Trajectories of Disagreement Sequences in Academic Argument in English by Native Speakers of English and Native Speakers of Japanese

Seiko Fujii ・ Noël Houck

Abstract

In this paper, we extend Coulter's (1990) investigation of 3-turn (argument) sequences to the exchange of ideas common in academic discussions by pairs of native speakers of English (NSE) and by native speakers of English interacting with native speakers of Japanese (NSJ). The purpose of this paper is to 1) identify and illustrate the types of disagreements that arise in academic discussion and 2) define the structure of disagreement sequences between pairs discussing the claims made in an academic text. We do this with an eye to establishing whether the NSE pairs and the NSE-NSJ pairs follow similar trajectories. Using conversation analytic techniques, we identified six general types of disagreement that occurred in interactions between NSE and NSJ; we also identified a basic 3-turn interactional sequence for extended academic disagreements that was common to both NSE-NSE and NSE-NSJ pairs.

1. Background

Recent work on verbal disputes has approached that topic from an interactional perspective. Rather than analyzing claims and counterclaims in terms of logical validity, many current studies consider argument a social interaction for which "generalizable rules that describe the sequence of any … argumentative interaction" (Antaki, 1994, p. 165) can be determined. In particular, researchers working from a conversation analytic perspective have produced detailed observations about the sequential characteristics of different stages of disagreement, based on the turn structure of disagreements in conversation (Houck & Fujii, 2006; Mori, 1999; Pomerantz, 1984a, 1984b; Schegloff, 2007).

Initial disagreements have been discussed extensively by researchers examining the turn-by-turn development of contrasting points of view. Pomerantz (1984a, 1984b) discusses assessments and assertions by a speaker (A) regarding information with which his or her interlocutor (B) is familiar. Production of such an assessment or assertion by A sets up an expectation that, barring issues of comprehension and unshared background knowledge, the next utterance (or lack thereof) by B can reasonably be taken to indicate B's stance toward A's claim. For instance, when B's initial response does not immediately convey some form of support or agreement, but rather introduces delay (Schegloff, 2007)

and is followed up with attempts to elicit a clear version of B's stance by A (Houck & Fujii, 2006, Pomerantz, 1984b), generally the eventual response is dispreferred. While a recognizable contrasting position may not emerge immediately as B hedges, offers pro-forma agreements, brings forth reasons for another point of view, and generally delays his or her opinion, eventually a perspective may emerge that is identifiable as at odds with A's initial assertion. The turn in which this position is produced constitutes the response, referred to here as a 2nd Turn (disagreement). Taken together, the initial assertion, the ensuing delays, and the expression of an identifiable disagreement represent a sequence in which the assertion constitutes the initial turn and the eventual disagreement, the interlocutor's response to the assertion.

Once a 2nd turn disagreement is expressed, the nature of an interaction shifts; that is, once contrasting claims from different interlocutors are in play, the succeeding interaction proceeds with two opposing points of view on the table. One researcher who has proposed a sequence of turns extending beyond the first disagreement is Coulter. Coulter (1990) used conversation analytic techniques to map out the turn structure of family disputes. Eliminating those sequences that were resolved by agreement after an initial disagreement, he proposed a 3-turn sequence characteristic of the disputes he studied. This sequence consisted of three disagreement turns – assertion by A (referred to henceforth as a claim), disagreement by B, and third turn by A.

  1st - A: Declarative Assertion (or claim)

  2nd - B: Disagreement (e.g., contradiction, qualification, contrasting perspective, challenge)

  3rd - A: Response to B Disagreement – which included:

      a. Backdown (modification of A's original claim)

      b. Reassertion (expansive recycling of A's original position)

  Or   c. "New Assertion" (essentially, a topic shift)

Coulter's sequence provides for backing down or changing the topic after a disagreement or counterassertion by B, as well as for continuing the argument in the 3rd Turn "opportunity space." In this paper we will be focusing primarily on 3-turn sequences resulting in or tending toward a 3rd Turn reassertion.

Using Coulter's 3-turn exchanges as a starting point in their description of disagreement sequences, Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) looked at 3rd Turn responses to a disagreement and compared them to 2nd Turn disagreement types. Muntigl and Turnbull found that while 2nd Turn disagreements dispute the original claim, the speaker of a 3rd Turn disagreement (or countermove) can either support the original claim or take issue with the 2nd Turn disagreement, thus adding another level of complexity to the sequence.

In this study, we extend the investigation of what we will refer to as 3-turn (disagreement) sequences to the exchange of ideas common in academic discussions (i) between two native speakers of English (NSE) and (ii) between native speakers of English in discussions with native speakers of Japanese (NSJ) with an eye toward addressing the following questions:

  1. How is (2nd Turn) disagreement expressed in academic discussion?

  2. How does the sequence following an initial (2nd Turn) disagreement in a 3-turn disagreement

sequence develop in an academic discussion?

3. Do 3-turn disagreement sequences in academic discussions between NSEs and NSE-NSJs follow similar trajectories?

2. Methodology

The data reported in this paper are part of a larger project involving dyadic interactions between 1) native speakers of English (NSE), 2) native speakers of Japanese (NSJ), and 3) NSE-NSJ dyads speaking English. Participants were seven NSE-NSJ pairs and five NSE-NSE pairs, all of whom were enrolled in a graduate course in second language acquisition at an American university in Japan. Admission to the master's program required a 575 TOEFL score for native speakers of languages other than English. Since the course was one of the final required classes in the master's program, the students were experienced at graduate level reading, writing, and discussion.

The pairs were engaged in a task similar to previous tasks that they had participated in during the course. Students were told to familiarize themselves with an article by Bley-Vroman (1987) in which he introduced ten characteristics of language acquisition. He claimed that, using these categories, one could identify differences between first and second language acquisition (referred to as L1 and L2) and similarities between L2 acquisition and general skill learning. A task sheet was provided listing the categories and the three types of learning discussed (see Appendix A). Students were told to review the task sheet beforehand, as they were not permitted to bring the article with them to the discussion. They had access to one copy of the task sheet per pair during the task.

The discussions lasted approximately 20 minutes. They were video-taped and transcribed, and a number of initial assertions/claims followed by indications of non-agreement were identified. Interactions were tracked as the discussants worked their way through their disagreements, with NSJs disagreeing almost as often as NSEs.

Conversation analytic techniques were used to analyze the sequences in order to identify the claim and disagreeing response and to characterize the turns leading up to the 3rd Turn disagreement response by A. Thus, we identified: a) a position-taking by one of the participants regarding one of the task questions (A's Claim); b) disagreement by B; and c) occurrence of a 3rd Turn non-agreeing response by A. Once the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd turns were ascertained, disagreements were identified and described, and the trajectory of the 3rd turn was characterized. The trajectory comprised the sequence following the 2nd turn disagreement and terminating with the 3rd Turn. Thus, the analysis of the 3rd Turn trajectory began with the first turn after B's disagreement and incorporated instances of Post-2nd and Pre-3rd sequences preceding the 3rd Turn.

3. The 3-Turn Sequence in Disagreements

Informed by the categories of disagreement identified by Muntigl & Turnbull (1998) and Mori (1999), we identified six different types of disagreement (including weak disagreement, which we refer to as

nonagreement) and three types of 3rd turn responses in our data. We then located instances of 3rd turn responding disagreement and characterized the intervening turns globally in terms of the positions taken by the participants. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: The 3-turn disagreement sequence with types of 2nd turn nonagreement and 3rd turn counters

The 3-Turn Sequence of Disagreement
1st Turn   **Speaker A makes a Claim:**
an utterance representing a position, on one of Bley Vroman's 30 claims
Post-1st Turn: Repair sequence
Pre-2nd Turn: Delay by Speaker B
2nd Turn   **Speaker B expresses Disagreement:**
a position that does not convey clear agreement with respect to the first turn; includes the following:
1. Contradiction: explicit expression of disagreement
2. Qualification: expression of nonagreement that limits the scope of the claim
3. Counterexample
4. Contrasting Perspective: alternative claim or counterclaim
■ **4a. Weak Contrasting Perspective** – alternative point of view or claim that does not directly contradict or challenge A's claim[1]
■ **4b. Strong Contrasting Perspective** – point of view or claim that can imply nonacceptance of all or part of the prior claim
5. Challenge: utterance implying that A cannot provide evidence for the claim (e.g., a question such as "When?" or "Where?") (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998)
6. Irrelevance: utterance that asserts that A's claim is not relevant to the discussion (e.g., a comment such as "That doesn't matter") (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998)
3rd Turn   **Speaker A delivers a Counter:**
a response that does not convey acceptance of the 2nd turn; includes one or more of the following:
1. Challenge or critique of B's claim
2. Reaffirmation of A's original claim
3. Backdown - modification of A's original claim[2]

[1] Note that contrasting perspectives can do other work such as topic change (Mori, 1999).

[2] While instances of Backdown occurred in our data, Backdowns are not included in this paper but are discussed elsewhere.

The 3-turn sequence of disagreement begins with an initial claim, which can be greeted with various types of delay by the recipient B. Eventually, B takes a position that does not align with that of Speaker A. In response, A may either take issue with B's claim or reaffirm the original claim.

The 2nd turn, consisting of six major types, can manifest itself either in clear disagreement or in more subtle forms of nonagreement (including partial agreement). Clear disagreement includes [1] contradiction; [4b] strong contrasting perspective; [5] challenge; and [6] irrelevance. More subtle expressions of nonagreement include [2] qualification; [3] counterexample; and [4a] weak contrasting perspective. Each of these six major types is elaborated on in Section 4.

3rd turn responses to disagreement in 3-turn sequences by NSE and NSE-NSJ pairs are examined and illustrated in Section 5.

4. Types of Disagreement in NSE and NSE/NSJ Disagreements

The types of disagreement listed in Table 1 were identified in the data. Excerpts 1-7 illustrate instances of the different types of disagreement - contradiction (Excerpts 1-2), qualification (Excerpt 3), counterexample (Excerpt 4), contrasting perspective (Excerpt 5), challenge (Excerpt 6), and irrelevance (Excerpt 7).

4.1 Contradiction
In Excerpt 1, Anna, a native speaker of English, initiates a discussion as to whether first language learners experience a general lack of success in acquiring their L1 by eliciting an opinion from Juko, a native speaker of Japanese. (Note that pseudonyms are used for all participants.)

Excerpt 1 Contradiction (Contr) (EJEF4 1a)
1.   Anna: bút (.) how (.) about this one, [mm?]
2. Claim Juko: [um] maybe?
3. Contr Anna: yeah uh I'd say no:

In Excerpt 2, Suki and Jack are discussing why L2 learners' language fossilizes.

Excerpt 2 Contradiction (Contr) (EJEM1 6b)
1. Claim Jack: they said usually they fossilize, after they're, they've come to a
2.   communicative, they can communicate.
3. Contr Suki: no-no, like, like I said, at the beginning. I think it seems to me,
4.   it's uh, God's work

In Excerpt 1 Anna disagrees with Juko's weak support for the possibility of a general lack of success by first language learners with a contradiction (*no*) preceded by a slight disfluency (*uh*) that is also

downgraded/distanced with *I'd say*. In Excerpt 2 (lines 3-4), Suki contradicts Jack's claim that learner language fossilizes once the learner is able to communicate (*no no*), then offering a counterclaim ("it's God's work"). It should be noted that this claim occurs well into a discussion of second language fossilization. However, in terms of Jack's claim, Suki's response illustrates a clear contradiction.

4.2 Qualification

In Excerpt 3 Tom and Kiyo are discussing whether there is general failure among learners of a general skill.

Excerpt 3 Qualification (Qual) (EJEM2 2c)

1. Claim Tom: okay general learning skills. general failure? (.) <I do:n't thínk so.>
2.   Kiyo: mmm I- I am not sure what does what- what it uh méan.
3.   Tom: general failure means =
4. Qual   Kiyo: = yeah I know but uh you know (.) I mean (.) it's depend yeah? a-
                 also depend on- depend on (.) learners (?).

Here Tom indicates his disagreement with the claim that general failure occurs with the acquisition of a general skill. Kiyo responds with a qualification "it depends."

4.3 Counterexample

In Excerpt 4, Suki and Jack are discussing whether variation exists in the goals that L2 learners set in language acquisition.

Excerpt 4 Counterexample (CE) (EJEM1 4b)

1. Claim Suki: often enough the uh goal is to uh pass the entrance examinations or
2.   or pass the uh uh pass the uh Japanese uh uh uh uh *eiken*
3. CE   Jack: mhm, but after that, people I mean, that's, they have all these
4.   language schools here, they've, they've done all this, they're
5.   adults now, they've gone through the, (.) jumped through all the
6.   hoops and [everything,] and,
7.   Suki: [yeah, yeah,]
8.   Jack: uh, they're still interested in, learning, language, English,

In this example, Suki indicates that often a learner's goal is just to pass the Japanese *eiken* (the Test for Practical English Proficiency). Jack responds with pro-forma agreement (line 3) followed by the observation that after graduation, adult Japanese still exhibit an interest in learning English (lines 3-6, 8), an example implying that learners have goals other than passing a test.

4.4 Contrasting Perspective

In Excerpt 5 Ella and Rie are considering the question of whether fossilization occurs in the L1. Rie's L1 is Japanese.

Excerpt 5 Contrasting Perspective (ContrP) (EJEF1 6a)

1.	Rie:	L1 is Japanese. so um, I went to the United ↑States when
2.		I was eight- eight years old? and I remember my Japanese
3.		is going really bad,
4.	Ella:	mm ah?
5.	Rie:	because I wasn't using my Japanese
6.	Ella:	mhm,
7. Claim	Rie:	so it díd backslide.
8. ContrP	Ella:	but it caught up later right (.) it didn't stay, it was like a
		temporary fossilization? maybe?

In this excerpt, Rie claims that her L1, Japanese, deteriorated when she was in the U.S. Ella implies disagreement with this claim by putting forth a counterclaim, that the fossilization was temporary – that it caught up later.

4.5 Challenge

In Excerpt 6, Anna and Juko express their views on whether L1 learners need negative evidence in order to acquire their L1.

Excerpt 6 Challenge (Chal) (EJEF4 9a)

1. Claim	Anna:	Í think it's important when children learn a language,
2.		for example a child says something but s-
3.		[nobody understands =
4.	Juko:	[°mhm,°
5.	Anna:	= what they are saying, negative evidence for the child
6.		when they try a different way? (.) uh I that's I think a child
7.		receives negative evidence. (.) what do you-
8. Chal	Juko:	but does it work?
9.	Anna:	uh does it help them? mm: ((laughs)) what do you think.

In this excerpt, Anna states that it is important for a child to receive indications that s/he is not understood (i.e., negative evidence). She begins to ask for Juko's opinion, a move that Juko ignores, responding rather with a question that can be heard to cast doubts on the validity of Anna's claim ("but does it work?"). Anna declines to respond, reformulating Juko's question, followed by *mm:*, which, considering its position

following the repetition of Juko's question, suggests that Anna has heard the question as in some sense rhetorical. At this point Anna laughs and returns the turn to Juko, this time completing her request for Juko's opinion.

4.6 Irrelevance

In Excerpt 7, Carl and Hiro are discussing the necessity of correction in L1 acquisition.

Excerpt 7 Irrelevance (Irrel) (EJEM4 9a)
1. Claim Hiro: ah, w- when, u:h you know, mother or you know father,
2.   Carl: °mhm°
3.   Hiro: (y'know,) correct, sometime correct, you know, children,
4.   Carl: yeah, they do that all the time,
5.   Hiro: (negative, uh)
6. Irrel Carl: but they say, that, that, doesn't matter,

In this excerpt Carl responds to Hiro's observation (that parents correct their children) with initially upgraded agreement (line 4); however, this agreement is followed by his comment that Hiro's comment is irrelevant to the discussion (line 6).

In this section we have illustrated six types of disagreement. Both native speakers of English and native speakers of Japanese speaking English employ a variety of disagreement types. The next question is how disagreement sequences evolve once some form of disagreement has been expressed. At this point, the disagreeing party may put forth various types of support for the disagreement (essentially "pursuing agreement"). It then resides with the original claimant whether to agree, whether to address his/her partner's opinion, or whether to counter with further support for or a reassertion of his/her original claim.

5. Responding to Disagreement in 3-turn Sequences in NSE and NSE/NSJ Disagreements

As already mentioned, after identifying 2nd turn disagreements followed by 3rd turn responding disagreements, we analyzed the intervening interaction, tracking the evolution of the disagreement. Examination of the data revealed that A's expression of a 3rd Turn position often followed some discussion by A and B. During the sequence following B's disagreement and preceding A's 3rd turn, several trajectories emerged. In addition to elaboration on the disagreement by B or backdown by A, A had two options:
1. A could respond to the disagreement by taking issue with B's claim - a "follow-up" to the 2nd turn.
2. A could instead focus on bolstering the original 1st turn claim by providing additional support for A's own 1st Turn claim. This option could include clarification and explanation such as definitions of terms, addition of background information, explanation of reasoning – often employing examples.

These findings indicate that academic differences of opinion involving both NSEs and NSJs speaking English follow the same disagreement trajectory as those described by Muntigl and Turnbull (1998).

The following excerpts (Excerpts 8-11) exemplify typical instances of the 3-turn disagreement sequences produced by NSE pairs and NSE-NSJ pairs.

5.1 Reaffirmation of A's Original claim

Excerpts 8-10 illustrate 3-turn sequences culminating in a reaffirmation of A's original claim by NSE-NSE pairs (Excerpts 8-9) and a NSE-NSJ pair (Excerpt 10). In Excerpt 8, Jill and Ann are discussing whether general lack of success applies to first language acquisition.

Excerpt 8 (EEEF1 1a)

1.	Jill:	OK. (0.8) all right well (0.2) uh for general lack of
2. 1st		success I guess (1.8) wouldn't think that generally
3.		pertains to L1 acquisi↑tion
4.		(0.4)
5.		I think most people are successful in attaining their
6.		(.) acquiring their native language
7.		(0.6)
8.		um but I would agree with it for foreign language acquisition
10.		(0.4)
11.		and for general skill learning.
12.		(2.8)
13.	Ann:	hh y'know (2.0) th- the one thing that I felt of- that-
14.		(0.8) ((sniff)) ab about what he said was that he didn't take into
15.		account um (1.4) il<u>lit</u>eracy
16.		(0.2)
17.		in- in L1 acquisition,
18.	Jill:	mhmm (0.4) mhmm
19. 2nd	Ann:	I mean not <u>every</u>body <u>does</u> become perfect you
20.		know
21.		(1.4)
22.		in their native lan [guage.]
23.	Jill:	[yeah] well I don't think
24		<u>most</u> people speak <u>perfectly</u>
25.		(0.4)
26.	Ann:	yeah
27.	Jill:	I mean if you wanted to (0.6) listen to someone
28.		and look at all their errors,

29.		(0.4)
30.	Ann:	yeah.
31.	Jill:	in their speaking and their writing most people are not
32.		absolutely perfect,
33.		(0.4)
34.	Ann:	right.
35.	Jill:	but I think um,
36.		(0.6)
37.	Ann:	and they're not- and most people are not also
38.		really (1.6) uhh (2.0) top- class speakers or
39.		wri [ters either they are] not- they don't=
40.	Jill:	[mhm (0.4) mhm]
41.	Ann:	=win the Nobel Prize.
42. 3rd	Jill:	mmhm (0.6) yeah that's true but I think most people um
43.		are successful
44.		(0.4)
45.		in acquiring their native language

In lines 13-17 (a pre-disagreement sequence) Ann takes issue with Jill's claim that the notion of a general lack of success cannot be applied to first language learning. She starts by noting that the author ignored illiteracy in the L1 and then expresses her disagreement, with a qualification – that *in this sense* not everyone becomes perfect in a native language. During the account preceding the disagreement, as well as during Ann's expression of disagreement, Jill bypasses opportunities to take the floor (lines 16, 18, 21). Finally, Jill responds with a long (pre-3rd) pro-forma agreement beginning in line 23 (noting that most people don't speak absolutely perfectly either) and culminating in her disagreement in lines 42-45 (but they're still successful in acquiring their L1).

In Excerpt 9 Ron and Lee disagree on whether learners of a general skill such as playing the guitar follow the same course and use the same strategies.

Excerpt 9 (EEEM13 3c)

1.		Ron:	ah, ah, how about general skill learning? if you and I
2.			are going to learn how to play the guitar,
3.		Lee:	hm.
4.		Ron:	you already know how to play but assuming you don't. ah,
5.			will we do it the same way?
6.		Lee:	well, I guess we won't (.) ah
7.	1st	Ron:	but I mean, but cer-certainly we wouldn't. I mean,
8.		Lee:	yeah.

9.		Ron:	I mean not exactly the same way. you know, we, ah
10.	2nd	Lee:	but there might be some initial basic steps
11.			that we both would have to follow.
12.		Ron:	well, sure. but how, but how would we, how do we follow
13.			em though.
14.		Lee:	yeah.
15.		Ron:	maybe we, one teacher might, your teacher might tell you
16.			that they, learn all the scales of, of each note,
17.			single note. my teacher might say "now let's start with
18.			chords first." or or something.
19.		Lee:	right.
20.	3rd	Ron:	something like that. ah, but it seems like ah
21.			there is variation.
22.		Lee:	variation.
23.		Ron:	alright.
24.		Lee:	OK.

Ron makes his opinion clear in line 7 – "cer- certainly we wouldn't" (follow the same course and strategy in learning to play the guitar). Lee observes that, at least initially, there might be some steps that everyone has to follow (lines 10-11). Ron immediately responds with a pro-forma agreement followed by a rhetorical question (which Lee treats as a claim – "yeah," line 14) introducing a contrasting perspective regarding the amount of variability involved in learning scales (a pre-3rd). He follows this up with a hypothetical example of how variation in learning to play the guitar might work, culminating in lines 20-21 with what amounts to a restatement of his initial claim ("there is variation"). Note that the question by A addresses the claim in B's 2nd Turn, while his (pre-3rd) hypothetical example (lines 12-13, 15-18) prepares the way for a reaffirmation of his 1st Turn claim.

In Excerpt 10, Jack and Suki are discussing whether L2 learners' language fossilizes. Jack begins with a brief response to the task question, "yeah."

Excerpt 10 (EJEM1 6b)

1.	1st	Jack:	fossilization, yeah, (.) yeah,
2.	2nd	Suki:	((°laughs°)) I don't, I don't really think, I, I, fossilized, uh, a, a lot.
3.		Jack:	yourself, I don't think so. I don't, [detect it,]
4.		Suki:	[u:h, uh,] uh, phonology-
5.			phonologically, >I don't think<, I, I, fossilized. uh, but the, uh,
6.			maybe, uh, uh, uh, syntactically, I <u>may</u> have, fossilized,
7.		Jack:	°hm°,
8.		Suki:	to, to, a very, uh, you know, fine point or something,

9.		Jack:	yeah, you've, I think you're at the high end of the spectrum.
10.		Suki:	yeah. I think so. yeah, yeah. >I think I'm one of the< uh, uh, uh,
11.			God's uh, ((laughs)) gift,
12.		Jack:	((laughs)) but, w-why, why do I , I guess the question, a- asked in
13.			this here, why do, they, why do people fossilize, (.) and they said
14.	3rd		usually they fossilize, after they're, they've come to a
15.			communicative, they can communicate.
16.	4th	Suki:	no-no, like, like I said, at the beginning. I think it seems to me,
17.			it's uh, God's work

In Excerpt 10, Suki responds to Jack's quick agreement with the notion that fossilization occurs in the L2 with a counterexample, himself. While Jack supports Suki's description of his own language ability (line 3), Suki follows up his self-evaluation with a (post-2nd) qualification in lines 4-6 and line 8 (his syntax may have fossilized slightly), but affirms that he has language talent ("God's gift") (lines 10-11). Despite Jack's agreement that Suki is at the high end of the spectrum (line 9), he persists in pursuing the issue of the occurrence of fossilization in the L2, refocusing the discussion with the question of why fossilization occurs (a pre-3rd in lines 12-13) and citing the Bley-Vroman article as claiming that it is a result of the learner's ability to communicate satisfactorily (lines 13-15), thus conveying a 3rd Turn claim that reinforces his original stance that fossilization does indeed occur in the L2 (while at the same time, not disagreeing with Suki's point). However, Suki immediately disagrees (a 4th Turn) with a contradiction, followed by a counterclaim - that language ability is "God's work" (i.e., the result of inherent abilities).

5.2 Challenge or Critique of B's Claim

In contrast to Excerpts 8-10, Excerpt 11 illustrates a 3rd Turn disagreement in which A takes issue with B's disagreeing claim. The pair in Excerpt 11 is composed of a NSE and a NSJ. The sequence centers on the question of whether negative evidence (for instance, correction) is necessary in L1 acquisition.

Excerpt 11 (EJEM4 9a)

1.		Jack:	((reading from handout)) importance of negative evidence,
2.	1st		okay. [so,] basically, that would be specifically L2 again,
3.		Suki:	[so]
4.			L2, right?
5.		Jack:	and maybe some general [skills learning, [but more
6.		Suki:	[mm [mhm
7.		Jack:	[specifically, it [would be L2 acquisition [wouldn't it,
8.		Suki:	[mhm [mhm [mm hm
9.		Jack:	you know. that's an incor[rect way of saying it.

10.		Suki:	[mhm
11. 2nd			ah, w- when, u:h you know, mother or you know father,
12.		Jack:	°mhm°
13.		Suki:	(y'know,) correct, sometime correct, you know, children,
14.		Jack:	yeah, they do that all the time,
15.		Suki:	(negative, uh)
16. 3rd		Jack:	but they say, that, that, doesn't matter,

In this excerpt Jack opens with a rather schematically expressed claim that negative evidence would be important in L2 ("basically that would be specifically L2 again") and maybe in some general skills learning ("more specifically it would be L2 acquisition"). (In line 9 Jack self-critiques his expression of the claim.) At this point Suki takes issue with the implication of Jack's initial claim (that negative evidence is important *only* in L2 and general skill learning - lines 2, 4) by introducing a contrasting perspective - that L1 learners also receive negative evidence (lines 11, 13). In his 3rd Turn disagreement, Jack responds with a (pre-3rd) pro-forma agreement, pointing out that while Suki is correct ("yeah, they do that all the time"), the negative evidence that children receive has no effect on their acquisition (lines 15-16); in other words, Suki's example is irrelevant to the discussion. Note that in this excerpt, Suki's 2nd Turn disagreement is never stated outright – rather, Jack comes in with a refutation of Suki's point, which he has inferred. In addition, the 3rd Turn does not include a reaffirmation of the 1st Turn, but rather focuses exclusively on rebutting Suki's 2nd Turn.

The excerpts presented in this section display both NSE-NSE and NSE-NSJ pairs engaged in 3-turn disagreement sequences – even extending to a 4th turn (as in Excerpt 10). Thus, both NSE-NSE pairs and NSE-NSJ pairs produced disagreement sequences during their discussion of Bley-Vroman's article, and they developed them into longer "3-turn" sequences reflecting Coulter's (1990) argument structure and the courses spelled out in Muntigl and Turnbull's (1998) description of post-disagreement countermoves.[3]

6. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper we set out to determine 1) how academic disagreement is expressed; 2) how 3-turn academic disagreement sequences are realized; and 3) whether a 3-turn sequence accurately describes the extended disagreement found in academic discussions between both NSE-NSE and NSE-NSJ pairs. Through extensive analysis, we identified six approaches to expressing disagreement in academic discussion and established that these six types did indeed capture the various ways in which disagreement was communicated.

---

[3] It should be reiterated that, as we mentioned in the initial discussion of Coulter's 3-turn sequence, another possible type of 3rd Turn response is Backdown, a modification by A of the 1st Turn claim. Although we have identified such cases in our data, Backdowns were not included in this paper but are discussed elsewhere.

With respect to the second research question, we determined two possible trajectories for 3rd Turn disagreements: Speaker A could realize a 3rd Turn that responded to B, challenging or disputing B's disagreement; or A could mount a defense of the original (1st Turn) claim (which A then often reconfirmed).

Finally, we explored the question whether 3-turn disagreement sequences involving pairs of NSE-NSE and of NSE-NSJ followed a similar course. The data support the claim that the trajectories summarized above are robust, accurately characterizing the types of disagreement, as well as capturing the features of post-disagreement turns in three-turn sequences produced by both NSE pairs and NSE-NSJ pairs engaged in academic discussion.

This claim is by no means meant to imply that all disagreement sequences are essentially identical. As has been identified in previous studies (Dippold, 2011; Pekarek Dohler, 2011), variations in linguistic and sequential characteristics of nonagreement characterize learners of different proficiency. Kotthoff (1993) has also showed that in some cases nonagreement becomes the preferred response. It is also important to note that our ultimate goal is to tease out the subtle differences in linguistic and local sequential resources deployed by NSEs and NSJs speaking English in 3-turn disagreement sequences. Elsewhere we have identified differences in interactional behaviors of NSE and NSJ in delaying disagreement (Houck & Fujii, 2006), in selecting pre-disagreement strategies (Houck & Fujii, 2002), and in exiting 3-turn disagreement sequences (Fujii & Houck, 2010).

In this paper we have defined the 3-turn disagreement sequence, laying out the types of pre-disagreement and disagreement turns that can occur in academic nonagreement sequences and thus making possible a grounded comparison of differences in manifestations of nonagreement in academic discussion by a variety of interactants (e.g., native speakers of different L1s, interactants speaking a second or additional language, male and female interactants). It also suggests a sequence against which nonagreement in non-academic speech events can be contrasted and to which divergences can be held accountable. Examination and explication of such variations can benefit greatly from a basic framework within which these differences can be made salient. What we have attempted in this paper is thus to develop such a framework, which proposes a clear set of interactional turns, along with terms and notions for describing the stages in the trajectory.

In employing this framework in future studies, one caveat should be kept in mind: The characterization of academic 3-turn disagreement sequences is not intended as a template for a fixed disagreement trajectory. The proposed trajectory set forth in the present paper should serve as a heuristic that can be used in tracking the development of academic disagreement sequences. Such a resource can enable the researcher to obtain not only a local, but a more global view of the development of a disagreement, allowing identification of recurring resources in extended disagreements (e.g., repetition or reformulation of the original claim; use of questions to challenge a point of view), as well as locating points of textual incoherence, confusion, and misunderstanding and identifying their potential source.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C. (1994). *Explaining and arguing: The social organization of accounts*. Ch. 9 London: Sage Publications.

Bley-Vroman, R. (1987), The fundamental character of foreign language learning. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching* (pp. 19-30). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Coulter, J. (1990). Elementary properties of argument sequences. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Interaction competence*. (pp. 181-203). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Dippold, D. (2011). Argumentative discourse in L2 German: A sociocognitive perspective on the development of facework strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 171-187.

Fujii, S., & Houck, N. (2010). Negotiating responses to disagreement in academic discussion. A paper presented at the 18th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Kobe Japan.

Houck, N., & Fujii, S. (2002). Initial disagreement by non-natives speakers. A paper presented at the 13th World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA), Singapore.

Houck, N., & Fujii, S. (2006). Delay as an interactional resource in native speaker-nonnative speaker academic interaction. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Felix Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.). *Pragmatics and language learning, 11*, pp. 29-55. Manoa, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Kothoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and Concession in Disputes: On the Context Sensitivity of Preference Structures. *Language in Society*, 22, 193-216.

Mori, J. (1999). *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese* (Chapters 4-6) Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Muntigl, P., & Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 29*, 225-256.

Pekarek Dohler (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction. A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. Kelly Hall, J. Hellerman, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds). *L2 interactional competence and development*, pp. 206-243. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures in social action*, (pp. 57-101). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures in social action* (pp. 152-163). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Appendix A

Task Sheet

L1=L2 QUESTION
(Exercise developed by R. Ellis)

This task gives you an opportunity to check Bley-Vroman's claims about the nature of L2 acquisition using your own experience and intuition.

Complete the table below by making notes about whether each characteristic of learning applies to a) L1 acquisition, b) foreign language acquisition, and c) general-skill learning.

Characteristic	L1 Acquisition	Foreign Lg. Acquisition	General Skill Learning
1. General lack of success			
2. General failure			
3. Variation in course and strategy			
4. Variation in goals			
5. Correlation of age and proficiency			
6. Fossilization			
7. Indeterminate knowledge			
8. Importance of instruction			
9. Importance of negative evidence			
10. Role of affective factors			

Appendix B

Transcription Conventions

Normal spelling is used with a few exceptions, ("y'd" for "you'd"; "c'n" for "can"); utterances do not begin with capital letters

At the end of a word, phrase, or clause

?	A question mark indicates high rising intonation.
¿	A reverse question mark indicates rising in Intonation, not too high.
.	A period indicates falling intonation.
,	A comma indicates nonfinal intonation – no strong movement in intonation; it is heard as unfinished.
↑↓	Arrows indicate shifts in intonation into especially high or low pitch.

No punctuation at clause end indicates transcriber uncertainty.

LOUD	Capital letters represent increase in volume.
raised pitch	Underlining represents a spike in pitch (sometimes accompanied by increase in volume.
°soft speech°	Degree marks indicate that speech is softer than the surrounding speech.
"quotation"	Quotation marks represent speech that is altered to represent another's voice
[ ]	Brackets indicate overlapping speech; a left bracket marks the point at which overlap begins; a right bracket marks the point at which overlap ends.
=	Equal signs indicate no break or gap (latching).
(.)	A dot within parentheses indicates a brief pause.
(1.5)	Numbers within parentheses indicates length of lapsed time in seconds.
(?) or ( )	A question mark or empty set of parentheses indicates an incomprehensible word or phrase.
(all right)	A word or phrase within parentheses indicates transcriber uncertainty about the bracketed word or phrase.
((laugh))	Double parentheses indicate nonlinguistic occurrences such as laughter, sighs, and transcriber comments.
< >	Open angle brackets indicate that the bracketed phrase is spoken at a slower rate.
> <	Closed angle brackets indicate that the bracketed phrase is spoken at a faster rate.
y-	A hyphen indicates a cut-off.