Language Art, 4(2): pp.105-122, 2019, Shiraz, Iran
DOI: 10.22046/LA.2019.12 DOR: 98.1000/2476-6526.1398.4.105.11.2.1587.32
Article No.: 42.62.139802.105122

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

"Through-Produced" Multiple Questions in Tagalog-English Faculty Meetings: Setting the Agenda Dimension of Questions

Dr. Leonardo O. Munalim[1]©
Associate Professor, Philippine Women's University-School of Arts and Sciences, Manila, Philippines.

Dr. Cecilia F. Genuino[2]
Associate Professor, Philippine Normal University-Manila, College of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Research. Philippines.

(Received: 30 December 2018; Accepted: 11 April 2019; Published: 28 May 2019)

This study describes the sequential pattern of "through-produced" multiple questions using Conversation Analysis that sets the agenda dimension of questions, and the academic conditions that advance its use during turns at talk from five faculty meetings. Results show that a. No first-pair of the "through-produced" questions has been answered; b. the answers to the second-pair questions are achieved through paraphrases, clarifications, keyword repetitions, and circuitous rephrasing until the hearer conforms with the agenda set; c. The subordinates frame their default identities with lower epistemic knowledge, and d. "Through-produced" multiple questions can be a manifestation of Chair's power. Implications and recommendations for cross-linguistic comparisons are offered to generalize the findings beyond the specific domain of the meeting.

***Keywords*:** "Through-produced" Multiple Questions, Agenda Dimension, Question Answer System, Faculty Meeting, Framing.

[1] E-mail: lomunalim@pwu.edu.ph © (Corresponding Author)
[2] E-mail: cecilia.genuino@dlsu.edu.ph

Introduction

Pursuing an answer to the question may not be readily available although a question as an obligating speech act from the point of view of Conversation Analysis (CA) is operationalized vis-à-vis its default answer (Boyd & Heritage, 2006; Englert, 2010; Schegloff, 2007; Steensig & Drew, 2008). Stivers and Rossano (2010, 4) suggest that questions have to be mobilized to increase "the recipient's accountability for responding-interrogative lexico-morphosyntax, interrogative prosody, recipient-focused epistemicity, and speaker gaze". The challenge of getting the answers becomes even more pressing when even the most appropriate syntactic structures of the utterances do not necessarily mobilize (dis)affiliative stance (Steensig & Drew, 2008) or mobilize answers in general.

The "through-produced" multiple questions as a type of questioning (as a term) has been proposed by Stivers and Enfield (2010). They recommend that "through-produced" multiple questions should have a special analysis separate from the usual question-answer system. It is because "through-produced" multiple questions are sets of more than one question in a speaking turn. They provide the hearer with the option which among the successive questions deserves a priority answer. With this in mind, it is clear that there is an issue about which of these questions deserves the prioritized answer that will eventually shape the overall turn-taking structure of a talk.

In the same year, Heritage and Clayman (2010) outlined four dimensions of questions based on a conversation analytic study of news interviews and doctor-patient interactions, both talks considered institutional in nature. The dimensions include agenda, presupposition, epistemic stance, and preference. A question can set an agenda when it attempts to delineate a specific topic at hand for an immediate or relevant response. Arguably, because "through-produced" multiple questions, or successive questions with lack of uptake, and the speaker immediately pursues with the second question (Stivers & Enfield, 2010), this type of questioning sits well with the agenda dimension. Repeated and paraphrased questions until the right answers are sought are meant to maintain that agenda dimension. It allows the obligated hearer to conform or do not conform to the topic agenda or action agenda put forth by the current speaker (Heritage & Clayman, 2010), and vice versa.

At heart, this present study has been motivated by three important concerns. First, the study is anchored on the particular methodological approach of CA that is microscopic, case-by-case, and corpus-driven in nature (Clifton, 2006; ten Have, 2007; Kress, 2001; Psathas & Anderson, 1990; Raymond, 2003; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2010; Schegloff, 1987; Schiffrin, 2000; Walters, 2007; Wooffitt, 2005). Second, there has been a bulk of studies on question and answer system (cf. Brown, 2010; Enfield, 2010; Englert, 2010; Hayashi, 2010; Heinemann,

2010; Hoymann, 2010; Levinson, 2010; Rossano, 2010; Stivers, 2010; Stivers & Levinson, 2010; Yoon, 2010). However, to the knowledge of these authors, the "through-produced" multiple questions have not been amalgamated with the agenda dimension of the question.

Questioning and Its Dimensions

A question can produce sequential relevant next turns where the hearer becomes accountable for obligatory answers (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In fact, a question itself is a turn-taking yielding system that obligates the hearer to take the next relevant turn to satisfy the first part of the pair, "either by providing an answer or by accounting for non-answer responses" (Stivers & Rossano, 2010, 7). Moreover, questions are obligating speech acts because they place constraints and restrictions on the recipient (Boyd & Heritage, 2006).

The dimensions of questions include agenda, presupposition, epistemic knowledge, and preference (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Accordingly, the agenda allows the obligated hearer to conform or do not conform to the topic agenda or action agendas. Second, embodying presuppositions allows the hearer to confirm or disconfirm the given presupposition. Third, conveying epistemic stance is a display of question that intends to expect a congruent or incongruent epistemic stance. Last, incorporating preferences expects a kind of alignment or misalignment with the preferences; that is, seeking for agreement or disagreement.

Overall, the dimensions of questions may affect the optionality of the answers. These questions can still be ignored even with the clearest syntactic structures. The absence of the answer will be treated inferentially by the questioning party as a rhetorical question which does not demand a straightforward answer. The case is more pronounced in a question with an epistemic stance. When all members share a mutual level of epistemic status and stance, the obligation to answer may not be necessary.

Epistemic Knowledge

The obligation to answer is closely attributed to an epistemic primacy and authority (Markaki & Mondada, 2012), either the person is identified or not. The K+ (knowledgeable) position and K- (unknowledgeable) position both can initiate and expand the sequence (Heritage, 2012), or most of the time they can deflect the course of the sequence. This case is common in a multi-party meeting when a person responds to the question not addressed to him or her.

For a meeting as an institution talk, the expectation is that the Chair has the default higher epistemic knowledge. He or she is cognizant of the agenda of the meeting, the information relayed to him or her from higher authorities of the school

or university, and the dynamics of the department he or she oversees. To this end, equal participation through turn may be uncertain due to unequal epistemic knowledge attached to the Chair and the members of the meeting. Lee and Roth (2004) show that the ascribed trait such as expertise made the participant in an interview a full-fledged member of a scientific speech community.

Framing, Footing, and Alignment of Institutional Identities

The manner of questioning reflects the framing, footing, and alignment of institutional identities. During the meeting, the subordinate faculty members may subject themselves into a prototype questioning behavior as members with lower epistemic knowledge. It is seen as a deliberate framing to maximize solidarity (Arminen, 1996) where various ensembles of members co-construct in real time with various practices (Schegloff, 1999). Likewise, Schegloff (1999) reminds that the participants of the business meeting may not act and behave by reference to the distinctive mode of the speech-exchange system of the meeting. Bushnell (2012) strengthens this argument by pointing Benwell and Stokoe's (2006) notion that identity is occasioned by, negotiated in, and existing only in and for specific interactional moments.

Simply put, the nature of discourse explicates a loose institutional talk that effectuates the smooth constitutive and regulative elements of (re)framing, (re)footing, and (re)alignment of institutional roles that process their human sociality that balances power for a collective effort to organize a professional faculty meeting (Cooren, 2004; Jenness, Smith & Stepan-Norris, 2007; Postma, 2008; Tannen, 1993). Speakers are constantly engaged in adjusting several linguistic resources that can help the conversation to go on smoothly, thus aimed at achieving institutional goals during a faculty meeting.

Meanwhile, framing, footing, and alignment have been operationalized differently across studies because Goffman (1974, 1981) failed to categorically explain these concepts (Tannen, 2006). Goffman maintains that footing is closely related to the concepts of positions, symmetrical, asymmetrical relations, and social distance arrangements. Hale (2011, 2) summarizes all the concepts of frames as "defined and constructed based on past experiences and an understanding of how particular types of interactions should manifest". In this present study, framing, footing, and alignment (as terms) are based on how the superordinate Chair and the subordinate members display and invoke their local conditions of higher and lower epistemic knowledge. For consistency, the authors use framing, footing, and alignment as one term (cf. Hale, 2011).

Purpose

Using corpus-driven CA methodology for the "seen but unnoticed" (Clifton, 2006, 202) machinery of talk, the study seeks to describe (1) the sequential patterns of talk organization of "through-produced" multiple questions that set the agenda dimension of the questions, and (2) the academic conditions that advance its use during turns at talk. Accounting for these descriptions helps one further understands how the manner of questioning is talked into being in the meeting as an institutional talk. Overall, it is assumed that setting the agenda through "through-produced" multiple questions reflects epistemic knowledge of both interlocutors, resulting in the framing and footing of academic conditions.

Such an analysis offers understanding "through-produced" multiple questions and agenda dimension through the local conditions of epistemic knowledge between the hierarchical superordinate-subordinate infrastructure in an academic meeting. Overall, the mergence of "through-produced" multiple questions and agenda dimension is offered to account for the kind of framing and footing of institutional identities invoked in this type of questioning.

Method

Five meetings conducted in a mix of Tagalog and English from three different departments in a private university in Manila. They recorded in audio and video forms after all ethical qualms were ironed out. All meetings lasted for five hours and 50 minutes, composed of a mix of 34 male and female part-time and full-time faculty members (School A-8; School B- 6; School C-20).

Following CA, the number of meetings would suffice because CA uses minimum sampling as the analysis at the qualitative microscopic level (ten Have, 2007; Gibson, 2003; Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). Conversation Analytical approach seeks to document the orderly and sequential structures of interaction (Maynard & Clayman, 2003). Likewise, Schegloff (1987, 1998, and 2010) maintains CA is microscopic, prompting him to support a single case analysis. Accordingly, interlocutors produce singular episodes of conversation in a manner that is orderly, which has to be well recognized by the analyst, thus a case-by-case, not based on statistical regularity. To date, there are many studies with a limited number of corpora (cf. Huisman, 2001; Itakura & Tsui, 2004; Mondada, 2012; O'Sullivan, 2010; Park, 2009; Saft, 2004; Vettin & Todt, 2004).

The meetings were chaired by two department Chairpersons and one dean. Data were transcribed using the selected transcription conventions by Jefferson (2004). Names were anonymized for strict confidentiality. For Tagalog utterances, an English gloss section has been provided. Whether the English gloss is a complete transliteration or not, its presence does not affect the analysis of the data. It was only

provided to assist non-Tagalog speakers. The Conversation Analytical descriptions of framing and footing of institutional identities spring from the patterns of the "through-produced" multiple questions, thus may be considered a limited critical discourse analyses given the academic institutional conditions invoked in the analysis are critical in nature (Burns, 2001; Culpeper, 2009; Gardner, 2004; Wooffitt, 2005).

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the sequential patterns of the "through-produced" multiple questions and the academic conditions that precipitate its production. From the limited occurrences of "through-produced" multiple questions, no first-pair of the multiple questions has been documented. Answers are usually given to satisfy the second and the last questions in the series. This may mean that the hearers orient to the first set of question in the series as prefatory which should not be answered outright.

The extracts below illustrate "through-produced" multiple questions that aim to delineate an agenda of the question. From Extract 84, Melvs asks two questions at line 761 and line 764, but the Chair at line 765 fails to answer either of the two questions. Because the clear recipient misses conforming to the action agenda (Heritage & Clayman, 2010); subsequently, Melvs repeats his question at line 768, with emphasis on the word "prerogative." Finally, Chair2 at lines 769 and 770 gives in and Melvs has been satisfied with a short but meaningful answer "Oo/yes".

Corpus 5, Extract 84: School B			**English Gloss**
761	Melvs ->	Gaano ka estrikto pala sa (.)	*How strict are you, by the way, in terms of*
762	Zel	Atten[dance]	*Attendance*
763	Melvs	[atten]dance ((gazing at Chair3))	*Attendance*
764	->	Kunwari nakalima na, prerogative parin ba ng fa[culty]?	*For instance, the student has had five absences, is it still the prerogative of the faculty?*
765	Chair3	[actua]lly dapat po ano, dahil ano=	*Actually, it should be because*
766	Rain	='Yong policy natin.	*That's our policy*
767	Chair	May policy po talaga na ganoon kaya lang siyempre	*There's really a policy like that but as usual*
768	Melvs	[pero] prerogative	*But it is still the prerogative*

Corpus 5, Extract 84: School B			**English Gloss**
		[ng] faculty kung (.) e-apply nya.	*of the faculty if he/she applies it*
769	Chair3	[ng] ((nodding))	
770		Oo.	*Yes.*

Lines 401 and 403 from Extract 16 demonstrate that there are two types of questions Zel raises. Although both questions are answerable by yes or no, both questions have inherent intentions and pragmatic purposes of securing the answers. In fact, the first question establishes the policy for enrollees, while the other one institutes students' official attendance in the classroom. From the answer, Chair3 obviously answers the second question when she overlaps at line 405. This is supported at line 407 when she assures Zel of the possibility for students to get in the class even when they are unofficially enrolled.

Corpus 5, Extract 16: School B				**English Gloss**
401	Zel	->	Ang ((hand's up)) excuse, ang: policy ba ay (.) ano kailangan officially enrolled ang students para umattend ng [klase?]	*Excuse me… does the policy say that students have been officially enrolled to attend the class?*
402	Chair3		[((coughing))]	
403	Zel	->	Puwede ba posible'; ba na ano umattend sila ng	*Is it possible for them to attend*
404	Zel		Clas[s] kahit di siya	*The class although s/he is not*
405	Chair3	*	[yes!] Ma'am.	
406	Zel		officially enrol[led?]	*Officially enrolled?*
407	Chair3	*	[Possi]ble naman so	*It is possible so*
408			long that they will ah really enroll, puwede naman po,	*Long that they will really enroll. It is possible.*

Lines 798, 799, 801, 803, and 805 from Extract 94 depict that Melvs wants to set an agenda by delineating the topic about the need for the testimonial program. The series of utterances attempts to paraphrase, rephrase, and clarify his point. His turns at talk through the litany of his questions are loaded with types of questions such as "*para kanino*/for whom," "*sino ang*/for whom," and "*sino ang*/who will." Although these are all paraphrases that are roundabout in nature, the members may have been

confused which question has to be answered first. Delineating this topic is also thickened with the audible cases of cooperative interruptions and overlapping (Takeda, 2016). Chair3 successfully secures a turn by answering the last question at line 807.

Corpus 5, Extract 94: School B				**English Gloss**
798	Melvs		Pero ang ano ko lang	*But my only concern*
799		->	Ano 'yong purpose, para kaninong 'yong testimonial? ((gazing at Chair3))	*What is the purpose, for whom is the testimonial?*
800	Chair3		Para sa mga nag-graduate [parang-]	*For those who graduated like*
801	Melvs		[I mean] kung [mag-tetestimony sila]	*I mean if they deliver testimonies*
802			[para sa mga pumapasa]	*For those who passed the board*
803	Melvs	->	sino ang inaalayan nila doon? ((gazing at Zel))	*Who are they offering the testimony for?*
804	Zel		Ang dapat ang school nag parang nag- [tribute yun binigay] yan,	*The school should be*
805	Melvs	->	[Sino dapat ang maki]kinig?	*Who should be listening?*
806	Zel		Binibigyan yan, [binibigay yan]-	*They are given with the testimony.*
807	Chair3	->	[Sila-sila lang] ata noon, 'di ba?	*I think they are just the ones listening themselves.*
808	Members		((no answers due to overlapping turns))	

There are also indirect answers to "through-produced" questions. Extract 15 shows a case of "through-produced" multiple questions. Rain at line 395 immediately asks two successive questions in one utterance. The first question traces back to the place or organization which the student applies for a scholarship, while the second question specifically elicits the type of scholarship in athletics. Looking at Vilma's answer, she answers neither of the questions because her answer is about the specific type of sport, not the foundation that offers scholarships, nor the type of scholarship in the athletic division. Prescriptively, she could have answered either or both: "At ABC Scholar Group" or "Type A Scholarship Grant for Athletes."

However, looking at the dispreferred answer of Vilma saying, "I don't know," we can aver that she is not cognizant of the information, thus singling her out to say this utterance.

Corpus 5, Extract 15: School B				**English Gloss**
393	Vilma		Pero I understand Ma'am, for this, starting this trimester, he applied for scholarship, athletics.	*But...*
394	Chair3		Ah:: ((nodding))	*I see.*
395	Rain	->	Saan? Anong scholarship?=	*Where? What scholarship?*
396	Vilma	*	=I don't know what which specific sport.	
397			Pero 'di ba may athletic scholarship tayo for athletes? =	*But we have athletic scholarship, don't we?*
398	Hans		=Approved siya?	*Has she been approved?*

Lastly, "through-produced" multiple questions may be a manifestation of the Chair's power during the meeting. Lines 552, 553, 554, and 556 from Extract 34 may credit the assumption that "through-produced" multiple questions are intentionally calibrated linguistically to strengthen the force of the utterance; thus, they intensify the possible effects on the hearer. At line 553 Chair3 asks if it is now possible to hold a general assembly. Although she has the prerogative to dictate the need for an assembly, she structures her demand through a question type that pragmatically functions as a suggestion or request. From the emic perspective, the structure of the utterance may have been intentional because most of the faculty members are part-timers who only report on Saturdays. Organizing an event for the board passers is quite a big task to do. But lines 554 and 554 confirm her intention by asking Prof. Juan and Ma'am Blue to oversee the program, with an accompanying line, *"Kayo po yung mag-take ng lead"* ((you will be the ones to take the lead.)) The successive questions both defer the need for the members to answer the question, and at the same time shove the faculty members to agree to the Chair.

The claim that the Chair demonstrates her power may be plausible especially that she can always exercise her power to get things done during the meeting. The logic to this claim may be aligned to the notion that she is entrusted with power and authority by virtue of her role (Vickers, 2014) to lead the social actions of the meeting. The meeting may be heightened by some institutional power; i.e., the "constitution of power effects" (Samra-Fredericks, 2005) for the realization of the

meeting such as, but not limited to, reporting, updating, decision making, exploring, and problem-solving (Schnurr, 2012; Weynton, 2002).

Corpus 5, Extract 34: School B				**English Gloss**
552	Chair3		We will: have another general assembly ah kasi ang dami din nating ano new students?	*We will have another general assembly because we have many new students.*
553		->	Oh so: (.) puwede na po tayong mag schedule ng general assembly natin?	*We can already schedule for our general assembly?*
554		->	And can we ask ano can we ask ah: si:: Prof. Juan and ano Prof. Juan and Ma'am Blue? ((gazing at Blue))	*And can we ask Prof Juan and Ma'am Blue?*
555			para sa ano (.) general assembly kayo po 'yong mag-take ng lead a(h)a(h)a(h)	*So that you will take the lead for the general assembly.*
556		->	Ano? (0.4) ((gazing at the two))	*What?*
557	Blue		Okay lang, wala namang problema.	*That's okay, there is no problem.*
558	Chair3	->	Ano, okay? ((gazing around))	*What now, is it okay?*
559	Rain		Okay!	*Okay!*

Overall Discussion

Based on the sequential patterns of "through-produced" multiple questions that set the agenda of the questions, there is a plausible reason to posit that the academic conditions of power and hierarchy frame this type of questioning. The subordinates frame their default identities with lower epistemic knowledge. They show a kind of a subordinate, willing, and submissive questioning party who are not much cognizant of the matters at the hand. Footing endeavors to assume and display stances (Goffman, 1981) with this type of questioning. Consequently, the framing boosts the higher epistemic knowledge and power of the Chair. Second, the "through-produced" multiple questions can be a manifestation of Chair's power to place perlocutionary effects on the hearer. The default status (Brown, 2007) during

the turns at talk was "categorized, constituted, deployed, and transformed" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, 295) in situ.

This means that the questioning speech act (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) and the attempts to maintain, yield, request, or deny the turns during the meeting are about the prototype of talk expected of the meeting members. Framing, footing, and alignment include participants' expectation of the structure to a generic and collective pre-conditioned idea (Goffman, 1974). The sequential patterns of the questions under study also invoke the institutional practices, stances, identities, and power within the academic conditions of the talk (Arminen, 2000; Drew & Sorjonen, 1997; Heritage, 2005; Leech, 1983; Pérez-Sabater, 2015). As Drew and Sorjonen (1997) posit the nature of the occasion and the roles embedded in it are consequential to the understanding of an ongoing talk. In this study, the manner of questioning delineates the specific and intended topical domains that require the hearer to conform or not conform to the relevant actions at hand, thus intended to sustain the agenda of the questions (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Stivers & Enfield, 2010).

At a more profound level, the predictability of the use of power should not be considered a threat to the ongoing talk, but it should be used as a reminder that meeting participants have institutional identities that are relevant to an ongoing talk that are impossibly detachable. The framing of epistemic knowledge and the academic conditions in this type of questioning link the meeting participants' personal social settings and impersonal social world together (Landis, 2001; Schaefer, 2013) in this educational, academic, and institutional talk.

Conclusion

At the microscopic analytical level, the study offers five major findings:

1. No first-pair of the "through-produced" questions has been answered. The absence means that the first question of the series is prefatory to the second or succeeding questions.
2. The second-pair questions have been answered when the current speaker delineates the agenda of the question until real answers are sought. Delineating the agenda is achieved through paraphrases, clarifications, keyword repetitions, and circuitous rephrasing until the hearer conforms with the question.
3. "Through-produced" multiple questions can be a manifestation of Chair's power to place perlocutionary effects on the hearer.
4. The subordinates frame their default identities subordinates with lower epistemic knowledge by delineating the agenda of the question via a "through-produced" manner. This boosts the higher epistemic knowledge

of the Chair even if the questions obligate her to satisfy the first-pair part of the adjacency pairs.

5. The "through-produced" multiple questions are strategic in nature employed by the Chair to impose her intention even if a question takes a form of a request.

The pragmatic roles of "through-produced" multiple questions provide implications in the teaching-learning communication processes. Stivers and Robinson (2006, 373) remind about the potential problem that non-answer questions may provide because speakers fail to collaborate and promote the progress of the activity. The non-answer questions "satisfy only the technical structural aspect of sequence closure while failing to promote closure of the activity". Unless the questioning party insists and delineates the agenda of the question, the hearer is able to elicit both the apology and the answer successfully (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). Consequently, Norlin, Sharp, and Firth (2007, 399) state that the "impact of unanswered questions on the quality, safety, and outcomes of pediatric primary care" should be understood. These cases should not be exempted in a faculty meeting as an institutional discourse.

Fortunately, some contextual factors that precipitate the cases of "through-produced" multiple questions cannot be dispelled. First, it is not impossible that the Filipino indirectness in the discourse may have hastened the production of both the circuitous way of asking and answering questions. Second, the interlocutors' physiological conditions, for instance, the hearing acuity and impairments may have gotten in the way (Gaitz, Niedereche, & Wilson, 2012) of this questioning type. All these aspects demand future robust triangulation and support researches to complement and supplement the present findings from "through-produced" multiple questions that set the agenda dimension of the questions. Lastly, cross-linguistic comparisons in more instances should be conducted to generalize these features beyond the specific domain of the faculty meeting conducted in Tagalog-English linguistic landscape.

Note

This article is part of a larger study, and was carried out without aid from any funding agency.

Reference

Arminen, I. (1996). The Construction of Topic in the Turns of Talk at the Meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy,* 16(5/6), pp. 88-130.

Arminen, I. (2000). On the Context Sensitivity of Institutional Interaction. *Discourse and Society,*11(4), pp. 435-458.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Benwell, B., and Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Boyd, E., and Heritage, J. (2006). Taking the history: Questioning during comprehensive history-taking. In: J. Heritage and D. W. Maynard, eds., *Communication in Medical Care*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151–184.

Brown, P. (2010). Questions and their Responses in Tzeltal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42,pp. 2627-2648.

Brown, S. D. (2007). Intergroup processes: Social identity theory. In: Langdridge, D., and S. Taylor, eds., *Critical Readings in Social Psychology*. London: Open University Press, pp. 133-162.

Burns, A. (2001). Analysing spoken discourse: Implications for TESOL. In: A. Burns and C. Coffin, eds., *Analysing English in a Global Context: A Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 123–148.

Bushnell, C. (2012). Talking the Talk: The Interactional Construction of Community and Identity at Conversation Analytic Data Sessions in Japan. *Humanities Studies,* 35,pp. 583-605.

Clifton, J. (2006). Conversation Analytical Approach to Business Communication: Case of Leadership. *Journal of Business Communication,* 43, pp. 202-219.

Cooren, F. (2004). The Communicative Achievement of Collective Minding: An Analysis of Board Meeting. *Management Communication Quarterly,* 17(4),pp. 517-551.

Culpeper, J. (2009). Historical sociopragmatics. In *Journal of Historical Pragmatics,* 10(2), pp. 179-186.

Drew, P., and Sorjonen, M. L. (1997). Institutional dialogue. In: T.A. van Dijk, *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 92-118.

Enfield, N. J. (2010). Questions and Responses in Lao. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 42,pp. 2649-2665.

Gaitz, C. M., Niedereche, G., and Wilson, N. H. (2012). *Aging 2000: Our health care destiny (Vol. 11: Psychosocial and policy issues).* Berlin, Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.

Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation analysis. In: A. Davies and C.Elder, eds., *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp.262-284.

Gibson, D. R. (2003). Participation Shifts: Order and Differentiation in Group Conversation. *Social Forces,* 81(4), pp. 1335-1381.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Footing: Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C., and Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 19, pp. 283-307.

Hale, C. (2011). A Frame by any Other Name: Testing the Taxonomy of Interactional Sociolinguistics. *Language Research Bulletin,* 26, pp. 1-7.

Hayashi, M. (2010). An Overview of the Question-Response Systemin Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42,pp. 2685-2702.

Heinemann, T. (2010). The Question-Response System in Danish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2703-2725.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In: K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders, eds., *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 103–147.

Heritage, J. (2012). The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 45(1), pp. 30-52.

Heritage, J., and Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hoymann, G. (2010). Questions and Responses in ǂĀkhoe Hai||om. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2726-2740.

Huisman, M. (2001). Decision-making in Meetings as Talk-in-Interaction. *International Studies of Management and Organization,* 31(3),pp. 69-90.

Itakura, H., and Tsui, A. B. N. (2004). Gender and Conversational Dominance in Japanese Conversation. *Language in Society,* 33,pp. 223-248.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: G. H. Lerner, ed. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*.. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp: 13-31.

Jenness, V., Smith, D. A., and Stepan-Norris, J. (2007). Editors' Note: Advances in Sociological Thinking about Interaction. *Contemporary Sociology,* 36(3), pp. vii-viii.

Kress, G. (2001). Critical sociolinguistics. In: R. Mesthrie, ed. *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 542-545.

Landis, J. R. (2001). *Sociology: Concepts and characteristics.* 11th ed. USA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Lee, Y. J., and Roth, W. M. (2004). Making a Scientist: Discursive "Doing" of Identity and Self-presentation during Research Interview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 5(1), pp. 1-24.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (2010). Questions and Responses in Yélî Dnye, the Papuan Language of Rossel Island. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42,pp. 2741-2755.

Markaki, V., and Mondada, L. (2012). Embodied Orientations towards co-participants in Multinational Meetings. *Discourse Studies,* 14(1),pp. 31-52.

Maynard, D. W., and Clayman, S. E. (2003). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In: L Reynolds, N. Herrman-Kinney, eds., *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*. Walnut Creek, CA, Altamira Press. pp. 173-202.

Mondada, L. (2012). The Dynamics of Embodied Participation and Language Choice in Multilingual Meetings. *Language in Society,* 41,pp. 213-235.

Norlin, C., Sharp, A. L., and Firth, S. (2007). Unanswered Questions Prompted during Pediatric Primary Care Visit. *Ambulatory Pediatrics,* 7(5), pp. 396-400.

O'Sullivan, T. (2010). More than Words? Conversation Analysis in Arts Marketing Research. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 4(1), pp. 20-32.

Park, J. E. (2009). *Turn-Taking Organization for Korean Conversation: With a Conversation Analysis Proposal for the Research and Teaching of Korean Learners of English.* A doctoral dissertation from University of California, Los Angeles. Available at: Proquest Theses and Dissertation Databases. (UMI 3388123) [Accessed 8 November 2018].

Pérez-Sabater, C. (2015). The Rhetoric of Online Support Groups: A Sociopragmatic Analysis. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada,* 28(2),pp. 465–485.

Postma, J. (2008). Balancing Power among Academic and Community Partners: The Case of El Proyecto Bienestar. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*. DOI: 10.1525/jer.2008.3.1.17

Psathas, G., and Anderson, T. (1990). The 'Practices' of Transcription in Conversation Analysis. *Semiotica*, 78, pp. 75-99.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/no Interrogatives and the Structure of responding. *American Sociological Review,* 68(6), pp. 939-967.

Rossano. F. (2010). Questioning and Responding in Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2756-2771.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50, pp. 696-735.

Saft, S. (2004). Conflict as Interactional Accomplishment in Japanese: Arguments in University Faculty Meeting. *Language in Society,* 33, pp. 549-584.

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2005). Strategic Practice, 'Discourse' and the Everyday Interactional Constitution of 'Power Effects'. *Organization,* 12(6), pp. 803-841.

Schaefer, R. T. (2013). *Sociology in Modules.* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In: J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelzer, eds., *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 207–234.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Discourses as an interactional achievement II: An exercise in conversation analysis. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Linguistic in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. Norwood: Ablex, pp. 135-159.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Discourse, Pragmatics, Conversation Analysis. *Discourse Studies,* 1(4),pp. 405-435.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in Interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: "Mobilizing Response". *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 43*(1), pp. 38-48.

Schegloff, E. A.,and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica* 8, pp. 289–327.

Schiffrin, D. (2000). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Schnurr, S. (2012). *Exploring professional communication: Language in action*. London: Routledge.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Steensig, J., and Drew, P. (2008). Introduction: Questioning and Affiliation/disaffiliation in Interaction. *Discourse Studies,* 19(1), pp. 5-15.

Stivers, T. (2010). An Overview of the Question-Response System in American English Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2772-2781.

Stivers, T., and Enfield, N. J. (2010). A Coding Scheme for Question-Response Sequences in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2620-2626.

Stivers, T., and Levinson, S. C. (2010). (Eds.). Question-Response Sequences in Conversation Across Ten Languages: An Introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2615-2619.

Stivers, T., and Robinson, J. D. (2006). A Preference for Progressivity in Interaction. *Language in Society*, 35, pp. 367-392.

Stivers, T., and Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing Response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, pp. 3–31.

Takeda, L. (2016). Collaboration Created through Overlaps: A Study of Japanese Interactions of Different Genres and Levels of Intimacy. *The Japanese Journal of Language in Society,* 19(1),pp. 87-102.

Tannen, D. (1993). What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Framing in Discourse*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press., pp. 14-56.

Tannen, D. (2006). Intertextuality in Action: Reframing Family Arguments in Public and Private. *Text & Talk,* 26,pp. 597– 617.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. Boston. Sage.

Vettin, J., and Todt, D. (2004). Laughter in Conversation: Features of Occurrence and Acoustic Structure. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior,* 28(2),pp. 93-115.

Vickers, M. H. (2014). Towards Reducing the Harm: Workplace Bullying as Workplace Corruption—A Critical Review. *Employment Response Rights Journal*, 26, pp. 95-113.

Weynton, B. (2002). *Organize meetings*. Michigan: Max Johnson.

Walters, F. S. (2007). A Conversation-analytic Hermeneutic Rating Protocol to Assess L2 Oral Pragmatic Competence. *Language Testing,* 24(2),pp. 155-183.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis & discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Yoon, K. E. (2010). Questions and Responses in Korean Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, pp. 2782-2798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.012

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE
Munalim, L., & Genuino, C. (2019). "Through-Produced" Multiple Questions in Tagalog-English Faculty Meetings: Setting the Agenda Dimension of Questions. *Language Art*, 4(2):105-122, Shiraz, Iran.
DOI: 10.22046/LA.2019.12
URL: https://www.languageart.ir/index.php/LA/article/view/95

Language Art, 4(2): pp. 105-122, 2019, Shiraz, Iran
DOI: 10.22046/LA.2019.12 DOR: 98.1000/2476-6526.1398.4.105.11.2.1587.32
فصلنامه هنر زبان، دوره ۴، شماره ۲، سال ۲۰۱۹، از صفحه ۱۰۵ تا ۱۲۲

سؤالات چندلایه «مولد» در جلسات دانشکده تاگالوگ - انگلیسی: تنظیم ابعاد سؤالات دستور جلسه

لئوناردو اُ. مونالیم[1]©

دانشیار، دانشکده‌ی علوم و هنر، دانشگاه زنان فیلیپین،
مانیل، فیلیپین.

سیسیلیا ف. جنیواینو[2]

دانشیار، دانشکده‌ی مطالعات تحصیلات تکمیلی و پژوهش‌های تربیت معلم، دانشگاه دولتی فیلیپین،
مانیل، فیلیپین.

(تاریخ دریافت: ۹ دی ۱۳۹۷؛ تاریخ پذیرش: ۲۲ فروردین ۱۳۹۸؛ تاریخ انتشار: ۷ خرداد ۱۳۹۸)

این مقاله الگوی سؤالات چندلایه «مولد» بااستفاده‌از تحلیل مکالمه‌ای به‌منظور تنظیم ابعاد سؤالات دستورجلسه و شرایط دانشگاهی درجهت پیشبرد کاربردشان طی چند نوبت گفتگو از پنج عضو هیئت علمی در جلسات را توصیف می‌کند. نتایج نشان می‌دهند که: الف. هیچ‌کدام از جفت‌سؤالات «مولد» نخست پاسخ داده نشده است؛ ب. پاسخ‌ها به جفت‌های دوم سؤالات ازطریق تأویل، تصریح، تکرار کلیدواژه‌ها و بیان جایگزین چرخه‌ای زمانی‌که شنونده آن‌ها را با دستورجلسه تطبیق داده، به‌دست آمده‌اند؛ پ. زیردستان هویت‌های پیش‌فرض خود را در چارچوب دانش شناختی کم‌تری قرار می‌دهند؛ و ت. سؤالات چندلایه «مولد» را می‌توان تجلی قدرت رئیس جلسه به‌حساب آورد. دلایل و پیشنهاداتی جهت مقایسه‌های میان‌زبانی به‌منظور تعمیم‌بخشی به دستاوردها ورای حوزه‌ی این جلسات ارائه می‌شود.

واژه‌های کلیدی: سؤالات چندلایه «مولد»، ابعاد دستورجلسه، نظام پرسش-پاسخ، جلسات اعضای هیئت علمی، چارچوب‌بندی.

©(نویسنده مسؤول)

[1] E-mail: lomunalim@pwu.edu.ph

[2] E-mail: cecilia.genuino@dlsu.edu.ph