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This study examines the relatively unexplored genre of argumentation for Korean EFL speakers. The data consisted of audio-recordings of a naturally occurring argumentative discussion between two non-native and two native university students. The argumentation was first analyzed by identifying the claims, counter-claims and supports that were made during the discussion. To observe the pragmatic aspects of the argumentative discussion, van Eemeren, Houtlosser, and Henkeman’s 2007 categorization of speech acts amongst the four stages of confrontation, opening, argumentation, and concluding for a critical discussion was examined for the two groups. In addition to the contextual and pragmatic factors, the participants’ perceptions on this genre and their awareness of their performance in stating claims and supports were examined through interviews and questionnaires. The results of the study revealed that there were particular pragmatic aspects which characterized the claims and supports of the participants that won the argument as well as features that differentiated the native and non-native speakers when engaged in argumentation. Suggestions for more instruction for the genre of argumentation in terms of the structure and pragmatic aspects of the content are given.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability for active spoken participation is an essential component for academic success in English speaking universities (Lucas & Murray, 2002; Murphy, 2005). To participate in this particular discourse community, students need to be aware of the pragmatic and sociocultural aspects needed to become active members within the academic discourse community. Recently, there have been reports of noticeable increases in the top three foreign student enrollments in U.S. colleges and universities. South Korea ranked third next to India and China and showed a significant increase of 11%, resulting in
a record high of 75,000 students having enrolled in U.S. higher education for the 2008-2009 academic year (The Chosun Ilbo, 2009). As more Korean students study abroad to further advance onto higher levels of education, proficient command of English is expected from all students regardless of their L1 (Ferris, 1998). A common issue amongst ESL students in English-speaking university content classrooms is the lack of English proficiency leading to inhibitions and frustration when engaging in speaking activities (Liu, 2001). The need for more studies on the academic speaking skills needed for university level students has not been met (Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b). In a subsequent study, Ferris (1998) examined the views of students and professors regarding the academic spoken skills needed for subject matter classes. The study found that while the students regarded formal speaking as an essential skill, professors considered communication and note-taking skills with more importance. However, studies have shown that students still regard academic speaking skills to be an area of difficulty that need to be overcome. The rise in English-medium lectures in Korean universities, have placed equal pressure on students within Korea who need to engage in English for academic purposes (Eun-Ju Kim, 2002).

Soonhyang Kim’s (2006) survey examined the academic speaking needs of East Asian international graduate students. This study revealed that Korean EFL university students regarded tasks such as group discussions and speaking presentation to be areas in which they experienced difficulty. The importance of explicit instruction on frequently used speaking communication tasks was included in the implications for EAP pedagogy. Explicit instruction on the ability to interrupt others in order to effectively express their own opinions was mentioned as a component needed for graduate studies. Stating an opinion calls for the ability to provide adequate support for the individual’s claim, a skill which is vital in the field of argumentation.

Argumentative discussions are needed in resolving the differences of opinion between two parties (van Eemeren, Grootendorst, & Snoeck, 2002). According to Schrieffen (1985), spoken argumentation is a genre in which the individual is simultaneously building support for their own position while undermining the opponent’s position. Argumentation is thus a skill which enables an individual to not only express their opinions, but have valid proof to support their claims. This skill is acknowledged to be an essential quality for students pursuing college or university studies in the US (Brown, 2009; Nemeth & Kormos, 2001). For EFL learners, this skill is considerably challenging to overcome due to the lack of input and the need to quickly adapt to the requirements and norms of a highly advanced academic context. Despite the importance of more awareness regarding this skill for Korean EFL learners, studies that examine the argumentation for advanced Korean EFL learners have not been studied. Therefore, this present study will examine a stretch of spoken argumentation between two native speakers (NS) of English and two non-native
Korean EFL learners (NNS). The study will examine the spoken argumentation between the two groups in terms of the structure, content, language use, and manner in which they proceed with the topic of *internet censorship*.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Theoretical Background on Spoken Interaction

   Spoken interaction requires not only the individual ability to talk but also encompasses the shared social activity of talking (Luoma, 2004). The interlocutors construct the process together and contribute to the resulting outcome of the interaction. Therefore, meaning is developed mutually by both the speaker and listener during spoken interaction through a system of turn-taking. The meaning is thus determined by the context and not predetermined in advance. As a result, conversational styles differ among various people and societies. Goffman (1974) however, was able to develop a list of the universal elements that occur in conversation:

   1. **Openings** - All societies have developed routine ways of beginning conversations.
   2. **Turn-taking** - All groups have subtle systems for deciding whose turn it is to speak.
   3. **Closings** - All societies have ritual ways of drawing conversations to a close.
   4. **Backchannel signals** - We all have developed verbal and non-verbal systems for the listener to give feedback to the speaker.
   5. **Repair systems** - All social groups have ways of ‘fixing’ a conversation if understanding breaks down.

   A conventional process for argumentative, critical discussion was developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984, 2002) in dealing with a difference of opinion in a rational way. The goal is to resolve the difference of opinion by determining the extent in which a particular standpoint is defensible. The process consists of the four stages of *confrontation, opening, argumentation*, and *concluding* stage.

2. Recent Models on Building Meaning and Discourse Representation

   According to Field (2008), the process of meaning building which a listener experiences from what the speaker says can be organized into three different levels. The first level considers the demands of having to retain excessive amount of words leading to great demands on the listener’s memory. The listener thus transforms what they have heard into
a proposition, ‘an abstract representation of a single idea’ (2008, p. 209). The idea of what is heard is stored, rather than the exact form of the words. A proposition is thus representative of the literal meaning of the clause, disregarding the context. Therefore, the listener needs to rely on the information given by world knowledge, topic knowledge, speaker knowledge, etc. for understanding the proposition’s relevance to the particular situation. An enriched version of the original proposition or a meaning representation occurs as a result. The last level of discourse representation is referring to the addition of the meaning representation to what has been said so far.

Expanding on the three levels of meaning is the building of a discourse representation. This representation is shown in figure 1. The three levels of meaning are included with the two additions of syntax, intonation and word meaning. Syntax and intonation is shown to highlight the need to relate syntax and intonation to the context in which they occur. Word meaning is included to show that when a word is decoded by the listener, a range of possibilities are retrieved rather than one single meaning. These two additions contribute to the final idea determined by the listener.

FIGURE 1
The Building of a Discourse Representation (Field, 2008, p. 242)

So far, the decisions on the relative significance of the content have been made at a local
level. Other decisions such as the omission of information due to insignificance are made at the global level. Commonly in the case for L2 listening, information might be omitted due to its interference with the discourse representation built so far resulting in the possibility for misunderstanding. The selection stage is in reference to the criteria that an expert listener considers in the inclusion or omission on the units of information. First and foremost, the listener determines what is perceived to be the intentions of the speaker. The contribution that the incoming piece of information has on the wider message that is apparently being conveyed by the speaker need to be determined. A second consideration is the listener’s purpose or goals for listening, an aspect that may not always be in alignment with those of the speaker. This representation is significant in that it shows that listeners are not simply taking in the information as given, but make their own judgments in the process of omitting, selecting and storing information. Therefore, the same utterance may constitute a variety of messages in the minds of different listeners. In the case for argumentation, the message which is determined by the speaker should be carefully considered on whether there is solid proof or supports to stay consistently on their claim. Therefore, the building of an information structure is vital for the participants of the argumentation in determining the pros and cons of the particular topic. The discourse representation that is constructed as a result is in terms of the specific genre of argumentation, an area which is relatively new in the field of L2 learning.

3. Background on Argumentation

The skill of spoken argumentation is a field which has not been studied at length within the context of L2 learning. Spoken argumentation is a genre that is very complex in structure (Kopperschmidt, 1985; Schiffrin, 1985; Toulmin, 1958; van Eemeren, Grootendorst, & Jacobs, 1997). Past research on arguments are embedded in various fields such as philosophy, rhetoric, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics (Schiffrin, 1985). As a result, studies have shown that L2 learners experience difficulty in having to produce argumentative texts (Connor, 1990; Connor & Lauer, 1988). Nonetheless, studies have identified the task of argumentation and debate to be a valuable and effective strategy to acquire for the improvement of L2 speaking and writing proficiency for advanced learners in particular (Connor, 1987; Massie, 2005; Sook-Kyung Jung, 2006).

4. Argumentation in the Field of Discourse Analysis

There have been significant studies implementing argumentation in the field of discourse analysis. Two in particular will be discussed in terms of this present study. One
of the most influential theories within this field is the pragmadialectical theory developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984). The theory integrates the pragmatic aspects along with the characteristics of argumentation. Argumentation is viewed as ideally being part of a critical discussion (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, p. 17). A critical discussion is an argumentative discussion in which the goal is to resolve the differences of opinion between the protagonist and antagonist. The two terms will be used interchangeably throughout this study. This process takes place through the following four stages: 1) confrontation stage, 2) opening stage, 3) argumentation stage, and 4) concluding stage (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 1992, 2004). The four stages will be used in this present study for analyzing the argumentative discussion at a macro-level.

Schiffrin (1985) analyzed the arguments that occur in everyday conversations. This study distinguished rhetorical argument from oppositional argument. Rhetorical argument is defined as “discourse through which a speaker presents an intact monologue supporting a disputable position.” Oppositional argument is “discourse in through which one or more speakers support openly disputed positions” (Schiffrin, 1985, p. 37). The terminology that will be used for this study in distinguishing the argumentative characteristics, will adopt the study of Nemeth and Kormos (2001). Within each of the stages in a critical discussion, Schiffrin’s (1985) analysis of arguments could be adapted in determining the various positions (POS) and supports (SUP) used to state their beliefs or positions and provide justification or support. However, the analysis of positions and supports were used for a rhetorical argument in which one speaker was justifying her beliefs. Therefore, the analysis from the study of Nemeth and Kormos (2001) was adopted for this study. Nemeth and Kormos (2001) drew on Toulmin’s (1958) model of argumentation and Varghese and Abraham’s (1998) adaptation of this model for analyzing L2 writing. The terminology used for this study will be further discussed in the analysis process.

5. Spoken Interaction in the Classroom

Studies that have focused on the English speaking skills needed by high-level L2 learners have mainly dealt with whole-class discussions and oral presentations (Lee, 2009; Leki, 2001; Morita, 2000, 2004; Murphy, 2005). Lee (2009) stressed the importance for more studies on international students in content classrooms or at the graduate level in the US. In general, language learners are focused on the main goal of learning the target language. However, students in content classrooms and even more for graduate level students it is presumed that they would be proficient in English to begin with. Therefore, the expectancy level is more advanced. This in turn highlights the need for more focus on high-level L2 learners in content-based classrooms.

The genre of argumentation has generally not been extensively dealt with for English
language learners. Nemeth and Kormos (2001) studied the effects of argumentation tasks for improving the pragmatic measures of task performance dealing with the number of claims and supports. However, the study was focused more on the general pragmatic aspects of task performance in terms of task type. A recent study by Brown (2009) addressed argumentation and debate in an EFL setting. The study focused on the application of debate activities for university foreign language classes. Jung (2006) presented a study on the effectiveness of implementing a debate class for the promotion of speaking skills of high level students. These studies have revealed the value of using argumentative strategies. However, there have not been studies that have analyzed the argumentation techniques of native and non-native speakers of English. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the spoken argumentation of NS and NNS in terms of the structure, content, and pragmatic awareness.

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. What differences characterize the argumentation for NS and NNS at the macro-level in terms of content and structure?
2. How does the micro-level analysis of NS and NNS argumentation differ in terms of structure, language use, and manner of speech?
3. How do NS and NNS perceive argumentative discussions?

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Participants

Two groups of university level students participated in the study. The NS consisted of two native speakers of English and the NNS group included two Korean learners of English. The native speakers had recently moved to Korea after having graduated from a university in the United States. Both participants were born in the US and have lived there for the past 15 ~ 20 years. Regarding their majors, Anne has received a Bachelor of Fine Arts and Jane has graduated with a degree in economics. The non-native speakers were enrolled in the graduating class of a university in Korea. They are English education majors and are high-level L2 learners of English as determined by their TOEFL iBT scores averaging in the upper advanced range of 96-110.

2. Data Collection

The argumentative discussions were audio-recorded and transcribed by the researcher.
The recorded data consisted of the critical discussion between two groups of NS and NNS on the topic of internet censorship. The NNS group and NS group met with the researcher for the recording. The topic was initiated by the researcher and the groups met at different times for the audio-recordings. The researcher did not contribute to the argumentation. The recording was transcribed and organized in terms of AS-units for analysis and to ensure that the two recordings were comparable (see Appendix A for the AS-unit categorizations).

1) Targeted Structures

The transcriptions were analyzed for the claims and supports which were made by the participants while engaged in an argumentative discussion. Within the identified structures, the content of the claims and supports were further examined in terms of the speech acts identified by van Eemeren et al. (2007) based on the typology of speech acts distinguished by Searle (1979).

2) Interview

The interview was conducted after the discussion took place in order to gain insight into the participants’ overall perceptions on taking part in an argumentative discussion. To provide an environment in which the participants would express their opinion freely, the interview was conducted in their native language. There were no structured questions formed initially for the interview itself since it was focused more on letting the participants speak freely on their perception of engaging in argumentation.

3) Listening Activity

In order to determine which features the participants noticed about their performance in contributing to the argumentative discussion, they were individually asked to listen to their own recording and fill out a questionnaire on how they would rate their performance. Also, they were free to determine which aspects they would like to improve on and comment on the overall content, organization, and manner in which they contributed to the discussion. The written responses were also in their native language.

3. Analysis

The transcriptions were analyzed in terms of the content within the framework of the ideal model of critical discussion at a macro-level. Within the four stages, the data was analyzed at a micro-level. The first step was to examine the frequency of use of the
argumentative characteristics of claim, support, counter-claim, and counter-support in terms of the AS-units in comparing the NS and the NNS. Within the categorization, the various speech acts which were applicable in terms of its function in resolving differences of opinions were categorized.

1) Macro-level Analysis

Van Eemeren et al. (2002) made a distinction between an argumentative discussion and an informative discussion. An argumentative discussion is a means to rationally handle a difference of opinion in determining the extent in which a particular standpoint is defensible. An informative discussion differs in regards to its purpose. This type of discussion focuses on conveying information. Frequently, the two types are combined in real-life contexts. When the participants are aware of the differences in their viewpoints, the realization naturally leads to the endeavor to determine the view which is most defensible. The participants of the discussion need to be acknowledged on each other's viewpoints. Therefore the discussion is not merely focused on informing an individual on a particular subject and is thus appropriately viewed to be an argumentative discussion (van Eemeren et al. 2002, p. 25).

The process of resolving a difference of a viewpoint can be organized analytically by the following four stages:

1) The confrontation stage is where the participants establish the differences of their opinion.
2) The opening stage is when both parties decide to attempt to resolve the differences of opinion. This stage is when the roles of protagonist and antagonist are assigned.
3) The argumentation stage is when the parties defend their standpoint. The protagonist would be defending against the antagonist with counterarguments.
4) In the concluding stage both parties assess the degree in which the contrasting views have been resolved and in whose favor.

It should be noted that this model is an 'ideal' model of a critical discussion and therefore, does not claim that all argumentative discussions go through the four steps or adhere by the particular order shown above. It is also apparent that in real-life discussions, very little time might be spent on the opening stage as well. However, this model allows for the identification of necessary elements which are missing or inadequately represented when the discussion fails to clearly identify the differences of opinion. For example, comparison with the model makes it possible to say that, in one instance, the discussion fails because the difference of opinion has not been clearly identified (van Eemeren et al.,
The following is an example of the four stages taken from the critical discussion between native speakers on the topic of internet censorship.

1. Confrontation stage
   Anne: We don’t need internet censorship...it’s ridiculous!
   Jane: Why would you say that?

2. Opening stage
   Anne: There’s no real risk of having your information out on the internet
   That is...it’s a total personal choice.
   Jane: There are plenty of risks!
   There are instances where people’s identities have been stole and used on-line.

3. Argumentation stage
   Anne: Well...if you’re too lazy to leave your house to go to the bank to take care of your business...you deserve to get your identity stolen.
   Jane: That’s not part of the...
   Anne: I’m just saying if you decide to use the convenience of internet banking...you should be able to handle the risk...and knowing when you sign up for internet banking that identity theft is definitely a risk...that’s your fault...with the person who finds out...not you personally.

4. Concluding stage
   Jane: Okay...that’s true.

* Pseudo-names have been used for the participants in this study

At the confrontation stage, the differences of opinion have been established when Jane does not immediately accept Anne’s claim. This leads the discussion into the opening stage in which the roles of the interlocutors are decided and they begin to state their claims. In this particular discussion, Anne is arguing for internet censorship to be banned while Jane is stating the need for censorship in dealing with the risks of being on-line. At the argument stage, both parties are beginning to support their claims. In this instance, Anne is supporting her claim by arguing that issues such as identity theft is a responsibility on the individual who decides to use the convenience of on-line banking instead of physically walking to the bank. The concluding stage is shown with Jane agreeing with Anne on the previous argument on the individual having responsibility in terms of taking a risk with their personal information.
2) Micro-level Analysis

The argumentation analysis at the micro-level consisted of the following terms of claims, support, counter-claims and counter-support. Claims were defined as “a statement or proposition that the arguer wants the audience to accept and/or act upon,” and support consisted of “facts, examples, data, etc. offered in support of a claim” (Varghese and Abraham, 1998, p. 292). Nemeth and Kormos (2001) defined counter-claim as “a statement or proposition that refutes the interlocutor’s claim, and facts,” and counter-support was “examples and data offered in support of the counter-claim” (2001, p. 223).

The total number of claims were counted and combined including the counter-claims and supports were also totaled with the inclusion of the counter-supports. According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), complexity could be measured in terms of the frequent usage of a particular language function that is linguistically and cognitively challenging or that indicates a ‘sophisticated’ knowledge regarding the conventions belonging to a particular type of discourse. In this case, the use of the following features: claim, support, counter-claim, and counter-support in terms of the total AS-units of the spoken data.

Excerpts 1 and 2 illustrate the identification of such features for both the native and non-native groups.

Excerpt (1)

36. Anne [C] I think total face to face confrontation is going to be more effective than reading something that some people wrote.
37. Jane [CC] Well...you’re talking about face to face...that’s not on the internet then.
38. Anne [S] Face to face is more...how can I say...is more effective in making someone feel bad because you can give them all your dirty looks.
39. Jane [CC] But that doesn’t stop people from slandering people on-line.
40. [CS] Slandering happens all the time these days.

Excerpt (2)

144. Lee [C] It’s not like about the internet..like the problem does not lie in the internet but the users...
145. [S] Like what we have to do is educate the people..not actually censor what we have and the information in it.
146. Park [CC] But there should be a guideline at least.
147. [CS] We should do this way...like internet users in the right direction.


To analyze the pragmatic aspects of the critical discussion, van Eemeren et al.’s (2007) categorization of implementing speech acts was adopted for this study. The speech acts
were based on those proposed by Searle (1979) and consists of five types: assertives, directives, commissives, and expressives. The following table includes van Eemeren et al.'s adaptation of speech acts in examining the pragmatic characteristics and relevance to verbal communication directed at resolving a difference of opinion.

### TABLE 1

**Speech Acts for Argumentation (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, pp. 109-112)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech acts</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>The speaker is committing him/herself to the truth of a proposition or in a broader sense, the speaker gives his/her view on the event of the proposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>Commissives may play different roles in a critical discussion: (1) to accept a standpoint or not; (2) to accept a challenge to defend a standpoint; (3) to decide to begin a discussion; (4) to agree to take on the part of protagonist or antagonist; (5) to agree with the rules of discussion; (6) to accept argumentation or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Their constructive function is to challenge the party who has come up with a standpoint, to request arguments to support the standpoint, or to request an explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage declaratives</td>
<td>The purpose of usage declaratives is to provide a definition, to explain, and to elucidate i.e. increase or facilitate the listener's understanding of other speech acts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 is illustrating the speech acts which were relevant and played a constructive role in a critical discussion according to the four stages of a critical discussion. The constructive role is referring to the contribution made in resolving a difference of opinion. After the identification of the claims and supports of groups A and B, the particular speech acts were identified in determining the actual effectiveness of the statements in terms of the argumentative structure. The effective use of such speech acts allow for the speakers to efficiently state their claims, counter-claims and supports in defending and explaining their viewpoints.

The identified speech acts for argumentation can also be organized in terms of the four stages of critical discussion mentioned earlier for the macro-analysis of the data. This organization is shown below in Figure 2.
FIGURE 2
Distribution of Speech Acts among the Four Stages of a Critical Discussion
(van Eemeren et al., 2007, p. 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Confrontation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Concluding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This distribution is an ‘ideal’ representation of how the speech acts would theoretically be distributed in the various stages of the ideal model of critical discussion mentioned earlier. This distribution is truly an ideal representation and therefore, does not mean that all critical discussions abide by this format. According to van Eemeren et al. (2002) the discrepancies between theory and practice do not diminish its usefulness as a tool for identifying where a real-life argumentative discussion goes wrong. Therefore, the four phases that make up the ideal model of critical discussion will be used to analyze instances in which the discussion has failed due to instances such as the difference of opinion have not been clearly identified.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following presents the results of the detailed quantitative analysis on the argumentative qualities of native and non-native discussions on the topic of Internet censorship.
1. Complexity in terms of Claims and Supports

In order to compare the transcribed data for groups A and B, the data was organized in terms of AS-units to check for the comparability between the two texts of spoken data. Group A's transcription consisted of 281 AS-units while group B resulted in 343 AS-units as shown in Table 2 below. Group A consists of the speakers who won the argument and group B are the speakers who lost the argument on internet censorship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>A(NNS)</th>
<th>B(NNS)</th>
<th>A(NS)</th>
<th>B(NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-units</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complexity of the text in terms of claims, supports, and counterclaims were categorized for each of the macro-level stages of confrontation, opening, argumentation, and concluding. ‘None’ refers to fillers such as *Uh huh, like, uh, oh, right, well,* etc. These *fillers,* or *hesitations markers,* are strategies used by speakers in order to create time to speak (Luoma, 2004). The fillers found in the discussions were classified as a component which occurs frequently in spoken language for the flow of conversation. However, they do not constructively contribute to the particular message itself as defined in Hasselgren’s (1998) investigation of the use of filler words with groups of children. Thus for the present study, the focal point of the frequency analysis dealt with the interlocuters’ statements of claim, support, counter-claim within the macro-structure of an argumentative discussion. Tables 3 and 4 below show the frequencies of the particular structures that occurred during the four ideal stages of an argumentative discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Concluding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>60 (18.1%)</td>
<td>23 (6.9%)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterclaim</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>23 (6.9%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7 (2.1%)</td>
<td>60 (18.1%)</td>
<td>26 (7.8%)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>15 (4.5%)</td>
<td>64 (19.3%)</td>
<td>34 (10.2%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14 (4.2%)</td>
<td>25 (7.5%)</td>
<td>207 (62.3%)</td>
<td>86 (25.9%)</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comparative Study of Argumentation Structure Between Native and Non-native Speakers of English

TABLE 4
The Structural Analysis of Native Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Concluding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(21.4%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
<td>(34.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterclaim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
<td>(28.3%)</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>(35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>(9.9%)</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.6%)</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>(71.7%)</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Tables 3 and 4 show infrequent instances of claims, counterclaims, supports and fillers in the opening stage compared to the other stages of a critical discussion. The opening stage occurs when the different roles of protagonist and antagonist are assigned. The interlocutors have decided to work toward resolving the difference of opinion. This stage is commonly taken for granted and may not be shown explicitly in the argumentation. Therefore, after the difference in opinion is recognized, the dialogue may proceed straight into the argumentation stage (van Eemeren, Grootendorst, & Snoeck, 2002). The frequent use of fillers by non-native speakers was also shown in the analysis. This was especially apparent during the opening and concluding stages. This feature noticeably influenced the way claims were made by the interlocutors. Fillers instill a certain amount of uncertainty in the form of hesitation markers for both parties of the discussion since the particular features do not contribute in supporting or claiming a viewpoint in favor of the genre of argumentation. Due to the frequent use of fillers by the non-native speakers, there were several instances in which one speaker would start a claim and the other speaker would provide particular words or phrases in assisting their counterpart so that the discussion would proceed without being held up for too long. Excerpt (3) example illustrates this feature.

Excerpt (3)

11. Lee: I wouldn't really think that censorship could actually...I don't know...like...
12. Park Prevent [the...]
13: Lee: [Right..protect the..uhm..]
14. Park Protect the human rights or...

In contrast, the native speakers stated their claims without the additional assistance of their counterpart as can be seen in Excerpt (4).
2. Structural Analysis at the Macro-level

In terms of the frequency of the claims and supports, the native speakers generally exhibited higher portions of claims and supports than the non-native speakers. The claims and supports were made mostly during the confronting and argumentation stage. According to van Eemeren et al. (2007), these two stages occur when the differences of opinion are determined and in which the individual claims are supported. Therefore, the interlocutors need to include valid claims and supports for the discussion to proceed. However, for non-native speakers, more time was spent during the opening and concluding stages. The native speakers on the other hand, spent less time in comparison. Excerpt 6 illustrates the opening phase for the non-native speakers.

Excerpt (5) Opening

101. Park: part..partly I think censorship is needed because in schools you have regulations.
102. Lee: Regulations...and you like those regulations?
103. Park: Well..some parts we have to give in our freedom to promote like bigger..like to get..bigger goods.
104. Lee: Right..for the right of a larger group.
105. Park: Uh huh...
106. Lee: Well...
107. Park: ..and people will do whatever they want to...if they are guaranteed like freedom...total complete freedom.
108. Lee: Right...

The opening stage is characterized by the interlocutors’ attempts in resolving the difference of opinion before moving on to the argumentation stage. In excerpt 5, it is apparent that after Park states her claim on comparing the need for censorship with school regulations. Lee is trying to come to terms with Park’s claims by asking a question on her opinion on regulations. However, it is evident from this sample that Park’s original claim of needing censorship similar to how schools have regulations is not fully supported with relevant supports. This creates a sense of ambiguity and in turn results in Lee questioning the particular claim with responses which are mostly fillers or one word answers.

In contrast, the native group’s opening stage is characterized with claims coming from
both of the interlocutors in coming to terms with the differences of opinions. This feature is shown below in excerpt (6).

Excerpt (6) Opening
83. Jane Cannibalism is a big issue...as well as suicide...and if there are sites that promote these kinds of activities...then it gives people an outlet to actually express these kinds of thoughts that could be very dangerous.
84. Anne Right...I would say that even if it weren't for the internet...there's this incredible force called the word of mouth. You can see it in Korea. Moms all the time...talking about where they're gonna send their kids. The word of mouth is powerful.

The native speakers display more direct and assertive claims during the opening stage. Jane is agreeing partially to Anne regarding the seriousness of the issues that are mentioned. However, Anne presents a counter-claim that is stated after acknowledging Jane's claim. The opening is very brief in terms of the way Jane and Anne exchange one turn of talk and proceeds quickly into the next argument consisting of claims, counter-claims and supports.

Table 5 shows the frequency of the argumentative features made by the interlocutors Park and Jane, who were unable to carry through with their claims (group B). This resulted in the discussion concluding in favor of their counterparts. Table 6 shows Lee and Anne's (group A) use of terms in directing the discussion in their favor.

### TABLE 5
The Argument Structure Analysis of Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Concluding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td>5 (2.1%)</td>
<td>34 (14.0%)</td>
<td>18 (7.4%)</td>
<td>61 (25.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterclaim</td>
<td>10 (4.1%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>36 (14.8%)</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td>52 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>7 (2.9%)</td>
<td>41 (16.9%)</td>
<td>11 (4.5%)</td>
<td>61 (25.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>6 (2.5%)</td>
<td>41 (16.9%)</td>
<td>20 (8.2%)</td>
<td>69 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (7.4%)</td>
<td>20 (8.2%)</td>
<td>152 (62.6%)</td>
<td>53 (21.8%)</td>
<td>243 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
The Argument Structure Analysis of Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Concluding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>(23.2%)</td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
<td>(33.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterclaim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(35.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
<td>(13.5%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(23.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
<td>(69.5%)</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Table 6 show that on average, the interlocutors who were able to direct the argumentation to their favor produced more utterances during the actual argumentation and confrontation than their counterparts. Additionally, the figures show that on average, the successful interlocutors spent less time during the opening stage. The highest figures accounted for the argumentation stage in terms of Lee and Anne’s arguments consisted of more claims and supports than Park and Jane, thus showing the importance of being able to state various claims and supports in presenting, opposing, or defending a viewpoint during argumentation. Excerpt 7 illustrates how Lee successfully directed the argumentation by stating her claims while Park was unable to contribute her viewpoints by stating counter-claims to Lee’s claims.

Excerpt (7) Lee’s claims and supports
124. Lee Yeah…people can say what they want to say and people can access to all the information necessary that they want to get
125. Lee Well nowadays…like Twitter…that’s a big thing
126. Lee Uhm::I am not a big Twitter person but I do have a web blog…yeah..I do sign up there on a regular basis..what is good about that is that I can get Spontaneous responses from various people around the world..which is well… the interest..like I..
129. Lee If I don’t want to get those information..then I would not follow them
130. Park [Right…
131. Lee [That’s what we do
132. Lee If we follow them we get the information…like I can definitely control what I want to get and for instance…even that information about the …what was it?
134. Loser?
135. Loser? Loser?
136. Park Oh…:the loser
137. Lee Person…yeah…:the personal information of a loser..
138. Park Well…if I’m not interested in it…then I would not access to it
139. Park Yeah…
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In excerpt (7), Lee is stating her claim on the accessibility of information available for everyone on the internet in lines 124-125. From lines 126-127, she supports her claim with an example of Twitter, a social networking and blogging service. This is followed by another claim in line 130 in which she states that it is her own choice on whether or not to gain particular information that is offered. In line 131, Park makes a commissive remark of agreeing to Lee’s claim. However, as can be seen in lines 136-137, Park is unable to counter any claims made by Lee.

3. Pragmatic Aspects in Terms of Speech Acts

Table 7 is comparing the speech acts of each interlocutor depending on whether they are a non-native or a native speaker. As mentioned earlier, the non-native group used significantly more fillers when compared to the native speakers. In terms of the interlocutors who concluded the argumentation in their favor, it is noticeable that they implemented more assertive speech acts than their counterparts. This can also be seen by their infrequent use of commissives. Commissive speech acts characterize the act of agreeing or disagreeing with what has been said. These speech acts frequently display collaboration on both sides in agreeing with the rules of the discussion such as whether or not to start a new discussion or determining the relevance of a claim (van Eemeren et al., 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Non-Native speaker</th>
<th>Native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L (212 units)</td>
<td>P (120 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>52 (24.53%)</td>
<td>25 (20.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>16 (7.55%)</td>
<td>19 (15.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage dec</td>
<td>70 (33.02%)</td>
<td>19 (15.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissive</td>
<td>19 (8.96%)</td>
<td>15 (12.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>55 (25.94%)</td>
<td>42 (35.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
Comparisons of Speech Acts Between Non-Native and Native Speakers
Excerpt (8) Speech Acts

108. Anne  Opinions change…
109.       everything changes…
110. what you have to really look at is the source
111. Where does it come from?
110. You cannot pick anyone’s word and be like, “Oh my god…this is what
111. the world thinks about me!”
111. You have to look at the source.
112. Jane  Well…exactly!
113. Because if a second grader said something like that…he wouldn’t
114. Anne  Well…okay…a second or third grader…
115 a second or third grader…
116. What about a seventh grader expressing her personal opinion about how
horrible the president was being in the United States?

Excerpt 8 shows the various features of speech acts which were analyzed in the analysis. Assertive speech acts are performed when the speaker is assertively claiming a standpoint. An example of the speech act would be Anne’s claim expressed by such phrases as “…what you have to look at is the source” which is repeated again for emphasis. Commissive speech acts however, have less assertiveness. This characteristic is shown in this example as the acceptance of a standpoint which can be seen by Jane agreeing with Anne’s claim. Another notable characteristic is the way Jane supports the claim. This can be noticed by Jane’s use of “because,” followed by more details. Anne uses the directive speech act to request for an explanation from Jane in the case of “a seventh grader expressing her personal opinion.” Finally, Jane explains the request from Anne by providing more insight into the initial claim made. From the sample data above,

4. Interview

Oral interviews were conducted after the initial argumentative discussion was recorded. The interview was given to each participant individually. An open-ended question was given by the researcher which asked them for their thoughts on having participated in the argumentative discussion. Since the interview took place almost immediately or within the hour of having completed the argumentative discussion, the participants were able to recount their experience with ease.

1) Non-native Speakers

The non-native speakers were given the option to respond in either their L1 or L2. Both speakers decided to speak in their L1. The two samples below are therefore a translated
version which illustrates Lee’s and Park’s perspective on argumentation.

(1) Lee’s response
I want to study in the U.S. in the near future. Since English is not my first language, I feel the need to practice speaking academically, not just casually. It is hard to get this type of practice at school. I think I was able to express my opinions pretty well, but at times I was unable to think of the right terms or fit my thoughts into a logical sentence quickly. It was very difficult to organize my thoughts when Park was not responding to what I was saying.

(2) Park’s response
This discussion was a challenge for me. I don’t think it is all related to the fact that English is my second language. It was just hard for me to think of what to say in general. Being unsure of certain terminology and on how to state grammatically correct sentences distracted me from being able to say what I wanted to say.

Both Lee and Park expressed the challenge of having to think of the proper terminology and grammatical structures during the argumentation. Considering the high English proficiency of both participants, the need for more awareness and instruction on the concept of stating claims and supports was apparent. These concerns support previous studies that have shown that pragmalinguistic forms and sociopragmatic rules need to be supported with pragmatic instruction for learners to notice them (Kasper & Rose, 2002) which in turn calls for some form of instruction to develop pragmatic proficiency (Takahashi, 2001).

2) Native Speakers

(1) Anne’s response
This discussion on internet censorship was pretty subdued, considering the other argumentative discussions that I have taken part in. I think it really depends on who you’re arguing with. In this case, Jane’s claims or disagreements weren’t really difficult to overturn or challenge.

---

1 Only the relevant content in terms of their perspectives on argumentation were selected to be shown as samples.
(2) Jane’s response

I think I lost my focus toward the end of the argument. It might have something to do with the fact that the more I discussed the issue of internet censorship, I began to realize that maybe this isn’t an issue which can be strictly divided into pros and cons. I don’t know...I think it varies depending on the context you put it in.

Anne and Jane’s responses dealt mostly with the affective factors in putting forth their claims. Anne recalled the ease in which she was able to counter Jane’s claims. On the other hand, Jane expressed the difficulty of staying focused and suggested that the topic of internet censorship is difficult to categorize as a pro or a con.

5. Questionnaire

The participants were sent a sound file of their particular argumentation along with questions dealing with their views on how they performed during the discussion and on the affective factors involved during the discussion. The questionnaire asked for their initial response after having heard the recording of the particular argumentative discussion.

1) Non-native Speakers

In summarizing their responses, both Park and Lee expressed bewilderment after hearing their argumentation. Lee mentioned the incompleteness of her claims in which she stated that she hardly finished any of her sentences. Park also mentioned incompleteness in her claims and even pointed out that she sounded very hesitant and nervous.

2) Native Speakers

Jane responded with regret on not being able to state more assertive claims. She stated that after listening to the recording, it was clear that she lost track of what Anne was saying. Anne responded that if she could do it over again, she would include more claims and supports dealing with privacy issues. An issue that she would mention specifically would deal with the role of the government after the 9/11 attack in the U.S.

Overall, the non-native speakers expressed concern for the structural aspects of argumentation in terms of claims and supports. In contrast, the native speakers responded more on content related issues that would have placed more validity on their claims to lead the argument in their favor.
V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The analysis of the argumentation of native and non-native speakers at the university level revealed the importance of structural and pragmatic elements specific to the genre. The analysis of the structure at a macro-level showed overall, the non-native speakers spent the least amount of time actually engaged in the stages of confrontation or argumentation. More dialogue took place in the opening and concluding stages of the discussion. This shows the general lack of knowledge regarding the genre of argumentation. Another feature shown by the non-native speakers was the frequent use of fillers which distracted the ability to clearly state claims, counter-claims, and supports in confronting and validating their viewpoints effectively. Since argumentation is a genre which considers the ability to assert claims along with the appropriate supports as significant indicators, the overuse of fillers created confusion and distracted the discussion from taking its course. Additionally, it conflicted with allowing one speaker to fully state their claim. Fillers resulted in the participants’ attempts to finish each other’s sentences and assist in certain terminology preventing the flow of the dialogue. On this note, native speakers’ use of fillers was considerably lower than the non-native speakers. There were no instances in which the two interlocutors had to assist each other in stating their claims or supports. Regardless, of any uncertainty being expressed during the attempt to state a claim, there were no interruptions or assistance given before the complete claim had been expressed. This brings up the need for more awareness on the part of the interlocutors on how fillers could negatively impact the flow of conversation in terms of the genre of argumentation.

Regarding the pragmatic aspects of the argumentation, it was noted that the non-native speakers were less assertive and direct in their utterances whereas the native speakers used considerably more commissive speech acts in their utterances. The assertive and usage declarative speech acts were characteristics that were found in the participants who lead the argument in their favor. For the non-native group, Lee’s claims and supports were more assertive and showed a considerably high use of usage declaratives. This suggests that providing a clear explanation or definition in facilitating the listener’s understanding was found to be effective in winning the argument. For the native speakers, Anne used significantly more assertive speech acts in stating her claims and supports. For native speakers, the ability to commit to a particular claim and to present viable supports in terms of their views on the claim was found to be essential quality for winning in their favor.

The skill of effectively delivering a viewpoint is a challenge for both native and non-native speakers. However, L2 learners do not have the automatized skills to process the target language as native speakers do when engaged in collaborative dialogue (Rost, 2002). The in-depth analysis of native and non-native argumentation reveals not only the
pragmatic characteristics of what constitutes a winning argument but suggests for more instruction in terms of the particular aspects specific to this genre in terms of the structure and pragmatic aspects of the content. The questionnaire and interview also support the need for more awareness in this area for high level EFL learners with goals for higher education in the U.S. More awareness on the specifics of the genre of argumentation could amount to the improvement of EFL learners to effectively express their viewpoints and to have their voices heard within an environment in which high proficiency of English is assumed and one’s viewpoints need to be expressed.
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### APPENDIX A

The Analysis of Speech Unit (Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of the unit</th>
<th>An AS-unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An independent clause</em> will be minimally a clause including a finite verb:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>I take a different way</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An independent sub-clausal unit</em> will consist of: either one or more phrases which can be elaborated to a full clause by means of recovery of ellipted elements from the context of the discourse or situation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: <em>how long you stay here</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: <em>three months.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or a minor utterance, which will be defined as one of the class of ‘Irregular sentences’ or ‘Nonsentences’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Oh poor woman</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Yes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A subordinate clause</em> will consist minimally of a finite or non-finite Verb element plus at least one other clause element (Subject, Object, Complement or Adverbial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In cases where coordination of verb phrases occurs, the coordinated phrases will normally be considered to belong to the same AS-unit, unless the first phrase is marked by falling or rising intonation and is followed by a pause of at least 0.5 seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A final adverbial clause should be within the same tone unit as at least one of the other preceding clause elements of the AS-unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. False starts, repetitions, and self-corrections

Dysfluency features, such as false starts, repetitions, and corrections, will be excluded. However, it is necessary to distinguish between those repetitions which indicate dysfluency, and those which are used for rhetorical effect.

{what about} can you give me a credit slip?
{I think :: they're a very} they have good time
{it's a very very bad man}

3. Topicalization

Noun phrase satellite units which are separated from the following AS-unit by falling intonation and a pause (equal to or greater than 0.5 sec) will be treated as separate AS-units.

{And especially the basic education (0.5)} they have to pass automatically from one grade to another
(2 AS-units)

4. Interruption and scaffolding

In the following example, the subordinate clause is latched to the preceding utterance by the same speaker, but speaker B has interrupted. In this case, A’s utterances would be analysed as one AS-unit with 3 clauses provided that the previously stated criteria for including a final adverbial in the preceding AS-unit are met.

A: oh that's a big problem
B: oh no!
A: :: because my shop's policy is only :: to give the credits for the return goods
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