

UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON

**DIFFICULTIES FACING IRAQI EFL
UNIVERSITY LEARNERS IN
LEARNING ENGLISH INDIRECT
QUESTIONS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL OF
THE COLLEGE OF BASIC EDUCATION,
UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON, IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN
METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

BY

Najah Thamir J'az

Supervised by

Assist. Prof.

Adil Al-Akkam

**July ٢٠٠٦ A. D.
H.**

Assist. Prof.

Hameed H. Bjaiya Ph. D.

Jumadi Al-Thanya ١٤٢٧ A.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الرُّوحِ قُلِ الرُّوحُ مِنْ أَمْرِ
رَبِّي وَمَا أُوتِيتُمْ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا)

صدق الله العلي العظيم
سورة الاسراء (آية)

TO MY LATE PARENTS

CERTIFICATION

We certify that this thesis, entitled “Difficulties Facing Iraqi EFL University Learners in Learning English Indirect Questions,” has been prepared by “Najah Thamir J'az” under our supervision at the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon, as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Name: Assist. Prof. Adil Al-Akkam (Supervisor)

Date: / / ٢٠٠٦

Signature:

Name: Assist. Prof. Hameed Hasoon Bjaiya Ph. D. (Supervisor)

Date: / / ٢٠٠٦

In view of the available recommendations, I forward this thesis for debate by the examining committee.

Signature:

Name: Assist. Prof. Hamza Abdul Wahid

Head of the Department of Higher Studies, College
of Basic Education, University of Babylon.

Date: / / ٢٠٠٦

We certify that we have read this thesis "Difficulties Facing Iraqi EFL University Learners in Learning English Indirect Questions" and, as Examining Committee, examined the student in its contents, and that in our opinion it is adequate as a thesis for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Name: Prof. Mohammed Jassim Butti
(Chairman)

Signature:

Name: Assist Prof. Hashim
Abdu Allah Hussayn
Al-Muraddi
(Member)

Signature:

Name: Assist. Prof. Assim Abood Zbar al-Dulaymi
(Member)

Signature:

Name: Hameed Hasoon Bjaiya Ph. D.
(Supervisor/Member)

Signature:

Name: Adil Al-Akkam
(Supervisor/Member)

Approved by the Council of the College of Basic Education.

Signature:

Name: Dr. Abbas Ubaid

Dean of the College of Basic Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	V
ABSTRACT.....	VII
ACKNOWLEDEMENTS.....	IX
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1.1. THE PROBLEM.....	1
1.2. AIMS OF THE STUDY.....	6
1.3. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY.....	6
1.4. LIMITS OF THE STUDY.....	7
1.5. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY.....	7
1.6. VALUE OF THE STUDY.....	7
1.7. DEFINITION OF BASIC TERMS.....	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	
2.1. TWO MODES OF REPORTED SPEECH.....	9

۲.۲. SOME PREVIOUS STUDIES.....	۱۰
۲.۳. DEICTIC FEATURES AND CONVERTING.....	۱۱
 DIRECT QUESTIONS INTO INDIRECT QUESTIONS	
۲.۳.۱. DEIXIS AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS.....	۱۱
 CONVERSION	
۲.۳.۲. DEICTIC FEATURES AND CONTEXT.....	۲۰
۲.۴. REPORTED SPEECH AND RELEVANCE.....	۲۴
 THEORY	
۲.۵. RELEVANCE THEORY, DEICTIC	۲۶
 REFERENCE AND INDIRECT SPEECH/ QUESTIONS	
۲.۶. COHERENCE AS A KEY ISSUE IN REPORTE... ۲۸	
 SPEECH CONVERSATION	
۲.۷. THREE TYPES OF TROUBLE IN	۲۹
 REPORTED SPEECH SEQUENCES	
۲.۸. FUNCTIONS OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS.....	۳۰
CHAPTER THREE.....	۴۳
 THE TEST	
۳.۱. INTRODUCTION.....	۴۳
۳.۲. OBJECTIVES OF THE TEST.....	۴۳

۳.۳. SELECTION OF MATERIAL	۴۴
۳.۴. TEST DESIGN.....	۴۴
۳.۵. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY.....	۴۶
۳.۶. SUBJECTS.....	۴۸
۳.۷. PILOT ADMINISTRATION.....	۴۸
۳.۷.۱. ITEM ANALYSIS.....	۴۹
۳.۸. FINAL ADMINISTRATION.....	۴۹
۳.۹. SCORING SCHEME.....	۵۰

CHAPTER FOUR ۵۱
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

۴.۱. INTRODUCTION.....	۵۱
۴.۲. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	۵۱
۴.۲.۱. SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT.....	۵۱
OF QUESTION ONE	
۴.۲.۲. SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT.....	۵۴
OF QUESTION TWO	
۴.۲.۳. SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT.....	۵۷
OF QUESTION THREE	
۴.۲.۴. SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT.....	۶۰
OF QUESTION FOUR	

ε.ζ. ERROR ANALYSIS.....	60
ε.ζ.1. SOURCES OF ERRORS.....	60
ε.ζ.1.1. INTERLINGUAL TRANSFER.....	60
ε.ζ.1.2. INTRALINGUAL TRANSFER.....	67
ε.ζ.1.3. CONTEXT OF LEARNING.....	72
ε.ζ.1.4. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES.....	73

CHAPTER FIVE 77
CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS
AND SUGGESTIONS

ο.1. INTRODUCTION.....	77
ο.2. CONCLUSIONS.....	77
ο.2.1. THEORETICAL CONCLUSIONS.....	77
ο.2.2. PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS.....	78
ο.3. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	80
ο.4. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER.....	81
RESEARCH	

APENDIX I THE TEST ITEMS..... 82

APENDIX II POSSIBLE ANSWERS OF..... 88
THE TEST ITEMS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... 93

LIST OF TABLES

<i>NUMBER</i>	<i>TABLE</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
١.	DISTRIBUTION OF THE SCORES OF THE TEST	٥١
٢.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (١), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٥٢
٣.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (١), UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISSIYA	٥٣
٤.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (٢), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٥٤
٥.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (٢), UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISSIYA	٥٥
٦.	SUBJECTS' TOTAL ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (١ AND ٢), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٥٦
٧.	SUBJECTS' TOTAL ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION LEVEL, QUESTION (١ AND ٢), UNIVERSITY OF	٥٦

AL-QADISSIYA

٨.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٣), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٥٨
٩.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٣), UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISSIYA	٥٩
١٠.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٤), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٦١
١١.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٤), UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISSIYA	٦٢
١٢.	SUBJECTS' TOTAL ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٣ AND ٤), UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٦٣
١٣.	SUBJECTS' TOTAL ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PRODUCTION LEVEL, QUESTION (٣ AND ٤), UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISSIYA	٦٣
١٤.	SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE RECOGNITION AND PRODUCTION LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON	٦٤

SUBJECTS' ACHIEVEMENT AT THE
RECOGNITION AND PRODUCTION
LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF AL-QADISIYA

ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with English indirect questions. Generally, there are two modes for reporting what people say, direct and indirect. Indirect speech is normally used in conversation and all the main sentence types can be converted into indirect speech, including questions which include Yes-No, Wh-, and alternative questions. The problem is that in converting direct into indirect questions several changes are required and affected by the deictic features present in the direct question. Three things are related here, deictic features, tense back-shift and tense sequence. This creates a sort of difficulty to Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (henceforth, EFL) university learners.

This study aims at investigating the ability of Iraqi EFL university learners to recognise and use indirect questions and to arrive at the main causes of their errors. The researcher hypothesizes that some Iraqi EFL learners do not distinguish direct from indirect questions. Yet, their achievement at the recognition level is expected to be better than theirs at the production level.

Based on these hypotheses the researcher devised and administered a diagnostic test to a sample of a hundred Iraqi EFL university learners at their fourth year from the Departments of English, Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadissiya. The statistical and linguistic analysis of the subjects' responses to the items of the test has led to the conclusions that Iraqi EFL learners encounter difficulty in recognizing

indirect questions and more difficulty at the production level.

The researcher has also found out that the subjects' errors are attributed to the following factors:

١. Intralingual transfer as represented by the wrong application of the former native language experiences into the Target Language (English henceforth, TL).
٢. Communication strategies that learners resort to in order to communicate what they mean.
٣. Context of learning as represented by the lack of attention given to a certain topic by learners or textbook designers.
٤. Interlingual transfer in the form of the transferring Arabic grammar rules into English.

This study encompasses five chapters. Chapter One is dedicated to the Problem, Aims, Hypotheses, Procedures, Limits, and Value of the study. Chapter Two represents the theoretical survey of the form and functions of indirect questions with emphasis on their functions in conversation. Chapter Three stands for a description of the diagnostic test that has been administered to the fourth year of Iraqi EFL university learners, Departments of English, Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadissiya. Chapter Four sums up the results of the test from the statistical and linguistic perspectives. The subjects' errors have been analyzed and the probable causes of their errors identified.

Finally, Chapter Five outlines the conclusions reached by the researcher in this study. Based on them, some pedagogical implications are presented and areas for further research are suggested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Adil Al-Akkam, Head of the English Department, College of Basic Education, University of Babylon, for his constant help and encouragement. Deepest of thanks go to Assist. Prof. Hameed Hassoon, Ph. D., for his help, cooperation and suggestions that guided me along the way.

I am grateful to all those who helped me in fulfilling this study.

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. *The Problem*

There are two general modes for reporting what other people say, the direct and the indirect modes. Both are introduced by a reporting clause that refers to the speaker, the act of communication, perhaps to the person or persons spoken to, and/or the manner of speaking and the circumstances of the speech act (Quirk et al, 1985:1027).

1. The direct mode, like the following example:

(1) *David said to me after the meeting, 'In my opinion the arguments in favour of radical changes in the curriculum are not convincing.'*

(2) The indirect mode as in:

(2) *David said to me after the meeting that in his opinion the arguments in favour of radical changes in the curriculum were not convincing (Ibid).*

In direct speech, we are supposed to repeat the original speaker's exact words, while in indirect speech we are to give the exact meaning of a remark or speech, without necessarily using the speaker's exact words (Thomson and Martinet, 1970:178).

Indirect speech is normally used in conversation and is used to repeat statements, taking the form of a nominal that-clause which might come as:

١. Direct object, e. g.,

(٢) *He said that he has lost his umbrella.*

٢. Subject complement, e. g.,

(٤) *What neighbours said was that as a teenager he had earned his pocket money by delivering newspapers.*

٣. An extraposed subject, e. g.,

(٥) *It was said that as a teenager he had earned his pocket money by delivering newspapers (Quirk et al, ١٠٢٦).*

All the main sentence types (i. e., questions, exclamations, directives, and statements) can be converted into indirect speech. In the case of questions, the indirect construction is usually a “dependent Wh-element,” e. g.,

(٦) Yes-No questions

(A) *“Are you ready yet?” asked Joan.*

(B) *Joan asked me whether I was ready yet.*

(٧) Wh-questions

(A) *“When will the plane leave?” I wondered.*

(B) *I wondered when the plane would leave.*

(^) Alternative questions

(A) *“Are you satisfied or not?” I asked her.*

(B) *I asked her whether or not she was satisfied. (Ibid, 1.29)*

Indirect questions occur in various syntactic contexts, e.g.,

(^) Subject

(A) *Whether they are coming remains uncertain.*

(^*) Complement of verb

(A) *I am not sure whether they are coming.*

(^^) Complement of adjective

(A) *I am not sure whether he is satisfied.*

(^^) Complement of preposition

(A) *The question of whether they are coming remains unresolved.*

Baynham

(1996:210)

In converting direct into indirect questions, several changes are required which are affected by the deictic features present in the direct question. These features are related to the time and place of the utterance and the persons referred to. Some of them are:

1. Tense forms of the verb;
2. Other time references, e. g., everyday, now...;
3. Place references, e. g., here, there...;
4. Personal pronouns;
5. The demonstratives this and these.

Quirk et al

(1980:1.27)

The problem of this study is represented by the changes involved in the conversion of direct into indirect questions that complicate the issue and render it difficult to the Iraqi EFL University learners. This results in an apparent inefficiency on the part of the learners to turn out grammatically well-formed indirect questions when writing, and things become even worse in speech (Bolden, ٢٠٠٤:١٠٨٧).

There are three things which are closely associated with each other in the process of changing direct into indirect questions or direct into indirect speech in general. These are the abovementioned deictic features, tense back-shift, and sequence of tenses. These three entities can be viewed to be arranged, or rather, juxtaposed, in a form of a chain or progression. It starts with deictic features present in the direct question, that act as a signalling factor for the needed type of tense back-shift, sometimes optional, that, in turn, determine the required sequence of tenses needed to keep the indirect question within the general lines of grammatical and semantic well-formedness (Buchstaller, ٢٠٠٢:٦٧).

When the time reference, a deictic feature, is no longer applicable at the time the utterance is reported, it is often necessary to change the tense forms of the verb. Such a change of the verb forms in indirect speech is termed back-shift. The resulting relationship of verb forms in the reporting and the reported clauses is known as the sequence of tenses.

Thus, the basis for outputting grammatically well-formed indirect questions is the time reference, which is the most significant deictic feature upon which the choice of back-shift type and sequence of tenses is to be determined, e. g.,

(١٣) (A) *“Are you paid by the hour?” he asked.*

(B) *He asked him whether he was paid by the hour.*

(١٤) (A) *“Have you been waiting for long?” he asked.*

(B) *He asked her whether she had been waiting for a long time.*

Buchstaller

(٢٠٠٢:٨٠)

If this time reference is misinterpreted, the following steps, i. e., the choice of back-shift and sequence of tenses, would be wrong and this is the main pitfall for most learners (Ibid). We can list some of the difficulties that face learners when converting direct questions into indirect ones in an ascending form depending on their frequency, hence significance.

١. Maintaining the subject-operator-inverted form, which is characteristic of direct questions, when forming indirect questions. This kind of error is expected more of beginners, e. g.,

(١٥) *“Where have all the cards gone?” he asked Tom.*

(A) * *He asked Tom where had all the cards gone.*

(B) *He asked Tom where all the cards had gone.*

٢. Not restoring non-assertive forms into assertive ones, e. g.,

(١٦) *“Did you find anyone/anybody there?” she asked John.*

(A) * *She asked John if/whether he had found anyone/anybody*

there.

(B) *She asked John if/whether he had found someone/somebody*

there.

٢. Closely associated with this kind of misrendering is the failure to change place-time references and the demonstratives this, these, e. g.,

(١٧) *“Anybody here?” he asked.*

(A) **He asked if/whether somebody was here.*

(B) *He asked if/whether somebody was there.*

(١٨) *“Are you going to the movies tomorrow?” she asked.*

(A)* *She asked whether/if we were going to the movies tomorrow.*

(B) *She asked whether/if we were going to the movies next day.*

(١٩) *“Who did this?” he asked angrily.*

(A)* *He asked angrily who had done this.*

(B) *He asked angrily who had done that.*

٤. Miscoordination between tense back-shift and tense sequence, a kind of error that characterizes the speech and writing of even advanced learners.

Salebi (٢٠٠٤:٩١)

١.٢. Aims of the Study

This study aims at

١.٢.١. Identifying Iraqi EFL university learners' performance in recognizing and producing indirect questions,

١.٢.٢. Presenting material about indirect questions that can be helpful in arriving at the role of indirect questions in conversation and their different functions,

١.٢.٣. Finding out the sources of the learners' errors so as for remedial procedures to be taken in order to overcome the difficulties faced by Iraqi EFL university learners.

١.٣. Hypotheses of the Study

In the light of the abovementioned aims it is hypothesized that:

١. Some Iraqi EFL university learners do not distinguish indirect questions in form from direct ones,
٢. They encounter difficulty in converting direct questions into indirect questions,
٣. Learners' achievement at the recognition level is expected to be better than theirs at the production level.

١.٤. Limits of the Study

This study is supposed to be limited to fourth stage learners, Colleges of Education, Departments of English, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadissiya because it is the stage at which reported speech is being taught. The study is limited to testing learners' proficiency in converting direct into indirect questions.

١.٥. Procedures of the Study

The researcher intends to conduct a written test to fourth year learners in an effort to diagnose difficult points in their conversion of direct into indirect questions, after collecting some material concerning the area of research.

1.7. Value of the Study

It is hoped that the findings of this study will be useful in the theoretical side through providing some recent information about indirect questions that might be of benefit to researchers for further study and for learners alike. The practical side and the pedagogical implications could be of importance to teachers in providing them with insight on how to teach the conversion of direct questions into indirect ones. This can be done by shedding light on these assumedly problematic aspects of this area of grammar. The study may also be of help to syllabus designers in providing them with better grounding for their material designing work.

1.8. Definition of Basic Terms

1.8.1. Difficulties is a term that refers to the subjects' errors resulting from the differences between the source language and the TL (Corder, 1973:206).

1.8.2. Indirect Question in its simplest definition is a question used to express a question someone has posed without using a direct quotation (Bolden, 2004:116).

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

2. 1. Two Modes of Reported Speech

Discourse, whether spoken or written, is, by default, understood to be authored, in the voice of the person speaking or writing (Sternberg, 1991:12). When speakers or writers wish to report the speech or thoughts

of another person, or when they report the words or thoughts of their own entertained at a time other than the moment of speaking, they typically make them as such: that is, they produce the speech or thoughts as reported speech (Ibid).

According to Bakhtin (1981:9) “The transmission and assessment of the speech of others, their discourse, is one of the most widespread and fundamental topics of human speech. In all areas of life and ideological activity, our speech is filled and overflowing with other people's words, which are transmitted with highly varied degrees of accuracy and impartiality.” He proposes that “in real life, people talk most of all about what others talk about” (Ibid). This implies that we are often replicating the discourse of others.

Volosinov, in an often-quoted definition, says that “Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance” (1993:118). Notwithstanding, people frequently indicate whether what they are saying constitutes their own speech or the discourse of another. The most realistic representation of the presence of other voices in one’s own speech is achieved by means of what is generally referred to as “direct speech,” defined by Gaulmyn (1992:2) as “the recorded broadcast of utterances previously pronounced by an identified enunciator.”

Janssen (2004:2) says that the oldest reference to the term “reported speech” goes back to Ulmann (1957:61), while the term “representation” is used by Leech and Short (1981:80) and is more convenient to them than “reporting” (Ibid). Williams (1988:75), gives several examples of the term “indirect discourse” in romance languages circles. “Projection” (report, ideas, and facts) are discussed

as a clause type by Haliday (1987, Ibid). On the other hand, Wynne (2004:33) points out that terms such as “reporting” and “reported speech” (representation as well) are problematic, especially where there has not been a prior speech event, and gives an explanation of the terminology as he tries to develop the Leech and Short (1981) model of “categories of reporting.” He has found out that it is necessary to talk about “speech, thought, and writing representation” as there are specific forms and functions associated with reports of written language (Janssen, 2004:2).

According to Quirk et al (1985:1,29-30) "There are several modes in which other people's language may be reported. The most explicit modes are introduced by a reported clause referring to the speaker and the act of communication in speech or writing and, perhaps, also to the person or persons spoken to or to the manner of speaking Indirect speech on the other hand, conveys in the words of a subsequent reporter, what has been said or written by the original speaker or writer."

2.2. Some Previous Studies

Most “recent” researchers concentrate on the pragmatic side of the use of indirect questions. Most of the researches try to understand how reported speech functions in what Bakhtin (2003:2) terms “focus groups’ discussion.” That is, to analyze it as a part of interaction or, as Volosinov (1993:36) puts it, “to take the phenomenon of reported speech and postulate it as a problem from a sociolinguistic orientation.” A wide range of researchers, not all sociolinguists, have taken up this challenge to consider why people

use indirect questions in talking in a variety of settings (reviewed in Baynham and Slembrouk, 1999:15); including college learners' talking about race (Buttny, 1998:9; Buttny, 1999:2; Buttny and Williams, 2000:22). Children's argument and play (Goodwin, 1990:19); teacher-and-learners' interaction in an adult math class (Baynham, 1996:51 and Baynham, 1999:32); conversation among school children (Maybin, 1997:45 and 1999:81); a psychiatric interview (Ravatsos and Berkenkotter, 1997:19 and 1999:24); among co-workers (Holt, 1999:56); a research interviews (Schiffrin, 1993:13 and 1996:67); radio news (Mitchell, 1998:24); courtroom testimony (Philips, 1993:90; Jacquemet, 1990:37; Matoesian, 2000:60); as well as the function we might expect from literary studies and everyday storytelling (Mitchell-Kiernan, 1972:19; Tannen, 1989:41; and Johnstone, 1993:73 and Schuman, 1993:20). What links many of these interactional studies of reported speech is that they are rhetorical, that is to say, the participants assume the existence of opposing views and use reported speech and indirect questions to dramatize, shift or reinfluence a view, or to bring out the tensions between views (Baynham and Slembrouk, 1999:16).

2.3. Deictic Features and Converting Direct Questions into

Indirect Questions

2.3.1. Deixis and Indirect Questions Conversion

The term deixis covers “the functions of personal and demonstrative pronouns of tense and of a variety of other grammatical and lexical features which relate utterances to the spatiotemporal coordinates of the utterance” (Lyons, 1977:636).

Some of the types of deixis are personal deixis, temporal deixis, discourse deixis, and social deixis (Fillmore, 1970; Brown and Yule, 1983 and Levinson, 1983). The researcher focuses on the three basic functions of person, place and time due to their relevance to the process of converting direct questions into indirect questions.

Personal deixis is concerned with the identification of persons who participate in utterance exchange: the speaker designated as “I,” the hearer as “you,” and any third party as “he, she, or they” (Uchida, 1997:3). In converting a direct into an indirect question, several changes are required which are affected by the deictic features present in the direct question. These features are related to person, place references, personal pronouns, and the demonstratives “this” and “these” (Quirk et al, 1985:1026).

Closely related to deictic features present in the direct question in the process of converting it into an indirect question, and probably depending on such deictic features, are tense back-shift, and sequence of tenses. These three entities, i. e., deictic features, tense back-shift, and sequence of tenses, are argued to be arranged in a form of a progression. This progression starts with deictic features present in the direct question that act as a signalling factor for the needed type of tense back-shift, sometimes optional, which in turn, determines the required sequence of tenses needed to keep the indirect question within the general lines of grammatical and semantic well-formedness (Buchstaller, 2002:10).

When the time reference, a deictic feature, no longer applies at the time that the utterance is reported, it is often necessary to change the tense forms of the verbs. Such a change of verb forms in indirect speech is termed “back-shift.” The resulting relationship of verb

forms in the reporting and reported clauses is known as the sequence of tenses. The changes can be illustrated as follows:

<i>Direct Speech</i>	<i>Back-shift in Indirect Speech</i>	
	1- Present	Past
		<i>Past or past perfective</i>
	2- Past	2- Present perfective
	} <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; font-size: 2em;">}</div>	<i>Past perfective</i>
3- past perfective		(Quirk et al, 1985:1026)

And, just as statements can be the object of a verb (becoming “indirect” statements) so also direct questions can be objects of verbs (becoming indirect questions) e.g.;

(20) (A) “What are you doing?”

(B) I wondered what you were doing.

(Weber,

1993:11)

In more complicated examples of indirect questions, more changes are required, e.g.;

(21) (A) “Did you see her?”

(B) I wanted to know whether you had seen her (or not).

(Ibid)

Therefore, when tenses start varying, the original direct question is often reshaped when it becomes indirect. There are also a variety of verbs which can introduce indirect questions, not just verbs which are asking a question like “to ask” or “to inquire” (Abbot, 1975:11).

The Collins Cobuild English Grammar gives a list of "reporting verbs used to report questions." (1990:222).

ask *inquire* *say*
discover *know* *saw*
enquire *remember* *wonder*

The last six of them are used before *if* and *whether*-clauses. There is a “list of verbs which can be used before clauses beginning with *wh*-words” (Ibid, 223).

decide *forget* *realize* *suggest* *wonder*
describe *guess* *remember* *teach*
discover *imagine* *reveal* *tell*
discuss *know* *say* *think*
explain *learn* *see* *understand*

One way of reporting what someone has said is to repeat his/her actual words. This is called a “quote structure.” Instead of repeating words, we can say “He, or, she etc... said/asked” This is called a “report structure.” Both, quote structure and report structure consist of two clauses. The main clause is called a “reporting clause” and the other clause indicates what someone said or thought. In a quote structure, this other clause is called quote. In a report structure, the clause is called the reported clause (Dart, ۱۹۸۲:۱۹۹).

Questions in report structures are called reported or indirect questions. The reporting verb most often used for reporting questions is “ask.” Questions can be reported in a more formal way by using “enquire” or “inquire” if the introductory verb is "say" e.g.;

(۲۲) *I enquired if I could stay with them.*

(۲۳) *She inquired how Ibrahim was getting then.*

(Christopherson and Sandved,
۱۹۷۰:۲۴).

The difference between the use of "ask," on the one hand, and "inquire, wonder and want to know" is that the former can be used with an indirect object, e. g.,

(ʔʒ) (A) *He said: "What have you got in your bag?"*

(B) *He asked me what I had got in my bag.*

While, the latter cannot take an indirect object, e. g.,

(ʔʑ) (A) *He said: "Mary, when is the next train?"*

(B) *He inquired when the next train was.*

(Thomson and Martinet,
1970:177)

When discussing conversion from direct into indirect questions, grammarians usually list a number of structural changes that are assumed to sum up all what is needed to render direct question into indirect ones, concentrating, for the main part, on the issues of back-shift. All the main sentence types (i.e., questions, exclamations, directives, and statements) can be converted into indirect speech. In the case of questions, the indirect construction is usually a dependent wh-element, e.g.;

(ʔʖ) Yes-No Questions

(A) *"Are you ready yet?" asked Joan.*

(B) *Joan asked me whether I was ready yet.*

(ʔʗ) Wh-Questions

(A) *"When will the plane leave?" I wondered.*

(B) I wondered when the plane would leave.

(۲۸) Alternative Questions

(A) "Are you satisfied or not?" I asked her.

(B) I asked her whether or not she was satisfied.

(Quirk et al,

۱۹۸۵:۱۰۲۹)

Thus, indirect questions are made dependent on a reporting verb, and for that purpose questions that do not open with an interrogative (i. g., so-called general questions: Are you coming etc...) are provided with an introduction word (if, whether) (Alexander, ۱۹۸۸:۲۹۰). If the indirect question begins with a question word (When, Where, etc...), the question word is repeated in the indirect question e. g.,

(۲۹) (A) *She asked: "What do you want?"*

(B) *She asked them what they wanted.*

(Thomson and Martinet,

۱۹۷۵:۱۷۷)

Additionally, questions beginning with "Shall I/we" can be of four kinds:

(1) Speculations, or requests for information about a future event. These are usually introduced by "wonder," e. g.,

(१०) (A) *He asked "Where shall I be this time next year?"*

(B) *He wondered where he would be in a year's time*

/at that time in the following year.

(२) Request for instruction or advice, e g.,

(११) (A) *He asked "What shall I do with it?"*

(B) *He wondered what he should do with it.*

(३) Offers, e. g.,

(१२) (A) *He asked: "Shall I bring you some tea?"*

(B) *He offered to bring me some tea.*

(४) Suggestions, e. g.,

(१३) (A) *She asked: "Shall we meet at the theatre?"*

(B) *She suggested meeting at the theatre.*

(Ibid,
۱۸۳)

Indirect questions can occur in various syntactic contexts
(Baynham, ۱۹۹۶:۲۱۰)

(۳۴) Subject

(A) Whether they are coming remains uncertain

(۳۵) Complement of verb

(A) I am not sure whether they are coming.

(۳۶) Complement of adjective

(A) I am not surprised whether they are coming or
not.

(۳۷) Complement of proposition

(A) The question of whether they are coming
remains
unresolved.

According to Stenström (۱۹۸۴:۵۶) in English, an indirect question is a finite construction. That is, the verb of the indirect question has person. A sentence with an indirect question “embedded” in it is essentially a complex sentence, with a subordinate subjunctive in a dependent clause. The part of the

sentence which introduces the indirect question is the main clause, and the indirect question itself is a subordinate clause, in which the verb happens to be in the subjunctive mood (Abbot, 1975:16). So, because this question involves a dependent clause, the rules of the sequence of tenses come into play (Sternberg, 1991:67).

The tense of the main verb determines the sequence of the sentences. If the main verb is one of the primary tenses, i. e., present, future perfect, and perfect, then the sentences follow the primary sequence. If, on the other hand, the main verb is one of the secondary tenses, i. e., perfect, imperfect, and pluperfect, then the sentences follow the secondary sequence (Weber, 1993:20). When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived of as contemporaneous with the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is either in the present tense (primary sequence) or in the imperfect tense (secondary sequence), for instance:

(ʃ^) *I do not know what you are doing.*

(ʃ^) *I did not know what you were doing.*

(ʒ^) *He asked whether our friends are coming.*

(ʒ^) *He asked whether our friends were coming.*

(Praninskas,
1961:176).

When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived of as having been undertaken before the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is either in the perfect tense (primary sequence) or in the pluperfect tense (secondary tense), e.g.,

(ʒ ʳ) *I do not know what you did.*

(ʒ ʳ) *I do not know what you had done (did).*

(ʒ ʒ) *He asks whether our friends came.*

(ʒ ʔ) *He asks whether our friends had come (came).*

(Ibid,

178)

When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived of as coming after the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is the active future periphrastic with the present subjunctive in the present tense (primary sequence) or the active future periphrastic with the imperfect subjunctive, e. g.,

(ʒ ʳ) *I do not know what you will do (you are going to*

do).

(4 v) *I did not know what you were going to do
(would
do).*

(4 ^) *He asked whether our friends will come (are
going to
Come).*

(4 9) *He asked whether our friends were coming
(would
Come).*

(Ibid, 178)

2.2.2. *Deictic Features and Context*

But one has to notice that every time a new utterance is produced by a new speaker, the whole picture of deictic information changes, i. e., the referents of “I,” “you,” and “there,” for example, must change. The following example illustrates this. Suppose the following exchange is a telephone conversation:

(๑๑) A: Do you know about the welcome party for newcomers tonight?

B: Yes, are you going there?

A: What? I can't hear you?

B: Hello, are you there? (Uchida, 1997:4)

It is obvious that B's first "there" does not refer to the same place as B's second "there." This second exchange between A and B constitutes what Schegloff (1972:193) calls an "insertion sequence," but on a situation-based view of context, it would remain within the overall situation of making a phone-call (Ibid).

The question then is how to account for such changes in referent, since this referent is what triggers off and decides changes in verb form and sequence of tenses. Here comes Uchida's (1997) concept of "dynamic immediate contexts" as opposed to the traditional static concept of context, in an attempt to accommodate for such changes. Thus in the exchange above, B's second utterance involves an independent immediate context (Ibid, ๑).

What seems to be agreed upon about context is that it has two aspects: linguistic and non-linguistic. The difficulty lies in the treatment of non-linguistic information which includes any kind of information that may be used in interpreting an utterance like old assumptions, common knowledge etc.... To understand the context referents and deictic features properly, we have to provide an analysis of these non-linguistic phenomena. One way to avoid this problem is to treat context as fixed in advance, so it is determined

before the comprehension process starts. But this static or passive concept of context, which Uchida (Ibid) rejects, fails in including any assumptions activated by on-going utterances, i. e., the initial context needs to be supplemented in some way by access to information about the physical situation, other encyclopaedic knowledge and so on.

Uchida (Ibid, ٧) following Sperber and Wilson's (١٩٨٦) active and revolutionary view of context, persuasively argues that a new notion of context should be incorporated in the pragmatic theory.

To explain how the context is determined is to explain how a particular subject of the individual's accessible assumptions is selected as part of the interpretation process. When a piece of new information is given, a set of background assumptions is achieved. For each item of new information, many different sets of assumptions from diverse sources might be selected as context. The assumptions left over in memory from the immediately preceding thought processes constitute an immediately given initial context in which the next utterance may be processed. This may then be extended as the interpretation proceeds, the aim being to find a relevant enough interpretation. Uchida (ibid).

That is to say, it is not the case, as almost all linguists have assumed, that the context is determined before the interpretation process takes place but rather the context is actively constructed based on the search for relevance. This approach sounds more plausible because our cognitive mechanism seems indeed to search

just for appropriate information as the utterance proceeds. The context selection process is guided by pragmatic principles (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:137).

Many researchers, including (Buttny, 1998:10; Baynham, 1999:41 and Williams, 2000:20) argue the appropriateness of Uchida's concept of immediate context, based on Sperber and Wilson's (1986) view of dynamic context, in interpreting deictic features present in the direct question that guide the process of conversion into indirect questions, as the following discussion tries to show.

The term "immediate context" means "any context that is most accessible at a given point in the utterance interpretation process. Each utterance will create its own range of immediate contexts, and, at any given point, the immediate context will contain the most immediately accessible assumptions, drawn from any source, including chunks of related information forming a frame, schema, scenario, or script. The initial context for a given utterance is its first immediate context (Uchida, 1997:3).

On the other hand, Romero (2003:14) remarks that deixis is a situation-bounded concept deeply rooted in speech events. Uchida (Ibid) asserts the same point in the following example:

(01) *"I will tell you about the matter here
tomorrow."*

Unless we identify the persons referred to by "I" and "you," the place denoted by "here," and the time specified by "tomorrow," we cannot interpret this utterance correctly. The whole picture of

reference will be entirely changed when a different speaker utters the same utterance above to a different hearer, a conventional case of a reported utterance.

Herschberg (1983:19) claims that person, place and time deixis are firmly anchored in “speech situations.” In reported speech or thought, two different situations are involved: the situation of the current utterance and the situation in which the reported utterance was originally produced. This suggests that deictic information can be at least “dual,” in the sense that “here,” for example, can mean “here” in the immediate context of the current utterance or “here” in the speech situation where “here” was originally used.

This point is elaborated on by Uchida (1997:9) by taking the same abovementioned utterance.

Suppose that the speaker is directly addressing the hearer, so that “I” refers to the speaker, “you” to the hearer, “here” to the place in which the utterance was uttered and, “tomorrow” to the day after the utterance. Suppose, then, that the hearer says: “Okay with me, but Bill might say, I do want to know right now.” It is obvious that “me” refers to the present speaker; “I” to “Bill” and “right now” does not mean the time the utterance is uttered. The two kinds of deictic information can interact with each other. In the utterance above, the two first person pronouns refer to different entities and “now” is not the main speaker and hearer’s now. That is, it is possible that

conversationalists are involved in at least two kinds of immediate context, primary and secondary immediate context.

Uchida (Ibid, ٦) goes on as to define these two terms, “tentatively.” “Primary immediate context is anchored to the speech situation in which the present speaker and hearer are directly involved,” while “secondary immediate context is providing referents for deictic items which do not belong to the primary immediate context, i.e., deictically dependent on the primary immediate context determined by utterance.”

The most typical case of this is reported speech. We can say that indirect speech/question is based on and closely related to primary immediate context and direct speech/question is influenced by both primary immediate context and secondary immediate context. Uchida (Ibid) explains this by the following example:

(٥٢) A: *Mary: Bill asked if she wanted to do it then.*

B: *Mary: Bill said: “Do you want to do it now?”*

In “A” the time is in the past, because the time reference is determined by the time when Mary speaks. Similarly, the word “then” is chosen based on the speech time of “A.” That is to say, time deixis in “A” is fixed in primary immediate context. “B,” on the other hand, consists of two parts; one is the reporting clause, and the other is the reported direct question. The former can be analyzed in the

same way as “A,” but the latter should involve a secondary immediate context, because the time there is determined by the time of Bill’s original utterance.

٢. ٤. *Reported Speech and Relevance Theory*

Many pages, in English grammar books, are spent explaining how to convert direct speech into indirect speech or vice versa. It is generally assumed, in such works, that direct speech conveys the original utterance literally and faithfully. However, recent work has shown that the situation is not so simple. Sternberg (١٩٩١:٥٩), for instance, discusses what he calls “direct discourse fallacy,” demonstrating the technical impossibility of conveying paralinguistic features of the original speech in direct speech quotations. Clark and Gerrig (١٩٩٠:٢٠٣) argue that direct speech is “demonstration,” “just as a tennis coach demonstrates for his learners how to serve by performing a service himself” (Ibid). Fludernik (١٩٩٣:٤٠٩-١٤) mentions Sternberg’s direct discourse fallacy and cites a number of examples which support his view.

The main claims of relevance theory are as follows: Clark and Gerrig (١٩٩٠:١٩١) mention that direct speech is intended to “depict,” not to “describe,” as in indirect discourse, some aspects of the original speaker’s utterance. The difference between depicting and describing is fundamental: depiction, e.g., paintings and sculptures resemble their referents, whereas description does not.

On the other hand, the approach of Sperber and Wilson (1986:80) to reported speech is both quite similar to and quite different from Clark and Gerrig's. Sperber and Wilson (Ibid) argue that every utterance exhibits one of two form types of use: descriptive and interpretive. A descriptively used utterance represents "some state of affairs in virtue of its propositional form being true of that state of affairs" (Ibid, 128). An interpretively used utterance, to which reported speech belongs, represents "some other representation which also has a propositional form -- a thought, for instance-- in virtue of a resemblance between the two propositional forms (Ibid, 28-9).

This notion of "representation by resemblance" is similar to Clark and Gerrig's (1990) notion of "depiction." The crucial difference between the two approaches is that Clark and Gerrig claim that direct and indirect speech fall on different sides of the distinction which Sperber and Wilson would deny. In Sperber and Wilson (1986:98), all types of reported speech both direct and indirect, are seen as involving representation by resemblance, either of content or of form. Sperber and Wilson (1986:99) say, "Direct speech is the most obvious example of utterances used to represent not what they describe but what they resemble. Maintaining Sperber and Wilson's basic assumptions Uchida (1997:9) claims that both direct and indirect speech are, basically, interpretation of the speaker.

The basic assumption of relevance theory is that human cognition is relevance oriented: we pay attention to information that seems relevant to us (Wilson, 1994:73). Relevance is achieved not at random but when new information interacts with existing assumptions in one of the following three ways: contextual

implication, strengthening and contradicting, and eliminating (Ibid).

Sperber and Wilson (1986:101) call these three types of interaction “contextual effects.” New information is relevant if it achieves contextual effects, and the greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance, other things being equal (Ibid). For them the two relevance principles are:

۲.۴.۱. The cognitive principle: the human cognitive system is looking for relevant information, the more relevant, the better.

۲.۴.۲. Communicative principle: every utterance creates a presumption of its own optimal relevance. An utterance on a given interpretation is optimally relevant if and only if it is relevant to worth the hearer’s attention and is the most relevant one the speaker is able and willing to produce.

۲.۵. Relevance Theory, Deictic Reference and Indirect Speech/Question

As above mentioned, it is often argued that in indirect speech some particular time reference in the original utterance can be converted into the corresponding time reference from the viewpoint of the current utterance time. For example:

(۵۳) (A) Bill asked: “Will you leave here tomorrow?”

(B) Bill asked whether you would leave there

today.

“Tomorrow” can be changed into “today” if tomorrow of the speech time of “Will you leave here tomorrow” corresponds to “today” at the reporting time, and if the place denoted by “here” is also the place where the current utterance is produced, “there” will be replaced by “here.”

Uchida (1997) argues that these replacements are originated in the immediate contexts created by each utterance. For instance direct speech involves two utterances, or speech acts, a reporting clause and a reported clause. The former is interpreted in the current primary immediate context and the latter in the secondary immediate context containing information available at the time of the speaker’s original utterance. So, in the examples above, “Will,” “tomorrow,” and “here” are determined in the domain of secondary immediate context, while “would,” “there,” and “today” as well as the “reporting clause” are interpreted in the primary immediate context.

Uchida (1997:12) asserts that indirect questions are preferable to direct questions when reporting people because speakers or writers tend to choose lexical items interpretable in primary immediate contexts (indirect speech) rather than secondary immediate context (direct speech) in order to make it easier for the speaker or hearer/reader to identify the time and other deictic referents concerned. Therefore, primary-immediate-context-bounded personal pronouns are preferred to secondary-immediate-context-bounded ones to make it easier to identify the persons concerned. Uchida (Ibid)

brings about the following principle: primary immediate context deixis tends to be selected unless otherwise restricted. The straightforwardness of first person pronouns lessens the utterance processing time and the smaller the processing effort, the greater the relevance. Thus, it is clear now that the principle of deixis in reported speech follows from the principles of Relevance Theory.

2.7. Coherence as a Key Issue in Reported Conversation

Schegloff (1990:55) argues that, in conversation, the issue of coherence can be subsumed under the general question, “Why that now?” In other words, participants in an interaction are constantly trying to make sense of talk as recipient-designed and situated action. When they are unable to infer a plausible answer to the question “Why that now?” they initiate repair strategies. One of them is the use of indirect questions (Couper-Kuhlen, 1998:5).

Bolden (2004:171) examines the different ways that indirect questions, is set apart from the current speaker’s own talk in conversation. He argues that this issue has received little attention in the literature on reported speech. Couper-Kuhlen (1998:3) suggests an approach to distinguish conversational reported speech, including indirect questions, based on the observation of the relation between prosody and reported speech:

It can be argued that coherence in conversational reported speech sequences will be manifestly lacking where participants in an interaction find repair to be necessary. When troubles in

coherence can be plausibly reconstructed as involving some prosodic or paralinguistic factor, insight will be gained into the specific nature of prosody's contribution to reported speech (Ibid).

۲.۷. *Three Types of Trouble in Reported Speech Sequences*

Silverstein (۱۹۹۳:۵) maintains that the use of indirect questions in conversation places special demands upon conversationalists and this is evident from the “trouble” they sometimes form for interaction. Schegloff (۱۹۹۶:۹) on the other hand proposes three uses of indirect questions in “trouble-shooting” three types of “troubles” in reported speech sequences.

One type of trouble appears to stem from non-clarity as to whether or not a speaker is reporting speech in the first place (Ibid). These are cases in which there is no clear answer to the question “Is this current speaker’s voice or someone else’s?” The reason why there might be doubt is because – contrary to what grammar books propagate about reported speech-- speakers in conversational interaction do not always explicitly introduce different “voices,” with reporting verbs or quotative constructions. Instead, figures are often “brought on stage” for the first time merely by being animated, without, for instance, a prefatory “He said” or “She asked.” In order for this device to succeed, however, the “figure's” voice must be reconstructibly different from the current speaker’s own voice (Ibid, ۱).

It is not the content of the utterance which is at issue here. The issue is the way the utterance is said, i. e., when the utterance “sounds like

someone else's." Here, indirect questions are used to clarify "Why that now?" When this question is answered, the inexplicit is rendered explicit (Bolden, 2004:174).

Given the deictic nature of prosodic and paralinguistic phenomena; troubles in reported speech sequences are to be expected when prosodic and paralinguistic cues are ambiguous (Ibid). This is what creates the necessity for repair initiation in some sequences in, i. e., the use of indirect questions to answer the question "Why that now and in that way?" (Schegloff, 1996:11)

The second type of trouble is the case when the addressee faces trouble as to whether what s/he hears is to be interpreted as a background commentary supplied by the speaker/reporter or just an animation of a "figure" in the "story" reported (Silverstein, 1993:6). One of the repairing uses of indirect questions in conversation is when an answer is demanded to the question "Whose other voice is this?" (Schegloff, 1996:12).

The third type of trouble occurs when the answer to the question "How is this other voice being done?" or "What the speaker is doing with this other voice?" is unclear (Ibid). It is often the way the voices are formatted prosaically and paralinguistically which contextualises what they are doing, or rather, what the current speaker is doing with them. Where this is not clear, participants may find it necessary to initiate repair, usually via indirect questions (Ibid, 13).

A much wider range of the functions, lexical and grammatical, of indirect questions has emerged as linguists have turned from literary examples to surveys of large corpora containing computer-readable texts from many written and spoken genres, such as CANCODE (Carter and McCarthy, 1990); COBUILD (Thompson, 1996:506); Corpus of Phone Conversations at the University of Konstanz (Gunthner, 1999; and Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen, 1999); and the British National Corpus (Leech, 2000). Corpus-based descriptions have found, for instance, that;

1. An indirect question may be signalled by “like, goes, or gets, as well as by some form of says” (Klewitz 1999:104), or that there may be no markers at all.
2. Discourse markers, such as “Oh, Well, and God” are often included in reports in indirect speech (Holt, 1996).
3. Prosodic cues such as variations in pitch, volume, pace and rhythm, may indicate stretches of reported speech in conversation, but the signalled boundaries do not always coincide exactly with those of the words to be taken as reported (Gunthner, 1999; and Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen, 1999).

Bakhtin (2003:3) argues that any particular use of indirect speech/questions can have apparently opposite functions. Clark and Gerrig (1990) in a key account of reported speech, argue that this sort of apparent contradiction can be understood if we see quotation

as a kind of demonstration, a non-serious depiction of the words of another. Thus, each of the functions that we are going to describe are supposed to contain the following two aspects:

1. **Detachment:** the reported speech is separated from what the speaker says for himself and is, in this case, “non-serious.” This aspect emphasizes the juxtaposition of two different roles, reported and reporting speakers (Ibid).
2. **Direct experience:** the report is a depiction of what is said rather than a description, so it can carry immediacy, an indexical connection to the original setting. Clark and Gerrig’s (1990) use of the word “depiction” suggests that demonstrations and quotations “do” rather than “tell.”

Because of these shifts, quotation is always both “partial,” in that some aspects of the depiction are to be disregarded, and “selective,” in that only some aspects of the reported phenomena are depicted (Bolden, 2004:1077).

While categories of reported speech/questions, based on form can be fairly clear-cut (Semino et al, 1999), categories of function, as for any human activity, of necessity blur, double, and multiply. Yet, basically, functions of indirect questions can be grouped under four major headings (Bakhtin, 2003:5):

1. **Situation:** indirect questions shift to another time or place.

ॡ. Participants: indirect questions enable participants to take on multiple roles, as speakers, hearers or over-hearers.

ॢ. Acts: indirect questions can give different words for the same meaning, or give the same words a different meaning.

ॣ. Key: indirect questions can cue shifts in interpretation like an indication of modality, more or less of a claim to functionality. we come to each of them in detail in the following.

1. *Situation*

1.1. *Intensifying an Event*

In reported speech the scene shifts from this living room, where the conversation is taking place (the reporting interaction) to a village street or office, where the reported interaction is set. For example, “Patrick” is responding to his interlocutor’s, Martin, questions about whether he takes global communications links for granted (Couper-kuhlen, 1998:131).

1. **Martin: Yeah, you go on holiday regularly, so you're aware of that.**

2. **Pat: I've got my mobile (laughter) everywhere I go.**

3. **Martin: Yeah.**

4. **Pat: I'll give you an example. I was by a pool in Majorca last year and daughter rings me up.**

5. **Martin: Yeah.**

6. **Pat: All right. I was sitting by the pool, she thought I was by the van (laughter) and she is talking away for about five minutes and I am nattering away to her. It's as clear as a bell.**

7. **Martin: Yeah.**

8. **Pat: And she asked me whether I was in the van. I said no, I'm in Majorca. She was like, Oh, my God, I'm on my boyfriend's phone. She slammed the phone down (laughter). You know, I mean, it was so: All right, we were thousands of miles away, whatever.**

9. **Martin: Mmm, yeah!**

10. **Pat: But, it was so close, isn't it? Years ago it didn't happen, you know. You'd link up here, link up there, and....**

11. **Martin: Yeah.**

12. **Pat: It took you ten minutes to get through.**

13. **Martin: that's right, yeah.**

14. **Pat: the whole world's shrunk!**

15. **Martin: Do other people have that feeling that it affects their lives as**

it does yours. Does it....

The story starts with a clear indication of place and time (٦) where it is signalled by a discourse marker “All right” and a shift to the present tense. The first part of talk, “She is talking away” is not a quotation but a description of the action without a depiction of its content. The shift into indirect question is indicated by the reporting verb “asked” (٨). The indirect question and the words following it vary in prosodic cues; “Oh, my God,..., slammed the phone down” are of a higher pitch, louder and faster. Then (Martin) confirms that the story supports a specific point of view on globalization by asking if other people have that feeling that it affects their lives as it does Patrick’s.

١.٢. *Typifying a Reported Event*

A common use of indirect questions is to present some utterances as happening again and again: not “Then he said this,” but “This is what they always say.” Where intensification prepared the way for a shift in views, the typicality of the remarks stresses the ongoing tension between the points of view. For instance, (Bakhtin,

٢٠٠٣:٧) mentions the following exchange.

١. Fille: But also, if you have got a car sitting outside the door you feel you should use it (laughter) whereas I’m sure if I....
٢. Allen: You’d been asked whether you do really need it (laughter) you think, Oh, yes. I do. You know. It’s like talking, if you’re used to having a car and then it’s someone says, oh, no, you don’t need that.
٣. Anderson: yeah, how about this idea?

4. Allen: How do you justify it?

One of the markers of typicality here is the use of “you” as a general pronoun. So the “you” in “do really...” refers to the quoting speaker, but the “you” in “you think,” is a more general reference that potentially includes the others in the group. On a closer observation, this is a composite with the kind of question (Fille) would be asked and then (his) response as reported thought, “oh, yes....” Typification in any setting calls on the other participants to recognize from one phrase that this is just what people always say (Ibid).

5. *Participants*

5.1. *Hearers and Overhearers*

Reported speech complicates the participation roles of an event (Goffman, 1981; Levinson, 1988; Antaki et al 1996; Lendar and Antaki, 1996; and Matoesian, 2000) by adding new layers of speakers and hearers in the reporting context. If someone reports the words of someone else in a story told to other people, one is enlisting an overhearing audience to share the reporter’s response as the hearer in the reported context (Bakhtin, 2003:8). The following conversation, mentioned in Goffman (1981:112), shows this vividly.

1. Sue: I think something has changed now. It’s not acceptable now, I think, in society for a woman to stay at home with the children. I

think a woman at home with the children, is very pressurized to go to work. Do you feel that?

٢. Ashlie: I feel terrible.

٣. Sue: Thirty years ago, my or whoever's mum, thirty years ago, it was nothing to stay at home with the children, it was expected.

٤. Ashlie: Yeah.

٥. Sue : It was expected of them.

٦. Ashlie: mm.

٧. Sue: To stay at home and put the meal on the table.

٨. Ashlie: yeah.

٩. Sue: More or less, it's not now I think.

١٠. Giena: They're like you don't work, you don't work.

١١. Sue: Women are pressurized to go back to work.

١٢. Ashlie : Yeah.

١٣. Monica: When I (packed) working, there's something wrong

with me.

١٤. Ashlie :Yeah.

١٥. Jannette: God, you are free all day

١٦. Ashlie: Lady of leisure

١٧.

١٨. Sue: I think that bit

١٩. Ashlie: That bit

٢٠. Sue: 'Cause you have to ask for.

٢١. Ashlie: You're looked down upon, because

are not working, cause you are at home.

٢٢. Ashlie: As though you've got no brains.

(Sue) makes a generalization about the changed attitude towards women whose work is at home and invites others to respond. After (Sue) says “now” (٩), (Giena) overleaps with an indirect question enacting the attitudes (Sue) has described, (١٠), in which the “you” is not (Sue) in particular but any woman hearing it. Therefore, the speakers or interlocutors work together to enlist each others as overhearers and to recognize that the response is shared (Ibid).

٢. ٢. Speaking for Another

Schiffrin (١٩٩٣) explores the relationships involved in speaking for another in sociolinguistic interviews. For instance, when one interviewee says of another, who is present, “She is on diet.” So, participants may quote a named or unnamed other, present or not, or they may simply attribute a general statement to an abstract point of view. Speaking for another is another way of managing the discussion of conversational opinions with a group of strangers (Bakhtin, ٢٠٠٣:٩).

١. Mart: In this day and age, people often do know how other people live.

٢. **Dan:** But some people prefer that. I mean I had a drink with some farmers up in Whitby way and they are like you live in the town and you have your ٨-hour days. Well, we have our ٨-hour days but it takes us ١٢ hours to do it. And that's philosophy of life. It's relative to where we are. I can live ١٢-hour days when I'm up there and when I'm down here the pressure of everything around you.

٣. **Mart:** You couldn't do it. (Ibid)

Here, Dan contrasts his shorter hours, with more pressure to longer hours of less stressful work of the farmers. The farmers' opinion is quoted as an indirect question (٣ ...you live...). The "you" is the teacher from the city; the "they" is the farmers. The time is when Dan "had a drink," past event, though it is something they say in the present tense, because it represents an ongoing philosophy of life. As Dan sums it up, (Mart) takes it as a comment on how one is to deal with different ideas of quality of life from one's own. Reported speech can be part of making such an imaginative leap (Ibid, ١٠).

٤. Acts

٤. ١. New Words for the Same Meaning

Speakers may set out reported speech as something to talk about, what Volosinov (1993:118) calls “commenting.” There are two broad ways for doing this: formulation, i. e., giving what is offered as the same meaning, in other words (you are saying that...), and mention, i. e., taking the same words but talking about them as words instead of using them with their usual meaning (“talk” is a four-letter word).

Bakhtin (2003:11) shows this in the following exchange:

1. Peter: ...and the third one, the responsibility for our environment is shared. It's not a duty for government alone. Any comments on these? Why would they say things like that?
2. Albert. The UK Government, If it's my fault.
3. : (laughter)

The comment in (1) is a straight evaluation of “the responsibility is shared.” The reported question in (2) is a formulation of its gist. The laughter in the next turn suggests that participants take it as an ironic equivalent. The formulation, thus, implies something about the kind of act in the original government statement (Ibid).

3. 2. New Meanings for the Same Words

Reported speech can also take the same words and give them a different meaning. One way of doing this is by mentioning rather than using a word. One distinction between use and mention is that,

we use a word to refer to the world, but mention a word to refer to the word itself (Goffman, 1974:316 and Lyons, 1977:7).

1. Mary: Can I mention something that you've said? You have said this with reference to a lot of things. You asked wouldn't someone do something about it.
2. Gwinne: He asked wouldn't someone do something.
3. Anne: Wouldn't someone do something.
4. John: Notice the someone do something (laughter).
5. Gwinne: The people up there that are supposed to do it (laughs).
6. Mary: You said it sort of about the youth clubs and things. You said it about the beaches and you said about the drugs.

The exchange above is about the drug problem among the youth. One of the participants claims that this problem would not last twenty years because "someone would do something about it." (Gwinne) gives a formulation of this turn in the form of an indirect question (2) (Ibid).

4. Key

4.1. Offering Evidence

Goffman (1981:66) uses the word "key" following Bateson (1972), to suggest, for instance, the difference between a "playful" and a "real" enactment of the same event. Reported speech serves to

provide evidence, because of the sense of “direct experience” arising from the depiction, the conveying of how it was said as well as what was said. Sometimes speakers present a quotation to support a potentially controversial remark. These instances of evidence are often vaguely attributed to “people” or “the newspapers” or “they,” and indeed may work better for their vagueness (Thompson, 1996:510). The following example from Thompson (1996:513) shows a similar case with indirect questions:

1. **Jim:** Female hormone, oestrogen, which is going into the water and it's making the male fish turn into females, but you don't see that.
2. **Patrick:** But we never had fish. Did we?
3. **Andrew:** No, there weren't fish before, I mean.
4. **Jim:** No, that's true.
5. **Patrick:** You know, we didn't have. I know people ask if there's fish in the Lostock now and if it's 40 years since there was fish at the Lostock.
6. **Jim:** Yeah.
7. **Andrew:** Yeah.
8. **Patrick:** You know. They've never seen it. So, to some degree it must be a lot cleaner. We've already got pollution in a different sense.
9. **Andrew:** We've seen that in our lifetime, haven't we? That's clean-up.

Here, there is disagreement. Jim has said that the oestrogen in the water is affecting the fish, while Patrick and Andrew are saying that the very existence of fish in these rivers in an industrial region is evidence of the environment getting better. Patrick links these two

viewpoints by repeating what he has just said (°), and then presenting it as something people in the neighbourhood tell him about a particular stream, the Lostock. This then gets a series of “yeah’s” from all around, and then he goes on to qualify this improvement. Thus, the attribution of word and act to others provides a basis for mediating a disagreement outside the opinions of the people present. It is a shift in key to a heightened modality in which one is speaking of experienced facts, not just personal impressions (Ibid).

4.2. Enacting Hypothetical Speech

As key can shift up to high claims for evidence, it can also be shifted down, in Goffman’s (1974:67) terms, forming some primary reality toward fiction, play, rehearsal, or parody. Many of the instances of reported speech in exchanges involve utterance that has not been made but could be made or should be made or could not have been made, i. e., they are in the future or potential or conditional or impossible. In the following example, the speaker is imagining a system he would like to see, but he denies ever existed (Bakhtin, 2003:14).

1. Barry: All the gardens on estates. By council houses. How many? All these houses. These council houses.
2. Martin: Yeah.
3. Barry: That’s on these estates, there could be a woman in her 60’s or 70’s, right?

- 4. **Martin: Right!**
- 5. **Barry: And I know they got these people if they've been to court they give them community work so they're expecting them to do it. But you should be able to go, somewhere, that council should be there, if you want to cut your grass and you can't afford that, or a lawnmower, or the edge trimmer. Where you should be able to go on that estate and say right there you are. And ask whether it's signed out for you to cut your fricking lawn!**
- 6. **Martin: Yeah, yeah!**
- 7. **Barry: At least you're given the option.**
- 8. **Martin: So, the council should actually look after people.**
- 9. **Jack: No others.**

10. **Martin: Who can't do it themselves.**

11. **Barry: Yeah.**

12. **Martin: Is that what you're saying.**

13. **Jack: No, no, but listen.**

14. **Barry: people often ask why they are not given the tools to do it themselves, if they can do it themselves.**

15. **Martin: But they did that, they did that!**

16. **Barry: Well, I've never seen it.**

Here, reported speech emphasizes the ordinariness and repetitiveness of the action that goes with the utterance, "handing over the mower." In turns 8-10, (Martin) formulates what Barry has said as a way of looking after those who "can't look after themselves." But Barry repeats it in turn (14) as a story of people

who can and do look after themselves, by using an indirect question once again. But Jack says that in fact such a system had been in operation (15), Barry insists that he has not seen it (16) (Ibid, 15).

Hypothetical reported speech, since it does not report anything that has actually been said, shows the rhetorical usefulness of detachment. In that, it is like the use of reported speech for typification, speaking for another, and mentioning (Ibid).

CHAPTER THREE

THE TEST

3.1 Introduction

To bring about the aims of this study, a test has been compiled and administered. An overall description of the test will be presented together with its objectives, material selection and its subjects. The researcher herein touches upon the issues of validity and reliability and the pilot test, then the main administration and the scoring scheme of the test.

3.2 Objectives of the Test

If we assume that a well-planned test should measure the extent to which learners “have fulfilled course objectives, then tests are a central

part of the learning process” (Bosanta, ١٩٩٥:٢). Testing tells teachers what learners can or cannot do, i. e., they show teachers how successful their teaching has been. It also tells learners how well they are progressing; and by identifying learners’ strengths and weaknesses, it can identify areas for remedial work. Testing, as well, helps in evaluating the effectiveness of the program, sourcebook, materials, and method (Ibid).

This test has been designed to investigate to what degree Iraqi EFL university learners master indirect question constructions. The test is meant to be a diagnostic one aiming at pinpointing and measuring the areas of difficulty faced by those learners using and converting direct questions into indirect ones along with attempting at identifying the causes of their errors in order for appropriate remedial measures and recommendations to be suggested on the basis of the test’s results.

The test is prepared to measure the recognition and the production abilities of the learners. The first and second questions measure the subjects’ responses at the recognition level, whereas the third and fourth questions measure their responses at the production level. In the light of the responses, the proposed hypotheses will be either verified or rejected.

٣.٣. Selection of Material

The majority of the items of the test have been selected from the researches, papers, and books mentioned in Chapter Two. They are assumed to cover most of the forms of indirect questions. The selection of the test items has been approved by a jury committee of ten experienced university lecturers.

٢.٤. Test Design

The test consists of four questions, see *APPENDIX I* (P. ٨٢). The first two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level. The first question comprises twelve items which meant to measure the subjects' ability in differentiating grammatically correct from grammatically incorrect indirect questions.

Question two is of eight items intended to check the ability of the learners to recognize the correct verbal, and sometimes adverbial, combination in the form of multiple-choices. The last two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the production level. The third question is compiled to test the learners' ability in producing the most suitable completion in the form of indirect questions based on the stimuli given to them. The fourth and last question represents the top of demands in asking learners to produce indirect questions on their own to check their ability to produce the needed type of tense back-shift and tense sequence.

The Test has been approved by the Following Experts:

Assist. Prof. Abbass Deghan (Ph. D. in Linguistics and Translation),
College of Education, University of Babylon.

Assist. Prof. Abdul Latif Al-Jumaily (Ph. D. in Applied Linguistics),
College of Arts, University of Baghdad.

Assist. Prof. Ahmad Mustafa (Ph. D. in Methods of Teaching English
as a Foreign Language), College of Education, University of Baghdad.

Assist. Prof. Hashim Al-Muraddi (Ph. D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language), College of Education, University of Al-Qadissiya.

Assist. Prof. Razzaq N. Mukheef (M. A. in English Language and Linguistics), College of Education, University of Babylon.

Assist. Prof. Riyad Tariq Al-Ameedi (Ph. D. in Linguistics and Translation), College of Education, University of Babylon.

Instructor Assim Abood Al-Dulaymi (Ph. D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language), College of Basic Education, University of Babylon.

Instructor Fareed (Ph. D. in English Language and Linguistics), College of Education, University of Babylon.

Instructor Maysa'a K. Hussein (Ph. D. in English Language and Linguistics), College of Education, University of Al-Qadissiya.

Instructor Wafa'a M. Faisal (Ph. D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language), College of Education, University of Babylon.

۳.۵. Validity and Reliability

The validity of a test is the extent to which it measures what it is supposed to measure and nothing else. Tests should be as valid as their

constructor can make them. The test must aim to provide a true measure of the particular skill which it is intended to measure (Heaton, 1974:103). Validity is divided into face and content validity (Bosanta, 1990:3). If a test item looks right to other testers, teachers, moderators, and testees, it can be described as having at least face validity (Heaton, 1974:160). Content validity depends on a careful analysis of the language being tested and of the particular course objectives. The test should be so well constructed as to contain a representation sample of the course, the relationship between the test items and the course objectives always being apparent (Ibid).

In order to satisfy both these ends, the test has been submitted to a jury of experts in order to approve its content validity in measuring what it intends to measure. The jury offered some suggestions which have been taken into consideration. Thus, certain items have been tempered with, others replaced.

Reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test. For a test to be valid, it has to be reliable as a measuring instrument. If the test is administered to the same candidates on different occasions, then, to the extent that it produces different results, it is not reliable (Ibid, 160).

Some kinds of reliability are described, among them are: test/retest and mark/remark reliability. The factors that affect reliability of a test are:

3.0.1. The extent of the sample of martial selected for testing.

3.0.2. The administration of the test (Bosanta, 1990:4).

The method followed for estimating the reliability in this test is Kurder-Richardson as represented by the

formula:

$$R = \frac{N}{N^2} - \left[\frac{n(n-m)}{N^2} \right]$$

Where;

R = reliability

N = number of the items in the test

M= mean of test scores

X = standard deviation of the test scores

Reliability coefficient of the present test is (0.837) for the test applied at the University of Al-Qadissiya and (0.827) for that applied at the University of Babylon; which are highly positive correlations.

3.7. Subjects

The sample of the test consists of a hundred subjects (55 males and 45 females) of the fourth year, academic year (2018-19) Departments of English language, colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qaddysia.

The sample represents something in the neighbourhood of 4% of the total university learners population. The learners are native speakers of Iraqi Arabic with similar EFL backgrounds. Their average age is twenty two.

Fourth-year learners are preferred as test's subjects because the topic in question is taught to them during the academic year and because they represent the top of expected performance of English Department learners. The textbook adopted is *A University Grammar of English* by Quirk and Greenbaum (١٩٧٣).

٣.٧. Pilot Administration

Prior to putting the actual administration of the main test into effect, a pilot test has been applied on April/٧/٢٠٠٥ to learners at the University of Babylon and on April/١٨/٢٠٠٥ to learners at the University of Al-Qaddysia. The two trials have been administered to ten randomly selected learners at each University from the population of fourth-year learners who were excluded from the subjects of the main test administration. Reasons behind the pilot test are: to arrive at the time required for answering the test, to check on the clarity of the items and directions to the subjects in order to know whether some of the items/questions are in need of modification, and finally, to analyze the items to determine their effectiveness, i. e., item difficulty and item discrimination power.

The results of the pilot test indicate that the time required to answer all items is about one hour, in addition to some instruction and item modifications. The outcomes of the pilot administration have been incorporated into the final version of the test.

٣.٧.١. Item Analysis

Careful consideration to the objectives should be matched by that dedicated to knowing “how far those objectives have been achieved by a particular test” (Heaton, 1974:172). This can provide us with valuable information concerning the performance of learners as a group of individual learners and of each item comprising the test (Ibid).

Related to this is the concept of item difficulty. “The index of difficulty (or the facility value) of an item simply shows how easy or difficult the particular item proved to be in the test. The index of difficulty is, generally, expressed as the fraction of the learners who answered the item correctly. It is calculated by using the formula:

$$F.V. = \frac{R}{N}$$

Where

R = number of correct answers

N = number of learners taking the test (Ibid).

3.4. Final Administration

Final tests were administered on April/24/2000 and April/20/2000 to learners at the Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadysia, respectively. Test time is one hour. Care has been taken to inform testees that the test has been carried out for research purposes and has no bearing upon their academic gain.

Test instructions were clearly explained to the subjects who were asked to answer on the same question form as a time and effort conscious technique. Then they were encouraged to ask any questions related to the items and not to write their names on the question forms. The marking

process was carried out by the researcher following the marking scheme outlined in the upcoming section.

३. १. Scoring Scheme

For the sake of objectivity and reliability, a well-defined scoring scheme has been followed. The test has been allocated the score of (१००). The scores have been distributed in such a way as to give two grades for each correct answer and zero for the incorrect one. Items left with no answer have also been given zero score because they have been assumed to show the failure of the testee to give the right answer.

The scoring scheme adopted is illustrated in the following table:

Table (१)

Distribution of the Scores of the Test

No. of Questions	No. of Items	Scores	Percentage
१	१२	२४	२४
२	८	१६	१६
३	१०	३०	३०
४	१०	३०	३०
Total	००	१००	१००

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

४. १. Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is the presentation and discussion of the results of the test. We try to identify errors that subjects made in using indirect questions and to demonstrate them statistically in an attempt at detecting the possible sources of these errors to shed light on the difficulties faced by Iraqi EFL university learners in manipulating indirect questions.

4. 2. Discussion of Results

In this section the performance of the subjects on each question of the test, in particular, and on the whole test in general, regarding the levels of recognition and production is presented. The subjects' mastery of indirect questions is determined by their correct responses which are used as a tool to verify or refute the hypotheses proposed in the beginning of this study.

4. 2. 1. Subjects' Achievement of Question One

Question One has been constructed to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level. The following two tables show the results obtained from analyzing the subjects' achievement on each item in this question.

Table (2)

Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition Level, Question (1),

University of Babylon

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣٠	٦٠	٢٠	٤٠		
٢	٢٨	٥٦	٢٢	٤٤		
٣	٣٢	٦٤	١٨	٣٦		
٤	٢٠	٤٠	٣٠	٦٠		
٥	١٨	٣٦	٣١	٦٢	١	٢
٦	١٦	٣٢	٣٢	٦٤	٢	٤
٧	٢٥	٥٠	٢٥	٥٠		
٨	٣٠	٦٠	٢٠	٤٠		
٩	٢٧	٥٤	٢٣	٤٦		
١٠	٢٥	٥٠	٢٤	٤٨	١	٢
١١	٣٢	٦٤	١٨	٣٦		
١٢	٣٦	٧٢	١٤	٢٨		
Total	٣١٩	٥٣.٣	٢٧٧	٤٦.١	٤	٠.٦

Table (٣)

**Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition Level, Question (١),
University of Al-Qadissiya**

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣٢	٦٤	١٨	٣٦		
٢	٢٦	٥٢	٢٤	٤٨		
٣	٣٠	٦٠	١٩	٣٨	١	٢
٤	٢١	٤٢	٢٩	٥٨		
٥	١٦	٣٢	٣١	٦٢	٣	٦
٦	١٦	٣٢	٣٣	٦٦	١	٢
٧	٢٢	٤٤	٢٨	٥٦		
٨	٣١	٦٢	١٩	٣٨		
٩	٣٠	٦٠	٢٠	٤٠		
١٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٩	٥٨	١	٢
١١	٣٣	٦٦	١٧	٣٤		
١٢	٣٠	٦٠	٢٠	٤٠		
Total	٣٠٧	٥١.١	٢٨٧	٤٧.١	٦	١

Tables (٢ and ٣) show that the total numbers of correct responses are (٣١٩, ٥٣.٣%) for the University of Babylon learners and (٣٠٧, ٥١.١%) for the University of Al-Qadissiya learners. Totals of incorrect responses (including avoided ones) are (٢٨١, ٤٦.٧%) for the University of Babylon learners and (٢٩٣, ٤٨.٨%) the University of Al-Qadissiya learners. This reveals the learners relative incompetence in distinguishing direct from indirect questions.

٤.٢.٢. Subjects' Achievement of Question Two

Question Two, recognition level, measures the learners' ability in choosing the most suitable completion in multiple-choice type sentences, particularly when it comes to deciding on the right verbal and adverbial combination. Tables (٤ and ٥) show the subjects' responses to each of the eight items in this question.

Table (٤)
Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition Level, Question (٢),
University of Babylon

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣٠	٦٠	٢٠	٤٠		
٢	٢٩	٥٨	٢١	٤٢		
٣	٣٢	٦٤	١٨	٣٦		
٤	٢٥	٥٠	٢٥	٥٠		
٥	١٩	٣٨	٣٠	٦٠	١	٢
٦	١٨	٣٦	٣٠	٦٠	٢	٤
٧	٢١	٤٢	٢٩	٥٨		
٨	٢٣	٤٦	٢٧	٥٤		
Total	١٩٧	٤٩.٢	٢٠٠	٥٠	٣	٠.٧٥

Table (٥)
Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition Level, Question (٢),
University of Al-Qadissiya

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣١	٦٢	١٩	٣٨		
٢	٢٥	٥٠	٢٥	٥٠		
٣	٢٩	٤٨	٢١	٤٢		
٤	٢٧	٥٨	٢٣	٤٦		
٥	١٨	٣٦	٣٠	٦٠	٢	٤
٦	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨	٥٦	٢	٤
٧	٢٠	٤٠	٢٩	٥٨	١	٢
٨	٢٦	٥٢	٢٣	٤٦	١	٢
Total	١٩٦	٤٨.٢	١٩٨	٤٩.٥	٦	٢

The two tables show that more than half of the subjects have given incorrect responses. Totals of incorrect responses (including avoided items) are as follows: (٢٠٣, ٥٠.٧%) for the University of Babylon learners and (٢٠٤, ٥١.٥%) for the University of Al-Qadissiya learners. This makes it clear that many learners have encountered some sort of difficulty in recognizing the correct verbal combination that characterizes the structure of indirect questions. Tables (٦ and ٧) illustrate the subjects' total achievement at the recognition level.

Table (٦)
Subjects' Total Achievement at the Recognition Level,
Question (١ and ٢), University of Babylon

No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣١٩	٥٣.٣	٢٧٧	٤٦.١	٤	٠.٦
٢	١٩٧	٤٩.٢	٢٠٠	٥٠	٣	٠.٧٥
Total	٥١٦	٥١.٢	٤٧٧	٤٨	٧	٠.٦

Table (٧)
Subjects' Total Achievement at the Recognition Level,
Question (١ and ٢), University of Al-Qadissiya

No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٣٠٧	٥١.١	٢٨٧	٤٧.٨	٦	١
٢	١٩٦	٤٢.٢	١٩٨	٤٩.٥	٦	٢
Total	٥٠٣	٤٩.٦	٤٨٥	٤٨.٦	١٢	١.٥

Figures indicate that many subjects have faced difficulty in distinguishing the correct verbal combination characterizing indirect questions in English as shown by the highest rates of their incorrect responses, (٤٨.١%) for the University of Babylon learners and (٥٠.١) for

the University of Al-Qadissiya learners. Thus, the first hypothesis stating that some Iraqi EFL college learners do not often distinguish the correct structure of indirect questions is verified.

٤.٢.٣ Subjects' Achievement of Question Three

This question consists of fifteen items primarily compiled to measure the subjects' achievement at the production level. Tables (٨ and ٩) go into detail of each item. It is apparent from these two tables that most learners are incompetent in producing correct versions of indirect questions as indicated by the high rates of incorrect responses scored by learners at both universities, (٥٤٩, ٧٣.١%) for subjects' at the University of Babylon and (٥٦٢, ٧٤.٢%) for those at the University of Al-Qadissiya.

Table (A)
Subjects' Achievement at the Production Level, Question (3),
University of Babylon

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	10	30	31	72	4	8
2	13	26	32	74	0	10
3	10	20	33	76	7	14
4	21	42	29	58		
5	19	38	31	72		
6	18	36	32	74		
7	12	24	38	76		
8	10	20	40	80		
9	11	22	31	72	8	16
10	9	18	30	70	6	12
11	10	30	30	70		
12	13	26	37	74		
13	9	18	41	82		
14	12	24	33	76	0	10
15	14	28	36	72		
Total	201	26.8	514	68.0	30	4.6

Table (٩)
Subjects' Achievement at the Production Level, Question (٣),
University of Al-Qadissiya

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	١٣	٢٦	٣٥	٧٠	٢	٤
٢	١٠	٢٠	٣٦	٧٢	٤	٨
٣	١٤	٢٨	٣٦	٧٢		
٤	١٨	٣٦	٣٢	٦٤		
٥	٢١	٤٢	٢٩	٥٨		
٦	١٥	٣٠	٣٢	٦٤	٣	٦
٧	١٠	٢٠	٣٦	٧٢	٤	٨
٨	١٢	٢٤	٣٨	٧٦		
٩	٩	١٨	٣٢	٦٤	٦	١٢
١٠	٩	١٨	٣٤	٦٨	٧	١٤
١١	١٩	٣٨	٣١	٦٢		
١٢	٨	١٦	٤٢	٨٤		
١٣	٧	١٤	٣٧	٧٤	٦	١٢
١٤	١٥	٣٠	٣٥	٧٠		
١٥	١٠	٢٠	٣٨	٧٦	٢	٤
Total	١٩٠	٢٥.٣	٥٢٨	٦٩.٧	٣٤	٤.٥

٤.٢.٤. Subjects' Achievement of Question Four

Question Four measures the subjects' abilities in producing the needed type of tense back-shift and tense sequence through asking them to provide complete indirect questions on their own based on stimuli offered to them. Tables (١٠ and ١١) indicate the learners' apparent incompetence in deciding on the needed type of tense back-shift and tense sequence as shown by the number of their incorrect responses, (٥٨٠, ٧٧.٤%) for the University of Babylon and (٥٩٨, ٧٩.٦%) for the University of Al-Qadissiya.

Table (١٠)
Subjects' Achievement at the Production Level, Question (٤),
University of Babylon

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	٩	١٨	٣٦	٧٢	٥	١٠
٢	٧	١٤	٣٧	٧٤	٤	٨
٣	٦	١٢	٤٠	٨٠	٤	٨
٤	٨	١٦	٣٩	٧٨	٣	٦
٥	٥	١٠	٣٩	٧٨	٦	١٢
٦	١٠	٢٠	٣٨	٧٦	٢	٤
٧	١٢	٢٤	٣٨	٧٨		
٨	١٥	٣٠	٣٣	٦٦	٢	٤
٩	١٠	٢٠	٤٠	٨٠		
١٠	١٣	٢٦	٣٧	٧٤		
١١	١٧	٣٤	٣٣	٦٦		
١٢	١٢	٢٤	٣٥	٧٠	٣	٦
١٣	١٥	٣٠	٣٥	٧٠		
١٤	١٣	٢٦	٣٣	٦٦	٤	٨
١٥	١٦	٣٢	٣٤	٦٨		
Total	١٦٨	٢٢.٤	٥٤.٧	٧٣	٣٣	٤.٤

Table (١١)
Subjects' Achievement at the Production Level, Question (٤),
University of Al-Qadissiya

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
١	١٠	٢٠	٣٤	٦٨	٦	١٢
٢	٦	١٢	٣٧	٧٤	٧	١٤
٣	٦	١٢	٣٨	٧٦	٦	١٢
٤	٧	١٤	٣٩	٧٨	٤	٨
٥	٤	٨	٤٣	٨٦	٣	٦
٦	٩	١٦	٣٩	٧٨	٢	٣
٧	١٠	٢٠	٣٩	٧٨	١	٢
٨	١٣	٢٦	٣٦	٧٢	١	٢
٩	٨	١٦	٣٩	٧٨	٣	٦
١٠	١١	٢٢	٣٥	٧٠	٤	٨
١١	١٥	٣٠	٣٣	٦٦	٢	٤
١٢	١٠	٢٠	٤٠	٨٠		
١٣	١٣	٢٦	٣١	٦٢	٦	١٢
١٤	١٥	٣٠	٣٥	٧٠		
١٥	١٥	٣٠	٣٥	٧٠		
Total	١٥٢	٢٠.١	٥٥٣	٧٣.٧	٤٥	٥.٩

The following tables, (١٢ and ١٣), sum up the subjects' achievement at the production level in questions (٣ and ٤).

Table (١٢)
Subjects' Total Achievement at the Production Level,
Questions (٣ and ٤), University of Babylon

No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
٣	٢٠١	٢٦.٨	٥١٤	٦٨.٥	٣٥	٤.٦
٤	١٦٨	٢٢.٤	٥٤٧	٧٣	٣٣	٤.٤
Total	٣٦٩	٢٤.٦	١٠٦١	٧٠.٧	٦٨	٤.٥

Table (١٣)
Subjects' Total Achievement at the Production Level,
Questions (٣ and ٤), University of Al-Qadissiya

No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
٣	١٩٠	٢٥.٣	٥٢٨	٦٩.٧	٣٤	٤.٥
٤	١٥٢	٢٠.١	٥٣٣	٧٣.٧	٤٥	٥.٩

Total	٣٤٢	٢٢.٧	١.٨١	٧١.٧	٧٩	٥.٢
-------	-----	------	------	------	----	-----

As indicated by learners' scores at both Universities, subjects show low recognitional knowledge when it comes to distinguishing direct from indirect questions and proved very incompetent in producing correct indirect questions, which validates the second hypothesis. This is illustrated in Tables (١٤ and ١٥) below.

Table (١٤)
Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition and
Production Level, University of Babylon

Level	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
Recognition	٥١٦	٥١.٢	٤٧٧	٤٨	٧	٠.٦
Production	٣٦٩	٢٤.٦	١.٦١	٧٠.٧	٦٨	٤.٥
Total	٨٨٥	٣٧.٩	١٥٣٨	٥٩.٣	٧٥	٢.٥

Table (١٥)
Subjects' Achievement at the Recognition and
Production Level, University of Al-Qadissiya

Level	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
Recognition	٥٠٣	٤٩.٦	٤٨٥	٤٨.٦	١٢	١.٥

Production	٣٤٢	٢٢.٧	١٠.٨١	٧١.٧	٧٩	٥.٢
Total	٨٤٥	٣٦.١	١٥٦٦	٦٠.١	٩١	٣.٣

٤.٣. Error Analysis

٤.٣.١. Sources of Errors

This section is dedicated to the identification and analysis of the subjects' errors and the strategies they follow in learning English indirect questions. Brown (١٩٨٧:٧٥) divides learners' errors into four categories: interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, context of learning and communication strategies.

٤.٣.١.١. Interlingual Transfer

Interlingual transfer is “a form of generalization that takes prior language experiences and applies them incorrectly” (Ibid, ٨). Brown (Ibid) states that in the early stages of learning a second language, before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw.

Some of the subjects' errors contain some of the features of this negative transfer. For instance, part of the subjects' errors bears the traits of this transfer, at the production level, as represented by the interference

of the subjects' mother tongue, in this case Arabic. Items (٦ and ٧), Q III, show

that wrong answers can be attributed to false translation into Arabic. Where the first sentence can be translated in its indirect-question converted version, especially in Iraqi Arabic, into (سألني عن ما في حقيبيتي) and not (سألني عن ما الذي كان موجوداً في حقيبيتي). Similarly, the second sentence's erroneous answer could be originated in the mistranslated version (تساءلت اين المحطة) while the most suitable translation is (تساءلت اين (كانت المحطة)).

(٥٤) Item (٦)

(A) *He asked searching the car for firearms,*

“What have you got in your bag?”

(B) **He asked what I have got in my bag.*

(C) *He asked what I had got in my bag.*

(٥٥) Item (٧)

(A) *“Where is the station?” she asked, after three hours*

of

continuous driving.

(B) **She asked where is the station.*

(C) *She asked where the station was.*

Following the same pattern, erroneous responses to items (٣ and ١١), Q III, can be traced back to the same error source of negative transfer. Example (٥٦) may be translated into (تساءلوا اين عليهم ان يكونوا في العام) and not (تساءلوا اين عليهم ان يكونوا في ظرف عام/في عين الوقت في العام) (القادم/التالي).

(التالي). Hence, we have the maintaining of (next year). Wrong answers to item (٥٧) could be the result of the almost apparently similar meaning of (anybody)=(أي أحد) and (somebody)=(أحدٍ ما) for some learners when translated into Arabic. This may result in keeping the non-assertive forms of the direct question in the indirect one.

(٥٦) Item (٣)

(A) *Thinking deeply in the situation they said:*

“Where Should we be this time next year?”

(B)**They inquired where they should be this time next year.*

(C)*They inquired where they should be in a year’s time/at that time in the following year.*

(٥٧) Item (١١)

(A) *The father shocked-like asked: “Anybody hurt?”*

(B)**The father shockingly asked whether anybody is hurt.*

(C) *The father shockingly asked if/whether somebody was hurt.*

Another example of this negative transfer is keeping the demonstratives

Without changing them into the case denoting remoteness, as in item (٩),
Q

III, below.

(٥٨) Item (٩)

(A) "Is anyone here?" he inquired, feeling his way in the

darkness.

(B) * He inquired whether someone was here.

(C) He inquired whether someone was there.

This error may be the result of mistranslating the indirect question into

(تسائل عما إذا كان من أحد هنا) instead of (تسائل عما إذا كان هناك).

The total number of errors that can be attributed to interlingual transfer

is (٢٣, ١.٤٪) for the University of Babylon and (٢٥, ١.٥٪) for the University of Al-Qadissiya.

٤.٣.١.٢. Intralingnal Transfer

A second source of error frequently identified in learners' responses is intralingnal transfer: the extending patterns from the TL or overgeneralising a learner's rule (Connor, ١٩٩٦:١٣). Such errors may be caused by the influence of one TL item upon another (Penny, ٢٠٠١:٩). Penny (Ibid) claims that when learners begin to acquire parts of the new (language) system, more and more intralingnal transfer--generalisation within the TL-- is manifested.

We can perceive the following errors that can be ascribed to such a type of negative transfer. Items (١ and ٨) of Q I and items (١, ٥ and ٧) Q II, are examples of overgeneralising direct question formation rules into forming indirect questions. This rule concerns maintaining the subject-operator inversion while forming indirect question.

(٥٩) Item (١)

- (A) *She asked her sister what should she say.*
- (B)* *She asked her sister what should she say.*
- (C) *She asked her sister what she should say.*

(٦٠) Item (٨)

- (A) *They asked if had you been to France three times.*
- (B) **They asked if had you been to France three times.*
- (C) *They asked if you had been to France three times.*

(٦١) Item (١)

- (A) *They askedgo hunting*
- (B)**They asked where would I go hunting.*
- (C)*They asked where I would go hinting.*

(٦٢) Item (٥)

- (A) *They askedknow the results of the test.*
- (B)**They asked when would they know the results
the test of the test.*

(C) *They asked when they would know the results of
the
test.*

(٦٣) Item (٧)

- (A) *I inquired.....do.*
- (B)**I inquired what should I do.*
- (C) *I inquired what I should do.*

Overgeneralising direct questions formation rules sometimes results in outrageous erroneous answers such as maintaining the question mark (?)

at the end of indirect questions in a direct violation of indirect question formation rules and which may be analyzed as a setback on the part of some learners to an earlier stage in their language acquisition process. Examples are items (1, 3, and 6), Q III.

(14) Item (1)

(A) *He after getting tired and bored, asked: "When is the next train, Mary?"*

(B) **He asked Mary tiredly when is the next train.*

(C) *He asked Mary when the following train was.*

(15) Item (3)

(A) *Thinking deeply in the situation they said: "Where shall we be this time next year?"*

(B) **They asked where they should be this time next year?*

(C) *They asked where they should be in a year's time.*

(16) Item (6)

(A) *She said while holding the three boxes: "Will you help me please?"*

(B) **She asked would you help me please?*

(C) *She asked whether he would help her.*

(17) Item (9)

(A) *"Is anyone here?" he inquired, feeling his way in the darkness.*

(B) *He inquired whether anybody is here.

(C) He inquired whether someone was there.

Connor (1996:20) states some other error generation processes such as ignorance of rule restriction (applying a grammar rule where it is not applicable), incomplete application of grammar rules (learners' confining to simple rules avoiding more complicated ones). Examples of ignorance of rule restriction are items (2, 3, and 4), Q IV.

(68) Item (2)

(A) He said: "If your children were older, would you emigrate?"

(B) *He asked if my children were older, I had emigrated.

(C) He asked whether I would emigrated if my children were older.

In this example we can keep the (would) without changing it into the past perfect because the sentence refers to an unfinished action at the time of reporting (Thomson and Martinet, 1970:180).

(69) Item (3)

(A) She asked: "Had anyone brought an umbrella with him prior my coming in here?"

(B)* She asked whether anyone had brought an umbrella with him prior they had come in here.

(C) *She asked whether someone had brought an umbrella with him prior they were coming in here.*

(٦٦) Item (١٣)

(A) *The manager asked: “How much of cash your project would claim before turning lucrative?”*

(B) **The manager asked him how much of cash his project would claim before it had turned lucrative.*

(C) *The manager asked him how much of cash his project would claim before it turned lucrative.*

Examples of incomplete application of grammar rules are items (١, ٣, and ٦),
Q IV.

(٦٧) Item (١)

(A) *He asked: “Who might have been there before you come?”*

(B) **He asked who might have been there before I come.*

(C) *He asked who might had been there before I had come.*

(٦٨) Item (٣)

(A) *She asked: “Have you decided not to buy the house*

because an internet café was being installed next door?”

(B)**She asked whether I had decided not to buy the house*

because an internet café was being installed next door.

(C) *She asked whether I had decided not to buy the house because an internet café had been being installed nextdoor. .*

(٦٩) Item (٦)

(A) *He asked: “When you were living in Paris were you*

often see Paul?”

(B)**He asked whether they have been often seeing Paul*

when they were living in Paris.

(C) *He asked whether they had often been seeing Paul*

when they had been living in Paris/there.

The researcher has noticed that this error source accounts for most of the errors committed by the subjects (٨٧٣, ٥٤.٢%) of the total number of errors for the University of Babylon and (٨٩١, ٥٣.٧%) for the University of Al-Qadissiya.

٤.٣.١.٣. Context of Learning

Other features that may be of negative influence in the teaching/learning

environment are the lacking explanations by the foreign language teacher as well as the textbook writers who may wish to emphasize some points at the expense of some other points depending on their own beliefs about how language and grammar should be taught (Salebi, ۲۰۰۴:۲۱۰).

In most of grammar books looked through by the researcher little attention has been paid to the topic of reported speech and, in particular, indirect questions. This point accounts for some of the difficulty learners encounter in dealing with this topic. Item (۱۲) of Q III and (۱۰) of Q IV illustrates this point.

(۷۰) Item (۱۲)

(A) *She asked tongue-in-head: "Does John drink?"*

(B) * *She asked cautiously whether John had drink.*

(C) *She wanted to know if John used to drink.*

(۷۱) Item (۱۰)

(A) *He asked: "What time must I go?"*

(B) * *He asked what time he must go.*

(C) *He asked what time he had to go.*

Most of the subjects (۴۸, ۹۶٪) failed to give the right answer to this item which reveals the amount of difficulty facing learners in tackling such almost neglected aspects of teaching reported speech. The total number of such errors in the subjects' responses is (۱۸۶, ۱۱.۵٪) for the University of Babylon and (۱۷۶, ۱۰.۶٪) for the University of Al-Qadissiya.

۴.۳.۱.۴. Communication Strategies

Communication strategies can be defined as the conscious employment of verbal or non-verbal mechanisms for communicating an idea when precise linguistic forms are for some reasons not available to the learner at that point in communication (Brown, 1980). The key defining criteria for communication strategies are problematization and consciousness, i. e., they are “used when L² learners encounter a problem in communication” (Rababah, 2003:22).

According to Tarone (1988) the most important of such strategies are avoidance (i.e., solving communicative problems by keeping silent) paraphrase and it consists of circumlocution (i.e., giving a definition of what one wants to say) coinage (i.e., making up a new word for the sake of communication) and approximation (i.e., bringing the meaning through word-relatedness (Rababah, 2003:22). Subjects have used some of the abovementioned strategies which led to correct answers as shown in the following examples. Coinage in example (V1), circumlocution in examples (V2 and V3) and approximation in examples (V4 and V5).

(V2) Item (4) QIII

(A) *He asked several times: “shall we meet at the theatre?”*

(B) *He asked severally whether we should meet there.*

(V3) Item (3) Q IV

(A) *She asked: “Have you decided not to buy the house because an internet café was being installed next door?”*

(B) *She asked whether the internet café was the reason for*

I had decided not to buy the house.

(Vξ) Item (ξ) Q III

(A) *They asked: “Are you going to join the party tomorrow when you finish your homework?”*

(B) *They asked if I was going to join the party the following day I finished my homework.*

(Vο) Item (V) Q IV

(A) *“Should we have sent it to your flat, sir?” he said*

(B) *He asked whether they should had sent it there.*

(Vϓ) Item (ϓξ) Q IV

(A) *They asked: “Which way had he followed?”*

(B) *They asked which way he had gone.*

But the employment of such strategies has led to a number of errors such as, circumlocution in examples (Vϓ and VV) and approximation in examples (Vλ, Vρ and λ⋅).

(VV) Item (V) Q IV

(A) *He said: “Who might have been there before you come?”*

(B)* *He asked who might had been there before my going.*

(Vλ) Item (V) Q IV

(A) He asked: "If your children were older, would you
emigrate?"

(B)* He asked whether I would emigrate when my children are older than now.

(V⁹) Item (A) Q IV

(A) They asked: "Have you been practicing most of the time last week?"

(B) *They asked whether I had been practicing most of
the time the week before.

(A⁰) Item (A⁰) Q IV

(A) He asked: "What time must I go?"

(B)* He asked when must he go.

(A¹) Item (A⁰) Q IV

(A) My mother asked me: "Whom did you bring with
you yesterday?"

(B)*My mother asked me whom I had brought with
me last night.

In the long run the avoidance strategy has pervasively been employed by subjects as represented by the items left by them without answers. The

researcher has entered them under “No. of Avoided Items” columns in the tables above.

The total numbers of errors resulting from the use of such strategies are (٥٣١, ٣٢.٩%) for the University of Babylon and (٥٦٥, ٣٤.٢%) for the University of Al-Qadissiya, respectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

٥. ١. Introduction

This chapter comprises the main conclusions reached via both the theoretical search and the results of the test of this study. The arrived-at conclusions are meant to act as a background for the pedagogical recommendations and suggestions for upcoming investigation in the area of indirect questions.

๑. ๓. Conclusions

๑. ๓. ๑. Theoretical Conclusions

๑. It is assumed that indirect speech is normally used in conversation especially to repeat statements that take the form of nominal that-clauses.

๒. It is possible to convert all the main sentence types into indirect speech. For questions, the indirect construction is usually a dependent wh-element.

๓. Indirect questions have several syntactic contexts, e. g., subject, complement of verb, complement of adjective, and complement of preposition.

๔. Three entities, which are closely related to the process of converting direct into indirect questions, deictic features, tense backshift, and sequence of tenses, are seen to be arranged in a form of a progression. This progression starts with the deictic features of the direct question which signal the degree of backshift that determines the required sequence of tenses.

٥.٢.٢. Practical Conclusions

Throughout the practical work in this research the researcher has come up with the following practical conclusions

١. Iraqi EFL university learners at the fourth year have been found to encounter difficulties in recognizing and producing indirect questions. This is proved by their low achievement in the test devised as shown by the rate of their correct responses (٣٧.٩%) for Babylon University and (٣٦.١%) for Al-Qadissiya University, which is markedly lower than that of their incorrect ones (٥٩.٣%) for Babylon University and (٦٠.١%) for Al-Qadissiya University. This validates the first hypothesis of this study.

٢. At the production level, outcomes of data analysis for Questions One and Two show the subjects' incompetence to produce indirect questions. Their correct rates regarding the two questions are (٢٤.٦%) and (٢٢.٧%) for Babylon and Al-Qadissiya Universities, whereas their incorrect responses rates are (٧٠.٧%) and (٧١.٧%) for Babylon and Al-Qadissiya Universities respectively. This supports the second hypothesis that some Iraqi EFL university learners encounter difficulty in converting direct questions into indirect ones.

٣. The subjects' achievement in the whole test has yielded the finding that Iraqi EFL college learners face more difficulty in using indirect questions at the production level than at the recognition one. The subjects' achievement at the recognition level has obtained a mean of (٢٥.٦) and that of the production level is (١٢.٣). This verifies the third hypothesis that learners' achievement at the recognition level is expected to be better than theirs at the production level.

ξ. Some of the possible reasons behind the subjects' poor achievement are the following arranged hierarchically according to frequency of errors ascribed to each:

١. Intralingual transfer that forms the majority of the subjects' errors accounts for (٥٤.٧%) of the total number of errors at Babylon University and (٥٣.٧%) at Al-Qadissiya University. The subjects' dependence on their background TL grammar rules knowledge without paying attention to their acceptability is the result of lacking understanding of these rules. This encourages overgeneralization, incomplete rule application and false concept hypothesis.

٢. Communication strategies to which subjects have refuged in an attempt to communicate and convey what they mean account for (٣٢.٩%) at Babylon University and (٣٤.٧%) at Al-Qadissiya University.

٣. Context of learning resulted in errors rates of (١١.٥%) for Babylon University and (١٠.٦%) for Al-Qadissiya University. Such errors are attributed to lack of ample attention given to a certain topic by the EFL teacher and textbook alike.

٤. Interlingual interference in which the subjects use their prior mother tongue experiences incorrectly accounts for (١.٤%) for Babylon University and (١.٥%) for Al-Qadissiya University.

٥. ٣. Recommendations

٥. ٣. ١. Pedagogical Implications

In view of the findings of this study, the following pedagogical implications can be made:

١. Iraqi EFL university learners are in need of a longer exposure to the topic of reported speech. It would be more effective if syllabus designers dedicated more space and examples to include all the possible cases of indirect questions. Adopting a cyclic stance in arranging material could be of benefit here. Instead of dealing with the topic in block, syllabus designers can break it down. So, learners encounter the part of converting direct questions into indirect questions when dealing with the interrogative type of sentence. In this way, it is going to be easier to learners to learn indirect questions formation rules as kinds of exceptions to these of direct questions.

٢. It is advisable to give more attention to the semantic and pragmatic side of the topic. This can be achieved through dedicating more time for acquainting learners with the importance of deictic features and, in particular, that of the time reference in determining the right degree of backshift and tense sequence.

٣. This means that concentrating on structural modifications cannot be enough for learners to master all the cases of reported speech and indirect questions, especially the difficult ones.

٤. The outcomes of this study might be of help to learners and syllabus designers. It can be advantageous to the former in shifting their attention to the deictic side of the topic and to the latter in including this side in

their designs and in preparing remedial programmes that can better the achievement of their learners regarding this area of English grammar.

٤. Suggestions for Further Research

The following topics are suggested for further research in this area:

١. A study can be carried out to investigate the influence of a deictically-oriented teaching of indirect questions and reported speech on the achievement of Iraqi EFL College learners

٢. Another study can be conducted to evaluate the role of the semantic content of the sentence as opposed to the structural form in relation to converting it into indirect speech.

APPENDIX I

The Test Items

I. State whether the following items are grammatically correct (T) or incorrect (F).

١. She asked her sister what should she say.
٢. He asked me which car my father had bought.
٣. They asked who broke the window.
٤. She asked whether they came.
٥. He wondered whose book was that.
٦. I asked where did she live.
٧. She asked if it has been raining earlier.
٨. They asked if had you been to France three times.
٩. The teacher asked how many learners will sit the exam.
١٠. My mother wanted to know how far lies the gas station
١١. The customer asked how much the dress would cost.
١٢. She asked if or not I am coming.

II. Choose the suitable completion from the choices bellow.

١. They askedgo hunting.

- A. where will I
- B. where would I
- C. where I will
- D. where I would

٢. He askedthat day.

- A. what should he be doing
- B. what he should be doing
- C. what shall he be doing
- D. what he shall be doing

٣. They askedsay.

- A. what could he
- B. what he could
- C. what can he
- D. what he can

٤. She asked whybe there.

- A. cannot he
- B. he cannot
- C. could not he
- D. he could not

٥. They askedknow the result of the test.

- A. when will they
- B. when they will
- C. when they would
- D. when would they

٦. She asked whether

- A. had she come over from London.
- B. has she come over from London.
- C. she had come over from London.
- D. she has come over from London.

٧. I inquireddo.

- A. what should I
- B. what I should
- C. what shall I
- D. what I shall

٨. She asked whethergo in two days time.

- A. she may
- B. she might
- C. may she
- D. might she

III. Fill in the blanks using the information given in the main item.

١. He, after getting tired and bored, asked: "When is the next train, Mary?"

-He asked

٢. Being annoyed by his careless driving she said: "Why did not you put on the brakes?"

-She wondered

٣. Thinking deeply in the situation they said: "Where shall we be this time next year?"

-They inquired.....

ξ. He asked several times: "Shall we meet at the theatre?"

-He asked.....

ο. She said while holding the three boxes: "Will you help me, please?"

- She wanted to know

ϛ. He asked searching the car for fire arms: "What have you got in your bag?"

- He asked

Ϝ. "Where is the station?" she asked, after three hours of continuous driving.

- She asked.....

λ. She asked, gazing at the pile of reports he has to read: "Are you going to stay or go out?"

- She asked.....

ϑ. "Is anyone here?" he inquired, feeling his way in the darkness.

- He inquired

ϝ. They said, looking at him right in the eye: "Why did you do this?"

- They asked

Ϟ. The father asked: "Anybody hurt?"

- The father asked.....

١٢. She asked tongue-in-head: "Does John drink?"

- She wanted to know.....

١٣. He, reading quickly through the document, asked: "How long he have been staying there?"

- He asked.....

١٤. His sister, checking the time left on the cell-phone card, asked: "How often you kept phoning her?"

- His sister asked.....

١٥. They asked steering on my brother's clothes: "Was your brother inside?"

- They asked

IV. Change the following into indirect questions

١. He said: "Who might have been there before you come?"

٢. He said: "If your children were older, would you emigrate?"

٣. She asked: "Have you decided not to buy the house because an internet café was being installed next door?"

٤. They asked: "Are you going to join the party tomorrow when you finish your homework?"

٥. She asked: "Had anyone brought umbrella with him prior coming in here?"

٦. He asked: "When you were living in Paris were you often see Paul?"

- ∨. "Should we have sent it to your flat, sir?" he said.
- ∧. They asked: "Have you been practicing most of the time last week?"
- ∩. She asked: "Could not you swim across the river?"
- ∪. He asked: "What time must I go?"
- ∩∩. Her brother wondered: "How do you feel now?"
- ∩∪. His co-driver asked: "How many kilometres you were travelling everyday last week?"
- ∩∩∩. The manager asked: "How much of cash your project would claim before turning lucrative?"
- ∩∩∩. They asked: "Which way he had followed?"
- ∩∩∩. My mother asked me: "Whom did you bring with you yesterday?"

APPENDIX II

Possible Answers of the Test Items

I. State whether the following items are grammatically correct (T) or incorrect (F).

١. F.

٢. T.

٣. F.

٤. F.

٥. T.

٦. T.

٧. T.

٨. F.

٩. F.

١٠. F.

١١. T.

١٢. F.

II. Choose the suitable completion from the choices bellow.

١. D.

٢. B.

٣. B.

٤. D.

٥. C.

٦. C.

٧. B.

٨. B.

III. Fill in the blanks using the information given in the main item.

١. He asked Mary tiredly when the following train was.

٢. She wandered why he had not put on the breaks.

٣. They inquired where they should be in a year's time/at that time in the following year.

- ξ. He asked whether we should meet there/at the theatre.
- ο. She wanted to know whether he would help her.
- ϒ. He asked me what I had got in my bag.
- ϒ. She asked where the station was.
- Ϡ. She asked him whether he was going to stay or go out.
- ϡ. He inquired if somebody was there.
- ϣ. They asked him why he had done that.
- ϣ. The father asked whether somebody was hurt.
- ϣ. She wanted to know if John used to drink.
- ϣ. He asked for how long had he been staying there.
- ϣ. His sister asked him how often he had kept phoning her.
- ϣ. They asked whether my brother had been inside.

IV. Change the following into indirect questions.

- ϣ. He asked who might have been there before I came.

٧. He asked whether I would emigrated if my children were older.
٨. She asked whether I had decided not to buy the house because an internet café had being installed next door.
٩. They asked if I was going to join the party the next day when I finished my homework.
١٠. She asked whether somebody had brought an umbrella with him prior he was coming in there.
١١. He asked whether they had often been seeing Paul when they had been living in Paris/there.
١٢. He asked if they should had sent it to his flat/there.
١٣. They asked whether I had been practicing most of the time the previous week.
١٤. She asked whether I could not swim across the river.
١٥. He asked what time he had to go.
١٦. Her brother wondered how she felt then.
١٧. His co-driver asked him how many kilometres he had been travelling everyday the previous week.

۱۳. The manager asked him how much of cash his project would claim before it turned lucrative.

۱۴. They asked which way he had gone.

۱۵. My mother asked me whom I had brought with me the day before.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SYMBOL

DESCRIPTION

EFL.....	ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
L ₂	SECOND LANGUAGE
TL.....	TARGET LANGUAGE
*	UNACCEPTABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, G. 1970. *English Language Units: Unit 29 Teachers' Book: Question-word: Questions*. London: Longman.

Alexander, L. G. 1988. *Longman English Grammar*. London: Longman.

Antatki, G.; L. Diaz; V. J. Cook; and D. B. Brown. 1996. "Questions and Answers to Psychological Assessment Schedules." Internet. [http://www.journalintellectual.disability.society/v\(3\):293.378/html](http://www.journalintellectual.disability.society/v(3):293.378/html).

Bakhtin, M. 1981. "Discourse in the Novel." Internet. <http://www.holquist/~dialogic.imagination/190.422.html>.

-----, 2003. "Representing Speech, Other Voices, Other

Places.” Internet. <http://www.bow.andfiles.lances.ac.uk/staff/greg/da/ch.7/7-represented.doc.pdf>.

Bateson, G. 1972. “*Steps to an Ecology of Mind.*” Internet. <http://www.knllantinebooks/kptmlp/pdf>.

Baynham, M. 1996. “*Direct Speech: What’s it doing in non-Narrative Discourse?*” Internet. [http://www.journalpragmatic.com/~20\(1\):61-81.html](http://www.journalpragmatic.com/~20(1):61-81.html).

Baynham, and Slembrouk. 1999. “*Prosody as a Marker of Indirect Reported Speech Boundary.*” Internet. <http://www.isca-speech-org/archive.html>.

Bolnden, G. 2004. “*The Quote and Beyond: Defining Boundaries of Reported Speech in Conversational Russian.*” Internet. <http://www.journalpragmatics/elsevier/pragmatica/pdf>.

Bosanta, V. 1990. “*English Writing System.*” Internet. <http://www.essex.ac.uk/~vcook/ewschapl.html>.

Brown, D. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.*

2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Brown, D and Yule, G. 1983. *“Discourse Analysis.”* Internet. <http://www.journalpragmatics/elsevier/pdf>.

Buchstaller, L. 2002. *“Indirect Speech, Tense, and Sequence of Tenses.”*

Internet. <http://www.cp/workinggroups/linguistic/~111-24/html>.

Buttny, M. 1997. *“Reported speech in Talking about Race on Campus.”*

Internet. [http://www.31\(1\):45-58/searchon/Language/pdf](http://www.31(1):45-58/searchon/Language/pdf).

-----, 1998. *“Putting Prior Talk into Context: Reporting Speech and the Reporting Context: Research on Language and Social Interaction.”* Internet. [http://www.ucl.ac/~31\(1\):45-58.html](http://www.ucl.ac/~31(1):45-58.html).

-----, 1999. *“Discursive Constructions of Racial Boundaries and Self-segregation on Campus.”* Internet. <http://www.mass-us/journalanguage/socialpsy/~268.html>.

Buttny, M and Williams, L. 2000. *“Demanding Respect: the Uses of Reported Speech in Discursive Constructions of*

Interracial Context.” Internet. [http://www.
discoursesociety/~11\(1\):109-133.html](http://www.discoursesociety/~11(1):109-133.html).

Carter, Y. and McCarthy, G. 1990. “*Grammar and Spoken Language.*”
Internet. [http://www.ed.appliedling/16\(2\): 141-180.html](http://www.ed.appliedling/16(2):141-180.html).

Christopherson, P. and Sandved, A. O. 1970. *An Advanced English
Grammar*. Bristol: Western Printing Services Ltd.

Clark, H. and Gerrig, R. 1990. “*Questions as Demonstrations.*”
Internet. <http://www.journaldistd/earving.ac-uk/html>.

Coldes-Counlthard, C. 1994. “*The Parliamentary Hausard.*” Internet
<http://www.p.zimmerma.edu/138-163/datacoll/html>.

Collins Cobuild English Grammar. 1990. Hammersmith, London:
Williams Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.

Connor, U. 1996. “*Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of
Language Writing.*” Internet [http://www.essex.ac.uk.
/~vcook/pdf](http://www.essex.ac.uk/~vcook/pdf).

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1998. “*Intonation and Clause Combining in*

Discourse.”Internet.<http://www.6133-389-426/pragmaticcircles/ac-uk/html>.

Dart, A. K. 1982. *ESL Grammar Handbook for Intermediate to Advanced Students of English as a Second Language*.
N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Fillmore, G. J. 1975. “*Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis.*” Internet. <http://www.amazon-downloadables/80-/linguisticclubs.html>.

Fludernik, F. 1993. “*The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction.*” Internet. <http://www.romtlege/higushimori/ucworkinngroups/1-24/html>.

Gaulmyn, L. 1992. “*Representation and Relevance.*” Internet. <http://www.133-03/workinggroup/ing/html>.

Goffman, E. 1974. “*Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.*” Internet. <http://www.rptboston/~1986/aka Ptmn/~30/pdf>.

-----, 1981. “*Forms of Talk.*” Internet. <http://www.busil/blakwell/~000.012/html>.

Goodwin, M. H. 1990. *“He-said-she-said: Talk as a Social Organization Among Black Children.”* Internet. <http://www.ind.univ/bloom/~36.v-^/html>.

Gunthner, S. 1999. *“Polyphony and the Layering of Voices in Reported Dialogues.”* Internet. <http://www.interling.sear.chdevice/~02/pdf>.

Haliday, M. A. K. 1982. *“Speech Representation.”* Internet. <http://www.linguistlist/~useftheterm.reportedspeech/html>.

Heaton, J. B. 1974. *Writing English language Tests*. London: Longman.

Herschberg, T. 2000. *“The Methodology of Focus Groups.”* Internet. [http://www.16\(1\):103-121/~linguistforum/ukiat/latinunum/html](http://www.16(1):103-121/~linguistforum/ukiat/latinunum/html).

Holt, E. 1996. *“Reporting Talk: The Use of Direct Reported Speech In Conversation.”* Internet. [http://www.linguistic.socialinteraction/~29\(3\):219-140/html](http://www.linguistic.socialinteraction/~29(3):219-140/html).

-----, 1999. *“Just Gassing: an Analysis of Direct Reported Speech in a Conversation between the Employees of a Gas Company.”*

Internet. <http://www.bow/and-files/uk~60-63/html>.

Jacquemet, M. 1990. *“Credibility in Court: Communicative Practices Of the Commorra Trials.”* Internet. <http://www.>

[jianticora~jeds~191-222/pdf](http://www.jianticora~jeds~191-222/pdf).

Janssen, H. 2004. *“Background of the Words Reported and Reporting.”*

Internet. <http://www.linguistlist/forums/html>.

Johnstone, B. 1993. *“Community and Contest: Midwestern Men and Women Creating their Words in Conversation*

Storytelling.” Internet. <http://www.dtunnen~edu/62-80/pdf>.

Klewitz, R. 1998. *“The Analysis of the Potential of Sensative Moments in Focus Group Discussions.”* Internet. [http://w ww.](http://www.)

[pragmaticgroup/9\(4\):406-480/pdf](http://www.pragmaticgroup/9(4):406-480/pdf).

Klewitz, R. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1999. *“Quote-Unquote? The Role of Prosody in the Contextualization of Reported Speech*

Sequences.” Internet. [http://www.metaprag.org.uk/9\(4\):
409-480/html](http://www.metaprag.org.uk/9(4):409-480/html).

Leech, G. 2000. “*Grammar of Spoken English: New Outcomes of Corpus-Oriented Research.*” Internet. [http://www.pinch.edu
U/language/learning/66-100.pdf](http://www.pinch.edu/U/language/learning/66-100.pdf).

----- and Short, A. 1981. “*Style in Fiction: English Fictional Prose.*”
Internet. <http://www.languagelearning/uk.org/ml>.

----- and Antaki, G. 1996. “*Backing Footing.*” Internet. [http://ww
w.00\(4\):r227/learningdata/uk.org/html](http://www.00(4):r227/learningdata/uk.org/html).

Levinson, S. C. 1983. “*Pragmatics.*” Internet. [http://www.eupuc/uk/c
ambridgeuni/html](http://www.eupuc/uk/cambridgeuni/html).

-----, 1988. “*Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing.*”
Internet.
<http://www.inp-drewwoot/om/~16~227/pdf>.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matoesian, G. M. 2000. “*Intertextual Authority in Reported Speech.*”

Internet. <http://www.nhulett-qume.aca.uk ckely/html>.

Maybin, J. 1997. "*Story Voices: The Use of Reported Speech in 10-12 Year-Old's Spontaneous Narratives.*" Internet. <http://www.pragmaticcoupt.uk~36-48/html>.

-----, 1999. "*Framing and Evaluation in Ten-to-Twelve Year Old School Children's Use of Reported Speech in Relation to their Induction into Educational Procedures and Practices.*" Internet. <http://www.pragmaticcoupt.uk~36/pdf>.

Mitchill, P. 1998. "*Authorial Voices in Radio News: A Framework for the Linguistic and Pragmatic Analysis of Objective Discourse Representation.*" Internet. <http://www.scunn.edu/~9/html>.

Mitchell-Kiernan, C. 1972. "*Signifying and Marking: Two Afro-American Speech Acts.*" Internet. <http://www.majijing-br~/dorisarrudata.br/pdf>.

Penny, W. K. 2001. "*An Analysis of Learners' Errors Patterns in Written English: Suggested Teaching procedures to help.*" Internet. <http://www.tefl/testjournal/berminguni/html>.

Philips, S. 1993. "Evidentiary Standards for American Trails: Just the Facts." Internet. <http://www.j~hill.edu/downloadbles~>

[01-60/pdf.](http://www.j~hill.edu/downloadbles~)

Praninskas, J. 1961. *Rapid Review of English Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Quirk, R.; S. Greenbaum; G. Leech; and J. Svartvik. 1985. A

Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.

London: Longman.

Rababah, G. 2003. "Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English. A Personal Perspective." Internet. [http://www.](http://www.teflwebjournal/vol.2.no.1/pdf)

[teflwebjournal/vol.2.no.1/pdf.](http://www.teflwebjournal/vol.2.no.1/pdf)

Ravatsos, D. and C. Berkekotter. 1997. "Social Organization in the Classroom". Internet. <http://www.ma~har/~79>

[societyacts/pdf.](http://www.ma~har/~79)

-----, 1999. "Voices in the Text: the Uses of Reported Speech in Psychotherapists Initial Assessments."

Internet. [http://www.ma~h ar/~79-text/^\(2\):21/239/pdf.](http://www.ma~h ar/~79-text/^(2):21/239/pdf)

Romero, M. ۲۰۰۳. "*Studies of Ethnomethodology.*" Internet. <http://www.nj.ac.downladables.bdm/mt/~۰۰-۷۰/pdf>.

Salebi, M. Y. ۲۰۰۴. "*Saudi College Learners' Perception of their Errors in Written English.*" Internet. <http://www.scienti cjournal/king.faisaluni/vol.۰no.۲/pdf>.

Schegloff, E. ۱۹۷۲. "*Notes on Conversational Practice.*" Internet. <http://www.ind~smdown/socialinterac/۳۴۶-۸۰/html>.

-----, ۱۹۹۰. "*On the Organization of Sequences as a Source of Coherence in Talk-in-Interaction.*" Internet. <http://sswww.ind.smdown/html>.

-----, ۱۹۹۶. "*Confirming Allusions: Toward an Impirical Account of Actions.*" Internet. <http://www.americanjou rnal/sociology/~۷۰/html>.

Schiffrin, D. ۱۹۹۳. "*speaking for Another in Sociolinguistic Interviews: Alignment, Identities and Frames.*" <http://www.tan-ed.downl.uk.oxf.۲۳۱-۲۶۳/pdf>.

-----, 1996. "*Narrative as Self-portrait: Sociolinguistic Constructions of Identity.*" Internet. <http://www.ontonde/~vv.^^/ny/pdf>.

Schuman, R. 1993. "*Discourse Strategies.*" Internet. <http://www.dc.edu/clubs/networkgroup/html>.

Semino, W.; H. Short; S. Culpeper and M. Wynne. 1999. "*Using a Corpus to Test a Model of Speech and Thought Presentation.*" Internet. <http://www.poetics/~20/v-43/akmel/html>

Silverstein, M. 1993. "*Metapragmatics Discourse and Metapragmatic Function.*" Internet. <http://www.cambridgepr/12series/html>

Sperber and Wilson. 1986. "*Irony and the Use-Mention Distinction.*" Internet. <http://www.pragmatic/cole/academic..org/html>.

Stenström, A. 1984. "*Questions and Answers in English Coonversation.*" Internet. <http://www.abir/forlang.ma/eng/html>.

Sternberg, M. 1991. "*Point of View and the Interactions of Direct Speech.*" Internet. <http://www.teraypragmat.~62-tlege/html>.

Svartvick, J and R. Quirck. 1980. "*A Corpus of English*

Conversation.” Internet. <http://www.346.80.akbkml.glegroup/html>.

Tannen, D. 1989. “*Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imaging In Conversational Discourse.*” Internet. <http://www.webcorpcivilrights/speeches/html>.

Tarone, A. 1977. “*Writing Expertise and Second Language Proficiency.*” Internet. <http://www.languagelearn.ac.uk/pdf>.

Thomson, A. J. and Martinet, A. V. 1970. *A practical English Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press.

Thompson, J. 1996. “*The Functions of Stories in Talk Show Discourse.*” Interet. <http://www.text.17/241-262/pdf>.

Uchida, S. 1997. “*Immediate Context and Reported Speech.*” Internet. <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/uchida/pdf>.

Ulmann, S. 1907. “*Reported Speech and Internal Monologue in Flambert.*” Intenet. <http://www.linguistlist/~useofthe.termreportedspeech.html>.

Volosinov, E. 1993. “*Conversation and quotation.*” Internet. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/home/86/30/pdf>.

Weber, E. ١٩٩٣. “*Varieties of Questions in English Conversation.*”
Internet.<http://www.pujubenjamen/~e.phiamaj/~٤٧.٥٥/pdf>.

Williams, L. ١٩٨٨. “*Speech and Thought Presentation Corpus.*”
Internet.<http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/uchida/pdf>.

Wilson, D. ١٩٩٤. “*Relevance and Understanding.*” Internet.
<http://www.pollitt/series/٣٥-٥٨٢oxford/pdf>.

Wynne, M. ٢٠٠٤. “*Speech and Thought Representation.*” Internet.
<http://www.shigack/u.k.kagoshn.research.pdf>.

المستخلص

تتعلق هذه أدراسة بالأسئلة غير ألباشرة في اللغة الإنجليزية. فالمعروف, على وجه أعموم, إن هنالك طريقتان لنقل ما يقوله الآخرون, ألكلام ألباشر و ألكلام غير ألباشر. يستخدم ألكلام غير ألباشر, عادة, في ألتحاور ويمكن تحويل جميع الأنواع الرئيسة للجملة إلى ألكلام غير ألباشر, بما فيها الأسئلة وألتي تشتمل على أسئلة الإيجاب أو النفي وأسئلة الـwh و أسئلة ألتخيير. أالمشكلة إنه عند تحويل الأسئلة ألباشرة إلى غير ألباشرة يتعين أجراء ألعديد من ألتغييرات وهذه ألتغييرات تتأثر بالسماط الإشارية للسؤال ألباشر. وهنا تترايط ثلاثة أشياء, السماط الإشارية وأرجاع الأزمن وألتعاقب الأزمني. وهذا يشكل نوع من الصعوبة لطلبة أالجامعة ألعراقيين أالدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية.

تهدف هذه أدراسة إلى تحري مقدره طلبة أالجامعة ألعراقيين أالدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية على تمييز وإستعمال الأسئلة غير ألباشرة وألتوصل إلى الأسباب الرئيسة لإخطائهم. يفترض أالباحث إن بعض الطلبة ألعراقيين أالجامعيين أالدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية لا يستطيعون ألتمييز ما بين الأسئلة ألباشرة و غير ألباشرة. بيد إنه يتوقع أن يكون إنجازهم على مستوى ألتمييز أفضل منه على مستوى أالإنتاج.

على أساس هذه أفرضيات صمم أالباحث إختباراً تشخيصياً وأقدمه إلى عينة من مائة طالب من طلبة ألكلية ألعراقيين أالدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في أالمرحلة أالرابعة من قسمي اللغة الإنجليزية, كليتي أالتربية في جامعتي بابل وألقادسية. أدي ألتحليل الإحصائي وألألغوي لإجابات الطلبة لفقرات أالاختبار إلى أالإستنتاج بأن طلبة أالجامعة ألعراقيين يواجهون صعوبة في تمييز الأسئلة غير ألباشرة ويواجهون صعوبة أكبر على مستوى أالإنتاج.

كما وجد أالباحث إن أخطاء الطلبة تعود إلى أالعوامل أالتالية:

١. أتناقل ما بين اللغتين كما يتمثل في التطبيق الخاطيء لخبرات اللغاة الأصلية في اللغاة المراد تعلمها, اللغاة الأنجليزية.

٢. إستراتيجيات ألتواصل ألتى يلتجى إليها ألتعلمون لغرض إيصال ما يقصدون.

٣. سياق ألتعلم وأتمثل بنقص الإهتمام ألتخصص لموضوع معين من قبل ألتدريسين أو مصممي ألتكتب المنهجية.

٤. أتناقل ما بين اللغات وأتمثل بنقل قواعد نحو اللغاة العربية إلى اللغاة الأنجليزية.

تقع هذه ألتدراسة في خمسة فصول. خصص ألتفصل ألتأول لمشكلة ألتدراسة وأهدافها وفرضياتها وإجرائها وألأفائدة منها. يمثل ألتفصل ألتأاني عرضاً نظرياً لصيغة ووظائف ألتأسئلة غير ألتباشرة مع ألتأكد على وظائفها في ألتحاور. يمثل ألتفصل ألتأالث وصفاً للإختبار ألتتشخيصي ألتذي قدم لطلبة ألتمرحلة ألتأربعة من طلبة ألتجامعة ألتعراقية ألتدريسين لللغاة الأنجليزية لغة ألتجنبية في قسمي اللغاة الأنجليزية في جامعتي بابل وألقادسية. يُلخص ألتفصل ألتأربع نتائج الإختبار من ألتنظورين الإحصائي وأللغوي. جرى ألتحليل ألتخطاء ألتطلبة وألأحددت ألتأسباب ألتمحتملة لها.

أخيراً، يوجز ألتفصل ألتأخامس ألتإستنتاجات ألتى توصل ألتباحث ألتيها من خلال هذه ألتدراسة. بناءً عليها جرى وضع بعض ألتظامين ألتعليمية واقترح بعض ألتبحوث ألتمستقبلية.

جامعة بابل

الصعوبات التي تواجه طلبة الجامعة
العراقيين أدارسين اللغة الإنجليزية
لغة أجنبية في تعلم الأسئلة الإنجليزية غير المباشرة

أطروحة

تقدم بها إلى مجلس كلية التربية الأساسية في جامعة بابل جزءاً من
متطلبات نيل درجة ماجستير تربية في طرائق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية لغة
أجنبية

نجاح ثامر جعاز

بأشراف

ا.م.د. حميد حسون

ا.م. السيد عادل العكام

تموز ٢٠٠٦ ميلادية

جمادي الثانية ١٤٢٧ هجرية