# TWO DIFFERENT POLES OF DISAGREEING STRATEGIES IN INDONESIAN GRADUATE EFL DISCUSSIONS

**Zuliati Rohmah**

**Abstract**: The present study is concerned with verbal strategies applied by doctorate students in expressing their disagreements during discussions in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. The study collected data from fourteen classroom discussions among the doctorate English Program students speaking in English as a foreign language. Among the five broad strategies applied, aggravating a disagreement seems to be an undesired strategy, and, acknowledging peers and asserting vulnerability during disagreements are the more favored strategies. Hence, the results of the study strengthen Viechnicki's (1997) findings that intellectual figure is fundamental to the graduate students that needs to be protected.

**Keywords**: verbal strategies, disagreeing strategies, EFL discussions.

Disagreement is an expression of one's stance which is different from the others' position. In academia, students are trained to evaluate others' arguments, prove their weaknesses and then offer their own ideas (Tannen, 1998: 268-269). However, a number of studies show that a disagreement is a dispreferred response (Mori, 1999; Pomerantz, 1984; Waring, 2000 & 2001). In fact, disagreements may threaten another person's face and may cause a dispute which prevents participants from further collaboration. Therefore, during discussions, participants are often put in a dilemmatic position when they should express their disagreements (Tracy & Baratz, 1993: 309-310).

One interesting aspect in discussion situations is that, during the discussions, participants try to display and enact their intellectual identities. In attending intellectual meetings, one prominent concern of the participants is to put an impression of being intellectually competent without being apparent as making efforts to be called as erudite (Tracy & Baratz, 1993: 306). Another study on participant intentions during graduate seminars done by Viechnicki (1997: 103-130) supports Tracy and Baratz's (1993: 306) and Tracy and Carjuzaa's (1993: 176-187) findings about the seminar participants' concern and their intellectual identity enactment. Vienicki observes the dual nature of seminars, that is, as an informal meeting among peers where self-aggrandizement is deemed improper and as a classroom in which personal-enhancement is essential to some points. This observation explains that the role of an intellectual figure is central to graduate students. To save their 'intellectual face', they are encouraged to assign intellectual attributes to their figures, which may affect their careers (Viechnicki, 1997: 122).

Indeed, combining an effort to support a cooperative atmosphere needed to gain better, shared comprehension and another effort to obtain self-aggrandizement is a very difficult task that often puts the participants in a dilemmatic position. Therefore, in managing these conflicting wants, students apply seminar strategies during discussions, such as those described by Waring (2000) and Rohmah (2003). Waring (2000) reports that students apply conversational management strategies, topic management strategies and social strategies during dis-

cussions. Rohmah's (2003) study of American students attending university classroom discussions shows that the participants apply eight general strategies in asking questions, six ways in offering opinions, three strategies in disagreeing, and four ways in interrupting others.

The students' acts of expressing disagreements may threaten others' faces, and this is dangerous for their collaboration in search for a shared understanding during classroom discussions. When expressing a face threatening act (FTA), including a disagreement, the speaker may consider the following three desires suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987: 68).

In the context of mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid these face-threatening acts, or will employ certain strategies to minimize the threat. In other words, he will take into consideration the relative weightings of (at least) three wants: (a) the want to communicate the content of the FTA *x* [the kind of FTA performed by S], (b) the want to be efficient or urgent, and (c) the want to maintain H's [hearer's] face to any degree. Unless (b) is greater than (c), S [speaker] will want to minimize the threat of his FTA.

It is clear from the quotation that an FTA is often avoided. In the case that an FTA cannot be avoided, an adult mature person potentially uses a number of strategies to express it to lessen its negative effect(s) on the addressee/hearer. A disagreement which is often apparent in discussions is one of FTAs. Different positions and understandings expressed in a manner which does not consider the addressee's condition may cause a deadlock in a discussion. To avoid this, strategies which can break the communication barriers need to be applied.

This paper reports the details of the discussions to show that aggravating a disagreement is an undesired strategy and expressing disagreements through peer acknowledgement and vulnerability assertion are more favored ones.

## METHOD

The study applied Conversational Analysis (hereafter, CA). CA was applied to describe the verbal disagreeing strategies used by students during classroom discussions and the responses of the students to the preceding disagreements. With CA, the researcher conducted detailed examination of the turn-taking and sequential structure of the dis-

cussions whereby she could document the students' disagreeing strategies (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998; Levinson, 1983; Sack, 1984; Schegloff, 1984; Wei, 2002).

The data in the current study were in the forms of the utterances of the students during fourteen classroom discussions. The subjects of the study were seven doctorate students of the English Education Program at a state university in East Java, Indonesia, who were taking the 'Topics in Foreign Language Teaching' course. The main instrument was the researcher, equipped with field-notes and an audio-tape recorder. After transcribing the data from the cassettes, the researcher identified the disagreements and analyzed the strategies applied by the speakers. In analyzing the disagreeing strategies, the researcher was much helped by Blum-Kulka et.al's CCARP Coding Manual (1989) and Brown and Levinson's (1987) four politeness strategies: bald-on-record strategies, positive politeness strategies, negative politeness strategies, and off record strategies.

## DISAGREEING STRATEGIES

Different from Brown and Levinson's (1987) four strategies, the data analysis in the present research results in five main strategies in conveying disagreements. The five strategies are aggravating disagreements, disagreeing baldly, acknowledging peers during disagreements, asserting vulnerability during disagreements and disagreeing indirectly. Besides, the findings also show that some of the strategies are combined by students. The five strategies can be arranged in a continuum based on the severity: the aggravated disagreement as the undesired strategy and the disagreements conveyed through peer acknowledgement and vulnerability assertion as the more favored strategies.

### Aggravated Disagreement: Undesired Strategy

Aggravating a disagreement is one way of expressing disagreements directly. In this strategy, the head act containing a disagreement can be seen in turn 36, "*Ya, then there is no discrimination, actually.*" This disagreement is strengthened by a series of questions prefacing and following the expression of the different stance. Excerpt 1 shows the disagreement expressed intensively by the student.

Excerpt 1 (14/26-42)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ovi: | ((presenting and explaining that the use of language in society shows discrimination between men and women)) | 25 |
| Edo: | Bu Ovi, <do you agree with me that discrimination does exist in our society?> | 26 |
| Ovi: | Yea, ya!! | 27 |
| Edo: | *Who discriminate who?* ((This signals a start of a heated argument)) | 28 |
| Ovi: | Who discriminate who? ((Low, weak voice to question herself; Ovi seems to be helpless, does not know what to say. This is very interesting; the audience noisily follow the exchange between the two persons)) | 29 |
| Edo: | I would like to know your comment. *Men discriminate women?* (.) A: If men discriminate women, Pak Sad, Pak Sad, >is it true< for Pak S ((the professor)), Edo, and all of us here to live with the inferior. Maybe it's you who are inferior, not all women= ((pointing at Ovi)) | 30 |
| Ovi: | =It's not me= | 31 |
| Edo: | *Do we go together with those who are inferior?* | 32 |
| Ovi: | Ya, the woman who is your wife is as servant. Not as your leaders. ((laughter)) She wash your clothes, she cook your food… ((The audience are overexcited)) | 33 |
| Edo: | Bu, Ovi. I read from a: psikologi wanita, that's, that a discrimination exists because women treat men as different. ((The discussion participants comment on the discussion noisily)) To me ( ) you, you, women need me to pay attention to. But, because we don't pay attention to you, you consider us, consider us discriminate women. | 34 |
| Ovi: | I don't think so because men always chase women. Not women chase men. The ( ) is women not= | 35 |
| Edo: ☞ | =*Ya, then there is no discrimination, actually.* ((Adi laughs followed by others)) | 36 |
| Ovi: | (You just interpret this) Women are usually do the domestic, domestic work, ya. So that they have no voice in the public at all, ya. So, for example, they can make decision. Decision is always made by men, ya. This is a discrimination, ya. | 37 |
| Edo: | … because, this is is very stupid. Edo is very stupid, Bu Ovi. If he:: >what is it< try or work hard to catch for a woman, maybe, he can himself be considered intolerant. Subordinate, so stupid Edo is. | 38 |
| Ovi: | But, that's what happens. You want a friend, but your friend should not, should not a:: comment them, should not order them. A friend= | 39 |
| Edo: | =Do you, do you= | 40 |
| Ovi: | who do something, take care of your business= | 41 |
| Edo: | Frankly speaking, Bu Ovi, do you consider your husband, a: do, does your husband consider you as a servant? | 42 |
| Ovi: | I think it is privat, ya. You can get the answer from Pak Sad ((All participants are boisterous when commenting the argument. Finally, Ovi leaves the presentation and sits on a chair among other students to listen to the professor's comment)). | 43 |

In this long excerpt, Edo, who is an Ambonese currently working as an English lecturer in a university in Menado, North Celebes, expresses his disagreement with Ovi, who previously states that language use in society shows a discrimination between men and women in the society and hints that the discrimination is done by men. Edo cannot accept her statement. To him, a discrimination does not really exist in the society; if it does exist, it is because someone sees others as different, and the 'one' here is a woman, including the presenter.

Edo articulates his different stance from Ovi, a Javanese female student married to a Padangese gentleman, by asking a question slowly with an emphatic stress, "*Bu Ovi, <do you agree with me that discrimination does exist in our society?>*" When this is agreed by Ovi, he asks a further question, "*Who discriminate who?*" This low pitched question uttered in his heavy voice makes those who hear it become frightened mixed with excited feelings for not knowing what to happen next. The situation and the way of expressing the ideas are so different from what the students usually do and experience thus far. He puts forth another question, "*Men discriminate women?*" by framing it that he desires her comment on the matter. He concludes turn 30 by accusing Ovi of feeling inferior to men that makes her perceive the discrimination from men. "*Maybe it's you who are inferior, not all women.*" He does this by pointing his fingers to Ovi. Here, Edo changes his footing from talking about something academically to talking about private, individual business. This degrades the quality of the academic discussion involving rational and intellectual capacity and shifts it into a non-academic debate exploiting emotions and feelings.

This is not all, Edo repeats his questions with another interrogation, "*Do we go together with those who are inferior?*" When this is responded by Ovi by raising Edo's personal matters, that is, that his wife has been his servant, "*She wash your clothes, she cook your food*" he stops questioning Ovi. He calms his voice and puts some accounts on his disagreement. However, this explanation is not accepted by Ovi; instead, she puts forward a reason which is not really connected to the matter being discussed. Edo then tries to offer a resolution which supports his stance, "*Ya, then there is no discrimination, actually.*" Again, it is rejected by Ovi; although she cannot provide a good rationale for her rejection.

In his last turn in this excerpt, Edo again launches a question, "*Frankly speaking, Bu Ovi, do you consider your husband, a: do, does your hus-*

*band consider you as a servant?*" This is the climax of the aggravating questions which make Ovi leave her 'presenter chair' without answering the question and return back to her seat among the other students.

Spencer-Oatey (in Ammon *et.al*, in press:4) explains that there are four face orientations of conversation participants: *rapport enhancement orientation* (the want to support and increase harmonious relationship), *rapport maintenance orientation* (the want to safeguard and preserve relationship), *rapport neglect orientation* (a lack of interest in the quality of the relationship between the interlocutors), and *rapport challenge orientation* (the concern to challenge or break the harmonious relationship). When we see the data in Excerpt 1, we recognize that when expressing his disagreement with Ovi, Edo goes back and forth applying different face orientations. In 26, Edo applies rapport maintenance orientation; he says 'Do you agree…' to maintain good relationship between them. In 28-36, Edo uses rapport neglect orientation and rapport challenge orientation. Edo challenges Ovi with his question, "*Do we go together with those who are inferior?*" and his statements, for instance, "*Maybe it's you who are inferior, not all women*," stressed by using the pointing of his fingers to Ovi. In 34, Edo neglects Ovi's feeling of being pressed with his challenges by saying, "*Bu, Ovi. I read from a: psikologi wanita, that's, that a discrimination exists because women treat men as different…*" When the argument reaches its climax in which Ovi still persists her position in spite of Edo's challenges, Edo changes the face orientation of his utterances. He tries to improve and fix the relationship by humbling himself as stupid, "*…this is is very stupid. Edo is very stupid, Bu Ovi*." He applies rapport enhancement orientation. Hence, the data do not support Brown and Levinson's (1987: 61) politeness theory suggesting that it is generally "in every participant's best interest to maintain each others' face". It is obvious from the data that Edo chooses to challenge Ovi in purpose and holds the four face orientations back and forth.

In Kakava's (2002) paper, disagreements expressed through provoked questions go with or without endearment term. In the case of the use of endearment term, the figurative kinship term *paidaki mou* 'my little child' is uttered (Kakava, 2002: 1550-2). In the data, the aggravated disagreement is expressed with respecting term of address 'Bu Ovi' and humbling oneself using '*this is is very stupid. Edo is very stupid*'. The term of address 'Bu' in this excerpt is applied not in the strategic sense as that

of Brown and Levinson's (1987: 183) negative politeness. 'Bu' is applied in any situation, including the situation in which they are involved in a heated argument as apparent in the excerpt.

Edo's way of asking questions before actually expressing his disagreement is the same as that of an attorney's in a courtroom as documented in Drew's (1998). The attorney uses a series of questions to imply an inconsistency in a witness's story. The attorney asks questions he knows the answer. This is similar to Edo's questions; he asks a series of questions not with an intention to get information. The difference is that Edo's questions are applied to pose Ovi in a situation in which she does not have a good account to reject what is stated by Edo in the following turn, "*Ya, then there is no discrimination, actually.*" As apparent in the data, Ovi cannot bring about good reasons in countering Edo's opinion. Although honorific term of address 'Bu' and humbling oneself are applied by Edo, the effect of the harsh disagreement cannot be minimized, and Ovi cannot bear it, then, stops the presentation and discussion. This way of expressing a disagreement cannot be equalized to any politeness strategy mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987). This is stronger than Brown and Levinson's (1987) bald-on-record strategy.

It is apparent from the data that the worst response is given to the disagreement expressed in an aggravating manner. There are three reasons why the aggravated disagreement results in a communication deadlock. The first is that maintaining the addressee's face does not always become the first concern of the speaker. Excerpt 1 shows that Edo does not only apply rapport enhancement orientation (turn 38) and rapport maintenance orientation (turn 26), but also rapport neglect orientation (turn 34) and rapport challenge orientation (turn 30 and 32). Hence, maintaining the addressee's face is not the concern of the speaker; therefore, the failure in communication is just natural.

The second reason is that there is no mediator during the disputes. In this case, the presence of a mediator is needed. Had one of the participant served as a mediator, the communication breakdown would not have emerged. A mediator is supposed to regulate the decision making procedure so as to empower the disputants to resolve their differences on their own (Jacobs, 2002). The mediator neither judges nor advocates, but serves only to facilitate the discussion between the disputants, in this case, Edo and Ovi. In classroom discussions, this role is usually performed by a moderator. Since there is no moderator in the doctorate discussions,

the role is vacant. Therefore, when the presenter has a dispute with the audience, no mediator can calm the situation and serve as the facilitator between the disputants. Had a mediator been present in the disputes between Edo and Ovi, and had he/she been consistent in his/her neutrality, such a breakdown in communication as shown in Excerpt 1 would have not appeared.

The third reason is that Ovi responds to Edo's challenge which is intended to tease her too seriously. She cannot manipulate and manage her feelings of being attacked. She bothers too much Edo's judgment about her that makes her unable to realize that it is actually intended to make fun of her. This is possible because every person has a certain desire to project a certain image about him/herself which is sometimes not the quality that he/she has. When this desired image is destroyed by others, the person gets hurt. Hence, he/she tends to react defensively to the criticism that is congruent more with the private perception of him/herself but does not agree with the image that he/she wants to give to the public (Pan, 1992).

In short, the aggravated disagreement results in an outburst by the addressee because of three reasons. The first is that the speaker does not always maintain the addressee's face. The second is that there is no mediator during the dispute, and the third is the fact that the addressee cannot manipulate and manage her feelings of being attacked. The response to the aggravated disagreement in the form of communication deadlock cannot facilitate further learning from peers. Thus, the strategy should be avoided and fixed for the sake of searching for a better understanding.

This kind of response is only apparent once during the discussion, that is, during the only aggravated disagreement. It is apparent from the fact that in Indonesian university settings, disagreement expressed openly and, especially, aggravatingly, is undesired. This is because in Indonesian society, in general, living in harmony is stressed. As a collectivist society, the individuals in it are motivated to give priority to the goals of the collectives over their own personal goals (Triandis, 1995).

## Acknowledging Peers and Asserting Vulnerability during Disagreements: More Favored Strategies

Among the five main strategies, acknowledging peers and asserting vulnerability during disagreements are more preferred. These two strategies facilitate further learning from peers.

## Peer Acknowledgment

Acknowledging peers during disagreements as a strategy is applied by the students to express their disagreements politely. This strategy resembles to that of Brown and Levinson's (1987: 101) positive politeness strategy. The doctorate English Program students acknowledge their peers during disagreements by applying four different strategies. The four strategies are assuring desirability of H's wants, asserting commonality, promoting cooperation, and fulfilling H's wants. Each of the strategies is realized through different verbal expressions.

To exemplify the use of acknowledging peers during disagreements, *attending to H's point* is described in brief. By applying this strategy, the speaker aims at conveying that he/she understands H's desire. This is realized by using 'as you explained', 'you have just mentioned' and 'It's quite right'. These expressions are placed either prefatory to or parenthetically inside the disagreement talk. This strategy has been referred to in the communication literature as "naming," "referencing back" (Barness & Todd, 1995, quoted in Waring, 2001:32) and "idea crediting" (Tracy, 1997, quoted in Waring, 2001: 32).

The following excerpt shows the use of 'you have just mentioned' to attend to the previous speaker's point.

Excerpt 2 (7/3)

| Edo: | … my general impression is that (.) a:: a good language program, a best program a: may >what's it< adopt (  ) condition of the program and should a: consider >what's that< a:, there should be (.) a: a: (.) (for all the assurance) mechanism (of the four factors …) | 1 |
|---|---|---|
| Prof: | Okay, anybody else? | 2 |
| Joni: ☞ | A: to me, *you have just mentioned* some good quality of language program, so a:, (  ) to me, there must be a: a: comprehend, a: a: linkage of these four factors, so one factors from another (  ) | 3 |

The data show that Joni uses 'you have just mentioned' to acknowledge that Joni understands what his interlocutor states. While showing that he understands Edo, Joni expresses his own position to the article discussed, "…*you have just mentioned some good quality of language program, so a:, (  ) to me, there must be a: a: comprehend, a: a: linkage of these four factors.…*" He concludes that the article does not only mention the four factors crucial to a language program—just like what has been stated by the preceding speaker—but the paper also suggests that there must be a connection

among these four factors. Thus, while thrusting out his own stance, he also acknowledges that the earlier speaker is also correct.

## Vulnerability Assertion

The term 'asserting vulnerability' is borrowed from Waring (2001:39). She refers 'asserting vulnerability' to the kinds of utterances in which the speakers frame themselves as being vulnerably confused, uncertain, lost, not knowing, or admit that their arguments have been less than accurate, consistent, coherent, or plausible. Among the examples given by Waring are 'I'm really lost,' 'I don't know' 'I wasn't sure,' 'I'm really off the deep end.' In Waring's, asserting vulnerability is applied to untie certain interactional deadlocks by backing down from unratified disagreements or challenge or from a successively reasserted critique. The use of the asserting vulnerability by the doctorate English Program students are realized through appealing and mitigating strategies. In the present study, asserting vulnerability is applied whenever the speaker intends to express disagreements with redressive actions directed to the addressee's wants to have freedom of action unopposed and attention unhindered. Thus, asserting vulnerability in the present study is comparable to negative politeness strategies in Brown and Levinson's (1987: 129) term.

In the data, asserting vulnerability is realized by appealing and mitigating strategies. Appealing is applied to make minimal assumption about the addressee, while mitigating strategy is used to soften the disagreements so as to give the addressee an option whether to accept or refuse the disagreements, to minimize the threat, and to dissociate the addressee from a particular intrusion. Appealing is done by searching for confirmation, approval, cooperation, acceptance, or information. Mitigating is shown by being pessimistic, minimizing the imposition, giving respect, expressing partial disagreements and apologizing.

The following data exemplify the use of asserting vulnerability to pursue approval from the addressee by using a word 'ya'.

Excerpt 3 (6/16)

| Adi: | Yes, the world get the what is here, get the size of let's say the size of the world can be what is here reduced into the small one. | 8 |
|---|---|---|
| | … | |
| Ovi: | I want to make a something clearer. Pak Adi's explanation about the world becomes a: (.) | 14 |
| Tia: | smaller. | 15 |
| Ovi: ☞ | smaller. The world will not become smaller, it is just like before, *ya*, the size is the same. But, what is meant by it becomes smaller, in my opinion, is the communication can be captured, now is more intensive, more frequent because of the advance in the technology in communication. So, maybe in the past I will not be able to communicate with people from other cultures because I have to come to that other country if I want to speak with them, but now through the internet, we can chat, and we can do things like that. That's number one. So, it is because of the communication between cultures more intensive and more frequent, we can go to New York, and after that we return to Indonesia just in one day. So, that's what is meant by the world becomes narrower. ... . | 16 |

In Excerpt 3, Ovi expresses her disagreement, "The world will not become smaller, it is just like before, ya, the size is the same," with Adi's interpretation of 'the world is getting smaller' which is, "Yes, the world get the what is here, get the size of let's say the size of the world can be what is here reduced into the small one." When trying to express her different opinion from Adi's opinion about what the meaning of 'the world becomes smaller' is, Ovi uses the word 'ya' to seek for approval from Tia about her explanation. The word 'ya' in, "The world will not become smaller, it is just like before, ya, the size is the same" is actually an Indonesian expression. When speaking in Indonesian, people use 'ya' to look for an approval from his/her addressee. In this excerpt, when speaking English, Ovi continues using the expression she usually uses in speaking Indonesian. Thus, this is a transfer from Indonesian as the language she uses in daily communication into English.

## More Favored Strategies

To show that disagreements expressed through peer acknowledgment and vulnerability assertion are the most favored ones by the addressees, a table showing responses of the addressees to the overall strategies applied is presented.

Table 1 illustrates that disagreements conveyed by acknowledging peers and asserting vulnerability facilitate further learning. Acceptance, partial acceptance and support are positive responses shown by the addressee to disagreements expressed through peer acknowledgment. Besides, disagreements through vulnerability assertion are also responded with some positive responses, that is, acceptance, support, offer of an account, support from another participant, and

neutralizer from another participant. Acceptance and partial acceptance as responses show that the addressee is willing to learn from the speaker, thus, he/she revises his/her own position and is ready to listen from another party. Likewise, support to the disagreeer is also a good attitude shown by the addressee that he/she is ready to evaluate him/herself and learn from others. Offer of an account is also considered positive for learning since it means that the addressee is inviting the speaker to have a further dialogue which might open new possibilities for new perspectives. Support from another participant is a good attitude shown by another discussion participant that may lead to a further exchange of ideas. Neutralizer from another participant as a response to a disagreement can save the one who disagrees and another who is disagreed with from an unhealthy dispute. Thus, this kind of response may also facilitate learning.

The fact that disagreements expressed through peer acknowledgment and vulnerability assertion are more favored by the addressees strengthens Viechnicki's (1997) findings that the intellectual figure is fundamental to the graduate students that needs to be protected. In the present study, disagreements which are expressed through peer ac-knowledgment can still save the intellectual figure of the addressee, because his/her being right in certain part of his/her opinion is recognized by the disagreer. Likewise, by asserting vulnerability during disagreements, the speaker shows that his position is not higher than that of the person he/she disagrees with; this indicates that the capability and intellectuality of the addressee is considered. Therefore, the addressee's intellectual figure is kept safe through peer acknowledgment and vulnerability assertion during disagreements in discussions.

## CLOSING REMARKS

As the study shows that the aggravated disagreement results in a communication breakdown, this strategy should be avoided if further search for better, shared understanding is expected. Besides, since learning is mostly facilitated when disagreements are expressed through peer acknowledgment and vulnerability assertion, the discussants are suggested to express their disagreements via the two favored strategies. However, the use of the two strategies may not be excessive, since an excessive use of the strategies may cause the discussion inefficient.

## Table 1. Responses to the Disagreeing Strategies

| Disagreeing Strategies | Responses |
|---|---|
| Aggravating disagreements | - communication breakdown |
| Disagreeing Baldly | - indirect disagreement from another participant. |
| | - ignoring |
| Acknowledging Peers During Disagreements | - acceptance |
| | - partial acceptance |
| | - support |
| | - no response/topic shift |
| | - laughter/acceptance |
| | - undetermined response |
| | - neutralizer from another participant |
| | - defense |
| | - refusal |
| Asserting Vulnerability During Disagreements | - acceptance |
| | - support |
| | - offering an account |
| | - support from another participant |
| | - neutralizer from another participant |
| | - undetermined response |
| | - support search |
| | - refusal |
| Disagreeing indirectly | - disagreement emphasis |
| | - defense with an account |
| | - topic shift |

## REFERENCES

Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood: Ablex publishing Co.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. 1998. Contested Evidence in Courtroom Cross-Examination: the Case of a Trial for Rape. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work* (pp. 359-417). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Furneaux, C., Locke, C., Robinson, P. & Tokyn, A. 1991. Talking Heads and Shifting Bottoms: The Ethnography of Academic Seminars. In A. Penny, H. Brian & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-Cultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes* (pp.74-87). London: Macmillan Publishers, Ltd.

Heritage, J. & Atkinson, J.M. 1984. Introduction. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffit, R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principle, Practices, and Applications*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher, Ltd.

Jacobs, S. 2002. Maintaining Neutrality in Dispute Mediation: Managing Disagreement While Managing Not to Disagree. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 34: 1403-1426.

Kakava, C. 2002. Opposition in Modern Greek Discourse: Cultural and Contextual Constraints, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1537-1568.

Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, T. & Anderson, K. 1991. Do You Mind If I Come In Here?—A comparison of EAP Seminar/discussion Materials and the Characteristics of Real Academic interaction. In A. Penny, H. Brian & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-Cultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes* (pp.74-87). London: Macmillan Publishers, Ltd.

Mori, J. 1999. *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement in Japanese: Connective Expressions and Turn Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pan, D. 1992. *Giving and Receiving Feedback and Criticism: Essential Skills for Professors*. Procedings of FASS symposium on Teaching and Learning at the National University of Singapore, 27-28 October.

Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rohmah, Z. 2003. *Male-Female Talk in Summer Curriculum Workshop*. Unpublished Research Report. Malang-Urbana: Fulbright Commission.

Sack, H. 1984. Notes on Methodology. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. 1984. On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 28-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (in press). Sociolingustics and Intercultural Communication. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, (Online), (http://209.15.42.137/ ic.org. uk/publications/socio.pdf, retrieved 24 September 2005).

Tannen, D. 1998. *The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue*. New York: Random House.

Tracy, K. & Baratz, S. 1993. Intellectual Discussion in the Academy as Situated Discourse. *Communication Monograph,* 13: 301-320.

Tracy, K. & Carjuzaa, J. 1993. Identity Enactment in Intellectual Discussion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12 (3): 171-194.

Triandis, H.C. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

Viechnicki, G.B. 1997. An Empirical Analysis of Participant Intentions: Discourse in A Graduate Seminar. *Language & Communication*, 17 (2):103-131.

Waring, H.Z. 2000. *Discourse Strategies Used in Seminar Discussion: A Conversation Analytic Approach*. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Waring, H.Z. 2001. Balancing the Competing Interests in Seminar Discussion: Peer Referencing and Asserting Vulnerability. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 12 (1): 29- 50.

Wei, L. 2002. 'What do You Want Me to Say?' On the Conversation Analysis Approach to Bilingual Interaction. *Language and Society*, 31: 159-180.