

記錄編號	5976
狀態	NC093FJU00462006
助教查核	
索書號	
學校名稱	輔仁大學
系所名稱	語言學研究所
舊系所名稱	
學號	488286064
研究生(中)	林逸昀
研究生(英)	YI-Yun Lin
論文名稱(中)	台灣大學生辯護語使用之性別差異研究

論文名稱 (英)	Gender Difference in Disagreement-defense: A Case Study of College and Graduate Students in Taiwan
其他題名	
指導教授 (中)	許洪坤教授
指導教授 (英)	Dr. Joseph H. Hsu
校內全文開放日期	
校外全文開放日期	
全文不開放理由	

電子全文送交國圖.	
國圖全文開放日期.	
檔案說明	
電子全文	
學位類別	碩士
畢業學年度	94
出版年	
語文別	英文
關鍵字	性別差異,辯護語,大學生 否定詞 攻擊性

(中)	
關鍵字 (英)	Gender difference, Disagreement, College students
摘要 (中)	<p>日常生活的對話中，不同意見的表達是常有的事。當說話者與聽話者雙方意見相左時，如何堅持自己的意見卻又不失彼此的面子，往往是在衝突對話裡重要的課題之一。本研究旨在了解當熟識的朋友間的談話內容意見不同時，談話的雙方如何為自己的立場做辯護。並且，這種辯護策略(pragmatic strategies)及語言特徵(linguistic features)的使用是否會隨著說話者的性別或對象而有所不同。研究過程中，語料的收集來自九筆熟識朋友間面對面互動的談話，談話的對象依性別可分為同性(含男、女)及異姓三類。所收集的語料除將分為辯護策略及辯護語言特徵之外，另再依同性情境及異性情境做分析，以便對辯護語的使用有全盤的了解。研究結果顯示，在辯護策略方面，在大部分的策略裡，兩性的策略使用頻率並無不同，但仍有少數策略，諸如解釋、反駁與批評，男性與女性有不同的使用頻率。但在同性與異性的情境比較中，辯護策略的使用在同性情境裡明顯比在異性情境裡使用的多，表示說話者在同性情境裡較能主動表達及堅持他們的意見。另一方面，在辯護的語言特徵使用方面，兩性均常使用修飾語(qualifier)與簡單問句(simple question)，但男性比女性使用較多的否定詞(negative marker)與插話的技巧(interruption)，而女性較常使用附加問句(tag question)、第一人稱(the first person pronoun)、第三人稱(the third person pronoun)等語言特徵。表示男性的語言特徵使用上仍是使用較攻擊性的語言，女性使用較溫和的語言策略。最後，在同性與異性的情境方面，說話者在兩個情境的語言特徵使用上並無不同，但與辯護策略使用相同的是，說話者在同性情境使用較多的攻擊性語言，例如否定詞(negative marker)，並且在異性情境裡使用較多的溫和性語言，例如句尾詞(particle)，顯示說話者在同性的情境裡較直接為自己的立場做辯護。</p>
摘要 (英)	<p>In daily conversation, conflict of opinions can't be avoided and speakers may insist their thinking at times. Since face and politeness are valued high in Chinese society, how do speakers defend in a disagreement context without losing hearer's face? This study aims to investigate the use of disagreement-defensive pragmatic strategies and linguistic features used by men and women. We try to comprehend how speakers uphold their stands and attack hearers' positions to make their opinions accepted. In this study, nine dyadic face to face daily conversations are collected: three male-to-male conversations, three female-to-female conversations and three mixed-sex conversations. Each conversation is given by two close friends and lasts for forty-five minutes. Besides, Chi-square is used to analyze these strategies and features. The findings of this study indicate that generally, men and women show similarities in choosing disagreement-defense strategies; however, women use more account than men do, while men use more rebuttal and criticism. In comparison between single-sex settings and mixed-sex settings, speakers defend more with single-sex interlocutors. As for the use of linguistic features, men use more aggressive features</p>

	<p>but women use more mitigating features. Speakers also make direct markers, such as negative marker, in talking with same-sex interlocutors but indirect markers, like particles, in talking with same-sex hearers. The phenomenon of frequent use of disagreement-defense strategies and features result from the change of social beliefs and attitudes towards gender, the casual conversation style and the close relations between speakers and hearers.</p>
<p>論 文 目 次</p>	<p>Table of Contents Table of Contents ii List of Tables iv Acknowledgements vi 中文摘要 vii English Abstract viii Table of Contents Chapter One Introduction 1 I. Motivation 1 II. Scope 2 III. Outline of this thesis 3 Chapter Two Literature Review 4 I. Introduction 4 II. Gender Differences 4 A. Social-cultural Influences on Gender Differences 4 B. Gender-based Differences in Linguistic Behavior 6 C. Female-male Language Change 9 III. Politeness 11 A. Definition 11 B. Social factors 13 C. Pragmatic Strategies and Linguistic Features 20 IV. Disagreement Studies 30 A. Conversational Structure 30 B. Pragmatic Strategies 33 C. Linguistic Features 34 V. Summary 34 Chapter Three Theoretical Framework and Objectives 36 I. Introduction 36 II. Definition of Disagreement-defense 36 III. Pragmatic Strategies 40 IV. Linguistic Features 49 V. Objectives 65 Chapter Four Methodology 67 I. Introduction 67 II. Subjects 67 III. Materials 68 IV. Procedures 69 V. Data Analysis 70 VI. Summary 71 Chapter Five Data Analysis and Discussion 72 I. Introduction 72 II. Pragmatic Strategies 72 A. Overall description 72 B. Comparisons Between Single-sex Settings and Mixed-sex Settings75 C. Specific Settings 78 D. Discussion on Pragmatic Strategies 83 III. Linguistic Features 90 A. Overall description 90 B. Comparisons between Single-sex Settings and Mixed-sex Settings93 C. Specific Settings 96 D. Discussion on Linguistic Features 101 IV. Summary 106 Chapter Six Conclusion 110 I. Summary of this Study 110 II. Implications 114 III. Suggestions For Further Study 115 Bibliography 117</p>
<p>參 考 文 獻</p>	<p>Bibliography Aries, E. 1976. Interaction Patterns and Themes of Male, Female and Mixed groups. <i>Small Group Behavior</i> 7:1, 7-18. Austin, J. L. 1962. <i>How to Do Things with Words</i>. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Bateson, G. 1972. <i>Steps to an Ecology of Mind</i>. New York: Ballantine. Benedict, R. 1943. <i>A Note on Chinese Culture and Personality</i>. Washington: Mimeo. Berk, L M. 1999. <i>English Syntax: From Word to Discourse</i>. New York: Oxford UP. Brown, P. & S. Levinson. 1987. <i>Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage</i>. New York: Cambridge UP. Chafe, W. 1982. <i>Integration and Interaction in Speaking, Writing and Oral Literature</i>. In Deborah Tannen, <i>Spoken and Written Language</i>, 35-53. Norwood: Albex. Chang, Y.Y. and Hsu Y. P. 1998. Requests on E-mail: A cross-cultural Comparison. <i>RELC Journal</i> 29:2, 121-51. Chao, Yuen Ren. 1976. <i>Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics</i>. Stanford: Stanford UP. Chen, R.1993. <i>Responding to Compliments: A Contrastive Study of Politeness Strategies between American English and Chinese Speakers</i>. <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> 20, 49-75. Chen, Shu Hsin. 2000. <i>Personal Pronouns in Political</i></p>

Discourse: A Study of the 1998 Taipei Mayoral Debates. Unpublished MA thesis: NTHU.

Chen, X., Ye, L. & Y. Zhang. 1995. Refusing in Chinese. In Kasper, G. (ed.) *Pragmatics of Chinese as Native and Target Language*, 119-164. Honolulu: Hawaii UP.

Coates, Jennifer. 1989. Gossip Revisited: Language in All-Female Groups. In Jennifer Coates and Deborah Cameron (eds.) *Women in Their Speech Communities*, 94-121. London: Longman.

Coates, Jennifer. 1993. *Women, men and language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. London: Longman.

Duck, S. 1983. *Friends for Life: The Psychology of Close Relationships*. Brighton: Harvester.

Edelsky, Carole. 1981. Who's Got the Floor? *Language in Society* 10, 383-421.

Eder, D. 1990. Serious and Playful Disputes: Variation in Conflict Talk among Female Adolescents. In A. D. Grimshaw (ed.), *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations in Conversations*, 67-84. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Fishman, Pamela M. 1983. Interaction: the Work Women Do. In Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley (eds.) *Language, Gender and Society*, 89-101, New York: Newbury House.

Folb, E. A. 1980. *Running Down Some Lines: The Language and Culture of Black Teenagers*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Fraser, B. 1975. The Concept of Politeness. Paper presented at the 1985 NAWAVW meeting: Georgetown University.

Fraser, B. 1990. Perspectives on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 219-236.

Glenn, P. J. & M. L Knapp. 1987. The Interactive Framing of Play in Adult Conversations. *Communication Quarterly* 35, 48-66.

Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior*. New York: Garden City.

Goodwin, Charles. 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Goodwin, Charles and M. H. Goodwin. 1990. Interstitial Argument. In A. D. Grimshaw (ed.). *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Goodwin, M. H. 1980. Directive-response Speech Sequences in Girl's and Boys' Task Activities. In Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker and Nelly Furman (eds.) *Women and Language in Literature and Society*, 157-173. New York: Praeger.

Gray, John. 1992. *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus*. New York: Harper Collins.

Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In Cole P. and J. L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3: *Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: Academic.

Grimshaw, A. D. 1990. *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Gruber, Helmut. 1998. Disagreeing: Structure and Sequential Placement of Disagreements in Conflicts Phase of Talk. *Text* 18, 467-503.

Gruber, Helmut. 2001. Questions and Strategic Orientation in Verbal Conflict Sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1815-1857.

Gu, Yue Guo. 1985. *Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese*. Unpublished MA dissertation: University of Lancaster.

Gu, Yue Guo. 1990. Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 237-257.

Harris, S. 1984. Questions as a Mode of Control in Magistrates' Courts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 49, 5-28.

Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, Men and Politeness*. London and New York: Longman.

Hong, W. 1998. *Request Patterns in Chinese and German: A Cross-cultural Study*. M?nchen: Lincom Europa.

Kalick, Susan. 1975. '...Like Ann's Gynecologist or the Time I Was Almost Raped' — Personal Narratives in Women's Rape Groups. *Journal of*

American Folklore 88, 3-11. Kong, K. C.C. 2003. "Are You my Friend?" : Negotiating Friendship in Conversations between Network Marketers and their Prospects. *Language in Society* 32, 487-522. Kuiper, Koenraad. 1991. Sporting Formulae in New Zealand English: Two Models of Male Solidarity. In Jenny Cheshire (ed.) *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 200-209. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Kuo, Sai-hua. 1993. Sociable Arguments among Chinese Friends: Process and Management. *The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 23:3, 253-285. La Barre, Weston. 1946a. Some Observations on Character Structure in the Orient: the Chinese. Part one. *Psychiatry* 9, 215-237. La Barre, Weston. 1946b. Some Observations on Character Structure in the Orient: The Chinese. Part two. *Psychiatry* 9, 375-395. Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP. Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper and Row. Lakoff, Robin. 1979. Stylistic Strategies within a Grammar of Style. In J. Orasanu, M. Slater, and L. Adler (eds.) *Language, Sex and Gender*, 53-80. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*. Lee, D. A., & Peck, J. 1995. Troubled Waters: Argument as Sociability Revised. *Language in Society* 24, 29-52. Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman. Leet-Pellegrini, H. M. 1980. Conversational Dominance as a Function of Gender and Expertise. In Howard Giles, Peter Robinson and Philip Smith (eds.) *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives*, 97-104. Oxford: Pergamon. Leung, Santoi. 2003. *Conflict Talk: A Discourse Analytical Perspective*. Working paper in Teachers College: Columbia University. Levinson, S. 1985. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Li, Charles N. and Sandra A Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: California UP. Liao, Chao-chih. 1994. *A Study on the Strategies, Maxims, and Development of Refusal in Mandarin Chinese*. Taipei: Crane. Lii-shih, Yu-hwei E. 1986. *Conversational Politeness and Foreign Language Teaching*. Taipei: Crane. Lii-shih, Yu-hwei E. 1994. What do "Yes" and "No" Really Mean in Chinese? In James E. Alatis (ed.) *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994*, 128-149. Lin, Zhi-yi. 1998. *Disagreement in Mandarin Chinese Conversation*. Unpublished MA thesis: NCCU. Maltz, Daniel N. and Borker, Ruth A. 1982. A Cultural Approach to Male-female Miscommunication. In *Language and Social Identity*. John J. Gumperz (ed.), 196-216. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Mayard, D. W. 1985. How Children Start Arguments. *Language in Society* 14, 1-29. Munro, Fran. 1987. *Female and Male Participation in Small-group Interaction in the ESOL classroom*. Unpublished terms project Graduate Diploma in TESOL. Sydney: Sydney College of Advanced Education. Muntigl, P. and William Turnbull. 1998. Conversational Structures and Facework in Arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29, 225-256. O' Barr, W. M. and B. K. Atkins. 1998. Women's Language or Powerless Language. In Jennifer Coates. *Language and Gender: a Reader*, 377-387. Oxford: Blackwell. Olshtain, E. 1989. Apologies across Languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, G. Kasper (eds.). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood: Ablex. Pang, Yu Ling. 2000. *Politeness in Chinese Face-to-face Interaction*. Stanford: Ablex. Peter A. Angeles. 1981. *Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Barnes and Noble. Pilkington, Jane. 1992. Don't Try to Make out that I'm

Nice: the Different Strategies Women and Men Use When Gossiping. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, 37-60. Rawlins, W. 1992. On Enacting Friendship and Interrogating Discourse. In N. Coupland et al. (eds.), *Understanding Face-to-face Interaction: Studies in Linking Goal and Discourse*, 101-105. Hillsdale: LEA. Rees-Miller, J. 2000. Power, Severity and Context in Disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1087-1111. Roger, L. E. & F. E. Miller. 1988. Relational Communication. In S. Duck (ed.). *Handbook of Personal Relationships*, 289-350. New York: John Wiley and Sons. Sacks, H. 1973. *Lecture Notes*. Summer Institute of Linguistics. Michigan: Ann Arbor. Schiffrin, Deborah. 1984. Jewish Argument as Sociability. *Language in Society* 13, 311-335. Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Searle, J. R. 1976. The Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society* 5, 1-24. Sheldon, Amy. 1990. Pickle Fights: Gendered Talk in Preschool Disputes. *Discourse Process* 13, 5-31. Sheldon, Amy. 1992a. Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Challenges to self-assertion and How Young Girls Meet them. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 38:1, 95-117. Sheldon, Amy. 1992b. Preschool Girls' Discourse Competence: Managing Conflict. In Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz and Birch Moonwomon (eds.) *Locating Power Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference Vol. 2*, 528-39. Cal.: Berkeley Women and Language Group. Simmel, George. 1961. The Sociology of Sociability. In T. Parsons et al. (eds.). *Theories of Society*. New York: Free Press. Stubbe, Maria. 1978. Sex roles in Conversation: A study of Small Group Interaction. Unpublished term paper: Victoria University. Stubbe, Maria. 1991. Talking at Cross-purposes: the Effect of Gender on New Zealand Primary School Children's Interaction Strategies in Pair Discussions. Unpublished MA thesis: Victoria University. Swacker, Marjorie. 1979. Women's Verbal Behavior at Learned and Professional Conferences. In Berry-Lou Dubois and Isobel Crouch (eds.). *Sociology of the Languages of American Women*, 155-160. San Antonio: Trinity University. Tajfel, H. 1981. *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Tannen, Deborah. 1984. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. Norwood: Alex. Tannen, Deborah. 1986. *That's not what I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*. New York: Ballantine. Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. Tannen, Deborah. 1994. *Gender and Discourse*. New York: Oxford UP. Tannen, Deborah. 1999. *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words*. New York: Ballantine. Tannen, Deborah. 2001a. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Quill. Tannen, Deborah. 2001b. *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men at Work*. New York: Quill. Yu, M. C. 1999. Universalistic and Culture-specific Perspectives on Variation in the Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence in an L2. *Pragmatics* 9:2, 281-312. Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford UP. van Alphen, Ingrid. 1987. Learning from your Peers: the Acquisition of Gender-specific Speech Styles. In Dede Brouwer and Dorian De Haan (eds.) *Women's Language, Socialization and Self-image*, 58-75. Dordrecht: Foris. van Baalen, Irene. 2001. *Male and Female Language: Growing together? Historical and Sociolinguistics and Socio-historical Linguistics*. Internet

	<p>Journal. van Eemeren, Frans & Rob Grootendorst. 1984. Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions. Dordrecht: Foris. van Eemeren, Frans, Rob Grootendorst, and Tjark Kruijer. 1987. Handbook of Argumentation Theory. Dordrecht: Foris. Varenne, Herve. 1984. The Interpretation of Pronominal Paradigms: Speech Situation, Pragmatic Meaning, and Cultural Structure. <i>Semiotica</i> 50:3 221-248. Wang, Yu Fang. 1997. Dispreferred Responses in Mandarin Chinese Conversation. In <i>Proceedings of the First Symposium on Discourse and Syntax in Chinese and Formosan Languages</i>, 103-134. Taipei: NTU. Widjaja, C. S. 1997. A study of Date Refusal: Taiwanese Females vs. American Females. <i>University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL</i> 15:2, 1-43. Wolfson, Nessa. 1988. The Bulge: A Theory of Speech Behavior and Social Distance. In J. Fine. (Ed.) <i>Second Language Discourse: A Textbook of Current Research</i>, 21-38. New Jersey: Ablex. Wu, Feng Chun. 2003. <i>Ta in Mandarin Spoken Discourse: Discourse-pragmatic Functions and Grammaticalization</i>. Unpublished MA thesis: NTNU. Zhan, Kaidi. 1992. <i>The Strategies of Politeness in the Chinese Language</i>. Berkeley: California UP. Zhu, H., W. Li and Y. Qian. 1998. Gift Offer and Acceptance in Chinese Culture: Contexts and Functions. <i>Journal of Asian Pacific Communication</i> 8:2, 87-101. Zhu, H., W. Li, and Y. Qian. 1999. The Sequential Organization of Gifts Offering and Acceptance in Chinese. <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> 32:1, 81-103. Zimmerman, D. H. and C. West. 1975. Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (eds.). <i>Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance</i>, 105-29. Rowley: Newbury House</p>
論文頁數	123
附註	
全文點閱次數	
資料建置時間	
轉檔	

日期	
全文檔存取記錄	
異動記錄	M admin Y2008.M7.D3 23:17 61.59.161.35