

# Are There Some Subjects about Which You Should Not Even Ask Questions

Luhongyi Wan

United World College of Changshu, Jiangsu215008, China

**Keywords:** Subject, Knowledge domain, Emotion

**Abstract:** To begin with this question, how to define the concept “subject” is very important. Subject should be a particular small area of knowledge that can be distinctively separated from other knowledge. If a description of knowledge cannot be clearly defined as knowledge in which area, then such knowledge couldn't be said to be included by a subject. For example, sine rule and cosine rule are definitely knowledge in math region: that can be clearly defined; while the chain reaction could be classified in both physics or chemistry, so we won't be discussing such knowledge in our essay. When people ask a question, the answer to the question is thought. The answers to some questions are very obvious. The purpose of asking questions is to express the emotion of the questioner; And the answers to some questions are really very complex. Maybe human beings can't understand them now, so the purpose of asking questions is to let people think and explore together, and finally find more results. In either case, we are trying to make everything better by asking questions. Maybe this improvement will not be shown immediately, but each of our questions will bring more benefits at a certain time after asking questions. That's why we ask questions.

## 1. Introduction

Questions can definitely be classified. Some questions are asked because of confusion, that the one who ask doesn't understand something and he/she is intended to comprehend. Some questions are asked because the one who ask doesn't believe in an argument or a belief that he/she wants to challenge the idea. These questions could be asked in different circumstances, and obviously the situation we are currently talking about is whether the question should be asked or not. Its further meaning is that whether asking the question benefits or not.

Restricted question: This kind of question defines a clear scope, which can limit the other party's answer and make the other party's answer coincide with your expected answer. Euphemistic questioning: This kind of questioning is tactful and implicit, which can not only avoid embarrassing scenes caused by the rejection of the other party, but also make the other party feel happy and avoid misunderstanding. Heuristic questioning: This kind of questioning often uses metaphors and analogies to inspire the other party to think about a problem and give the questioner the answer he wants. Negotiation question: If you want the other party to act according to your intention, you should ask the other party in a consultative tone. Because this will make both sides in an atmosphere of equality, harmony and relaxation. On the contrary, it will hurt each other's self-esteem and arouse each other's antipathy. Inductive questioning: This kind of questioning is to induce the other party to say what they want the other party to say, and then take the conversation and express what they want to say. Every method of asking questions has its own characteristics. In language communication, we should start from the actual needs, start from each other's personality characteristics, and flexibly and appropriately choose questioning methods in order to achieve the best results.

## 2. Meaning of Questioning

To benefit means that asking such questions help make progress in the area studied. Questions, sometimes, happened to lead people in some different ways that they may not have considered before, if the way the questions lead human beings to improve conditions of current human beings, then we may say it benefits, and these questions could be asked; while in the opposite situation the

questions may not be asked (corresponding to the phrase in the question “should not be asked”).

The phrase “should not” is in fact a strong element to suggest the direction of analyzing this question. Since it is a strong phrase, the threat brought by such inappropriate questions must be kind of serious. It is a common confusion in this question: don't people make their study better based on questionings? In most people's perspectives, a good way to find out places to improve in a study is to ask, and a good way to learn about a subject is to ask about it. But this doesn't always work for scholars or people who are playing an important role –let's see later.

The case could be complex when questions are asked towards some particular academic questions. One of my friends who is already in college was once doubted by his peer. His peer is like: “I can't understand your codes, but after I ran it by myself I found it's incorrect...are you sure that you didn't make any mistakes?” Then my friend just got mad. At first I was a bit confused as well, since I regarded such doubt as a rather peaceful and polite one, but then I got to know that to say someone's result cannot be made out again in some ways means that the result is fake and the one who made the result out is related with academic dishonesty. This reminds us of a saying: “Different people could have different understanding on the same words.”

There was one professor who had great fame in physical health area that he could directly represent the authority. There was once a time that an interviewer from a television program asked him about a common habit of most citizens that have never been doubted to be harmful for the past decades. Although the professor made a very precise and professional explanation of the truth that the acknowledgement of people in the past decades is correct, the question asked still led to bad consequences: since most citizens could not understand the terminology the expert used in his explanation, some merchants who were able to make profit from degrading the action started to do misleading advertisements, and some citizens didn't dare to believe, so that as a whole lots of people stopped the right action and followed those misleaders.

Subjective and objective positions are different. In the matter of whether or not to ask questions, people may feel that some questions should not be asked because they are inappropriate, or they may have a negative impact on people at that time. From the perspective of an ordinary resident, it seems that the reasons why these questions should not be asked are very sufficient. However, from the perspective of a thinker who pays attention to the development of all mankind, the final result of asking questions may be turmoil and bloodshed subjectively, but objectively, there is progress and advancement brought by cruelty. There is no development and progress that allows people to continue to live in the comfortable life they have been used to, because turning old things into new things means that people can jump out of the comfortable way of life they already feel and accept new life styles again. This will cause a lot of dissatisfaction and resistance, It may be necessary to use a certain degree of violence to survive this, so for people, these changes are not good, even disaster, but the final result in the historical process is better than the original. For example, many people under the Chinese Qing Dynasty had no way to survive, they were oppressed everywhere, and there was no comparability in their efforts and rewards. However, after people began the revolution, many people were reluctant to participate in the revolution, Rather than obey the rule of the original government, it is not willing to exchange for a new life through their own struggle. People's self-protection awareness makes many people very conservative in these choices, so they may not realize that some irrelevant choices they make sometimes are also because they are used to self-protection. Self-protection is right, but we can't say that those big changes that really move society and history forward are incorrect.

Throughout all the ideas I concluded seven premises and a final conclusion as shown by the following.

P1) Harm is inevitable in changes of grand ideas, systems or episodes.

P2) Although some improvements may harm, people still need to improve to live better or to survive in the future situations.

P3) Sometimes people feel that they are harmed because they are forced to leave their comfort zone.

P4) Obligating people to leave their comfort zones are not always harming them, and in most

cases it helps people improve.

P5) A progress of ideas and theories usually bring citizens lives that are not peaceful.

P6) Misleading and harm often took place in big changes in mindsets and the result of such change benefits new generations.

P7) People may be harm by being misled or affected by big changes, but it will finally benefit new generations and reach a progress of human beings as a whole.

C) Therefore, we should not be afraid to ask supposedly ‘dangerous’ questions.

To look at premise 7, people may be harm by being misled or affected by big changes, but it will finally benefit new generations and reach a progress of human beings as a whole. Its counter argument is probably “the harms don’t always benefit all people in exactly the same way or sometimes don’t generate major benefit for all”. However, even harms may take place in lots of generations, but looking at the progress of society throughout history, we cannot deny an overall improvement in the lives of people. For example, the revolution happened in China in 1920s to 1940s are in some ways catastrophe for those who lost their fortune and family, some even their life. But look at the situation in China right now – it’s still not that good, but at least it’s much better than the one before the revolution – is there any chance for China to reach a state like this if this revolution didn’t take place? No, definitely no. Although there were some Chinese people who were harmed in the revolution could not forgive the revolution which caused their loss, most people who were harmed in those twenty years agreed that such revolution in fact saved them after the revolution. Ideas of such revolution were regarded as ridiculous imagination before it really happened, and most people didn’t support it in the country, but people changed their mind (most of them) when the final result came out. A great change seemed harmful and dangerous is really simple a thing: otherwise most people will come up with it and there won’t be accumulated problems.

### **3. Social Adaptation of Tv Interview Questions**

From the perspective of two-way interaction, the reporter's interview activity can be regarded as a special communicative activity. Communication can not be separated from an effective “lubricant”, that is, communication etiquette. It is a code of conduct recognized and observed by people in social communication activities. Its essence is to express sincere, respectful, friendly and considerate emotional communication and expression among people through some standardized behaviors, so as to regulate and enhance the communication and contact between people. The so-called social world refers to all social norms and guidelines that appear in daily life and are gradually established, and are reflected through food, clothing, housing and transportation. The social world is gradual, unfixed and regional. Meanwhile, culture is an important part of the social world. The use and choice of language reflects and reflects the social world and culture. According to Wiesallen, the social factors that are compatible with language selection are infinite. Respect is the soul of social etiquette. Mutual respect is conditional on the equality of personality status, which is not necessarily related to people's political status and economic status. The principle of respect first requires respecting the personality and value of others while respecting self-esteem and self-love, and communicating with others as equals. TV interview is a speech act in a specific scene, so it is restricted and restricted by related factors in a specific social context such as TV interview. The definition and analysis of the discourse function of questioning driving information, instruction and expression cannot be divorced from the social and cultural background. In order to promote the dynamic development of the interview context, the host often considers the relevant social factors that influence the questioning comprehensively, so as to promote the smooth progress of the interview. Therefore, the questioning in the social context of TV interviews bears relevant social norms and cultural factors. Questioning under the influence of social context has a variety of cultural functions and social connotations.

Journalists should keep in mind the principle of respect in questioning, and then pay attention to the art of questioning, enhance their affinity and appeal, show their approachability, and have an equal dialogue with interviewees, so that interviewees feel that journalists are worthy of

communication and try their best to win the cooperation of interviewees. Social norms and cultural factors play an important role in the generation of questioning discourse in TV interviews. TV interview questioning behavior is social. In a specific interview context, in order to conform to various communication norms and principles, the host often uses different communication strategies to construct questioning discourse. The moderator should pay special attention to respecting the social status of the interviewees. Social status refers to the position of social members in the social system. It is often used to express the level of social prestige and honor, and also refers to the ownership of property, power and authority. Treating people with tolerance requires caring, understanding, understanding and tolerating others. In social interaction, each person's level of thinking and understanding of problems is always different, so it is impossible to ask all people with one standard. Only by being lenient with others can we resolve interpersonal conflicts in our daily life.

Journalists should also abide by the principle of tolerance, which is a communicative etiquette. They can understand that the interviewee may not give a satisfactory answer, and then take a step-by-step approach to ask questions. They must not restrict each other from their own perspective. In TV interviews, in order to show respect for the social status of the interviewees, the host often intentionally or unintentionally uses appropriate address forms to form questioning discourse. The differences in growth environment, learning background, mental development and other aspects between people create different viewpoints and behaviors. Following the purpose of valuing harmony, people often express their respect for others' views and behaviors through speech acts. When reporters ask questions in interviews, especially in the face of simple interviewees like Zhou Yang's parents, who can't hide themselves, it is necessary to treat the interviewees' answers with tolerance, which requires clever inspiration and less questioning. If journalists are eager for success and take aggressive and continuous questions, the results often backfire. In TV interviews, the interviewees usually face all kinds of questions from the host with gentleness and answer them sincerely. However, this does not mean that they are not concerned about their privacy. In fact, in today's society, people pay more and more attention to and protect their privacy, and at the same time pay more attention to respecting others' privacy. Therefore, in TV interviews, in order not to destroy the harmonious communication atmosphere between the interviewees, the host will be cautious when asking questions related to personal privacy.

As a special communicative activity, the interaction between reporters and interviewees affects whether the interview goal can be achieved. Questioning is an important part of reporters' interview activities, a tool to achieve effective communication between reporters and interviewees, and a key factor to determine whether the interview objectives can be achieved. Appropriate questions can prompt the other party to think, standardize the way to dialect, decide the direction of conversation, and improve the quality of conversation. Otherwise, communication will be blocked. The perspective selection of personal deixis involves the expression and adaptation of interpersonal relationship. They can achieve different interpersonal functions in specific contexts. As far as personal deixis is concerned, the first person deixis obviously has a smaller social distance than the third person deixis, and the degree of intimacy is naturally higher. The above-mentioned journalists should abide by the principles of respect, tolerance and moderation when interviewing questions. If we further explore, it can be summed up as the core principle of communication etiquette, that is, the principle of self-discipline. Self-discipline is the highest realm of communication etiquette, which means that people can consciously restrain themselves, control themselves, compare themselves and reflect on themselves according to the norms of communication etiquette without any supervision. Self-discipline requires a person to establish a noble moral belief and code of conduct through etiquette study and practice, and constantly improve the ability of self-restraint and self-restraint. The principle of self-discipline in communication etiquette is the basic requirement that journalists must abide by in the whole interview process, and it is also the basic guarantee for journalists to ask questions effectively.

#### **4. Conclusion**

When we look at our premise 5, which is “A progress of ideas and theories usually bring citizens lives that are not peaceful”, there might occur a counter argument that not all citizens will be badly affected by those revolutions. The truth is, although there were indeed examples of citizens who were still living peacefully during the revolution, these examples are too weak to demonstrate the situation most citizens are facing. According to the record, people were really having a difficult time during big changes, because some basic production are influenced and their income were affected, which caused them not having enough food to eat or not having enough money to pay for their daily cost. It’s not a strong counter to simply talk about special cases. But also, it could be a sign for me to improve my premise, since changing into “A progress of ideas and theories usually bring part of the citizens lives that are not comfortable or peaceful” sounds better and more appropriate for a conclusion. So my premise 7 will be turned into “A progress of ideas and theories usually bring part of the citizens lives that are not comfortable or peaceful”.

## References

- [1] Yu Shangchuang. On the questioning skills in high school mathematics classroom[J]. Xueweekly, 2016, 289(13):74-75.
- [2] Li Yanan. Analysis on the interview characteristics and questioning skills of broadcast journalists[J]. West China Radio and Television, 2016, 000(018):147-147.
- [3] Chen Yingqi. The role and strategy of classroom questioning skills in junior high school English teaching[J]. Xueweekly, 2018(13): 74-75.
- [4] Nichols K, Burgh G, Kennedy C. Comparing Two Inquiry Professional Development Interventions in Science on Primary Students' Questioning and Other Inquiry Behaviours[J]. Research in Science Education, 2017, 47(1):1-24.
- [5] Brosnan M, Johnson H, Grawemeyer B, et al. Deficits in metacognitive monitoring in mathematics assessments in learners with autism spectrum disorder[J]. Autism, 2016:463-472.
- [6] Krkovic K, S Wüstenberg, Greiff S. Assessing Collaborative Behavior in Students-An Experiment-Based Assessment Approach[J]. European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 2016, 32(1):52-60.