

Verbal and nonverbal disagreement in an ELF academic discussion task

Chen Liu, Kim McDonough, Pavel Trofimovich, & Pakize Uludag



Liu, C., McDonough, K., Trofimovich, P., & Uludag, P. (2022). Verbal and nonverbal disagreement in an ELF academic discussion task. *Applied Linguistics Review*. Published online 13 April 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0043>

Verbal and Nonverbal Disagreement in an ELF Academic Discussion Task

1 Introduction

English is spoken as a lingua franca in academic contexts where speakers of different first languages and cultures interact with each other using English as a medium of communication (Firth 1996; Seidlhofer 2005). As the mobility of international students, staff, and scholars worldwide increases, English as a lingua franca (ELF) use in academic settings has become more common. As a result, an increasing number of studies have explored experiences and practices of ELF interactions in European (e.g., Björkman 2015; Seidlhofer 2020) and Asian academic contexts (e.g., Seongyong and Arum 2020; Sung 2020). Whereas ELF interactions have been observed to be consensus-oriented, mutually supportive, and cooperative (Seidlhofer 2001), disagreement may be unavoidable because academic discourse is based on exchanging and challenging ideas.

Disagreement has been defined as a situation in which a speaker considers an addressee's utterance untrue and reacts with an oppositional utterance (Rees-Miller 2000). Although typically defined through reference to verbal behavior, disagreement can also be expressed through nonverbal cues such as gaze aversion, smiles, facial expressions, as well as head and hand gestures (Bousmalis et al., 2013). However, few studies to date have explored nonverbal aspects of disagreement while also considering ELF students' perspectives (Toomaneejinda and Harding 2018) and even fewer have examined ELF interactions in North American contexts. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing body of research by examining the verbal features and visual cues employed by ELF speakers in relation to their

perceptions of disagreement as revealed through stimulated recall in an English medium university in the North America.

2 Literature Review

The traditional conception of disagreement as an uncooperative and face-threatening speech act (Brown and Levinson 1987) has generated considerable research to identify the verbal strategies employed to mitigate such threats. Previous studies have classified disagreement features in terms of the broad categories of mitigated or unmitigated (Björkman 2015; Georgakopoulou 2001; Rees-Miller 2000; Toomaneejinda and Harding, 2018). Mitigated features such as token agreement, hedges, and explanations minimize the directness of the disagreement (Kreutel 2007). Among mitigated features, hedging was used most frequently by both second language (L2) and ELF speakers (e.g., Kreutel 2007; Lawson 2009; Maíz-Arévalo 2014). As for the types of hedges, Lawson (2009) found that *I don't think (so)*, mid-speech pause, and meaningless fillers (e.g., *uhm/eh*) were used frequently by Japanese speakers of English. Maíz-Arévalo's (2014) study, on the other hand, showed that *I think*, modal verbs, and modal adverbs were the most frequent hedges used by ELF students. Unmitigated features, on the other hand, include direct negation markers (e.g., *no*), blunt statements of the opposite, and the performative (i.e., *I disagree*) (Bjørge 2012; Kreutel 2007; Toomaneejinda and Harding 2018).

Some researchers have reported that ELF speakers choose to avoid explicit disagreement, instead preferring mitigated disagreements in both face-to-face and online academic conversations. For example, Bjørge (2012) examined a corpus of team and

individual negotiations involving business students at a Norwegian university. Analysis of students' conversations showed that mitigated disagreement such as token agreement, appreciation, and apology occurred more frequently than unmitigated disagreement.

However, team negotiations had elicited more unmitigated disagreement features than the individual negotiations. Also exploring face-to-face academic conversations, Toomaneejinda and Harding (2018) compared discussions of ELF students in a British university during a discussion and a simulated meeting. They found that very few disagreements were performative; instead, the speakers adopted a variety of mitigated strategies to disagree, including hedges and apologies. Moving from face-to-face context to an online classroom setting, Maíz-Arévalo (2014) reported that ELF speakers at a Spanish university mostly used mitigation such as token agreement, hedges, and clarification requests during an online academic discussion.

Although disagreement is typically expressed indirectly with mitigated features, in academic settings, disagreement is not necessarily perceived as face threatening (e.g., Angouri 2012; Sifianou 2012); as a result, it may not require mitigation as claimed by Brown and Levinson (1987). For example, House (2008) investigated disagreements in an ELF context, analyzing office hour interactions between teaching staff and university students in German universities. The teaching staff used more direct and unmitigated ways such as a straight *no* to disagree with students during advising sessions. Also focusing on office hour interactions between PhD students and their advisors in a Swedish university, Björkman (2015) found that ELF students preferred explicit and direct disagreements such as

disagreeing in the turn-initial position with *but I think* and negations *no/not*. Thus, disagreement tends to be expressed in an unmitigated and direct way in some academic contexts, particularly in conversations between teaching staff and students. To sum up, there are conflicting findings as to the extent to which ELF speakers in academic settings verbally mitigate disagreements, which raises the possibility that ELF speakers signal mitigation visually rather than verbally.

A limited number of studies have discussed how ELF speakers employ nonverbal strategies when disagreeing. In a recent study, Matsumoto (2018) illustrated how an ELF student used nonverbal interactional resources such as smiles, metaphoric gestures, beat gestures, and gaze aversion to disagree with his teacher in an academic writing class at an American university. On the other hand, in Toomaneejinda and Harding's (2018) research, ELF students preferred indirect disagreement and used nonverbal resources such as eye gaze behaviors to function as a replacement for mitigated disagreement. In a similar way, several qualitative studies have shown that nonverbal resources such as smiling, eye gaze, and gestures are associated with disagreement in academic settings (Fujimoto 2012; Jacquin 2018).

To shed further light on the verbal and nonverbal features of disagreement, ELF students' perspectives need to be considered when deciding whether a disagreement has occurred. Locher and Watts (2005) argued that what is polite or impolite should depend on the interlocutor's perspective rather than the researcher's perception. That is, what appears to be disagreement might not be disagreement for the speaker while what seems to be an

agreement actually might be a disagreement. However, interlocutor perspectives are rarely considered in disagreement research because researchers identify disagreement by searching transcripts for episodes that conform to existing definitions of disagreement (e.g., Björkman 2015). Thus, it is methodologically important to incorporate speaker perspectives when examining disagreement episodes.

In addition to identifying disagreement episodes, speaker interpretations are necessary to shed light on whether they perceive disagreements as “conflict” (Waldron and Applegate 1994) or “an opportunity to acquire new knowledge” (Björkman 2015). One way to uncover speaker perspectives during the task is through a stimulated recall, which is a research tool used to prompt participants to recollect and recall the thoughts they had during the task (Gass and Mackey 2000). Additionally, existing research has not explored how ELF speakers express disagreement nonverbally while also considering their perspectives. In light of the importance of disagreements in academic settings, ELF speakers’ perceptions of disagreement are needed in order to understand whether they perceive them as face-threatening. Similarly, it is necessary to connect speakers’ perspectives with their verbal and nonverbal behaviors to identify the multimodal nature of disagreements in academic ELF discourse.

To summarize, researchers have reported mixed findings as to whether L2 speakers in academic settings mitigate when they verbally disagree. However, very few studies have investigated nonverbal cues of disagreement or considered ELF speakers’ perceptions about disagreement. Therefore, this study examined the verbal features and nonverbal cues

associated with disagreements while also considering ELF speakers' perceptions of disagreement. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What verbal features and nonverbal cues do ELF students use to disagree during an academic discussion task?
2. How do ELF students perceive disagreement?

3 Method

3.1 Corpus & Data Sampling

The data were sampled from the Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca Interaction (CELF), which consists of paired conversations between L2 English speakers from Canadian English-medium universities during three, 10-minute communicative tasks (Authors xxxx). As degree-seeking students, the ELF speakers had met the minimum English proficiency required for admission to their universities (minimum TOEFL iBT score of 75 or equivalent). They were at the B2 to C1 levels in the Common European Framework of Reference. Students were randomly assigned to pairs ($N = 225$) to interact with someone from a different language background. There was an equal distribution of dyads with same and different reported genders. This study examines the academic discussion task, where students selected a topic (motivation, medical ethics, advertising, or nature vs. nurture), read a brief description of a research article, summarized it for their partner, and then exchanged opinions about the topic. Their interaction was audio- and video-recorded.

The sample analyzed here consists of 24 conversations that were selected because a student mentioned disagreeing with the partner during a stimulated recall session that

immediately followed the academic discussion task. The stimulated recall session involved showing the academic task video to each student, pausing to ask what the student was thinking at various points in the conversations, such as when gestures were used, if feedback was provided, and if dysfluencies occurred. Students could also pause the video to comment at any time. The entire stimulated recall session lasted approximately 20 minutes. The 24 students (13 women, 11 men) in the sample were studying undergraduate (9) and graduate (15) degrees. They ranged in age from 18 to 33, with a mean age of 24 ($SD = 3.7$), and they reported speaking 11 different first languages, which included Mandarin (6), Arabic (3), Spanish (4), Farsi (3), French (2), Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Telugu, Turkish, and Urhobo (1 each). They self-rated their English-speaking ability as 7.2 on a 9-point scale ($SD = 1.2$) and reported having studied English for a mean of 13.3 years ($SD = 4.9$).

3.2 Data Coding

Audio-recordings of the paired conversations and stimulated recall sessions were transcribed and verified by research assistants. Transcripts of the paired conversations were coded by the first researcher for the occurrence of verbal disagreement by drawing upon multiple coding frameworks (Bjørge 2012; Kreutel 2007; Maíz-Arévalo 2014). The coding scheme distinguished between mitigated and unmitigated features. Mitigated features included token agreement (e.g., *yeah/yes...but* and *I agree...but*), clarification requests (*really?*), explanation (e.g., *because...*, *for example...*, *if you...*), expressions of regret (e.g., apologies), positive remarks (e.g., compliments), indirect suggestions (e.g., *maybe they should*), and hedges (e.g., *uhm*, *I think*, *maybe*). Unmitigated features included bald

statements (e.g., *that's wrong*), the performative (i.e., *I disagree*), performative negation (e.g., *I don't agree*), direct suggestions (e.g., *they shouldn't...*), bare negation (e.g., *no*), interruptions with *but*, and blunt statements of the opposite idea. A third coding category, non-engagement, emerged from the data and referred to cases when the speaker stated in the stimulated recall session that a disagreement had occurred, but the transcript lacked any verbal evidence of disagreement. Rather than verbally disagree, the speaker responded with backchannels or other-repetition. Following training from the first researcher, a research assistant coded a subset of the data (50% of the disagreement episodes) for interrater reliability. Interrater reliability, using two-way mixed average-measures intraclass correlation coefficients, was .90 for mitigated features and .83 for unmitigated features. Cohen's kappa was 1.00 for the identification of non-engagement.

To identify nonverbal cues of disagreement, the videos were bottom-up coded by the first researcher in terms of (a) stages of disagreement and (b) types of visual cues. To determine when nonverbal cues occurred relative to the verbal disagreement, the disagreements were segmented into three stages. The first stage occurred prior to the initial verbal disagreement move when the disagreeer was listening to the speaker. The second stage was during the disagreeer's verbal disagreement. The third stage occurred when the disagreeer was listening to the speaker's response. Table 1 illustrates the three stages of a disagreement episode. In this example, the speakers were discussing instrumental and integrative motivation when studying a second language. Prior to the verbal disagreement, P372 simply

listens as P371 states their opinion, after which P372 disagrees. After P372 responds to the disagreement, he resumes listening.

Table 1: The Three Phases in a Disagreement Episode.

Phase	Speaker utterance
Prior to disagreement	P371: but I think... I don't think like you because yeah instrumental motivation is... uh I think it is better because uh what what do you want to do with the new language that you uh that you learn...%if you can%--
During verbal disagreement	P372: --%it's always better% to learn new language
Listening	P371: yeah of course it is always better but I think if you cannot get admission to new universities you cannot get a job with that... uh new language if you cannot %make money%

After segmenting the episodes, the nonverbal cues that occurred in each stage were coded. Five categories of nonverbal cues emerged from the data: face expressions (smiling/laughter and raised eyebrows), gaze aversion, head movement (head nods, tilting head to one side, and head shake), body movement (sitting back, adjusting sitting position, and shrug), and hand gestures, (iconic, metaphoric, deictic, and non-content carrying gestures). The definitions of the five nonverbal cue categories are presented in the Appendix. Following training from the first researchers, the fourth researcher coded 50% of the data independently for interrater reliability. The two-way mixed average-measures intraclass

correlation coefficients were .92 for face expressions, .97 for gaze aversion, .98 for head movement, .88 for body movement, and .94 for hand gestures.

4 Results

The first research question asked what verbal features and nonverbal cues ELF students used to disagree during an academic discussion task. The results showed that 11 different verbal features were used. Students used from zero to five strategies, with a mean of three strategies per student ($SD = 1.6$). Three students showed non-engagement in that they did not produce a verbal disagreement even though they stated that a disagreement had occurred during the stimulated recall sessions. The remaining 21 students employed 203 verbal features in total and used mitigated disagreement features (87.7%) more frequently than unmitigated features (12.3%). In terms of the distribution of mitigation across specific features, hedges (59.6%) were used most frequently, followed by explanations (15.8%), token agreement (7.4%), requests for clarification (3.4%), direct suggestions (3.4%), interrupt with *but* (3.4%), blunt statement of the opposite (2.5%), use of the bare exclamation (2.5%), indirect suggestions (1.0%), and use of the performative (0.5%), and positive remarks (0.5%). Three verbal features identified in previous research (expression of regret, total lack of mitigation, and use of the performative negation) did not occur in the data. Excerpt 1 illustrates ELF speakers' use of mitigated features such as token agreement (*yeah I know but*), hedges (*sometimes, I don't know, uh*), and explanations (*for example*). As this excerpt shows, a single turn contained multiple mitigation features.

Excerpt 1. Use of mitigated features to disagree

P199: yeah I know but it's also sometimes I don't know... it it also I think dependent to

the character when you have a funny uh for example mother or father or they

have good sense of humor well that's already in your genes

For nonverbal cues associated with disagreement, gaze aversion, smiling, and head nods were used most frequently by the disagreeer. Gaze aversion occurred frequently throughout all three stages of disagreement: listening prior to the verbal disagreement (34.6%), while producing the verbal disagreement (42.8%), and while listening after the verbal disagreement (37.4%). Head nods (37.2%) tended to occur prior to a verbal disagreement move and smiling (34.4%) tended to occur after a verbal disagreement. Table 2 displays the distribution of the disagreeer's four most frequent nonverbal cues associated by stage.

Table 2: Distribution of Nonverbal Cues by Disagreement Stage.

	Prior	During	After
Smiling/laughter	19.2%	15.9%	34.4%
Gaze aversion	34.6%	42.8%	37.4%
Head nod	37.2%	3.6%	22.9%
Non-carrying gesture	0.0%	21.5%	0.0%

Excerpt 2 illustrates an example with the most frequent nonverbal cues in disagreement episodes. As a representative of the whole dataset, the disagreeer P75 uses smiles/laughter, gaze aversions, and head nods to express disagreement.

Excerpt 2. Using nonverbal cues to disagree

P76: Yeah I feel... yeah %nurture% (P75 sitting back; averting eye gaze)

P75: %Yeah mine I--yeah% (averting eye gaze)

P76: Nurture nurture is important (P75 averting eye gaze)

P75: Na--nature or nurture? (averting eye gaze)

P76: Mm (P75 averting eye gaze)

P75: The first one or second one? (averting eye gaze)

P76: I feel nurture (P75 averting eye gaze)

P75: Nurture okay yeah (nodding and averting eye gaze)

P76: Yeah. How about you? (P75 averting eye gaze)

P75: Nature... (laughing and averting eye gaze)

P76: Nature? (P75 laughing and averting eye gaze)

As mentioned previously, three students did not verbally disagree but employed head nods, smiles, and gaze aversion, which were the same nonverbal cues used by students who expressed disagreement verbally. In Excerpt 3, P271 did not express any verbal disagreement, but nodded, smiled, and averted eye gaze while listening P272's explanation.

Excerpt 3. Disagreeing with no verbal expression of disagreement

P272: %But three% billion dollars is like... you can't just get three billion dollars just because... well imagine if a surgeon removed your spleen. They did all the work to treat you for cancer. (P271 nodding, smiling, and averting eye gaze)

P271: Mmhmm.

P272: And then... that ended

P271: Yeah. (nodding)

P272: up being a good spleen. And it—and now it's--you can't really get three billion dollars for that I think. It's uh—it's—it's very deter—like it's not good for the research community... (P271 smiling and averting eye gaze)

P271: Mmhmm. (averting eye gaze)

To sum up, disagreeers in this ELF corpus preferred mitigated verbal disagreement and used gaze aversion, smiling, and head nods frequently. Although three disagreeers did not disagree verbally, they did use gaze aversion, smiling, and head nods to disagree.

The second research question explored ELF speakers' perceptions of disagreement. Analysis of stimulated recall interviews revealed that ELF students perceived disagreements as a friendly opportunity to exchange information, not a conflict. Six out of 21 students mentioned that they chose to avoid “conflict” or “debate” during disagreement. They made efforts to turn disagreement from “conflict” to a “relaxing” discussion. In the stimulated recall comment in Excerpt 4, P75 mentioned disagreement is not like a conflict, and having different opinions did not lead to a conflict but contributed to a “fluent and smooth” pair discussion.

Excerpt 4. Disagreement as information exchange

RA: So you guys were laughing here because

P75: All the time but--but even though we have different opinions the discussion is still fluent and smooth. It's not like conflict it's just talking about each other's opinion.

In a similar vein, P286 also showed a tendency to avoid potential conflict. In the stimulated recall, P286 mentioned that he did not disagree in a bad way but paid attention to his interlocutor with respect (see Excerpt 5).

Excerpt 5. Disagreement as non-confrontation

P286: Yeah so there I was paying attention but in the same time I was--w--uh disagreeing on what she was saying but just leaving her... not in a bad way, just like respect to what she's saying and understand the point right?

Similarly, in the stimulated recall with P283 (see Excerpt 6), he mentioned that he tried to express disagreement nicely. In other words, he wanted to make sure that the conversation was relaxing because he knew that disagreement could be face threatening and "brutal."

Excerpt 6. Friendly disagreement

P283: Yeah um so I guess I was uh trying to disagree with him oh um but in—in a nice way. I didn't want to be uh brutal so I tried to laugh to just um yeah relaxing.

Thus, the above stimulated recall excerpts revealed that students showed a positive attitude towards disagreement and considered disagreement as an opportunity to exchange information in a friendly rather than confrontational manner.

5 Discussion

The goal of the present study was to explore verbal and nonverbal features of disagreements during academic ELF interactions by focusing narrowly on interactions identified by the participants as having a disagreement. One key result was that ELF speakers who disagreed verbally used mitigated features (87.7%) more frequently than unmitigated features (12.3%), which aligns with the findings of prior studies which examined disagreements during online (Maíz-Arévalo 2014) and face-to-face (Bjørge 2012; Toomaneejinda and Harding 2018) academic discussions. In contrast, these results diverge from those reported by House (2008) and Björkman (2015) where ELF speakers mostly used explicit and unmitigated verbal disagreement. One possible explanation for the prevalence of mitigated disagreement concerns the research context such as the interlocutors' familiarity. The CELFI corpus consists of task interactions carried out for research purposes in a campus office between students who had not previously met. Based on Locher and Watts' (2005) relational framework, it is possible that these students considered the use of mitigation as politic for this setting and with these interlocutors. This contrasts with the lack of mitigation when interlocutors are familiar to each other such as PhD students talking to their supervisors (Björkman, 2015) or students conversing with their research assistants and professors (House, 2008). In sum, the use of mitigation may depend on interlocutor familiarity along with their perception of what is politic.

When comparing the ELF verbal disagreement strategies found here to native-speaker interactions with verbal disagreement, there are both similarities and differences. In terms of

similarities with native-speaker interactions (e.g., García, 1989; Christoffersen, 2015), these ELF speakers also tended to mitigate and use nonconfrontational disagreement strategies. However, they did not use explanation as a mitigation strategy as frequently as has been reported in native-speaker interaction, which were characterized by lengthy remarks and explanations (Christoffersen, 2015). Rather than engage in lengthy explanations (only 15.8%), these ELF speakers preferred hedges (59.6%). Since they viewed disagreement as a friendly, nonconfrontational exchange of opinions, they may have preferred to “let it pass” rather than engage in lengthy remarks.

Turning to the nonverbal cues associated with disagreements, the analysis revealed that head nods, gaze aversion, and smiling were the three most frequent nonverbal cues used by the disagreeer in disagreement episodes. Head nods occurred most frequently prior to disagreement (37.2%), which confirms prior studies that found an association between nodding and dispreferred utterances (Whitehead 2011). In other words, these students’ nods may signal that the speaker’s ideas are dispreferred (Duncan 1972) prior to their verbal statement of disagreement. Thus, listener head nods may be an initial signal of disagreement with the speaker’s ideas (Nash 2007), which is then followed by verbal disagreement. Turning to gaze aversion, it occurred most often during the expression of disagreement (42.8%). Thus, the ELF speakers might have shifted their attention from their interlocutor’s face as a way to ease potential negative social-emotional experience created by the verbal disagreement (Doherty-Sneddon and Phelps 2005). Finally, smiling/laughter occurred most frequently while listening to the interlocutor’s response (34.4%), which may have been a way

to mitigate any potential face threats and reduce the distance between unfamiliar interlocutors (e.g., Fujimoto 2012; Matsumoto 2014). In sum, the visual cue data confirmed the findings of previous studies showing an association between disagreement and head nods (Lopez-Ozieblo 2018), gaze aversion (Fujimoto 2012; Toomaneejinda and Harding 2018), and smiling (Fujimoto 2012; Matsumoto 2014).

As for the analysis of stimulated recall interviews, these ELF speakers did not view disagreements as a conflict but considered them as an opportunity to listen to their interlocutor's opinion, think about their interlocutor's argument, and share different opinions with each other. Their comments indicate that disagreement was seen as a positive and productive interaction rather than a negative action (Matsumoto, 2018). This finding is interesting, given that disagreements are often considered as face-threatening acts requiring speakers to use various mitigation strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987).

Although previous studies have investigated verbal and nonverbal ELF disagreement with the use of stimulated recall, our study adds new findings on this topic by examining pair interactions rather than group discussions, specifically the discussions among six interlocutors in Toomaneejinda and Harding (2018). They found that ELF group discussions involved complex dynamics such as focus shifts and complex turn-management, whereas the paired interactions investigated here involved less complex turn management. Besides confirming that mitigation is frequently used in ELF disagreements, our findings also provided insight into the specific strategies that students preferred, which revealed their frequent use of hedges. In addition to confirming their finding that gaze is a nonverbal

strategy associated with disagreement, we also found that smiles and head nods are characterizing disagreement, including when speakers chose not to verbally engage in disagreement.

The findings of this study provide insight into different perspectives toward politeness theory, specifically those of Brown and Levinson (1987) and Locher and Watts (2005). Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework, mitigation during disagreements would be expected between our ELF speakers due to their lack of familiarity and resulting distance. In other words, mitigated features were necessary to soften the face-threatening act of disagreement and make those disagreements more polite. However, the stimulated recall data indicated that the speakers did not consider disagreement to be a conflict, which raises doubts about whether they found them to be face-threatening. Their stimulated recall remarks serve as an important reminder of Locher and Watt's (2005) claim that interlocutors themselves must determine whether a speech act is face-threatening. Put simply, these EFL students did mitigate while disagreeing, but their use of mitigation strategies was not triggered by a desire to reduce potential conflict or threats to face because they perceived disagreement as a friendly exchange. To expand on these findings, future research needs to examine why ELF speakers chose to mitigate in contexts where they do not perceive a speech act to be face-threatening.

6 Limitations and Conclusion

This study has some limitations that may impact its generalizability. First, the academic task used in this corpus is a simulated task conducted in a laboratory setting as

opposed to a classroom or study group. Future studies on ELF disagreement should focus on authentic academic settings such as an academic discussion in the classroom. A second limitation is the small sample size, which was due to the inclusion criterion that speakers should explicitly mention in the stimulated recall that a disagreement had occurred. Another limitation is that the stimulated recalls were not designed to ask about disagreements specifically. As an alternative, interviews could be conducted with ELF students after the task to ask about the disagreement specifically. In conclusion, mitigated verbal features were favored by ELF students, with smiling/laughter, gaze aversion, and head nods used most frequently as nonverbal cues of disagreement. Although it is common to teach L2 students verbal features of disagreement, it may be beneficial to highlight the role of nonverbal cues in disagreement.

References

- Angouri, Jo. 2012. Managing disagreement in problem solving meeting talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(12). 1565-1579.
- Bjørge, Anne Kari. 2012. Expressing disagreement in ELF business negotiations: Theory and practice. *Applied Linguistics* 33(4). 406–427.
- Björkman, Beyza. 2015. PhD supervisor-PhD student interactions in an English-medium Higher Education (HE) setting: Expressing disagreement. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(2). 205–229.

- Bousmalis, Konstantinos, Marc Mehu & Maja Pantic. 2013. Towards the automatic detection of spontaneous agreement and disagreement based on nonverbal behaviour: A survey of related cues, databases, and tools. *Image and Vision Computing* 31(2), 203–221.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christoffersen, Katherine O'Donnell. 2015. Mitigation of disagreement in peer review among L2 learners and native speakers in a college writing class. *GiST Education and Learning Research Journal* 11. 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.285>
- Doherty-Sneddon, Gwyneth & Fiona G. Phelps. 2005. Gaze aversion: A response to cognitive or social difficulty? *Memory & Cognition* 33(4). 727-733.
- Duncan, Starkey. 1972. Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 23(2). 283-292.
- Firth, Alan. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca” English and Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(2). 237-259.
- Fujimoto, Donna T. 2012. *Agreement and disagreement: Novice language learners in small group discussion*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University dissertation.
- García, Carmen. 1989. Disagreeing and requesting by Americans and Venezuelans. *Linguistics and Education* 1(3). 299–322. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(89\)80004-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(89)80004-X)
- Gass, Susan & Alison Mackey. 2000. *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2001. Arguing about the future: On indirect disagreements in conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(12). 1881-1900.
- House, Juliane. 2008. (Im)politeness in English as lingua franca discourse. In Miriam Locher & Jürg Strässler (eds.), *Standard and norms in the English language*, 351–366. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jacquin, Jérôme. 2018. Multimodal positioning and reference in argumentative talk-in-interaction: Balancing context-dependency and context-independency. *International Review of Pragmatics* 10(2). 198-218.
- Kong, Anthony Pak-Hin, Sam-Po Law, Connie Ching-Yin Kwan, Christy Lai & Vivian Lam. 2015. A coding system with independent annotations of gesture forms and functions during verbal communication: Development of a database of speech and gesture (DoSaGE). *Journal of nonverbal behavior* 39(1). 93–111.
- Kreutel, Karen. 2007. “I’m not agree with you.” ESL learners’ expressions of disagreement. *TESL-EJ* 11(3), 1–35.
- Lawson, Andrew J. 2009. *From the classroom to the bar-room: Expressions of disagreement by Japanese speakers of English*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham MA thesis.
- Lee, Seongyong & Arum Kim. 2020. Experiences and practices of English as a lingua franca communication in the international university: An integrative view of student voices. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 000010151520200072. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0072>

- Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 9-33.
- Lopez-Ozieblo, Renia. 2018. Disagreeing without a 'no': How teachers indicate disagreement in a Hong Kong classroom. *Journal of Pragmatics* 137. 1-18.
- Maíz-Arévalo, Carmen. 2014. Expressing disagreement in English as a lingua franca: Whose pragmatic rules? *Intercultural Pragmatics* 11(2). 199-224.
- Matsumoto, Yumi. 2014. Collaborative co-construction of humorous interaction among ELF speakers. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 3(1). 81-107.
- Matsumoto, Yumi. 2018. Challenging moments as opportunities to learn: The role of nonverbal interactional resources in dealing with conflicts in English as a lingua franca classroom interactions. *Linguistics and Education* 48. 35-51.
- Mauranen, Anna. 2012. *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, Kim & Pavel Trofimovich (2019). *Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca Interaction (CELF)*. Montreal, Canada: Concordia University.
- Nash, Caroline E. 2007. Gestural regulators in French, Japanese and American English dialogues. In Marion Grein & Edda Weigand (eds.), *Dialogue and culture*, 115-140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rees-Miller, Janie. 2000. Power, severity, and context in disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(8). 1087–1111.

- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. Closing the conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(2). 133–158.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005. English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal* 59(4), 339–341.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2020. English as a lingua franca in the European context. In Andy Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, 389-407. London: Imprint Routledge.
- Sifianou, M. 2012. Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(12). 1554-1564.
- Sung, Chit Cheung Matthew. 2020. English as a lingua franca in the international university: Language experiences and perceptions among international students in multilingual Hong Kong. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 33(3). 258-273.
- Toomaneejinda, Anuchit & Luke Harding. 2018. Disagreement practices in ELF academic group discussion: verbal, nonverbal and interactional strategies. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 7(2). 307–332.
- Waldron, Vincent R. & James L. Applegate. 1994. Interpersonal construct differentiation and conversational planning: an examination of two cognitive accounts for the production of competent verbal disagreement tactics. *Human Communication Research* 21(1). 3–35.
- Whitehead, Kevin A. 2011. Some uses of head nods in “third position” in talk-in-interaction. *Gesture* 11(2). 103-122.

Appendix: Coding Framework of Nonverbal Cues

1. Facial expressions included smiles/laughs and raised eyebrows. If a speaker smiled or laughed continuously, then smiles/laughs was counted in each turn. For example, if a smile lasted for three turns, then it was counted as three smiles. Raised eyebrows was defined as raising both of the two eyebrows.
2. Gaze aversion was defined as looking up/down/side and glance away. If a gaze aversion lasted for several turns, then it was counted in each turn. For example, if a gaze aversion lasted for two turns, then it was counted as two gaze aversions.
3. Head movements included nods up and down, tilting to one side, and shakes left to right. If a speaker nodded continuously, it was counted as one nod.
4. Body movements included sitting back (i.e., moving the body backward), adjusting sitting position (e.g., moving to a new position or back to a previous position), and shrugging (i.e., raising both shoulders).
5. Hand gestures included iconic, metaphoric, deictic, and non-content carrying following Kong et al. (2015). Whereas iconic gestures model a shape or action, metaphoric gestures communicate abstract ideas. Deictic gestures locate objects in conversational space while non-content carrying gestures include rhythmic beating and non-identifiable movements.