Western Journal of Communication
Vol. 74, No. 5, October–December 2010, pp. 547–569

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

"I'm Just Raising the Question": Terms for Talk and Practical Metadiscursive Argument in Public Meetings

James L. Leighter & Laura Black

This study examines the meanings and functions of raising questions in utterances such as "I'm just raising the question." We examine such phrases as they were used in deliberative public meetings about a water conservation initiative. We show how raising questions is a distinctive mode of talk that draws attention to an issue requiring further discussion. The family of terms, each of which includes some form of the words raise *and* question*, are used as a practical metadiscourse in these meetings. We show how situated use of the terms reveals a distinctive sociality and rhetoric for participants in the meetings.*

Keywords: Group Discussion; Practical Metadiscourse; Public Meetings; Terms for Talk

In some contexts, such as public meetings, talk about talk appears to be an unavoidable and integral aspect of communication.[1] Citizens in public meetings often talk at great length about what can be said, how it can be said, and by whom (e.g., Buttny & Cohen, 2007; Craig & Tracy, 2005; Tracy & Ashcraft, 2001; Tracy & Durfy, 2005). Moreover, citizens can actively shape the communicative scene of a public meeting (Leighter & Castor, 2009) characterize the social connections of people in a community (Tracy & Dimock, 2004) or enact "local democracy" (Townsend, 2009)

James L. Leighter is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Creighton University. Laura Black is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Ohio University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2005 National Communication Association's annual convention, where it received a Top Four Papers Award from the Language and Social Interaction Division. The authors would like to thank John Gastil, Gerry Philipsen, Kristine Fitch, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on this essay. Correspondence to: James L. Leighter, Department of Communication Studies, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178, USA. E-mail: leighter@creighton.edu

ISSN 1057-0314 (print)/ISSN 1745-1027 (online) © 2010 Western States Communication Association
DOI: 10.1080/10570314.2010.512281

in and through their communication in these types of meetings. Public meetings are not exclusively about such talk, of course. The topics for which public meetings are convened (e.g., schools, sewers, public safety, economic development, zoning, and conservation) receive considerable attention. Nevertheless, talk about talk in public meetings appears to be an inextricably bound up in such events for those who participate in them.

In this study, we examine uses of a family of terms for talk, or metacommunicative terms, in a particular set of public meetings. More specifically, we examine instances when participants in these meetings raise questions and/or talk about raised questions during discussions about a proposed city initiative for water conservation in Seattle, WA.

While observing videotaped records of these meetings, we were struck by the frequency with which group members talked about questions. Many of the participants in the meeting posed, raised, discussed, asked, recorded in writing, commented on, and challenged their own questions as well as the questions of other participants. In a variety of ways, questions were as significant a topic of talk as the water conservation initiative that brought the group together. Some examples of such talk include the comments, ''I'm just raising the question,'' ''The question this raises in my mind,'' ''This is one of the questions I had, glad you raised it,'' and ''It's not fair to raise all these questions and not be able to answer them in some plain language.'' As analysts of communication, hearing these expressions caused us to wonder: When a speaker labels an utterance by saying, for example, ''I'm just raising the question,'' what does the expression of this term indicate? What is the person doing in employing such language and how do others orient to it? Put simply, our purpose is to raise the question of raising questions.

We draw from three treatments of metacommunicative terms to conceptualize our study. First, Carbaugh (1989) points out that *terms for talk* differentiate types of verbal action. For example, the term *raising a question* can differentiate a unique verbal activity from *asking a factual question.* Such differentiation is analogous to the way someone might draw a distinction between the verbal acts of a put-down and a joke. In addition, the term raising questions can serve as labels for a way of speaking (Hymes, 1962, 1972; Philipsen, 1997; Philipsen, Coutu, & Covarrubias, 2005) and, thus, distinguish one type of being and doing verbal action from another. For example, as part of a discussion, a group may engage in raising questions as a distinct way of speaking and one that differs from, say, a question and answer period following a presentation.

Second, Craig (1999) draws distinctions between *practical metadiscourse* and *theoretical metadiscourse* by illustrating the influence everyday ways of talking about talk have on theorizing about such ways, and vice versa. In this study we examine raising questions as a family of terms that occur in a variety of forms. Those terms are part of a practical metadiscourse heard in a series of public meetings on a water conservation initiative. We hope to shed light on the situated uses of these terms as they are deployed in this context.

Third, after describing expressions of these terms as part of practical metadiscourse in these meetings, we show how a participant in the meetings under study uses

forms of these terms rhetorically. Thus, we demonstrate instances of raising questions as part of a *practical metadiscourse for argument* (Craig & Tracy, 2005) in the context of a public meeting.

Why Examine Raised Questions?

One reason to examine raising questions is that phrases including *raise* and *question* can be heard and read frequently in public life.[2] For example, recent headlines indicate that events in the public domain involving potential conflicts of interest (such as doctors advertising for pharmaceutical companies or mortgage companies giving VIP loans to Washington politicians)[3] raise questions for the American public. Such uses appear almost every day in national and international newspapers. A Lexis/Nexis general news search for "rais*"[4] and "question" in the headlines (only) of major newspapers in the last six months will likely yield many articles questions raised in the headlines.[5] Although the present study does not include analysis of raising questions in such media texts, we believe that an examination of ways in which these terms are deployed in the speech situation under study warrants some claims concerning forms of this potentially important metacommunicative resource in some contexts.

Although raising questions has received little attention, some of the communicative and linguistic aspects raising questions are addressed by past research. Searle (1969), for example, uses the phrase "raising the question of" in his observation "that predication is not an act which can occur alone, but can only occur as part of some illocutionary act" (p. 124). According to Searle, "One only raises the question in the performance of some illocutionary act" (p. 124). He adds, a speaker raising a question is "raising it in some other form or other, interrogative, assertive, promissory, etc." (p. 124). Searle's claims suggest a range of activity and meaning associated with the act of raising a question.

Levinson's (1983) exposition of speech act theory, particularly his discussion of indirect speech acts and the literal force hypothesis, further emphasizes Searle's point that questions may have a range of illocutionary force. As Levinson suggests, questions can be assigned literal force by participants and, thus, function as their grammatical form indicates. Or, the meaning of the interrogative sentence type "can be thought of as an open proposition, closed by a set of appropriate answers" (p. 274). Or, "A particular interrogative may be held to denote the set of its true answers . . . thus, interrogatives can be used with the illocutionary forces of 'real' questions, 'exam' questions, rhetorical questions, requests, offers, suggestions, threats and for many other functions, without over-riding some 'literal force' " (pp. 274–275). Thus, we assume the nature of the relationship between form and force is an open, empirical question and one worthy of investigation in naturally occurring expressions.

Bilmes (2001) offers one close point of intersection with our analysis because of his attention to questions raised in public discourse. Bilmes's examination of question placement in the 1992 vice presidential debate provides a background for examining questions in political discussions more generally. He uses the term "question" as a "cover term for any utterance that recognizably calls for a coparticipant to supply

some specified item of information here and now'' (p. 154). He analyzes utterances that conform to this definition and, given their placement within the structure of talk, draws conclusions about the properties of the utterances as well as their tactical use by the vice presidential candidates in the debate.

Bilmes (2001) was concerned with the examination of discourse structure and rhetorical force. From his examination, he developed a category of questions called ''raising questions'' (p. 161). In so doing, he notes: ''To ask a question is to raise it, but to raise it is not necessarily to ask it. To raise it is to make it relevant—to remind the participants, and the audience, that it is there and (in the case of reraising) has been asked but not yet answered (or answered adequately)'' (p. 163). Bilmes describes this category, like the others in his study, in terms of the placement of interrogatives in the structure of interaction.

In our study, we built on past research by investigating instances of raising questions or talking about raised questions in situated usage. We did not assume that all terms used to raise questions or talk about raised questions are a single category of communicative phenomenon. Rather, we viewed the specific terms as a family of metacommunicative terms which, like other terms for talk, serve a variety of discursive functions. On the occasions in which these specific terms were used, we assume such forms refer to multiple levels of communicative acts and contain a variety of messages about communication, sociality, and personhood. We took for granted that all terms for talk serve these functions, but believe an explication of how raising questions does is warranted in view of the significance these phrases have in group, public, and political domains.

To this end, we investigate terms used to raise questions or talk about raised questions to examine what these terms mean to the people who use and experience them. Specifically, we asked: *What are the features of raising questions that mark it as a distinctive mode of communication? Who is involved in acts of raising questions? And, what social relations and functions are they acting or commenting on when they do so?*

Materials and Analytic Method

Our corpus of materials came from the meetings of the ''Initiative-63 Citizen's Analysis Panel'' (hereafter I-63) convened in Seattle, WA, in August of 2001. That summer, the I-63 water conservation initiative received the required number of signatures to be placed on the ballot the following autumn. The meetings were, in our view, analogous to citizen juries and other such forums (e.g., Ackerman & Fishkin, 2002; Crosby & Nethercutt, 2005; Fishkin & Luskin, 1999; Gastil, 2000). The meetings were constructed to foster group deliberation (e.g., Burkhalter, Gastil, & Kelshaw, 2002; Gastil & Black, 2008), which involves free, equal, and respectful discussion among citizens who collaborate in analyzing a public issue and aim to arrive at a ''rationally motivated consensus'' (Cohen, 1997, p. 74) that will serve the common good and honor the core values of the community.

To call these meetings deliberative explains, in part, the format or design of the interaction; it does not fully describe the political context in which these meetings

were convened. In 2001, the Seattle City Council passed a unique resolution allowing the Council to convene review panels for the examination of city initiatives. Shortly after, the Seattle City Council, led by a president who openly opposed the measure, announced the creation of the I-63 Citizens' Analysis Panel. Before the panels were convened, a press release from the City Council stated such citizen panels "could help ensure voters have objective information about ballot initiatives, including practical impacts as well as legal, fiscal, and policy ramifications."[6]

The creation of the review panel was not well received by the supporters of I-63. Proponents of I-63 filed a complaint with the City of Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission (Murakami, 2001) hoping to stop the review of I-63. The City Council countered with a lawsuit asking the courts to remove I-63 from the ballot (Johnson & Murakami, 2001; see also Heyamoto, 2001) and an alternative initiative they labeled I-63B ("Pageler Proposes," 2001; Taus, 2001b). In spite of these political maneuvers, the I-63 Citizens' Analysis Panel met four times between July 31 and August 21 of 2001. In a total of 16 hours of meetings, they listened to expert testimony on I-63, discussed the initiative at length, and drafted a document for the City Council to review. The final written product of the panel reflected heavy opposition to I-63, with ten panelists opposing the initiative and one supporting it (Taus, 2001a).

The panel consisted of 12 people who had an interest in and/or knowledge of water conservation issues. Participants on the panel represented a range of expertise and professional affiliation, including environmental advocacy, biological science, law (including specifically water law), real estate development, hospital administration, city park management, and local industry. In the early portions of each meeting, the panel heard expert presentations concerning the water conservation efforts of Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), issues regarding water rights law, and the science of water conservation and fish protection in western Washington rivers. The meetings took place in the Seattle City Council chambers, were cablecast on local television, and open to the public. The City Council hired a professionally trained moderator and his staff, who organized and facilitated the meetings.

The basic sequence of each of the meetings was as follows: 1) the facilitator, Bill, and his team provide an introduction to the meeting, including talk about prior meetings and open discussion of the agenda; 2) presenters with expertise on a topic germane to water law, conservation or usage speak for 30–45 minutes; 3) the panelists ask questions of the presenters and the presenter stays for a while to discuss the initiative; 4) the facilitator leads a discussion, taking the panel through what they had learned during the presentations and discussion in this and previous meetings; and 5) Q & A from members of the public who observed the meeting. The interactional features of the meetings were, of course, more complex than this sequence suggests. For our purposes, noting when an instance of raising questions or talk about raised questions occurred in this basic sequence was helpful in our analysis and description of the situated usage.

These materials are a rich source for the study of the practices of public meetings, deliberation, citizen participation, and the like. Our examination of the materials for this study began not with a search for instances of raising questions but a general

search for the ways of speaking (Hymes, 1972; Philipsen & Coutu, 2005) in these meetings. We watched the videotaped meetings a total of eight times. Two of those times we viewed the materials together and discussed our observations about the meetings. Our method was, first, to develop an exhaustive collection of all expressions when a speaker used a form of *raise* and a form of *question* in a single utterance. We found 10 instances from seven different speakers. Second, we transcribed each instance while fixing on the page the utterance in which the expression occurred in addition to the discourse preceding and following the expression; we did so in order to situate the instance in the flow of the talk. Third, we submitted each instance to an interpretive analysis via use of established principles of discourse analytic interpretation. We searched for patterns in the discourse (Hymes, 1962, 1972; Philipsen & Coutu, 2005) when people raised questions or talked about raised questions. More specifically, we searched for meaning in these expressions by examining the sequences of talk in the meetings.

One way to assess meaning in verbal actions is to examine how others respond to them (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1989). Participants in these meetings responded to the act of raising questions in patterned ways. Such patterns are indicators of the ways in which people orient to these acts and what they take them to mean (Hymes, 1962, 1972; Pike, 1964; Searle, 1969). As Philipsen and Coutu (2005) put it, "The significance of conduct to people is found in what they do and in how they orient, behaviorally, to what they and others do, in the course of interaction" (p. 361). Finally, we reviewed the audio and video materials again in order to refine our claims (see Jackson, 1986) and develop our exposition.

Findings and Discussion

Raising Questions: A Distinctive Mode of Communication

In this section, we examine the features of raising questions that mark it as a distinctive mode of communication. These features involve the addressee, the intended outcome, and the discursive function of such acts in ongoing interaction. To frame these features, we begin with a contrast between raising questions and a more prototypical understanding of the role of questions in group discussion.

One standard notion of a question is that it is a request for an answer. For example, Goffman (1981) describes a common interrogative form in which the addresser poses a question to an addressee for the purpose of eliciting a reply to meaningful elements of the content of the question. Similarly, Bilmes (2001) describes a "prototypical" question as one in which "A requests information from B that A lacks" (p. 155). In our materials, we saw many examples of participants' asking what they referred to as factual questions and we offer the following examples as a backdrop for our analysis of raising questions.

Factual questions are typically directed toward someone in the interaction who has sufficient knowledge or expertise to offer a reply to the content of the question. Excerpt 1 includes two prototypical factual questions. Jim (J) poses these questions to Tim (T), an "expert" from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) who has just concluded

his presentation. In this instance, Jim does not specify that the question is for Tim. Jim's first turn, however, comes immediately after Tim has just yielded the floor to provide an opportunity for questions from the panel.

Excerpt 1
01 J: I have a question since I'm not really familiar with the CPA. Is this
02 all based on voluntary conservation number one and number two
03 was that built into somehow the rate structure that's in current you
04 know use in order to pay for these conservation programs.
05 T: Well the CPA is based on voluntary programs and so there's no
06 you know rule or regulation. We have a whole different world if
07 we get into a very severe drought thing and we call that
08 curtailment instead of conservation and there is a possibility in our
09 curtailment plan for regulations and things like that. Uh the
10 second part of your question was uh?
11 J: Is the capital cost for the conservation program coming from the
12 existing rate structure.
13 T: Oh yeah yes

In this excerpt, Jim expresses unfamiliarity with the topic as the purpose for posing a question to Tim (line 01). The replies Tim offer appear to be sufficient in addressing the content of the questions in that there is no further talk on the topic including especially any dispute about the replies.

That Jim does not contest the reply or indicate any need for further consideration suggests the finality of the adjacency pair. The pragmatic outcome of a factual question is that the topic is no longer up-in-the-air, so to speak. Instead, there is some closure or resolution to the two-part question-answer sequence. This is not to suggest that a topic could not be revisited or that a reply could be insufficient or inept. Nor are we suggesting that all question sequences develop in this simple two-part form. Rather, we are showing here a typical sequence from our data that demonstrates what the participants in this meeting often referred to as a "factual" question.

In contrast, when participants raised questions, they indicated that they were doing something other than seeking a direct reply to the content of the question. Participants orient to raised questions as if there are not obvious answers or even obvious addressees who could provide answers. Instead, the participants orient to raised questions as if an "issue" has been identified that merits further analysis through "talk" or "discussion." Raised questions are often posed in such a manner that some or all of the copresent participants are potential addressees. We use Amy's (A) act of raising the question (excerpt 2) and Bill's response to it (excerpt 3) for formulating these initial claims. For these excerpts, it is important to note Amy is a panelist and is speaking after opening remarks in the first meeting from Anne, a member of Bill's facilitation team. Anne has just concluded a description of several main features of I-63. Amy says:

Excerpt 2
01 A: In the um section excuse me section five uh talking about the new
02 water rate. Um is that well I guess I um if you read this one
03 way it would just be businesses and residences in the city of

04 Seattle. If you read it another way it might be businesses and
05 residences outside of Seattle. So that I'm just raising the
06 question uh to be clear about.

In this example, Amy proposes two hypothetical readings of the initiative and claims that each one would lead to a different conclusion. Amy labels her utterance by saying, "So that I'm just raising the question" (lines 05 and 06).

Amy gives some hint as to the purpose or function of her utterance, that is, "to be clear about" (line 06) the initiative. We cannot be sure of Amy's intentions here, but the responses of others show that at least one person is orienting to Amy's question as something other than a request for factual information. Bill (B) speaks after Amy.

Excerpt 3
01 B: The initiative refers to boundaries. Within Seattle it refers to the
02 urban growth boundary, the people who are borrowing the money.
03 I think that's an important issue for you all to keep in mind.
04 Do you always know which part of this regional system are included
05 in the initiative and if so in what manner?

The initial part of Bill's utterance seems to be a reply to the content of something that Amy was asking about. However, Bill does not respond with a suggestion for considering the wording of the initiative with reference to "boundaries"; rather, he states that there is an "urban growth boundary" (line 02). The response does not answer the question of whether the initiative is referencing those "within" or "outside" of Seattle. In addition, Bill, speaking as the facilitator to the panelists, expresses his view that boundaries are "an important issue for you all to keep in mind" (line 03). Thus, Bill's response displays three characteristics not typical of the responses to factual questions shown above. First, there is not a reply to the content of the question. Second, an issue has been established. As we will continue to demonstrate below, the term issue co-occurs frequently with the family of raising question terms. Third, that the issue is "for you all to keep in mind" (line 03) suggests that it merits further consideration.

Amy's utterance, though not specified, appears to be addressed to the group generally and leaves open the possibility that others will respond to it. We believe Bill concurs with Amy, in his talk: "boundaries" are indeed an "issue" "to keep in mind" (line 03). His paraphrase of Amy's question appears to be a question raised for the purpose of future participant consideration (lines 03–05). This does not mean that all participants took Amy's question as a raised question, and not as something else. Later in the meeting, during group discussion among the panelists, Will (W) also labels what Amy has done, but reframes it as a "fairly factual question" for "SPU" (line 10), the public utility.

Excerpt 4
01 W: Yeah Bill I'd like to suggest a sort of a process point for both
02 processes I (). That is where questions come up that are uh
03 that we can sort of flag specifically could you or someone keep a
04 list of those and then at the end of the session decide um do we
05 are those the issues that we want to try to get some answers from
06 uh going to the next session so we accelerate our learning as

07 quickly as possible. For instance Amy asked a very good
08 question about basically the geographic scope of this rate
09 provision and does it only apply to users within Seattle or does it
10 apply more broadly. That's a fairly factual question about the rate
11 structure for SPU. . .

Like Bill, Will comments on and extends in some way what Amy has done in her earlier utterance, and, like Bill, Will paraphrases Amy's question as an interrogative. Here, however, he reframes the characteristics of her act by suggesting that the question is "for SPU" (line 11), an expert on "the geographic scope of this rate provision" (lines 08–09) and, thus, changes what can be done with the question. Rather than an issue that needs to be considered by the group, according to Will, "the geographic scope" is a "fairly factual question" that can be "answered" by SPU (lines 07–11). That individual participants perceive the same utterance in different ways is not surprising, but it is notable that even when they do so, they seem to orient to factual questions and raised questions in patterned and distinctive ways.

To demonstrate that these distinctions between factual questions and raised questions occur moment-by-moment, we offer an example in which a panelist, Rob (R), poses an interrogative to a scientist, Cleve (C), who would likely be able to reply to the content of the question (excerpt 4). Rob asks what we call a factual question just after Cleve concludes his presentation and yields the floor. Cleve, in turn, labels Rob's verbal action as a "question" that Rob "raised" (line 03).

Excerpt 5
01 R: Can you show me on that graph where the conserved water is that
02 would be built from this initiative?
03 C: Ok. This is one of the questions I had (.) glad you raised it. I I did
04 not have uh an estimate uh prior to talking to Rand () with the
05 department today of what the conserved water would actually
06 mean in terms of u- increases of flow.

Why did Cleve respond this way, that is label a verbal action that appears to be a factual question as "questions" that have been "raised"? One clue is that Cleve himself "had" "the question" (line 03) and, thus, was not able to offer a reply to the content of the question: "where the conserved water is" "on the graph" (line 01). Thus, Cleve does not offer a reply to the content of the question, but rather a response in which he expresses appreciation (line 03) for the "raised question" because he himself, the scientist, did not have the answer. Although Cleve does not say it, we suggest that the amount of "conserved water" "built from this initiative" is now an issue that requires further discussion by the panel.

At the most basic level, participants in this speech situation draw from the family of raising question terms we analyze to categorize their own speech and the speech of others. For example, as was mentioned above prior to excerpt 2, in the first meeting a member of the facilitator's staff, Anne (N) delivers an extended presentation on I-63 to open the first meeting. There are seven main points to this presentation, each of which speaks to some aspect of I-63. The last of these main points is a "citizen suit

provision'' (line 01). Anne categorizes her presentation by saying ''questions that were raised here'' (line 02). She says:

Excerpt 6
01 N: There is a citizen suit provision included in the initiative.
02 So, some of the questions that were raised here may be revisited in a
03 context of a citizen's suit. So with that, I think I'll close and see if
04 any panel members have questions either for me, or for our
05 experts.

In her words, the main points of her presentation to the group are ''questions that were raised,'' which, if left unresolved, could later be ''revisited in a context of a citizen's suit'' (line 02). Notice also the differentiation Anne makes between questions in the presentation of the main points of the initiative and ''questions either for me, or for our experts'' (lines 04–05), the latter of which we would call factual questions.

In contrast, Sarah categorizes the utterance by another speaker by saying he ''raised a good question.'' She does so at a point in the meeting when there is some concern among panelists whether the document they create for the city council should be a report or a recommendation. Vocal opponents of I-63 prefer a recommendation. In other words, those opposed to I-63 expressed a desire to, generally speaking, recommend to the council (and, thus, the city) that I-63 should not pass. Several panelists speak to the matter, and, at one point, the facilitator, Bill emphasizes the importance of this distinction by saying: ''I want to make sure we have a pretty common understanding of when do we cross the line into recommendation if indeed you think you don't want to do a recommendation.''

Several turns later, Sarah, a vocal advocate in favor of I-63, and also a supporter of the notion that the panel should produce a report, talks about what Bill said.

Excerpt 7
01 S: W-I I think you raised a good question which I would like to hear
02 everyone's answers to of um you know when does it cross that
03 line and when do we want to cross that line. I think that would
04 really help us to structure our conversation.

In this instance, Bill's utterance is more clearly declarative than interrogative. Nevertheless, Sarah characterizes Bill's utterance as a ''good question'' that was raised. Notice also that Sarah does not indicate that there is a definitive answer to this question that a person knowledgeable about the topic might have. Rather, Sarah ''would like to hear everyone's answers.'' Those answers would, in turn, ''really help us to structure our conversation.'' Here, we display this excerpt to show it as an example of when a speaker categorizes the talk of another person as a ''raised'' ''question.'' Below, we will address its strategic (rhetorical) use.

In excerpt 8, Rob (R) prefaces two interrogatives that he poses to the group by suggesting that the current discussion (line 01) raised questions (line 03).

Excerpt 8
01 R: This discussion that the purveyors have been paying eighty
02 percent of the cost of conservation with the city for many years.

03 Twenty years? Twenty twenty-five years. So the questions that it
04 raises in my mind is there that much cost effective conservation
05 that needs to be done in the city of Seattle? Or are all of the
06 potential conservation targets now within the purveyors because
07 they've been paying ((inaudible)) the city ((inaudible))
08 themselves?

In this excerpt, Rob reveals the impetus for questions raised "in my mind." Rob refers to the discussion about conservation efforts by the city of Seattle. This discussion, according to Rob, "raises" questions concerning whether or not the city of Seattle is capable of additional "cost effective conservation." These questions loom large in the meetings because the I-63 would require the city to conform to additional conservation measures.

As is the case with excerpt 8, excerpt 9 also demonstrates an instance in which the questions are neither raised by the speaker nor the participants in the discussion, but by the "discussion" in its own right. In this instance, Tom (T), a panelist and a water rights attorney, is alluding to the complexity of "these [water rights] issues." In the opening moments of the group discussion in the first meeting, Tom says:

Excerpt 9
01 T: Um I as a water rights attorney myself I can appreciate that you
02 know when we get into discussion about these issues it tends
03 raise more questions than answers.

One additional way in which participants refer to raised questions is as the collective communicative accomplishment of the group. Using Hymes's (1962, 1972) terms, a raised question can refer to the ends or outcomes of a given speech activity. For example, in excerpt 10, Bill (B) suggests the "questions you've raised" (line 04), meaning the questions raised by the panelists in the process of group discussion, can be a topic of talk. In the latter part of the first meeting, Bill says:

Excerpt 10
01 B: Okay uh time check. We have an hour and twenty minutes
02 before nine o'clock. We have uh to reserve some time for the
03 possibility of public comment to you all. Uh and uh we want to
04 spend time talking about the questions you've raised or the
05 observations you're starting to make for purposes of assuring that
06 we have the right meeting next week.

Here, as the moderator, Bill is speaking to the group and referring to the questions and observations as one future topic of talk (lines 04–05). In other words, the "questions you've raised" will be taken together as a topic and will be used to make sure "we have the right meeting next week."

Similarly, Bill refers to "questions that had been raised" as he articulates the collective communicative accomplishments of the group from a prior meeting. In this case, the questions raised provided structure or a "format" for the "discussion

that occurred.'' This format has been recorded in the distributed material (lines 13–16) in the current meeting. According to Bill:

Excerpt 11
01 B: Um for those u:h three of you who were unable to come to the
02 meeting uh some of you haven't had time to look at videos and or
03 talk to us. Uh what we did was to divide the initiative up into >if
04 you will<sections that were logical on the basis of (.) observations
05 that people around the table about the initiative in and of itself as a
06 whole so we talked a bit about the initiative then we broke it into
07 its (constituent) pieces and we still have uh a couple of those
08 pieces to go through (.) that we were planning on going through
09 and then we would step back and again look at the initiative as a
10 whole and start to uh >if you will<organize ourselves according to
11 how uh you would like to uh comment on it. Uh in order to move
12 that forward we took the uh ba- (.) basically the discussion that
13 occurred and uh- laid it out in a format that the group talked about
14 uh last week which was pros and cons (.) and observations or
15 questions that had been raised around the table. Um and that is
16 the material that had been distributed to each of you.

Thus, the raising of questions identifies verbal action as part of the work of the group (lines 06–11). We display this longer excerpt because it demonstrates raising questions as one among many of the communicative actions a group may engage in and, in turn, raised questions become one among many of the communicative accomplishments or outcomes a group may produce. Thus, questions raised can become resources for subsequent communicative actions in the group.

In all examples above, the speakers raise questions or talk about raised questions. Doing so demonstrates at least one category of communicative behavior that is distinct from, for example, asking factual questions. The participants in these meetings orient to raising questions or raised questions in a manner that is distinct from how they orient to factual questions. For raised questions, a reply to the content of the question is not an expectation. Rather, the act of raising a question typically establishes some issue that merits further discussion or talk among the participants. People can label their own talk or the talk of others as raising questions or raised questions. Additionally, questions can be raised by the discussion itself. Finally, once questions have been raised, they can be referred to as a product or outcome of group communication that can then function as a communicative resource for further talk or discussion.

Implications for Sociality and Rhetoric

Above, we have demonstrated how participants in these meetings orient to the act of raising questions or talk about raising questions in patterned ways. Returning to our conceptualization of the family of terms used to raise questions or talk about raising questions helps us further our analysis. Carbaugh (1989) observes that speakers use terms for talk to comment about their own and other people's communication. He notes speakers ''may also be talking indirectly about their society, their relations

among each other, and the institutions in which they find themselves and through which they speak'' (p. 108). In using terms for talk, people characterize and evaluate their social relations along such dimensions as close/distant, competitive/cooperative, and solidarity/power. Moreover, terms for talk express ''cultural premises for being a person'' (p. 111) and help demarcate categories of persons who are engaging in these social relations.

Taking Carbaugh's (1989) explanation of terms for talk into account, we consider how talk about raising or raised questions serves as a practical metadiscourse (Craig, 1999) used in argument (e.g., Craig, 1999; Craig & Tracy, 2005) in this context of this public meeting. To build on our analysis above, we pose the questions: *What kinds of people are involved in acts of raising questions? What social relations are they enacting or commenting on through when talking about raised questions? How is raising questions used rhetorically? And what does the rhetorical use of raised questions reveal about the person using it?*

In addressing these questions, we focus on three expressions by one speaker, Sarah, who uses one of the family of raising questions terms. We focus on Sarah's talk for two reasons. First, we noted above that the panel's final report to the Council was in heavy opposition to I-63, receiving 10 votes against the initiative and 1 vote in support. Based on the video records of the event, we speculate, but cannot prove, that Sarah is the voter in favor of I-63 in this report. Even if Sarah was not the lone voter, Sarah is a vocal proponent of I-63 throughout the meetings of the panel. Second, and more importantly for our purpose, Sarah voices this support in a number of ways.[7] Some of her efforts to support I-63 in the meetings of the panel include either talk about raising questions or the act of raising questions.

Above, we displayed excerpt 7 as an instance when Sarah categorized Bill's talk as a raised question. Here, we discuss the rhetorical features of this instance. Sarah (S) says:

Excerpt 7
01 S: W-I I think you raised a good question which I would like to hear
02 everyone's answers to of um you know when does it cross that
03 line and when do we want to cross that line. I think that would
04 really help us to structure our conversation.

Bill had asked the panel to give some attention to whether they were going to create a report or a recommendation, for which Sarah praises Bill saying, ''I think you raised a good question.'' Building from our interpretations above, Sarah has, thus, supported Bill's move to make this distinction (i.e., report or recommendation), an issue that merits further consideration in ''our conversation.'' We interpret Sarah's categorization of Bill's talk as a rhetorical move because, at this point in the meeting, she is one of a few panelists, if not the only one, who believes the written product of the panel should not be a recommendation but rather a report. By labeling Bill's talk as a raised question, Sarah's has, in our view, put off resolution of the matter in the face of strong support for a recommendation. For her, more conversation is needed.

A second example occurs in an utterance in which Sarah makes judgments about raising questions as an inappropriate way of speaking (Hymes, 1972; Philipsen

& Coutu, 2005). Her statements indicate that there may be rules for raising questions: who can, when, and for what purpose. In this instance, Tom (T), an expert in water rights law, has just completed his presentation to the I-63 panel. In his presentation, and in his words, Tom was asked by the moderator "to come and just provide some understanding of the issues that the initiative raises in terms of water rights analysis." In his opening remarks, Tom suggests that "reading through the initiative a lot of issues do arise." For example, he points out that the initiative "does raise the issue as to what rights the City of Seattle has."

After roughly 15 minutes of uninterrupted speaking, Tom relinquishes the floor and Sarah is the first to speak. Sarah challenges Tom and his talk (lines 02, 06, 14) by, in part, referring to his way of speaking (line 15).

Excerpt 12

01 S: But um you know basically what he just explained there um
02 sounded very mysterious. It sounded like there were a lot of
03 questions that we can't possibly hope to answer because you
04 know I don't think many of us are as qualified as he is in water
05 rights law and um and he didn't have answers for them. Um so
06 I don't know to me it was (.) i- causes a lot of consternation. Um
07 but I assume that there are some precedents and that the utilities
08 already grappled with some of these issues. I know in uh working
09 on the Cedar River watershed (HCP) they've already dealt with a
10 lot of these and I guess I would like to know in um you know
11 simple terms i- um talking about precedents that have already
12 been established how we would answer these as opposed to just
13 creating a lot of questions that make us nervous. I I guess I didn't
14 feel like that was (.) i- i- it wasn't really fair to people like me who
15 aren't versed in in water law to raise all these questions and not
16 be able to answer them in in some plain language.

That others experience Sarah's utterance as a challenge is evidenced in the talk. Sarah's talk is followed by marked silence, then talk by Bill (B), and overlapping laughter by the panel (P), all which provide evidence for a unique confrontational moment in these meetings. In addition, Tom's joke with the attorneys on the panel and his stuttered speech seems to indicate that Sarah's act was, in some way, a challenge.

17 (1.5)
18 B: OK [Tom.
19 P: [((laughing))]
20 T: [((laugh)) You guys ((to two attorneys on the panel)) leave
21 the room. ((laugh)) I I I you're you're you're correct. . .

Using Carbaugh's (1989) framework as a guide for the examination of cultural terms for talk, we can offer some tentative observations about what Sarah says in line 15. When Sarah says, "raise all these questions," she is referring to a single act by Tom, his presentation, while simultaneously commenting that there are other ways of speaking that would be more appropriate for Tom to use. Functionally, Sarah's

challenge (Turner, 1980) suggests that Tom has violated Sarah's sensibilities about when and where raising questions is an appropriate verbal action. Her challenge also suggests that Tom's talk was efficacious (significant and substantial); otherwise, why would she challenge what he has done? In her challenge, Sarah provides an alternative way of speaking that would have, in her view, been more appropriate: Tom should answer questions "in some plain language" (lines 15–16). She has identified raising questions as an inappropriate way of speaking for Tom, but a way of speaking, or style, nonetheless.

Sarah's utterance shows a critique of Tom's way of speaking that is based on premises about personhood and social relations. Sarah's critique arises from her assessment of Tom as someone who is more qualified in understanding water rights law (lines 04–05) than others present in the meeting. Her observation that Tom engaged in raising questions causes Sarah to express "consternation" (line 01), because, as someone who is knowledgeable, Tom should presumably be able to answer questions "in plain language" (line 16). Sarah argues that Tom should not speak in a way that makes things "sound very mysterious" (line 02) by "creating a lot of questions that make us nervous" (line 13) and "that we can't possibly hope to answer"(line 03).

In her talk, and as part of her critique of what Tom has done, Sarah declares belonging to another category of people. This category consists of "people like me who aren't versed in water law" (lines 14–15). For Sarah, the positioning of experts against "people like me" in her argument exposes an asymmetrical power relationship among the participants in the meeting. Sarah criticizes Tom for raising "all these questions" because it is not "fair" to "people like me" (line 15).

This insight leads us to formulate tentative claims about personhood and sociality that are evident in Sarah's challenge and, more significantly for our purposes, the basis for her rhetoric in support of I-63. That is, while our intent is to formulate a premise about raising questions, we do so by grounding our formulation in the context of this speech situation and from the point of view of the person challenging the use of this way of speaking: *In meetings such as this one, experts should present information and answer questions in understandable ways. For an expert to raise questions, rather than provide answers, is to unfairly complicate issues that could be addressed by discussing how other groups have dealt with these questions in the past. When citizen panelists are confronted with experts who fail to fulfill their role, they have the right to challenge the experts.*

These tentative observations about personhood and sociality are further supported by our analysis of the next instance. In excerpt 13, Sarah is again the speaker. In this instance, she is speaking about the absence of the drafters of the I-63 initiative in the "panel process." That the people who drafted I-63 were not present at these meetings was a recurring topic of talk in the meetings. In excerpt 13, Sarah says that their absence has "skewed" the "panel discussion" (line 01). For Sarah, the skewed panel discussion is a premise for asserting that she tried to raise questions (lines 11–12):

Excerpt 13
01 S: This panel discussion are skewed by the fact that the initiative
02 sixty three proponents are not here. I know that we would all like
03 for them to be here but the fact is that they are not. And that um

04 we were given an opportunity to address some real concerns that
05 they brought up at the beginning that have also been echoed by
06 the public in their public comment period and by the League of
07 Women Voters in their comments. And we chose not to really
08 address those concerns. We chose to go forward. Um and I
09 think that we have to accept the responsibility for that choice. That
10 that means that we didn't get all the information that we needed in
11 order to make a full um report. And um I've tried to raise
12 questions throughout this process when I feel like some of the
13 information that we're being given doesn't tell the whole story.

In the excerpt, Sarah says she has "tried to raise questions" (lines 11–12) as a response to the lack of "information" (line 10) and not being told "the whole story" (line 13).

There are at least three categories of people implicated in Sarah's statements. One is we members of the citizen panel, whom Sarah is addressing in this excerpt. This group has been "given an opportunity to address some real concerns" (excerpt 13, line 04), needs "information" (line 10) to fulfill their obligations, and, according to Sarah, has "to accept responsibility" (line 09) for their choice to act without full information. A second category implicated in this excerpt is the proponents of I-63, the people who drafted the water conservation initiative being discussed in these meetings. Sarah expresses regret that these proponents did not attend the meetings and, hence, were unable to provide their perspective on the issues and concerns being discussed. A third category is the public and representatives of public organizations, such as the League of Women Voters, who attended these meetings to observe the discussions and made comments about the process. Sarah notes that some "real concerns" had been "brought up" and "echoed" by the "public" (lines 03–06), which the citizen panel should be in the position to address. Finally, although they are not explicitly named as such in excerpt 13, another relevant category consists of experts who made presentations and provided information for the citizen panelists to discuss. Building on her challenge in excerpt 12, Sarah criticizes the panel for being "skewed" (line 01) because of the absence of the I-63 proponents and the fact that the panelists "didn't get all the information we needed" (line 10) to accomplish their task well.

Juxtaposing excerpts 12 and 13 permits some conclusions about raising questions stemming from the fact that the same speaker in one instance chastises a speaker for raising questions, and in the other observes that doing so was an appropriate, perhaps effective, way of speaking. Our interpretation of Sarah's judgments about raising questions is that she is suggesting that the expert presenters in these meetings should not be raising questions because doing so undermines (her) support for I-63. Interestingly, Sarah's response to the unfair situation—created, in part, by experts' inappropriate raising of questions—is to herself engage in the act of raising questions in her attempt to bolster support for I-63. Thus, Sarah demonstrates ways in which raising questions is used as a practical metacommunicative resource in making her arguments.

Summary of Analysis

The talk of the participants in the meetings seems to indicate that raising questions can be an efficacious form of communicative action. For example, it can serve some productive purpose for the group. In excerpt 2, Amy ''raises the question'' . . . ''to be clear about'' (lines 05–06) the boundaries indicated in the initiative. Thus, raising questions can contribute to clarity. In excerpt 5, Cleve expresses appreciation to Rob for raising a question (line 03). Rob's question was judged favorably by Cleve and, in our interpretation, is seen as a productive form of communicative action. In excerpt 7, Sarah suggests that ''hearing everyone's answers to'' Bill's ''raised'' ''question'' (lines 01–02) ''would really help us to structure our conversation'' (lines 04–05). In this instance, Sarah comments that Bill ''raised a good question'' (line 01), one that will positively affect the communication of the group. In excerpt 10, Bill presses the group to ''spend time talking about the questions you've raised'' ''for purposes of assuring that we have the right meeting next week'' (lines 04–06). In excerpt 11, ''questions that had been raised around the table'' (line 15) serve as part of the ''format'' (line 14) for discussion. Even in the instance in which raising questions was judged negatively (excerpt 12), there is evidence suggesting that Sarah does not take Tom's talk lightly. It is significant to her that Tom has ''raised all these questions'' (line 15). Taken together, these instances all demonstrate the significance or efficacy of this verbal action. The family of raising questions terms expressed in these meetings served primarily to label verbal actions meant to advance the purpose of the I-63 panel, and these verbal enactments do so in a cooperative manner (see, for example, excerpts 5, 8, 10). With one obvious exception (excerpt 12), labeling talk in some way as raising questions or raised questions relayed messages of felicitous, cooperative, and unitary (Mansbridge, 1980/1983) social relations among the participants.

Taking liberty with the talk of the I-63 panelists, we summarize our analysis as follows: Participants in the process of a speech situation, such as a meeting, should raise questions to meet the goals of the group, including achieving clarity, helping to structure conversation, and adding to information that doesn't tell the whole story. To do so can be interpreted by group members as a unitary, or collaborative, communicative action that helps the group achieve its goals. Raising questions does have limitations for use and enactment, however. As we demonstrated in the case of excerpt 12, if an issue has already been dealt with or grappled with, presumably through talk or discussion, questions should not be raised about the issue. To raise a question about an issue that group members believe has already been adequately addressed is to undermine established precedents and can be interpreted as adversarial, and not unitary (Mansbridge, 1980/1983), action.

Conclusion

The family of raising questions terms we analyzed operate on a variety of communicative levels, including acts, events, and styles. We make no claims that the variety of terms should be treated as coterminous. Rather, we wished to show a range of instances to open the investigation of these terms because they can be heard frequently

in public discourse and appear to hold some (rhetorical) significance in the times and places they are used and heard.

The act of raising questions is metaphorical in nature, insofar as linguistic expressions are referred to as independent objects (questions) that may be held, possessed, and, most importantly, raised (Lakoff, 1993). The term question identifies a bounded linguistic expression. The act of raising it puts this linguistic expression on display, presumably for others to see and hear. Metaphorically speaking, we speculate that the questions originate from somewhere within persons or from another location that is hidden and inconspicuous. Thus, the metaphorical raising of questions may be either a lifting up/elevating of the question or a conjuring up/making visible of the question. Our data do not afford us the basis for definitively concluding from where the questions are raised, however.

People may raise questions individually (act) or in cooperative, collaborative, and dialogic communicative action (event). That participants make distinctions between and express preferences for raising questions, answering questions, asking factual questions, and other communicative acts suggests to us that the category of behavior labeled as raising questions (either as acts or events) can be organized within a larger system of alternative ways of speaking. In other words, raising questions is a way of speaking, a variety of talk that may be selected for use from among many other styles.

In the domain of group discussion, broadly speaking, there exists a hierarchy between the communicative actions labeled with the terms answers and questions. When they are available, answers are always preferred over questions. When answers are not available, questions, particularly those that are raised are a valuable and effective communicative resource. As such, raising questions in lieu of, for instance, seeking answers is a practical alternative in group discussion. One unique functional feature of raising questions that runs counter to, for example, asking factual questions, is that answers do not appear to be a predictable or even preferred outcome of an act of raising questions. Rather, as our data demonstrate, someone will characterize her or his linguistic expression as a question that has been raised, and this question becomes a topic for further talk or discussion.

As an examination of a family of terms about raising questions, our study has interesting points of intersection with discourse analytic treatments of the term *issue* (Craig, 1999; Craig & Tracy, 2005; Goodwin, 2002) in public and group discussion settings. Goodwin (2002) notes that although contention is an important feature, an issue is ''not just that about which we contend, it is an object of contention that has some significant consequences for action or belief'' (p. 85). That is, an issue is not only something that group members disagree about; it is marked as a significant object of the group's attention. Goodwin (2002) argues that issues are created discursively: ''An issue does not simply lie there; rather it is something that we *raise, take, put in, press, force, join,* or *frame.* An issue arises when we *make an issue* of it'' (p. 86).

Craig's (1999) pragmatic study of the use of issue in classroom discussions depicts a pattern of use that is largely consistent with Goodwin's description of the term. Craig describes the issue, in the classroom context, as ''a resource that enables participants to conduct their discussion while reflecting on the normative basis of some

of the practices by which they conduct their discussion'' (p. 27). A straightforward connection with our study is that the outcome of raising a question is, typically, an issue. Therefore, one way our analysis contributes to this body of work on issues is to simply note that raising a question is one way an issue can be created during group discussion. Moreover, our analysis has shown that raising questions, or talking about raising questions, has implications for the notions of personhood, sociality, and collaboration among group members. In this way, raising questions, like issue, also reflects the normative bases by which group members conduct their discussion.

Goodwin's (2002) pragmatic analysis makes two related claims about issues that are relevant to our analysis of raising questions as part of a practical discourse for arguing. These claims are also connected to Craig and Tracy's (Craig, 1999; Craig & Tracy, 2005) work on issue as a practical metadiscursive term. First, Goodwin notes that sometimes people make issues ''not necessarily to resolve them, but often merely to induce attention to them and thought about them'' (p. 94). That is, at times a speaker might raise an issue not because he or she wants it to be discussed at that particular moment, but because the speaker wants other participants to think about the issue and perhaps have it brought up later in the discussion. In some ways, this pragmatic function of issue is consistent with Sarah's talk about raising questions as a practical metadiscourse for arguing. When Sarah states that she has ''tried to raise questions'' because she believed ''some of the information that we're being given doesn't tell the whole story'' (excerpt 13, lines 11–13), she is, in effect, drawing attention to issues that have been overlooked or obscured. This is also the case in excerpt 7 when Sarah staves off a decision on the nature of the group's written document by suggesting that distinction between a report and a recommendation was a good raised question. Sarah's use of the practical metadiscourse we have described served argumentative functions and helped Sarah defend her position as the minority voice on the panel, the sole advocate for the initiative proposal.

Second, Goodwin (2002) argues, ''To make an issue of something often requires creating the conditions under which arguers are and can be held responsible for what they say and do'' (p. 94). This function is also consistent with our analysis. It seems that part of what Sarah might be doing in excerpt 12 is to challenge the expert's right to raise questions, which would put the burden of responsibility for the issue onto the citizen panel. By claiming that it's not fair for the expert to raise questions, Sarah resists the expert's move and the burden of responsibility it puts on the panel.

This understanding of raising questions connects to a description of how issues were used in school board meetings (Craig & Tracy, 2005). At those meetings, Craig and Tracy report, it was common for participants to distinguish between problems, which were undesirable situations that everyone agrees need to be addressed, and issues, which were contentious situations that required discussion and action on the part of the group. They write, ''in this context, speakers do everything they can to frame their concerns as being noncontroversial, problems rather than issues. Speakers, however, cannot control how others respond and once a good number of others begin weighing in with different opinions, a problem becomes an issue'' (Craig & Tracy, 2005, pp. 21–22). In our analysis, Sarah's challenge to Tom could be seen as

distinguishing between issues and problems. That is, Sarah's challenge posits that experts such as Tom need to take responsibility for understanding the problems related to water use. If others have adequately dealt with these problems, then they are no longer issues. Thus, as Sarah notes, it is not fair for Tom to raise all these questions to create issues that are not contentious and needing action by the panel.

When many individual acts of raising questions occur in groups, participants often refer to this as a collective accomplishment. The group may then utilize these raised questions to a variety of ends (functional outcomes), including structuring conversation. This secondary use suggests that raising questions is a necessary and valued aspect of group discussion.

Moreover, raising questions can sometimes represent a preferred style or way of speaking. We postulate that because answers are preferred to questions, when a person is expected to provide answers but instead raises questions, she or he can violate the sensibilities of the others in the group. In short, the term for talk raising questions not only identifies a type of talk, but it also enables us to demarcate indigenous notions about individuals and sociality. In our data, an expert was challenged for his individual act of raising questions when he was expected to answer questions in some plain language. Thus, Sarah's situated argument, the challenge from people like me (ordinary citizens, or nonexperts), distinguishes this type of person from those who are experts on the social (rather than cultural or content) level.

In summary, raising a question means labeling a linguistic expression as a question that has been, metaphorically speaking, lifted or conjured up for others to hear and view. The question is, effectively, on display for the others who are present. When several individual acts of "raising questions" occur among multiple speakers, the term identifies a collaborative and dialogic accomplishment. The act of raising questions is hierarchically ordered below the linguistic act of getting or seeking answers. Sometimes, however, raising questions is a practical remedy when answers are not available. Raising questions, raised questions, and the family of terms used to talk about these acts and linguistic expressions are a practical metadiscourse for group discussion, including discussion in public meetings. This practical metadiscourse, in turn can be used rhetorically in such contexts.

Notes

[1] Talk about talk, or metacommunication, is a central concern in the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1962, 1972; Philipsen & Coutu, 2005), cultural communication (Carbaugh, 1989, 2005), the study of speech codes (Philipsen, 1992, 1997; Philipsen & Coutu, 2005) and metapragmatics (Dirven, Goossens, Putseys, & Vorlat, 1982; Verschuren, 1989).

[2] We do not have statistical evidence to back this claim, but there is at least some anecdotal support. Since undertaking this project, we have been amazed by the number of times we hear forms of "raising the question" in small group discussions and meetings of all types. One happy instance occurred immediately before presenting a version of this manuscript in the Language and Social Interaction Division of the National Communication Association Annual Convention. In the business meeting preceding the presentation, the Chair of the division "raised questions" for the members to consider as part of the LSI business meeting and we could not help but point this out in our presentation.

[3] These examples are from *The New York Times* (Feb 7, 2008), available at http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/07/business/media/07jarvik.html; and the *Los Angeles Times* (June 14, 2008), available at http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-countrywide14-2008jun14,0,3537897.story.

[4] Searching for "rais*" yields all forms of raise including raises, raised, and raising.

[5] Such a query resulted in the identification of 303 such articles on January 23, 2006, and 102 on July 10, 2008.

[6] Cited from the original document that has now been removed from the Seattle City Council Web site.

[7] Including, but not limited to, challenging the selection process of the panelists, the legitimacy of the panel process and the void of input by the I-63 creators.

References

Ackerman, B., & Fishkin, J. (2002). Deliberation day. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, *10*, 129–152.

Bilmes, J. (2001). Tactics and styles in the 1992 vice presidential debate: Question placement. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *34*, 151–181.

Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., & Kelshaw, T. (2002). A conceptual definition and theoretical model of public deliberation in small face-to-face groups. *Communication Theory*, *12*, 398–422.

Buttny, R., & Cohen, J. R. (2007). Drawing on the words of others at public hearings: Zoning, Wal-Mart, and the threat to the aquifer. *Language in Society*, *36*, 735–756.

Carbaugh, D. (1989). Fifty terms for talk: A cross-cultural study. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, *13*, 93–120.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In J. F. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics* (pp. 67–91). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Metadiscourse, theory and practice. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *32*(1&2), 21–29.

Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2005). The "issue" in argumentation practice and theory. In F. H. VanEemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The practice of argumentation* (pp. 11–28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Crosby, N., & Nethercutt, D. (2005). Citizens Juries: Creating a trustworthy voice of the people. In J. Gastil, & P. Levine (Eds.), *The deliberative democracy handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the 21st century* (pp. 111–119). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dirven, R., Goossens, L., Putseys, Y., & Vorlat, E. (1982). *The scene of linguistic action and its perspectivization by SPEAK, TALK, SAY, and TELL.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Fishkin, J. S., & Luskin, R. C. (1999). Bringing deliberation to the democratic dialogue. In M. McCombs & A. Reynolds (Eds.), *The poll with a human face: The National Issues Convention experiment in political communication.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gastil, J. (2000). *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gastil, J., & Black, L. W. (2008). Public deliberation as an organizing principle for political communication. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, *4*, article 3.

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

Goodwin, J. (2002). Designing issues. In F. H. vanEemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The warp and woof of argumentation analysis* (pp. 81–96). Dodrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Heyamoto, L. (2001, August 22). Water initiative violates the law, city tells court. *The Seattle Times*, p. B1.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–77). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jackson, S. (1986). Building a case for claims about discourse structure. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes* (pp. 149–167). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johnson, T., & Murakami, K. (2001, August 22). City challenges water initiative. *Seattle Post Intelligencer*. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/36088_water22.shtml

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed. (pp. 202–251). Cambridge University Press.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1989). *Communication in everyday life: A social interpretation*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Leighter, J. L., & Castor, T. (2009). What are we going to ''talk about'' in this public ''meeting''?: An examination of talk about communication in the North Omaha Development Project. *International Journal of Public Participation*, *3*(2), 57–75.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mansbridge, J. (1983). *Beyond adversary democracy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1980).

Murakami, K. (2001, August 1). Backers of water-conservation initiative file ethics complaint. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/33483_water01.shtml

Pageler proposes creating 'water trust' to protect fish. (2001, August 31). *Seattle Post Intelligencer*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/37218_tl131.shtml

Philipsen, G. (1992). *Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing communication theories* (pp. 119–156). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Philipsen, G., & Coutu, L. (2005). The ethnography of speaking. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 355–380). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Philipsen, G., Coutu, L., & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech codes theory: Restatements, revisions, and response to criticisms. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 55–68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Pike, K. (1964). Towards a theory of the structure of human behavior. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 54–62). New York: Harper & Row.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Taus, M. (2001a, August 30). Panel cold to water initiative. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/37724water30.shtml

Taus, M. (2001b, September 5). I-63 backers want alternative scrapped. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/37724_liquid05shtml

Townsend, R. (2009). Town meeting as communicative event: Democracy's act sequence. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *42*(1), 68–89.

Tracy, K., & Ashcraft, K. (2001). Crafting policies about controversial values: How wording disputes manage a group dilemma. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *29*, 297–316.

Tracy, K., & Dimock, A. (2004). Meetings: Discursive sites for building and fragmenting community. In P. J. Kabfleisch (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 28* (pp. 127–165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tracy, K., & Durfy, M. (2005). Speaking out in public: Citizen participation in contentious school board meetings. *Discourse & Communication*, *1*(2), 223–249.

Turner, V. (1980). Social dramas and stories about them. *Critical Inquiry*, *7*, 141–168.

Verschuren, J. (1989). Language on language: Toward metapragmatic universals. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, *5*, 5–144.