

## APPENDIX I

### ACADEMIA

Accelerating the world's research.

# A speech function analysis of tag questions in British English spontaneous dialogue

Ditte Kimps

*Journal of Pragmatics*

#### Cite this paper

Downloaded from [Academia.edu](#)

[Get the citation in MLA, APA, or Chicago styles](#)

#### Related papers

[Download a PDF Pack of the best related papers](#)



[The speech functions of tag questions in British English spontaneous dialogue \(Kimps, Ditte; ... Bert Cornillie](#)

[The Speech functions of tag questions and their properties. A comparison of their distribution in COL... Ditte Kimps, Bert Cornillie](#)

[Tag questions in fiction dialogue Karin Axelsson](#)

## APPENDIX II

No.	Data Code	The Sentences Containing Nominalizations
1.	VN 1	Kimps (2007) has proposed that in some subtypes of TQs, <b>the modification of the main clause</b> is better captured in terms of a broad concept of evidentially (Chafe, 1986; DeLancey, 2001), which includes “not only what the speaker knows and how s/he knows it, but also what can be taken to be an addressee’s state of knowledge” (Downing, 2001:251).
2.	VN 2, VN 2.1 & VN 2.2	<b>The confrontation between the speaker’s assumptions and the addressee’s presumed knowledge</b> can trigger such <b>meanings as reproach and challenge</b> , as in (2) above.
3.	VN 3	The second main approach in the literature aims at drawing up <b>an optimal semantic-pragmatic classification of the various uses of TQs</b> (Nässlin, 1984; Algeo, 1990; Holmes, 1995; Roesle, 2001; Tottie and Hoffmann; 2006, 2009)
4.	VN 4	Moreover, <b>the first speaker’s reaction to these disagreements</b> is less surprised or strong than with the other information-oriented types of TQs
5.	VN 5	<b>Her description</b> was developed, like ours, within the framework of Halliday (1994) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) with <b>the addition of notions</b> from conversation analysis, but we incorporate prosodic criteria.
6.	VN 6	As defined by Quirk et al. (1985:809), orientation is found only in polar interrogatives and codes <b>the speaker’s expectation of a negative or positive answer.</b>
7.	VN 7 & VN 7.1	<b>Categorizing them as a statement</b> , on the other hand, is also problematic since these TQs intrinsically expect a <b>response from the co-</b>

		<b>participant(s)</b>
8.	AN 1	Formally, the anchor is a declarative and the use of modals is rare in accordance with <b>the speaker's certainty about the proposition</b>
9.	VN 8	They can have either positive negative (5) or negative-positive (6) polarity patterns, but according to Quirk et al. intonation is the formal variable determining <b>the most fundamental meaning distinctions</b>
10.	VN 9	<b>The use and meaning of English TQs</b> is less easy to describe.
11.	VN 10	Speech function is intrinsically interactional, referring to the speaker and hearer's linguistic and social roles in dialogue, while rhetorical modification is concerned with <b>the speaker's presuppositions</b> and attitudes and those which s/he ascribes to the hearer
12.	VN 11	<b>The aim of this article</b> is to develop a comprehensive, data-driven description of all the speech functions English TQs can serve, which is not yet available in the literature.
13.	VN 12	One is <b>the observation</b> that TQs that ask the co-participant to decide on the truth of the proposition generally have a rise on the tag.
14.	VN 13	Tone involves change in pitch, <b>whose most prominent manifestation</b> is situated on one syllable, the nucleus or tonic syllable.
15.	AN 2 & AN 2.1	Axelsson (2011:136) correctly pointed out that declaratives with modals referring to <b>the addressee's ability</b> or <b>willingness to realize the action</b> are also found in TQs communicating a command.
16.	AN 3 & AN 3.1	Different degrees of bias towards <b>positivity</b> or <b>negativity</b> are, for instance, conveyed by

		combinations of modality and polarity in declaratives such as <i>It may/ might/ might not/ may not be in the cupboard</i>
17.	VN 14	Conversation analysis contributes four analytical distinctions that are highly relevant to <b>the recognition of the different speech functions of TQs</b> .
18.	VN 15	A <b>confirmation</b> can be just a polarity item as in (25), or a clause with the expected polarity, e.g. (29).
19.	VN 16 & VN 16.1	A third criterion is formed by the responses to TQs: Is there a response? If so, what kind of response is it? And are there further reactions to these responses? <b>The answers to these questions</b> can provide <b>important indications to distinguish the intended speech function of TQs</b> .
20.	VN 17	<b>Labeling them as a question</b> would be stretching the limits of the category since the speaker is not seeking information, but is a primary knower making an assertion or evaluation.
21.	AN 4	<b>Conduciveness to a response</b> is inherently implied in the ‘demanding’ speech functions of commands and questions, but not in statements, which may be acknowledged by the co-participant(s) but which may also be followed by another statement by the same speaker.
22.	VN 18 & VN 18.1	Blends crucially involve <b>the combination of two source forms</b> , selecting only some elements from both, which, however, remain recognizable (Aarts, 2007:192ff), and, by their combination, create a new meaning, in which elements from <b>the readings of both source</b> constructs play an essential role
23.	VN 19 & VN 19.1	<b>Identifying primary and secondary knowers</b> may require <b>extra-textual information</b> and the analysis of large contexts

24.	VN 20 & VN 20.1	The <b>blending of speech functions</b> considered here involves, at the coding level, selective mixing of formal features of interrogatives and declaratives, and, at the semantic-pragmatic level, <b>the creation of a new meaning</b> involving both knowing and giving of information (typical of statements) and demanding a response (typical of questions)
25.	VN 21 & VN 21.1	When initiating the adjacency pair, they are ambiguous between commands and statements. Response TQs can be ambiguous between <b>refusals</b> and <b>contradictions</b>
26.	AN 5	Consonant with <b>their level of assertiveness</b> and certainty, they have positive-negative polarity in 79% of cases, conveying the assumption that the proposition is true.
27.	VN 22	In most cases they are an acknowledgement, which may be a confirmation of <b>the other speaker's evaluation</b> , e.g. (59).
28.	VN 23	In terms of polarity, <b>the prohibition subtype within the command category</b> has negative–positive polarity, as in (60). Requests, e.g. (62), are associated with constant polarity
29.	VN 24	For instance, as we will see in Section 4.2, TQs that ask the hearer if the proposition in the anchor is true have in the majority of our data (60%) a single tone unit for <b>the whole construction</b> .
30.	VN 25	<b>The resulting typology</b> goes against a number of assumptions in the grammar-based literature on English TQs, which views them as questions conducive to answers

## APPENDIX III



YAYASAN PERGURUAN TINGGI 17 AGUSTUS 1945 SURABAYA  
**UNIVERSITAS 17 AGUSTUS 1945 SURABAYA**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA**

Program Studi Sastra Inggris  
Program Studi Sastra Jepang  
Kampus: Jl. Semolowaru No 45 Surabaya 60118 Telp. 5931800 (hunting) Ex. 289, Email: [fib@untag-sby.ac.id](mailto:fib@untag-sby.ac.id).

Terakreditasi  
Terakreditasi

### PENGESAHAN REVISI

Judul Skripsi : AN ANALYSIS OF NOMINALIZATION IN KIMPS'  
SCIENTIFIC TEXT -

Nama Lengkap : NURINA RAHMA ZHAFIRA

N.P.M : 1611800012

No.	Nama Penguji	Tanggal	Tanda tangan	Keterangan
1.	Cassie C. Garnida	4/7 23		ok.
2.	Priinta V. Sulekli	4/7 23		ok
3.	Donna Rahayu S.	4/7 23		
4.				