with it in person, number, and gender, if it is a full noun phrase (see b.ii):
- i. “*She has gone, hasn’t she?*”
 - ii. “*The man finished, didn’t he?*”
- c. If the statement is affirmative, the tag is typically negative, and vice versa, as in (c.i and c.iii). The tag may be negated by the enclitic *n’t* attached to the operator (see c.i) or by the full-form *not* following the subject pronoun, as in (c.ii):
- i. “*She has gone, hasn’t she?*”
 - ii. “*She has gone, has she not?*”
 - iii. “*She hasn’t gone, has she?*”
- d. The nuclear tone of the tag may be either rising or falling, and occurs on the operator, as in (d.i) and (d.ii), or on a full form *not* when it is present, as in (d.iii) and (d.iv):
- i. “*She’s gone, hásn’t she?*”
 - ii. “*She’s gone, hàsn’t she?*”
 - iii. “*She’s gone, has she nó?*”
 - iv. “*She’s gone, has she nò?*”

Explaining the structure and formation of tag questions by using syntactic rules only is not enough. After a thorough analysis of data concerning tag questions, Bennett (1989) concluded that “the limitations on the grammaticality of tags are not syntactic but semantic in origin” (p. 331); therefore, the tagging has a semantic origin.

2.3. The Meanings and Pragmatic Functions of Tag Questions

Bublitz (1979) claims that syntactic rules are not enough to explain the implicated meanings of tag questions unless they are accompanied by pragmatic theory. Bublitz (1979) also believes that “only a grammatical theory which either includes a pragmatic component or is completed by a pragmatic theory has the explanatory power” (p. 20) to explain the meanings of tag questions.

Tag questions are characterized by complex multifunctionality and diversity of meaning, which can make it difficult to classify tags in terms of their pragmatic (Cameron et al., 1989). Algeo (1988, 1990) classifies the pragmatic functions of English tag questions into five categories: the informational tag, the confirmatory tag, the punctuational tag, the peremptory tag, and the aggressive tag.

1. The “informational tag” is often spoken with a rising intonation and makes a genuine polite request for information. The informational tag often expects a direct response from the recipient and shows an equal partnership between the interlocutors, e.g.,

“John is busy, isn’t he?”.

A negative host sentence followed by a tag signals a higher degree of politeness because the tag makes the negative host sentence function as a 'petition', therefore, the speaker sounds less dominant in the request made.

2. The "confirmatory tag" is usually spoken with a falling intonation and is considered high on the scale of politeness. It invites the addressee to agree with the speaker, to involve the addressee into the discourse by providing support to the speaker, and to elicit a response from the addressee that encourages the speaker to continue (Algeo, 1988, p. 181), e.g.,

"You are the new student, aren't you?"

3. The "punctuational tag" usually asks the listener to pay attention to the speaker and is neither communicative nor friendly but merely self-centred (Algeo, 1990, p.446),e.g.,

"I've just said it, haven't I?"

4. The 'peremptory tag' is used to end the discussion of a topic. When it is spoken with a falling intonation, the peremptory tag seeks to end a discussion or a conversation, e.g.,

"That's enough, isn't it?"

5. The 'aggressive tag' is spoken with a falling intonation with an intention to be openly hostile, and is used to accuse the hearer of a "lack of common sense, consideration, or good will" (Algeo, 1990, p. 449), e.g.,

"You're such an idiot, aren't you?"

The informational and confirmatory tags are signals of politeness. When speakers use these tags they intend to defer to the listener and to involve him/her in the discourse. The punctuational, peremptory and aggressive tags, on the other hand, are signals of impoliteness; the speaker's intention is to establish superiority over the listener (Algeo, 1988, p. 188).

The pragmatic functions of tag questions is a controversial issue and we can hardly find agreement among researchers on these pragmatic functions which makes it complicated to test all these functions in one study. Therefore, the focus of this study is on the first two pragmatic functions: the 'informational tag' and the "confirmatory tag". In other words, this study will test only two pragmatic functions of tag questions: asking for information and seeking confirmation. However, this section reviews some of the studies that deal with other pragmatic functions of tag questions for the reference of readers who might be interested in pursuing further future investigation of the pragmatic functions of tag questions.

Holmes (1982) argues that tag questions aim at eliciting a response from the addressee and keeping the interaction going. They may also "express speaker's uncertainty, appeal to the listener for reassurance, [...] and signal group identity" (Holmes, 1982, p. 45). In order to be able to interpret the meanings or functions of tag questions, it is very important to take into consideration the social factors of the context in which these questions occur. According to Holmes (1982, p. 44), there are three relevant factors that are significant and should be taken into consideration when analysing the meanings or the functions of tag questions:

1. “the relative status or power of the speaker and addressees;
2. the degree of intimacy or social distance (e.g., the solidarity dimension) between the speaker and the addressee;
3. the role of the speaker and addressee in the social context”.

Tag questions are also useful linguistic devices for hedging or reducing the strength of the communicative effect or the illocutionary force of an utterance compared to untagged forms. Holmes (1982) points out that “distinguishing the illocutionary force of the utterance as a whole from that of the untagged utterance is a necessary step in clarifying the effect of the tag question” (p. 47).

This complexity of the pragmatic functions of tag questions explains why second language learners avoid using them. It is not only a matter of applying syntactic rules to get a tag question. Second language learners should be aware of the social and cultural contexts in which tag questions are used in order to be able to use them correctly. I expect to find the biggest challenge that adult ESL learners have to be in this specific area of tag questions.

The pragmatic functions and the meanings of tag questions can not be separated and they are highly interrelated. It is not only a matter of applying syntactic rules or being aware of the pragmatic functions that would enable second language learners to use tag questions appropriately, but the kind of relationship that interlocutors have and the social roles that they play also affect their use of tag questions.

Based on data collected from native speakers, Holmes (1982) argues that tag questions have a kind of “AFFECTIVE MEANING” which is used to express attitude

to addressee. This is one of the reasons that makes speakers hedge their propositions. Speakers almost have no doubts about the validity or the truth of their utterance; however, they use tag questions to express affective meaning. Holmes (1982) distinguishes three categories of affective meaning.

1. The first one is used to express solidarity and this kind is addressee oriented. In this context, tags are used to reach out to addressees and encourage them to respond to or continue a conversation. Tag questions in this case facilitate the response and the contribution to the social interaction and are used as “supportive linguistic devices which invite and encourage others to contribute to the work involved in maintaining verbal interaction” (Holmes, 1982, p. 53). These kinds of facilitating tags are usually used by “those whose social role in the situation involves taking some responsibilities for the progress of the discussion or conversation” (Holmes, 1982, p. 54). Some examples of speakers who use this kind of tag questions include teachers, hosts, and interviewers. Tags under this category also serve different functions and meanings. Some of them have prodding meanings which prod a speaker to continue his talk. Other tags may consider the listener as “a co-participant and seems to express a sense of identity with the listener” (Holmes, 1982, p. 55). Another type of tags under this category functions as a responsive tag and is used to indicate agreement with the speaker. The last type of tags under this category functions as “in-group identity marker”. Holmes (1982) found that the “invariant tag “ch”

functions in New Zealand as an identity marker among rural children and Maori adolescent in particular” (p. 56).

2. The second category of affective meaning according to Holmes (1982) is speaker oriented and used to appeal to solidarity. The major function of this type of tag questions is to elicit agreement from the interlocutor. Tag questions of this type are used as linguistic devices to encourage the interlocutor or the addressee to go on in the interaction. The speaker “simply wishes to elicit reassurance and agreement from the addressee” (Holmes, 1982, p. 57).
3. The third category is used to protect solidarity by being tactful or polite. The major function of this category of tag questions is to “reduce the force of utterances which could be interpreted as threatening, critical or in any way disagreeable to the addressee” (Holmes, 1982, p. 58). Tag questions hedge the utterance and by doing so they reduce its strength and make it more acceptable to the addressee. Tag questions that hedge and soften criticism, complaints and negative comments fall under this category.

Tag questions have different functions and meanings and these functions and meanings depend on many factors. They do not only signal acknowledgment or uncertainty and using them appropriately depends on many factors such as relative status, social role, social context and the degree of intimacy between interlocutors.

2.4. Intonation and Polarity of Tag Questions

Intonation, whether falling or rising, and polarity, whether reversed or consistent, are tools that enable the speaker “to signal what kind of speech act he is performing” (Bublitz, 1979, p. 6). They play important roles in the function of tag questions, such as the degree of certainty of an utterance (Holmes, 1982) or helping the hearer to recognize the attitudes and expectations of the speaker (Bublitz, 1979).

Falling intonation, for example, usually indicates a high degree of certainty, as when the speaker wants the hearer to confront what s/he is saying and to confirm the truth of the content of the host sentence. Falling intonation also indicates that the speaker “wants to make sure that the hearer shares the speaker knowledge, attitudes, and expectations” (Bublitz, 1979, p. 7).

Also, according to Cattell (1973) intonation is an important issue that should be taken into consideration. In a sentence such as “John didn’t fail, did he?” with a falling intonation, Cattell (1973) argues that the reading will be that “the speaker’s view is that John didn’t fail” and s/he is seeking confirmation. However, if the tag question has a rising intonation, then the reading will involve the notion that “the speaker is not putting forward the proposition John didn’t fail” as his own. The speaker has heard something about John and s/he is asking for information.

The polarity of tag questions does not only depend on the preceding declarative host sentences but also depends on the pragmatic conditions of the tag questions use. A host sentence can have both contrasting and matching polarity, as shown in (3.a and b), respectively.

a. “It’s hot in here, isn’t it?”

b. "It's hot in here, is it?"

The example in (3.a.) refers to the "verbal and non-verbal actions performed by the hearer" (Bublitz, 1979 p.7). Therefore, for Bublitz (1979) the different polarity of tag questions for the same host declarative sentence is acceptable. The polarity of the tag question in these examples depends on the speaker's "attitude and expectations and on the circumstances of the speech situations" (Bublitz, 1979, p. 10).

Cattell (1973) also concludes that it is possible to have tag questions with both matching and contrasting polarity. However, tag questions show contrasting polarity to the host sentence when the tag question represents the speaker's point of view, and matching polarity when the tag question does not represent the speaker's point of view. Furthermore, Cattell (1973) believes that there is a kind of principled semantic regularity governing the conditions under which contrasting and matching polarity occur. It is anticipated that these subtle demands of polarity and intonation of tag questions will be difficult for the second language learners participating in this study.

Chapter Three: Acquisition of Tag Questions

Based on my observations as an adult ESL instructor, Arabic-speakers rarely use English canonical tag questions regardless of their level of proficiency in the English language. In many cases where English canonical tag questions are attempted to be used by adult Arabic-speakers, one form "*isn't it*" is used, regardless of the subject or the tense of the host sentence.

To date only one empirical quantitative study, Al-Ani (2000), has been conducted to describe the syntactic errors made by Arabic-speakers who learn English as a foreign language when they use tag questions. However, to be able to understand the problems and the difficulties that adult Arabic-speakers have in forming and using English canonical tag questions more than syntax is needed.

Section 3.1 of this chapter will review some studies that draw on the difficulties that speakers of other languages have in mastering and using tag questions adequately. The similarity between these languages and the Arabic language is that all of them have a form of fixed or stereotyped tag words. Section 3.2 will review some studies conducted on children who are native speakers of English. These studies show that even native speakers of English acquire tag question at a late stage in the process of language acquisition. The findings of these studies may help explain why adult ESL learners have problems in forming and using tag questions appropriately.

3.1. Tag Questions and Second Language Learners

Although tag questions appear to be simple and easy to teach, it seems that they do not easily become a part of the ESL students' productive language (Beardsmore, 1970). After more than 330 hours of intensive instruction of English language, Beardsmore (1970) noticed that the students, who were mainly of French, Dutch, and Vietnamese origins, could barely use confirmation tag questions correctly although they could manipulate the construction of tag questions adequately when they were asked to do so. Thus, students know about the structure of tag questions and their level of English is advanced, however, tag questions failed to become part of their conversational English.

Beardsmore (1970) tried to explain the reason behind this problem. She argues that the reason that ESL students avoid using tag questions is their complexity. Other languages have a kind of stereotyped phrases to express confirmation and attitudes: French "*n'est-ce pas*", German "*nicht wahr*", Italian "*non e' vero*", Dutch "*nicht wahr*", Spanish "*no es verdad*". These stereotyped phrases make it difficult for speakers of other languages to master and adequately use the highly complex tag questions in English. The polarity of tag questions, negation and number, gender and tense agreement, as well as falling and rising intonation to express attitude make them highly complicated for ESL students to learn and use appropriately.

Beardsmore (1970) found that, taking into consideration that the main function of tag questions is asking for confirmation, students tended to use less complex structures to ask for confirmation, such as Yes/No questions. However, the problem of expressing the speaker's attitude cannot be conveyed through using such questions,

therefore, students used other expressions in addition to the Yes/No questions, such as “think” and “suppose”. Thus, students adopted these two strategies instead of tag questions to ask for confirmation. Although these two strategies may seem more complicated than one single tag question which can convey confirmation and attitude simultaneously, ESL students found them easier to use than tag questions.

Cheng, K. (1995) attempted to discover the forms of tag questions and the functions they serve when used by Malaysian speakers. Cheng’s study draws on a conclusion by Platt and Weber (1980) who claim that tag question used by Malaysians were confined to two forms “is it?” and “isn’t it?”:

- a. “You check out now, *is it?*”
- b. “You want Carlsberg, *isn’t it?*”

The participants in her study were divided into five groups ranging from advanced proficient to non-proficient speakers of English. All of the participants were adult native speakers of Malay and Cantonese, between 19 to 21 years of age, who were enrolled in local institutions of higher education and had received 10 years of instruction of EFL.

According to Cheng, K. (1995), in Malay a tag question consists of a declarative sentence and a tag “*bukan*” “not” in a sentence final position. The declarative sentence may be in the positive or negative, however, there is no reversal of polarity in the tag structure. In Cantonese a tag question is formed from a declarative sentence and a tag “ah” (particle) in sentence final position, and as with tag questions in Malay, there is no reversal of polarity.

Cheng, K. (1995) used two tasks, one written and the other one oral. The oral task focused on communicating an idea or opinion rather than the forms of the language. Participants in the five groups were divided into two pairs, A and B. Student A gave instructions to student B to draw a map, and student B asked for confirmation about the map.

In the written task participants were asked to make tag questions in their mother language and then to translate these tags into English. This was a linguistic manipulation task that focused on the rules necessary to carry out a given task and did not fulfill any communicative function.

After analysing the data, Cheng, K. (1995) concluded that the level of proficiency played an important role in determining the ability to produce and understand the structure of tag questions. She also argued that native language interference was evident in the area of auxiliary usage and polarity reversal. Cheng, K. (1995) argued that the participants' inability to reverse the polarity of the tag questions could be the result of the absence of the rule of polarity reversal in the formation of tag questions in the participants' native languages. Moreover, the participants had problems coping with the rule of auxiliary, especially DO support and there was a tendency to simplify the tag question structure to two forms "He likes swimming, isn't he?" and "He likes swimming, is he?"

In another corpus-based study, Cheng, W. and Warren (2001) compared the syntactic form and pragmatic use of tag questions used by non-native speakers (NNS) who were Hong Kong Chinese and native speakers of English (NS).

The data for that study were obtained from the Hong Kong Corpus of Conversational English (HKCCE), which consisted of naturally-occurring conversations between non-native speakers and native speakers who knew each other as friends or acquaintances. The conversations took place in a range of locations, both public and private, such as homes, restaurants and cafes. In this study, both tag questions and 'word tags' were examined in order to account for the similarities and differences in tag usage between the two groups of speakers in the data.

Cheng and Warren tried to explain where, when, and why tags were used by the two groups of speakers in their conversations. The usual tag in Cantonese, according to Cheng and Warren (2001), is "*huih-mhaih*", meaning "isn't that so?" This kind of question tends to presume an affirmative answer. Similar to the English tags, the Cantonese tags are often contracted. As a result, "*haih-mhaih*" can become "*haih-maih*" or "*haih-mai*".

Cheng and Warren (2001) found that NNS use English tag questions much less frequently compared to native speakers of English, in a ratio of 1:4, although NNS use of tag words was twice that of the NS. They also found that the syntactic realization of English tag questions by NNS tended to be the use of invariant forms of tag questions, namely "*isn't it*" and "*is it*", possibly influenced by the invariant tag form in Cantonese. In terms of polarity, NNS use the negative-affirmative tag question combination less frequently than NS. For both groups of speakers, the most common syntactic form for tag questions was affirmative-negative, followed by affirmative-affirmative, with the negative-affirmative having the lowest number of instances. However, there were no examples of the use of the negative-negative combination,

neither by NS or NNS, in any of the conversations. While NNS used tag questions less frequently than NS, they used word tags more frequently. Interestingly, for both NNS and NS the only word tag used was “right”.

Finally, the two groups of speakers used tags differently to express pragmatic meaning. The NNS displayed a preference for using invariant tag forms and used tags mostly to seek confirmation from the addressee. The tags used by native speakers of English were more evenly spread across a number of pragmatic functions such as asking for information, seeking confirmation and emphasizing what was being said.

Al-Ani (2000) argues that non-native speakers have problems in learning and formulating tag questions. In his empirical quantitative study Al-Ani (2000) tried to identify and describe the most frequent syntactical errors made by 150 EFL Iraqi students at the University of Baghdad when forming tag questions and whether the sex of the students influenced the frequency of those errors.

At the end of his study, Al-Ani (2000) ranked the most frequent syntactic errors according to their occurrence as the following: irregular form, tense agreement, replacement of subject, replacement of auxiliary, and negative affirmative agreement, with the first one as the most frequent and the last as the least frequent. He also concluded that “there were no significant differences between males and females in making errors in four types. These are “irregular forms, tense agreement, replacement of subject and negative affirmative agreement” (p. 33). The only significant difference between males and females was in the replacement of auxiliary.

Al-Ani (2000) claims that there might more than one reason behind these syntactic problems but these reasons are mainly due to curricula consideration such as the material and the method of instruction. The main reason behind these errors, though, is due “to the way in which tag-questions are presented in the educational settings” (Al-Ani, 2000, p. 40).

Al-Ani (2000) dealt with the tag question problems from only a syntactic point of view, only the formation of tag questions. However, to be able to understand these problems more than syntax is needed. Mastering and using tag questions requires a high level of proficiency in the English language (Holmes, 1982) and high level of proficiency doesn't only mean proficiency in the syntax of the target language.

The languages in the various studies investigated share a similarity with the Arabic language in that they all have one fixed form of invariant tag questions. According to these studies native language interference affects the ability of its speaker to produce correct canonical tag questions, in addition to the syntactic and pragmatic requirements of canonical tag questions. In the case of adult Arabic ESL learners, I expect that the influence of the Arabic language to exist because Arabic has one fixed form of invariant tag question, but still the main reason for the difficulties they face is due to the syntactic and pragmatic requirements of the canonical tag questions.

3.2. Tag Questions and Native Children

Dennis et al. (1982) argues that correctly forming a tag question is a language skill that requires manipulation of grammatical constituents within a sentence, therefore, is acquired later in the process of language acquisition. The production of tag

question requires coordination of various surface structure syntactic features. "Tag question production involves not only that certain surface structure syntactic features of the sentence be known, but also that they be coordinated simultaneously into a coherent production" (Dennis et al., 1982, p. 1254).

Dennis et al. (1982) conducted a study on fifty normal children to test their ability to produce canonical tag questions. The fifty children were of five different age groups, six, eight, ten, twelve and fourteen years, with ten children in each group. Dennis et al. (1982) found that the overall tag production improved from 6-8 years but not thereafter. The various canonical tag question rules involving pronoun, verb, polarity and subject-auxiliary inversion, were acquired at different ages. The inversion rule was well established in half the youngest group, while pronoun and verb manipulation improved over the age groups tested. The polarity rule, though, was mastered by only half the oldest children. Dennis et al. (1982) concludes that linguistic skills involving simultaneous manipulation of various surface-structure syntactic features are acquired late in the process of language development.

In another study Weeks (1991) examined the ability of British and American preschoolers to repeat either positive or negative polarity tag questions. The participants of Weeks' study were 9 children, five included in the normal language group and four included in the lower language group. An elicited imitation task was used to determine if the patterns of repetition by children with lower-level language skills differed from the patterns of repetition by children with normal language skills. Weeks (1991) differentiated between two types of tag questions: grammatically simple tag question, which Holmes (1982) refers to as invariant tag question, and grammatically

complex tags or canonical tags. Children acquire and use invariant tag question at an early stage in the process of language acquisition. For canonical tag questions, however, Weeks (1991) concluded her study with some interesting findings about the acquisition of these types of questions by pre-schoolers:

1. It was found that both British and American children made polarity-matching errors.
2. Errors in the production of grammatically complex tags or canonical tags are expected because they involve the coordination of a number of grammatically complex rules: DO-insertion, negation, subject-auxiliary inversion and pronominalization.

The study showed that preschool children with slow-to-normal language development produced numerous errors in an elicited imitation task with tag questions. Polarity matching errors occurred in almost 33% of the children's repetitions.

Richards (1988), cited in Weeks (1991), argues that "mastering the syntax of tags, developing the processing capacity required for their production, and having an adequate supply of exemplars, while being necessary conditions, are not sufficient to allow acquisition. Tags form a complex system in which the interaction between intonation and polarity patterns corresponds with discourse role and subtle variations in attitudes towards propositions" (p.11).

The findings of Dennis et al. (1982) and Weeks (1991) support Holmes (1982) assumption that using tag questions adequately requires considerable conversational skills. It is expected that the acquisition of tag questions will happen in a later stage in the process of second language learning, as well.

Chapter Four: Method of Study

4.1. Design of the Study

This study adopted the quantitative method approach in collecting and analysing data. According to Dornyei (2004), quantitative research “involves data collection procedures that result primarily in numerical data which is then analysed primarily by statistical methods” (p. 24). The benefits of using this approach in applied linguistics are many. Quantitative method approach is “systematic, rigorous, focused and tightly controlled, involving precise measurement and producing reliable and replicable data that is generalizable to other contexts” (Dornyei, 2004, p. 34)

Data collection included answering two written tests that measured controlled variables. The first one was a Cloze Test with twenty-five blank spaces and the missing words were given to the participants. The second one was a Tag Question Written Test with twenty five sentences and participants were asked to make tag questions on these sentences. Then, participants were asked to produce twenty tag questions orally that measured controlled variables. Those twenty questions were designed in a way to measure the same syntactic properties that Tag Question Written Test measures. After that, participants were invited to read aloud two sets of pragmatic tests that included tag questions in order to measure the participants’ abilities to produce tag questions with correct intonations. The intonations in these two tests were distributed evenly, 50% rising intonation and 50% falling intonation. In the last activity, Arabic-speaking participants were engaged in an oral conversation in order to measure their oral proficiency. Some questions to direct the conversation had been forehanded to the

participants, and rubrics to measure their performance in this activity had been developed.

Raw data collected quantitatively were converted into numerical data and then analysed primarily by statistical methods. The statistical analytical method “offers some in-built quality checks and indices (such as statistical significance) that help readers decide on the validity of the quantitative findings” (Dornyei, 2004, p 34).

4.2. Participants

Two groups of participants were recruited: Arabic-speaking participants (AS) as an experimental group; and Native speaking participants (NS) as a control group.

4.2.1. Arabic Speakers (AS)

The Arabic speakers were recruited from the Ottawa Community Immigrant Services (OCISO) School and the Arabic community in Ottawa, Canada. The Arabic-speakers group consisted of thirty-two adult Arabic-speakers, fifteen females and seventeen males between the ages of 20 and 50 years old (see appendix 1). The participants were from eight Arabic countries: Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Saudi Arabia and Syria. Consequently, they spoke eight different dialects of Arabic. They had learned English as a foreign and second language before and after coming to Canada for periods that lasted between one to fifteen years. The participants were of different educational backgrounds. Six of the participants held high school diplomas, four held college diplomas, one participant was an undergraduate student in a Canadian university, five participants held BA degrees, and eighteen were, at the time of

study, current MA and Ph.D. candidates at Canadian universities. The participants had been living in Canada for periods of one to six years. After coming to Canada, some of the participants had been involved in the Language Instruction for New Comers (LINC) program. Their level of proficiency in the English language ranged between beginners to advanced based on two proficiency tests designed for this study. The level of proficiency of some of the AS participants, especially those involved in the LINC program, had been determined according to a placement test they had gone through before being placed in the relevant level, and some other AS participants had taken one of the standard English proficiency tests such as IELTS.

4.2.2. Native English Speakers (NS)

The native speakers were colleagues recruited from Carleton University. The native speakers group consisted of ten participants, seven females and three males, who spoke Canadian English. The age of NS participants ranged between 20 and 60 years old. The educational background of the NS varied between BA degrees to PhD candidates: one BA holder, two MA students, six MA holders, and one PhD candidate (see appendix 2).

4.3. Study Tests

4.3.1. Proficiency Tests

Two tests were developed to measure the proficiency level of the AS participants in English. The first one was a Cloze Test and the second one was an Oral Proficiency Test.

4.3.1.1. Cloze Test

In the Cloze Test the AS participants read a story with twenty five blank spaces (see appendix 3). The missing words were provided in a list in alphabetical order, and the participants had to fill in the blanks using each word only once. The Cloze Test was graded out of twenty five, one point for each blank, and then raw scores were converted to a score out of hundred. The same test was also given to the native speaking participants.

4.3.1.2. Oral Proficiency Test

The Oral Proficiency Test was an oral interview in which AS participants talked about their experience learning English. The oral interview was designed in a way that pairs of participants get engaged in a conversation to talk about their experience learning English before and after Canada, their goals behind learning English,...etc. Oral proficiency rubrics were developed following the guidelines suggested by Brown (2004) and based on the Foreign Service Institute Oral Interview rubrics mentioned in W.Oller (1979) (see appendix 4). Some questions were provided to AS participants beforehand in order for them to prepare for their oral interview. The oral proficiency interview was recorded, and based on the rubrics graded out of twenty. Their raw scores were then converted to scores out of one hundred.

4.3.2. Experimental Tests

Four tests were developed to test participants' knowledge of tag questions: Tag Question Written Test, Tag Question Oral Test, Pragmatics Test 1, and

Pragmatics Test 2. These tests fell under two categories: linguistic manipulation tasks and natural communication tasks.

4.3.2.1. Tag Question Written Test

The first category consisted of a Tag Question Written Test. The test had twenty-five sentences, twenty regular sentences that tested polarity, auxiliary, tense, agreement, pronominalization, and contraction e.g., “Sally is eating outside, isn’t she?”, and five irregular sentences that included four imperatives, e.g., “Don’t come to class late again, would you?” and one suggestion, “Let’s have a party, shall we?” (see appendix 5). Six of the sentences in the regular category had direct auxiliary verbs. The auxiliary verbs were “have, had, is, was, were”, e.g., “My friends have never come to class on time”, “Mary was watching TV at noon”, “The birds were singing in the park”. Four of the sentences had the modal verbs will and should, e.g., “Your sister will be here soon”, “The little boy should try again”. Three of the sentences consisted of the copula verb “be”, e.g., “Mike is your friend”. The remaining seven sentences in the regular category required the insertion of Do-support in order to form tag questions, e.g., “The toy costs a lot of money”, “They didn’t eat pizza”. It should be noted that ten of the regular sentences were affirmative and the other ten were negative.

The participants were asked to make a correct tag question on each one of these sentences. The purpose behind this test was to measure the participants’ abilities to produce syntactically correct tag questions in writing, where they were given the time to manipulate the tag question rules and implement them. This test was conducted on both the AS and the NS participants. The AS participants did the test after the researcher

introduced and explained tag questions to them, their forms and their meanings with examples.

4.3.2.2. Tag Question Oral Test

The Tag Question Oral Test consisted of an oral activity in which participants were encouraged to use tag questions. Eliciting tag questions from participants naturally was not an easy task because, based on my observation and previous studies, non-native speakers tend to use canonical tag questions far less frequently than native speakers (Cheng, 1995; Beardsmore, 1979). This activity was designed to test the participants' abilities to produce syntactically correct oral tag questions. Participants were not given the time to manipulate the tag question rules, as in the written task (see Appendix 6), however, the participants did this test after the researcher had explained the syntactic rules of tag questions to them and after they had applied these rules in a linguistic manipulation test, the Tag Question Written Test.

In the first part of this test, each participant worked with a partner to ask twenty Yes/No questions, such as "Is the beaver a symbol of Canada?". Then, in the second part of this test, after asking the twenty Yes/No questions, and based on the answers provided by their partners, participants made tag questions to check information or seek confirmation, e.g., "The beaver is a symbol of Canada, isn't it?" or "The beaver isn't a symbol of Canada, is it?". The Tag Question Oral Test was designed to test the same syntactic properties that the Tag Question Written Test tested.

The first version of the Tag Question Oral Test consisted of twenty-five wh-questions and participants were not supposed to write down the answers of their partners.

Also, there was a time frame, about twenty minutes, between asking the wh-questions and using tag questions to check information. That first version was designed to test both the syntactic and pragmatic properties of tag questions. However, after piloting that activity with both Arabic speakers and native speakers, it turned out to be too difficult for the participants to remember the answers provided by their partners at the beginning of the activity and the activity didn't test what it was designed to test, that is, the two pragmatic functions of tag questions, asking for information and seeking confirmation, in addition to the syntactic properties.

As a result, the wh-questions in that activity were changed to Yes/No questions and the number of items was reduced to twenty. Also, the participants were allowed to write down the answers to their partners' questions and there was no time frame between asking the Yes/No questions and producing the tag questions. The new version of this activity was designed to test the participants' oral abilities to produce syntactically correct tag questions without any focus on the pragmatic functions.

It should be noted here that the verb tenses, auxiliaries and the polarity of the twenty regular sentences in the two tests, the written and the oral, matched. However, the Tag Question Written Test had five more items to test the participants' abilities to produce tag questions in writing for imperative sentences such as "Open the door, please" and suggestions such as "Let's have a party". The Tag Question Oral Test, on the other hand, didn't have such sentences due to the difficulty of creating artificial situations in which participants were urged to produce imperatives or suggestions and make tag questions on them. The major focus of these two tests was testing the abilities of the participants to produce syntactically correct tag questions.

4.3.2.3. Pragmatic Test 1

The intonation of the tag questions “rising or falling” has a major role in determining their pragmatic meanings. Therefore, in order to be able to test the participants’ abilities to use the two pragmatic functions of tag questions correctly, two activities were designed.

Pragmatic Test 1 consisted of twenty situations, e.g., “Peter has trouble reading signs when he’s driving”, and each situation was followed by a comment that ended with a tag questions in order to check information or seek confirmation, e.g., “He doesn’t need new glasses, does he?”. The end of tag question punctuation in this activity was left out in order not to influence the participant’s choice of intonation. Moreover, the activity had two versions of the comments where the intonation of the tag question goes up in the first one “He doesn’t need new glasses, does he”, and in the second one the intonation of the tag question goes down “He needs new glasses, doesn’t he?”. Sixteen of the AS and five of the NS participants did the first version of this test and the other sixteen AS and the other five NS participants did the second version of this test. The participants read this activity loud in order to test their abilities to use the correct intonation and, consequently, their abilities to use the pragmatic functions of tag questions correctly. The two versions of this activity had been piloted with native speakers and consequently amended before the final drafts had been approved (see appendix 7).

4.3.2.4. Pragmatic Test 2

Pragmatic Test 2 consisted of a conversation between a teacher and a student who is always late for classes and forgets his assignments and quizzes. The student is unsure of his information and uses tag questions to ask for information, therefore, the intonation of his tag questions is supposed to go up all the time, e.g., "I'm not late for class today, am I?". The teacher, on the other hand, is sure of her information and uses tag questions to seek confirmation from the student, therefore, the intonation of her tag questions is supposed to go down, e.g., "Yes, you are. In fact you're 15 minutes late. You missed your bus again, didn't you?". Participants were asked to read the conversation loud with the correct intonation. Again, this activity had been piloted with native speakers of English and amended before the final draft had been approved (see appendix 8).

4.4. Procedure

Consent forms were signed by participants after the purpose of the study and method of data collection had been explained and the participants were fully aware of the purpose of the study. After signing the consent forms, participants provided some demographic information about their sex, age, level of education, years in Canada, English learning before and after Canada, other languages they spoke, daily time they spent practicing English, Arabic dialect they spoke, and their level in the English language.

Then participants completed the Cloze Test which took about 15-20 minutes. After completing the Cloze Test, tag questions were explained to the

participants and then the participants did the Tag Question Written Test. Next, participants worked in pairs to do the first part of the Tag Question Oral Test and then they did the second part of the same test where they produced tag questions orally. The second part of the Tag Question Oral Test was audio-recorded and then transcribed (see appendix 17 for AS and appendix 18 for NS).

The next activity was Pragmatic Test 1. Participants read the sixteen situations and the comments on them aloud and the activity was audio-recorded. After that the participants read aloud the teacher-students conversation in Pragmatic Test 2 and, again, this activity was recorded. The last activity for the Arabic-speaking participants was the Oral Proficiency Test where pairs of participants engaged in a conversation about their experience learning English language. This conversation was also audio-recorded.

The same procedure of data collection was followed with all the participants, both AS and NS participants. It should be noted here that in some cases during the process of data collection there were only individual participants and, as mentioned earlier, some activities require pairs of participants; therefore, the researcher took the role of the missing partner.

The first four Arabic-speaking participants were recruited from the community. They had different levels of education and different levels of English language. The second group of Arabic-speaking participants was recruited from the OCISO School in Ottawa. There were eight participants who were of different levels in the English language. In order to be able to finish with the eight participants within the time frame given to meet with them and in order to cause the least disturbance and the

least distraction from their classes, help was sought from a friend who is a graduate student at the school of linguistics in the process of data collection.

Although the participants from the OCISO School were placed in their English classes based on a placement test prior to joining their relevant classes, for the sake of consistency of this study, the same Cloze Test and the same Oral Proficiency Test were given to them at the time of data collection. The other participants were recruited from the community and the same procedure of data collection was followed with all the participants.

The other AS participants were recruited from the community. The researcher met with the participants in their houses or in the researcher's house. The whole process of data collection from the two groups of participants took about two months.

Chapter Five: Results

5.1. Proficiency Tests

5.1.1. Cloze Test

The Cloze Test was corrected out of twenty-five, one point was given to each correct answer, and then the overall score for each participant in the two groups was converted to a score out of one hundred (see Table 1). The mean score of the AS participants on the Cloze Test was 81.1%. The mean score of the NS participants; on the other hand, on the same test was 100%. The highest score for AS was 100% and the lowest score was 16%. Appendix 9 shows the raw scores and the scores out of one hundred on the Cloze Test and the Oral Proficiency Test for all AS participants and the same scores for NS participants on the Cloze Test.

Table 1: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Cloze Test

	Cloze Test	
	Raw Score (0 out of 25)	100% Score
AS Participants	20.2	81.1
NS Participants	25	100

A Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to compare the scores of the two groups of participants on the Cloze Test. This test was used because all NS participants scored 100% on the Cloze Test; therefore, their results did not follow the normal distribution. The result of Mann-Whitney *U* test showed that the performance AS

participants was significantly different from the performance of NS participants, $U = 235$, $Z = -2.2$, $p < .05$.

Although the result of the Mann-Whitney U test showed a statistically significant difference which was expected since AS were being compared to a highly educated NS, yet seventeen of the AS participants behaved exactly the same as NS because they scored 100% on the Cloze Test. Seven of the AS participants scored between 80%-99% and the overall mean score of the AS participants on this test was 81.1. These scores of the AS participants indicate that the majority of them were of advanced level in the English language.

5.1.2. Oral Proficiency Test

The Oral Proficiency Test was listened to by the researcher twice for each participant. Then, the test was graded based on the rubrics created for this activity. The rubrics consisted of five categories: accuracy, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and clarity. Each category had a scale that ranged from four to one, with four as the highest and one as the lowest. Based on the rubrics scale, each AS participant was given a score out of twenty and then the overall score was converted to a score out of one hundred.

For example, AS participant 19 scored 4 under the grammar category because grammar was used to communicate effectively and there were no more than two errors. Under the vocabulary category the same participant scored 3 because Vocabulary was adequate and there were a few minor difficulties arose from not using the right vocabulary. Under the fluency category the score of same participant was 4 because speech was effortless and smooth and the participant acted as a facilitator, helping the

conversation flow and develop by asking and answering the right questions. Under the comprehension category, the participant scored 4 because the participant understood everything and responded to questions with right answers, acknowledged all statements and incorporated them into the conversation. Under the clarity category the same participant scored 4 because the participant's pronunciation was clear and expressions were used to enhance communication and there were no unnecessary repetitions. The overall score of AS participant 19 was 19/20.

AS participant 24 scored 3 under the accuracy category because there were few minor errors and no difficulties in communication arose from not using the grammar correctly. Under the vocabulary category the participant scored 3 because vocabulary was adequate and only a few minor difficulties arose from not using the right vocabulary. The participant scored 2 under the fluency category because speech was frequently hesitant and some effort was required to maintain the conversation. Some questions and answers were irrelevant. Under the comprehension category, the participant scored 3 because the participant understood quite well and responded to most questions appropriately, acknowledged most statements, and incorporated many of them into the conversation. Under the clarity category the participant scored 3 because no communication problems arose but better expressions and pronunciation could have made communication more efficient and there were some unnecessary repetitions. The overall score of that participant was 14/20.

AS participants 5 scored 1 under the accuracy category because grammar was almost entirely inaccurate and constant errors prevented communication. Under the vocabulary category the participant scored 1 because the participant's vocabulary was

very limited and inadequate and communication was prevented due to lack of vocabulary. Under the fluency category, the participant also scored 1 because speech was very slow with many long pauses and sometimes so halting and the participant didn't ask questions correctly or answer questions appropriately. Under the comprehension category the participant scored 2 because the participant understood very little, failed to answer many questions appropriately and failed to acknowledge some statements. Under the clarity category, the participant scored 2 because there were some communication problems arose due to unclear pronunciation and lack of expressions and there were also frequent unnecessary repetitions. The overall score of AS participant 5 was 7/20.

The mean score of the AS participants on the Oral Proficiency Test was 75%. The highest grade was 95% and the lowest was 25% (see appendix 9). The NS participants did not take the Oral Proficiency Test as they were highly educated native speakers of the language; therefore, their language abilities are presumably of a high level. Table 2 below compares the results of the AS participants on the two proficiency tests, Cloze and Oral.

Table 2: Mean scores of AS participants on the Cloze Test and the Oral Proficiency Test

	Cloze Test		Oral Proficiency Test	
	Raw Score (out of 20)	100% Score	Raw Score (out of 20)	100% Score
AS participants	20.2	81.1	18.8	75

A paired-samples *t*-test was carried out to compare the mean scores of AS participants on the proficiency tests. The results of the test showed that the scores of the

AS participants on the Cloze Test ($M = 81.09$, $SD = 30.63$) and the Oral Proficiency Test ($M = 75.00$, $SD = 17.78$) did not differ significantly: $t(31) = 1.9$, $p = .056$. The result of the paired samples t -test indicates a consistency in the two tests and that the majority of AS participants were of advanced level in the English language, as shown by their similar performance to the NS participants on the Cloze Test.

5.2. Experimental Tests

The experimental tests, Tag Question Written, Tag Question Oral, Pragmatic Test 1 and Pragmatic Test 2, were corrected and converted to out of one hundred for all participants, both AS and NS. Appendix 10 summarizes the results and the means of the NS and AS on all experimental tests used to obtain data from the two groups of participants.

5.2.1. Tag Question Written Test

The Tag Question Written test was corrected out of twenty-five. There were twenty-five items in the Tag Question Written test, so one point was given for each correct answer and then the overall raw score for each participant was converted to one hundred. The same procedure was followed for both groups of participants, AS and NS. Table 3 shows the mean scores of the two groups of participants on the Tag Question Written test.

Table 3: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Written Test.

	AS	NS
Mean Score	21.17	84.68
Standard Deviation	24.4	97.6

The mean score of the AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test was close to 85%. It was expected that they would perform well since tag questions were explained to the participants before they did the test and they had the time to manipulate and apply the syntactic rules of tag questions during the test. The mean score of the NS participants on the same test was 97.6%.

Again, because the results of NS participants on the Tag Question Written Test did not follow the normal distribution, a Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to compare the mean scores of the two groups of participants. The result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test showed that the performance of the AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test was significantly different from the performance of NS participants, $U = 53.0, Z = -3.2, p < .05$.

Although the result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test indicates statistical difference between the performance of the AS and NS participants, the overall performance of the AS participants was still high because their mean score on the Tag Question Written Test was 84.68%. This was expected because, as mentioned above, tag

questions were explained to them before doing the task and they had enough time to manipulate and apply the syntactic rules of tag questions.

After that, an error analysis was conducted on the twenty regular sentences for the two groups of participants based on six categories:

1. Polarity: did the participants use the correct polarity for each of the sentences? e.g., “Mike *is* your friend, *isn't* he?” as a correct polarity and “Mike *isn't* your friend, *isn't* he?” as incorrect polarity.
2. Auxiliary: Did the participants use the correct auxiliary when forming a tag question? e.g., “Jane's brother *drove* a nice car, *didn't* he?”
3. Verb Tense: Did the participants use a correct auxiliary tense in the tag question that matches the tense of the host sentence? e.g., “Mary *ate* cereal for breakfast, *didn't* she?”
4. Subject-Verb Agreement: Did the participants use an auxiliary that agrees with the subject pronoun? e.g., “She never *goes* to school by bus, *does* she?”
5. Pronominalization: Did the participants use the correct subject pronoun in the tag question? e.g., “*The birds* were singing in the park, weren't *they*?”
6. Contraction: Did the participants use the correct contracted form of tag question? e.g., “*isn't* it?”. This category was added during the process of error analysis because some of the AS participants did not use the right contraction, e.g., “*is not* it?”. Although this kind of error was not expected and it was not common among the participants, some AS participants made some mistakes in contraction especially in the Tag Question Oral test.

The other five irregular sentences were exempted from this analysis because there was disagreement among the NS participants on the correct syntactic rule to tag these irregular sentences. Some NS participants did not even tag some of those five irregular sentences because they argued that tagging imperative sentences would give the listener a chance to disagree with the speaker and that is something that the imperative sentences do not serve.

The total number of errors committed by the NS on the Tag Question Written Test was eight. The AS participants, on the other hand, made one hundred and eighty-two errors in the same test. When dividing the total number of errors committed by the AS participants (182) by the number of participants (32) the mean number of errors made by each AS participant on the Tag Question Written Test was 5.7 error per AS participant. However, the mean number of errors made by each NS participant on the same test was 0.8 errors per NS participant. Appendix 11 shows the result of error analysis for the AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test and Appendix 12 shows the result of this analysis for NS participants. Table 4 below shows a summary of the mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants for each type of error.

Table 4: Mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Written Test.

Participant	Tagging	Question	Form	Agreement	Number	Mean	Total
AS	1.59	1.16	0.97	0.69	1.22	0.03	5.7
NS	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0	0.8

5.2.2. Tag Question Oral Test

The Tag Question Oral Test was transcribed for both AS participants (see appendix 17) and NS participants (see appendix 18). The number of items in the Tag Question Oral Test was twenty, so each correct answer was given one point and the overall raw score was converted to a score out of one hundred. Table 5 below shows the mean scores of the two groups of participants on this test.

Table 5: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test.

		Tag Question Oral Test	
		Raw Score (out of 20)	100% Score
AS Speakers		12.75	63.75%
NS Speakers		19.5	97.5%

The results of NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test did not follow the normal distribution, so a Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the scores of the two groups of participants, AS and NS, on the Tag Question Oral Test. The result of Mann-Whitney U test showed that the two sets of scores differed significantly, $U = 15$, $Z = -4.3$, $p < .05$. The performance of the AS participants was significantly different from the performance of the NS participants and that was expected because AS participants had difficulty in applying the syntactic rules of tag questions and keep the flow of their speech at the same time.

Error analysis of Tag Question Oral Test was conducted in the same manner as the Tag Question Written Test based on polarity, auxiliary, verb tense, subject-

verb agreement, pronominalization, and contraction. Appendix 13 shows the result of error analysis for AS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test and appendix 14 shows the result of error analysis for NS participants on the same test.

The AS participants made 332 errors on the Tag Question Oral Test. When dividing the total number of errors committed by the AS participants (332) by the number of participants (32) the mean number of errors made by each AS participant on the Tag Question Oral Test was 10.38. On the other hand, the total number of errors made by the NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test was 10. The mean number of errors made by each NS participant on the same test was 1.0 error. Table 6 below shows a summary of the mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants for each type of error on the Tag Question Oral Test.

Table 6: Mean number of errors made by AS and NS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test.

Participant	Polarity	Auxiliary	Topic	Agreement	Presence	Contraction	Overall mean of errors
AS	4.4	1.78	1.65	0.59	1.65	0.18	10.38
NS	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	1.0

Although the Tag Question Oral Test items matched the twenty regular items of the Tag Question Written Test and was intended to test the participants' abilities to produce tag questions that were syntactically correct, there was a difference in the AS participants' performance on the two tests (see Table 7 below).

Table 7: Scores and mean number of errors made by AS and NS on TQ Written and Oral Tests

	Tag Question Written Test			Tag Question Oral Test		
	Mean Score	Percentage	Mean Number of Errors	Mean Score	Percentage	Mean Number of Errors
AS Participants	21.17	84.6%	5.7	12.75	63.75%	10.38
NS Participants	24.4	97.6%	0.8	19.5	97.5%	1.0

The mean score of the AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test was 84.6% but their mean score on the Tag Question Oral Test was almost 64%. AS participants made 332 errors on the Tag Question Oral Test compared to 182 in the Written Test. The number of errors made by NS participants, on the other hand, on the Tag Question Oral test was 10 compared to 8 on the Tag Question Written test. The mean scores of the NS participants on the Tag Written and Oral Tests were almost the same, 97.6% and 97.5% respectively.

A paired-samples *t*-test was carried out to compare the mean scores of AS participants on the Tag Question Written and Oral Tests. The results of the test show that the scores of the AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test ($M = 84.69$, $SD = 19.50$) and the Tag Question Oral Test ($M = 63.75$, $SD = 23.14$) differed significantly: $t(31) = 5.61$, $p < .05$. The result of the paired samples *t*-test showed that the same group of AS participants behaved differently on the Tag Question Written Tests and the Tag Question Oral Test although the two tests measured the same syntactic properties.

5.2.3. Pragmatic Test 1

As described in Section 4.3.2 above, the Pragmatic Test 1 consisted of 16 situations with a tag question on each one and participants were asked to read out loud these situations and the tag questions with the correct intonation. The target intonations consisted of 8 rising and 8 falling, depending on whether the tag question was used to seek information (rising intonation) or confirmation (falling intonation). The flat intonation was a third category added during the process of data analysis because many AS participants produced tag questions with this intonation.

The test was listened to by the researcher the first time and the intonations used by the participants were marked on their papers. Then, the recordings were listened to a second time by a native speaker of English and the researcher to confirm the right intonation for each tag question used by each participant, both AS and NS. Appendix 15 compares the intonations used by both NS and AS participants in this test.

When correcting the Pragmatic Test 1, the target intonations provided by the native speaker judges when designing the study tests were taken as the baseline. Table 8 shows the mean number of rising, falling and flat intonations provided by AS and NS participants.

Table 8: Mean number of intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic1 Test.

	Number of Target Intonations	AS Intonations	NS Intonations
Rising	8	11.41	8.4
Falling	8	0.03	7.6
Flat	0	4.46	0
Total	16	15.89*	16

***One AS participant (AS 4) missed two situations**

Rising intonation was the dominant one and flat intonation was the second dominant intonation used by AS participants in Pragmatic Test1. The falling intonation, however, was almost absent for this group of participants. NS participants, on the other hand, produced a variety of rising and falling intonations on the Pragmatic Test 1 but none of them used a flat intonation.

While Table 8 shows the mean number of intonations produced by AS and NS participants, it does not compare the intonations responses with the actual target rising and falling items on the test. Therefore, another analysis was conducted to analyse the distribution of intonations responses with respect to the target rising and falling intonations (see tables 9 and 10).

In Table 9, the first row shows the mean number of rising, falling and flat intonations provided by AS participants on the 8 rising intonation items on Pragmatic Test 1. It also shows the mean number of correctly matching items, and then that score out of one hundred. The second row shows the same information for the 8 falling intonation items. Table 10 presents the same results for NS participants.

Table 9: Mean number of AS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 1 for rising and falling intonations.

	Mean No. of Rising	Mean No. of Falling	Mean No. of Flat	Mean No. of Correct Intonations	100% Score
Pragmatic Test 1	5.8*	0.03	2.1	5.8/8	72.5
Pragmatic Test 2	5.8	0.03*	2.3	0.03/8	0.38
Total Mean and Range (AS)	11.6	0.06	4.3	5.83/16	36.4

**Mean number of correct intonations provided by AS participants that matched the target ones.*

Table 10: Mean number of NS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 1 for rising and falling intonations.

	Mean No. of Rising	Mean No. of Falling	Mean No. of Flat	Mean No. of Correct Intonations	100% Score
Pragmatic Test 1	7.1*	0.9	0.0	7.1/8	88.8
Pragmatic Test 2	1.3	6.7*	0.0	6.7/8	83.8
Total Mean and Range (NS)	8.4	7.6	0.0	13.8/16	86.2

**Mean number of correct intonations provided by NS participants that matched the target ones.*

The Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to compare the mean number of correct intonations of the two groups of participants, AS and NS, on the Pragmatic1 Test. The result of Mann-Whitney test showed that the two sets of scores differed significantly, $U = .000$, $Z = -4.79$, $p < .05$. The performance of the AS participants was significantly lower than the performance of the NS participants on Pragmatic Test 1.

5.2.4. Pragmatic Test 2

The second pragmatic test was a conversation between a student and a teacher. It consisted of fourteen tag questions, seven produced by the student to ask for

information and seven used by teacher to seek information (see Appendix 8). The student's tag questions were supposed to end with high intonations and the teacher' tag questions were supposed to end with rising intonations. Therefore, the target intonations were seven rising and seven falling.

Again, the second pragmatic test was listened to by the researcher the first time and the intonations used by the participants were marked on their papers. Then, the recordings were listened to a second time by a native speaker of English and the researcher to confirm the right intonation for each tag question used by each participant, both AS and NS. Appendix 16 compares the intonations used by the two groups of participants on this test.

When correcting the Pragmatic Test 2, the target intonations provided by the native speaker judges when designing the study tests were taken as the baseline. Table 11 shows the mean number of rising, falling and flat intonation provided by each group of participant on Pragmatic Test 2.

Table 11: Mean number of intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 2.

	Number of Target Intonation	AS Intonations	NS Intonations
Rising	7	9.6	8.2
Falling	7	0.68	5.8
Flat	0	3.72	0
Total	14	14	14

Similar to Pragmatic Test 1, for the AS participants the rising intonation was the dominant one on the Pragmatic Test 2 and the flat intonation was the second

dominant intonation. The falling intonation was the least used intonation by AS participants. NS participants, on the other hand, used a variety of rising and falling intonations on this pragmatic test but none used a flat intonation.

As with Pragmatic Test 1, another analysis was conducted to analyse the intonation responses provided by the AS and NS participants compared to the target rising and falling intonations. Table 12 shows the results of this analysis for AS participants and Table 13 shows the same results for NS participants.

Table 12: Mean Number of AS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 2 that matched the target intonations.

	Mean No. of Rising	Mean No. of Falling	Mean No. of Flat	Mean No. of Correct Intonations	100% Score
Total Mean (N=10)	5.15*	0.28	1.56	5.15/7	73.6
Mean (N=5)	3.78	0.40*	2.75	0.40/7	5.8
Total Mean and SD (N=10)	8.88	0.68	4.31	5.55/14	39.7

**mean No. of correct intonations provided by AS participants that matched the target ones.*

Table 13: Mean number of NS Participants' intonations on Pragmatic Test 2 compared to the target intonations.

	Mean No. of Rising	Mean No. of Falling	Mean No. of Flat	Mean No. of Correct Intonations	100% Score
Total Mean (N=10)	6.0*	1.0	0.0	6.0/7	85.7
Mean (N=5)	2.2	4.8*	0.0	0.40/7	68.5
Total Mean and SD (N=10)	8.2	5.8	0.0	13.8/16	77.1

**Mean No. of correct intonations provided by NS participants that matched the target ones.*

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the mean number of correct intonations of the two groups of participants, AS and NS, on the Pragmatic Test 2. The result of Mann-Whitney U test show that the two sets of scores differed significantly, $U = 17.00$, $Z = -4.27$, $p < .05$. The performance of the AS participants was significantly lower than the performance of the NS participants.

Table 14 below compares the mean scores of AS and NS participants on the two pragmatic tests.

Table 14: Mean scores of AS and NS participants on the two Pragmatic tests.

	Pragmatic 1	Pragmatic 2
AS Participants	36.4	39.7
NS Participants	86.2	77.1

A paired-samples t -test was carried out to compare the mean scores of AS participants on the two pragmatic tests. The results of the test show that the scores of the AS participants on the Pragmatic Test 1 ($M = 36.4$, $SD = 19.96$) and the Pragmatic Test 2 ($M = 39.7$, $SD = 16.63$) did not differ significantly: $t(31) = 1.19$, $p = .240$. The result of the paired samples t -test indicates that the performance of the AS participants on the two tests was similar. This indicates that if an AS participant did not do well on Pragmatic Test 1, s/he would not have done well on Pragmatic Test 2.

5.3. Proficiency and Performance

The NS participants did not take the Oral Proficiency Test; therefore, the Cloze Test will be used as a reference to measure the AS participants' level of proficiency and their abilities to produce tag questions that are syntactically and pragmatically correct.

5.3.1. Cloze and Experimental Tests

Table 15 below provides a summary of the paired samples *t*-test results for AS participants mean scores on the experimental tests compared to their mean scores on the Cloze Test. The results show that the scores of the AS participants on the Cloze Test and the Tag Question Written Test did not differ significantly: $t(31) = -.91, p = .36$, but their scores differed significantly on the other three tests, Tag Question Oral, Pragmatic 1, and Pragmatic 2.

Table 15: Cloze Test vs. Experimental Tests

Cloze Test	Experimental Test	Mean	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Mean 81.1	Tag Question	84.7	.91	.36
	Tag Question Oral	63.8	4.3	.000
	Pragmatic 1	36.4	10.68	.000
	Pragmatic 2	39.7	7.59	.000

5.3.2. Proficiency Level and Performance

Based on their results on the Cloze Test, AS participants were divided into three groups: advanced, intermediate and beginners. The first group consisted of seventeen participants who scored 100% on the Cloze Test. The second group consisted of seven participants and their scores on the Cloze Test were between 80% and 99%. The third group consisted of the other eight participants who scored less than 70% on the Cloze Test. In order to find the relationship between the level of proficiency of the AS participants in English and their abilities to produce syntactically and pragmatically correct tag questions, a series of one way ANOVAs was conducted. Table 16 below summarises and compares the mean scores of the three groups of AS participants on these four experimental tests.

Table 16: Summary of the mean scores of AS participants on the experimental tests.

	Advanced		Intermediate		Beginners		Significant Differences
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
TQ written	93.53	4.55	89.29	8.38	61.88	27.76	Advanced > Beginners Intermediate > Beginners
TQ Oral	73.82	19.8	62.86	13.8	43.13	24.04	Advanced > Intermediate Advanced > Beginners
Pragmatic	40.29	16.82	40.71	8.73	15.5	22.8	Advanced > Beginners Intermediate > Beginners
Formal	37.88	17.48	45.43	7.3	32.88	19.91	No significant difference

5.3.2.1. Proficiency and Tag Question Written Test

The result of the one way ANOVA test revealed that there was a significant difference on the scores of Tag Question Written Test amongst the advanced group ($M=93.53$, $SD=4.55$), intermediate group ($M = 89.29$, $SD = 8.38$), and beginners

($M = 61.88$, $SD = 27.76$), $F = 13.30$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc test was conducted to find where these differences lie. The result of this test revealed that the scores of the advanced group were significantly different from the scores of the beginners group, $p < .05$. Moreover, Tukey post hoc test revealed that the scores of the intermediate group were significantly different from the scores of the beginner group on the Tag Question Written Test, $p < .05$. The scores of the advanced group and the intermediate group, however, did not differ significantly, $p = .05$. The results of the one way ANOVA test indicate that the higher the level of proficiency of the AS participants is, the higher their scores on the Tag Question Written Test.

5.3.2.2. Proficiency and Tag Question Oral Test

The result of the one way ANOVA test revealed that there was a significant difference on the scores of Tag Question Oral Test amongst the advanced group ($M = 73.82$, $SD = 19.80$), intermediate group ($M = 62.86$, $SD = 13.80$), and beginner group ($M = 43.13$, $SD = 24.04$), $F = 6.50$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc test revealed that the scores of the advanced group were significantly different from the scores of the beginners group, $p < .05$, but the scores of the intermediate group and the beginner group did not differ significantly. This suggests that only highly advanced AS participants were able to orally produce syntactically correct tag questions.

5.3.2.3. Proficiency and Pragmatic Test 1

The result of the one way ANOVA test revealed that there was a significant difference on the scores of Pragmatic Test 1 amongst the advanced group (M

= 40.29, $SD = 16.83$), intermediate group ($M = 40.71$, $SD = 8.73$), and beginners ($M = 15.50$, $SD = 22.80$), $F = 6.26$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc test revealed that the scores of the advanced group and the intermediate group did not differ significantly. However, the scores of both groups, the advanced and the intermediate, were significantly different from the scores of the beginner group in the Pragmatic Test 1, $p < .05$. This suggests that advanced and intermediate AS participants behaved similarly in the Pragmatic Test 1, yet their performance was low ($M = 40.29$ and $M = 40.71$, respectively).

5.3.2.4. Proficiency and Pragmatic Test 2

The result of the one way ANOVA test revealed that there was no significant difference on the scores of Pragmatic Test 2 amongst the advanced group ($M = 37.88$, $SD = 17.84$), intermediate group ($M = 45.43$, $SD = 7.30$), and beginners ($M = 32.88$, $SD = 19.91$), $F = 1.08$, $p = .353$. The result of the one way ANOVA test showed the three groups of AS participants behaved similarly in the Pragmatic Test 2 which indicates that AS participants could not produce pragmatically correct tag questions regardless of their level of proficiency in the English language.

Chapter Six: Discussion

6.1. The Syntactic Properties of Tag Questions

The two tag question tests, the oral and the written, were analysed in order to discover the syntactic difficulties that AS participants had in the formation of tag questions. The analysis was conducted on the six syntactic categories mentioned in the research questions: polarity, auxiliary, verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, pronominalization, and contraction. The contraction category was added during the process of data analysis, although it was not expected, because some AS participants had a problem with it especially during the Tag Question Oral Test.

The total number of wrong tag questions made by AS participants on the Tag Question Written Test was 91. Error analysis of these wrong tag questions revealed that the most syntactic difficulty that adult AS participants had in the formation of canonical tag questions was in polarity with a total number of 51 errors, the second difficulty was in pronominalization, 39 errors, and then auxiliary with a total number of 37 errors. The fourth difficulty was in using a tense in the tag question that matches the tense of the host sentence, and the least difficulty was in agreement, 22 errors. In addition one error in contraction was made by one AS participant in the Tag Question Written Test.

However, when it comes to the Tag Question Oral Test, the number and frequency of the same errors changed drastically, although the two tests designed to test the same syntactic properties. The total number of wrong tag questions was 231, compared to 91 on the written test. The most difficulty was, again, in polarity but this time with a total number of 141 compared to 91 in the written test. The second difficulty

was in auxiliary with a total number of 57 errors. The third difficulty was in pronominalization and tense, 53 errors each. Agreement came next with a total number of 19 errors. Similar to the written test, the least number of errors was in contraction but this time with a total number of 6 errors, compared to one error on the written test. As expected, the major polarity problem that adult Arabic-speakers had when they used English canonical tag questions was in reversal polarity with negative host sentences "It isn't hot, is it?". AS participants tended to use negative polarity most of the time even if the host sentence was negative. The findings of this research support our hypothesis in regard to the syntactic problems that AS participants were expected to have. Table 17 below summarises and compares the errors made by AS participants on both Tag Question Written and Oral Tests:

Table 17: Summary of Errors made by AS participants on TQ Written and Oral Tests

	TQ Written Test		TQ Oral Test
1. Contraction Errors	1	1. Contraction Errors	6
2. Agreement Errors	22	2. Agreement Errors	19
3. Tense Errors	31	3. A. Tense Errors	53
4. Auxiliary Errors	37	3. B. Pronoun Errors	53
5. Pronoun Errors	39	4. Auxiliary Errors	57
6. Polarity Errors	51	5. Polarity Errors	141
Total Errors	91	Total Tag Errors	231

A very interesting and noticeable observation about the frequency of errors is the pattern that they take in the Tag Question Written Test and the Tag Question Oral Test. The ranking of the errors in the two tests is almost the same, except for auxiliary and pronoun in the Oral Test with a small difference. The same errors were

made in the two tag questions tests in almost the same order of frequency. Contraction was the least made errors in the two tests, then agreement second in the rank. Polarity is the most committed error in the two tests.

I was wondering if this case can be generalized for all syntactic properties of the language or just happened by chance in this study. The ranking of errors is almost the same in the written and the oral tests but the frequency is higher in the oral test. The syntactic rules of tag questions had been explained to the participants with plenty of examples before they did the Tag Question Written Test. After knowing the rules and implementing them in a written test, they should have committed fewer errors in the oral test, but what happened was completely the opposite. This would be a very interesting area for future research in error analysis and for research in knowing about the language and knowing the language.

6.2. Pragmatics of Tag Questions

Data analysis revealed that adult AS participants could not use the pragmatic functions of English canonical tag questions appropriately. The focus of this study was two pragmatic functions: asking for information and seeking confirmation. Yet, data analysis showed that AS participants could use neither of these functions appropriately. The scores of AS participants in the pragmatic tests were very low. One reason behind their inability to perform well in the pragmatic test could be their lack of awareness of these pragmatic functions of tag questions and the social context in which these questions are used in. This finding supports our hypothesis and was expected because intonation plays a major role in determining the pragmatic functions of canonical

tag questions; nonetheless, AS participants could not use the correct intonation that matched the pragmatic function.

The scores of the NS participants on the two pragmatic tests were higher than the scores of the AS participants, yet their scores on these two tests were lower than their scores on the Tag Question Written and Oral Tests. One possible explanation behind their lower scores could be because their understanding of the social context of the tag questions in the two pragmatic tests was different; as a result, they used the intonation that matched the tag question within that social context.

6.3. Intonation of Tag Questions

Data analysis revealed that the dominant intonation used by AS participants when producing tag questions was the rising one and then the flat intonation. The least used intonation was the falling one. The rising intonation was the dominant one in the two tests and the two tests were designed with 50% rising intonations. I would like to claim that AS participants scored these scores on the pragmatic tests, although they were low, by default. The hypothesis indicated in the research question assumed that the flat intonation would be the dominant one; however, the finding contradicts with our hypothesis, the flat intonation is the second dominant one after the rising intonation.

6.4. L2 Proficiency and Tag Questions

Data analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between the scores of the AS participants on the Cloze Test ($M = 81.1$) and the Oral Proficiency Test ($M = 75$). This indicates that the majority of the AS participants were of an advanced

level in English. Also, data analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between the level of proficiency and the AS participants' abilities to produce syntactically correct tag questions in writing only.

When using tag questions orally, data analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the AS participants' level of proficiency and their abilities to produce syntactically correct tag questions orally. Their scores on the Tag Question Oral Test were lower than their scores on the Tag Question Written Test. For example, the mean score of the advanced AS participant group on the Tag Question Written Test was 93.53 compared to 73.82 on the Tag Question Oral Test. The intermediate group scored 89.29 on the Tag Question Written Test, but they scored 62.86 on the Tag Question Oral Test.

When it comes to the pragmatic functions of tag questions, data analysis showed that there was a significant difference between the AS participants' level of proficiency and their abilities to produce pragmatically correct tag questions; even participants who were of an advanced level in the English language could not use the pragmatic functions of the English canonical tag questions appropriately. This finding supports our hypothesis that Arabic-Speakers who learn English as a second language can't use English canonical tag questions appropriately regardless of their level of proficiency in the English language.

Except for their scores on the Tag Question Written tests, there was a significant difference between AS participants' scores on the Cloze Test on the one hand and their scores on the other experimental tests in the other hand. Although there was no significant difference between AS level of proficiency and their abilities to produce

syntactically correct tag questions in writing, there was a significant difference between the AS participants' level of proficiency and their abilities to produce syntactically and pragmatically correct tag questions orally.

There was a significant difference between the AS participants' scores on the Cloze Test and their scores in the Tag Question Oral Test. Based on the paired samples *t*-test results, the AS participants' scores on the Cloze Test were 9-25 points larger than those of the Tag Question Oral Test. Moreover, there was a significant difference between the AS participants' scores on the Tag Question Written Test and their scores on the Tag Question Oral Test, in spite of the fact that the two tests measured the same syntactic properties. The AS participants' scores on the Tag Question Written Test were 13-28 points larger than those of the Tag Question Oral Test. This indicates that there was a weak relationship between their syntactic knowledge of the tag question and their abilities to implement this knowledge when producing tag questions orally.

Moreover, data analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the AS participants' scores on the Cloze Test and their scores on the Pragmatic Test 2. This significant difference indicates that they could not produce tag questions that were pragmatically correct. In addition, data analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between the AS participants' scores on the two pragmatic tests. This means if an AS participant didn't perform well on the first pragmatic test, most probably s/he wouldn't have performed well on the second pragmatic test. Compared to their means in the Cloze Test, 81.09, the AS participants' means in the two pragmatic tests, 36.4 and 39.7, prove that there was a significant difference between their level of proficiency and their abilities to produce pragmatically correct tag questions. Based on

the results of the paired samples *t*-test, the scores of the AS participants on the Cloze Test were 37-55 points larger than their scores on Pragmatic Test 1 and 31-54 points larger than their scores on Pragmatic Test 2.

This difference between the AS participants' level of proficiency and their abilities to produce syntactically and pragmatically correct tag questions proves that there is a big difference between knowing about the language and knowing the language. In a written test learners have the time to manipulate and implement their knowledge about the language and that exactly what AS participants did in the Tag Question Written Test. However, what matters most is the learners' knowledge of the language, their ability to use the language appropriately in a given social context, which was something that AS participants could not achieve successfully.

When comparing the results of the AS participants on the Tag Question Oral Test to the NS participants', the difference is even bigger, the mean score of NS participants was 97.5%, compared to 63.75% for the AS participants. Besides, it was difficult for AS participants to keep the flow of their speech while producing tag questions orally. At some points during the Tag Question Oral Test, AS participants had to stop and figure out the rule and then produce the tag questions. In contrast, NS participants spent less time in this activity with greater accuracy.

A very interesting point that some native speakers mentioned while doing this activity was that if they had to think of the syntactic rules to apply, they would have difficulty in producing a correct tag question. They just automatically and unconsciously produced correct tag questions. This point is very interesting because it shows how deep the syntactic rules of tag question are rooted in the unconscious knowledge of the native

speakers to a degree that they were not aware of them. The moment they consciously thought of the syntactic rules of tag questions, they would have made mistakes. This is true to almost every language. The rules of our native languages are deeply rooted in our unconscious knowledge. We speak our native languages and we apply their rules, no matter how complicated these rules are, unconsciously and the moment we think of these rules, we make mistakes.

The findings of this study are consistent with Beardsmore (1970) that the reason that makes ESL students avoid using tag questions is their complexity. Similar to the languages of Beardsmore's students, the Arabic language has a sort of invariant tag question that makes it difficult for Arabic-speakers to master and adequately use canonical tag questions in English. On the Tag Question Oral Test, it was difficult for AS participant to implement the syntactic rules of tag questions and keep the flow of their speech at the same time. The polarity of tag questions, auxiliary, pronominalization, tense, agreement and contraction, as well as falling and rising intonation make them highly complicated for Arabic-speaking learners to use appropriately. The findings are also consistent with Dennis et al (1982) that "Tag question production involves not only that certain surface structure syntactic features of the sentence be known, but also that they be coordinated simultaneously into a coherent production" (p. 1254).

When it comes to the pragmatic functions of tag questions, the findings of this study are consistent with Cheng and Warren (2001). The two groups of participants used tag questions differently. Intonation plays a major role in identifying the meaning of the tag questions. NS participants used rising and falling intonations to express two pragmatic functions of the tag questions: asking for information and seeking

confirmation because they were aware of these pragmatic functions. AS participants used tag questions with mainly rising and flat intonations because they were not aware of the meanings and the social context in which tag questions are used in.

The findings of this study contradict with Cheng (1995). The level of proficiency does not play an important role in determining the ability to produce tag questions. The level of proficiency plays a role in producing syntactically correct tag questions in writing only. Nevertheless, when it comes to the pragmatic functions of tag questions, the level of proficiency doesn't matter. Yet, the findings of this study are consistent with Cheng (1995) in that native language interference was evident in the area of polarity reversal as this was the most frequent error in the production of tag questions, both orally and in writing. The AS participants' inability to reverse the polarity of the tag questions, as Cheng (1995) argues, could be the result of the absence of the rule of polarity reversal in the formation of tag questions in the Arabic language.

The findings of this study are also consistent with Al-Ani (2000). The way in which tag questions are presented in the educational setting is one reason behind the difficulty that Arabic speakers have in the formation and use of tag questions. However, the uniqueness of the canonical tag questions to the English language beside the lack of awareness of their pragmatic functions and the social contexts in which they are used could also be other reasons. On the other hand, the findings of this study contradict with Al-Ani (2000) in the frequency of the syntactic errors and their occurrence.

The findings of this study support Weeks (1991), Dennis et al (1982), and Holmes (1982) assumption that using tag questions adequately requires considerable

conversational skills. There was no significant difference among the three levels of AS participants in using tag questions appropriately. Advanced, intermediate and beginner AS participants behaved almost similarly in Pragmatic Test 1 and Pragmatic Test 2.

This raises the importance of improving the proficiency and the automaticity of ESL learners. Some AS participants were of an advanced level in the English language and they were able to orally produce syntactically correct tag questions; however, when it came to the pragmatic functions of the tag questions they made mistakes and weren't able to produce tag questions that were pragmatically correct. Syntactic knowledge of the target language is important but not enough. When comparing the mean scores of the NS participants in the Pragmatic Tests 1 and 2 to those of the AS participants, we find a significant difference. On Pragmatic Test 1, the mean scores of the NS participants was 86.2%, compared to 36.4% for the AS participants. On the second Pragmatic Test the mean score of the NS participants was 77.1%, compared to 39.7% for the AS participants. The differences in their means on these two tests were very significant, more than 100% in the first one. When it comes to tag questions, it is their pragmatic functions that matter most. The syntactic rules of tag questions are easy to teach and learn, although they might be difficult to apply orally. The pragmatic functions of the language and the social contexts in which certain utterances occur are major parts of the target language and they should be included in language courses and language text books in order to help learners improve their proficiency and their automaticity in that target language.

Tag questions are important hedging devices in the English language and they are used very often by native speakers of English on every day conversations. They

are signals of politeness and they invite the interlocutors to participate in the conversation. Although tag questions appear to be simple and easy to teach and use, they are highly complicated and non-native speakers of the language have difficulties in using them appropriately. The different pragmatic functions of tag questions make them even more complicated to non-native speakers of English language. Algeo (1988) argues that tag question pragmatic functions “runs from the most to [...] the least polite ranges of English” (p. 187). The difficulty and the variety of these pragmatic functions raise the issue of adopting a different approach when introducing such structures to second language learners. This approach should focus more on the pragmatic functions of the target language rather than on the syntactic knowledge of the language, although it is important to raise the awareness of the second language learners, especially the adult ones, of the grammar of the target language, yet it is the social context in which utterances take place that matter most.

During the process of preparing the pragmatic tests for this study and while seeking the native speakers’ judgment on one of the test items which was supposed to test “asking for information”, I was told that tag question item expressed “sarcastic meaning” rather than asking for information and, consequently the item was changed with the help of a native speaker. That argument provided by the native speaker supports Cameron et al.’s (1989) argument that tag questions are characterized by complex multifunctionality and diversity of meaning. That argument is also a good example of how tag questions, as Algeo (1988) argues, in the process of changing their social functions. Since the pragmatic functions of tag questions are changing, then the method of approaching such expressions in the ESL classroom should also be changed. This also

supports (Bublitz, 1979) that, besides syntax, a pragmatic theory that explains the real use of tag questions in social contexts is needed.

Other evidence that supports the need for a pragmatic-based approach in the ESL classroom was when the NS participants were asked to tag the five irregular sentences, four imperative and one suggestive, in the Tag Question Written Test. Although these five irregular tag questions were analyzed in the same manner as the regular twenty items, they were eliminated from this study because of the disagreement among NS participants on the right form of tagging these types of sentences. However, these five irregular sentences and how to tag them provide strong evidence of the need for a pragmatic-based approach in the ESL classroom. Some NS participants used "Okay" as a tag question for the majority of the four imperative sentences, other NS participants mentioned that they would not tag imperative sentences because tagging such sentences means giving the listener a chance to disagree with the speaker, which is not the case when giving someone an order. Other NS participants mentioned that tagging these types of sentence depends on the social role of the interlocutor, whether s/he is a class mate, a co-worker, a spouse or a son. The suggestive sentence "Let's have a party" was tagged with the invariant tag question "Okay" by seven NS participants, "can we" by one NS and "shall we" by two NS participants. Generally speaking tagging imperative and suggestive sentences according to the NS participants does not have one convention or one syntactic rule to follow. It depends on the social context in which the utterance takes place in addition to the social role of the interlocutor.

Except for one AS participant, one noticeable thing about these imperative and suggestive sentences was the ease that AS participants had in tagging

them by applying the rule that had been explained to them before doing the Tag Question Written Test, “could/would you?” for imperative sentences and “shall we?” for the suggestion. I would like to argue that these kinds of tag questions “could/would we?” could be a form of invariant tag questions that would go with almost any imperative sentence. Since the Arabic language also has a fixed tag question that would go with almost any sentence in Arabic, the AS participants did not have a difficulty in tagging these imperative sentences in English and this is evidence of the mother tongue language interference during the process of learning a second language. Because tagging imperative sentences in English has almost a sort of stereotyped form, AS participants didn’t have a difficulty in tagging English imperative sentences.

6.5. Limitations and Recommendation

Future research in the area may focus on the other pragmatic functions of tag questions and how these functions are used by both native and non-native speakers of English. Another area for future investigation might be how tag questions are perceived and interpreted by non-native speakers. These areas of investigation show the importance of the pragmatic functions of the language and might open the doors wide for the necessity of incorporating a pragmatic-based approach in the ESL classroom.

One of the limitations to this study and future studies in this area is eliciting tag questions from non-native speakers in naturally occurring situations because non-native speakers usually don’t use canonical tag questions. Therefore, I would like to suggest building an English language corpus for speakers of other languages who learn English as a second language. The benefits of this language corpus will be limitless

because it will help researchers analyse not only tag question errors, but also other errors made by second language learners and consequently develop principles to design more effective methods for teaching ESL in order to improve the learners' proficiency and automaticity in the English language.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: The Demographic Information of the Arabic-Speaking Participants

Participant	Sex	Age Group	Education	Lived in Canada	English in Canada	English before Canada	Other Languages	English outside class	Arabic Dialect	English Level
AS 1	M	36-40	MA/Statics	3-4 yrs	0-3 months	6-8 yrs	NA	1 hr/day	Palestinian	NA
AS 2	M	36-40	MA/Math	3-4 yrs	0-3 months	6-8 yrs	NA	1 hr/day	Egyptian	NA
AS 3	F	36-40	Diploma	2-3 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	NA	30 mins	Palestinian	NA
AS 4	F	26-30	MA-Math	5-6 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	NA	30 mins	Palestinian	NA
AS 5	F	36-40	High School	2-3 yrs	3-6 months	NA	NA	few	Palestinian	1
AS 6	F	36-40	Diploma	4-5 yrs	3-6 months	2-4 yrs	French	sometimes	Lebanese	4
AS 8	F	36-40	BA	1-2 yrs	1-2 yrs	2-4 yrs	French	sometimes	Libyan	4
AS 9	F	36-40	Diploma	2-3 yrs	3-6 months	1-2 yrs	French	few	Palestinian	2
AS 10	F	36-40	High School	3-4 yrs	1-2 yrs	1-2 yrs	NA	few	Lebanese	2
AS 12	F	20-25	High School	2-3 yrs	6-12 months	6-8 yrs	NA	sometimes	Syrian	5
AS 13	F	31-35	BSc	0-1 yrs	6-12 months	4-6 yrs	NA	3 hrs/day	Egyptian	5
AS 14	F	36-40	Diploma	1-2 yrs	3-6 months	4-6 yrs	French	Occasionally	Lebanese	6
AS 15	F	31-35	BSc	4-5yrs	0-3 months	6-8 yrs	NA	1 hrs/day	Palestinian	6
AS 16	F	31-35	PhD	4-5 yrs	NA	15 yrs	Basic French	1 hrs/day	Egyptian	NA
AS 17	F	26-30	MA	1-2 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	NA	most of the time	Saudi	NA
AS 18	M	20-25	High School	0-1 yrs	3-6 months	4-6 yrs	NA	most of the time	Palestinian	3
AS 19	F	20-25	1st yr university	1-2 yrs	1-2 yrs	2-4 yrs	French	most of the time	Libyan	9
AS 20	M	36-40	BA English	0-1 yrs	NA	13 yrs	NA	3 hrs/day	Palestinian	IELTS 7.5
AS 21	M	26-30	MA Student	2-3 yrs	1-2 yrs	4-6 yrs	NA	1 hrs/day	Saudi	Advanced
AS 22	M	26-30	MA Student	2-3 yrs	2-3 yrs	4-6 yrs	NA	2-3 hrs/day	Saudi	NA
AS 23	M	41-45	MA Student	3-4 yrs	1-2 yrs	15 yrs	French/Italian	often	Morocco	Advanced
AS 24	M	26-30	BA	1-2 yrs	1-2 yrs	4-6 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Saudi	Advanced
AS 25	M	20-25	High School	1-2 yrs	0-3 months	6-8 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Saudi	Advanced
AS 26	M	20-25	High School	0-1 yrs	3-6 yrs	6-8 yrs	NA	3 hrs/day	Saudi	5
AS 27	M	36-40	MA	1-2 yrs	NA	10-12 yrs	NA	6-8 hrs/day	Jordanian	IELTS 7
AS 28	M	46-50	PhD Student	5-6 yrs	NA	12-14 yrs	NA	3 hrs/day	Jordanian	advanced
AS 29	M	36-40	MA	3-4 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Jordanian	IELTS 6.5
AS 30	M	36-40	PhD Student	10 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	German	1 hrs/day	Jordanian	NA
AS 32	M	36-40	PhD	11 yrs	NA	6-8 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Jordanian	NA
AS 33	M	26-30	PhD Student	3-4 yrs	NA	12 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Jordanian	NA
AS 34	F	36-40	MA	2-3 yrs	NA	10 yrs	Urdu/Turkish	4 hrs/day	Syrian	NA
AS 36	M	26-30	PhD	1-2 yrs	NA	9-10 yrs	NA	2 hrs/day	Jordanian	IELTS 6.5

Appendix 2: Demographic Information of the English Native Speakers (NS):

Participant	Sex	Age Group	Education	English Dialect	Other Languages
NS 1	M	20-25	MA Student	Canadian	NA
NS 2	F	36-40	MA	Canadian	French/Basic Arabic
NS 3	F	40-45	MA	Canadian	NA
NS 4	F	26-30	MA	Canadian	French
NS 5	F	26-30	MA student	Canadian	French
NS 6	F	26-30	PHD Student	Canadian	French & Spanish
NS 7	M	56-60	BA	Canadian	German
NS 8	F	40-45	MA	Canadian	Spanish/French
NS 9	M	45-50	MA	Canadian	Spanish
NS 10	F	31-35	MA	Canadian	French/Spanish

Appendix 3: Cloze Test.



School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Read the following story and fill in the blanks with words from the WORDLIST. Each word should be used only once. The words in the wordlist are in the alphabetical order.

- | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. a | 6. but | 11. liked | 16. surprised | 21. transportation |
| 2. about | 7. dirty | 12. next | 17. the | 22. us |
| 3. all | 8. first | 13. paying | 18. their | 23. what |
| 4. and | 9. guests | 14. proof | 19. them | 24. within |
| 5. booked | 10. immediately | 15. suitable | 20. told | 25. witnessed |

Tom, the manager of the Paradise Hotel, _____ a couple that they would have to leave the hotel after just one night. The couple had _____ a room for eight nights.

“They wanted a super clean environment,” Tom said. “They should have rented a room in _____ hospital, maybe an operating room. This hotel is clean, but it isn’t germ-free.”

Tom said that on the _____ day the couple brought _____ the sheets and pillowcases down to _____ main lobby and just dropped _____ next to the front desk. They stood there next to this pile of bedding while other _____ looked, pointed, and murmured. The hotel got three cancellations _____ the hour from people who _____ this strange event.

When Tom asked the couple _____ the problem was, they said that _____ bedding was _____ and they wanted it replaced. The couple could not identify any specific “dirt” on the bedding. The wife just said, “We’re

_____ good money to stay here. How dare you doubt _____?
We know the dirt is there. That's all the _____ you need." Tom called room
service, and the bedding was replaced _____.

The _____ day the couple marched to the front desk again
_____ demanded seven cans of spray disinfectant. "We need a can for each
night. We have to spray the phone, the TV, all the door handles, the toilet handle, the
shower stall, the faucet, the sink, and any hotel staff entering our room."

Worried _____ what their demands might be in the following days, Tom
politely suggested that a hotel more _____ for them was just around the
corner. He then called ahead to reserve a "very clean" room, and gave them free
_____ in the hotel limousine.

"They seemed _____ that I suggested a different hotel, _____
they liked the idea that I didn't charge them for the second day, and they really
_____ the limousine service," said Tom.

Appendix 4: Oral Proficiency Test Grading Rubrics

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1	Score
Grammar	Grammar was used to communicate effectively. No more than two errors	Few minor errors, no difficulties in communication arose from not using the grammar correctly.	Frequent errors led to major difficulties in communication and caused misunderstanding.	Grammar was almost entirely inaccurate. Constant errors prevented communication.	
Vocabulary	Vocabulary was broad and precise, used to express ideas appropriately.	Vocabulary was adequate. A few minor difficulties arose from not using the right vocabulary.	Choice of words was sometimes inaccurate. Some difficulties arose due to limited vocabulary.	Vocabulary was very limited and inadequate. Communication was prevented due to lack of vocabulary.	
Fluency	Speech was effortless and smooth. Participant acted as a facilitator, helping the conversation flow and develop by asking and answering the right questions.	Speech was occasionally hesitant. Some minor difficulties maintaining the conversation were evident due to not asking and/or answering the right questions.	Speech was frequently hesitant. Some effort was required to maintain the conversation. Some questions and /or answers were irrelevant.	Speech was very slow with many long pauses and sometimes so halting. Didn't ask questions correctly or answer questions appropriately.	
Comprehension	Participant understood everything and responded to questions with right answers, acknowledged all statements and incorporated them into the conversation.	Participant understood quite well and responded to most questions appropriately, acknowledged most statements, and incorporated many of them into the conversation.	Participant understood very little, failed to answer many questions appropriately and failed to acknowledge some statements.	Participant understood almost nothing. Failed to understand most questions and statements.	
Clarity	Pronunciation was clear and expressions were used to enhance communication. No unnecessary repetitions.	No communication problems arose but better expressions and pronunciation could have made communication more efficient. Some unnecessary repetitions.	Some communication problems arose due to unclear pronunciation and/or lack of expression. Frequent unnecessary repetitions.	Pronunciation and/or expression prevented communication.	

Appendix 5: Tag Question Written Test



Canada's Capital University

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Read the following sentences and for each one add a correct tag question.

1. Mike is your friend,..... ?
2. Sally is eating outside, ?
3. Your sister will be here soon, ?
4. The dogs were not barking at you, ?
5. My friends have never come to class on time, ?
6. Don't come to class late again, ?
7. The birds were singing in the park, ?
8. The little boy should try again, ?
9. The computer was not fixed last week, ?
10. The toy costs a lot of money, ?
11. He had forgotten his homework, ?
12. John and Mary will never go to that theatre again, ?
13. Do your homework before going out, ?
14. You should not talk so loud, ?
15. Jane's brother had a nice car, ?
16. Stop shouting, ?
17. My classmates were not outside, ?
18. Mary was not watching TV at noon, ?
19. They have a big house, ?
20. Open the door, please, ?
21. Peter's sister did not have a bike last year, ?
22. She never goes to school by bus, ?
23. Let's have a party, ?
24. They did not eat pizza for dinner today, ?
25. Tom's parents went to France last month, ?

Appendix 6: Tag Question Oral Test



School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Tag Question Oral Test Part 1:

You will work in pairs. First, Student A will ask the questions and Student B will answer. Then, Student B will ask the questions and Student A will answer.

1. Is the beaver a symbol of Canada?
2. Is it going to rain this summer?
3. Will you have a vacation this summer?
4. Were your parents living in Korea when you were born?
5. Have you ever been to the moon?
6. Were most people sleeping at 3:00 this morning?
7. Should students try harder if they don't do well?
8. Was Ottawa a big city 100 years ago?
9. Does a new car cost \$1000?
10. Had you studied any language before learning English?
11. Will you ever study at elementary school again?
12. Should we drive a car without snow tires in the winter?
13. Did you have a toy when you were a child?
14. Were you outside at 3:00 o'clock this morning?
15. Was it snowing last week?
16. Do you have more than two chairs at your house?
17. Did you watch the movie "Avalanche 2" last week?
18. Does the Prime Minister live in Ottawa?
19. Did you eat fried bananas for breakfast today?
20. Did you speak English last week?

Tag Question Oral Test Part Two

You will work with the same partner. Check the information that your partner provided by using tag questions.

Example:

Student A: The beaver is a symbol of Canada, isn't it?

Student B: Yes, it is. OR No, it isn't.

Student A: The beaver isn't a symbol of Canada, is it?

Student B: No, it isn't. OR Yes, it is.

Appendix 7.1: Pragmatic Test 1 Version 1.



Canada's Capital University

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

In the following activity you have 16 situations with comments on each one. Read the situation first and then the comment.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Peter has trouble reading signs when he's driving. | He doesn't need new glasses, does he |
| 2 | Sally is looking very happy today. | She has a new boyfriend, doesn't she |
| 3 | Frank looked panicked when he opened his briefcase. | He didn't forget to bring the report, did he |
| 4 | You two look so much alike. | You're not twins, are you |
| 5 | Tom never eats cheese or ice cream. | He's allergic to dairy like his sister, isn't he |
| 6 | Everyone noticed that Mary wasn't at the party. | But she was invited to the party, wasn't she |
| 7 | Kathy didn't attend the meeting today. | She has a headache again, doesn't she |
| 8 | Jane looks like she is gaining weight. | But she's been exercising a lot, hasn't she? |
| 9 | Peter did really well in the race today. | He won first prize, didn't he |
| 10 | David took the bus to work today. | But he does have a car, doesn't he |
| 11 | John was absent from work this afternoon. | He had another doctor appointment, didn't he |
| 12 | Mike is so tired this morning, he fell asleep in class. | He was out partying last night, wasn't he |
| 13 | The little boy looks so angry. | His sister didn't break his new toy again, did she |
| 14 | Ann has a cast on her right leg. | She didn't break her leg again, did she |
| 15 | Susan came back from shopping with a huge box. | She bought a new TV, didn't she |
| 16 | George is looking quite depressed after his meeting with his boss. | He just lost his job, didn't he |

Appendix 7.2: Pragmatic Test 1 Version 2



Carleton
UNIVERSITY

Canada's Capital University

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

In the following activity you have 16 situations with comments on each one. Read the situation first and then the comment.

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Peter has trouble reading signs when he's driving. | He really needs new glasses, doesn't he |
| 2 | Sally is looking very happy today. | She doesn't have a new boyfriend, does she |
| 3 | Frank looked panicked when he opened his briefcase. | He forgot to bring the report, didn't he |
| 4 | You two look so much alike. | You're twins, aren't you |
| 5 | Tom never eats cheese or ice cream. | He isn't allergic to dairy like his sister, is he |
| 6 | Everyone noticed that Mary wasn't at the party. | She wasn't invited to the party, was she |
| 7 | Kathy didn't attend the meeting today. | She doesn't have a headache again, does she |
| 8 | Jane looks like she is gaining weight. | She hasn't been exercising much, has she |
| 9 | Peter did really well in the race today. | He didn't win first prize, did he |
| 10 | David took the bus to work today. | He doesn't have a car, does he |
| 11 | John was absent from work this afternoon. | But he didn't have another doctor's appointment, did he |
| 12 | Mike is so tired this morning, he fell asleep in class. | But he wasn't out partying last night, was he |
| 13 | The little boy looks so angry. | His sister broke his new toy again, didn't she |
| 14 | Ann has a cast on her right leg. | She broke her leg again, didn't she |
| 15 | Susan came back from shopping with a huge box. | She didn't buy a new TV, did she |
| 16 | George is looking quite depressed after his meeting with his boss. | But he didn't lose his job, did he |

Appendix 8: Pragmatic Test 2.



**Canada's Capital University
School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies**

The following activity is a conversation between a teacher and a student who usually comes to class late and forgets his assignments. You will read the conversation aloud.

Student: I'm not late for class today, am I.

Teacher: Yes, you are. In fact you're 15 minutes late. You missed your bus again, didn't you.

Student: Yes, unfortunately I did. I am really sorry about that. But I can still come into class, can't I.

Teacher: Yes, you can. And I assume you've forgotten your homework again, haven't you.

Student: But we didn't have any homework for today, did we?

Teacher: Yes, you did. You should have done exercises 4 and 5 for today's class.

Student: That's for Thursday's class, isn't it.

Teacher: That's right and today is Thursday, isn't it.

Student: Oops, I am afraid I made a mistake, I thought today was Wednesday. But I can still hand it in tomorrow, can't I.

Teacher: Well, I suppose so, but let's agree that 2 points will be taken off for lateness.

Student: Oh, okay. Thank you for letting me hand it in late.

Teacher: But it's not going to happen again, is it.

Student: No, sure it isn't.

Later in class

Teacher: Okay class...and now it's time for the quiz.

The same student raises up his hand

Teacher: Yes...

Student: But we don't have a quiz today, do we.

Teacher: Yes, we do. Last week we agreed to have our second quiz today, didn't we.

Student: Oh, yeah! I am afraid I made another mistake.

Teacher: Sounds like you should write everything down in your agenda, shouldn't you.

Student: Yes you're right again. But we can still do it tomorrow, can't we.

Teacher: No. I am afraid this time you're out of luck. But it never hurts to ask, does it.

Appendix 9: The results and the mean scores of AS and NS on the Proficiency Tests:

Proficiency	AS		NS	
	Pass	Score	Pass	Score
AS 1	17	68	15	75
AS 2	25	100	15	75
AS 3	21	84	13	65
AS 4	20	80	13	65
AS 5	5	20	7	35
AS 6	6	24	12	60
AS 7	4	16	9	45
AS 8	4	16	10	50
AS 9	4	16	5	25
AS 10	25	100	16	80
AS 11	24	96	17	85
AS 12	17	68	16	80
AS 13	25	100	18	90
AS 14	25	100	15	85
AS 15	25	100	19	95
AS 16	9	36	10	50
AS 17	25	100	19	95
AS 18	25	100	18	90
AS 19	23	92	17	85
AS 20	25	100	17	85
AS 21	24	96	18	90
AS 22	25	100	14	70
AS 23	25	100	16	80
AS 24	24	96	14	70
AS 25	25	100	19	95
AS 26	25	100	19	95
AS 27	25	100	16	80
AS 28	22	88	16	80
AS 29	25	100	16	80
AS 30	25	100	16	80
AS 31	25	100	18	90
AS 32	25	100	15	75
AS 33				

Proficiency	NS	
	Pass	Score
NS 1	25	100
NS 2	25	100
NS 3	25	100
NS 4	25	100
NS 5	25	100
NS 6	25	100
NS 7	25	100
NS 8	25	100
NS 9	25	100
NS 10	25	100
NS 11		

Appendix 10: The results and the mean scores of AS and NS on the experimental tests

AS	NS	AS	NS	AS	NS	AS	NS
96	95	80	75	81	0	71	28
96	90	100	85	100	0	71	35
100	80	100	45	81	50	71	50
100	90	95	60	87	25	78	50
100	10	100	15	81	0	92	0
100	55	100	20	87	0	71	14
96	85	100	40	93	31	92	50
92	80	100	35	87	21	42	21
96	75	100	25	81	0	85	50
100	90	100	75	93	50	100	42
	100		90		43		42
	55		75		64		50
	90		95		50		50
	95		90		50		50
	100		100		43		50
	40		60		8		50
	90		85		31		21
	100		80		50		64
	90		60		37		42
	95		90		30		42
	100		65		43		57
	90		70		43		50
	90		75		50		50
	85		55		50		42
	95		45		50		42
	85		45		50		42
	92		90		50		42
	80		65		37		35
	92		60		25		0
	96		85		0		21
	100		90		43		42
	100		35		50		0
Mean	77.4	85.9	77.3	85.2	35.1	71.3	35.3

Appendix 11: Error analysis of AS on the Tag Question Written Test.

Participant	No. of Questions	No. of Misheard Tags	Polarity	Modality	Form	Agreement	Emphasis	Intonation	Total
AS 1	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
AS 2	24	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
AS 3	24	4	3	4	3	3	3	0	6
AS 4	24	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
AS 5	24	20	15	13	12	12	15	0	20
AS 6	24	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	1
AS 7	24	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	2
AS 8	24	0	0	2	1	1	3	0	0
AS 9	24	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	0
AS 10	24	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
AS 11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 12	24	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1
AS 13	24	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
AS 14	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
AS 15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 16	24	10	10	2	5	1	2	0	10
AS 17	24	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
AS 18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 19	24	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
AS 20	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
AS 21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 25	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
AS 26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 37	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 38	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 39	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 40	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 41	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 42	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 43	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 44	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 45	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 46	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 47	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 48	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 49	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 50	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 51	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 52	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 53	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 54	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 55	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 56	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 57	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 58	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 59	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 60	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 61	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 62	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 63	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 64	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 65	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 66	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 67	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 68	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 69	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 70	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 71	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 72	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 73	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 74	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 75	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 76	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 77	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 78	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 79	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 80	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 81	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 82	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 83	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 84	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 85	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 86	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 87	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 88	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 89	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 90	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 91	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 92	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 93	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 94	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 95	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 96	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 97	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 98	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 99	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS 100	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		44	47	27	21	25	25	1	102

Appendix 12: Error analysis of NS on the Tag Question Written Test.

Participant	Correct	Incorrect	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix 13: Error analysis of AS on the Tag Question Oral Test.

Participant	Age	Gender	Correct	Incorrect	Total	Correct	Incorrect	Total	Correct
AS01	20	F	3	1	4	3	1	4	75%
AS02	20	F	2	0	2	2	0	2	100%
AS03	20	F	9	6	15	10	5	15	67%
AS04	20	F	3	1	4	3	1	4	75%
AS05	20	F	18	10	28	18	10	28	64%
AS06	20	F	7	3	10	7	3	10	70%
AS07	20	F	4	2	6	4	2	6	67%
AS08	20	F	10	3	13	10	3	13	77%
AS09	20	F	9	6	15	9	6	15	60%
AS10	20	F	3	1	4	3	1	4	75%
AS11	20	F	2	0	2	2	0	2	100%
AS12	20	F	4	1	5	4	1	5	80%
AS13	20	F	1	0	1	1	0	1	100%
AS14	20	F	2	0	2	2	0	2	100%
AS15	20	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
AS16	20	F	4	1	5	4	1	5	80%
AS17	20	F	1	1	2	1	1	2	50%
AS18	20	F	3	0	3	3	0	3	100%
AS19	20	F	6	1	7	6	1	7	86%
AS20	20	F	1	1	2	1	1	2	50%
AS21	20	F	7	2	9	7	2	9	78%
AS22	20	F	2	1	3	2	1	3	67%
AS23	20	F	4	1	5	4	1	5	80%
AS24	20	F	6	4	10	6	4	10	60%
AS25	20	F	5	2	7	5	2	7	71%
AS26	20	F	5	4	9	5	4	9	56%
AS27	20	F	1	1	2	1	1	2	50%
AS28	20	F	3	2	5	3	2	5	60%
AS29	20	F	6	0	6	6	0	6	100%
AS30	20	F	1	0	1	1	0	1	100%
AS31	20	F	9	1	10	9	1	10	90%
AS32	20	F	2	1	3	2	1	3	67%
Total			144	62	206	144	62	206	70%

Appendix 14: Error analysis of NS on the Tag Question Oral Test.

1	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix 15: Intonations provided by NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 1.

	Rising	Falling	Flat		Rising	Falling	Flat
	7	9	0		0	0	16
	8	8	0		0	0	16
	8	8	0		16	0	0
	10	6	0		8	0	6
	7	9	0		0	0	16
	10	6	0		2	0	14
	9	7	0		10	0	6
	8	8	0		4	0	12
	10	6	0		16	0	0
	7	9	0		16	0	0
TOTAL	84	76	0		15	0	1
					14	0	2
					16	0	0
					16	0	0
					13	0	3
					16	0	0
					13	1	2
					15	0	1
					14	0	2
					15	0	1
					14	0	2
					11	0	5
					14	0	2
					16	0	0
					15	0	1
					13	0	3
					16	0	0
					11	0	5
					7	0	9
					0	0	16
					14	0	2
					16	0	0
					TOTAL	366	1
							143

Missed 2

Appendix 16: Intonations provided by both NS and AS on Pragmatic Test 2.

	Rising	Falling	Flat
8	6	0	
10	4	0	
7	7	0	
10	4	0	
8	6	0	
9	5	0	
8	6	0	
6	8	0	
9	5	0	
7	7	0	
TOTAL	82	58	0

	Rising	Falling	Flat
8	1	5	
9	1	4	
14	0	0	
12	1	1	
0	0	14	
2	1	11	
14	0	0	
6	0	8	
14	0	0	
13	0	1	
12	0	2	
13	1	0	
14	0	0	
14	0	0	
11	1	2	
11	0	3	
8	6	0	
8	3	3	
11	0	3	
12	1	1	
10	1	3	
12	0	2	
10	0	4	
12	0	2	
7	4	3	
9	0	5	
11	0	3	
10	0	4	
1	0	13	
4	1	9	
10	0	4	
5	0	9	
TOTAL	307	22	119

Appendix 17: Samples of the AS participants' responses on the Tag Question Oral Test

No.	Statements	Responses
1.	The beaver is a symbol of Canada,	isn't it?, is he?,
2.	It is going to rain this summer,	isn't it?, is it?, won't it?, wouldn't it?, will it?
3.	You will have a vacation this summer,	won't you?, will not you?, will you?, haven't you?, wouldn't you? Will it?
4.	Your parents weren't living in Korea when you were born,	weren't they?, where were they are?, weren't you?, were they?, were you?
5.	You have never been to the moon,	have you?, haven't you?, were you?,
6.	Most people were sleeping at 3:00 this morning,	weren't they?, weren't they are?, were they?, were not they?
7.	Students should try harder if they don't do well,	shouldn't they?, do they?, don't well?, should you?, should they?
8.	Ottawa wasn't a big city 100 years ago,	was it?, wasn't it?,
9.	A new car doesn't cost \$1000,	doesn't it?, does it?, do it?, did it?
10.	You had studied another language before learning English,	hadn't you?, had you?, aren't you?, haven't you?, did you?
11.	You will never study at elementary school again,	will you?, won't you?, will not he?
12.	We shouldn't drive a car without snow tires in the winter,	should we?, shouldn't they?, shouldn't we?,
13.	You had a toy when you were a child,	didn't you?, hadn't you?, haven't you?, have you?, did you?,
14.	You weren't outside at 3:00 o'clock this morning,	were you?, weren't you?, were they?
15.	It wasn't snowing last week,	was it?, wasn't it?,
16.	You have more than two chairs at your house,	don't you?, haven't you?, didn't you?, did you?, have you?
17.	You didn't watch the movie "Avalanche 2" last week	didn't you?, did you?, have you?, does you?
18.	The Prime Minister lives in Ottawa,	doesn't he?, does he?, doesn't it?, isn't he?, did he?,
19.	You didn't eat fried bananas for breakfast today,	did you?, didn't you?, do you eat?, didn't he?
20.	You spoke English last week	didn't you?, did you?, don't you?, weren't you?, did he?

Appendix 18: Samples of the NS participants' responses on the Tag Question Oral Test

No.	Sentence	Tag Question
1.	The beaver is a symbol of Canada,	isn't it?, is he?,
2.	It is going to rain this summer,	isn't it?
3.	You will have a vacation this summer,	won't you?, don't you?, aren't you?
4.	Your parents weren't living in Korea when you were born,	weren't they?, were they,
5.	You have never been to the moon,	have you?, haven' you?
6.	Most people were sleeping at 3:00 this morning,	weren't they?, were they?
7.	Students should try harder if they don't do well,	shouldn't they?, do they?, should you?, should they?,
8.	Ottawa wasn't a big city 100 years ago,	was it?,
9.	A new doesn't car cost \$1000,	doesn't it?, does it?, do they?
10.	You had studied another language before learning English,	hadn't you?, had you?, didn't you?
11.	You will never study at elementary school again,	will you?, won't you?
12.	We shouldn't drive a car without snow tires in the winter,	should we?,
13.	You had a toy when you were a child,	didn't you?
14.	You weren't outside at 3:00 o'clock this morning,	were you?, weren't you?,
15.	It wasn't snowing last week,	was it?, wasn't it?
16.	You have more than two chairs at your house,	don't you?,
17.	You didn't watch the movie "Avalanche 2" last week	did you?, didn't you?
18.	The Prime Minister lives in Ottawa,	doesn't he?
19.	You didn't eat fried bananas for breakfast today,	did you?, didn't you?
20.	You spoke English last week	didn't you?

References

- Algeo, J. (1988). The tag question in British English: It's different, i'n'it? *English World-Wide*, 9 (2), 171-191.
- Algeo, J. (1990). It's a myth, innit? Politeness and the English tag question. In: Christopher Ricks and Leonard Michaels (Eds.), *The state of the language*. 443-450. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Applebaum, S. D. & Taborek, E. (1986). Developing oral placement tests for community-based language programs. *TESOL Canada Journal*, 3 (Special Issue), 207-223.
Retrieved from:
<http://journals.sfu.ca/tesl/index.php/tesl/article/viewFile/1006/825>.
- Armagost, L. (1972). English declarative tags, intonation tags, and tag questions. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Learning*, X, 1-54.
- Beardsmore, H. (1979). The problem of tags. *English language teaching*, 25 (1), 14-19.
- Berninger, G., & Garvey, C. (1982). Tag construction: structure and function in child discourse. *Journal of Child Language*, 9, 151-168.
- Bennett, W. (1989). The structure of English tag questions. *Word*, 3 (40), 315-333.
- Biber, D., Stig J., Geoffrey, L., Conrad, S., & Edward F. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (2004 a). Performance assessment: Existing literature and directions for research. *Second Language Studies*, 22(2), 91-139.
- Brown, J. D. (2004 b). What do we mean by bias, Englishes, Englishes in testing, and English language proficiency? *World Englishes*, 23 (2), 317-319.
- Brown, R. (1973). *A first language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, R., & Hanlon, C. (1970). Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In J. R. Hayes (Ed.), *Cognition and the development of language*. (pp 10-19). New York: Wiley.
- Bublitz, W. (1979). Tag questions, transformational grammar and pragmatics. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 9, 5 - 22.

- Cattell, R. (1973). Negative transportations and tag questions. *Language*, 49, 612-639.
- Cheng, K. (1995). It is a tag question, isn't it? In *the English teacher XXIV*, pp. 1-11
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2001). 'She knows more about Hong Kong than you do isn't it': Tags in Hong Kong conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (9), 1419-1439.
- Culicover, P. (1992). English tag questions in universal grammar. *Lingua*, 88, 193-226.
- Dennis, M., Sugar, J. & Whitaker, H. (1982). The acquisition of tag questions. *Child development* 53 (4), 1254-1257.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, B. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24, 37-53.
- El-Hassan, S. (1988). The intonation of questions in English and Arabic. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 22, 97-108.
- Ferrel, A., Holm, W., Murphy, P. & Spolsky, B. (1972). Three functional tests of oral proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 6 (3), 221-235.
- Folland, D. & Robertson, D. (1976). Towards objectivity in group oral testing. *ELT Journal*, XXX (2), 156-167.
- Helen, W. (1975). English declarative tags, intonation tags, and tag questions. In *archiv fir das stadium der neueren sprachen und literaturen* , 212 (2), pp. 359-361.
- Holmes, J. (1990). Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. *Language & Communication*, 10 (3), 185-205
- Holmes, J. (1986). Functions of *you know* in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society*, 15 (1), 1-21.
- Holmes, J. (1983). The functions of tag questions. *English Language Research Journal*, 3, 40-65
- Holmes, J. (1982). Expressing doubts and certainty in English. *RELC Journal*, 13 (2), 9-28.

- Holmes, J. & Stubbe, M. (1995). You know, eh and other “exasperating expressions”: An analysis of social and stylistic variation in the use of pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. *Language & Communication*, 15 (1), 63-88.
- Huddleston, R. (1970). Two approaches to the analysis of tags. *JL*, 6, 215-222.
- Hudson, R. (1975). The meaning of questions. *Language*, 31, 1-32.
- Klein-Braley, C. (1997). C-Tests in the context of reduced redundancy testing: an appraisal. *Language Testing*, 14 (1), 47-84.
- Lakoff, R. (1969b). A syntactic argument for negative transportation. *CLS*, 5, 140-147
- Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-225). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Levis, J. M. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice, revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (1), 37-63.
- Mills, A. E. (1981). It is easier in German, isn't it? The question of tag questions in a bilingual child. *Journal of Child Language*, 8, 641-647.
- Moskal, Barbara M. (2003). Recommendations for developing classroom performance assessments and scoring rubrics. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8 (14). Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=14>.
- North, B. & Schneider, G. (1998). Scaling descriptors for language proficiency scales. *Language Testing*, 15 (2) 217-263.
- Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia: status, features, functions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richard, B. J. (1988, March). “Not wee-wee had he? Individual differences and the development of tag questions in two- and three-year-olds. Paper presented at the child language seminar, University of Warwick, England.
- Roever, C. (2011). Testing of second language pragmatics: Past and future. *Language Testing*, 28 (4), 463-481.

- Rossi, G. J. (1983). Foreign language proficiency testing: A selected, annotated guide to standardized instruments, Rating Scales, and Literature. *The French Review*, 56 (6), 840-858.
- Todd, P. (1982). Tagging after the red herrings: evidence against the processing capacity explanation in child language. *Journal of Child Language*, 9, 99-114.
- W. Oller, J. (1979). *Language tests at school*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Weeks, L. (1991). Preschooler's production of tag questions and adherence to the polarity-principle. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 21 (1), 31-40.