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Abstract

Asians are said to use silence in academic situation more than other learners from Europe and America. With the increased need for students' oral participation in the language learning classroom and other academic situations, the Asian silent behavior has been considered a problem. The aim of this study is to investigate factors that contribute to the use of conversational silence by Malaysian science and non-science undergraduate students in academic discourse. Seventeen undergraduate students from a local university in Malaysia participated in a focus group interview which required them to respond to questions related to the beliefs of their culture on the use of silence, the extent to which the participants practice silence in academic discourse, and factors that contribute to the use of conversational silence. There were two groups each from the Departments of English and Computer and Communication System who informed the research. The study was underpinned by Brown and Levinson Politeness Theory, which is tied to the concept of 'face' as something that is highly valuable, and must be guarded in interaction. The findings suggest that some factors such as socio-cultural upbringing, personality and intimidation by the environment play a role in the use of silence by the informants of this study.
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Framing academic discourse as a metaphorical battle leads to a variety of negative consequences, many of which have ethical as well as personal dimensions. Among these consequences is a widespread assumption that critical dialogue is synonymous with negative critique, at the expense of other types of 'critical thinking'. Another is the requirement that scholars search for weaknesses in others' work at the expense of seeking strengths, understanding the roots of theoretical differences, or integrating disparate but related ideas. I begin by sketching my own early interest in agonism in conversational discourse.