

مجله علوم اجتماعی و انسانی دانشگاه شیراز
دوره بیست و یکم، شماره اول، بهار ۱۳۸۳ (پیاپی ۴۰)
(ویژه نامه زبان انگلیسی و زبان شناسی)

بررسی مقابله‌ای ساخت‌های پرسشی پاسخ طلب در نمایشنامه‌های معاصر انگلیسی و
فارسی

ژانین جعفری
عضو هیأت علمی دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی

دکتر لطف الله یارمحمدی
استاد دانشگاه شیراز

چکیده

هدف این تحقیق بررسی کارایی الگوی تجزیه و تحلیل گفتار تسویی (۱۹۹۵) به خصوص در مورد زیر مقوله‌های ساخت‌های پرسشی پاسخ طلب و بررسی مقابله‌ای آنها در فارسی و انگلیسی می‌باشد. به منظور دستیابی به این اهداف تعداد ۳۶۱ نمونه ساخت پرسشی از سه نمایشنامه معاصر انگلیسی و تعداد ۳۳۷ نمونه از سه نمایشنامه معاصر فارسی استخراج و مقابله شده‌اند.

نتایج این مطالعه نشان داد که الگوی تسویی برای توصیف ساخت‌های پرسشی پاسخ طلب و رده‌بندی این ساخت‌ها بر حسب نقش گفتمانی آنها مناسب است.

A Contrastive Study of Elicitation Questions in English and Persian Modern Plays

J. Jafari*

Islamshahr Islamic Azad University
Janin- Jafari@yahoo.com

Dr. L. Yarmohammadi**

Shiraz University
yarmohml@sums.ac.ir

Abstract

This article examines the applicability of Tsui's (1995) framework of conversational structure, particularly in regards to different subcategories of elicitations and their comparison in English and Persian. The data for the study are elicitation questions taken from three modern English plays and three modern Persian plays. 698 instances of elicitation questions were analyzed and compared. The results indicate that Tsui's model as well as her classification of elicitations which is basically function-based can account for the data.

Key words: 1.Elicitation questions, 2.Conversational structures, 3.Elicitation classifications

1. Introduction

1.1. Background for Elicitation

Natural languages divide main sentences according to their conventional use into declarative sentences usually used to report facts; interrogative sentences primarily used to ask questions; and imperatives which are used to make requests. Although types of sentences can vary from language to language it appears that the three basic sentence types: declarative, interrogative and imperative are universal. These sentence types can realize twenty-one discourse acts. Three of them which occur in all forms of spoken discourse are: elicitation, directive and informative. Quirk, et al. (1985: 803-4) maintain that the use of these syntactic types correlate largely with different discourse functions. "Statements are primarily used to convey information; questions are primarily used to seek information on a specific point; directives are primarily used to instruct somebody to do something and exclamations are primarily used for expressing the extent to which the speaker is impressed by something." Recently, however, the nature of this correlation has been called into questions. As Lyons (1981: 141) points out "...statements, questions, and commands are only a few of the many functionally distinguishable speech acts which are systematically inter-related in various ways." Among the sentence types, interrogatives either expect the addressee to give a positive or negative answer or to provide the addressee with new information. In what follows a number of classifications of questions will be reviewed to indicate how a variety of utterances have been identified as questions on the basis of different viewpoints.

Quirk, et al. (1985) consider question as a semantic class mainly used to seek

* Member of Teaching Staff.

** Professor of Linguistics

information on a specific point. They divide questions into three major classes according to the type of answers such sentences expect:

1. Yes/No questions that expect affirmation or negation, as in "Have you closed the door?"
2. WH-questions/information questions that typically expect an answer from an open range of answers, as in "What is your job?";
3. Alternative questions that typically expect an answer based on one of two or more options presented in the question, as in "Would you like to go for a WALK or stay at HOME?".

They further classify yes/no questions into neutral and conducive questions. Neutral questions have no bias for eliciting yes or no answers. However, conducive questions contain some elements which make them biased towards either a positive or a negative answer. In addition, tag questions and declarative questions have also been classified under yes/no questions on the basis of responses they prospect.

Although Quirk, et al. claim that their classification of question is made according to the response expected, Tsui (1995) shows that in their actual characterization of different classes of questions, the precedence is given to syntactic form rather than the expected responses. In other words, they pay more attention to the form of the responses than the function or the communicative choice realized by the responses.

Lyons (1981) defines 'question' as an utterance with a particular illocutionary force. According to Falk (1978: 264), illocutionary force refers to "...the speaker's communicative intention in producing an utterance;" she adds, "Types of illocutionary force include assertions, requests for action (imperatives), and requests for information (questions)." Lyons (1981) makes a distinction between questions and statements as illocutionary acts. He explains that the former is characterized by a feature of doubt and that it is felicitous if the speaker does not know the answer to the question. Moreover, he maintains that the association of a response with a question is conventional and independent of the illocutionary force of the question.

Tsui (1995) claims that Lyon's characterization of questions is not consistent because of two reasons. First, if the expectation of answer is independent of the illocutionary force of a question, then there should be no distinction between the following two questions:

Is the window open?

The window is open, isn't it?

However, it is clear that Lyons makes a distinction between the two questions by referring to the type of answers they prospect. Second, since Lyon's characterization of questions does not contain the feature of doubt (because the speaker already knows the answer), it is difficult to see how rhetorical questions can be considered as a kind of question.

It seems that Lyons took into account both syntactic form and discourse function. Therefore, inconsistent criteria are used in the identification and classification of 'questions'. So the category of question lies equally between a syntactic category and a discourse category.

Katz and Postal, Gordon and Lakoff, Katz, Labov and Fenshel (as cited in Tsui, 1995) consider questions as requests for information and propose that the logical form of questions should be "I request you tell me" rather than "I ask you". Katz (as cited in Tsui 1995: 79) characterizes questions as "... requests which have the purpose of eliciting information." Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 865-6) discuss kinds of question in detail based on recent grammatical and pragmatic insights.

The term 'question' is commonly used at both the semantic and pragmatic levels. At

the semantic level, a question is distinguished by the fact that it defines a set of logically possible answers:

[1] QUESTION

i a. *Have you seen it?*ii a. *Who broke it?**The*

ANSWERS

b. *I have seen it. I haven't seen it.*b. *I broke it. Kim broke it.**priest broke it.**One of her children broke it ...*

The pragmatic concept of question is an illocutionary category. Prototypically, a question in this sense is an **inquiry**. To make a (genuine) inquiry is to ask a question to which one does not know the answer with the aim of obtaining the answer from the addressee. An inquiry can be thought of as effectively a kind of a directive—a directive (usually a request) to the addressee to supply the answer. The directive force is indirect, however, since the propositional content of the implied directive (“Tell me the answer to the question ...”) is not the same as that which is actually expressed. As with the indirect directives discussed in § 3.2, the request force can be signaled explicitly in the non-propositional component by the marker *please*, as in *What time is it, please?*

Not all questions are inquiries. The category of question is much broader than that of inquiry. Consider, for example:

[3] i A: *Ed's coming round tonight.* B: *Is he? I didn't know he was*

*still in London.*ii *What will become of her, I wonder?*iii *What were the names of Henry VIII's six wives?*iv *How can this problem be overcome? I suggest that the first**step**is ...*

Example [i] illustrates the case where a question is used to indicate surprised or interested acknowledgement of new information. B's *is he?* is not an inquiry: it does not seek to find out the answer, for A has just provided it, and B is not challenging what A has said. In [ii] I am wondering, not inquiring—probably not asking for an answer (much less 'the' answer). Question [iii] might be used in a quiz or exam: in this case it is not an inquiry since presumably I already know the answer, my aim being to test whether you do. And [iv] is intended as an expository question. Instead of asking you for the answer, I am directing your attention to a question whose answer I'm about to give you. Other cases of questions that are not inquiries include indirect speech acts like *Could you turn your radio down a little* or *Isn't she fantastic!* ([11] of § 3), where the question force is secondary and very much backgrounded.

In comparison with a statement, a question on its own is informationally incomplete: it needs the answer to complete it. In an utterance with question as its primary force, I draw attention to this need for a completing answer. What we are calling an inquiry is then the special, but most common, case where I ask you to provide this answer.

Katz and Postal (1964: 85) propose that an important fact about question is that “Semantically, they are somewhat like imperatives in that questions are requests of specific kind.” They conclude that “Unlike imperatives, which, in general, request some form of nonlinguistic behavior or action, questions are concerned primarily with linguistic responses” (86). Questions have also been characterized as a kind of directive because a directive is an instruction to do something and questions are instructions to

make a verbal performance.

While this kind of characterization is superior to that of Lyons and Quirk, et al. in that it does not confuse form and function, it is not without problems. In other words, the discourse function of 'question' is different from that of 'request'. In this regard, Tsui (1995) criticizes this kind of characterization and asserts that questions and requests prospect two completely different answers. Questions prospect an obligatory verbal response or a non-verbal surrogate and the interaction between the speaker and the addressee is completed at the verbal level; whereas, requests expect an obligatory non-verbal response and sometimes accompany a verbal response which is completed at the non-verbal level.

Tsui (1995) adopted the term 'elicitation' from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) who for the first time used it to refer to the classroom utterances which elicit a verbal response. In the description of conversations, she borrows the terms: act, move and exchange from Sinclair and Coulthard's descriptive framework (Coulthard, 1995). She also maintains that a three-part exchange, i.e. initiation, response and follow-up, is more powerful as a description of the basic unit of conversational organization than an adjacency pair. Based on the structural location criterion, Tsui (1991) establishes three primary classes of acts: a) initiating acts (initiations) which occur at the head of the initiating move, b) responding acts (responses) which occur at the head of the responding move and c) follow-up acts (follow-ups) which occur at the head of the follow-up move. Then she distinguishes four subclasses of initiating acts as: directives, requestives, informatives and elicitations. Elicitations are those verbal responses that supply the missing information indicated in the initiating move.

Accordingly, Tsui (1995: 81) describes that the term 'Elicitation' is used as "A discourse category to describe any utterance, both inside and outside the classroom which functions to elicit an obligatory verbal or its non-verbal surrogate." She further classifies elicitations into six subcategories in terms of different responses they expect. The six subcategories appear in the following:

Elicit: inform

The first subcategory refers to elicitations which function to elicit a piece of missing information. This subcategory may be realized in the form of yes/no questions, wh-questions, alternative questions or indirect questions.

Elicit: confirm

The second subcategory refers to elicitations which invite the addressee to confirm what the speaker assumes to be true. This subcategory may be realized in the form of tag questions, negative and positive polarity interrogatives.

Elicit: agree

The third subcategory consists of elicitations which invite the addressee to agree with the speaker's assumption that the expressed proposition is self-evidently true. This kind of elicitation is often used to start a conversation, especially between strangers, to make conditions ready for further interaction. This subcategory may be realized by tag interrogatives and negative polar interrogatives.

Elicit: commit

The fourth subcategory elicits a verbal response and some sort of commitment on the part of addressee. This subcategory may be realized by yes/no questions or wh-interrogatives. The interrogatives in this subcategory are similar to requests in the sense

that if responded to positively, they will involve some sort of commitment to further action. However, they differ from requests because they obligatorily elicit a verbal response while it is optional in requests.

Elicit: repeat and Elicit: clarify

The fifth and sixth subcategories elicit: repeat and elicit: clarify, prospect a repetition and clarification of a preceding utterance(s). Elicit: repeat may be realized by wh-interrogatives such as "Who/When/Where/What did you say?", or words such as "Sorry?", "Pardon?" or "Huh?". Elicit: clarify can be realized by wh-interrogatives such as "What do you mean?", "Which room?" or "What?".

1.2. Responses to Elicitation

As Tsui (1995) points out, responses have been given little attention in the speech act literature. This is because of the characterization of illocutionary acts which is often carried out by making a semantic analysis of performative verbs rather than by considering the function of utterances in discourse. Response acts, therefore, are neglected because they do not have corresponding performative verbs. Knowing both the illocutionary intent and the pragmatic presuppositions of the initiation are important criteria for identifying the responding move. If the responding move meets the presuppositions and the illocutionary intent of the preceding utterance, then the move can be characterized as a responding move; otherwise, it will challenge the preceding utterance and will be characterized as a challenging move. Fully-fitting responding acts which are preferred fulfill the illocutionary intent and imply the pragmatic presuppositions of the initiating move and are labeled positive responding acts. The utterances which do not fulfill the illocutionary intent and challenge the pragmatic presuppositions of the initiating act, can be categorized as negative responding acts which are dispreferred. Temporizations are other kinds of dispreferred responding acts which do not fulfill the illocutionary intent of the initiating move, but they do not challenge its pragmatic presuppositions, which also postpone the decision-making.

Although all challenges are dispreferred and face-threatening, some of them are more face-threatening than others. Tsui (1995: 166) points out that "Challenging the presupposition that one is able to provide the requested information is less face-threatening than challenging the presupposition that one is willing to provide the requested information." This is why participants who are unwilling to provide information usually make use of declaration of ignorance, such as "I don't know", and also use fillers, hesitation or evasive answers.

Therefore, only fully-fitting answers which fulfill the illocutionary intent of the speaker serve as positive answers to elicitation. However, elicit: commit is an exception which commits the addressee to a future verbal or non-verbal action, like requestives, then all three subclasses of responding acts can be realized and there is no challenging move.

1.3. Follow-up acts

Follow-up acts generally aim to acknowledge the outcome of an exchange. They are subcategorized as: endorsement, concession and acknowledgment. These three subclasses are determined on the basis of prospective classification.

Follow-up acts which endorse the positive outcome of the interaction are identified as endorsement and realized by items such as 'wonderful', 'great', 'good', 'splendid', etc. For example, in an elicit: inform, if the provided information is considered as a service rendered, an appreciation for the service rendered or a comment on the information can show an endorsement.

A follow-up act which has the function of accepting a negative outcome of the

intention is labeled a concession. Since negative responses do not fulfill the illocutionary intent of the preceding initiation, they are face-threatening effect of the negative response.

The other subclass of follow-up act is a minimal acknowledgment that the response has been heard, understood or accepted and the interaction has been felicitous. This type of follow-up act can be realized by items such as 'okay', 'right', 'alright', 'yeah', 'oh I see' or a repetition of the preceding response in low key. Acknowledgments may follow all three subclasses of responding acts.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

This study was carried out to find answers to the following questions:

1. Is Tsui's characterization of utterance applicable to the conversational structure of English and Persian modern plays?
2. Is Tsui's classification of 'Elicitation questions' workable in English and Persian modern plays?
3. Which one of Tsui's Elicitation questions' subcategories is the most frequently used in English and Persian modern plays?
4. Are the elicited responses in accordance with Tsui's classification of responding moves in English and Persian modern plays?

2. Method

2.1. The Corpus

The corpus of this study consists of three English and three Persian modern plays. The three English modern plays are:

1. **The Glass Menagerie** (Williams, T. 1944)
2. **The Time of Your Life** (Saroyan, W. 1939)
3. **Trifles** (Glaspell, S. 1948)

and the three Persian modern plays are:

1. **?arusiye-xubaan** (Makhmalbaf, M. 1366/1987)
2. **rouzane-ye-?aabi** (Radi, A. 1340/1961)
3. **vaay bar maqlub** (Gouhar-Morad, 1356/1977)

The three modern English plays and the three modern Persian plays are written by famous contemporary writers.

After a systematic search for five sub-categories of 'Elicitation questions', 361 English and 337 Persian dyads were analyzed. The data of this research are taken from Jafari's (2000) M.A. thesis. It is worth noting that Persian instances were also transcribed and subsequently transliterated for data analysis. The most important reason for choosing modern plays as the corpus of the present study lies in the fact that the language of modern plays is somewhat spontaneous and close to the natural everyday conversations.

2.2. Analysis of the Data

First, 'elicitation questions' both in English and Persian modern plays were detected and extracted. It is noticeable to mention that Elicit: confirm is not included in the study because the discourse function in it depends on the intonation employed by the speakers. Second, the data were analyzed in terms of the conversational structure model proposed by Tsui (1995) as in the following:

1. Elicit: inform

The elicitations which invite the addressee to supply a piece of information.

2. Elicit: agree

The elicitations which invite the addressee to agree with the speaker's assumption that the expressed proposition is self-evidently true.

3. Elicit: commit

The elicitions which elicit more than just a verbal response from the addressee. It also elicits commitment of some kind.

4. Elicit: repeat and 5) Elicit: clarify

The elicitions which prospect a repetition and clarification of a preceding utterance(s).

The following examples with their analyses are given for further illustration:

Elicit: inform**1.**

I. 1 A: baa xadije che kaar mikon-i?

with khadije what work do + present, 2nd per., sing.(you)
what do you want to do with khadije?

R.1 B: miferest-am-ash karbaas mahalleh.

send I her karbaas district
am: +present, 1st per., sing. (I) ash: 3rd per., sing. (her)
I will send her to karbaas mahalleh.

(*vaay bar maqlub*, 58)

2.

I. 1 A: Where are you going?

R.1 B: I'm going to the movies.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 994)

3.

I. 1 A: Haven't you ever liked some boy?

R.1 B: Yes. I liked one once. I came across his picture a while ago.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 996)

4.

I. 1 A: Is there a moon this evening?

R.1 B: It's rising over Garfinkel's Delicatessen.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 1002)

Initiating moves (I.1) in examples (1) and (2) are instances of information seeking questions. Therefore, in both cases, the addressee provides the speaker with the requested information. The responses are both positive and preferred because both meet the illocutionary intent of the speakers. In these interactions no follow-up has been realized. It may be concluded that follow-up acts occur more in spoken forms than in written forms because in a face-to-face interaction the follow-up moves may be realized non-verbally.

In (3), I.1 is what Quirk, et al. (1985) refer to as "negative polarity interrogative" which prospects a negative answer. Nevertheless, it is apparent that A's utterance (I.1) is not negatively oriented and its discourse function is to elicit information. In this case, the responding move is positive and fulfills the presupposition underlying the preceding utterance. The follow-up act is also absent. This may be due to the fact that since A who seeks information is in a higher position, then the follow-up act may be realized non-verbally.

In (4), I.1 is an example of "neutral polarity yes/no question" which implies that the speaker has no assumption as to whether the answer is 'yes' or 'no'. Here the speaker does not have any assumption to arouse confirmation or disconfirmation, but rather the speaker seeks information. In other words, this information seeking question does not necessarily prospect either a 'yes' or 'no' answer. The response to A's utterance (I.1)

fully fulfills the speaker's illocutionary intent and is a positive responding act. In this case no follow-up act is present. The reason can be due to the fact that the participants know each other well.

Elicit: agree

1.

I. 1 A: sedaa-ye paa mishna-vi?
Sound of foot hear +present, 2 nd per.,sing.(you)
There s a footstep .Do you hear?

R.1 B: ?aare mardaaneh ?ast.
Yes.manly is
Yes.Of a man.

(rouzane-ye-?aabi, 58)

2.

I. 1 A: Is it broken?

R.1 B: Now it is just like the other horses.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 1014)

3.

I. 1 A: Did he seem pleased?

R.1 B: Yeah

(*The Time of Your Life*, 694)

4.

I. 1 A: Is that you and Mr. O'Conner?

R.1 B: Yes, Mother.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 1007)

The initiations in all these examples are 'neutral polarity yes/no questions' uttered with a question intonation which invite the addressees to agree with the speakers' assumption that the expressed propositions are self-evidently true. In this part the context of situation plays an important role in order to disambiguate the discourse function of the utterance. The absence of the follow-up acts may be because the utterances are taken from written forms rather than spoken forms.

Elicit: commit

1.

I. 1 A: xaanoom chaa?i dam begozaar-am
madam tea brew put + present, 1st per., sing. (I)
Shall I brew the tea, madam?

R.1 B: chaa?iyee laahijan ?ast. kam ber-iz. por zur
tea of Lahijan is little pour strong
-iz: +present, 2nd per., sing. (you)
It is Lahijan tea, so use little, and do
nabaashad. baraaye qalb mozer ?ast.
not be for heart harmful is
not make strong tea. It is harmful for the heart.

(rouzane-ye-?aabi, 56)

2.

I. 1 A: Mr. Nick can I play the piano again?

R.1 B: Sure. Practice all you like until I tell you to stop.

(*The Time of Your Life*, 685)

3.

I. 1 A: Where'll I take them?

R.1 B: Given them to some kid. No, take them up to Kitty.

(The Time of Your Life, 685)

I.1 in both (1) and (2) is a neutral polarity yes/no question used to not only elicit a verbal response but also get the addressee to commit himself to do something. In this kind of elicitation the speaker clarifies his/her intent by identifying the kind of commitment he/she demands on the part of the addressee.

In (3), I.1 is another instance of elicit: commit realized by a wh-interrogative which invites the addressee not only to supply the missing information signaled by 'where', but also to commit to a specific place of taking toys. The follow-up acts in all interactions are absent. This may be because of the mentioned reasons.

Elicit: repeat

1.

I. 1 A: goft-id saa?at chand ?ast?

tell you hour what is tell: + present, 2nd per., sing.(you)

What time did you tell it is?

R.1 B: dar hodud-e se.

in around of three

Around three.

(rouzane-ye-?aabi, 71)

2.

I. 1 A: Give me a pillow.

I. 2 B: What?

R.2 A: A pillow.

F.1 B: Oh!

(The Glass Menagerie, 1010)

3.

I. 1 A: What have you done since high school?

I. 2 B: Huh?

R.2 A: I said what have you done since high school, Laura?

R.1 B: Nothing much.

(The Glass Menagerie, 1012)

The second initiating move (I.2) in both (1) and (2) is a wh-interrogative asking for a repetition of part of A's preceding utterance. All responding moves are positive and fulfill the presuppositions underlying the preceding utterances. However, in the first and the third interactions the follow-up acts are not observed. This may be due to the fact that the interlocutors know each other well, or it may be realized non-verbally. In (2), the follow-up act is realized by acknowledging receipt of information.

Elicit: clarify

1.

I. 1 A: xod-am mi?aar-am-ash. ?az kodum var ber-am?

myself I bring from which direction take I

am: + present, 1st per.,sing. (I) ash: + present +, 3rd per., sing. (her)

I will bring her myself. Which direction shall we take?

R.1 B: ?az jelow bepich be raast.

from straight turn to right
Go straight, then turn right.

(?arusiye-xubaan, 52)

2.

I. 1 A: Mother, you mustn't expect too much of Laura.

I. 2 B: What do you mean?

R.2 A: Laura seems all those things to you and me because she's ours and we love her.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 1004)

3.

I. 1 A: What class was that?

R.1 B: It was singing-chorus.

F.1 A: Aw.

(*The Glass Menagerie*, 1011)

4.

I. 1 A: Who, for instance?

R.1 B: Me.

(*The Time of Your Life*, 674)

I.2 in both (1) and (2) and also I.1 in (3) and (4) is a wh-interrogative used to ask for clarification of the preceding utterance. All elicitations are followed by positive responding acts. However, only the third interaction includes a follow-up act in A's utterance, which is in the form of a minimal acknowledgment.

2.3. Procedures

The statistical procedures utilized were first, obtaining the frequency of each subcategory in the two languages; second, calculating the percentage of these elicitations in both English and Persian texts; and third, running Chi-square tests to see if there were significant differences between the subcategories of a language and also among the two languages.

3. Results and Discussion

The questions obtained from the data analysis are presented in five subcategories of 'Elicitation questions'- i.e., information, agreement, commitment, repetition and clarification. The frequencies and percentages are given in the following table.

Table 1: The Frequency of Different Types of Elicitation Questions in English and Persian Texts

Elicitation Question Types	Frequencies		Percentages	
	English	Persian	English	Persian
Elicit: Inform	219	214	66.66	63.50
Elicit: Clarify	99	83	27.42	24.63
Elicit: Repeat	21	5	5.82	1.49
Elicit: Agree	14	27	3.88	8.01
Elicit: Commit	8	8	2.22	2.37
Total	361	377	100	100

Table 1 illustrates that questions which seek information and clarification were the most frequent types of elicitation question in both English and Persian texts. The Elicit: Repeat constituted 5.82 percent of this type of question in Persian texts. That is, the tendency of the English texts in the use of Elicit: Repeat was nearly four times as many as the Persian texts. This tendency was reverse in the case of Elicit: Agree. The English

texts used 14 instances (3.88%) of this type of question which was nearly twice less than that of the Persian texts. In the Elicit: Commit, however, both the English and Persian texts indicated nearly the same tendency in the use of Elicit: Commit. The English texts used 8 instances (2.22%) compared with 8 instances in Persian texts (2.37%).

The Chi-square test is applied to tap the significance of these differences. They are reported in the following tables:

Table 2: Different Types of Elicitation Questions in English Texts

Types of Questions Language	Inform	Clarify	Repeat	Commit	Agree
English	60.66%	27.42%	5.82%	3.88%	2.22%
$\chi^2=448.7^*$					

*P < .05

It can be observed from Table 2 that the difference between subcategories of Elicitation questions in English texts was highly significant.

Table 3: Different Types of Elicitation Questions in Persian Texts

Types of Questions Language	Inform	Clarify	Repeat	Agree	Commit
Persian	63.50%	24.63%	1.49%	8.01%	2.37%
$\chi^2=456.7^*$					

*P < .05

Here the result of the Chi-square revealed an extremely great significant difference between the subcategories of Elicitation questions in Persian.

Table 4: Different Types of Elicitation Questions in Persian and English Texts

Types of Questions Language	Inform	Clarify	Repeat	Agree	Commit
English	60.66%	27.42%	5.82%	3.88%	2.22%
Persian	63.50%	24.63%	1.49%	8.01%	2.37%
$X^2=14.62^*$					

*P < .05

Table 4 indicates that the difference among the subcategories of Elicitation questions in English and Persian is significant.

To sum up, the tables of the five subcategories showed that both English and Persian texts demonstrated significance in Elicit: Inform and Elicit: Clarify at P < .05.

The data reported here largely support the research questions that Tsui's (1995) model of 'Elicitation question' is efficient and any question regarding its function can be classified as one of the five subcategories of elicitation in English and Persian modern plays.

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that Elicit: Inform had the highest percentage in both English and Persian texts. This finding can be considered as an indication of the fact that different forms of questions had the same function, that is, they were frequently used to elicit a piece of missing information. This table indicated that the second highest percentage belonged to Elicit: Clarify, that is 27.42 percent of the total questions in English texts and 24.63 percent of the total questions in Persian texts. Because on the results, next to getting information, the function of most of the questions was to seek further clarification.

Table 1 also showed that only 1.49 percent of the total 'Elicitation questions' were

Elicit: Repeat in Persian texts; while, this type of elicitation question constituted 5.82 percent of the whole questions in English texts (i.e., the third highest percentage). In the use of Elicit: Agree, the instances of Persian texts (i.e. 8.01% of the total elicitation questions) were nearly twice more than that of the English ones (i.e. 3.88%). In this table, with a total of 8 English instances of commitment compared with 8 Persian instances of commitment indicated that both English and Persian texts used Elicit: Commit equally. It might be the case because of the fact that the interlocutors possibly performed this function in the requestive forms.

So the highest and the lowest percentages of 'Elicitation questions' in English texts belonged to Elicit: Inform and Elicit: Commit and in Persian texts belonged to Elicit: Inform and Elicit: Repeat respectively.

The application of Chi-square test demonstrated that there were significant differences between the frequencies of the subclasses of Elicitation questions in each language and also among the frequencies of the subclasses in the two languages

4. Conclusions

Based on the findings and the analyses of the data gathered in this research, the following conclusions are drawn:

1-It is evident that Tsui's characterization of the utterance which occurs in the initiating move and elicits an obligatory verbal response as an 'Elicitation questions' regardless of its syntactic form is applicable to the conversational structure of English and Persian modern plays.

2-It appears that Tsui's classification of 'Elicitation questions' into five subcategories which is on the basis of the discourse function of the utterances is proper and workable in English and Persian modern plays.

3-The results of this investigation show that there are some similarities and differences in using subcategories of 'Elicitation questions' in both English and Persian texts. That is, most of the questions in both English and Persian texts were asked for getting information and clarification, next the questions in English texts were asked for repetition and then agreement while in Persian texts these tendencies were reverse, at last asking for commitment and repetition were the least frequent types of questions in English and Persian respectively.

4-The elicited responses are also in accordance with the Tsui's classification of responding moves with reference to the third element of conversation, in most cases no follow-up move was realized. The absence of follow-up act may be accounted for by the facts that: 1) the interlocutors knew each other well, 2) those who asked a question were in a higher position in which the follow-up act might be realized non-verbally, and 3) the utterances are taken from written texts, therefore, non-verbal follow-up acts were not observed.

References

- Coulthard, M. (1992). **Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis**, London: Routledge.
- Falk, J. S. (1978). **Linguistics and Language: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Implications** (2nd ed), New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Glaspell, S. (1948). **Trifles**, New York: Random House, Inc.
- Gouhar-Morad, (1356/1977). **Vaay Bar Maqlub**, Tehran: Aagaah Publication.
- Huddleston R. and Pullum, K. (2002) **The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language**, Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- Jafari, J.(2000). **A Contrastive Study of Elicitation Questions in English and Persian Modern Plays**, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The Islamic Azad University, Shiraz.
- Katz, J. J. & Postal, P. M. (1964). **An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions**, Monograph Series, No. 26. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press Research.
- Lyons, H. (1981). **Language and Linguistics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makhmalbaf, M. (1366/1987). **?Arusiye-xubaan**, Tehran: Soroush Publication.
- Quirk, et al. (1985). **A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language**, London: Longman.
- Radi, A. (1340/1961). **Rouzane-ye-?aabi**. Tehran: Nikpu Publication.
- Saroyan, W. (1939). **The Time of -Your- Life**, New York: Random House, Inc.
- Sinclair, J.M. & Coulthard, M. (1975). **Towards an Analysis of Discourse**, London: Oxford University Press.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1991). *Sequencing rules and coherence in discourse*, **Journal of Pragmatics**, 15, 29- 111.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). **English Conversation**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, T. (1944). **The Glass Menagerie**, New York: Random House, Inc.