

Hatime Çiftçi* and Camilla Vásquez

Co-constructed oppositional stance and facework in an office hour interaction

<https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2017-0013>

Received May 03, 2017; Accepted July 13, 2018

Abstract: Stance plays a salient role in communicating interpersonal meaning through language use. Understanding stance as co-constructed within dialogic interaction uncovers subtleties of how interlocutors use language to express their subjectivities and thus, negotiate their interpersonal relationship. The notion of face and facework, or relational work (Locher 2004), is therefore relevant to the understanding of stance in interaction. Drawing on Du Bois' (2007) stance triangle, our study analyzes oppositional stance in a single, extended interaction and shows how two interlocutors in an academic setting jointly construct oppositional stance, each by drawing on their own interpretations. Our analysis indicates that this co-constructed oppositional stance is enacted throughout three broader stages, which we call initiation, negotiation, and resolution. We also demonstrate that expressing oppositional stance is a complex process where interlocutors employ various discourse strategies to express pessimistic evaluation, shifting positionings, and (dis)alignment. Meanwhile, instances of oppositional stance become face-maintaining and face-challenging at different stages in which directness and indirectness are variably employed.

Keywords: oppositional stance, facework, interactional sociolinguistics, epistemic stance, affective stance

1 Introduction

Stance is omnipresent in communication and a notable feature of discourse as it contributes to the interpersonal and relational meanings created in human interactions through language users' linguistic choices. Research on stance in interaction has received a recent upsurge of interest by language scholars who

*Corresponding author: Hatime Çiftçi, MEF University – Department of English Language Teaching, Ayazaga Cad. No:4 Maslak, Istanbul, Sariyer 34396, Turkey, E-Mail: ciftcih@mef.edu.tr

Camilla Vásquez, University of South Florida, Department of World Languages, Tampa, Florida, United States, E-Mail: cvasquez@usf.edu

have examined various instances of stance in a wide array of genres and settings including both spoken and written discourse as well as institutional, everyday, and online communication (e. g., Kärkkäinen 2003; White 2003; Englebretson 2004; Fitzmaurice 2004; Wu 2004; Hyland and Tse 2005; Jaffe 2009). In this study, we examine how oppositional stance is co-constructed and negotiated in one instance of a dyadic interaction taking place in an academic context. We present a discourse analysis of a case of oppositional stance (Adams 1999) in its entirety to illustrate how the two interlocutors use evaluative and affective language and how they position themselves towards and align themselves with each other's stances, while also jointly constructing the act of oppositional stance through their interpretations and negotiations.

Our focus on stance in interaction in this study falls under the broader category of interpersonal pragmatics. Locher and Graham (2010) view interpersonal pragmatics as a relational, or interpersonal, perspective on language use in ongoing interaction, or as a term used to identify “examinations of interaction between people that both affect and are affected by their understanding of culture, society, and their own and others' interpretations” (Locher and Graham 2010: 2). Considering that stance is broadly the expression of personal viewpoints, attitudes, feelings, and judgments in response to the propositional content of an *a priori* message (Biber et al. 2002), it does have an interpersonal function in interactions and has been analyzed as an aspect of discourse (Jaffe 2009). Similarly, there is a conceptual overlap between interpersonal pragmatics and relational work (Langlotz and Locher 2013), as relational work alludes to “all aspects of the work invested by individuals in the construction, maintenance, reproduction and transformation of interpersonal relationships among those engaged in social practice” (Locher and Watts 2008: 96). This process of defining or negotiating relationships in interaction is called “*facework* or *relational work*” (Locher 2004: 51, italics original), and politeness is only one aspect of relational work (Locher and Watts 2005). One key dimension of relational work – and how participants attend to their interpersonal goals – is the notion of face. The perspective of relational work asserts that face is discursively negotiated by participants in interpersonal interactions (Locher and Watts 2005). In other words, participants jointly shape and achieve face through social interaction (Arundale 2010). While doing so, they attend each other's face needs and wants by using language.

Informed by the discursive turn in (im)politeness research (Locher 2004, 2013, 2015; Locher and Watts 2005, 2008; Haugh 2007; Mills 2011; van der Bom and Mills 2015), we understand stance and its relation to (im)politeness as a co-constructed social practice by members of a community through their emic evaluations or judgments of self and other. Thus, enactment of stance in the ongoing interaction is usually in a state of flux and mirrors both local and broader social norms in a

community of practice simultaneously. Given its interpersonal, relational, and social functions, stance in discourse contributes to facework by the interlocutors; this facework might be face-maintaining, face-saving, face-challenging, and even face-aggravating (Locher 2013) depending on how it is enacted and situated in the ongoing interaction. Therefore, we examine stance and its relevance to (im) politeness in this study not only through interlocutors' linguistic choices at utterance level, but also through their reactions and responses to one other in the negotiation of meaning, and of their relationship. In what follows, we review the major perspectives on stance in discourse to arrive at a working understanding of this concept, and we then briefly define oppositional stance. Following this, we present our analysis of an office hour interaction at an English-medium university in Turkey where an instructor and her student co-construct oppositional stance throughout their ongoing interaction.

2 Stance in Discourse

Various perspectives on stance have been developed in language studies, and each framework has presented certain facets of stance as its core components. One common element shared by many of these frameworks is that of evaluation. Du Bois (2007), for instance, defines stance as an evaluative act, pointing out the salient role of “the process whereby a stancetaker orients to an object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value” (Du Bois 2007: 143). Such a value-laden characterization of an object or event by a stancetaker thus constitutes the evaluative nature of stance in talk. Additionally, this three-part model of stance entailing a stancetaker, a stance object and a subject, underscores the pragmatic functions of stance, which are evaluation, positioning, and alignment. That is, in stancetaking, the subject concomitantly evaluates something (or an object), positions himself/herself, and aligns with other(s) in the interaction. Recognizing each of these functions as different aspects of stance, Du Bois (2007: 163) emphasizes that they are “subsidiary acts of a single overarching, unified stance act” rather than discrete elements. Thus, a stancetaker can simultaneously evaluate the stance object and position himself/herself, or while positioning himself/herself, she/he can also align with the other speaker(s) in the interaction. Evaluation as the fundamental facet of stancetaking has also been emphasized by many others (Hunston and Thompson 2000; Martin and White 2005; Bednarek 2006;). As pointed out by Englebretson (2007), considering stance as evaluation highlights its subjective nature. Subjectivity is defined as self-expression and self-representation of the interlocutor's perspective, which is

called “a speaker’s imprint” by Finegan (1995: 1). That is, the speaker voices his/her personal attitudes, beliefs, and/or perspective on a topic, event, or affair at hand. This interwoven relationship between evaluation and subjectivity residing in any act of stance is usually categorized into two broad types: *epistemic* and *affective* stance. Epistemic stance often refers to the speaker’s certainty/uncertainty with respect to positioning himself/herself towards the stance object, whereas affective stance usually indexes the emotional or attitudinal state of the speaker (Du Bois 2007; Kiesling 2011).

In this study, we analyze stance from an interactional and dialogic perspective. Drawing on Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogicality, we understand stance as a co-constructed act where interlocutors as social actors build on each other’s utterances and collaboratively contribute to the process of their evaluation, positioning, and alignment in the ongoing interaction (White 2003; Du Bois 2007; Jaffe 2009; Rojo and Molina 2017;). Thus, identifying the stance subject and object would not be sufficient to fully understand the process of stancetaking in its dialogic sequence, making it necessary to understand the prior expressions of stance that actually initiate the act of stance that follows. This involves consideration of the enactment and negotiation of stance along with the “*uptake* of acts of stance” throughout the ongoing dialogic interaction (Jaffe 2009: 8, italics original). By identifying the extent to which interlocutors show alignment (convergence) and disalignment (divergence) in response to each other’s utterances, it becomes possible to identify the preceding stance act in the dialogic sequence as well as the “*stance lead*” and “*stance follow*” (Du Bois 2007: 161, italics original). This also highlights the notion of intersubjectivity in stancetaking, as it is jointly constructed through either the exchange of similar stances (alignment or convergence), or displays of disalignment (divergence) in relation to a message or topic (Scheibman 2007). Along these lines, Kärkkäinen (2007), by examining one specific epistemic stance particle (e. g., *I guess*), has shown how stance from an intersubjective perspective is carried out by one speaker building on evidence or stimulus from previous turn(s).

Stance in discourse has also been linked to various separate but interrelated concepts. These include footing, or alignment (Goffman 1981), positioning (Davies and Harré 1990), attitude (Halliday 1994), appraisal (Martin 2000; White 2003), assessment (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Goodwin 2006), and textual voice (Hyland 2005) as well as metadiscourse (Hyland and Tse 2005) in written communication. The appraisal framework, for instance, situates appraisal as an interpersonal meaning-making system that includes negotiation and involvement through discourse-level semantic sources. That framework proposes three evaluative means of attitude, engagement, and gradation (Iedema Feez and White 1994; Martin 2000; White 2003; Martin and White 2005). Therefore, stance is a

co-constructed social act reflecting interlocutors' subjective and personal attitudes as well as their positioning of themselves and one another, which occurs in ongoing talk. Thus, stance is viewed as being closely linked to the concept of assessment, or the activity of evaluation, by several scholars. More recently, Kiesling (2011) offers three interrelated dimensions in the analysis of stance in discourse: affect, alignment, and investment. Affect is related to "the polarity and quality of the stance" and involves assessment; alignment is about how an interlocutor aligns or disaligns to the other(s) in talk; and investment is usually the interlocutor's strength of investment in the talk and the extent to which she/he maintains claims and opinions (Kiesling 2011: 5). Taken collectively, all these perspectives on stance delineate what stance communicates in the ongoing interaction, and how it functions pragmatically, by emphasizing evaluation, alignment, and engagement (or positioning).

Advancing the understanding of oppositional stance in discourse, our study is important because it demonstrates how interlocutors navigate oppositional stance throughout the flow of an intercultural and institutional interaction. By examining how these interlocutors respond to each other and co-construct meaning in an everyday communicative activity, we shed light on how and where they evaluate the stance object, position themselves, and align and disalign with each other through their language use in a situated, dialogic interaction. Drawing on previous research, we further define oppositional stance in our study as: an antagonistic/resistant act, given academic conventions or norms (Baker and Ellece 2011); a complex social practice involving various discourse strategies over several turns where interlocutors negotiate their meaning and relationships; and a discursive act where the meaning is co-constructed through discourse (Gumperz 1982; Schiffrin 1994; Tannen 2004 2005; Jaspers 2012). More importantly, we consider this instantiation of oppositional stance as a "collaborative act of co-participants in dialogic interaction" (Du Bois 2007: 141).

3 Methodology

We adopt an interactional sociolinguistic approach¹ (Schiffrin 1994; Schiffrin Tannen and Hamilton 2003) to the following analysis of an office hour interaction between an Italian instructor and a Turkish freshman student at an Eng-

¹ Interactional sociolinguistics assumes that social groups have their own way of expressing meaning in their language, and the primary goal is to study language use in real interaction by which interlocutors create meaning and form their social relationships (Tannen, 2004, 2005).

lish-medium university in the northwest of Turkey. As part of a larger study, 38 office hour interactions (including the case in our study) taking place between 3 international instructors and their 34 Turkish students were audio-recorded over 4 months (from November 2014 to the end of February 2015) at two Turkish universities. All participants gave their informed consent prior to the study. The researchers were not present while office hours were being audio-recorded. Verbatim transcriptions were made by the primary researcher (and first author). While transcribing, hesitation devices, false starts and latching, reformulations, and prosodic features, such as intonation and stress, were included since they “provide clues to how participants mobilize resources to plan and produce utterances, and to how they negotiate with each other the ongoing social interaction” (Du Bois 1991: 73). As Gee (2011: 122) states, “humans interpret the world” and language is a tool to make this interpretation. Therefore, any analysis of discourse is an interpretative work. In this study, the underlying multilayered theoretical framework and a detailed multilayered analysis contribute to the rigour of our interpretations. Validity was maintained through a detailed analysis of linguistic features, and our focus was on how participants themselves responded to, negotiated, and interpreted what was being said during this interaction.

The particular case in this study offers an interesting example in that it presents an enactment of oppositional stance as it evolved during a complete office hour session (i. e., 12 minutes and 3 seconds). In office hour interactions in this context, both student and instructor interlocutors typically used language to achieve communicative goals, such as giving/receiving feedback or asking for/providing clarification/information. However, in one unusual interaction, a student expressed his oppositional stance towards academic expectations. In our analysis, we first identified in the transcript instances of oppositional stance as well as other verbal acts that co-occurred with these acts of opposition. Thus, we were able to identify stages of oppositional stance within a single interaction, which we call initiation, negotiation, and resolution of oppositional stance. To illustrate the distinct stages of oppositional stance, we have divided the transcript of the interaction into four segments in the following analysis. Due to space limitations, some lines have been deleted from the transcript; however, the four segments are presented here in sequential order.

3.1 The participants

The instructor in this interaction, Maria (a pseudonym), is an Italian speaker of English. A native speaker of Italian and Friulian, Maria also has some proficiency in Turkish (B2 level according to The Common European Framework of Reference

for Languages), and she had been living in Turkey for 8 years when the study began. At the time of data collection, Maria had been an instructor at the Department of Modern Languages for 5 years. Her entire teaching experience consisted of 7 years at university in Turkey and 3 years at high schools in her home country. In the 2 years prior to the study, Maria had been teaching *Communication Skills and Academic Reporting* to freshmen students, and *Italian* to sophomores.

The student in this interaction, Arda (also a pseudonym), is a 21-year-old male Turkish undergraduate. As a student in the Department of Software Engineering, Arda had been studying academic English full-time at this university for one and half years at the time of data collection. He did not have any study abroad experience and used English outside of the educational context only on the rare occasion when he spoke with tourists he met in Turkey. Arda's stated goal for this office hour interaction was to talk to Maria about a couple of connected concerns: the content in the current lessons, her feedback on his midterm writing task, and his overall writing performance in her class.

4 Analysis

The office hour interaction between Maria and Arda begins with a typical opening sequence (Limberg 2010). Following this, Arda begins to set the agenda in his turn in line 5. As he starts to present his purpose for initiating this office hour meeting, Arda relies on a prolonged pause filler *a::h*. He first refers to leadership styles discussed in a previous class in his turn in line 5, and then initiates his first stance act in this interaction in line 6 by positioning himself on an affective scale about the object of his stance (Du Bois 2007). The subjectivity of Arda's stance towards the course content, which is the object of stance here (*the topic*), is indexed via his use of first-person pronoun (*I'm*) in the syntactic role of subject, which is followed by an adjective phrase (*interested in the topic*) indicating Arda's personal perspective along with his affective self-positioning towards leadership. He then asks Maria what she thinks about the topic, in lines 6–7, ostensibly wanting his instructor's personal opinion about the course content that he himself is also interested in. While this seems like a simple inquiry, it is potentially an attempt to elicit Maria's subjective perspective and positioning on the content at this initiation stage of the interaction.

Excerpt 1:

- 05 Arda: A::h we a::h learnt in last lecture a::h the leadership styles, a::h
and
06 a::h I'm interested in a::h the topic, and what you think about
07 leadership, your opinion.
- 08 Maria: Why don't we go the other way around? Why don't you tell me your
09 opinion first and then we'll see if ↑yours matches ↑mine.
- 10 Arda: A::h I, I said, a::h as you can remember I don't believe any leader.
11 A::h (0.2) and they are saying lie to get into part. A::h I imagine
the
12 the leader is behind the society which they choosed a::h like a::h
13 think a (0.1) a man who a::h take the like scavenger. He has a
14 responsibi- responsibilities to society and I don't think a::h (0.2)
a::h
15 the authority has much a::h powerful or much thoughtful for us.
- 16 Maria: (taking a breath) okay so you're making a very ↑general uh
17 connection to the idea of power in a, in a, in a say (0.2) in a in a big
18 picture where you're talking about society and leaders like in
19 governments, organizations. And I agree with you that umm (0.2)
20 they ↑may not be thinking about people below. However, the
21 leadership, the topic we had a look at in class today, ↑could have
22 been applied to kind of u::h (0.3)
- 23 Arda: what?
- 24 Maria: to tinier examples, like, like, I don't know...

Maria, in line 8, responds to her student's inquiries with a directive in the form of an imbedded imperative (Ervin-Tripp 1976). Opting for the conventionally indirect syntactic form, Maria frames her suggestion as a collaborative act with the use of the inclusive pronoun *we*. As she continues, Maria reformulates this suggestion with the same syntactic frame but this time, she shifts the subject pronoun to *you*, and anticipates a comparison between Arda's opinions and her own in line 9. Maria's response of suggesting that Arda tell her his opinion functions as an implicit refusal to his request. Indirectness in Maria's refusal addresses Arda's face needs (Goffman 1967) in relation to his goal for this office hour interaction mentioned above (e. g., his desire to talk to Maria about a couple of connected concerns). In switching the focus onto her student quite tactfully, Maria thus paves the way for successive stance acts in this dialogic interaction and contributes to the initiation of Arda's upcoming oppositional stance acts as he reiterates and expands on what he believes about leaders in society in lines 10–15. Arda starts his turn with the pause filler *A::h* and a false start. Following this,

Arda begins his explanation with a preface (*as you can remember*), reminding Maria that he has already stated it before, and he then elucidates his pessimistic stance about leaders – *I don't believe any leader*. Combined with a frequent use of the pause filler *ah* (10 instances) and three mid-turn pauses of a second or more, Arda's antagonistic stance is reflected through his epistemic evaluation of the same stance object (*leader* and the *authority*) in lines 14 and 15 (*I don't think*). Arda's subjectivity and evaluation of the stance object at an epistemic scale this time is indexed through first-person pronoun (*I*) and negated mental verbs (e. g., *don't believe* and *don't think*). However, the only difference between these two epistemic oppositional stance acts by Arda is that the second has a propositional content (*the authority has much a::h powerful or much thoughtful for us*).

As stated in previous section, in dialogic exchanges stance is intersubjective (Du Bois 2007) in that it relies on the subjects' uptake of stance acts with either convergence (alignment) or divergence (disalignment) with each other's evaluation and positioning (Kärkkäinen 2007; Scheibman 2007; Rojo and Molina 2017). When Maria starts her next turn in line 16, her audible in-breath plus her two discourse markers (*okay so* in line 16) signal a potential problem with Arda's oppositional stance acts related to leadership and authority. Her reformulation of Arda's preceding statement and her implicit critique of his epistemic evaluations of these stance objects involves two salient features in lines 16–19: her stress on the lexical item *general* to emphasize the core of this problem; and her repetition of *in a, in a, in a say (0.2) in a in a big picture*, which also includes a two-second mid-turn pause, perhaps indicating her caution as she proceeds with the interaction. Thus, immediately at this initiation stage of successive oppositional stance acts, Maria demonstrates her disalignment with Arda in relation to his antagonistic stance towards, and subjective evaluation of, the course content. Yet, she displays a temporary alignment to Arda's proposition about leaders' attitude towards people (*I agree with you* in line 19) even though her increased stress on *may not* indicates her cautiousness not to generalize about it. This serves as a prelude to her assertion that the content they covered in class with regard to leadership was actually different, which is again displayed through increased stress on *could have been* in lines 21–22. Her cautious interactional approach is confirmed by various linguistic elements, or contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982), such as the use of the lexical hedge *kind of*, hesitation marker *u::h*, and end-of-turn pause for three seconds, which leaves her utterance incomplete. Prompted by Arda's question in line 23, she then completes her assertion in line 24, followed by additional self-repetition and a marker of uncertainty: *to tinier examples, like, like, I don't know*. Maria then provides a different example to narrow down the general topic of leadership into a specific example that may be more familiar for the student. (She elaborates a bit further on this example in lines 24 and 32, which have been deleted.)

As their interaction continues, Arda introduces an even more complicated perspective in connecting the topic of leadership styles to other situations. Thus, Excerpt 2 is the stage at which Arda's oppositional stance takes a different form and leads to further negotiation between the two interlocutors.

Excerpt 2:

- 32 Arda: Mmm, I saw a::h a::h in philosophy a::h lecture, there was a person
- 33 Maria: < @ > ((nervous))
- 34 Arda: who told me like that “maybe God is” you know in Quran, he
- 35 always say ‘we’.
- 36 Maria: hmhm
- 37 Arda: “maybe” he said, a::h “maybe God is democratic and many, there is
- 38 many person, and they’re deciding with like autocratic leadership”
- 39 Maria: Okay, that is an interesting perspective ↑but today the aim of the
- 40 autocratic or laissez-faire leadership style is just to let you know
- 41 different, you know, learn about new different styles of leaderships,
- 42 okay? Umm (0.3) in the final exam, if ever you’re gonna talk about
- 43 leadership styles, ↑don’t make it this complex.
- 44 Arda: but you know my brain (0.2) like a, (0.2) a:h it’s, a:h (0.2) keep it
- 45 Maria: < @ > ((nervous))
- 46 Arda: to focusing all, and sharing all, wants to share all idea, but there is a
- 47 strict content, (0.2) and I don’t want to obey something, (0.2) rules.
- 48 Maria: but we we’ve talked about this before. I ↑know that you wanna
- 49 mention the things that you feel passionate about, or that you
- 50 want to put on paper your ideas, and ↑I’m fine with it, ↑but this kind of
- 51 writing especially in this class is not creative writing. It’s not free
- 52 writing...

In the sequence of talk between lines 32–38, there is no explicit linguistic form indicating a stance act. However, Arda constructs his disalignment with Maria's example presented in the previous segment by presenting a type of abstract connection between the leadership styles and a controversial topic that falls outside of the scope of Maria's course. He achieves his disalignment by introducing a new

topic in line 32, which is overlapped by Maria's very soft and nervous laughter, and by sharing an example from a philosophy lecture and a person he encountered in that lecture. At this point, Arda uses analogy as a discourse strategy to index his disalignment and he makes references to Islam (in lines 32, 34–35, and 37–38) to further explain his oppositional stance related to leadership and authority. In doing so, Arda attempts to use direct reported speech first in line 34 (“*maybe God is...*”) to give an account of what the person in a philosophy lecture mentioned, which he then interrupts with his own account to provide a piece of background information (*you know in Quran, he always say ‘we’*). Arda then completes his account in the form of direct reported speech in lines 37 and 38. Meanwhile, Maria signals she is listening in line 36 with her minimal response *hmhm*, allowing Arda to maintain the floor for a while longer. When Maria takes the floor next (line 39) and reacts to Arda's example, she opens with the acknowledgement token *okay* and then offers her evaluation of Arda's analogy (*that is an interesting perspective*). Even though Maria's tone of voice remains empathic, her lexical choice of *interesting* for her evaluation creates some ambiguity with respect to its potentially positive or negative sentiment. However, her sudden increase in stress and pitch on *but today* signals a contradictory assertion indicating that she recognized Arda's introduction of a new topic and analogy as a disalignment and, in doing so, she provides a counterargument (Rojo and Molina 2017) or an alternative view (Vásquez 2011). She refers specifically to *the aim of autocratic or laissez-faire leadership style* that was covered in their class (in lines 39–43), which implies that Arda's example falls outside of the course content. However, Maria also attends to Arda's positive face wants, as she uses the hedge *just* to downgrade her proposition, and seeks agreement or input from Arda by using cajoler *you know* in line 41 and discourse marker *okay* at the end of her statement in line 42. Following this, she shifts the focus to the final exam to indicate that her expectations for students on such major exams are different from how Arda appears to be connecting the course content to other topics (lines 42 and 43).

Arda responds here by vocalizing his oppositional stance more explicitly. In line 44, he starts his turn with *but* to present his counter-argument, while at the same time, seeking agreement with *you know*. Then, he shifts the focus to his own way of thinking by saying *my brain* at the beginning of his turn, which overlaps with Maria's nervous laughter (line 45). Prefacing his propositional content with frequent pauses, pause fillers, and false starts in line 44, he states that he *wants to share* his ideas *but there is a strict content* in line 46. Following his proposition about what prevents him from sharing all his ideas, Arda goes unhesitatingly on record and produces his affective stance explicitly (*I don't want to obey something* in line 47). His subjective positioning towards the indefinite object of his affective stance (e. g., *something*, perhaps referring to the item, *rules*, which follows)

is indexed through the first-person pronoun (*I*) once more and then followed by a negated attitudinal verb (*don't want*). Maria responds to this clearly stated oppositional stance act on an affective scale with the same empathic tone she has been using, by reminding Arda that they have talked about this topic before (line 48). Again, her sudden increased pitch in the epistemic phrase *I know* in line 48 (Kärkkäinen 2003) and attitudinal adjective *fine* in line 50 emphasizes her epistemic understanding with certainty and affective positioning towards Arda's desire to write down all his ideas. Maria thus positions herself as welcoming the student's desire to express his own ideas, which also displays her face-maintaining efforts on the part of her student, Arda. However, by using the conjunction *but* again with a notable increase in stress and pitch, she explains that what Arda wants to do is not what they do in her class with regard to writing in lines 50–52, repeating her similar uptake of Arda's disalignment and oppositional stance in the previous lines here. Such an exchange of stance acts and counterarguments at both utterance and discourse levels demonstrates how intersubjectivity is co-constructed and negotiated by both parties through divergence, disalignment (Du Bois 2007), or a collision in positioning towards each other's stance (Rojo and Molina 2017). Additionally, the expression of Arda's affective stance and Maria's uptake of it with epistemic stance exemplifies what Du Bois (2007) calls stance lead and stance follow in the ongoing dialogic interaction. Next, Maria maintains the floor for an uninterrupted and longer stretch of talk, and emphasizes that Arda actually needs to focus on his sentence and paragraph structure in her class (lines 52–80). At this point in the interaction, Maria's holding of the floor is vital because “opposing participants typically assume that the more one group controls the floor the more likely their ascendancy” (Adams 1999: 245–246).

In the following excerpt, we see more instances of Arda's oppositional stance and Maria's uptake functioning as stance lead and stance follow (Du Bois 2007) throughout this longer sequence of talk. In that sense, Excerpt 3 below also presents how the act of oppositional stance is negotiated in this interaction. Prior to this sequence of interaction, Maria once more emphasizes her expectations for Arda in her course and important exams by making suggestions in relation to structure and expression of ideas in academic writing.

Excerpt 3:

- 81 Arda: You, you saying that but a::h (0.2) it's same as the academic a::h
I, I
- 82 don't suppose the word science and a::h the academic's a::h
- 83 performance related to. ↑There isn't any sentence about this,
showing

- 84 this, but ↑everybody knows the a::h (0.2) you said complex but ↑it
 85 has the relationship and I, I, I didn't see other perspective when I
 86 write you something.
- 87 Maria: Okay. ↑If the connection between academic performance and
 science
 88 is ↑clear in your paragraph, ↑then I'll look at the logical flow.
 ↑But, if
 89 there is no connection, so if you did not explain how science is
 90 connected to academic performance, ↑then you do understand
 that
 91 ↑that science goes a little bit off-topic.
- 92 Arda: yeah. (0.2) In last a::h last year a::h I failed because I think ↑they
 93 didn't try to understand my paragraph. I, I, (0.2) I can write, I
 94 can think, but they does, doesn't like my ideas.
- 95 Maria: ↑Look! Okay. They may, they ↑don't like your paragraph because
 96 sometimes, I'm I'm just assuming, but the thing is this. You can
 97 think. (0.2) You can write but when it comes to writing, your
 98 sentences are a bit confusing because the grammar and the sen-
 tence
 99 structure, it's not really in a, let's say (0.3) in an understandable
 100 English.
- 101 Arda: if I
- 102 Maria: so they ↑may not like not the idea o::r the concept you want to
 103 express. ↑It's the way you express it. That's the problem. That's
 104 why I keep asking you to work on sentences, work on vocabulary
 105 because academic writing is not about how many words you put
 on
 106 your paper. It's ↑the quality of the words you choose.
- 107 Arda: but a::h how can I show a::h my ideas without native spea-, I'm
 not
 108 native speaker, and a::h I try to say something a::h I have in my
 109 mind and
- 110 Maria: but while saying it, you have to check for grammar. So,
 111 subject verb object is the minimum requirement, okay?
- 112 Arda: [yeah]
- 113 Maria: Then if you want to work on compound and complex sentences,
 114 you remember we worked simple, compound, complex, you can
 put
 115 two simple sentences and then combine them but make sure the
 116 sentences are ↑correct.

- 117 Arda: but in my brain a::h ↑^opposite^ is happen-ing
 118 Maria: yes, but that's why
 119 Arda: in first complex sentence, then I try to simplify
 120 and a::h (0.2) when when you saw the lecture who tried to < @ >
 121 a::h read them by paragraph, they a::h saying still my simple
 122 sentence too complex.

At the beginning of this excerpt, Arda seems to be accepting Maria's words (*you saying that* in line 81) in the preceding sequence of talk but he then constructs another counterargument focusing on what he did in the previous midterm exam. Prefacing his upcoming epistemic stance with a false start (*but a::h (0.2) it's same as the academic*), he presents his pessimistic evaluation with regard to the connection between the notion of science and academic performance, which was possibly the topic in the midterm writing exam in lines 81–83. Arda's epistemic stance is again indexed through first-person pronoun (*I*) and negated mental verb (*don't suppose*) where the stance object is the relationship between science and academic writing (*the word science and a::h the academic's a::h performance related to*). His increased stress on *there isn't any* in his next utterance supports his opinion that these two concepts are not related. A similar prosodic change on *everybody knows* and *it has the relationship* displays his effort to show his awareness of how others see the topic (lines 84–85). However, this does not prevent him from expressing his own subjective positioning towards a different perspective on the same topic while writing (*I didn't see other perspective when I write you something* in lines 85–86). Maria's response to yet another instance of oppositional stance initially starts with a calm *okay* in line 87. Formulating two conditional clauses, she then elucidates how she approaches reading the student's paragraph (lines 87–91). Maria's use of increased stress again on certain lexical items throughout her turn (i. e., *If* in line 87; *clear, then, and but* in line 88; *then* in line 90; and *that science* in line 91) enables her to emphasize the most salient pieces of information she aims to convey to Arda.

In his next turn Arda first acknowledges what Maria has just said. However, after a two-second mid-turn pause, he then performs another discourse level act of oppositional stance: placing blame on others. Arda makes a statement of fact (*In last a::h last year a::h I failed* in line 92) and suggests that his failure was due to others' (i. e., his instructors') lack of trying to understand his meaning. His discourse strategy of blaming his instructors, who graded his paper, is accomplished through another epistemic stance act (*I think*) and demonstrates how he positions them with respect to himself (↑*they didn't try to understand my paragraph* in lines 92 and 93). Even though he hesitates with repeated first-person pronoun *I* and a two-second mid-turn pause, he completes his turn by emphasizing his abili-

ties (*I can write, I can think* in lines 93–94), and constructs others as responsible for his failure (*but they does, doesn't like my ideas* in line 94). While instructors are expected to listen to their students' academic concerns or problems, this presents an obviously face-challenging situation for Maria since the *they* in Arda's utterances refers to Maria's colleagues, as Arda blames his previous instructors in order to shift the responsibility for his poor grades away from himself. This does not seem like an intentional face-attack by Arda; and he probably does not realize that this is markedly inappropriate, nor is it likely his intention to put Maria in an awkward position. However, this is where Maria's directness becomes most evident, as she indicates to him, in her subsequent turns, that they diverge on their interpretations of the situation.

At the very beginning of her next turn starting in line 95, Maria increases her stress and pitch, this time on the attention-getter *Look!*. This is followed by the agreement token *okay*. Maria's use of *okay* is ambiguous here in the sense that she might be either partially agreeing with Arda, or she might be trying to cautiously sketch out her turn. In that sense, her false start (*they may* in line 95) becomes salient because she switches and upgrades to a more certain syntactic form, with increased stress on *don't*. However, Maria's shift to a less certain form (*because sometimes I'm I'm just assuming* in line 96) contradicts this syntactic choice and allows her to formulate her interpretation of the main problem in a vaguer manner (*but the thing is this* in line 96). She then echoes Arda's words by repeating his assertion (*you can think, (0.2) you can write* in lines 96–97) to preface what she sees as his main language related problems in lines 97–100. With regard to Maria's present turn, it could be speculated that she is being indirect by using two initial moves before her proposition that the problem is about Arda's English use in academic writing. At the same time, she also demonstrates her disalignment with Arda's epistemic stance by indirectly rejecting his assertion that his other teachers do not like his ideas. Again, indirectness in Maria's response to Arda's oppositional stance indicates how she attends to his face wants (Goffman, 1967) in this interaction.

Just as Arda attempts to take his next turn (*if I* in line 101), Maria interrupts him to take the floor again. In contrast to her cautiousness in her previous turn, she now goes on record more directly by reformulating her former proposition (*so they ↑may not like not the idea*) with regard to the source of problem (*↑It's the way you express it. That's the problem* in lines 103). As is typical of Maria's prosodic style, the increased stress and pitch on certain segments is notable as a way of adding emphasis. Maria then uses her direct statements about Arda's problem in academic writing in English as a justification for her directives (*That's why I keep asking you to work on sentences, work on vocabulary* in lines 103–104). She follows this by explaining what academic writing is “not” about (*because*

academic writing is not about how many words you put on your paper in line 105), and she completes her turn with *it's the quality of the words you choose* in line 106, serving as a hint that suggests what Arda should work on in his writing.

The sequence of interaction in Excerpt 3 thus involves two oppositional stance acts (e. g., *I don't suppose ...* at the utterance level, and placing blame on others as a discourse strategy) on an epistemic scale by Arda, where the stance object is broadly academic writing norms and expectations in Maria's course. These expressions of Arda's stance are responded to by Maria with an increasingly more direct, and on-record, communicative style – ultimately, leading to her disalignment with Arda's oppositional stance. Rather than repeating the same or similar stance utterance, Maria utilizes different linguistic and discourse resources to show her divergence; Kiesling (2019) notes that the opportunities to display alignment or disalignment are numerous. Thus, Maria constructs disalignment in her following stances by using explanations, reformulations of Arda's propositions and assertions, directives, and suggestions, along with increased stress and pitch on specific fragments and various contextualization clues, such as the use of attention-getters, discourse markers, and connectors.

As the interaction continues in lines 107–118, with Arda and Maria discussing his problems with academic writing and expected norms, we observe a set of successive disalignment acts used to reframe and redefine (Rojo and Molina 2017) their respective positionings towards this recurring stance object in the interaction. This is mainly achieved through the use of *but* to signal counterarguments by both parties each time they take a turn. Arda first initiates his turn by formulating a question (*but a::h how can I show a::h my ideas without native spea-*) as an attempt to justify his inability to express his ideas accurately without having native-speaker competence; however, he leaves this effort incomplete in lines 107–109. Maria then takes the floor and cuts off his new counterargument in line 110 by giving an example of accurate use of English language. Her turn here (lines 110 and 116) includes two declarative and one imperative suggestion in sequence (*but while saying it, you have to check for grammar* in line 110; *Then if you want to [...], you can put two simple sentences and then combine them* in lines 113–115; and finally *but make sure the sentences are correct* in lines 115–116). Arda is again persistent in his disalignment with Maria in terms of academic writing conventions – as can be seen in his next attempt at a justification used as a counterargument in line 117 (*but in my brain a::h [↑]opposite[^] is happen-ing*). Finally, Maria responds, once again providing another possible set of explanations in line 118 (*yes, but that's why*). At the end of this sequence of interaction, Arda interrupts Maria and takes the floor to elaborate on what he has just said in his previous turn in line 117 by explaining that he starts with complex sentences, which he later attempts to simplify (*in first complex sentence, then I try to simplify* in line

119). Combined with his overlapping agreement *yeah* in line 112, this seems to be a possible alignment with his instructor. Yet, this alignment is temporary as Arda returns to his previous strategy of placing blame on unnamed third parties (*they*), presumably the same English instructors he referred to earlier (*they a::h saying still my simple sentence too complex* in lines 121–122). In lines 123 and 137 (not shown here) Maria takes a longer and uninterrupted turn where she repeats her earlier suggestions, adding further details about how to organize ideas in one's writing. During her turn, Arda overlaps with the agreement token *yeah* in line 131, but is otherwise silent.

In the last excerpt, the oppositional stance in this office hour interaction begins to wind down as Maria and her student, Arda, gradually reach a final consensus. Therefore, we call this stage a resolution of oppositional stance.

Excerpt 4:

- 138 Arda: I wish a::h they will read the a::h my paragraph with me and
(smile)
- 139 I can't, I can't a::h say all the a::h
- 140 Maria: is this how you ↑read the books?
- 141 You read the book with the author because the author explains the
- 142 tricky parts ↑you don't understand?
- 143 Arda: a::h but you know a::h before the author, there is the publisher
and
- 144 they're many times write the paragraph.
- 145 Maria: but ↑that's your job. ↑Revision and rewriting is your job. That's
what
- 146 I keep telling you. ↑Revise before submission.
- 147 Arda: yeah
- 148 Maria: You know what we ↑do for the midterm, (0.2) we read your
midterm
- 149 together.
- 150 Arda: okay
- 151 Maria: okay? We'll, we'll, I'll take your paper, we read your midterm
- 152 together during the week or next week, maybe on Monday, and you
- 153 have a look at how I try to understand your ideas, and when I
don't
- 154 understand, you'll fill me in but it doesn't mean that the grade is
- 155 gonna change, okay?
- 156 Arda: okay.
- 157 Maria: I'll tell you ↑what I don't understand

Excerpt 4 starts with Arda's *wish* statement related to his earlier-stated 'third party factor' reason for his failure (*I wish a::h they will read the a::h my paragraph with me* in line 138), implying that his instructors might have understood his meaning if they had read his writing with Arda present. As he continues to explain his rationale, Maria interrupts him again, asking him a very direct question (*is this how you ↑read the books?* in line 140) with increased loudness. Her question functions as a direct challenge to the logic Arda has just offered in his *wish* statement. She continues by reformulating her question in an affirmative form by elaborating on it using rising, or questioning, intonation which constructs an incredulous positioning of Arda's prior assertion (*You read the book with the author because the author explains the tricky parts ↑you don't understand?* in lines 141–142). Arda starts his response to Maria's questions with his typical turn initial move, *a::h but* and also solicits agreement from Maria (*you know* in line 143). Following this, he provides a justification by indirectly asserting that it is not only the author – *before the author* – but also the publisher who makes several revisions in published books (*there is the publisher and they're many times write the paragraph* in lines 143–144). Once again, Maria goes on record not only with her syntactic choices but also with a marked increased stress on *that's your job* and *revision and writing is your job* in line 145 to stress that the responsibility for his academic writing belongs to Arda exclusively. She then completes her turn with an imperative suggestion repeating her very same proposition with a stress on the verb *revise* in line 146, which increases the illocutionary force of her direct suggestion. Arda finally agrees with Maria, with his agreement token *yeah* in his next turn. He makes no further attempts at explanations or justifications.

The interaction in lines 147 through 165 in Excerpt 4 can be characterized as a smooth transition, leading to the final consensus reached between Maria and Arda. With no further acts of oppositional stance by Arda, Maria initiates a sequence that signals the end of this office hour interaction. Starting her turn with a solicitation of understanding from Arda, Maria offers to read his midterm together in lines 148–149. The clear uptake by Arda is evident in his *okay* in line 150. Following this, Maria elaborates on the details of how to do the business of reading Arda's midterm together between the lines 151 and 154, responding to her student's former *wish* statement in line 138. However, she sets the code of conduct (*but it doesn't mean that the grade is gonna change* in lines 154–155) followed by *alserter okay* for a confirmation check. At this point, Maria's offer is marked since she proposes to do something that she does not technically have to do, thus making a face-saving move, by showing her willingness to help Arda better understand academic writing norms and expectations. Her offer is immediately ratified by Arda (*okay* in line 156), and then they harmoniously finalize their

decision of a collaborative reading of his midterm between the lines 157 and 161 (not shown here) before they terminate the session.

5 Conclusion

We have demonstrated how oppositional stance was initiated, developed, negotiated, and then resolved throughout a single office hour interaction. Drawing primarily on Du Bois' (2007) stance triangle, our discourse analysis of a dyadic interaction has uncovered how evaluation, positioning, and alignment, through both epistemic and affective oppositional stance acts, were mutually constructed in the ongoing talk. In other words, enacting an oppositional stance is not an isolated act, but rather, it is jointly created in how an utterance, or a series of utterances, is responded to, or managed, by the other interlocutor. Unlike previous research on stance (Biber et al. 2002; Kärkkäinen 2003; Du Bois 2007), which has focused on utterances from native speakers of English, our study has examined stance in an academic setting where English was used as a *Lingua Franca*. Our analysis contributes to an understanding of "the relation between one actor's subjectivity and another's" (Du Bois 2007: 140) and shows how such intersubjectivity is also achieved through divergence and disalignment in oppositional stance, rather than only through alignment and convergence.

The co-constructed oppositional stance between an instructor and student in this academic setting was also complex in nature in the sense that interlocutors employed various strategies to express their evaluation, positioning, and disalignment in this dialogic interaction. The enactment of oppositional stance in our analysis included instances of positioning at an affective scale and evaluation at an epistemic scale along with elucidations or explanations, repetitions and reformulations of prior assertions, analogy, and exchange of counterarguments. Disalignment was achieved in a highly varied manner – by both the instructor and student – throughout the entire interaction. Instances of temporary alignment in the data appear have been utilized to preface an assertion in response to oppositional stance or a return to a previous stance act. Our analysis also illustrated how contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982), such as a sudden increase in stress and/or pitch on certain segments or lexical items, discourse markers, and discourse features (e. g., pauses, pause fillers, lexical hedges, hesitation markers, false starts) played a salient role in co-constructing oppositional stance throughout the ongoing interaction.

Understanding co-constructed oppositional stance in our study also highlights the role of uptake of the stance acts in the ongoing interaction. Given that

it was the student showing his antagonistic stance towards course content and academic writing conventions, the way it was responded to by the instructor led to the mutually constructed stance in this interaction. First of all, an initiation move by the instructor in the form of a directive, as one of the three major acts in spoken discourse according to Sinclair and Coulthard (2013), triggered the co-construction of oppositional stance in this interaction. By giving interactional space to her student, the instructor enabled him to voice his pessimistic attitudes and evaluations. Furthermore, her repeated assertions of the course requirements and expectations constituted one of her major strategies for responding to the instances of oppositional stance by the student. However, when the student's oppositional stance escalated, the instructor became more direct, thus curtailing any further acts of oppositional stance.

At the different stages of oppositional stance, which we call initiation, negotiation and resolution, the interplay of directness and indirectness were important features of the relational work (Locher 2004; Locher and Watts 2005) occurring in this interaction. In that sense, oppositional stance is also linked to the notion of face, as interlocutors negotiate and maintain their relationship through evaluation, positioning, and disalignment. We have observed that indirectness is evident for face-maintaining purposes while responding to oppositional stance, and willingness to allow interactional space for the other party to express opposition facilitated the process of initiating and negotiating the act of oppositional stance, displaying the role of floor apportionment (Adams 1999). However, as one party escalates and becomes more direct, the other party becomes increasingly more direct as well.

References

- Adams, Karen L. 1999. Deliberate dispute and the construction of oppositional stance. *Pragmatics*. 9(2). 231–248.
- Arundale, Robert B. 2010. Constituting face in conversation: Face, facework, and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 42. 2078–2105.
- Baker, Paul & Sibonile Ellece. 2011. *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bednarek, Monika. 2006. *Evaluation in media discourse: Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. London: Continuum.
- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad & Geoffrey Leech. 2002. *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Essex: Pearson.
- Bom, Isabelle van der & Sara Mills. 2015. A discursive approach to the analysis of politeness data. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*. 11(2). 179–206.

- Davies, Bronwyn & Rom Harré. 1990. Positioning: Conversation and the production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*. 20. 43–63.
- Du Bois, John W. 1991. Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research. *Pragmatics*. 1(71). 71–106.
- Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.). *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2004. *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Presentation at the 10th Biennial Rice Linguistics Symposium, March 31–April 3, Rice University, Houston, TX.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2007. *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*. 5(1). 25–66.
- Finegan, Edward. 1995. Subjectivity and subjectivisation: an introduction. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.). *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*. 1–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2004. Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the historical construction of interlocutor stance: From stance markers to discourse markers. *Discourse Studies*, 6(4). 427–448.
- Gee, James Paul. 2011. *An Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 2006. *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status, and exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles & Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent operation on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics*. 1(1). 1–55.
- Gumperz, John Joseph. 1982. Interethnic communication. In John Joseph Gumperz (ed.). *Discourse strategies*. 172–186. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Haugh, Michael. 2007. Emic conceptualizations of (im)politeness and face in Japanese: implications for the discursive negotiation of second language learner identities. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 3(4). 657–680.
- Hunston, Susan & Geoffrey Thompson. 2000. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, Ken. 2005. Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*. 7(2). 173–192.
- Hyland, Ken & Polly Tse. 2005. Evaluative *that* constructions: Signaling stance in research abstracts. *Functions of Language*. 12(1). 39–63.
- Iedema, Rick, Susan Feez & Peter White. 1994. *Media literacy*. Sydney, Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Department of School Education.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2009. *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jaspers, Jürgen. 2012. Interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. In James Paul Gee & Michael Handford (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. 135–159. London/New York: Routledge.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on 'I think'*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2007. The role of *I guess* in conversational stancetaking. In Robert Englebretson (ed.). *Stancetaking in discourse*. 183–220. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kiesling, Scott F. 2011. *Stance in context: Affect, alignment and investment in the analysis of stancetaking*. Paper presented at the iMean Conference, April 15, The University of the West England, Bristol, UK.
- Kiesling, Scott F. 2019. Stances of the 'Gay Voice' and 'Brospeak': Towards a systematic model of stancetaking. In Kira Hall & Rusty Barrett (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of language and sexuality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langlotz, Andreas. & Miriam A. Locher. 2013. The role of emotions in relational work. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 58. 87–107.
- Limberg, Holger. 2010. *The interactional organization of academic talk: office hour consultations*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Locher, Miriam A. 2004. *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Locher, Miriam A. 2013. Politeness. In Carol A. Chapelle (ed.). *The encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. 1–6. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Locher, Miriam A. 2015. Interpersonal pragmatics and its link to (im)politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 86. 5–10.
- Locher, Miriam A. & Sage L. Graham. 2010. Introduction to interpersonal pragmatics. In Miriam A. Locher & Sage L. Graham (eds.). *Interpersonal pragmatics*. 1–13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 9–33.
- Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2008. Relational work and impoliteness: negotiating norms of linguistic behavior. In Derek Bousfield & Miriam A. Locher (eds.). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. 77–99. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Martin, James. 2000. Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In Susan Hunston & Geoff Thompson (eds.). *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. 142–175. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, James & Peter White. 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mills, Sara. 2011. Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (ed.). *Discursive approaches to politeness*. 19–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rojo, Luisa Martín & Clara Molina. 2017. Cosmopolitan stance negotiation in multicultural academic settings. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 21(5). 672–695.
- Scheibman, Joanne. 2007. Subjective and intersubjective uses of generalizations in English conversations. In Robert Englebretson (ed.). *Stancetaking in discourse*. 111–138. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton. 2003. *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sinclair, John & Malcolm Coulthard. 2013. Towards an analysis of discourse. In Malcolm Coulthard (ed.). *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. 1–34. New York: Routledge.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2004. Interactional sociolinguistics. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier & Peter Trudgill (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook*. 76–88. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2005. Interactional sociolinguistics as a resource for intercultural pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 2(2). 205–208.
- Vásquez, Camilla. 2011. Complaints online: The case of TripAdvisor. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43. 1707–1717.
- White, Peter. 2003. Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text*. 23(2). 259–284.
- Wu, Ruy-Juan Regina. 2004. *Stance in talk: A conversation analysis of Mandarin final particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix: Transcription Conventions and Codes

:	Lengthening of a sound or syllable
(#. #)	Pause in seconds e. g., (0.2) for a two-second pause
@	Laughter, multiple @ shows longer laughter
[]	Speech overlap
(())	Researcher's transcription comments
↑	Increase in stress or pitch
“ ”	Direct speech (or utterance read from a student's paper)
...	Continuing turn
^word^	Mispronunciation

Bionote

Hatime Çiftçi

Hatime Çiftçi is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at MEF University. She teaches courses such as Sociolinguistics, Applied Linguistics and Research Methods. She received her Ph.D. in Second Language Acquisition and Instructional Technology from University of South Florida. Her research interests include pragmatics and discourse, politeness, intercultural communication, and computer-mediated communication.

Camilla Vásquez

Camilla Vásquez is a Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of South Florida, where she teaches courses such as Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistics and Internet Language.

Camilla is the author of *The Discourse of Online Consumer Reviews* (Bloomsbury, 2014), as well as a number of articles that have appeared in journals such as *Discourse Context & Media*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Narrative Inquiry*, *Text & Talk*, among others.