Chapter-I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1. PRELIMINARIES

The present study is intended to be of some use to practising teachers, teacher trainers and material writers. Therefore, through the study an attempt will be made to examine the structural and functional behaviour of questions in English and Kannada. But before that we get down to an actual analysis it is necessary to define the nature, scope and aim of the study and to provide a theoretical matrix highlighting certain fundamental concepts which will be referring to time and again.

2. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study of 'Interrogatives in English and Kannada' is an exercise in applied and pedagogical linguistics. To put it in other words, it is not an attempt to analyse and explicate questions within the framework of any theoretical model such as the transformational generative grammar model. However, we will be using some technical terms such as a 'movement' and 'scrambling' which are extensively used in hard core theoretical linguistics or in advanced syntax.
The area of questions has always fascinated not only grammarians but also linguists, psycholinguists, sociolinguists, philosophers, etc. Linguists have looked at questions from the structural and generative perspectives, to mention only two. Psycholinguists have attempted to throw light on questions from the point of view of the functioning of human mind. They think that the questioner's receptions and attitudes condition the reception and the production of questions. In other words, questions reveal working of the mind of the questioner. Sociolinguists look upon questions from the angle of two social principles and the power principle. That is to say, the topic, the form, and the function of questions are to some extent determined by sociolinguistic criteria like who says, what, to whom, why, where and when. Philosophers are concerned with questions as instruments of investigating the nature and functioning of the universe as well as human experience.

One could study questions from yet another perspective. For instance, questions can be classified theoretically or on the basis of field or domain of discourse such as science, religion, literature etc. Alternatively, they could also be discussed in the light of interpersonal reaction. This would be a study in pragmatics of questioning. Questions could also be classified with reference to their authenticity; for instance, information seeking questions are authentic in so far as possession of information on the part of the questioner is concerned. A genuine question is an outcome of the questioner's desire to elicit information from the questionee. This does not necessarily happen in
the case of examination questions or interview questions. In nine cases out of ten, the interviewer, the examiner or the paper setter knows the answers to the questions he asks the interviewee and the examinee respectively. We could also study questions from the point of view of functions.

Traditional grammar would say that an interrogative sentence is one that asks a question. This has been refuted by discourse analysts and semioticians. They have rightly pointed out "the multiple functions of each one of the four types of sentences: declarative, interrogative imperative and exclamatory. For example, an interrogative sentence may be used to ask a question, to suggest, to request, to criticise and to perform a whole lot of other functions".

The present study attempts to examine and discuss functions of questions in English and Kannada from the point of language teaching. It intends to discuss some aspects of questions in the two languages. For instance, two languages operate on two different principles in the formation of questions - movement, inversion and scrambling. A characteristic aspect of questions in English is the movement of auxiliary and the Wh-word. On the other hand, in Kannada, questions exhibit considerable flexibility in the placement of the question word. Another salient feature of the behaviour of the question words in English is that they occur in the sentence initial position and that they are followed by the inverted operator. This does not happen in Kannada. In this language, the place of Wh-words in questions is not fixed, and there is neither Wh-movement nor inversion.
The dominant tendency of question formation in Kannada is simple replacement of the subject, object, complement, adverbial, prepositional phrase, etc. by the Wh-words in these display flexibility in terms of their placement whereas in English, question words are rigid in terms of their syntactic position. Thus, there are some differences and some similarities also. All these will be discussed in the following chapters. Besides this, the focus is also on various functions of the question-words in both the languages.

As stated in the beginning, the study is comparative and contrastive in nature. At the same time the orientation of the study is pedagogical. That is to say, the similarities and differences between questions in English and Kannada will be considered keeping in mind their implications for:

(1) The language teacher   (2) The language learner
(3) The material writers.

Since there will be frequent comparisons and references to the learner errors throughout the dissertation, it would be in the fitness of both the contrastive analysis and error analysis.

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Every analysis has some purpose and this purpose could be either theoretical or applied. Sometimes we start with a hypothesis and attempt to either prove or disprove it. The other alternative is to analyse the phenomenon and to arrive at a hypothesis. In the present study,
we start with the hypothesis that Kannada learners of English as a second or foreign language make mistakes in the formation of questions in English because the two languages use different processes of interrogation. These processes will be briefly stated in the sub-section on the theoretical framework. For the time being let us make the observation that influence of the first language is a major cause of errors committed by second or foreign language learners. This hypothesis is supported by several practising teachers of English and our main aim in this thesis is to show that the hypothesis is valid.

The present study is a comparative analysis of questions in English and Kannada. Like any other comparative study, the present one is simultaneously contrastive in nature. In other words, throughout the study, we will be highlighting not only similarities but also differences in the structural patterns of questions in the two languages. The data analysed in the study are partly taken from English and Kannada grammar books and partly from responses given by Kannada learners of English. In addition to these, this thesis aims at discussing the various forms and functions of question words in English and Kannada.

4. THE FRAMEWORK

As we have said in the sub-section on the aims of the study, this is an exercise in pedagogical linguistics. However, any applied research needs to be placed or carried out within the framework of some theory or using some theoretical concepts. The present study tries to apply
three key concepts of Halliday’s functional grammar and three concepts from the Chomskyan tradition of Transformational Generative Grammar. The concepts taken from Halliday’s grammar are “those of ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions”2. We use language to organise, to understand, to express our perceptions of the world and of our own consciousness. The ideational function of language refers to this. This function is further classified into experimental and the logical. The experimental function is largely concerned with content or ideas. Secondly, we use language to participate in communicative acts and judgements. This is known as interpersonal function. Thirdly, language is used to relate what is said or written to the real world and to other linguistic events. This involves the use of language to text itself. This is known as the textual function. Out of these three functions, it is mainly interpersonal function for which people ask each other questions. However, there is no denying the fact that the questioner perceives the world in his own way and therefore questions are part of traditional function. Equally important is the fact that, “the questions are related to linguistic and extralinguistic context and therefore they form a part of the textual function”3. In addition to these key concepts, we will be using the three structural concepts borrowed from transformational generative grammar. They are as follows:

(a) Movement: It refers to the fronting of the Wh-element while framing a Wh-question. For example, declarative sentence may contain expressions indicating time, place, manner, reason, etc. One can frame a Wh-question asking information about any one of these expressions.
The Wh-words that a questioner requires to form questions about these expressions are 'what', 'who', 'when' (time), 'where' (place), 'why' (reason), 'how' (manner) etc. In the deep structure, this Wh-constituent is placed in the position of the respective expression. Then, this Wh-constituent which may occur sentence medially or finally is moved to the sentence initial position. This is the meaning of movement. However, there is no Wh-movement in the case of the question about sentence initial subject. Here, we merely substitute the subject (noun or pronoun) by the Wh-word 'who'.

(b) Inversion: This refers to the movement of auxiliary verb to a position immediately after the Wh-constituent in the case of Wh-questions and the movement of auxiliary verb to sentence initial position in the case of Yes-No questions. Where there is no helping verb in the deep structure or Kernel sentence, we require to apply the 'Do support' rule'. An important difference between the Wh-movement and 'subject-auxiliary-inversion' movement is that, in the former case, the Wh-element is invariably borrowed from outside whereas in the latter case, the helping verb is usually present in the deep structure.

(c) Scrambling: This refers to the free movement of the Wh-words or elements in the sentence structure. This phenomenon is not found in English Wh-questions; probably, the only exceptions could be found in poetic discourse. On the other hand, it is a common phenomenon in Kannada questions. The Wh-element may occur sentence initially, medially or finally, though the position in the sentence is the medial position. In Kannada questions, we simply substitute the respective
expression with the corresponding Wh-word and leave it in the same position. There is no Wh-movement in Kannada questions as it is found in English.

In all Wh-questions in English, barring the exception of echo questions, the Wh-element is moved to the front position. In brief, Kannada employs two processes in the formation of questions and these processes are substitution and scrambling, in that order of importance. In other words, the process of substitution is more common and dominant than that of scrambling.

Thus, the theoretical model or framework that is used in the present study is an eclectic one. Moreover, we have not used the two models - the Halliday model and the Chomskyan model - in their totality. We have accepted and used only relevant concepts and categories from the functional model and the transformational generative grammar model.

5. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

As we know language is a system of systems as the phonological, the morphological, the syntactic, the semantic and the pragmatic system. All languages consist of these fundamental systems and this commonality can be described as a language universal. Linguists have shown that languages all over the world use words, phrases, and sentences. They have a repertoire of word classes such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc. and sentence types like declarative interrogative, imperative and exclamatory. However, languages differ
In the use and formation of words and sentences. The similarities between languages can be called language universal or principles. The variation in terms of how sentence types, for instance, behave structurally or formally as well as functionally, can be termed as parameters. For instance, both English and Kannada declarative sentences have subjects, verbs and objects in them, but the order in which these three constituents of the sentences occur is different in the two languages. A Kannada declarative sentence follows subject+object+verb pattern whereas in English declarative sentence observe subject+verb+object pattern. The occurrence of three components in a declarative sentence in the two languages is a matter of similarities, on the other hand, the order in which the components occur is a matter of difference.

Contrastive analysis may incidentally refer to similarities between languages, but that is not the main job of contrastive analysis. In any contrastive analysis the focus is on variations or dissimilarities or differences. A contrastive analysis could have either theoretical orientation or pedagogical orientation. A theoretically oriented contrastive study will look at one or more systems of two or more languages, discover the areas of distinction and stop at that end. An applied contrastive investigation will do this but will proceed to discuss the problems that learners of foreign language are likely to face. To put it differently the theoretical contrastive analysis will be only descriptive in nature, whereas pedagogically-oriented contrastive study will be predictive in addition to being descriptive or analytical.
The basic assumptions of any contrastive analysis are as follows:

(1) The phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties and norms of the first language may create hurdles in the way of the learning of a foreign language. This is called the interference of mother-tongue or the first language.

(2) Contrastive analysis foregrounds the dissimilarities between languages and therefore can predict problems or difficulties likely to be faced by a foreign language learner.

(3) A materials writer or a text book editor can make use of the language insights and predictions offered by contrastive analysis. Remedial teaching benefits a lot from contrastive analysis.

However, there are certain criticisms of contrastive analysis and these can be summerised in the following manner.

(1) The predictive validity of contrastive analysis is doubtful. We can not say for sure that all errors result from the interference of mother tongue. Some errors may be caused by the first language influence, others may not.

(2) A holistic contrastive analysis is an impossibility. In other words, it is not really possible to compare and contrast languages as whole. Linguists can only compare and contrast sub-systems and describe cross-linguistic differences and similarities on a micro level.
(3) Contrastive analysis may help us to anticipate some learning problems or difficulties. There may be several others which may not be predicted and they are known as unpredictable or incidental errors.

(4) Contrastive analysis is based on an underlying static idea of language where one linguistic variable is isolated without placing within a larger reference frame.

6. ERROR ANALYSIS

All language learners make mistakes. Here we have to make a distinction between mistakes made by first language learner and errors committed by second or foreign language learners. Contrastive analysis shows us how similarities between the learners first language and his second or foreign language facilitate the learning of a target language. It also explains how the differences between the first language and the target language pose problems for the learners. The thrust of the contrastive analysis is mother tongue influence or first language interference. However, there are other causes of the errors such as analogy or overgeneralizations, carelessness, ignorance of the rules of the target language, etc. At this point, it is necessary to understand the difference between deviations and errors. In some literary works, mainly poetic works, writers violate the rules and regulations of the language they write in. This is deliberately done. A very good example of this flouting of linguistic norms is the poetry of the American poet E. E. Cummings. A poet has a complete mastery on the language and
so he can toy with it. In the case of second or foreign language learner, the cause of breaking linguistic rules is ignorance or mother tongue interference. One can describe a poet as a contortionist and a second language learner as a cripple. Poetic deviations are appreciated and the poet is praised for linguistic creativity on the other hand, errors committed by second or foreign language learner are criticised and are directly or indirectly corrected.

In this context it is essential to briefly consider the two major theories of language learning- behaviourist and cognitivist. The former group thinks that a learner starts with a clean slate of mind, with what is called tabula rasa. In their opinion, the learner acquires or learns a language through a process of trial and error. A behaviourist will not tolerate any mistakes or errors and will like to correct them immediately. The behaviourist theory believes that human behaviour, including linguistic behaviour can be explained in terms of the chain of stimulus-response-reinforcement. That is to say, the learner is given input in the form of listening and reading and is required to respond to questions, activities, tasks etc. The learner's response could be right or wrong, appropriate or inappropriate. His correct and inappropriate response is appreciated and because it is strengthened. In the same way, an incorrect or inappropriate response is criticised and rejected. Thus, desirable language habits are inculcated in a learner through positive feedback and reward. Whereas unwanted dispreferred language habits are eliminated through criticism and punishment. In the view of this theory of language learning, errors are indicators of failures and therefore must be immediately dealt with.
The cognitive theory of language learning believes that a normal child is equipped with an innate ability to learn a language, which they call a language acquisition device. This innate capacity is ignited through exposure to a language. However, a learner is bound to make mistakes which are indicators of his/her attempt to acquire a language. Therefore, errors need not be criticised and learners not to be punished. The main differences between the two theories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviourist</th>
<th>Cognitivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) human mind is a blank slate</td>
<td>human mind has language acquisition device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) errors indicate failures.</td>
<td>errors indicate effort and acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) errors must be corrected directly and indirectly</td>
<td>errors need not be corrected directly and immediately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having briefly looked at the attitude of the behaviourist school and the cognitive school to second or foreign language learner's errors. We now look at the nature and use of error analysis. Error analysis is a study of errors committed by second or foreign language learners. We carry out an error analysis in order to:

(a) find out how well someone knows a language.

(b) find out how a person learns a language.

(c) obtain information about common difficulties in language learning.
The most obvious practical use of error analysis is to the teacher. Errors provide feedback, they tell the teacher something about the effectiveness of his/her teaching materials and his/her teaching techniques. They also show him or her what items have been inadequately learnt or taught and hence need further attention. They enable him or her to decide whether s/he can move on to the next item of the syllabus or whether s/he must devote more time to the item s/he has been teaching on. This is day-to-day value of errors. But analysis of errors also helps us in terms of broader planning and with new group of learners. Errors provide information for designing a remedial syllabus or a programme of reteaching.

In addition to the above mentioned practical uses of error analysis, there are two important theoretical uses:

1) The application of scientific discipline to the solution of practical problems provides feedback to theory. The application provides confirmation or refutation of theory. The study of learner's errors is such an application.

2) The psycholinguist predicts that the nature of the mother tongue will facilitate or hinder the learning of certain aspects of the second language. We make a comparative study of two languages and identify the areas of difference, and on this basis we predict that the learner will find certain aspects of second language difficult. Thus, the study of errors is a part of an experiment to confirm or disprove the psycholinguistic theory of transfer. The theoretical interest in studies
of errors has therefore a feedback value for both descriptive linguistics and psycholinguistics.

Here, we would like to say few words about Indian English in general. Of late linguistics and language teaching experts have started concentrating on the learner. This learner-centered approach has thrown open quite a few issues.

(a) What are the learning strategies that the learner, especially that of a foreign language, adopts to learn the language?

(b) Does the mother tongue act as a hindrance or support in the learning of a foreign language?

(c) Are there similarities between the mother tongue and the other language, which, instead of accelerating learning of a foreign language, slow down the process?

(d) Similarly, are there differences between the first and the second language that accelerate the learning of the latter?

Another related issue is whether errors are indicators of failures or signals of learnings. Indian learners of English commit quite a few errors in the area of questions, to mention one area. They make mistakes with definite article 'the', 'world' instead of 'the world' and the use of present continuous tense 'I am understanding' in the place of 'I understand', and the use of singular in the place of plural i.e. 'foreign thing' in the place of 'foreign things'.
And this aspect pertains to the formation of questions in English by Indian, especially Canerese users of English. The two important features of Indian English questions are omission of auxiliary verb or the operator and absence of inversion. In fact the second feature is more common and more prominent than the first. Here are a few examples of the two features:

(a) Omission of auxiliary verb.

1. Why you laughing?
2. What you do?
3. When you go?

(b) Absence of inversion.

1. Where she has gone?
2. What you are writing?
3. Why the child is crying?
4. When they are born?

As we have stated earlier, questions in English behave differently from those in Kannada. The predominant characteristics or patterns of questions in English are addition of auxiliary in cases where it is absent in statements and inversion of the auxiliary which is already present in the basic sentence or added during the process of transformation. Let us discuss an example from English in detail.
1. (a) He went to Mangalore yesterday.

The given sentence is a declarative sentence. Now how do we go about transforming it into an information seeking question or Wh-question? We can explicate the process in the following way. First, we must replace the adverbial phrase/prepositional phrase 'to Mangalore' by the locative Wh-word 'where' and the resulting sentence reads as follows:

1. (b) He went where yesterday.

This is simple substitution or replacement of the respective constituent by the corresponding wh-word. Second, the wh-element fronted or foregrounded and the sentence we get is:

1. (c) Where he went yesterday.

Our observation is that Kannada users of English follow these two steps. But then 'where he went yesterday' is not a correct sentence or grammatically acceptable Wh-question in English. In order to make it so, we need to follow some more steps. The first one, which is in fact the third step, is subtracting the past tense form from the verb 'went'. On carrying out this operation we get a string of words like:

1. (d) Where he past go yesterday.

Then because there is no auxiliary verb present in the original sentence, it is necessary to borrow and insert the helping verb 'do'. In Chomskyan grammar, this transformation is called 'Do Support'. As a result, we get the following sentence:
1. (e) Where he do past go yesterday.

The next step is to merge the past tense with the supporting auxiliary 'do' which yields 'did' and gives us the following string:

1. (f) Where he did go yesterday?

The last step is to exchange the positions of the subject and the auxiliary which is known as subject-auxiliary-inversion in the transformational generative grammar. The resulting transformed sentence will be:

1. (g) Where did he go yesterday?

The Yes-No question in English does not involve the number of transformations that the Wh-question does. For instance:

2. (a) He is doing the homework.

This is a declarative sentence which can be transformed into Yes-No question through the subject-auxiliary-inversion. The subject auxiliary inversion movement involves the fronting of an operator, followed by the subject and the lexical verb. Then the transformed Yes-No question would be:

2. (b) Is he doing the home work?

Such Yes-No questions shown theoretically be easier for Kannada learners of English. But surprisingly enough, even such questions are problematic for them. Most Kannada learners of English produce questions such as:
3. (a) He is doing the home work?

This is not to say that this question is a wrong one. In fact, such question is called a declarative question or a question in the form of a statement. The difference here is that of intonational use. The native speaker of English knows the difference between 'Is he doing the home work?' and 'He is doing the home work?' He has mastered the two ways of asking Yes-No questions. A Kannada proficient user of English, has also mastered the two forms.

The available Kannada grammar is deficient in yet another respect. They do not classify and discuss question types as scientifically as English grammars do. For example Jesperson (1969)⁴, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1972)⁵, Leech and Svartvik (1975), Krishnaswamy (1975) and Quirk and Greenbaum (1980) classify questions into Yes-No and Wh-type and then further sub classify Wh-type question into rhetorical, echo, alternative, etc questions. The process that is at operation in the formation of Kannada questions is called scrambling. Sadly, no grammarian in Kannada has studied the scrambling in accordance with interrogative sentences. D.N.S. Bhat⁶ and K.V.T. Bhat⁷ have discussed scrambling in Kannada declarative sentences but not in interrogative sentences. Therefore, the present study draws heavily upon Ross (1967), Chomsky (1977), Redford (1984), D.N.S.Bhat (1989) for discussion of concepts like movement, inversion and scrambling.
The following are "syntactic aspects of interrogative sentences in English and Kannada". When we talk of questions, it is essential to keep in mind the kernel or declarative sentences as a backdrop. That is to say, the discussion of question will be punctuated by references to assertive sentences. As we know, the questions are not kernel sentences; they are transformed sentences. We derive interrogative sentences from basic sentences. While transforming basic sentences into interrogative sentences, we make certain changes through subtracting, adding, rearranging and modifying some of the elements of the basic sentence. The behaviour pattern exhibited by questions in Kannada differs from that of English. The basic differences between questions in the two languages can be summarized in the following way: The dominant rules operative in English are substitution, movement and inversion. On the other hand, the rules that apply are followed to questions in Kannada are substitution, scrambling and (in a few cases) reduplication. In the present study we will examine these processes with reference to the two languages.

I. MOVEMENT

This is a term used in transformational generative syntax which is highly technical, mathematical and theoretical discipline. However, since the present study has pedagogical orientation, we will not delve deep into the abstract theoretical aspects of transformative generative grammar. We will look at the process of movement in a general and non-specialized way. From the point of view of a teacher interested in learners' errors, active research and remedial teaching, movement
simply means shifting of constituent from its original position to some other position. This shifting may have either syntactic purpose or a stylistic intension.

As we have said, the questions are derived constructions. Therefore, they have to be discussed with reference to the basic constructions. A basic sentence in English may have a reference to time, place, manner, reason, etc. People who ask questions want to get information about these and similar references. For example, we would like to know who did a particular thing, when, where, how and why. A questioner is ignorant of these things and therefore may like to elicit information about them. In English, we have a closed system of interrogative pronouns with which we begin our questions. This system consists of words such as who, when, why, where, how etc.

When we ask a question, we have in our mind some assumption about a particular person, thing, location, cause, event and so on. This assumption, as it were, exists in declarative form. One example of this is, 'Gopal went somewhere'. The questioner does not know where Gopal went, and he assumes that the person questioned probably knows the place where Gopal went. If the questioner knows the place, we can say that something like 'Gopal went to school' exists in the mind of the questionee. Now, let us see what a deep structure question expecting a locative answer would look like:

1. Gopal went where?

But this is not a grammatically acceptable question in English,
unless it happens to be an echo question. What has happened in this question is that the prepositional phrase functioning 'to school' as an adjunct is replaced by the locative interrogative word 'where'. If we stop at this stage, and do not carry out the next stage, we will be left with an echo-question. In an echo-question, the questioner uses a Wh-word about that part of his conversational partner's utterance. Which he has failed to hear properly. He wants to confirm and therefore he says 'Gopal went where?' but, here, we are not concerned with echo-questions.

Thus, the first process that we observe in the formation is that of substitution. The next move is to shift the Wh-word to sentence initial position, because that is how a question in English is formed. This carrying backward or fronting of Wh-word is called Wh-movement. When we front the interrogative pronoun, it leaves a vacant position 'which' is described as 'trace'.

Wh-movement is mainly concerned with the occurrence of Wh-words in clause initial or sentence initial position rather than in one of the clause-initial positions. Let us look at the following sentences.

2. (a) The boys met **the teacher**.
    
    b) The boys met **someone**.
    
    (c) The boys met **who**.
    
    (d) **Who** did the boys meet?
3. (a) Rajesh will leave tomorrow.
(b) Rajesh will leave sometime.
(c) Rajesh will leave when.
(d) When will Rajesh leave?

4. (a) Padma put the books on the table.
(b) Padma put the books somewhere.
(c) Padma put the books where.
(d) Where did Padma put the books?

We notice that the underlined noun phrases occur in different positions in the (a) sentences whereas the corresponding Wh-words in the (d) sentences occur uniformly in the sentence-initial position. Another point is that the end position in the (d) sentences corresponding to those of the underlined noun phrases in the (a) sentences are all vacant as indicated by dots or traces. These traces are considered to result from the movement of these wh-words from their original position inside the clause to sentence initial position.

Though some linguists regard this movement as obligatory in English, Bhat (1989) says that "the occurrence of movement is not a direct or inherent property of Wh-words, rather, it is the property of some of the functions in which the Wh-words are used in some of the languages."
II. INVERSION:

Inversion is a type of movement with a difference. In wh-movement, the wh-word first replaces the respective constituent—subject, object, complement, adjunct etc., and then it is fronted. In a majority of cases of inversion, there is no deletion and substitution, there is only shifting of the auxiliary verb in order to frame a question. In the case of question beginning with a Wh-word, the auxiliary verb comes immediately after it. Let us consider the following examples.

5. (a) Ramesh is going to Bangalore to buy some books
    (statement)
    (b) Ramesh is going to Bangalore why.
    (c) Why Ramesh is going to Bangalore.
    (d) Why is Ramesh going to Bangalore?

Here, we notice that the Wh-movement stage is followed by the inversion stage. In (a) the auxiliary verb occurs after the subject. In (b) and (c) also, it remains in the same position, in order to make it so it is necessary to apply the auxiliary inversion rule. When we do so, the auxiliary verb jumps over the subject and positions itself between the interrogative pronoun and the subject. However there are exceptions to this simple flip-flop. In some sentences, there is no helping verb. Let us look at the following examples:

6. (a) Savita went to Mangalore.
    (b) Savita went where?
    (c) Where Savita went?
The sentence (c) is ungrammatical one. Because there is no helping verb here, we are required to borrow a dummy 'do' and the resulting string of words reads as follows:

(d) Where Savita do went.

Once again, we have got an ungrammatical construction. Therefore, we need to carry out three more changes. First of all, we subtract the past tense from the main verb 'went'. This gives us two elements 'past' and 'go'. Then we merge the 'past tense' with the dummy 'do' and finally place 'did' between the Wh-word 'where' and the subject 'Savita'. As a result, we get the following grammatical sentence.

7. Where did Savita go?

The same can be described in a slightly technical languages in the following manner. In English, Yes-No questions are characterised by 'T'-movement. This rule, which has a central role in the syntax of Yes-No-questions, is sometimes described as a "subject-auxiliary-inversion rule". As we have already stated, Yes-No questions are derived from declarative sentences with either positive or negative orientation. Let us consider the following examples:

8. (a) She will find a job.

S VP NP

(b) Will she find a job?

Aux mod S V NP
Sentence (a) is declarative in form but (b) is an interrogative in form. An interesting observation about the modal 'will' in the two sentences is its positional variation. In sentence (a), it is positioned between the subject and the main verb where as in sentence (b) it occurs as the first element. In (b) which is Yes-No question, the modal originates in the "Inversion" position within the sentence and is moved to empty 'comp' position outside the sentences. This movement is known as 'I'-movement. When the auxiliary is moved to a sentence initial position, the subject occupies the second position. Therefore, this inversion is called 'Subject-Auxiliary Inversion'.

Yes-No questions in English and Kannada differ in form. As we have seen, Yes-No questions in English placed the auxiliary in the sentence initial position followed by the subject noun phrase and the verb phrase. But in Kannada, Yes-No questions are formed by adding the clitic- 'aa-ee-oo' at the end of the declarative sentence. Let us consider the following example:

9. (a) sureshanu shaalege hoodanu (statement)
    (b) Suresh to school go+past+3psl.
    (c) Suresh went to school.

10. (a) sureshanu shaalege hoodanee? (Question)
    (b) Suresh to school go+post+3psl+q
    (c) Did Suresh go to school?

This example prove the point that in English questions like 'Did suresh go to school?'. We carry out subtraction, addition and inversion.
The past tense form of verb 'went' is reduced to bare infinitive 'go' the dummy verb 'do' is borrowed, the subtracted past tense is added to the dummy 'do' and finally resulting auxiliary verb is placed sentence initially. All these things do not happen in the formation of the above stated Kannada question 'sureshanu shaalege hoodanee?'. The only requirement is the addition of the morpheme 'ee' in the sentence final position. This only means that question formation in Kannada is not as complicated as in English. Evidently, this has implications for the teaching of English question formation in the context of teaching English as a second language or a foreign language.

III. SCRAMBLING

The process of scrambling is similar to the process of the movement in one respect but is different from it in another respect. In movement as well as in scrambling, the constituent that corresponds to the Wh-word or the Ye-word is replaced by the appropriate Wh-word or Ye-word. After we have replaced the object, complement and adjuncts by the respective word in English, what we get is not a surface structure but a deep structure which is an ungrammatical sentence. We get a grammatical sentence only when we have moved the Wh-constituent to the sentence initial position. This stage of movement is not possible and even not necessary in Kannada. The only thing that we need to do is to substitute the subject, object, complement, etc., by the proper Wh-word. The resulting string of words is not a deep structure but a surface structure.
Ross (1967) makes a distinction between movement and scrambling. In his view movement is a transformational process whereas scrambling is not. The occurrence of Wh-word in the sentence initial position is a result of movement which leaves a trace behind it. On the other hand, the free occurrence of a ‘Wh’-word in initial, medial, and final stage in Kannada sentence is considered to be a result of scrambling which does not leave any trace behind it. Let us look at the following sentences:

11. (a) avanige li pustakavannu ravi koTTanu. (statement)
   (b) him this book Ravi gave.
   (c) Ravi gave him this book.

12. (a) avanige li pustakavannu yaaru koTTaru? (question)
   (b) him this book who gave.
   (c) Who gave him this book?

13. (a) avanige raviyu li pustakavannu koTTanu. (statement)
   (b) him Ravi this book gave.
   (c) Ravi gave him this book.

14. (a) avanige yaaru li pustakavannu koTTaru? (question)
   (b) him who this book gave.
   (c) Who gave him this book?

15. (a) raviyu avanige li pustakavannu koTTanu. (statement)
   (b) Ravi him this book gave.
   (c) Ravi gave him this book.
16. (a) yaaru avanige ii pustakavannu koTTaru. (question)
(b) Who him this book gave.
(c) Who gave him this book?

These examples reveal the flexible nature of the ye-words in Kannada and the fixed position of the wh-words in the English. There is yet another difference between movement and scrambling. The latter does not affect such aspects of sentence structure as case-marking and auxiliary system whereas the former does. Therefore, movement is regarded as a grammaticalised variety of scrambling.
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