

Are There Any Differences Between the Native Speakers and Chinese English Learners in Using Rising Declaratives?

CHEN Zhenyun^{[a],*}

^[a]Shanghai University of Engineering Science, China. *Corresponding author.

Received 8 December 2014; accepted 20 March 2015 Published online 25 April 2015

Abstract

This article reports on an empirical study investigating whether Chinese English learners are able to make the similar choices to the native speakers for the questions, especially the rising declaratives, in different scenarios. Results suggest that language transfer has an eminent influence on the Chinese English learners in making the choices, showing intense negative transfer in this process. However, there is divergence between the questions in different specific conditions. The effects of language transfer are manifested comparatively clearly in the context where only rising interrogatives, or both interrogatives and rising declaratives can be uses as questions. Consequently, this quantitative study can explicitly reflect to what degree and in which aspects the cross-linguistic effects can influence the using of questions among the Chinese English speakers.

Key words: Questions; Rising declaratives; Language transfer; Quantitative study

Chen, Z. Y. (2015). Are There Any Differences Between the Native Speakers and Chinese English Learners in Using Rising Declaratives?. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *10*(4), 51-59. Available from: http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/6885 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/6885

INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts to test the effects of *language transfer* (Odlin, 1989) on the English rising declaratives as questions used by Chinese English learners. Our hypothesis is that Chinese English learners tend to overuse

English rising declaratives to substitute interrogatives as questions, that is, there exists *negative transfer* (Odlin, 1989) among the Chinese learners.

In the field of second language acquisition and cognitive linguistics, *language transfer* is one of the most important concerns for linguists to make the researches in methodology and cross-cultural comparison. The researches show that *language transfer* can occur at all levels (phonology, lexis, morphology, syntax and pragmatics) and all phases, (Navés *et al.*, 2005; Burton, 2013), in addition, *language transfer* can be positive--the bilingual children scored higher than the monolingual children on a grammaticality judgment test (Foursha-Stevenson *et al.*, 2011), negative--the multilingual learners usually make some mistakes during the study of third language because of the interference of second language (Yang, 2012), or both (Keung & Ho, 2009).

Chinese questions study mainly focus on the classification or typology of Chinese questions (Wu, 2004 & 2008; Zhao, 2006; Yin, 2007; Shao, 2012), syntactic, semantic or pragmatic analysis on Chinese questions (Chen, 2012; Long, 2012; Xue, 2014;), or contrast studies of Chinese and English questions (Li, 2012). As for the effects of *transfer* on English questions acquisition, in which the quantitative research is rare, however, then all the hypotheses or deduction about it lack the support of data. For the purpose of testifying whether language transfer have effects on the Chinese English learners acquiring English questions, we designed a questionnaire which involves 25 items, including 5 scenarios in which only interrogatives can be used as questions, 5 only rising declaratives are appropriate, 5 both can be used and the other 10 as the fillers. The questionnaire is revised by two native speakers and two pilot studies of three native speakers respectively and another two pilot studies of 10 Chinese learners respectively have been conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

1. INTERRROGATIVES AND RISING DECLARATIVES AS QUESTIONS AND LANGUAGE TRANSFER

Herein, the terms interrogative and declarative refer to syntactic sentence types. Both interrogatives and rising declaratives will serve as questions, which are not limited to information questions in this paper, however. Ginzburg & Sag (2000) argue that a root declarative clause is used to make an assertion, while a root interrogative clause is to make a query. There is a class of utterances which have a declarative form but have been analyzed as interrogatives, or as having the effect of a query. They are called as 'intonation question', 'rising declarative', 'declarative question' or 'questioning declarative' (Abeille *et al.*, 2013: 129).

Gunlogson (2003) stated the equivalence of effects between rising declarative questions and interrogatives as :

If an utterance of \uparrow Sdecl is a polar question in C, \uparrow Sdecl(C) = \uparrow Sinterr(C) = C, where \uparrow Sinterr and \uparrow Sdecl have the same descriptive content.

Interrogatives are uninformative by nature, while declaratives satisfy the Uninformativeness Condition--an utterance of a locution L is a polar question in C only if L is uninformative with respect to $cs_{Addr}(C)$ --only when the Addressee is already publicly committed to the descriptive content of the declarative, which is a contextual condition that limits the possibility of declaratives as questions. Generally, we assume that declaratives express a bias that is absent with the use of interrogatives; they cannot be used as neutral questions. A rising declarative is more marked as a question than an interrogative with the same content (Gunlogson, 2003).

Different from English, as a typical wh-in situ language, Chinese lack the kind of syntactic distinction that defines the declarative-interrogative contrast in English. Even though (Ginzburg, 2013:127) argues that English also possesses in situ unary interrogatives which express regular information question, subjectauxiliary-inversion clauses are the main form of query in English (which conforms to Gunlogson's argument). In this case, we can boldly infer that cross-linguistic influence will have effects on the Chinese English learners acquiring English questions. Such influence is termed Language Transfer (Odlin, 1989), which has often been distinguished as borrowing transfer and substratum transfer. Borrowing transfer concerns with how and to what degree a second language influences an acquired language, while substratum transfer is about how and to what degree a source language affects the acquisition of a target language cross-linguistically. Since this article will focus on native language influences, the term language transfer or transfer or will hereafter refer to substratum transfer. Language transfer can be negative or positive. Negative transfer includes 'cross-linguistic influences resulting in errors, over-production, underproduction, miscomprehension, and other effects' (Odlin, 1989: 167). *Positive transfer* involves 'any facilitating effects on acquisition due to the influence of cross-linguistic similarities. '(Odlin, 1989: 168)

English as a target language has such a distinction with Chinese as a source language in syntactic structure, thus we can make an assumption that the nature of Chinese questions lacking formal distinction has the effects of *negative transfer* on the behavior of English learners using English questions. To determine if *language transfer* exists, we carry out the following empirical study.

2. EMPIRICAL STUDY

2.1 Design

We designed a questionnaire including 25 items, each of which has a scenario to control the answers. The five scenarios that function as the contexts in which a rising interrogative is acceptable but the corresponding rising declarative is unacceptable as a question are classified into Type A, five scenarios that work as the contexts in which rising declaratives are acceptable as questions and rising interrogatives are not are grouped into Type B, and another five scenarios that serve as the contexts in which both the rising interrogative and the rising declarative versions of a question are acceptable are into Type C. And the other ten are fillers.

What we primarily concern are Type B and Type C since our aim is to observe whether there is the negative transfer in the learners' acquisition of rising declaratives as questions. Gunlogson (2003) states that contexts in which rising declaratives can be used as questions but rising interrogatives cannot be are rare to non-existent. There are chiefly two kinds: echoing questions and declaratives involving sorts of modifiers or bias markers (such as of course), which are the construction fundamentals for Type B. Type C aims at finding whether there exists the tendency or preference of using rising declarative as questions among Chinese participants. The existence of this tendency can prove our hypothesis that there is *negative transfer*.

2.2 Participants

Ten native undergraduate students at age 20-21 were enrolled in the native group, among which 7 copies of questionnaire are valid, 46 Chinese undergraduates at the same age participated in the study, with 37 copies valid, and 18 Chinese graduates are in another group, with 1 copy invalid.

The native speaker group works as the control group. The Chinese undergraduates are sophomores of a Shanghai university who have learned English at least 13 years, and those in the graduate group who specialize in English are expected that whose behavior would resemble the native speakers more than the undergraduate group.

3. RESULTS

The results of the independent t test indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the natives and the undergraduates in Type B and Type C, and the difference exists in Type A, even though there are only two items reflecting the difference. The detailed results are as follows¹:

	<i>t</i> -value	р	
Item 1 (Type A)	t(36)=2.09	0.04	
Item 25 (Type A)	t(36)=2.38	0.02	
Item 6 (Type B)	t(42)=2.58	0.01	
Item 12(Type B)	t(36)=7.699	0.00	
Item 21(Type B)	t(42)=2.37	0.02	
Item 23(Type B)	t(36)=3.65	0.00	
Item 8 (Type C)	t(6.54)=2.56	0.04	
Item 14 (Type C)	t(6.78)=2.41	0.05	
Item 16 (Type C)	t(6.40)=2.84	0.03	

Meanwhile, the results of the independent t test between the native group and the graduates were not significant except item 12 and 16, showing that there is no significant difference between them.

	<i>t</i> -value	р
Item 12(Type B)	<i>t</i> (16)=2.22	0.04
Item 16 (Type C)	t(6.96)=2.74	0.03

4. CONCLUSION

Before making the conclusion that negative transfer influences the acquisition of rising declarative as questions among the Chinese undergraduates, we should make a deeper research in the reasons which lead to the differences. First analysis will begin with Type B, in which 4 items manifest difference. But opposite to our expectation that most participants will choose rising declaratives as questions since Chinese lack the subjectauxiliary-inversion form in questioning, the majority of them (item 6: 73%; item 12: 62%; item 21: 68%; item 23: 30%) chose interrrogatives. The only exception is the ninth item of the questionnaire, different from the other four which are either echoing questions or with modifiers in the middle of the sentences, whose bias marker is in the initial position of the sentence:

Item 9. Scenario: A and B notice that their friend Jane's car is parked in front of her office building.

A: Jane's car is parked in front.

B's response:

a. Therefore is she in the office?

b. Therefore she's in the office?

In addition, compared with the other three, the proportion of those who chose interrogatives as questions in item 23 is lower. The reason is that this is not a strict echoing question, instead, it is a statement that shows the surprise of the speaker:

Item 23. Scenario: B is hosting a party for all of his friends. He invited his pal Professor Johnny but he doesn't expect that he will show up because they have just had a fight.

A: Your friend Professor Johnny has arrived,

B's response:

a. He's here? He came here?

b. Is he here? Did he come here?

Between the natives and the Chinese graduates, the differences exist only in two items: item 12 of Type B and item 16 of Type C. Item 12 is an echoing question, and only 4 out of 17 chose interrogative as the form of query, consequently this is not significant compared with the undergraduate group. It terms of Type C, the graduate group present preference to the rising declarative except item 16:

Item 16.Scenario: In the copy room, A notices that her coworker B is struggling to use one of the two printers.

A:That printer tray is empty.

a. Is it? Thanks. I'll use another one.

b. It is? Thanks. I'll use another one.

It seems apparently that we cannot absolutely prove the existence of *negative transfer* in Type B that only rising declaratives are acceptable as questions and Type C that both the rising interrogative and the rising declarative versions of a question are acceptable.

REFERENCES

- Abeille, A, (2013). Danièle Godard and Jean-Marie Marandin. In P. Hofmeister & E. Norcliffe (Eds.), *French Questioning Declaratives in Question. The Core and the Periphery* (pp.129-161). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Burton, G. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence in non-native languages: explaining lexical transfer using language production models. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *10*(1), 46-59.
- Chen, X. L. (2012). *Meaning deviation and high-level metonymy in the modern Chinese interrogative sentence. Foreign Language Research*, (6), 30-34.
- Foursha-Stevenson, C., & Nicoladis, E. (2011). Early emergence of syntactic awareness and cross-linguistic influence in bilingual children's Judgments. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15, 521-534.

Ginzburg, J., & Sag, I. A. (2000). Interrogative investigations: the form, meaning and use of English interrogatives. *CSLI Lecture Notes*, (123). Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Ginzburg, J. (2013). Questions about Questions. In P. Hofmeister & E. Norcliffe (Eds.), *The core and the Periphery*, (pp.125-

¹ Notes: The statistics of independent t test is in Appendix I.

B's response:

128). Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Gunlogson, C. (2003). *True to form: Rising and falling declaratives as questions in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Keung, Y. C., & Connie S. H. H. (2009). Transfer of readingrelated cognitive skills in learning to read Chinese (L1) and English (L2) among Chinese elementary school children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, (34), 103-112.
- Li, E. (2012). Contrastive studies of Chinese and English imperative questions. Journal of Shanxi University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition), 35(2), 32-37.
- Long, Y Z. (2010). Functional features of interrogative sentences in modern Chinese phatic communication. *Journal of Yunan Normal University (Teaching and Research on Chinese as A Foreign Language Edition)*, 8(6), 15-20.
- Navés, T., Miralpeix, I., & Celaya, M. L. (2005). Who transfers more...and what? Cross-linguistic Influence in relation to school grade and language dominance in EFL. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(2), 113-134.
- Odlin, T. (1989). Language transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in language learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Shao, J. (2012). The function of modal particle " $A(\mathfrak{P})$ " in interrogative sentences and the introspection of relevant methodology. Linguistic Sciences, 11(6), 596-602.
- Wu, Z. S. (2004). Semantic and pragmatic classification of answers and interrogative statements in modern Chinese. Journal of Guizhou university for Ethnic Minorities (Philosophy and social science), (1), 112-116.
- Wu, Z. S. (2008). Two kinds of different interrogative angle in modern Chinese language. *Journal of Chuxiong Normal* University, 23(7), 73-68.
- Xue, X. Y. (2014). On the non-interrogative use of Chinese wh-phrases. Journal of Hunan University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition), 17(3), 128-132.
- Yang, L. (2012). Analysis of French teaching from the perspective of language interference theory. *Journal of Jixi* University, 12(5), 61-62.
- Yin, H. B. (2007). Speech performance types of modern Chinese interrogatives. *Journal of Jianghan University(Humanities Sciences)*, 26(3), 47-51.
- Zhao, Q. (2006). Questionless questions--reclassification of questions as pragmatic entities. *Journal of Chongqing Institute of Technology*, 20(3), 142-146.

APPENDIX I STATISTICS OF INDEPENDENT T TEST STATISICS OF INDEPENDENT *T* TEST

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TypeA01	Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	1.06	.243	.059
TypeA05	Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	.94	.243	.059
TypeA18	Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	.82	.529	.128
TypeA20	Native	7	1.14	.378	.143
	nonnative graduate	17	.94	.429	.104
TypeA25	Native	7	1.00	.000ª	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	1.00	$.000^{a}$.000
ТуреВ06	Native	7	.71	.488	.184
	nonnative graduate	17	.35	.493	.119
ТуреВ09	Native	7	.86	.690	.261
	nonnative graduate	17	.82	.393	.095
TypeB12	Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	.76	.437	.106
ТуреВ21	Native	7	.86	.690	.261
	nonnative graduate	17	.41	.618	.150
ТуреВ23	Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
	nonnative graduate	17	.88	.332	.081
TypeC03	Native	7	.86	.900	.340
	nonnative graduate	17	.53	.624	.151
TypeC08	Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
	nonnative graduate	17	.59	.507	.123
TypeC11	Native	7	1.00	.816	.309

To be continued

Continued					
	nonnative graduate	17	.53	.514	.125
TypeC14	Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
	nonnative graduate	17	.82	.529	.128
TypeC16	Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
	nonnative graduate	17	.18	.393	.095

a. t cannot be computed because the standard deviations of both group are 0.

Group Statistics

Croup	N	Moon	Std Doviation	Std. Error Mean
1				
	,			.000 .052
-				.052
				.000
-				
				.000
-				.069
				.143
-				.057
				.000
C				.057
				.184
-				.072
				.261
-				.083
			.000	.000
nonnative undergraduates	37	.38	.492	.081
Native	7	.86	.690	.261
nonnative undergraduates	37	.35	.484	.080
Native	7	1.00	.000	.000
nonnative undergraduates	37	.73	.450	.074
Native	7	.86	.900	.340
nonnative undergraduates	37	.22	.417	.069
Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
nonnative undergraduates	37	.24	.435	.072
Native	7	1.00	.816	.309
nonnative undergraduates	37	.57	.502	.083
Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
nonnative undergraduates	37	.30	.520	.085
Native	7	1.14	.900	.340
nonnative undergraduates	37	.16	.374	.061
	Independent Sa	mples Test		
	nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native nonnative undergraduates Native	Native7nonnative undergraduates37Native7nonnative undergraduates37Native7 <tr< td=""><td>Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .89 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .92 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .92 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.14 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .24 Native 7 .24 Native 7 .86 nonnative undergraduates 37 .38 Native 7 .86 nonnative undergraduates 37 .35 Native 7 .66 nonnative undergraduates 37 .73 Native 7 1.00 <td< td=""><td>Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.89.315Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.92.277Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.419Native71.14.378nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native7.71.488nonnative undergraduates37.24.435Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.54.505Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.38.492Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.35.484Native7.100.000nonnative undergraduates37.22.417Native7.1.00.86.900nonnative undergraduates37.24.435Native7.1.00.816nonnative undergraduates37.57.502Native7.1.14.900nonnative undergraduates37.57.502Native7.1.14.900n</td></td<></td></tr<>	Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .89 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .92 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .92 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.14 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .86 Native 7 1.00 nonnative undergraduates 37 .24 Native 7 .24 Native 7 .86 nonnative undergraduates 37 .38 Native 7 .86 nonnative undergraduates 37 .35 Native 7 .66 nonnative undergraduates 37 .73 Native 7 1.00 <td< td=""><td>Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.89.315Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.92.277Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.419Native71.14.378nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates37.86.347Native7.71.488nonnative undergraduates37.24.435Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.54.505Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.38.492Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates37.35.484Native7.100.000nonnative undergraduates37.22.417Native7.1.00.86.900nonnative undergraduates37.24.435Native7.1.00.816nonnative undergraduates37.57.502Native7.1.14.900nonnative undergraduates37.57.502Native7.1.14.900n</td></td<>	Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .89.315Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .92.277Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .86.419Native71.14.378nonnative undergraduates 37 .86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .86.347Native71.00.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .86.347Native7.71.488nonnative undergraduates 37 .24.435Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates 37 .54.505Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates 37 .38.492Native7.86.690nonnative undergraduates 37 .35.484Native7.100.000nonnative undergraduates 37 .22.417Native7.1.00.86.900nonnative undergraduates 37 .24.435Native7.1.00.816nonnative undergraduates 37 .57.502Native7.1.14.900nonnative undergraduates 37 .57.502Native7.1.14.900n

		Levene's Equal Varia	ity of			<i>t</i> -test f				
		F	Sig.	t	t df	df Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TypeA01	Equal variances assumed	4. 195	.047	.900	42	.373	.108	.120	134	.351
	Equal variances not assumed			2.089	36.000	.044	.108	.052	.003	.213
TypeA05	Equal variances assumed	2.837	.100	.768	42	.447	.081	.106	132	.294
	Equal variances not assumed			1.782	36.000	.083	.081	.045	011	.173
TypeA18	Equal variances assumed	5. 699	.022	.845	42	.403	.135	.160	188	.458

To be continued

Continue	d									
	Equal variances not assumed			1.961	36.000	.058	.135	.069	005	.275
TypeA20	Equal variances assumed	.011	.916	1.920	42	.062	.278	.145	014	.570
	Equal variances not assumed			1.807	8.027	.108	.278	.154	076	.632
TypeA25	Equal variances assumed	5.866	.020	1.022	42	.313	.135	.132	132	.402
	Equal variances not assumed			2.372	36.000	.023	.135	.057	.020	.251
TypeB06	Equal variances assumed	.192	.663	2.580	42	.013	.471	.183	.103	.839
	Equal variances not assumed			2.381	7.910	.045	.471	.198	.014	.928
TypeB09	Equal variances assumed	.010	.923	1.434	42	.159	.317	.221	129	.762
	Equal variances not assumed			1.157	7.266	.284	.317	.274	326	.959
TypeB12	Equal variances assumed	106.249	.000	3.313	42	.002	.622	.188	.243	1.000
	Equal variances not assumed			7.690	36.000	.000	.622	.081	.458	.786
TypeB21	Equal variances assumed	.149	.702	2.367	42	.023	.506	.214	.075	.937
	Equal variances not assumed			1.855	7.158	.105	.506	.273	136	1.148
ТуреВ23	Equal variances assumed	24.970	.000	1.573	42	.123	.270	.172	076	.617
	Equal variances not assumed			3.651	36.000	.001	.270	.074	.120	.420
TypeC03	Equal variances assumed	12.497	.001	3.021	42	.004	.641	.212	.213	1.069
	Equal variances not assumed			1.847	6. 497	.110	.641	.347	192	1.474
TypeC08	Equal variances assumed	11. 554	.001	4.141	42	.000	.900	.217	.461	1.338
	Equal variances not assumed			2.589	6.540	.038	.900	.348	.066	1.733
TypeC11	Equal variances assumed	.853	.361	1.880	42	.067	.432	.230	032	.897
	Equal variances not assumed			1.354	6.884	.219	.432	.319	326	1.190
TypeC14	Equal variances assumed	5.821	.020	3.481	42	.001	.846	.243	.355	1.336
	Equal variances not assumed			2. 411	6. 777	.048	.846	.351	.011	1.680
TypeC16	Equal variances assumed	15.706	.000	4.905	42	.000	.981	.200	.577	1.384
	Equal variances not assumed			2.838	6. 397	.028	.981	.346	.148	1.814
				1 4 6	males Te					

Are There Any Differences Between the Native Speakers and Chinese English Learners in Using Rising Declaratives?

Independent Samples Test

		Levene for Equ Varia	ality of			t-1	test for Equa	15		
		F	F Sig.	. t	t df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TypeA01	Equal variances assumed	1.825	.190	633	22	.533	059	.093	251	.134
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.000	16.000	.332	059	.059	184	.066
TypeA05	Equal variances assumed	1.825	.190	.633	22	.533	.059	.093	134	.251
	Equal variances not assumed			1.000	16.000	.332	.059	.059	066	.184
TypeA18	Equal variances assumed	8.545	.008	.872	22	.393	.176	.202	243	.596
	Equal variances not assumed			1.376	16.000	.188	.176	.128	095	.448
TypeA20	Equal variances assumed	.024	.879	1.081	22	.291	.202	.187	185	.589
	Equal variances not assumed			1.141	12.705	.275	.202	.177	181	.584

To be continued

Continued

		Levene for Equ Varia	ality of	t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	of the D	ence Interval ifference
									Lower	Upper
TypeB06	Equal variances assumed	.430	.519	1.638	22	.116	.361	.221	096	.819
	Equal variances not assumed			1.644	11.343	.127	.361	.220	121	.843
TypeB09	Equal variances assumed	1.955	.176	.152	22	.880	.034	.221	425	.492
	Equal variances not assumed			.121	7.658	.907	.034	.278	612	.679
TypeB12	Equal variances assumed	16.477	.001	1.405	22	.174	.235	.167	112	.583
	Equal variances not assumed			2.219	16.000	.041	.235	.106	.010	.460
TypeB21	Equal variances assumed	.082	.777	1.553	22	.135	.445	.287	149	1.040
	Equal variances not assumed			1.480	10.205	.169	.445	.301	223	1.114
ТуреВ23	Equal variances assumed	4. 556	.044	.925	22	.365	.118	.127	146	.381
	Equal variances not assumed			1.461	16.000	.163	.118	.081	053	.288
TypeC03	Equal variances assumed	1.677	.209	1.028	22	.315	.328	.319	334	.989
	Equal variances not assumed			.880	8.489	.403	.328	.372	522	1.178
TypeC08	Equal variances assumed	5.661	.026	1.934	22	.066	.555	.287	040	1.149
	Equal variances not assumed			1.534	7.625	.166	.555	.362	287	1.396
TypeC11	Equal variances assumed	.338	.567	1.713	22	.101	.471	.275	099	1.040
	Equal variances not assumed			1.414	8.042	.195	.471	.333	296	1.238
TypeC14	Equal variances assumed	4.388	.048	1.092	22	.287	.319	.292	287	.926
	Equal variances not assumed			.879	7. 768	.406	.319	.363	523	1.162
TypeC16	Equal variances assumed	10.178	.004	3.729	22	.001	.966	.259	.429	1.504
J1 -	Equal variances not assumed			2.736	6. 963	.029	.966	.353	.130	1.802

Age:

First Language:

How long have you learned English: years.

For each scenario below, indicate by circling whether one or both sentences are appropriate.

- 1) Scenario: a question on an exam a. Is the Earth bigger than Jupiter? b. The Earth is bigger than Jupiter?
- 2) Scenario: Mary is talking about something that happened to her this afternoon. a. I saw Jim's playing the football. b. I saw Jim playing the football.
- Scenario: A and B are discussing plans to have a party at their house. Their friend Mary wanted to invite many 3) people but A is worried whether they can host so many people. A: Mary would have called everyone. B's response: a. And do you think that's okay? b. And you think that's okay?
- 4) Scenario: A is asked to serve as a witness in a court trial in which his boss is accused. A is telling his friend B: a. My boss asked me not to tell the truth.

b. My boss asked me to not tell the truth.

- 5) Scenario: A and B are considering hiring Jim as a new employee. A says:a. The question is, does he have the qualification?b. The question is, he has the qualification?
- 6) Scenario: Two school administers are discussing schedule changes for that semester.a. Has Professor Smith of course been informed of the schedule change?b. Professor Smith has of course been informed of the schedule change?
- 7). Scenario: A and B are discussing about classical music.a. I like Mozart more than Beethoven.b. I like Mozart better than Beethoven.
- 8) Scenario: A is complaining to his friend B that everyone gossips in his new work place.
 a. You know what I don't understand? Everyone seems to know everyone else's business.
 b. Do you know what I don't understand? Everyone seems to know everyone else's business.
- 9) Scenario: A and B notice that their friend Jane's car is parked in front of her office building.
 A: Jane's car is parked in front.
 B's response:
 a. Therefore is she in the office?
 - b. Therefore she's in the office?
- Scenario: A and B are discussing a movie they saw recently.
 A: I didn't like Woody Allen's new movie.
 B's response:

 a. I didn't like it, either.
 b. I didn't like it, too.
- Scenario: A is telling B the latest news about Professor Smith.A: Professor Smith has taken early retirement.B's response:a. You said he officially retired? I thought he'd taken a sabbatical.
 - b. Did you say he officially retired? I thought he'd taken a sabbatical.
- 12) Scenario: A is telling B that he spotted a snake on the balcony. B cannot believe it. A: There's a snake in the balcony. B's response:a. Is there a snake in the balcony?b. There's a snake in the balcony?
- 13) Scenario: In the library, a student wants to borrow a copy of Hamlet, but the only available copy he can find is damaged. So he goes to the front desk where a librarian is working.a. I want a different book from this one.b. I want a book different from this one.
- Scenario: A knows that B has recently bought a new toaster but he cannot seem to find it.A: Where is the new toaster?B's response:a. In the kitchen. You didn't notice it?b. In the kitchen. Didn't you notice it?
- 15) Scenario: There is a bad professor at A's school who has bad reputation for asking personal questions. A feels uncomfortable at the idea of taking the class and he is complaining to his friend B. B says:a. You can simply not answer the question, can you?

b. You can simply not answer the question, can't you?

- Scenario: In the copy room, A notices that her coworker B is struggling to use one of the two printers. A:That printer tray is empty. B's response:
 a. Is it? Thanks. I'll use another one.
 b. It is? Thanks, I'll use another one.
- 17) Scenario: A is a close friend of Janica and she calls her house for a chat. Instead, Janica's roommate B answers the phone.

A: May I speak to Janica? B's response:

a. I'm afraid she's not here. Didn't you know that she's on vacation?

- b. I'm afraid she's not here. Did you know that she's on vacation?
- 18). Scenario: A is eating a piece of papaya. B is walking by and wants to start a conversation and says:a. Is that a papaya?b. That's a papaya?
- 19) Scenario: A just came back from a wonderful vacation in Hawaii and since then she won't stopping talking about it.

A: everyone should visit Hawaii at least once.

B's response:

a. Not all people can have the chance.

- b. All people cannot have the chance.
- 20) Scenario: In a court hearing, a defence lawyer is questioning a witness.a. You're a member of the audit committee?b. Are you a member of the audit committee?
- 21) Scenario: Professor Smith's student Ann knows that he leaves his office at 5 Pm every day. Even though it's 5:15, she is wondering if he's still there by chance and asks the secretary.a. Has Professor Smith presumably left already?b. Professor Smith has presumably left already?
- 22) Scenario: A and B are discussing whether two songs have classical influences. A thinks that they do, but B disagrees.a. Neither of them had no classical influences.b. Both of them had no classical influences.
- 23) Scenario: After a long bus ride, John looks ill. Mary comments to his friend Mike:a. Perhaps he has motion sickness?b. Perhaps does he have motion sickness?
- 24) Scenario: Ann is a fruit seller at the market. She helps a customer find apples and oranges and she says:a. There's something else you need?b. There's anything else you need?
- 25) Scenario: A is going for a walk and notices a passerby walking a dog, and he feels curious about the dog's breed. He says:Pardon me, but...a. That's a German Shepherd?
 - b. Is that a German Shepherd?