English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 12, No. 2 Summer 2006

Korean EFL Learners' Cognitive Tendencies in Critical Reading of Argumentative Texts

Jong-Hee Lee
(Kangwon National University)

Lee, Jong-Hee. (2006). Korean EFL learners' cognitive tendencies in critical reading of argumentative texts. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(2), 107-125.

This article reports some Korean EFL learners' cognitive tendencies drawn up from their responses to logical fallacies in the argument passages, and its pedagogical implications. The findings of experimental study show the meaningful disparities in three sets of judgment tests designed to identify and explicate faulty arguments: based on the three general types of fallacies using language, emotions, and distraction tactics, subjects on average gained the highest scores in the test questions with language-loaded fallacies and the lowest scores in those with emotion-based ones among the three different types; for this reason, the scores that subjects obtained in the test of distraction-loaded fallacious arguments fell in between the two poles. These discrepancies, mainly based on statistical inferences, support the possibility that the Korean EFL learners are most likely to be manipulated by emotions/distraction-loaded argument tactics than by language-based ones in the three types of fallacious arguments; and, they are least likely to be influenced by language-oriented trickeries. As a consequence, such variances in abilities to recognize the intrinsic elements of logical fallacies suggest some basic instructional approaches to critical reading of argumentative texts with due weights on the Korean EFL learners' culture-specific cognitive tendencies.

[critical reading/argumentative text/logical fallacy/cognitive tendency]

I. INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension, one of the receptive skills, provides a valid foundation for the rudimentary processes of second language acquisition (Block,

1992; Ellis, 1994). Critical reading in particular is widely recognized as an advanced step to enable language learners to interpret a text in a proactive manner (Kim, 2006). On the part of readers, its aim is to construct their own ideas and speculations, or to evaluate the concepts and viewpoints they often encounter in an argumentative text (Lee, 2004; Schwegler, 2004). In doing so, the reader, getting out of the routine procedures of data reception and interpretation, would take an aggressive stance rather than a submissive attitude toward the language input (Widdowson, 1995). Yet, critical analysis may not be cogent and equitable unless it is well grounded on a circumspect and effective grasp of the reading materials (Mayfield, 2004).

To build up the reader's abilities for decoding a text critically, thorough comprehension of the text contents must precede any possible criticism. And, as a follow-up action, one should have an adequate understanding of how arguments in the text are organized and worked out (ibid). An argumentative prose is, to a large extent, dependent upon specific modes of exposition for logical reasoning (Schwegler, 2004). Those developmental mechanisms are exploited to bring the reader into the writer's lines of perception and/or argumentation on the issues the writer has raised. If properly designed, the author, by means of such methodological tactics, can be in an advantageous position to persuade the reader to admit of and comply with her/his standpoints (Lee, 2004). It is, however, essential in processing an argumentative text that the reader should question and challenge the writer's assertions to find out whether they are based on the fallacious proofs (Wood, 2001).

This article constitutes two main parts: (a) theoretical descriptions made through relevant literature surveys, and (b) experimental investigations, including the analysis of test results, to find out a basic approach to curriculum and syllabus designs. So I first intend to take a look at the structural properties of an argument and some major sources of proofs supporting its purposes. Much attention will be paid to the elements of logical fallacies manipulated by pseudo-reasoning to confirm the formative aspects of the faulty argument tactics. Such intentional pseudo-proofs have been primarily selected to examine the responses of Korean students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), and thus to explore their culture-based cognitive tendencies in relation to teaching critical reading strategies focused on interpreting argumentative texts.

In doing this, research questions have been formulated to look at how Korean EFL learners react to the logical fallacies written in their target language. Given

the primary objective of this study, it is necessary to describe the subjects' individual responses to the major types of logical fallacies in argumentative texts and to explore the cognitive tendencies based on their reactions. One of the important steps was to examine their answers on a set of test materials, which contains thirty different argument passages. All the analyses and discussions in later sections are grounded on the following research topics:

[Research Questions]

(a) To what types of fallacious arguments do the subject groups show greater weaknesses in identifying and explaining logical fallacies than the other types?; and

(b) What cognitive tendencies can we find out from their overall responses to logical fallacies on the basis of the proportional distributions of such weaknesses?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Basic Structure of Arguments

In general, arguments are used to advocate opinions. A well-reasoned argument can persuade others to accept the writer's ideas or assertions. To do this successfully, an argument should be developed in accordance with its essential binary structure; reason and conclusion (Mayfield, 2004; Wood, 2001). So a quick method for analyzing such a basic argument is to disassemble its entire structure into the two interlinked components; first identifying its conclusion, and then separating the core statement from the peripheral reasons offered to support it.

In terms of reasons, persuasive statements are offered to explain, justify, or support the conclusion as the crucial part of an argument (Seyler, 2003). To formulate valid reasons, the statements may involve facts, statistics, evidence, or reasoning processes (ibid). Depending on the features of issues, the number of reasons can vary in constructing a single conclusion. On the other hand, a conclusion is often composed of an explicit statement of what an argument mainly intends to prove (Wood, 2001). This statement serves as the argument's thesis, final opinion, or judgment. It clearly presents the author's specific position on a controversial issue.

A reasoning process in arguments usually takes the form of either inductive or deductive method (Mayfield, 2004). The simplified models of these reasoning patterns can reveal an argumentative structure more easily. In case of an inductive method, the author makes an attempt to draw up a conclusion or a generalized principle out of the detailed and individual facts; in case of a deductive method, the author tries to jump into a concluding statement first, and then to provide supporting details for the justification of its central claim. So, in the formal reasoning of induction and deduction, a conclusion, functioning as a core statement of purpose, is placed in the final step in such a process (ibid).

A simple illustration is as follows: Inductive reasoning; (a) Last week I was happy playing the violin; (b) Yesterday I was happy playing the violin; (c) Whenever I play the violin, I feel happy; (d) Conclusion: Playing the violin makes me happy; and Deductive reasoning; (a) Playing the violin makes me happy; (b) I am playing the violin; (c) Conclusion: I am happy. As noted here, there are two indispensable components of an argument: (a) what main point is being made, and (b) how this point is supported.

In actuality, however, there may be a third component to any good argument: the assumptions which connect reason to conclusion (Seyler, 2003). In other words, the arguer can hold objective viewpoints guiding the reader to accept without questioning that the reasons or evidence does verify the conclusion or claim. Therefore, we can recognize that the initial task for students as readers of argument to enhance their critical reading strategies is to sort out the essential parts of a valid argument: (a) to identify the claim or conclusion; (b) to identify the reasons or evidence; and (c) to think about the assumptions the writer must hold in order to make the evidence work as solid evidence.

Approaching arguments with an adequate understanding of their inner organizations can lead us to improve critical reading strategies for the argumentative texts. Such fundamental skills are also regarded as a prerequisite for the development of evaluation capabilities as to whether an argument is valid or not. In parallel with this outline, then, it is further necessary to have a close look at the various types of proofs employed to validate an argument in order to gain a well-integrated knowledge of how it is organized.

2. Sources of Proofs for Arguments

The facts or judgments that verify claims in arguments are referred to as proofs or evidence (Mayfield, 2004). Presenting material proofs supporting the author's viewpoints is considered to be an effective way to persuade people's minds. Aristotle, in his classical book entitled "Rhetoric", stated that an arguer has to offer a claim (or a proposition) and prove it. He further provided the two broad categories of proof used to increase the probability of a claim: one group refers to the proofs that can be physically observed and confirmed such as a weapon, fingerprints, or a written contract; and the other refers to the proofs that can be abstractively constructed and derived from a person's intelligence and creative thinking.

It is well known that Aristotle classified the intangible category of evidence noted above into three subcategories: (a) logos - proofs that appeal to logic and reason; (b) ethos - proofs that establish the credibility of the source; and (c) pathos - proofs that appeal to the emotions (Wood, 2001).

First, logical proof can have an impact on a person's reasoning process, general cognitive mechanisms, and schematic knowledge of the world. As convincing evidence, it is dependent on inferred viewpoints, and factual confirmations, and further on the truthfulness of such supporting frameworks. Aristotle pointed out that this type of proof is the most essential part in an argument, and a majority of modern researchers share this position with him.

Second, proofs that establish ethos appeal to a person's impressions, opinions, and judgments with regard to the speaker who presents the argument. Those who display high degrees of their capabilities, decent personality and objective standpoints toward the audience are more reliable than arguers possessing lower standards of these qualities.

Third, emotional proof may play a role in stimulating the audience to arouse their feelings. To work out this intent, it is recommended to use the appropriate language containing emotional elements such as vivid examples of a specific circumstance and concrete descriptions based on personal experiences. As solid logical proofs can support an argument's intended conclusion, so pathos-based language can persuade the reader to accept the main purpose of logical argument.

3. Major Types of Fallacious Arguments

Because argument is, as a whole, concerned with probability other than certainty, arguments may vary in the degree to which each of them is reliable. In most cases, the credibility of proofs is the primary determinant as to whether an argument is successful or not (Mayfield, 2004). Thus, the reader should be able to evaluate the integrity of an argument, which is largely mediated through the reliability of facts, the soundness of inferences, and the logic of reasons. Quite understandably, weak, faulty or unacceptable arguments involve certain patterns of illogical development, which is often referred to as 'logical fallacies' (ibid). The effectiveness of fallacies derives from their pseudo-reasoning, their adoption of covert appeals to our emotions, and their abilities to divert our attention from their weaknesses. Seemingly those arguments may be considered to be plausible, but to take a careful look at them would recognize fundamental defects or intentional manipulation.

With such an overview in mind, this section of the article will address the three major types of logical fallacies that exploit trickeries with language, emotions and distraction by means of summarizing the widely recognized literatures that introduce the underlying principles of faulty arguments in details (Mayfield, 2004; Seyler, 2003; Wood, 2001).

1) Fallacies Using Language Trickery

Faulty arguments usually rely on a skillful selection of words or a purposeful use of words that are unclear, ambiguous, and even biased in connotative meaning. These fallacies attempt to persuade the audience by employing vague or deceptive language; word ambiguity, misleading euphemisms, and prejudicial language. A brief survey of these language trickeries is given below.

(1) Word Ambiguity

The fallacy caused by ambiguous words in sentences refers to the case that as core words with meanings more than one are left undefined, the reader has to assume what actual meaning has been intended. A misleading argument tries to gain an unfair advantage by selecting words that may confuse the readers and entice them to consent with a given claim without an adequate understanding of it. For this purpose, advertisers often prefer to choose vague or ambiguous words to

coax buyers into possessing their own desires. The advantage of this scheme for advertisers is that afterwards they can avoid responsibility for the buyer's subjective interpretation.

(2) Misleading Euphemisms

Euphemisms are inoffensive or positive words employed to maintain a decent level of social formality. On the other hand, misleading euphemisms, deliberately coined for the purpose of unnoticed evasion and manipulation, camouflage actions, things, or events that could appear to be unacceptable in light of socially recognized values. So they are often adopted for political and commercial propaganda. Unlike these trickeries, ordinary euphemisms allow people to avoid taboo subjects and polite social interactions.

(3) Prejudicial Language

The fallacy of prejudicial language is an attempt to persuade through the selection of distorted or loaded words that carry a bias in one way or another. The implications in such a tactic is that the words chosen only describe what is real and true. In these language uses, no supporting reasons are provided, and persuasion is attempted mainly through evaluative word choices. So the task for the critical reader is to separate word selection from word meaning and thus detach from the emotional power of word connotations. We can easily notice the cases that journalists rely on highly elusive or slanted words in order to attract their readers' attention without equitable and objective reasons.

2) Fallacies Using Emotion Trickery

Fallacies based on emotional trickery in general seek to persuade people by appealing to fear, pity, popular belief, false authority, and prejudiced viewpoints. Readers are required to grasp the writer's improper strategies used to move themselves emotionally, so that they are more able to judge the relevant matter on the basis of the logic and evidence of the argument.

(1) Appeals to Emotions

An apparent sign of a false argument is one relying on presenting unilateral evaluative words. In this case, those words can quickly stir up the reader's emotions and urge him to agree with such evaluations. Once the reader is

influenced by the words, he may have difficulties in noticing faulty reasoning. So, emotional appeals can be effective in arousing the reader's strong interest and impeding his rational analysis of a given issue. However, we need to be aware that all of this type of arguments stimulating emotions are not fallacious. Usually people are not inclined to construct sound arguments unless they are motivated by feelings. In maintaining normal mentality and judgment on various matters, most of them are likely to be supported by clear and just anger, hostility, or sorrow. On the contrary, an argument taking advantage of emotional tricks tends to avoid or omit cogent reasoning processes, and to count largely on bringing about such affective reactions as fear, pity, greed, and animosity.

(2) Appeals to False Authority

In a broad term, an authority is one who has expertise in a particular field. Appeals to false authority seek to persuade people by citing the fake or inappropriate sources of the authority. The argument is not upheld by authoritative experts, but by the questionable endorsements of individuals who do not have reliable credentials or officially recognized capabilities on the issues concerned. These kinds of appeals usually display a number of variations initiating with appeals to well-known public figures. Advertising psychology research has reported that if a consumer can be manipulated into equating a positive popular figure with their commodity, then the consumer tends to assume that purchasing the product also indicates owning the favorable attitudes of the said figure. Hence, we can acknowledge the probability that most of commercial advertisements exploiting the fame of athletes, movie stars, and other celebrities can have considerable impacts on the consumers' decision-making patterns.

(3) Appeals to Prejudice

In general, prejudice is referred to as a biased or unfair set of feelings just like a mixture of envy, fear, and wrath. Those who have prejudiced ways of thinking cannot sustain equitable and objective standpoints necessary for logical reasoning. There are two different fallacious arguments to prejudice: one makes a direct and personal attack; and the other tries to contaminate a whole surrounding so that it can be distrusted or devalued, which is often called 'poisoning the well'. The former type of argument usually occurs during the political campaigns involving attacks on a candidate's personality irrelevant to his general qualifications required for the position. Such arguments are fallacious because they lead the

audience to have prejudice and to neglect the central substance of the argument. The latter form of argument is used to make the audience feel aversion towards all aspects of an individual or group by means of discrediting any partial element of the entity at the initial stage. So it is analogous to the case that when a certain amount of poison is poured into a clean well, its entire water turns to be contaminated.

3) Fallacies Using Distraction Trickery

The tactics of distraction employ some various tricks to divert the audience's attention away to other irrelevant issues with the intent to cover up the pitfalls of an argument. The fallacies belonging to these schemes may be categorized into many strands, but all of them mostly share insufficient reasons to support their conclusion. However, each of those fallacies can be difficult to detect chiefly because they can actually succeed in distracting people. Such major types of these fallacies as red herring, straw man, and circular reasoning are briefly introduced here.

(1) Red Herring

The red herring fallacy is devised to scatter our attention from the claim in question and to derail us into another matter. The term, red herring, originates from a lure used by prison escapees who would smear themselves with the fish in order to back the dogs as shepherds off their own smells. One of the familiar examples belonging to this category can be found in the sentence; 'Guns do not kill people, but people do'. The argument here does not offer adequate reasons to prove the claim that guns do not kill people, nor does it verify the covert claim that guns in themselves are not dangerous weapons. Apparently the statement diverts the reader's attention into disputing on the innate properties of people's mind. It is generally recognized that fallacies relying on a red herring tactic may be the most difficult of all faulty arguments to identify because it seems to virtually prove a claim on the surface; namely, the claim verified by the sidetracking maneuver has no relationship with one originally intended.

(2) Straw Man

The straw man fallacy points out the weakness in an argument by explaining that the arguer's opponents do not hold such views. Usually it takes the form of

ridicule and oversimplification by way of refutation. If someone argues that 'bilingual education is a serious mistake because it encourages students to use only their native language', the arguer denies the fact that advocates of bilingual instruction recognize it as an effective way to keep students learning subjects while it also enables them to acquire English mediated in their classrooms. Just like the statement that 'I cannot respect Hindus because they wear those red spots painted on their foreheads', such a fallacy can also attack and disapprove a trivial aspect of an argument, then claim that the whole argument has been destroyed as a consequence. Hence, the fallacy of straw man makes a false judgment regarding an opposing argument, and decomposes it subsequently.

(3) Circular Reasoning

The fallacy of circular reasoning is the assertion or repeated assertion of a claim without offering adequate support for the same conclusion. This type of fallacy causes an illusion of evidence by simply arguing its conclusion as if it were a validated reason, or by reasserting the virtually identical claim in different words. Such a fallacy is also called 'begging the question', which means to solicit prompt approval rather than gaining it by virtue of a valid argument. As easily seen in the statement that 'running is good for your health, and so if you want to be physically strong, you should run', circular reasoning can pretend that an inference is being drawn up from the preceding claim. In fact, however, all we earn in this false argument are the same binary conclusions, instead of obtaining a conclusion and a logical inference made between the two internal statements.

III. METHOD

The foregoing general survey of literature indicates that the logical fallacies in arguments can be footed in diverse tactical sources associated with people's normal ways of thinking. So we can foresee the possibility that the ordinary readers without prior training on aspects of arguments may be easily influenced and even manipulated by such trickeries.

1. Subjects

This pilot study was carried out with two different mixed-sex groups: one

group (opaque) consisted of twenty-two college students who have never received formal instruction related to logic, critical reading and/or argumentative writing; the other group (transparent) nineteen students who have learned those subjects at a tertiary level. All the participants, selected randomly through the minimum requirement for reading comprehension skills, whose target language proficiency were at an intermediate level and beyond, gauged by their TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) test scores starting from around 700. Their major fields were in humanities and social sciences, and at the time of taking judgment tests, none of them were informed of their binary groupings based on relevant formal instructions. The main purpose of employing the two separate groups in terms of prior background knowledge was to find out whether we can recognize any meaningful variation tendencies, if any, between their respective overall responses.

2. Task

All the subjects in either group were requested to take their individual judgment tests on identifying and describing the elements of logical fallacies used in the argument texts graded in length. The attached thirty different pieces of passages (see APPENDIX) were carefully selected to evaluate their overall reactions to three general types of fallacies involving language, emotions and distraction tactics. Almost all thirty different argument passages provided in the APPENDIX include the factors of logical fallacies belonging to three general types in almost the same proportions to one another. In each of three separate sets of test materials are three argument texts that are non-fallacious in themselves.

The subjects were instructed to perform this problem-solving task on the basis of two cognitive processes; one was their intuitive judgments (description-oriented process) on either existence or non-existence of a fallacy itself in each passage; the other was their analytical judgments (explanation-oriented process) on the reasons or evidence for a fallacy or non-fallacy involved in each argument text. In line with the methods and procedures above, five consecutive levels made on a scale of two through ten were adopted as the scoring criteria for the subjects' individual answers; 2 (poor), 4 (low), 6 (average), 8 (good), and 10 (excellent). All of these techniques were devised primarily to collect the reliable data for this experiment study.

IV. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

1. Results

Efforts, including statistical inferences, were made to provide a valid foundation for extracting the following outcomes, mainly because this experiment study involved open-ended answering types in conducting the evaluation test. As a result, in accordance with the experimental methods and procedures noted above, the numerical outcomes gained from the subjects' argument judgment test appear in Table below:

TABLE
Numerical Results of Argument Evaluation Test

Variable	Subject Group-1			Subject Group-2			
	MS	***SD***	***n***	***MS***	***SD***	***n***	***t-value***
Language	62.27	5.39	22	64.42	4.08	19	1.45*
Emotion	54.45	5.72	22	63.58	5.23	19	5.34
Distraction	60.36	3.36	22	65.89	3.35	19	5.27

[Three separate variables, **Language**, **Emotion** and **Distraction**, stand for: (1) test questions that contain logical fallacies using *Language* tactics; (2) those using *Emotion* tactics; and (3) those using *Distraction* tactics respectively.]

* $p < .05$

2. Data analysis

1) Quantitative Estimations

As described in the section of Subjects above, the two groups are divided into their normative levels – *opaque* and *transparent* – of previously acquired knowledge about general logical reasoning skills. In this experimental study intending to draw up their relevant cognitive tendencies, the comparison of the

two groups on a measure of evaluating performance is expected to provide a momentum to support such a quantitative estimation. So, the initial question to be investigated is whether there really is a significant difference in the actual performances between the two sample groups with regard to three types of logical fallacies. As the normal procedure for confirming the existence of a real difference begins with a null hypothesis – a statement that no relationship exists between the samples being compared, the first priority is to decide if the null hypothesis on a possible difference between Group-1 and Group-2 in the individual variables can be accepted or rejected.

According to a conventional level of significance, the probability of obtaining the difference by chance between the two groups is put to being less than five % ($p < .05$). So, in the cases of Group-1(n=22) and Group-2 (n=19) subjects, the binary poles of computed *t*-values satisfying such a significance level are determined to be 1.721 ~ –1.721 and 1.734 ~ –1.734 under the relevant degrees of freedom (*df*). As shown in the table above, the computed *t*-value (1.45) in the *language* variable falls within such two poles, and the respective computed *t*-values (5.34 & 5.27) in *emotion* and *distraction* variables fall out of the two acceptance areas. These statistical inferences indicate that the null hypothesis can be accepted only in the *language* variable, and so those *t*-values support the high probability of significant differences in *emotion* and *distraction* variables between the two groups as a result of their evaluation performances. Therefore, it is secure to mention that the *emotion* and *distraction* variables – the distinctive gaps between the opaque (non-existence) and transparent (existence) subjects in prior background knowledge – may be recognized as the relatively most sensitive areas with respect to the level of significance.

2) Pedagogical Implications

As indicated in the Table, based on three general types of logical fallacies using language, emotions, and distraction tactics, the two groups' test performances are considered meaningful in terms of statistical inferences despite the narrowly definable scope of participants in this small-scaled experiment. Although the performance gaps are not much tangible in case of fallacies using language, there are fairly notable differences between the numerical results concerning distraction-based and emotions-based fallacies in arguments. Specifically, group-1 subjects (opaque) without relevant formal instruction show

the lowest average score (54.45) in test questions with emotion-loaded fallacies than in the other types; group-2 subjects (transparent) with background knowledge concerned also do so (63.58) in such a type, but gained fairly similar scores to the other two types of logically faulty arguments, which are language-related and distraction-related fallacies. In addition, the range of standard deviations (3.35~5.72) across the subject groups and test categories largely support the cogency of this experimental outcome.

Coupled with the quantitative estimations above, these numerical differences between the two groups also back up the possibility that Korean EFL learners are more likely to be cajoled by emotion-loaded and distraction-based argument trickeries than by the language-oriented fallacious arguments in this experiment study. On the ground that there were the lowest discrepancies in language-based faulty arguments, the learners are not much likely to be coaxed by such a type of argument trickeries. In this regard, the practitioner may need to take note of Korean EFL learners' cognitive tendencies relatively more manipulated by emotion-distraction tactics in persuasive discourse and logical reasoning processes. It is, however, necessary to take note of the possibility that the statistical inferences above may contain an intrinsic limitation in establishing cogent argumentations, derived from the small number of subjects' initial reactions to a limited set of evaluation test questions.

V. CONCLUSION

This pilot experiment study has addressed the two research questions set up earlier: (a) To what types of fallacious arguments do the subject groups show greater weaknesses in identifying and explaining logical fallacies than the other types?; and (b) What cognitive tendencies can we find out from their overall responses to logical fallacies on the basis of the proportional distributions of such weaknesses?

The first research topic requires the description of a fundamental question as to whether there will be any meaningful discrepancies in their capabilities to detect and judge faulty arguments. For this purpose, this empirical study made use of statistical estimations for the exploration of the first study question. And, the second research topic necessitates the explanation of practical questions as to what educational implications and approaches can be drawn up from these

distinctive responses to logical fallacies. Hence it has been a matter of elicitation to carry out the main objectives of this experimental inquiry.

As a result of the foregoing considerations, it would be, though with a narrowly definable cogency in EFL literacy education, secure in offering the following conclusions as the far-reaching guidelines for pedagogical approaches and future research activities in the relevant fields: (a) In teaching critical reading strategies for argumentative texts, the language practitioner may take due note of the Korean EFL learners' relative weaknesses on emotions-loaded and distraction-based fallacious arguments in their cognitive processing inclinations in exploring the learner-specific curriculum and syllabus designs; (b) In performing argumentative writing researches, the language theoretician may pay much attention to ethnographical variations in the interpretation patterns of persuasive or argumentative texts containing various logical reasoning methods, particularly with due weight on Korean EFL learners' unique cognitive tendencies in critical reading processes.

REFERENCES

Block, E. L. (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(3), 375-406.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. H. (2004). Analytical tools for ideological texts in critical reading instruction. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 10*(3), 89-112.

Kim, Y. M. (2006). L2 reader's critical reading interpretation. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 12*(1), 1-27.

Mayfield, M. (2003). *Thinking for yourself: Developing critical thinking skills through reading and writing* (6th edition). Toronto, Canada: Thomson & Heinle.

Seyler, D. U. (2003). *The reading context: Developing college reading skills* (3rd edition). New York: Longman.

Schwegler, J. C. (2004). *Patterns of exposition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4*(3), 157-172.

Wood, N. V. (2001). *Perspectives on Argument* (3rd edition). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

APPENDIX

Excerpts from Subjects

(Directions) The main purpose of this test is to examine and analyze the test-takers' overall responses to three sets of argumentative texts provided below. There are two consecutive steps for each set of the separate tests: the first (test-time limit; 10 minutes), as an identification process, is to mark **"F"** on each item of your answer sheet (TYPE-A) in case it is considered **fallacious** in an argument, and mark **"L"** in case it is considered **legitimate;** and the second (test-time limit; 30 minutes), as an explication process, is to write down the **reasons or evidence** on your answer sheet (TYPE-B) that you think are true and appropriate as regards each of the fallacious or legitimate arguments that you have recognized:

[Test Materials-1]

(1) These pies made from locally grown cherries and have that old-fashioned country taste.
(2) This president, who has never worn a uniform, announced today that he would send our troops overseas.
(3) You have to go to law school. Every oldest child in this family for the past four generations has gone to law school.
(4) A ten-year study by leading scientists has found that Tuff toothpaste prevents decay in four out of five cases.
(5) "Women have babies and men provide the support. If you don't like the way we're made, you've got to take it up with God."
(6) These are our beliefs. During your life you can accept them or not. If you do, you will be saved. Otherwise you will go to hell for eternity.
(7) Marijuana smoking is not all that harmful. I would feel safer in a car with a driver who had smoked weed than one under the influence of liquor any day.
(8) It was announced today that our troops, who have been shelled for some weeks now in Lebanon, have made a strategic transfer to their ships offshore of that country.
(9) Cigarettes are not addictive. I know this to be true because the Chairman of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company testified before Congress that tobacco is not an addictive substance.

(10) Tom Jones was the tenth victim of police brutality this year. Arrested for murdering his two children in a fit of insanity due to the pressures of poverty, he had hoped, on release from a mental institution, to make a new life for himself. But on Sunday he was shot down mercilessly by the pigs when he ran from a police officer after robbing a liquor store.

[Break Time: 10 minutes]

[Test Materials-2]

(1) Those who object to irradiated foods are picky purists whose ideas run counter to common sense.

(2) Using hidden notes on a test is not unethical; our professors would not be where they are today if they had not done the same thing.

(3) The U.S. government has no right to accuse us Chinese of human rights violations when the United States has the highest crime rate in the world.

(4) I cannot understand why the environmentalists feel it is harmful to cut down the redwood forests. This work provides a good living to loggers and their families.

(5) And where are all the jobs that welfare mothers are supposed to get? Even a burger joint wants you to work evenings and weekends, times when there is virtually no child-care.

(6) Senator Brown is trying to increase welfare benefits for single moms. Again he is trying to push one of his Socialist ideas down our throats. Socialism has been proven to be no good.

(7) Some people would have us eliminate the use of all pesticides on fruits and vegetables. But both fruits and vegetables are essential for health and excellent sources of vitamins and minerals.

(8) A spokesman for a chemical industrial firm, when charged and fined for disposing of toxic wastes in the lakes of Illinois, protested, "Thousands of other industries are doing the same thing."

(9) American educators, in a recent survey, unanimously agreed that more homework, more intensive classroom activities and longer school years than now would only harm children and not necessarily result in better learning.

(10) The budget given the Pentagon by Congress again exceeded military requests by a few billion dollars. Isn't it obvious that when we have the best-funded defense in the world, we will have the best defense in the world?

[Break Time: 10 minutes]

[Test Materials-3]

(1) In China, Europe, and Brazil, efforts are being made to control the population growth that adds one billion people to the planet every decade.

(2) America's dirty little war in El Salvador has so far been limited to thin transfusions of money and material as well as moral support for murderous regimes.

(3) Why do you object to people smoking? What are you doing about the problem of smog pollution? Exhaust fumes are far more likely to give people lung cancer.

(4) We should stop giving handouts to the homeless. The poor of this world, of which we have all been a part at one time in our lives, have pride and work hard to improve themselves. The homeless have no pride and do not try to work.

(5) It is not fair to blame the U.S. government for not signing the international treaty to destroy all existing land mines. Ask anyone in the world about the U.S. record on human rights and about all it has done to alleviate human suffering.

(6) Why do you complain about cruelty to animals in scientific experiments? Look at the way animals are cruel to one another. Have you ever seen the way lions bite into the necks of zebras, rip open their insides, then eat their hearts and entrails?

(7) It has been estimated that illegal aliens are costing our taxpayers in excess of 5 billion dollars a year. Should our senior citizens be denied full health care benefits, should our children suffer overcrowded classrooms in order to subsidize the costs of illegal aliens?

(8) "One out of every five Americans experience a mental disorder in any given year, and half of all Americans have such disorders at some time in their lives but most of them never seek treatment, the surgeon general of the United States says in a comprehensive new report."

(9) During his career, Saddam Hussein has transformed himself into numerous expedient political persona, including a revolutionary, a party henchman, an Iraqi strongman, a devout Moslem, and a Pan-Arabic messiah. His mercurial ruthlessness, combined with his domestic terror tactics, his xenophobia, and his political acumen have enabled him to become the absolute ruler of Iraq.

(10) I am bewildered by those who support the "three strikes and you are out" law. This tough position denies all possibility for change in people. With it, we turn our backs on these people, saying they can never get better. Thus, we buy into a cycle of hate and fear in a total rejection of love and compassion, locking ourselves up in our houses of fear just like we lock up the prisoners in our prisons.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: College/Higher

Lee, Jong-Hee
Department of English Language, Literature and Tourism
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Kangwon National University-Samcheok Campus
1, Joongang-ro, Samcheok-si, Kangwon-do 245-711
Tel: (033)570-6652
Fax: (033)574-6653
E-mail: freshfields@kangwon.ac.kr

Received in April, 2006
Reviewed in May, 2006
Revised version received in June, 2006