Chapter 4
Data Analysis

This chapter presents the results of the quantitative analyses of disagreement collected from the 12 conversations. Disagreement without the constraint of age is first analyzed. Then, the influences of speaker's age, hearer's age, and the interaction between speaker's and hearer's age are examined.

4.1. Disagreement in General

In this section, disagreement and its subtypes are introduced first. Linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies used in disagreement are analyzed latter. Afterwards, the interaction between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies are inspected. In this section, the subjects are taken as a whole without consideration of their social characteristics.

4.1.1. Disagreement and Its Subtypes

1073 tokens of disagreement are found in the collected data. Among all, 31.50% (or 338) are content- based disagreement (C-disagreement) and 68.50% (or 735) are evaluation-based disagreement (E-disagreement). The number of E-disagreement is nearly twice as much as that of C-disagreement, which suggests that when people disagree with each other, opposition is caused more often by individual's evaluation than by content of the message. Table 5 presents the distributions of C-disagreement, E-disagreement and their subtypes.

Table 5. Types and subtypes of disagreement (Number in parentheses are frequencies)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Disagreement
100.00% (1073)</td><td rowspan="3">C-disagreement
31.50% (338)</td><td colspan="2">Accuracy 95.27% (322)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Ambiguity 4.14% (14)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Vagueness 0.59% (2)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">E-disagreement
68.50% (735)</td><td rowspan="3">Personal Judgment
98.37% (723)</td><td>[±Right] 78.42% (567)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[±Should] 12.17% (88)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[±Good] 9.41% (68)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Socio-cultural Evaluation
1.63% (12)</td><td>[±Right] 83.33% (10)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[±Should] 16.67% (2)</td></tr>
<tr><td>[±Good] 0.00% (0)</td></tr>
</table>

4.1.1.1. Findings Related to C-disagreement

C-disagreement is caused by interlocutor's inconsistency in factual knowledge. Since factual knowledge can be confirmed through outside norms, when interlocutors disagree over the authenticity of the discussed fact, a reference back to the norms could solve the opposition. According to Table 5, 95.27% of C-disagreement is based on the accuracy of the message content. Accuracy is the essential element in successful communication; therefore, once it is violated, very likely it would cause communication breakdown. This accounts for its high frequency in C-disagreement.

Unlike C-disagreements based on inaccurate content, C-disagreement based on ambiguity and vagueness are comparatively low in percentage (4.14% and 0.59%, respectively). Ambiguity lacks distinctive target for interlocutors to disagree on, and

vagueness shows null content to disagree on. Also, ambiguity and vagueness violates CP's Maxim of Manner, which makes them naturally less likely to occur in conversation. Their nature makes communication unable to begin, and, thus, they show little influence in C-disagreement.

4.1.1.2. Findings Related to E-disagreement

There are two subtypes in E-disagreement: E-disagreement based on personal judgment and E-disagreement based on socio-cultural evaluation. As for E-disagreement, disagreement based on personal judgment (98.37% or 723 tokens) has significantly higher percentage than disagreement based on socio-cultural evaluation (1.63% or 12 tokens). The high percentage personal E-disagreement is caused by the lack of shared value system between the interlocutors. What the speaker considers is right or wrong, should or should not do, or good or bad is based solely on him/herself. Under such notion, interlocutors engaged in personal E-disagreement do not compromise with the other's judgment. Without a shared value system, which could act as bondage for the interlocutors, the interlocutor's persistence on his/her judgment ultimately leads to high percentage of personal E-disagreement. On the contrary, socio-cultural evaluation of E-disagreement shows much lower percentage. In every society or culture, there are norms regulating people's thoughts and behaviors, which are shared and obeyed by the people living within it. Due to this condition, interlocutors are aware that communication might breakdown if they violate the socio-cultural norms, just like C-disagreement. These existing norms obeyed by people in the society and culture explain the comparatively low frequency of socio-cultural evaluation based on E-disagreement.

1. E-disagreement by Personal Judgment. In personal E-disagreement, disagreement base on [±Right] receives the highest percentage (78.42%, 567 tokens), followed by [±Should] (12.17%, 88 tokens) and [±Good] (9.41%, 68 tokens).

Disagreement on [±Right] targets CP's Maxim of Quality, when value systems are not shared by interlocutors, a person often equates his/her judgment on what is right/wrong with the truth/falsity of a subject matter. Since the judgment on what is right/wrong varies from person to person, the inconsistency on value system gives rise to high frequency in personal E-disagreement. Besides, personal judgment on right/wrong is less likely to change because the set of binary notions serve as the foundation for people to make sense of the world. The less mobile and more fixed quality of right/wrong explains for the high percentage in personal judgment on E-disagreement.

Personal E-disagreement on should/shouldn't, which deals with a person's obligation, and that on good/bad, which deals with a person's preference toward a subject matter, are relatively low (12.17% and 9.41%, respectively). [±Should] deals with a person's obligation and [±Good] deals with a person's preference toward a subject matter. Since from time to time, obligation may be cancelled and preference may shift, the possibility to change makes [±Should] and [±Good] less likely to be aroused in E-disagreement.

2. E-disagreement by Socio-cultural Evaluation. As for socio-cultural E-disagreement, as few as 12 tokens are found, including 10 tokens of [±Right], and 2 tokens of [±Should], while tokens of [±Good] feature never appeared. Due to limited data, percentages of E-disagreement by socio-cultural evaluation are fairly low in frequencies, no detailed analysis can/will be made, except that it is interesting to note most of socio-cultural E-disagreement are based on [±Right]. The possible reason behind this is because socio-cultural norms act as factual knowledge in C-disagreement. According to Lii-Shih (1986: 29), every society has a particular set of social norms which consists of explicit rules prescribing a certain behavior, a state of affairs, or a way s of thinking within a context. They are obeyed by people within

the society and are less likely to be changed. Thus, once it is violated, the norms which regulate the society shake and chaos may arise. Socio-cultural E-disagreement is based on [±Right] is the key to place the society in order. Therefore, within socio-cultural E-disagreement, [±Right] has the highest frequency. [±Should] and [±Good] are relatively low (2 tokens and 0 token, respectively) because their nature is more likely to alter from time to time.

4.1.2. Summary of 4.1.

Disagreement occurs more frequently in E-disagreement, where different value systems are not shared, than in C-disagreement, where factual norm is shared. In C-disagreement, opposition based on accuracy obtains the highest percentage because when information is inaccurate, communication easily breaks down. CP's requirement on Maxim of Manner has significantly influences C-disagreement. In E-disagreement, opposition based on personal judgment is significantly more frequent than opposition based on social-cultural evaluation. Major reason to the phenomenon is the unshared value system between the interlocutors. Moreover, the subtype right/wrong on personal E-disagreement has higher percentage than should/shouldn't and good/bad because the former system is more stubborn than the latter two since right/wrong is related to CP's Manner of Quality.

4.2. Linguistic Markers in Disagreement

In this section, linguistic markers used in general disagreement, C-disagreement, and E-disagreement are analyzed first, followed by subtypes of C-disagreement and subtypes of E-disagreement.

4.2.1. General Disagreement by Linguistic Markers

Generally speaking, linguistic markers used in disagreement belong to two linguistic levels: syntactical and lexical. While lexical markers modify the propositional content with partial differences, syntactic structures change the

proposition holistically. Table 6 displays the result of linguistic markers used in disagreement.

Table 6. Disagreement by linguistic markers (Number in parentheses are frequencies)

Negation	**28.52%**	(306)
Affirmative	17.43%	(187)
Question	14.35%	(154)
Pre-Announcement Marker	19.11%	(205)
Degree Marker	15.10%	(162)
Modal	5.50%	(59)
Total	100.00%	(1073)

As the above table reveals, disagreement is linguistically realized primarily through negative sentence structure (28.52%); secondarily by pre-announcement markers (19.11%), affirmative (17.43%), degree markers (15.10%) and question form (14.53%) are the second preferences; and least by modals (5.50%). Statistic results support the categorization of linguistic markers into three major categories:

NEG > {AFF/QUE/Pre-Ann/DM} > MOD

The above scale shows that when people disagree with others, negative sentence pattern is the preferred syntactic form while pre-announcement marker is the preferred lexical modifier.

The possible reasons behind the priority orders of percentages of each linguistic marker are explained. High percentage of negative sentence pattern is within reason. A possible cause why negation is considered as the optimal linguistic form to express disagreement is because it has been conventionally linked with disagreement. Many studies have found obvious correlation of negation and disagreement (Pan, 1994; Wang, 1997; Lin, 1999; Scott, 2002). The illocutionary force carried out by negation

on hearers is more powerful and forceful than other linguistic markers. A follow-up questionnaire conducted for linguistic offensiveness also confirms negation as the most face-threatening linguistic marker of the six linguistic markers. As for the high percentage of affirmative, it may result from the previous proposition with negative meaning. In order to oppose the negative proposition, affirmative form, which often happens in defense, is adapted. Besides, when a new proposition is brought up because of correction or partial disagreement, affirmative pattern is used. Question is used with lower frequency than affirmative. Its more indirect and less imposing nature makes it less optimal to deliver direct and face-threatening disagreement.

In lexical markers, pre-announcement marker has the highest frequency. Pre-announcement marker is lexically attached in front of sentences, and its peripheral attachment is situational conditioned. It means the influence of pre-announcement marker is outside of the proposition. Without touching the content of the proposition, pre-announcement marker is considered more indirect and less face-threatening than the other lexical markers—degree marker and modal. The high frequency of pre-announcement marker is in contradiction to the directness and face-threatening nature of disagreement. But, with the high frequencies of its subtypes (which will be further illustrated), such as causal marker in account, contrast marker in correct, defense, and partial disagreement, emotional marker and performative verb in challenge, the high frequency of pre-announcement marker in disagreement can be explained. Degree marker maintains the core of the propositional content, but slightly modifies the degree of the content. Degree markers, which are formulaic in disagreement, are considered less indirect and more face-threatening than pre-announcement markers, especially as they touch upon the content of the proposition. Kuo (1992) has also mentioned that when disagreement becomes aggravated, formulaic forms are adapted. Formulaic expressions are considered less

indirect and more face-threatening than the others. Modal is least adapted in disagreement. The semantic meaning of modal shows degree of possibility. Modal is mostly adapted in suggestion, which is one of the more indirect and less face-threatening strategies in disagreement. Since suggestion is often misunderstood as pure advice instead of disagreement, the low frequency of suggestion also explains for the low frequency of modal.

4.2.2. Intersection of Types of Disagreement and Types of Linguistic Forms

Disagreement is further divided in to C-disagreement and E-disagreement. The distribution of linguistic markers in the two types of disagreement is first presented in Table 7, and analyzed afterwards.

Table 7. C-disagreement and E-disagreement by linguistic markers

Linguistic Markers	Types of Disagreement			
	C-disagreement		E-disagreement	
Negation	**36.18%**	(123)	**24.97%**	(183)
Affirmative	**25.00%**	(85)	13.92%	(102)
Question	10.59%	(36)	16.10%	(118)
Pre-Announcement Marker	14.41%	(49)	**21.28%**	(156)
Degree Marker	10.88%	(37)	17.05%	(125)
Modal	2.35%	(8)	6.96%	(51)
Total	100.00%	(338)	100.00%	(735)

4.2.2.1. C-disagreement by Linguistic Markers

When disagreement is further classified into C-disagreement and E-disagreement, the distribution of linguistic markers differs. In C-disagreement, first, negation (36.18%) is still adopted most frequently, followed by affirmative (25.00%). However, according to statistic results, negation is not significantly different from affirmative (P= .080). Second, pre-announcement marker (14.41%), degree marker (10.88%) and question (10.59%) are adopted significantly less frequently than negation, but statistic

result indicates that there is no significant difference between pre-announcement marker and affirmative (P= .071). Third, modal (2.35%) is least used in C-disagreement. According to statistic results, linguistic markers in C-disagreement can be categorized into three groups, with affirmative as the overlapping of the first and second groups:

{NEG/ [AFF} > {Pre-Ann] /QUE/DM} > MOD

Reasons for grouping the linguistic markers in C-disagreement into the above scale are provided in the following. The high percentage of negation (36.18%) and affirmative (25.00%) can be explained by the nature of C-disagreement. Negation is a linguistic marker that is conventionally linked with disagreement. Therefore, in C-disagreement, negation is the most direct and convenient way to inform disagreement due to inaccuracy, which violates CP's Maxim of Manner. Affirmative is also highly used because of its similar nature with negation, but in opposite direction: affirmative disagrees with positive statement, but negation disagrees with negative statement. Either pattern serves the purpose to correct the inaccurate proposition in order to fulfill Maxim of Quality in C-disagreement.

4.2.2.2. E-disagreement by Linguistic Markers

Several findings are derived from Table 7. First, negation (24.97%) and pre-announcement markers (21.28%) are adopted most frequently. Statistic results indicate that the difference between negation and pre-announcement markers is insignificant (P= .210). Next, degree markers (17.05%), question (16.10%) and affirmative (13.92%) show lower frequencies. However, although they are in significant differences with negation, they display no significant differences with pre-announcement marker. Last, modal (6.96%) is adopted less frequently in E-disagreement as well. Based on the statistic results, linguistic markers for E-disagreement can be categorized into three groups in following order:

{NEG/ [Pre-Ann} > {DM] /QUE/AFF} > MOD

As observed in Table 7, people adopt syntactic markers more often in C-disagreement, but lexical and syntactic forms are equally preferred in E-disagreement. Reasons for grouping the linguistic markers in E-disagreement into the above scale are as follows. In E-disagreement, the distribution of linguistic markers is relatively equal. Although negations (24.97%) still serve as the most frequently adopted linguistic marker in E-disagreement, the percentage is much lower when comparing with C-disagreement. E-disagreement occurs because the interlocutors hold different personal judgments. Maxim of Quality in CP is not shared by the interlocutors in terms of truth/falsity. Without a shared value system, opposition may occur easily. Thus, unlike C-disagreement, direct negation is not as powerful and effective as it is in E-disagreement. Besides negation, personal judgment on E-disagreement seems to depend more on indirect speech act than direct speech act. The finding agrees with Lin's claim(1999). According to Lin, who based her explanation on Lii-Shih's (1986)'s statement in negative politeness, in order to avoid threatening other's face and for the sake of negative politeness, speakers are more incline to use linguistic forms that tone down disagreement rather than performing it in a direct and bald way. Especially when E-disagreement is naturally more competitive because lacking of consensus, the tendency of avoiding severe opposition and mitigating disagreement is observed. High percentages of pre-announcement markers (21.28%), degree markers (17.05%) and questions (16.10%) suggest that when personal value systems are involved, interlocutors prefer indirect linguistic markers. On syntactic level, question is widely used due to its close relationship to indirectness. In lexical level, pre-announcement markers are more indirect than degree marker, and the result shows that the former is indeed used more frequently in disagreement than the latter. Affirmative, which is highly adopted in C-disagreement,

shows low percentage in E-disagreement. When personal judgments are involved in disagreement, there are no norms to be shared by both interlocutors. Each interlocutor believes he/she is right and when disagreement happens, interlocutors are more likely to take it personal and become defensive. Therefore, to disagree with direct statement, such as negation and affirmative, would be too direct and face-threatening which would quickly ruin the politeness between the interlocutors. Thus, when there is no shared value system, it is more optimal to disagree with more indirect and less face-threatening linguistic markers. Otherwise, disagreement may easily be aroused into serious conflict.

4.2.3. Subtypes of C-disagreement by Linguistic Markers

The data used in this study indicate that C-disagreement can be categorized into three subtypes by accuracy, ambiguity, and vagueness. The choices of linguistic markers are also influenced by cause of C-disagreement. Table 8 shows the linguistic markers found in these three subtypes of C-disagreement.

Table 8. Subtypes of C-disagreement by linguistic markers

Linguistic Markers	C-disagreement		
	Accuracy	Ambiguity	Vagueness
Negation	**36.73%** (119)	**28.57%** (4)	0.00% (0)
Affirmative	**25.00%** (81)	**28.57%** (4)	0.00% (0)
Question	9.88% (32)	14.29% (2)	**100.00%** (2)
Pre-Announcement Marker	13.89% (45)	**28.57%** (4)	0.00% (0)
Degree Marker	11.42% (37)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Modal	2.47% (8)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Total	100.00% (322)	100.00% (14)	100.00% (2)

As previously mentioned, C-disagreement occurs predominately when the discussed content or information is inaccurate. Therefore, the linguistic priority pattern of C-disagreement based on accuracy follows the same pattern found in

C-disagreement (see p. 59). In here, negation (36.73%) and affirmative (25.00%) are used much more often by interlocutors than the other linguistic markers; pre-announcement markers (13.89%), degree marker (11.42%) and question (9.88%) are used less frequently; whereas modals are rarely used (2.47%). Although pre-announcement marker is in significant difference with negation (P= .000), it is not with affirmative (P= .056). Again, it is believed that direct statement such as negation and affirmative are optimal to change the entire proposition to secure continuity of communication.

Limited data are found in disagreement based on ambiguity and vagueness. 14 disagreements are found based on ambiguity and linguistic markers based on ambiguity are equally distributed in negation (28.57%), affirmative (28.57%) and pre-announcement marker (28.57%). Also, only 2 disagreements are based on vagueness, both rely on question form. Due to limited data, it would be pre-mature to draw any conclusion on the speaker's linguistic preference based on ambiguity and vagueness, and are thus excluded from further analysis and discussion.

4.2.4. Subtypes of E-disagreement by Linguistic Markers

There are two subtypes of E-disagreement: E-disagreement based on personal judgment and E-disagreement based on socio-cultural evaluation. Since there are as few as only 12 out of 735 tokens found for socio-cultural E-disagreement, only those linguistic markers used for E-disagreement based on personal judgment are analyzed and discussed

Table 9. Subtypes of E-disagreement by linguistic markers

Linguistic Markers	Personal E-disagreement			
	[±Right]	[±Should]	[±Good]	Total
Negation	(136)**75.98%** **23.99%**	(24)13.41% **27.27%**	(19)10.61% **27.94%**	(179)100.00% **24.76%**
Affirmative	(94)**92.16%** 16.58%	(6)5.88% 6.82%	(2)1.96% 2.94%	(102)100.00% 14.11%
Question	(87)**74.36%** 15.34%	(21)17.95% **23.86%**	(9)7.69% 13.24%	(117)100.00% 16.18%
Pre-Announcement Marker	(123)**80.92%** **21.69%**	(14)9.21% 15.91%	(15)9.87% **22.06%**	(152)100.00% **21.02%**
Degree Marker	(90)**73.77%** 15.87%	(10)8.20% 11.36%	(22)18.03% **32.35%**	(122)100.00% 16.87%
Modal	(37)**72.55%** 6.53%	(13)**25.49%** 14.77%	(1)1.96% 1.47%	(51)100.00% 7.05%
Total	(567)**78.42%** 100.00%	(88)12.17% 100.00%	(68)9.41% 100.00%	(723)100.00% 100.00%

Among the 723 tokens of E-disagreement based on personal judgment, negation (24.76%) and pre-announcement marker (21.02%) are adopted more often than degree marker (16.87%) question (16.18%) and affirmative (14.11%), and modal (7.05%) is least used. Statistic results indicate fuzzy orders among the linguistic markers. First, negation is in significant difference with all the other linguistic markers, except with pre-announcement marker (P= .214). Next, question is in significant difference with modal (P= .005), but not with the others. Also, affirmative does not show significant difference with modal (P= .060). The fuzziness of linguistic markers suggests that expressing personal E-disagreement is more complicated than in C-disagreement.

In showing personal E-disagreement for [±Right], negation (23.99%) and pre-announcement marker (21.69%) are adopted the most; affirmative (16.58%), degree marker (15.87%) and question (15.34%) are less used; modal (6.53%) is used the least. [±Right] in personal E-disagreement, similar to accuracy in C-disagreement,

invites higher frequency of using direct statements. However, comparing with C-disagreement (see p. 62), the use of direct statement, such as negation and affirmative, is much lower in frequency. Due to difference in value systems, direct statement need to be modified by lexical markers in order to be less forceful or imposing. Therefore, choices of syntactic patterns and lexical modifiers are both crucial in personal E-disagreement based on [±Right].

In personal E-disagreement for [±Should], negation (27.27%) and question (23.86%) are used most frequently; pre-announcement markers (15.91%), modal (14.77%) and degree marker (11.36%) less frequently; and affirmative (6.82%) least frequently. Since [±Should] in personal E-disagreement deals with a person's obligation, modals which tell degree of possibility are important when showing disagreement. Therefore, when modals used in the three subtypes of personal E-disagreement are compared, the frequency (25.49%) is higher than the other linguistic markers.

As for [±Good] of personal E-disagreement, degree marker (32.35%) has the highest frequency; negation (27.94%) and pre-announcement markers (22.06%) the second highest; affirmative (2.94%) and modal (1.47%) the least. Results of statistic tests indicate that there is no significant among the first three forms, but they are significantly different from affirmative and modal. As for question, it is not in significant difference with any of the other five types of linguistic markers. Personal preferences are more frequently expressed by degree markers. By intensifying or mitigating the propositional content, the speaker expresses his/her feelings to different degree. Negation is frequently adapted because of its conventional link to disagreement. Since personal E-disagreement based on [±Good] often gives explanation or shows counter judgment to the former proposition, pre-announcement marker is also frequently adopted.

When comparing the percentage of linguistic markers of the subtypes of personal E-disagreement, all the markers for [±Should] and [±Good], except modal, both are in significant difference with [±Right]. Modal (25.49%) is used comparatively high in [±Should]. For each type of linguistic markers, [±Right] always overrides [±Should] and [±Good].

4.2.5. Summary of 4.2.

In general, linguistic markers are categorized into three major groups according to their frequencies. Negation is more frequently adopted than all the other markers in general disagreement. However, when linguistic markers are adopted according to the nature of disagreement, the frequencies differ. In C-disagreement, negation is more frequently used than all the other markers because it is the most efficient and direct way to turn the inaccurate propositions into accurate ones. Especially in the subtypes of accuracy, which constitute the majority of C-disagreement, direct statements, such as negation and affirmative, are significantly adopted than the other markers. However, in E-disagreement, the frequency of negation drops and it is in a near equal status with pre-announcement marker. Since E-disagreement is more face-threatening due to the lack of shared value system, more indirect and less face-threatening lexical marker could tone down the offensive force of direct syntactic pattern. In subtypes of personal E-disagreement, except for modal in [±Should], the percentage of each type of linguistic markers on [±Right] always overrides [±Should] and [±Good].

4.3. Pragmatic Strategies in Disagreement

In this section, disagreement in general, C-disagreement and E-disagreement by pragmatic strategies are analyzed respectively, followed by subtypes of C-disagreement and subtypes of personal E-disagreement.

4.3.1. General Disagreement by Pragmatic Strategies

Eight pragmatic strategies are found in the collected data. The distribution is revealed in Table 10.

Table 10.Disagreement by pragmatic strategies

Correction	**37.28%**	(400)
Account	19.94%	(214)
Challenge	18.73%	(201)
Defense	7.18%	(77)
Clarification	5.87%	(63)
Confirmation	5.22%	(56)
Partial Disagreement	4.10%	(44)
Suggestion	1.68%	(18)
Total	100.00%	(1073)

Disagreement in general, correction (37.28%) is more highly adopted in than the other strategies; account (19.94%) and challenge (18.73%) less frequently; defense (7.18%), clarification (5.87%), confirmation (5.22%) and partial disagreement (4.10%) even less frequently; suggestion (1.68%) the least. According to statistic results, pragmatic strategies can be grouped broadly into four categories:

COR > {ACC/CHA} > {DEF/CLA/CON/PD} > SUG

The above scale indicates pragmatic strategies are categorized into four groups by frequency in general disagreement. Only the three most frequently used pragmatic strategies are explained. Correction obtains the highest percentage due to its direct illocutionary force in disagreement. The conventional link with disagreement also makes correction the most efficient strategy to show opposition. Account is highly adopted when explanation is required for the disagreed proposition. According to the 12 conversations, the high frequency results from multiple accounts to single disagreement and they may stretch over several turns. Challenge shows disagreement

by requesting the hearer for evidence. High frequency of the use of challenge usually is due to the result of lacking consensus on the interlocutors' value systems. Especially in E-disagreement, which is derived from the lack of shared value systems between the interlocutors, challenge is considered a good way to express disagreement. Like correction, challenge is a direct speech act which results in its high frequency in disagreement.

High percentage of correction, account and challenge is in accordance with Lin's (1999) study. According to her, in casual conversation between friends, adapting direct and explicit utterance is more appropriate and crucial for the speaker and the hearer to shorten their social distance. Besides, many studies (Schiffrin, 1984; Kuo, 1992; Kakava, 1993) have reported that interlocutors perform direct disagreement for the purpose of sociability. In some cultures, a form of talk has the surface look of disagreement and confrontation, but underlyingly, it is cooperative, non-serious, and sociable. According to Kuo's (1992) statement, Chinese enjoy talking vigorously with happiness, although on the surface, it might seem aggressively and competitively. In the present data, we do find instances when interlocutors engage in argument to ratify their relationships. Moreover, according to Tannen (1984), the intended meaning of disagreement is sometimes conveyed through the metamessage, which helps the interlocutors to interpret the others' saying. Thus, although indirectness may avoid confrontation when formal politeness is demanded and social distance is required, directness sends out the metamessage of brotherhood when intimacy and informality are expected. Therefore, in the context of social argument, the metamessage of aggravated disagreement strategies signals rapport and involvement. Also, the desire to be an independent self may also be a reason to direct strategies. As stated by Kuo (1992), to use direct and aggravated disagreement strategies not only show the intimate relationship between the interlocutors, but simultaneously, their strong desire

to maintain personal independence in the conversation. According to the possible explanations mentioned above, unless disagreement is performed with special functions, such as sociability or enhancing interpersonal relationships, disagreement is still considered competitive and face-threatening by its nature, and if not handled properly, serious problem on politeness would occur.

4.3.2. Intersection of Types of Disagreement and Types of Pragmatic Strategies

Choices of pragmatic strategies are found to be different in C-disagreement and E-disagreement. Table 11 provides distributions of the eight pragmatic strategies in these two types of disagreement.

Table 11.C-disagreement and E-disagreement by pragmatic strategies

Pragmatic Strategies	Types of Disagreement			
	C-disagreement		E-disagreement	
Correction	**57.40%**	(194)	**28.03%**	(206)
Account	**15.98%**	(54)	**21.77%**	(160)
Challenge	7.69%	(26)	**23.81%**	(175)
Clarification	7.99%	(27)	4.90%	(36)
Confirmation	6.51%	(22)	4.63%	(34)
Partial Disagreement	2.37%	(8)	4.90%	(36)
Defense	2.07%	(7)	9.52%	(70)
Suggestion	0.00%	(0)	2.45%	(18)
Total	100.00%	(338)	100.00%	(735)

4.3.2.1. C-disagreement by Pragmatic Strategies

When disagreement is further classified by their nature, different pattern of priority orders reveals. In C-disagreement, correction (57.40%) is the strategy that predominates, and is followed by account (15.98%), which is significantly different from correction (P= .000). Next comes clarification (7.99%) and challenge (7.69%), which are significantly different from correction (P= .000 and P= .000, respectively),

but insignificantly different from account (P= .092 and P= .080, respectively). Confirmation (6.51%), partial disagreement (2.37%) and defense (2.07%) are used even less often, and suggestion never appeared. Therefore, the priority orders for pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement are as follows:

COR > {ACC/CLA/CHA} > {CON/PD/DEF} > SUG

The above scale indicates pragmatic strategies are categorized into four groups by frequency in C-disagreement. The nature of C-disagreement may be the reason behind this phenomenon. In C-disagreement, correctness and accuracy of factual knowledge is most importantly stressed, since it is related to successful communication. Under such requirement, direct correction is the most suitable strategy in C-disagreement, and thus, correction is the primary pragmatic strategy for C-disagreement. The relatively low frequency of account, the pragmatic strategy second highly used in C-disagreement, suggests fewer explanations are needed in C-disagreement because of its emphasis on the accuracy and correctness on factual knowledge. Since the fact is shared by interlocutors, fewer explanations are needed because factual knowledge is self-evident. Clarification and challenge are also the preferred strategies used in C-disagreement. Clarification clears the content message and secures communication success. Therefore, it has a crucial position in C-disagreement. Challenge questions the genuine nature of the content message, which implies strong disagreement to the discussed content. The question proposed by challenge is rhetorical and makes the prior speaker think for the authenticity of the discussed issue. One thing worth noticing is that suggestion is not used in C-disagreement at all. Using suggestion sounds like providing alternatives that the hearers may choose not to take, which is against the nature of giving C-disagreement.

4.3.2.2. E-disagreement by Pragmatic Strategies

In E-disagreement, priority order of the pragmatic strategies is much different from the pattern found in C-disagreement. Correction (28.03%), challenge (23.81%) and account (21.77%) are frequently used in E-disagreement, although challenge is far less adopted in C-disagreement. Next comes defense (9.52%), partial disagreement (4.90%), clarification (4.90%), confirmation (4.63%), and suggestion (2.45%). Based on the results of statistic tests, pragmatic strategies for E-disagreement can be classified into two groups:

{COR/CHA/ACC} > {DEF/PD/CLA/CON/SUG}

Reasons for the above scale are explained as follows. First, correction, account, and challenge are the three primary pragmatic strategies for E-disagreement. Unlike in C-disagreement, the proportion of correction takes less than 30% for E-disagreement. Correction, by nature, aims at changing what is wrong into what is right. The notion of right/wrong suggests that a set of norms must exist first in order to do so. Accordingly, the high frequency of E-disagreement would be taken as the lack of shared value system or norms. Since no shared value system can be reached in E-disagreement, to correct without a shared norm would be meaningless. Thus, correction is used less in E-disagreement. Next, account is adopted more often in E-disagreement than in C-disagreement. One possible cause is that interlocutors in E-disagreement lacks shared value systems; therefore, it is important to provide the reason behind the opposition. Another reason comes from the high frequency of explanations after making a disagreement. Account aims at making the hearer understand the speaker's idea or concept. In order to reach the clarity, it is reasonable that the speaker gives recurrent explanations. As for challenge, it questions the hearer for explanation or evidence to the disagreed proposition, especially when the speaker is unable to persuade the hearer to accept his/her value system. Since E-disagreement

is primarily evoked for the reason of lacking shared value system between the speaker and the hearer, it is not surprising that challenge is highly adopted. Also, it is common that when differences in personal value systems emerge, a speaker would usually insist on his/her own opinion, and, try to get his/her opinion cross. Since the use of challenge strategy always sounds forceful and suppressive, it is an effective tool to reach the goals, and thus frequently chosen.

4.3.3. Subtypes of C-disagreement by Pragmatic Strategies

Pragmatic strategies used in subtypes of C-disagreement are presented in Table 12.

Table 12.Subtypes of C-disagreement by pragmatic strategies

Pragmatic Strategies	C-disagreement		
	Accuracy	Ambiguity	Vagueness
Correction	**60.25%** (194)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Account	16.77% (54)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Challenge	8.07% (26)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Confirmation	5.59% (18)	14.29% (2)	**100.00%** (2)
Clarification	4.66% (15)	**85.71%** (12)	0.00% (0)
Partial Disagreement	2.48% (8)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Defense	2.17% (7)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Suggestion	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Total	100.00% (322)	100.00% (14)	100.00% (2)

In C-disagreement based on content's accuracy, correction (60.25%) outnumbered other pragmatic strategies; next comes account (16.77%), followed by challenge (8.07%), with the latter two showing no significance between them (P= .092). The next on the line are confirmation (5.59%), clarification (4.66%), partial disagreement (2.48%) and defense (2.17%). The difference between challenge and account is insignificant. Challenge is also insignificantly different from confirmation

(P= .469), from clarification (P= .235), from partial disagreement (P= .062), and from defense (P= .065). However, confirmation is significantly different from account (P= .020) and from defense (P= .002). Suggestion is ignored since it is not used in any subtypes of C-disagreement.

Explanations to the finding are reasoned as follows. Only correction and account are explained due to their higher frequencies comparing to the other markers. First, correction is the direct speech act that helps maintain the accuracy of content matters in order to prevent communication breakdown. Since C-disagreement is purely factual, using direct strategy in correcting would not be considered as face-threatening as it is in E-disagreement. Next, account further explains for the disagreement. However, since factual knowledge is shared by speaker and hearer, fewer accounts are required in accuracy of C-disagreement.

Limited data are found in ambiguity and vagueness. There are 14 tokens for C-disagreement for ambiguity, with 12 tokens (or 85.71%) implemented through the use of clarification, and 2 tokens (or 14.29%) through confirmation. Since clarification aims to clarify the misunderstanding of the information, it is the best choice when the target of the content is ambiguous. Due to extremely low frequency, the distributions of the other pragmatic strategies are ignored.

4.3.4. Subtypes of E-disagreement by Pragmatic Strategies

As mentioned previously, only pragmatic strategies adopted in personal E-disagreement are discussed. Table 13 shows the result of data collected in personal E-disagreement by subtypes of E-disagreement based on personal judgment and pragmatic strategies.

Table 13.Subtypes of E-disagreement by pragmatic strategies

Pragmatic Strategies	Personal E-disagreement			
	[±Right]	[±Should]	[±Good]	Total
Correction	(173)**85.22%** **30.51%**	(19)9.36% **21.59%**	(11)5.42% 16.18%	(203)100.00% **28.08%**
Challenge	(133)**76.44%** **23.46%**	(25)14.37% **28.41%**	(16)9.20% **23.53%**	(174)100.00% **24.07%**
Account	(115)**74.19%** **20.28%**	(25)16.13% **28.41%**	(15)9.68% **22.06%**	(155)100.00% **21.44%**
Defense	(61)**91.04%** 10.76%	(3)4.48% 3.41%	(3)4.48% 4.41%	(67)100.00% 9.27%
Clarification	(31)**86.11%** 5.47%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)13.89% 7.35%	(36)100.00% 4.98%
Confirmation	(27)**79.41%** 4.76%	(5)14.71% 5.68%	(2)5.88% 2.94%	(34)100.00% 4.70%
Partial Disagreement	(21)**58.33%** 3.70%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(15)**41.67%** **22.06%**	(36)100.00% 4.98%
Suggestion	(6)**33.33%** 1.06%	(11)**61.11%** 12.50%	(1)5.56% 1.47%	(18)100.00% 2.49%
Total	(567)**78.42%** 100.00%	(88)12.17% 100.00%	(68)9.41% 100.00%	(723)100.00% 100.00%

In personal E-disagreement, correction, challenge, and account are highly adopted (28.08%, 24.07%, and 21.44%, respectively). Following them are defense, clarification, partial disagreement, confirmation, and suggestion (9.27%, 4.98%, 4.98%, 4.70%, and 2.49% respectively). Statistic results indicate that the pragmatic strategies in personal E-disagreement can be broadly categorized in to two groups with defense in the second group being significantly different from suggestion in the same group (P= .020), as indicated in the priority order given below.

{COR/CHA/ACC} > {[DEF]/CLA/PD/CON/[SUG]}

The reasons for the scale above are explained as follows. Although correction is still the most frequent strategy, the high percentages of challenge and account suggest

that when different value systems are put into consideration, to correct may not always be the best option. Giving explanation or asking for reason to express the personal E-disagreement is less aggressive and less imposing on the hearer, which is in accordance with Lakoff's (1973) submaxims of don't impose and give option.

In [±Right] of personal E-disagreement, correction (30.51%), challenge (23.46%) and account (20.28%), which are insignificantly different from each other, are used significantly more frequent than the other strategies. Among the rest, defense (10.76%), clarification (5.47%), confirmation (4.76%), and partial disagreement (3.70%) are not in significant difference. However, the former group is significantly different from the latter group. As for suggestion (1.06%), it is significantly lower (P> .05) than the other pragmatic strategies.

In [±Should] of personal E-disagreement, challenge (28.41%), account (28.41%), and correction (21.59%) are adopted most frequently. Next, suggestion (12.50%) is used more frequently than confirmation (5.68%) and defense (3.41%), but suggestion does not show significant difference with the latter two (P= .458 and P= .236, respectively). Last, partial disagreement is not found at all.

In [±Good] of personal E-disagreement, challenge (23.53%), account (22.06%), partial disagreement (22.06%), and correction (16.18%) are used more often than the others. Those strategies used least frequently are clarification (7.35%), defense (4.41%), confirmation (2.94%) and suggestion (1.47%). To sum up, correction, challenge, and account are the pragmatic strategies most frequently adopted to meet the requirements of the three subgroups of personal E-disagreement.

When comparing the percentage of pragmatic strategies in subtypes of personal E-disagreement, it is found that for [±Right], all the strategies other than partial disagreement (58.33%) and suggestion (33.33%) are adopted; for [±Should], suggestion (61.11%) is used more frequently; for [±Good], partial disagreement

(41.67%) shows a comparatively higher percentage. Suggestion given to the hearer in disagreement implies the speaker think the proposition should be done in another way. Different viewpoints on the prior speaker's obligation, which is the nature of [±Should], to the discussed proposition give rise to the high percentage of suggestion. Partial disagreement often shows agreement before stating disagreement. Although the target part is the disagreement, the previous agreement part helps to make the entire strategy less direct and face-threatening. Since preference to subject matters is personally judged, showing agreement by adopting partial disagreement is a better camouflage to tone down the following face-threatening disagreement.

4.3.5. Summary of 4.3.

Pragmatic strategies can be broadly categorized into four groups according to their frequencies. In general, correction is significantly adopted in disagreement in general due to its direct force and conventional link with disagreement. When the nature of disagreement is put into consideration, different pragmatic strategies are adopted. In C-disagreement, correction and account are more frequently used, with the former adopted significant more frequent than the latter. Factual nature of C-disagreement allows the use of direct and forceful correction. The pattern is upheld by accuracy of C-disagreement. As for E-disagreement, correction, account and challenge are used in a fairly equal percentage. This is because when no shared value system is shared by interlocutors, a bold correction would be too face-threatening which would ultimately ruin the politeness between the speaker and the hearer. Thus, giving explanation by account or questioning why by challenge may be better choice than the direct correction. In subtypes of personal E-disagreement, different pragmatic strategies are adopted. Both [±Right] and [±Should] more frequently adopt correction, account and challenge than the other strategies, but their priority orders are different. Instead of using correction, [±Good] adopts partial disagreement more frequently.

From the choices of pragmatic strategies made in different types of disagreement, it is clear that degree of directness is situationally controlled by the nature of the disagreement in order to reach appropriateness in the conversation. Under special occasions, directness of disagreement strategies may be interpreted as intimacy and rapport (Schiffrin, 1984; Tannen, 1986; Kuo, 1992; Kakava, 1993). However, most of the disagreements found in the data are real disagreement with face-threatening force that requires careful manipulation to prevent serious conflict. When the directness of pragmatic strategies in disagreement is not carefully measured, it can either lead to serious conflict or the message of disagreement simply fails to be conveyed.

4.4. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in Disagreement

In this section, the interaction and correlation between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies will be discussed. Disagreement in general is analyzed first. The interaction between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies for C-disagreement and E-disagreement are discussed latter.

4.4.1. General Disagreement by Linguistic Marker and Pragmatic Strategies

The interaction between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in disagreement is shown in Table 14. Since Table 14 is fairly complicated to read, not to say analyzing it, correlation coefficient tests are applied to examine the relationship between pragmatic strategies and linguistic markers, as indicated in Table 15.

Table 14.Disagreement by linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
COR	(206)**51.50%** **67.32%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(98)**24.50%** **52.41%**	(24)6.00% 11.71%	(51)12.75% **31.48%**	(21)5.25% **35.59%**	(400)100.00% **37.28%**
ACC	(37)17.29% 12.09%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(36)16.82% 19.25%	(86)**40.19%** **41.95%**	(44)**20.56%** **27.16%**	(11)5.14% 18.64%	(214)100.00% 19.94%
CHA	(19)9.45% 6.21%	(105)**52.24%** **68.18%**	(5)2.49% 2.67%	(40)19.90% 19.51%	(26)12.94% 16.05%	(6)2.99% 10.17%	(201)100.00% 18.73%
DEF	(16)**20.78%** 5.23%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(34)**44.16%** 18.18%	(10)12.99% 4.88%	(12)15.58% 7.41%	(5)6.49% 8.47%	(77)100.00% 7.18%
PD	(9)**20.45%** 2.94%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)4.55% 1.07%	(15)**34.09%** 7.32%	(17)**38.64%** 10.49%	(1)2.27% 1.69%	(44)100.00% 4.10%
CLA	(17)**26.98%** 5.56%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(10)15.87% 5.35%	(24)**38.10%** 11.71%	(9)14.29% 5.56%	(3)4.76% 5.08%	(63)100.00% 5.87%
CON	(1)1.79% 0.33%	(49)**87.52%** **31.82%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)1.79% 0.49%	(3)5.36% 1.85%	(2)3.57% 3.39%	(56)100.00% 5.22%
SUG	(1)5.56% 0.33%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)11.11% 1.07%	(5)**27.78%** 2.44%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(10)**55.56%** 16.95%	(18)100.00% 1.68%
Total	(306)**28.52%** 100.00%	(154)14.35% 100.00%	(187)17.43% 100.00%	(205)19.11% 100.00%	(162)15.10% 100.00%	(59)5.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%

Not all correlation between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies for disagreement are significant. Table 15 presents only the significant ones, which is analyzed and discussed in the section after the table.

Table 15.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies for disagreement in general. (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal; "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
COR	.739**		.685**		.510*	
ACC	.522**		.432*	.634**	.414*	
CHA		.864**			.455*	
DEF	.490*		.694**			
PD						
CLA				.764**		
CON		.648*			.530**	
SUG						.690**

As indicated by Table 15, only some of the logical combinations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies show significant correlations. Certain linguistic and pragmatic combinations have significant differences over the other combinations. As partial disagreement has no significant correlation with any linguistic markers, it is excluded from this section. This means that partial disagreement adopts different linguistic markers rather equally in disagreement.

1. Correction. Linguistic markers significantly related to correction are negation, affirmative, and degree markers. Syntactically, negation and affirmative are adopted because they are direct statements which suit the pragmatic function of correction. Correction can be brought about through two ways: either to negate proposition X into ~X, or to change proposition X into proposition Y. Negation is highly correlated with correction due to its comparatively effortless nature to negate the previous proposition, which is the easiest and most efficient way to disagree. Since the

pragmatic nature of correction is direct and face-threatening, its conventional link with negations for the sake of disagreement makes negation the most suitable linguistic marker to display opposition. On the other hand, to correct by affirmative statement means the proposition X is intrinsically negative; thus, the most efficient and effortless way to correct is to turn the negative proposition X into a positive one. To change proposition X into ~X is shared by negation and affirmative. Affirmative is also adopted to change the old proposition X into a new proposition Y. Correcting by bringing up a new proposition cannot be achieved by negation, and thus, it explains the significant correlation between correction and affirmative. Lin (1999: 56) also confirms that correction is usually accompanied with syntactic presentation, especially in negation form.

To change the proposition X into Y can also be done through lexical modification, which is most efficiently carried out through degree marker. However, since modifying the proposition X into αX (α = degree value) is more complicated than just negates it into ~X, the correlation between degree markers (r= 510, P= .011) and correction is less significant than between negation (r= 739, P= .000) and affirmative (r= 685, P= .000).

2. Account. Account is used when there is a need to explain why the content is inaccurate or why, from the speaker's personal judgment, the discussed issue is right/wrong, good/bad, or should/shouldn't be done. There are significant correlation between account and four linguistic markers: negation, affirmative, pre-announcement marker, and degree marker. Syntactically, negative and affirmative structures are adopted when giving explanation. When the explanation for certain disagreement is just the opposite of the proposed proposition or new reasons need to be brought up, under such circumstances, negation and affirmative are the most efficient way to make the explanation.

Lexically, pre-announcement markers, such as causal markers and expressive markers, signal the explanation, and degree markers aims at modifying the proposition to different strength. Pre-announcement markers are highly used in the initial position of an utterance, especially for causal markers and expressive markers. Causal markers, which introduce the relationship between cause and effect, are conventional links used in account. However, the conventional usage of causal markers does not make them the major linguistic markers used in account, which suggests interlocutors are well-comprehended of the causal relationship even without them. As for expressive markers, which introduce the subjective judgments in the speaker's mind, indicate the source of the explanation is the speaker him/herself. Although account is regarded as a less direct speech act in disagreement, applying pre-announcement markers could further lower the force of opposition. Other than pre-announcement markers, oppositions are often explained due to degree differences to the proposition. Under such condition, degree modifiers, which modify the proposition through degree differences, are frequently adopted to give explanation to the disagreed issues.

3. Challenge. Syntactically, challenge significantly correlates with question because the nature of challenge is to question the hearer of the proposed proposition. Mutingl and Turnbull (1998) state that challenge typically have the syntactic form of an interrogative, and Lin (1999) further supports this significant correlation. In Scott's (2002) study, she found two strong features in challenge: question and negation. Demand for answer or proof to the disagreed proposition can easily and directly be carried out through question forms. Since challenge occurs primarily in E-disagreement (see p. 69, Table 11), the questions posed by the speaker are rhetoric questions, which are not intended to be answered by the hearer. By using rhetoric questions, the speaker actually shows disagreement.

Lexically, degree marker is the linguistic marker significantly correlates with challenge. Since degree modifiers, which intensify or mitigate the propositions, are able to display the strength of opposition, the speaker frequently poses them in challenge.

4. Defense. Defense significantly correlates with negation and affirmative, with both being syntactic devices. Defense and challenge are actually two sides of the same coin. Since challenge is carried out primarily through question form, the significant correlation between negations and defense (r= .490, P= .015) and defense and affirmative (r= .694, P= .000) can be accounted for the defensive answers to the questions. The use of negations and affirmations in defense imply the question form used in challenge is primarily yes/no question. The convention to disagree through yes/no question is by giving a negative answer. But, if the yes/no question proposed in challenge is in negative form, the conventional answer to show disagreement would change into affirmative. Besides A-not-A questions, wh-question is also adopted in challenge, and thus, makes affirmative more significantly correlated with defense.

5. Clarification. The only linguistic marker significantly correlated with clarification is pre-announcement marker. When clarifying, pre-announcement marker often prefaces the upcoming proposition which is contrary to what the prior speaker has perceived. Expressive markers which signal the source of the disagreement is often used to clarify, and the finding is in consistency with Lin's (1999) study.

6. Confirmation. Confirmation is significantly correlated with question and degree marker. Syntactically, confirmation is conducted by questioning the former speaker with real questions. The nature of confirmation—verifying the previously perceived proposition—gives advantage to this linguistic form. The most direct way to verify a proposition is through questioning. But, unlike challenge, questions asked for confirmation are real questions that demands answer from the hearer. The sincerity in

asking the questions makes confirmation sound more polite and less aggressive than challenge.

As for lexical devices correlated with confirmation, degree marker is used either to emphasize the question or to intensify the content message.

7. Suggestion. The only linguistic marker significantly correlate with suggestion is modality. The intrinsic nature of suggestion is to advise the hearer. Although modals carry the meaning of different degree of possibility, if related to power differences, such as age, the meaning of modals would be multiple. According to Hodges and Kress (1993), modality establishes degree of authority in utterance (122). If interpreted under such notion, the modals for suggestion should be interpreted as degree of obligation rather than degree of possibility. Then, the advice that shows disagreement also implies obligation that the hearer must follow. Lin's (1999) study confirms the close relationship between suggestion and modal.

4.4.2. C-disagreement by Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies

The interaction between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement is shown in Table 16. For the same reason as indicated in section 4.4.1., Table 16 is too complicated to read and analyze; therefore, correlation coefficient tests are applied to identify significant relationships between pragmatic strategies and linguistic markers, and Table 17 shows the result of significant correlations found in C-disagreement.

Table 16.C-disagreement by linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
COR	(104)**53.61%** **84.55%**	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(59)**30.41%** **69.41%**	(4)2.06% 8.16%	(22)11.34% **59.46%**	(5)2.58% **62.50%**	(194) 100.00% **57.40%**
ACC	(5)9.26% 4.07%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(13)**24.07%** 15.29%	(28)**51.85%** **57.14%**	(7)12.96% 18.92%	(1)1.85% 12.50%	(54) 100.00% 15.98%
CHA	(3)11.54% 2.44%	(16) 0.00% **44.44%**	(1)3.85% 1.18%	(2)7.69% 4.08%	(3)11.54% 8.11%	(1)3.85% 12.50%	(26) 100.00% 7.69%
DEF	(3)**42.86%** 2.44%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(3)**42.86%** 3.53%	(1)14.29% 2.04%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(7) 100.00% 2.07%
PD	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(2)**25.00%** 2.35%	(4)**50.00%** 8.16%	(2)**25.00%** 5.41%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(8) 100.00% 2.37%
CLA	(8)**29.63%** 6.50%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(7)**25.93%** 8.24%	(10)**37.04%** **20.41%**	(2)7.41% 5.41%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(27)100.00% 7.99%
CON	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(20)**90.91%** **55.56%**	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(1)4.55% 2.70%	(1)4.55% 12.50%)	(22) 100.00% 6.51%
SUG	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(00.00% 0.00%)	(0) 0.00% 0.00%
Total	(123)**36.39%** 100.00%	(36)10.65% 100.00%	(85)**25.15%** 100.00%	(49)14.50% 100.00%	(37)10.95% 100.00%	(8)2.37% 100.00%	(338) 100.00% 100.00%

Table 17.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal; "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level; "—" = not used)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
COR	.757**		.538**		.663**	
ACC				.678**		
CHA		.701**				
DEF						
PD	.486*				.687**	
CLA				.590**		
CON		.773 **				
SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 17 indicates that some, but not all, logical combinations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies show significant correlations. Comparing to Table 15, the significant correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies for C-disagreement are different.

1. Correction. Linguistic markers significantly correlate with correction are negation and affirmative, which are both syntactic devices. As mentioned in previously, negation and affirmative are direct statement which change the proposition X into ~X or bringing up a new proposition Y. In factual based C-disagreement, direct correction by either statement clearly and efficiently modifies the inaccurate message, and thus, resumes the process of communication.

2. Account. Account is only significantly correlated with pre-announcement marker (r= .768, P= .000) in C-disagreement. This means that speakers frequently foretell the reasons for disagreement by content-based pre-announcement markers, such as causal

markers and contrast markers.

3. Challenge. Challenge is significantly correlated with question (r= .701, P= .000). This is because the nature of challenge, which is to question someone or something, is typically linked with interrogative forms (Mutingl and Turnbull, 1998; Lin, 1999; Scott, 2002).

4. Partial Disagreement. Two linguistic markers, negation (r= .486, P= .016) and degree marker (r= .687, P= .000) are significantly correlated with Partial disagreement. Although agreement and disagreement are both shown in partial disagreement, the emphasis is on the disagreed part of the utterance. Therefore, syntactically, negation is the most direct and clearest way to show the disagreed part in partial disagreement. Lexically, degree marker modifies the content that is disagreed and is more significant adopted than the others in partial disagreement.

5. Clarification. Clarification is significantly correlated with pre-announcement marker. Clarification clears the misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, by adopting subtypes of pre-announcement markers, such as contrast markers or causal markers, the hearer can easily notice the proposition after these markers is the speaker's real intention, and thus, notice the implied disagreement.

6. Confirmation. Confirmation, resembling challenge, is significantly correlated with question. Confirmation for C-disagreement verifies the accuracy of the content message; therefore, question form is significantly correlated because it suits the role.

However, no significant correlation can be found in pragmatic strategies of defense and linguistic marker of modal. In fact, modals are not significantly correlated with any one of the pragmatic strategies. Also, suggestion is never used in C-disagreement; therefore, it is impossible to have any statistic result.

4.4.3. E-disagreement by Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies

The interaction between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement is shown in Table 18. Again, correlation coefficient tests applied and reduced into Table 19, which presents significant correlations between pragmatic strategies and linguistic markers.

Table 18.E-disagreement by linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
COR	(102) **42.51%** **55.74%**	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(39)18.93% **38.24%**	(20)9.71% 12.82%	(29)14.08% **23.20%**	(16)7.77% **31.37%**	(206) 100.00% **28.03%**
ACC	(32)**20.00%** 17.49%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(23)14.38% **22.55%**	(58)**36.25%** **37.18%**	(37)**23.13%** **29.60%**	(10)6.25% 19.61%	(160) 100.00% **21.77%**
CHA	(16)9.14% 8.74%	(89)**50.86%** **75.42%**	(4)2.29% 3.92%	(38)**21.71%** **24.36%**	(23)13.14% 18.40%	(5)2.86% 9.80%	(175) 100.00% **23.81%**
DEF	(13)18.57% 7.10%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(31)**44.29%** **30.39%**	(9)12.86% 5.77%	(12)17.14% 9.60%	(5)7.14% 9.80%	(70) 100.00% 9.52%
PD	(9)**25.00%** 4.92%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(11)**30.56%** 7.05%	(15)**41.67%** 12.00%	(1) 2.78% 1.96%	(36) 100.00% 4.90%
CLA	(9)**25.00%** 4.92%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(3)8.33% 2.94%	(14)**38.89%** 8.97%	(7)19.44% 5.60%	(3)8.33% 5.88%	(36) 100.00% 4.90%
CON	(1)2.94% 0.55%	(29) 0.00% **24.58%**	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(1)2.94% 0.64%	(2)5.88% 1.60%	(1)2.94% 1.96%	(34) 100.00% 4.63%
SUG	(1)5.56% 0.55%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(2)11.11% 1.96%	(5)**27.78%** 3.21%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(10)**55.56%** 19.61%	(18) 100.00% 2.45%
Total	(183)**24.90%** 100.00%	(118)16.05% 100.00%	(102)13.88% 100.00%	(156)**21.22%** 100.00%	(125)17.01% 100.00%	(51)6.94% 100.00%	(735) 100.00% 100.00%

Table 19.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement (COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; SUG = Suggestion; NEG = Negation; QUE = Question; AFF = Affirmative; Pre-Ann= Pre-announcement Marker; DM = Degree Marker; MOD = Modal; "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level)

PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
COR	.818**		.849**	.440*	.568**	.409*
ACC	.478*		.515*	.649**	.516**	
CHA	.574**	.861**		.553**	.627**	
DEF	.614**		.812**			
PD						
CLA	.489*			.647**		
CON		.550**				
SUG						.714**

Table 19 indicates the logical combinations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies with significant correlations.

1. Correction. Five linguistic markers are significantly correlated with correction: negation and affirmative are syntactic patterns and pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and modal are lexical markers. Syntactically, negation and affirmative are significantly correlated with correction because they are the most direct and efficient way to show disagreement. Correction, which is a less indirect and more face-threatening act, is in accordance with the nature of negation and affirmative. Therefore, the correlations between them are significant. However, the direct and face-threatening nature of correction is dangerous in E-disagreement where no shared value system can be based on. Therefore, more indirect and less face-threatening markers need to be used.

In order not to be offensive by direct speech act, such as negation, lexically, pre-announcement marker is used to signal and prepare the hearer of the upcoming disagreement. Degree marker could modify the strength of the propositional content. Modal is significantly correlated with correction because when personal judgment is involved, degree of possibility varies from person to person. Besides, Hodges and Kress's (1993) degree of authority by modality may also serve as an explanation of the significant correlation between correction and modality in E-disagreeement. Since correction is considered direct and more face-threatening, the authoritative meaning of modality is in accordance with the strategy.

2. Account. Account is significantly correlated with four linguistic markers, namely, negation, affirmative, pre-announcement marker and degree marker. Account provides explanations to the disagreed proposition. Thus, syntactically, explanations are realized through statement, which accord with the nature negation and affirmative. Their significant correlation is not a surprise. Lexically, pre-announcement markers, such as causal markers, expressive markers, and contrast markers, signal the upcoming explanation to the disagreed issue. Either to intensify or to mitigate the strength of disagreement, degree marker modifies the propositional content when accounting for disagreement.

3. Challenge. As indicated above, challenge significantly correlates with negation, question, pre-announcement marker and degree marker. Syntactically, when different values are involved, the tension of challenge might rise to certain strength that direct negative statement must be adopted to show strong and forceful disagreement. However, since there lays a logical relationship between challenge and question form, correlation between challenge and question is still significant. Significant correlations of the two syntactic forms are confirmed and supported by Scott's (2002) qualitative study of linguistic markers in personal challenge disagreement. Lexically,

pre-announcement marker significantly correlates with challenge in E-disagreement because emotional expressions, such as cussing words, and negative performative verbs are adopted. Adapting these types of pre-announcement markers is considered very direct and face-threatening, which is in accordance with the nature of challenge. Degree marker may also strengthen the force of disagreement by intensifier and words with significant degree differences, for example, *fool* and *idiot*.

4. Defense. Two syntactic patterns, negation and affirmative, are in significant correlation with defense. Challenge often presupposes defense. Since challenge often appears in question form (Mutingl and Turnbull, 1998; Lin, 1999; Scott, 2002), whether A-not-A question or wh-question, defense adopts statement to fight back. And thus, negation and affirmative, which are statements, are ideal linguistic marker to defense.

5. Clarification. Clarification is significantly correlated with negation and pre-announcement marker. When misunderstanding is based on evaluation, serious attitudinal opposition may arise. Under the high tension between the speaker and the hearer, direct and forceful negation is adopted to clarify the misunderstanding and release the tension between the interlocutors. Otherwise, communication could not proceed. Pre-announcement marker, such as expressive markers and contrast markers, are placed in front of the clarified proposition to signal the hearer of the disagreement (Wang, 1997; Lin, 1999).

6. Confirmation. Confirmation is significantly correlated with question. Because the nature of confirmation is to verify the propositional content, to question is the best way to carry out the strategy.

As shown in Table 19, except for partial disagreement, which do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker, all linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies have significant preference of certain combinations over the others.

4.4.4. Summary of 4.4.

In this section, we have analyzed and discussed the significant correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in general disagreement, C-disagreement and E-disagreement. Correlations in different types of disagreement show different significant combinations. Analysis indicates that significant correlations found in E-disagreement are much more than in C-disagreement. The result shows that when people disagree by different value systems, the manipulation between linguistic markers in individual pragmatic strategies are more complicated, and thus, must be handled more carefully. The need for more linguistic markers in serving individual pragmatic functions in E-disagreement may be caused by more serious face-threatening force. Thus, in order not to be so face-threatening and maintain politeness in E-disagreement, minding one's p's and q's (Lakoff, 1973) is crucially considered.

4.5. Subcategorization of Linguistic Markers by Types of Disagreement and Pragmatic Strategies

As mentioned in Chapter 3, some linguistic markers, such as question, pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and modal, can be further subcategorized. However, due to the pressure of time and the scope of the study, further subcategorization of the subtypes of these linguistic markers is fairly impossible. According to the amount of data, pre-announcement marker is the linguistic marker that can be subcategorized with enough tokens. Therefore, pre-announcement marker is presented as a demonstration of subcategorizing linguistic markers in types of disagreement and their interaction with pragmatic strategies.

4.5.1. Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker in Disagreement

Linguistic markers, such as question, pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and modal can be further categorized by their semantic nature. However, due to the

scope of the study and the limit of time, they are grouped as a whole to observe the general pattern in disagreement. In this section, investigation of subtypes of pre-announcement marker acts as a demonstration of further subcategorization in individual linguistic categories. Subtypes of pre-announcement markers are analyzed and discussed in disagreement in general, C-disagreement and E-disagreement. Table 20 displays the frequencies of different subtypes used in disagreement in general.

Table 20. Disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker

Contrast Marker	**41.46%**	(85)
Causal Marker	**22.93%**	(47)
Expressive Marker	19.02%	(39)
Emotional Marker	14.15%	(29)
Performative Verb	2.44%	(5)
Total	100.00%	(205)

As data reveal, contrast marker (41.46%) is used more frequently than all the other pre-announcement markers; followed by causal marker (22.93%), expressive marker (19.02%), and emotional marker (14.15%); and performative verb (2.44%) is used the least. Statistic results show that contrast marker is used significantly more often than the others. No significant difference lies among causal marker, expressive marker, and emotional marker. Performative verb is significantly lower than the others. Therefore, subtypes of pre-announcement markers can be categorized into three groups as follows:

ConM > {CauM/ExpM/EmoM} > PfV

Reasons for the above scale can are given below. Contrast marker signals the contrast meaning between propositions, which suits the nature of disagreement. Therefore, it is used significantly more frequently than the other markers. Causal marker shows cause and effect relationship in disagreement, which often occurs in

account where explanations are required. Expressive marker indicates the source of the disagreement is by the speaker him/herself. Emotional marker makes attitudinal judgment towards the disagreed issue. Expressive marker and emotional marker are used frequently in E-disagreement due to the judgmental nature. Performative verb occurs least frequently because the offensive force it carries is strong enough the raise disagreement into conflict within turns.

4.5.1.1. Intersection of Types of Disagreement and Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker

When disagreement is further classifies into C-disagreement and E-disagreement, the distributions of subtypes of pre-announcement markers differ. Table 21 shows the frequencies of different markers and the distributions are analyzed afterwards.

Table 21.C-disagreement and E-disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker

Pre-announcement Marker	Types of Disagreement	
	C-disagreement	E-disagreement
Contrast Marker	**48.98%** (24)	**39.10%** (61)
Causal Marker	**44.90%** (22)	16.03% (25)
Expressive Marker	6.12% (3)	**23.08%** (36)
Emotional Marker	0.00% (0)	18.59% (29)
Performative Verb	0.00% (0)	3.21% (5)
Total	100.00% (49)	100.00% (156)

4.5.1.1.1. C-disagreement by Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker

When subtypes of pre-announcement marker are used in C-disagreement and E-disagreement, the distributions of markers are different. In C-disagreement, contrast marker (48.98%) and causal marker (44.90%) are adopted most frequently due to their nature in accordance to content-based disagreement. Expressive marker (6.12%) is in significant difference with contrast marker and causal marker (P= .026 and P= .019,

respectively). Although expressive marker is used to signal the proposition by the speaker's judgment, in data collected, 3 expressive markers are used to clarify what the speaker said previously without any extra judgmental meanings, which means expressive markers have more or less become formulaic in giving C-disagreement. Emotional marker and performative verb are strongly attitudinal and they are excluded from C-disagreement because of their subjective nature. Therefore, it can be concluded that, in general, contrast marker and causal marker are the only two subtypes of pre-announcement markers used in C-disagreement.

4.5.1.1.2. E-disagreement by Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker

In E-disagreement, contrast marker (39.10%) is adopted more frequently than the others; expressive marker (23.08%), emotional marker (18.59%), and causal marker (16.03%) come after; performative verb (3.21%), again, is the least used. Statistic results indicate that contrast marker is significantly more often than all the other markers. Expressive marker, emotional marker, and causal marker are not significantly different from one another and they are categorized as the second most frequently used markers. Performative verb is used the least frequently and is significantly different from all the other markers. Thus, subtypes of pre-announcement markers in E-disagreement can be categorized as follow:

ConM > {ExpM/EmoM/CauM} > PfV

The above scale repeats the priority order found in disagreement in general, and explanations to the finding are as follow. Contrast marker is used most frequently in E-disagreement due to its conventional link with the opposite meaning in disagreement. Expressive marker which foretells the source of disagreement is in accordance with the judgmental nature of E-disagreement. Since E-disagreement rises due to different value systems, strong attitudinal expressions toward the disagreed content are more likely to occur. Emotional marker signals the strong attitudinal

judgment carried by the speaker. Causal marker is used with lower frequency in E-disagreement. According to data collected, interlocutors often express causal relationship without causal markers when disagreement becomes intensive. Every performative verb is used in E-disagreement because the action carried out by the verb contains personal attitude towards the disagreement.

4.5.1.2. Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker in C-disagreement

Subtypes of pre-announcement markers used in the data can be further categorized into three subtypes by accuracy, ambiguity, and vagueness. Table 22 gives the result of subtypes of pre-announcement markers used in the three subtypes of C-disagreement.

Table 22.Subtypes of C-disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker

Pre-announcement Marker	C-disagreement		
	Accuracy	Ambiguity	Vagueness
Causal Marker	**48.89%** (22)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Contrast Marker	**44.44%** (20)	**100.00%** (4)	0.00% (0)
Expressive Marker	6.67% (3)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Emotional Marker	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Performative Verb	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
Total	100.00% (45)	100.00% (4)	0.00% (0)

According to Table 8 (see p. 62), most subtypes of pre-announcement marker occur in accuracy. Since accuracy makes up 95.27% of C-disagreement, high percentages found in accuracy are understandable. Causal marker (48.89%) and contrast marker (44.44%) are used most frequently. They are in significant difference with expressive marker (6.67%) (P= .019 and P= .026, respectively). In ambiguity, only contrast marker is adopted. However, since only 4 tokens of contrast makers are found in data collected, discussion based on ambiguity is excluded. No pre-announcement marker is used in vagueness.

4.5.1.3. Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker in E-disagreement

There are two subtypes of E-disagreement: E-disagreement based on personal judgment and E-disagreement based on socio-cultural evaluation. Since only 4 out of 156 pre-announcement markers are found for socio-cultural E-disagreement, only subtypes of pre-announcement markers used in personal judgment are analyzed and discussed. Table 23 demonstrates subtypes of pre-announcement markers used in personal E-disagreement.

Table 23.Subtypes of E-disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker

Pre-announcement Marker	Personal E-disagreement			
	[±Right]	[±Should]	[±Good]	Total
Contrast Marker	(46)**80.70%** **37.40%**	(5)8.77% **35.71%**	(6)10.53% **40.00%**	(57)100.00% **37.50%**
Emotional Marker	(26)**89.66%** **21.14%**	(2)6.90% 14.29%	(1)3.45% 6.67%	(29)100.00% 19.08%
Expressive Marker	(24)**66.67%** 19.51%	(5)13.89% **35.71%**	(7)19.44% **46.67%**	(36)100.00% **23.68%**
Causal Marker	(22)**88.00%** 17.89%	(2)8.00% 14.29%	(1)4.00% 6.67%	(25)100.00% 16.45%
Performative Verb	(5)**100.00%** 4.07%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)100.00% 3.29%
Total	(123)**80.92%** 100.00%	(14)9.21% 100.00%	(15)9.87% 100.00%	(152)100.00% 100.00%

Among the 152 tokens based on personal E-disagreement, contrast marker (37.50%) and expressive marker (23.68%) are adopted more often than emotional marker (19.08%), causal marker (16.45%), and performative verb (3.29%). Statistic tests indicate significant differences between performative verb and all the other markers. Contrast marker is in significant difference with causal market (P= .005), but not with the other markers. Expressive marker, emotional marker, and causal marker

are insignificantly different.

In showing personal E-disagreement for [±Right], contrast marker (37.40%) and emotional marker (21.14%) are used more often than expressive marker (19.51%), causal marker (17.89%), and performative verb (4.07%). Except for emotional marker, contrast marker is significantly different from the other markers. No significant difference lies among emotional marker, expressive marker, and causal marker. Performative verb is significantly different from all the others.

Contrast marker has the highest frequency in personal E-disagreement for [±Right] because of its similar nature of truth/false in C-disagreement based on accuracy. Right and wrong about subject matters contrast with each other and the contrastive situation is most easily expresses through contrast marker. High frequency of emotional marker shows the lower changeability of [±Right] on personal E-disagreement. Therefore, strong attitudinal expressions are more frequently used. Although performative verb only counts for 4.07% of subtypes of pre-announcement marker used for [±Right], close observation indicates all the performative verbs found are used in this subtype of personal E-disagreement. Since the concept of right/wrong is less likely to change, strong attitudinal performative verbs are most likely to be used to express personal judgments on subject matters.

In showing personal E-disagreement for [±Should], the distributions of different pre-announcement marker are rather symmetrical: contrastive marker (35.71%) and expressive marker (35.71%) are both more highly adopted than causal marker (14.29%) and emotional marker (14.29%). No performative verb is used in personal E-disagreement for [±Should]. Statistic results indicate no significant difference is found among any two of the subtypes of pre-announcement markers in personal E-disagreement based on [±Should].

As for [±Good] on personal E-disagreement, expressive marker (46.67%) and

contrast marker (40.00%) are more frequently adopted than causal marker (6.67%) and emotional marker (6.67%). Performative verb is not adopted in this subtype of personal E-disagreement. According to statistic tests, contrast marker and expressive marker are both significantly different from emotional marker (P= .022 and P= .031, respectively) and performative verb (P= .031 and P= .016%).

Expressive markers are often used to indicate the speaker's opinion and feeling toward the disagreed proposition. Since personal E-disagreement based on [±Good] is often raised because of different preferences, the high frequency of expressive marker is understandable. The high frequency of contrast marker comes from its intrinsic oppositional nature in disagreement.

When comparing individual pre-announcement markers of the different subtypes of personal E-disagreement, all markers, except for performative verb, are used significantly more frequent in personal E-disagreement on [±Right] than on [±Should] and on [±Good]. No significant difference is found between [±Should] and [±Good]. The high frequency of personal E-disagreement based on [±Right] explains the result.

4.5.2. Interaction between Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker and Pragmatic Strategies

In this section, the interaction and correlation between pragmatic strategies and subtypes of pre-announcement markers will be discussed. Interactions in disagreement in general are analyzed first, followed by interactions in C-disagreement and in E-disagreement.

4.5.2.1. Disagreement in General by Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker and Pragmatic Strategies

Since Table 24 of interactions between pragmatic strategies and linguistic markers are complicated to read, not to mention analyzing it, analyses and discussions will be based on the correlation and coefficient test presented in Table 25. As

indicated by Table 25, only some of the logical combinations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies show significant correlations. Certain linguistic and pragmatic combinations have significant differences over the other combinations. Thus, only significant correlation in account, challenge and clarification are discussed and analyzed.

Table 24.Disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV	Total
COR	(11)**45.83%** 12.94%	(1)4.17% 2.13%	(9)**37.50%** **23.08%**	(1)4.17% 3.45%	(2)8.33% **40.00%**	(24)100.00% 11.71%
ACC	(38)**44.19%** **44.71%**	(42)**48.84%** **89.36%**	(6)6.98% 15.38%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(86)100.00% **41.95%**
CHA	(6)15.00% 7.06%	(3)7.50% 6.38%	(1)2.50% 2.56%	(27)**67.50%** **93.10%**	(3)7.50% **60.00%**	(40)100.00% 19.51%
DEF	(7)**70.00%** 8.24%	(1)10.00% 2.13%	(2)**20.00%** 5.13%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(10)100.00% 4.88%
PD	(10)**66.67%** 11.76%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)**33.33%** 12.82%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(15)100.00% 7.32%
CLA	(12)**50.00%** 14.12%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(12)**50.00%** **30.77%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(24)100.00% 11.71%
CON	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)**100.00%** 3.45%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)100.00% 0.49%
SUG	(1)20.00% 1.18%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(4)**80.00%** 10.26%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)100.00% 2.44%
Total	(85)**41.46%** 100.00%	(47)**22.93%** 100.00%	(39)19.02% 100.00%	(29)14.15% 100.00%	(5)2.44% 100.00%	(205)100.00% 100.00%

Table 25.Correlations between subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies in disagreement in general (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV
COR					
ACC	.521**	.717**			
CHA				.516**	
DEF					
PD					
CLA	.583**		.671**	.612**	
CON					
SUG					

1. Account. Account shows significant correlations with contrast marker and with causal marker. Causal marker has a conventional link with account because it foretells the relationship of cause and effect. Contrast marker signals the contrastive meaning between the current proposition and the prior proposition, which is in accordance with the nature of disagreement. Also, the pragmatic nature of account is more indirect because it does not change the referential content. Therefore, using neutral pre-announcement markers, such as contrast marker and causal marker, suits the more indirect nature of account in signaling the forthcoming explanation to the oppositional content.

2. Challenge. Challenge has significant correlation with emotional marker. Since the nature of challenge is rather forceful and less indirect, adopting more attitudinal and subjective emotional marker could strengthen the intension of disagreement.

3. Clarification. Three subtypes of pre-announcement markers have significant correlations with clarification: contrast marker, expressive marker, and emotional marker. Contrast marker is conventionally linked with disagreement; therefore, it is optimal to signal the forth coming disagreement carried out by clarification. Clarification aims to clarify the current speaker's intention, which was previously misunderstood by the hearer. Using expressive marker to disagree makes the hearer understand the clarification of the propositional content is from the speaker's own perspective.

4.5.2.2. C-disagreement by Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker and Pragmatic Strategies

Only some logical combinations between pragmatic strategies and pre-announcement markers show significant correlations in C-disagreement, and further discussion will be based on those significant correlations. Since the nature of emotional marker and performative verb are purely subjective, according to Table 26, they are not adopted in content-based C-disagreement. Table 27 shows the significant correlations between pre-announcement markers and pragmatic strategies found in C-disagreement.

Table 26.C-disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV	Total
COR	(3)**75.00%** 12.50%	(1)**25.00%** 4.55%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(4)100.00% 8.16%
ACC	(8)**28.57%** **33.33%**	(20)**71.43%** **90.91%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(28)100.00% **57.14%**
CHA	(1)**50.00%** 4.17%	(1)**50.00%** 4.55%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)100.00% 4.08%
DEF	(1)**100.00%** 4.17%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)100.00% 2.04%
PD	(4)**100.00%** 16.67%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(4)100.00% 8.16%
CLA	(7)**70.00%** **29.17%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(3)30.00% **100.00%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(10)100.00% **20.41%**
CON	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%
SUG	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%
Total	(24)**48.98%** 100.00%	(22)**44.90%** 100.00%	(3)6.12% 100.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(49)100.00% 100.00%

Table 27.Correlations between subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level; "—" = not used)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV
COR				—	—
ACC		.848**		—	—
CHA				—	—
DEF				—	—
PD				—	—
CLA	.643**			—	—
CON				—	—
SUG	—	—	—	—	—

Only two pairs of significant correlations are found in C-disagreement: account and causal marker, and clarification and contrast marker.

1. Account. Account is significantly correlated with causal marker in C-disagreement. Since causal marker indicates the causal relationship, which is in accordance with the nature of explanation, the significant correlation between account and causal marker is expected.

2. Clarification. Clarification shows significant correlation with contrast marker. Clarification is considered less indirect in speech act because it clarifies the misinterpreted referential content; therefore, contrast marker, which is conventionally linked with disagreement, is preferred to foretell the disagreement.

4.5.2.3. E-disagreement by Subtypes of Pre-announcement Marker and Pragmatic Strategies

Table 28 shows the frequency of subtypes of pre-announcement marker adopted

in pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement. Since Table 28 is fairly complicated to read, not to mention analyzing it, correlation and coefficient tests are conducted. Only some logical combinations between pragmatic strategies and pre-announcement markers show significant correlations in E-disagreement, and further discussion will be based on those significant correlations. Table 28 indicates the significant correlations between pre-announcement markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement.

Table 28.E-disagreement by subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV	Total
COR	(8)**40.00%** 13.11%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(9)**45.00%** **25.00%**	(1)5.00% 3.45%	(2)10.00% **40.00%**	(20)100.00% 12.82%
ACC	(30)**51.72%** **49.18%**	(22)**37.93%** **88.00%**	(6)10.34% 16.67%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(58)100.00% **37.18%**
CHA	(5)13.16% 8.20%	(2)5.26% 8.00%	(1)2.63% 2.78%	(27)**71.05%** **93.10%**	(3)7.89% **60.00%**	(38)100.00% **24.36%**
DEF	(6)**66.67%** 9.84%	(1)11.11% 4.00%	(2)**22.22%** 5.56%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(9)100.00% 5.77%
PD	(6)**54.55%** 9.84%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)**45.45%** 13.89%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(11)100.00% 7.05%
CLA	(5)**35.71%** 8.20%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(9)**64.29%** **25.00%**	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(14)100.00% 8.97%
CON	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)**100.00%** 3.45%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(1)100.00% 0.64%
SUG	(1)**20.00%** 1.64%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(4)**80.00%** 11.11%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(5)100.00% 3.21%
Total	(61)**39.10%** 100.00%	(25)16.03% 100.00%	(36)**23.08%** 100.00%	(29)18.59% 100.00%	(5)3.21% 100.00%	(156)100.00% 100.00%

Table 29.Correlations between subtypes of pre-announcement marker and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement (ConM = Contrast Marker; CauM = Causal Marker; ExpM = Expressive Marker; EmoM = Emotional Marker; Pfv = Performative Verb; COR= Correction; ACC = Account; CHA = Challenge; DEF= Defense; PD= Partial Disagreement; CLA = Clarification; CON = Confirmation; "*" = significant at the 0.05 level; "**" = significant at the 0.01 level)

P-A / PG	ConM	CauM	ExpM	EmoM	PfV
COR					
ACC	.665**	.617**			
CHA				.614**	
DEF					
PD			.424*		
CLA			.412*	.768**	
CON					
SUG					

According to the table above, account, challenge, partial disagreement, and clarification have shown significant correlations with certain pre-announcement markers. However, correction, defense, confirmation, and suggestion do not have significant correlation with any subtypes of pre-announcement markers. It may imply that these strategies do not have significant preference for certain subtype of pre-announcement markers in E-disagreement.

1. Account. Account shows significant correlation with contrast marker and with causal marker, which is in accordance with the result found in disagreement in general. Even in subjective judgment of E-disagreement, account is by nature a more indirect strategy because it does not touch upon the referential content. Thus, adopting neutral pre-announcement markers, such as causal marker, which conventionally foretells the causal relationship in explanation, and contrast marker, which is conventionally linked with disagreement, are optimal in giving explanations to the disagreed

proposition.

2. Challenge. Challenge is significantly correlated with emotional marker. Since emotional marker conveys strong subjective attitude, it is the optimal choice in signaling more face-threatening and forceful challenge.

3. Partial Disagreement. Partial disagreement significantly correlates with expressive marker. In order not to confuse the hearer by the agreement token prior to the disagreement content, expressive marker which signals the speaker's opinion could aware the hearer of the following disagreement and emphasize the opposition.

4. Clarification. Clarification shows significant correlations with expressive marker and with emotional marker. Expressive marker indicates the following proposition is by personal opinion, which is frequently used before giving clarification to the misinterpreted propositional content. Emotional markers are used when the clarification is adopted because of serious misinterpretation made by the hearer.

4.6. Age in Disagreement

In this section, disagreement and its subtypes, linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies are analyzed by social factor of age.

4.6.1. General Disagreement by Age

In this section, disagreement and its subtypes are analyzed from the perspectives of the speaker, the hearer, and both the speaker and the hearer. Table 30 shows the result of disagreement found in data collected.

Table 30.Disagreement by age differences (O = Old; Y = Young)

Age		Types of Disagreement		
		C-disagreement	E-disagreement	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(158)31.60% 46.75%	(342)68.40% 46.53%	(500)100.00% 46.60%
	Y	(180)31.41% 53.25%	(393)68.59% 53.47%	(573)100.00% 53.40%
	Total	(338)31.50% 100.00%	(735)68.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(147)31.41% 43.49%	(321)68.59% 43.67%	(468)100.00% 43.62%
	Y	(191)31.57% 56.51%	(414)68.43% 56.33%	(605)100.00% 56.38%
	Total	(338)31.50% 100.00%	(735)68.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(105)35.35% 31.07%	(192)64.65% 26.12%	(297)100.00% 27.68%
	Y-Y	(138)34.33% 40.83%	(264)65.67% 35.92%	(402)100.00% 37.47%
	O-Y	(53)26.11% 15.68%	(150)73.89% 20.41%	(203)100.00% 18.92%
	Y-O	(42)24.56% 12.43%	(129)75.44% 17.55%	(171)100.00% 15.94%
	Total	(338)31.50% 100.00%	(735)68.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.1.1. General Disagreement by Speaker's Age

According to Table 30, from the perspective of disagreement types, old speakers (OS) and young speakers (YS) show no significant difference in disagreement in general, in C-disagreement, and in E-disagreement. In fact, the two age groups' percentages display similar pattern: YS disagrees slightly more often than OS. However, from the viewpoint of speaker's production of C-disagreement and E-disagreement, statistic results indicate significant differences lie in both OS

(P= .036) and YS (P= .005). That is, for both OS and YS, E-disagreement is used significantly more frequent than C-disagreement. Based on the result, it can be said that speaker of both age group share the same pattern in disagreement and its subtypes. In other words, age is not a crucial factor influencing the speaker's use of disagreement.

4.6.1.2. General Disagreement by Hearer's Age

The result of types of disagreement by hearer's perspective is in accordance with speaker's perspective. From the perspective of disagreement types, hearers of different age group share the same pattern: Young hearers (YH) receive more disagreement than old hearers (OH). However, when comparing C-disagreement and E-disagreement from the hearer's perspective, statistic results indicate that C-disagreement and E-disagreement perceived by YH have significant differences (P= .001), but not OH (P= .064). This finding means that although OH and YH share similar pattern in receiving C-disagreement and E-disagreement, the discrepancy between C-disagreement and E-disagreement is significant for YH, but not for OH. Significantly more E-disagreement than C-disagreement is addressed to YH. However, the differences do not affect the general pattern: YH is more likely to receive disagreement than OH. One possible reason for OH's fewer frequency in disagreement is that in Chinese culture where age often implies power, disagreeing with older hearer is considered to be impolite. Hearer's age has significant cultural control on the speakers when making disagreement.

4.6.1.3. General Disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

The discrepancy of age between the speaker and the hearer may influence the speaker's performance in disagreement.

According to Table 30, in disagreement in general, the two same-age groups (with both the speakers and the hearers being old or being young) perform

disagreement more often than two cross-age groups. Statistic results show the discrepancy between the same- age groups and the cross-age group is not significant. In same-age groups, young interlocutors (Y-Y) disagree more than old interlocutors (O-O) in both C-disagreement and E-disagreement. For the two cross-age groups, disagreement occurs more with old speaker to young hearer (O-Y) than with young speaker to old hearer (Y-O).

The above pattern is repeated in both C-disagreement and E-disagreement: No significant differences are located between O-O and Y-Y, and O-Y and Y-O are not significant. When comparing the four age groups' frequencies of different disagreement types, according to statistic result, again, no significant differences are found.

Statistic results indicate that the discrepancy between C-disagreement and E-disagreement is larger in the two same-age groups (i.e. O-O and Y-Y) (P= .006) than in the two cross-age groups (namely, O-Y and Y-O) (P= .034). When there is age difference between the speaker and the hearer, contrary to the hypothesis, the frequency of old speakers disagreeing with young hearer is about the same frequency of young speakers disagreeing with old hearer. Moreover, all four groups show a similar pattern in using C-disagreement and E-disagreement: E-disagreement is adopted more often than C-disagreement. However, only Y-Y's difference in between is statistically significant (P= .002).

The statistic results show that interlocutors of the same-age group do disagree with each other more frequently than interlocutors if different age groups and this finding confirms the third hypothesis in this study (see p. 3). However, unlike what has been hypothesized that young speakers are less likely to disagree with old hearers, young speakers show high frequency of disagreement in communication with old hearers. Three possible reasons are offered to explain the phenomenon. First, the

younger generation's value system has changed. Through the influence of western individualism and modern education's encouragement to express personal opinions also affects younger speaker's willingness to show opposition, younger speakers are more willing to speak for themselves and to show opposition. The old Southern Min proverb, "Children should only listen but not speak" is not encouraged anymore in modern society. Younger generations may have begun to shift their value system from the "situation-centered-oriented" Chinese culture (Lii-Shih, 1994) to the "more-individualism-oriented" western cultures (Lii-Shih, 1994).

Second, due to limited data, in the current study, the age distance between the older group (ranging from 45 to 60 years old) and the younger group (ranging from 20-33 years old) is not so wide apart; therefore, the age barrier set by traditional Chinese culture might not be strongly influential. It is believed that when the age range between the youngest and the oldest is enhanced and the categorization of age group is further divided into three groups, disagreement difference based on age factor would be more conspicuous.

Third, in personal interviews, an old man once said that he would be reluctant to disagree with young hearers because he thinks they are not able to understand the meaning of his opposition, which would make his disagreement meaningless. In other words, the desire not to be considered old-fashioned or stubborn may also explains why the frequency of O-Y is not as high as hypothesized.

4.6.2. C-disagreement by Age

Age differences by subtypes of C-disagreement are examined in this section. Table 31 demonstrates the result of subtypes of C-disagreement by speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age of old and young.

Table 31.Subtypes of C-disagreement by age differences (O= Old; Y= Young)

Age		C-disagreement			
		Accuracy	Ambiguity	Vagueness	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(156)98.73% 48.45%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)1.27% 100.00%	(158)100.00% 46.75%
	Y	(166)92.22% 51.55%	(14)7.78% 100.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(180)100.00% 53.25%
	Total	(322)95.27% 100.00%	(14)4.14% 100.00%	(2)0.59% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(145)98.64% 45.03%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)1.36% 100.00%	(147)100.00% 43.49%
	Y	(177)92.67% 54.97%	(14)7.33% 100.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(191)100.00% 56.51%
	Total	(322)95.27% 100.00%	(14)4.14% 100.00%	(2)0.59% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	OO	(103)98.10% 31.99%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)1.90% 100.00%	(105)100.00% 31.07%
	YY	(124)89.86% 38.51%	(14)10.14% 100.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(138)100.00% 40.83%
	OY	(53)100.00% 16.46%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(53)100.00% 15.68%
	YO	(42)100.00% 13.04%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(42)100.00% 12.43%
	Total	(322)95.27% 100.00%	(14)4.14% 100.00%	(2)0.59% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.2.1. C-disagreement by Speaker's Age

Table 31 gives some patterns related to the use of the subtypes of C-disagreement. Among the three subtypes, C-disagreement based on accuracy takes 95.27% or (322 tokens) of the total C-disagreements; ambiguity type, 4.14% (or 14 tokens); and vagueness, 0.59% (or 2 tokens). Since accuracy builds up 95.27% of C-disagreement, a pattern similar to that is C-disagreement in general is predicted and verified: speaker's age is not an influential factor for the use of C-disagreement based

on accuracy. As for C-disagreement based on ambiguity, OS and YS show distinctive preferences, with all of the 14 tokens being used by YS, none by OS. Since C-disagreement based on vagueness is extremely low in frequency (only 2 out of 338 tokens), it is ignored here.

4.6.2.2. C-disagreement by Hearer's Age

The distributions of the three subtypes of C-disagreement from hearer's point of view either resemble or copy the patterns. First, accuracy accounts for the majority of -disagreement, and there is no significant age difference between OH (p= .036) and YH (P= .005). Next, all the 14 tokens of the ambiguity type derived from the situation when the hearer is young. Again, the vagueness type is low in frequency and, is, thus, ignored.

4.6.2.3. C-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

As indicated previously that disagreement occurs more often when interlocutors belong to the same age group than when speaker and hearer are of different age groups, this pattern repeats itself in C-disagreement based on accuracy when both the speaker's age and the hearer's age are taken into consideration. Also, no age difference is found between O-O and Y-Y, or between O-Y and Y-O. As for C-disagreement based on ambiguity, all the C-disagreement on ambiguity are found to be used by the Y-Y same-age interlocutors. C-disagreement based on vagueness, since low in frequency (with both of the only 2 tokens being used by O-O groups), is, again, ignored.

The reason why age does not show significant influence in C-disagreement is because of its nature. Since the content that interlocutors disagree is factual and can be proven by outside references, the barrier caused by age would be less influential.

4.6.3. E-disagreement by Age

Age difference in subtypes of personal E-disagreement is examined in this section. Due to limited data found in socio-cultural E-disagreement, disagreements of its subtypes are not discussed. Table 32 demonstrates the result of subtypes of C-disagreement by speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age of old and young.

Table 32.Subtypes of E-disagreement by age differences (O= Old; Y= Young)

Age		Personal E-disagreement			
		[±Right]	[±Should]	[±Good]	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(289)87.58% 50.97%	(17)5.15% 19.32%	(24)7.27% 35.29%	(330)100.00% 45.64%
	Y	(278)70.74% 49.03%	(71)18.07% 80.68%	(44)11.20% 64.71%	(393)100.00% 54.36%
	Total	(567)78.42% 100.00%	(88)12.17% 100.00%	(68)9.41% 100.00%	(723)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(281)89.78% 49.56%	(16)5.11% 18.18%	(16)5.11% 23.53%	(313)100.00% 43.29%
	Y	(286)69.76% 50.44%	(72)17.56% 81.82%	(52)12.68% 76.47%	(410)100.00% 56.71%
	Total	(567)78.42% 100.00%	(88)12.17% 100.00%	(68)9.41% 100.00%	(723)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(163)88.59% 28.75%	(10)5.43% 11.36%	(11)5.98% 16.18%	(184)100.00% 25.45%
	Y-Y	(160)60.61% 28.22%	(65)24.62% 73.86%	(39)14.77% 57.35%	(264)100.00% 36.51%
	O-Y	(126)86.30% 22.22%	(7)4.79% 7.95%	(13)8.90% 19.12%	(146)100.00% 20.19%
	Y-O	(118)91.47% 20.81%	(6)4.65% 6.82%	(5)3.88% 7.35%	(129)100.00% 17.84%
	Total	(567)100.00% 100.00%	(88)100.00% 100.00%	(68)100.00% 100.00%	(723)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.3.1. E-disagreement by Speaker's Age

In personal E-disagreement, OS (45.64% or 330 tokens) and YS (54.36% or393 tokens) show insignificant difference (P= .473). As in subtypes of E-disagreement, the pattern is repeated when personal E-disagreement is based on [±Right]. In [±Should], YS (80.68%) scores significantly higher than OS (19.32%) (P= .018). In [±Good], YS (64.71%) disagree more often than OS (35.29%), but the discrepancy is not significant (P= .267).

Moreover, OS and YS share the same pattern in using personal E-disagreement: with [±Right] being adopted significantly more frequently than [±Should] (OS, P= .002; YS, P= .016) and [±Good] (OS, P= .003; YS, P= .006).

4.6.3.2. E-disagreement by Hearer's Age

In personal E-disagreement, the pattern OH and YH in receiving disagreement are in accordance with those based on speaker's age. In personal E-disagreement on [±Right], no age difference is located. However, in both [±Should] and [±Good] of personal E-disagreement, YH perceives significantly more disagreements than OH (for [±Should], P= .015; for [±Good], P= 0.44).

In addition, OH and YH share similar pattern in that E-disagreement on [±Right] are perceived significantly more often than [±Should] (OH, P= .003, YH, P= .011) and [±Good] (OH, P= .003, YH, P= .005). In cross comparisons of the percentage found in the three subtypes of personal E-disagreement, OH and YH share a similar way in using the three subtypes of E-disagreement.

4.6.3.3. E-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

When both the speaker's age and the hearer's age are taken into consideration, a different picture emerges. First, in the use of personal E-disagreement, if speaker and hearer are from the same age group, they seem to disagree slightly more often than speaker and hearer from different age groups. Next, in general, same-age interlocutors

disagree more often than cross-age interlocutors. However, in examining the four age combination groups, it is noticed that the four groups show parallel distributions in using [±Right], but it is Y-Y that show high percentage in [±Should] (73.86%) and [±Good] (57.35%). Statistic results indicate that in personal E-disagreement based on [±Should], Y-Y is significantly different from O-O (P= .005), O-Y (P= .039), and Y-O (P= .031), but not in [±Right] and [±Good]. Besides [±Right], Y-Y is more likely to produce other subtypes of personal E-disagreement. To sum, from speaker's and hearer's perspective, same-aged interlocutors and cross-aged interlocutors share the same pattern. When viewed individually, Y-Y's pattern is rather different from the other three groups in disagreeing with [±Should].

On using [±Right] on personal E-disagreement, which resembles with accuracy on C-disagreement, interlocutors must have a set of personal norm within their judgment. However, since this norm can neither be shared nor be changed, high frequency of personal E-disagreement appears. Maxim of Quality is not shared in communication. Y-Y differs from the other groups by showing significant percentage of personal E-disagreement on [±Should] and [±Good]. Unlike the more stable [±Right], the nature of [±Should] and [±Good] is more likely to change from time to time and it is less imposing. Because of the less stubborn and unfixed nature of [±Should] and [±Good] and the more flexible value system shared by younger generations, more personal E-disagreements based on [±Should] and [±Good] occur between Y-Y. Data collection confirms that young interlocutors talk and disagree with each other more about things with more changeable and less imposing nature.

4.6.4. Linguistic Markers by Age

This section discusses choices of linguistic markers under the influence of age. Linguistic markers in disagreement are discussed first. Their distributions in C-disagreement and E-disagreement are discussed secondly and thirdly.

4.6.4.1. Linguistic Markers in General Disagreement by Age

Age difference in linguistic markers is analyzed in this section. Age difference from speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age are examined. Table 33 demonstrates the result of the data collected.

Table 33. Disagreement by linguistic markers by age differences

AGE \ LX		NEG	AFF	QUE	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(146)**29.20%** 47.71%	(103)**20.60%** 55.08%	(57)11.40% 37.01%	(84)16.80% 40.98%	(77)15.40% 47.53%	(33)6.60% 55.93%	(500)100.00% 46.60%
	Y	(160)**27.92%** 52.29%	(84)14.66% 44.92%	(97)16.93% 62.99%	(121)**21.12%** 59.02%	(85)14.83% 52.47%	(26)4.54% 44.07%	(573)100.00% 53.40%
	Total	(306)**28.52%** 100.00%	(187)17.43% 100.00%	(154)14.35% 100.00%	(205)19.11% 100.00%	(162)15.10% 100.00%	(59)5.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(121)**25.85%** 39.54%	(67)14.32% 35.83%	(88)18.80% 57.14%	(90)19.23% 43.90%	(73)15.60% 45.06%	(29)6.20% 49.15%	(468)100.00% 43.62%
	Y	(185)**30.58%** 60.46%	(120)19.83% 64.17%	(66)10.91% 42.86%	(115)19.01% 56.10%	(89)14.71% 54.94%	(30)4.96% 50.85%	(605)100.00% 56.38%
	Total	(306)**28.52%** 100.00%	(187)17.43% 100.00%	(154)14.35% 100.00%	(205)19.11% 100.00%	(162)15.10% 100.00%	(59)5.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(86)**28.96%** 28.10%	(39)13.13% 20.86%	(40)13.47% 25.97%	(61)**20.54%** 29.76%	(52)17.51% 32.10%	(19)6.40% 32.20%	(297)100.00% 27.68%
	Y-Y	(125)**31.09%** 40.85%	(56)13.93% 29.95%	(49)12.19% 31.82%	(92)**22.89%** 44.88%	(64)15.92% 39.51%	(16)3.98% 27.12%	(402)100.00% 37.47%
	O-Y	(60)**29.56%** 19.61%	(64)**31.53%** 34.22%	(17)8.37% 11.04%	(23)11.33% 11.22%	(25)12.32% 15.43%	(14)6.90% 23.73%	(203)100.00% 18.92%
	Y-O	(35)**20.47%** 11.44%	(28)16.37% 14.97%	(48)**28.07%** 31.17%	(29)16.96% 14.15%	(21)12.28% 12.96%	(10)5.85% 16.95%	(171)100.00% 15.94%
	Total	(306)**28.52%** 100.00%	(187)17.43% 100.00%	(154)14.35% 100.00%	(205)19.11% 100.00%	(162)15.10% 100.00%	(59)5.50% 100.00%	(1073)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.4.1.1. Linguistic Markers in General Disagreement by Speaker's Age

From linguistics' viewpoint, in disagreement, OS and YS adopt different linguistic markers with nearly equal percentage. Statistic results indicate that no significant differences are found between OS and YS when using different linguistic markers.

From speaker's perspective, speakers of different age groups display different patterns of priority preferences in linguistic markers. Negation is used most frequently by both OS (29.20%) and YS (27.29%), but other linguistic markers are used in different by speakers of different age groups. First, OS prefers affirmative (20.60%), pre-announcement markers (16.80%), degree markers (15.40%) and question (11.40%). The finding implies that OS prefer syntactic form to lexical marker. Modal (6.60%) is least used and is significantly different from the other linguistic markers. Next, for YS, Pre-announcement marker (21.12%), question (16.93%), degree marker (14.83%) and affirmative (14.66%) are the preferred order. Syntactic and lexical markers are stressed at similar portion by YS. Statistic results show no significant difference among negation, pre-announcement marker, and question. Modal (4.54%) is used significantly less frequently than the other linguistic markers.

Also, significant differences between linguistic markers by speaker's age lie in three pairs: negation and question, negation and affirmative, and question and modal. OS shows significant difference between negation and question (P= .000). Since age creates power for OS, negation, as a direct statement for disagreement, is used more frequently to less powerful hearer, i.e., YH. Question implies choice and requests answer from the hearer, which is not suitable for speaker of power, and thus, question form is significantly less adopted by OS. YS shows significant differences between negation and affirmative (P= .003), and question and modal (P= .000). YS prefers negative structure over

affirmative when disagreeing with his/her hearer. Although both negative and affirmative statements can be used to implement direct speech act, YS prefers using negative form for its conventional link with disagreement, and thus, more face-threatening. Significant difference between question and modal shows YS depend more heavily on question than OS. As mentioned above, since question gives the hearer options to answer the speaker's question and to offer the hearer's opinion, and since young speaker are socially less powerful in Chinese culture, it is more suitable for speaker with less power.

4.6.4.1.2. Linguistic Markers in General Disagreement by Hearer's Age

From linguistics' viewpoint, OH and YH show very close percentages in receiving different linguistic markers. Yet, some differences are found in negation, affirmative, and question. Syntactically, YH receives negation and affirmative more frequently than OH (YH, 60.46% and 64.17%; OH, 39.54% and 35.38%). Statistic results show significant difference only occurs in negation (P= .028). In question, OH receives more tokens than YH (57.14%, 42.86%, respectively). Lexically, percentages between OH and YH in different markers are in slight differences. The result shows age difference lies in syntactic pattern: YH are more likely to receive negative and affirmative statement while question is received more frequency by OH. Other than negation, statistic results indicate that no significant differences are found between OH and YH in different linguistic markers.

From hearer's perspective, negation is used more frequently than the other linguistic markers to both to OH (25.85%) and YH (30.58%). As for the rest, for OH, the priority orders for linguistic markers are pre-announcement marker (19.23%), question (18.80%), degree marker (15.60%), and affirmative (14.32%); modal (6.20%) is the one least used. Among all the linguistic marker, significant difference is found between negation and

affirmative (P=.028) and negation and degree marker (P= .024). Modal is insignificantly different from all the other markers. For YH, affirmative (19.83%), pre-announcement markers (19.0%), degree marker (14.7%) and question (10.91%) are used significantly more frequently than modal (5.50%). Statistic tests indicate that question is in significant difference with pre-announcement marker (P =.043). Both negation and modal is significantly different from all the other linguistic markers. The two groups of hearers differ from each other in three aspects: negation and question, negation and pre-announcement marker, and question and pre-announcement marker. Among the three pairs, for YH, difference between the two linguistic marker of each of the three pairs of linguistic markers is significant: between negation and question (P= .000); negation and pre-announcement marker (P= .003), and question and pre-announcement marker (P= .043). But for OH, the difference is insignificant. In other words, while YH shows distinctive differences between negation, question and pre-announcement marker, the difference is not significant to OH. The result suggests significant difference occurs with hearer's age. The result could be explained by Bell's (1984) theory of audience design. According to the theory, linguistic style-shifting occurs in responding to the speaker's audience. Speakers would adjust their speech towards their audience in order to express solidarity or intimacy or away from their audience by expressing distance. Different choices of linguistic markers are made to hearer of different age indicate speaker's awareness toward his/her audiences.

4.6.4.1.3. Linguistic Markers in General Disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

From linguistics' viewpoint, same-age groups (namely, O-O and Y-Y) and cross-age groups (namely, O-Y and Y-O) use the six linguistic markers in similar ways, and no

difference is located. However, when four types of interlocutors are individually observed, significant age difference is found between O-O and Y-O for the use of question(P= .047), and that of affirmative is found between O-Y and O-O (P= .012) and between O-Y and Y-Y (P= .048).

The priority order of using the six types of linguistic markers is found to be more consistent in O-O and Y-Y than in O-Y and Y-O. To be specific, both O-O and Y-Y adopt negation (28.10% and 40.85%, respectively) and pre-announcement marker (29.76% and 44.88%, respectively) more frequently than the others. Also to O-O and Y-Y, difference between negation and pre-announcement marker is insignificant in O-O and in Y-Y. For cross-age interlocutors, O-Y prefers affirmative (31.53%) and negation (29.56%) over the other linguistic markers, but for Y-O, question (28.07%) and negation (20.47%) are adopted more frequently. Thus, the major difference between O-Y and Y-O is in the use of affirmative and question. The result shows that when facing hearers from the same age groups, speakers would choose different linguistic markers. Affirmative statements are more direct and forceful than optional questions, and thus, when speaking to more powerful hearers (in this case, older hearer), giving option would be a better strategy than direct statement. Table 34 shows the significant differences between linguistic markers in disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age, and those insignificant ones are excluded from this table. In total, 8 out of 15 pairs of linguistic markers are found to be significantly different by the four age groups.

Table 34.Significant differences between linguistic markers in disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
NEG--QUE	.023*	.001*	.004*	
NEG--AFF	.044*	.003*		
NEG--Pre-Ann			.008*	
NEG--DM	.036*	.000*	.025*	
NEG--MOD	.014*	.001*	.014*	
AFF--MOD		.005*		
Pre-Ann--MOD	.044*	.011*		
DM--MOD		.022*		.010*

According to Table 34, O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y resemble one another in showing significant differences between negation and question, between negation and degree marker, and between negation and modal. O-O and Y-Y further share in differentiating negation and affirmative and in pre-announcement marker and modal. Y-Y identifies itself from the other three age groups by showing significant difference in differentiating affirmative and modal and in degree marker and modal. To O-Y, the only significant difference lies in the pair of degree marker and modal.

Further interpretations based on those data are given below. For O-O, negation is separated from question, affirmative, modal, and degree marker, with modal significantly different from pre-announcement marker, but not from degree marker. For Y-Y, negation is significantly different from question, affirmative, degree marker and modal, respectively, with modal significantly different from question, modal, degree marker and pre-announcement marker, respectively. O-Y joins the two same-age groups, except it does not identify negation from affirmative. Apart from these three age groups, Y-O is unique in making one and only one difference between degree marker and modal, which

is shared by Y-Y. In other words, it seems that when the speaker is young, despite the age of the hearer, differentiation between degree marker and modal is necessary. What just mentioned, seem to indicate, first, that for interlocutors from the same age group (i.e., O-O and Y-Y), it is necessary that negation is distinguished from the other linguistic forms except pre-announcement marker.

4.6.4.2. Linguistic Markers in C-disagreement by Age

Age difference in linguistic markers in C-disagreement is analyzed in this section. Age difference from speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age are examined. Table 35 shows the result of data collected

Table 35. C-disagreement by linguistic markers and age differences

AGE \ LX		NEG	AFF	QUE	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(58)**36.71%** 47.15%	(47)**29.75%** 55.29%	(7)4.43% 19.44%	(19)12.03% 38.78%	(22)13.92% 59.46%	(5)3.16% 62.50%	(158)100.00% 46.75%
	Y	(65)**36.11%** 52.85%	(38)**21.11%** 44.71%	(29)16.11% 80.56%	(30)16.67% 61.22%	(15)8.33% 40.54%	(3)1.67% 37.50%	(180)100.00% 53.25%
	Total	(123)**36.39%** 100.00%	(85)**25.15%** 100.00%	(36)10.65% 100.00%	(49)14.50% 100.00%	(37)10.95% 100.00%	(8)2.37% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(48)**32.65%** 39.02%	(35)**23.81%** 41.18%	(19)12.93% 52.78%	(20)13.61% 40.82%	(20)13.61% 54.05%	(5)3.40% 62.50%	(147)100.00% 43.49%
	Y	(75)**39.27%** 60.98%	(50)**26.18%** 58.82%	(17)8.90% 47.22%	(29)15.18% 59.18%	(17)8.90% 45.95%	(3)1.57% 37.50%	(191)100.00% 56.51%
	Total	(123)**36.39%** 100.00%	(85)**25.15%** 100.00%	(36)10.65% 100.00%	(49)14.50% 100.00%	(37)10.95% 100.00%	(8)2.37% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(35)**33.33%** 28.46%	(25)**23.81%** 29.41%	(7)6.67% 19.44%	(17)16.19% 34.69%	(18)17.14% 48.65%	(3)2.86% 37.50%	(105)100.00% 31.07%
	Y-Y	(52)**37.68%** 42.28%	(28)**20.29%** 32.94%	(17)12.32% 47.22%	(27)19.57% 55.10%	(13)9.42% 35.14%	(1)0.72% 12.50%	(138)100.00% 40.83%
	O-Y	(23)**43.40%** 18.70%	(22)**41.51%** 25.88%	(0)0.00% 0.00%	(2)3.77% 4.08%	(4)7.55% 10.81%	(2)3.77% 25.00%	(53)100.00% 15.68%
	Y-O	(13)**30.95%** 10.57%	(10)**23.81%** 11.76%	(12)**28.57%** 33.33%	(3)7.14% 6.12%	(2)4.76% 5.41%	(2)4.76% 25.00%	(42)100.00% 12.43%
	Total	(123)**36.39%** 100.00%	(85)**25.15%** 100.00%	(36)10.65% 100.00%	(49)14.50% 100.00%	(37)10.95% 100.00%	(8)2.37% 100.00%	(338)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.4.2.1. Linguistic Markers for C-disagreement by Speaker's Age

From linguistic viewpoint, in the use of linguistic markers, except question, no age difference is located. In other words, the influence of speaker's age on linguistic choice is significant only in question (P= .024). Since question form provides option, under the power influence derived from age, it is understandable that the less powerful one (i.e., young speaker) would use it more often that the more powerful one (i.e., old speaker).

From speaker's perspective, negation and affirmative are used more frequently than the other linguistic markers both by OS (36.71% and 29.75%) and by YS (36.11% and 21.11%). In addition, for OS, degree marker (13.92%) and pre-announcement marker (12.03%) are used less frequently. Question (4.43%) and modal (3.16%) are least adopted. For YS, pre-announcement marker (16.67%), question (16.11%), and degree marker (10.59%) are used less frequently than negation and affirmative, but more often than modal (1.67%). Significant differences between linguistic markers in C-disagreement by speaker's age are found in 5 pairs of linguistic markers. For OS, significant difference only lie between question and affirmative (P= .002). However, for YS, four pairs of significant differences are found: that between question and modal (P= .003), that between affirmative and degree marker (P= .003), that between pre-announcement marker and modal (P= .027), and that between degree marker and modal (P= .039). It seems that YS shoulder heavier burden than OS do in distinguishing among the linguistic forms. After all, it is the powerless ones, not the powerful ones that should pay more attention to their verbal performance. Especially in verbal exchanges which are potentially face-threatening, like disagreement.

4.6.4.2.2. Linguistic Markers in C-disagreement by Hearer's Age

From linguistics' viewpoint, OS and YS adopt different linguistic markers in nearly equal percentage and no significant differences are found within the linguistic markers. The result indicates that when speakers disagree with hearers of different ages, the linguistic choices they make are not significantly influenced by hearer's age.

Statistic results indicate that no age difference exists when the two age groups use each of the six linguistic forms. From hearer's perspective, first, negation and affirmative are used most frequently both to OH (32.65% and 23.81%) and to YH (39.27% and 26.18%) as well. Next, for OH, pre-announcement marker (13.61%), degree marker (13.61%) and question (12.93%) are perceived less frequently, and modal (3.40%) is least used. For YH, again, pre-announcement markers (15.18%) are used more frequently than question (8.90%) and degree marker (8.90%). Again, modal (1.57%) is least perceived. Significant differences between linguistic markers in C-disagreement by hearer's age are found in 5 pairs of linguistic markers, and all the significant differences belong to YH: negation and question (p= .000), question and affirmative (P= .012), affirmative and degree marker (P= .006), pre-announcement marker and modal (P= .038), and degree marker and modal (P= .019). Hearer's age is an influential factor to determine which linguistic form(s) to be used for C-disagreement (Bell, 1984).

4.6.4.2.3. Linguistic Markers in C-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

Repeating the pattern in the previous section, no age difference emerges when the four age groups use each of the six linguistic forms. From linguistics' perspective, same-age groups (i.e., O-O and Y-Y) differ from cross-age groups (i.e., O-Y and Y-O) in their uses of pre-announcement marker (P= .012).

Table 36.Significant differences between linguistic markers in C-disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
NEG--QUE		.010*	.017*	
NEG--Pre-Ann		.023*	.025*	
NEG--DM	.049*	.003*	.023*	
NEG--MOD	.047*	.001*	.006*	
QUE--AFF	.038*		.019*	
QUE--MOD		.037*		
AFF--Pre-Ann			.019*	
AFF--DM			.037*	
AFF--MOD		.001*	.027*	
Pre-Ann--MOD		.027*		
DM--MOD		.026*		

According to Table 36, O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y resemble one another in showing significant differences between negation and degree marker, and between negation and modal. Y-Y and O-Y even share in distinguishing between negation and question, between negation and pre-announcement marker, and between affirmative and modal. O-O and O-Y differentiate between question and affirmative. Y-Y identifies itself from the other three groups by showing significant difference between question and modal, between pre-announcement marker and modal, and between degree marker and modal. O-Y also identifies itself from the others by significantly differentiating between affirmative and pre-announcement marker, and between affirmative and degree marker.

Further interpretations based on those data are given below. For O-O, negation is separated from degree marker and modal. Also, question is separated from affirmative. O-O distinguishes between two syntactic forms in C-disagreement. For Y-Y, negation is significantly different from question, pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and

modal. Modal also shows significant difference between question, affirmative, pre-announcement marker and degree marker. Lexically, modal must be differentiated from the other two lexical markers. Y-Y shows clear distinction in negation and in modal. O-Y joins Y-Y in the differentiation of negation with the four linguistic markers previously mentioned. Furthermore, O-Y separate affirmative from question, pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and modal. The result indicates O-Y show clear distinction in two syntactic forms: negation and affirmative. Y-O does not show any significant difference. Taken all groups together, it is found that when speaker is old, regardless of the hearer's age, a distinction needs to be made between question and affirmative.

4.6.4.3. Linguistic Markers in E-disagreement by Age

Age difference in linguistic markers in E-disagreement is analyzed in this section. Age difference from speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age are examined. The result of data collected is presented in Table 37.

Table 37. E-disagreement by linguistic markers and age differences

AGE \ LX		NEG	AFF	QUE	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(88)**25.73%** 48.09%	(56)16.37% 54.90%	(50)14.62% 42.37%	(65)19.01% 41.67%	(55)16.08% 44.00%	(28)8.19% 54.90%	(342)100.00% 46.53%
	Y	(95)**24.17%** 51.91%	(46)11.70% 45.10%	(68)17.30% 57.63%	(91)**23.16%** 58.33%	(70)17.81% 56.00%	(23)5.85% 45.10%	(393)100.00% 53.47%
	Total	(183)**24.90%** 100.00%	(102)13.88% 100.00%	(118)16.05% 100.00%	(156)**21.22%** 100.00%	(125)17.01% 100.00%	(51)6.94% 100.00%	(735)100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(73)**22.74%** 39.89%	(32)9.97% 31.37%	(69)**21.50%** 58.47%	(70)**21.81%** 44.87%	(53)16.51% 42.40%	(24)7.48% 47.06%	(321)100.00% 43.67%
	Y	(110)**26.57%** 60.11%	(70)16.91% 68.63%	(49)11.84% 41.53%	(86)**20.77%** 55.13%	(72)17.39% 57.60%	(27)6.52% 52.94%	(414)100.00% 56.33%
	Total	(183)**24.90%** 100.00%	(102)13.88% 100.00%	(118)16.05% 100.00%	(156)**21.22%** 100.00%	(125)17.01% 100.00%	(51)6.94% 100.00%	(735)100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(51)**26.56%** 27.87%	(14)7.29% 13.73%	(33)17.19% 27.97%	(44)**22.92%** 28.21%	(34)17.71% 27.20%	(16)8.33% 31.37%	(192)100.00% 26.12%
	Y-Y	(73)**27.65%** 39.89%	(28)10.61% 27.45%	(32)12.12% 27.12%	(65)**24.62%** 41.67%	(51)19.32% 40.80%	(15)5.68% 29.41%	(264)100.00% 35.92%
	O-Y	(37)**24.67%** 20.22%	(42)**28.00%** 41.18%	(17)11.33% 14.41%	(21)14.00% 13.46%	(21)14.00% 16.80%	(12)8.00% 23.53%	(150)100.00% 20.41%
	Y-O	(22)17.05% 12.02%	(18)13.95% 17.65%	(36)**27.91%** 30.51%	(26)**20.16%** 16.67%	(19)14.73% 15.20%	(8)6.20% 15.69%	(129)100.00% 17.55%
	Total	(183)**24.90%** 100.00%	(102)13.88% 100.00%	(118)16.05% 100.00%	(156)**21.22%** 100.00%	(125)17.01% 100.00%	(51)6.94% 100.00%	(735)100.00% 100.00%

4.6.4.3.1. Linguistic Markers in E-disagreement by Speaker's Age

From linguistics' perspective, OS and YS produce nearly equal linguistic markers in E-disagreement, with YS (62.99%) use slightly more question form than OS (37.01%). Not one single age difference between OS and YS is found in these two age groups' use of each of the six linguistic forms.

In addition, the priority orders of linguistic choices given by OS and that by YS resemble each other, except that OS shows higher preference to affirmative than YS does. To be specific, the order is negation (25.73%), pre-announcement marker (19.01%), affirmative (16.37%), degree marker (16.08%), question (14.62%), and modal (8.9%), in this order; for YS, it is negation (24.17%), pre-announcement marker (23.16%), degree marker (17.8%), question (17.30%) and affirmative (11.70%), and modal (5.85%). Statistic results reveal among the 5 pairs of linguistic markers that yield significant age difference, only one is done by OS: negation and question (P= .012); and the other four are provided by YS: negation and affirmative (P= .001), question and modal (P= .011), affirmative and pre-announcement marker (P= .008), and affirmative and degree marker (P= .042). Again, YS is more distinctive about different linguistic markers than OS.

4.6.4.3.2. Linguistic Markers in E-disagreement by Hearer's Age

When hearer's age is taken into consideration, OH and YH behave similarly in choosing linguistic marker for E-disagreement. Statistic results indicate that the markers perceived by OH and YH do not show any significant age differences.

Also, the priority orders for OH are negation (22.74%), pre-announcement marker (21.81%), question (21.50%), degree marker (16.5%), affirmative (9.97%), and modal (7.48%), in this order. For YH, the order is negation (26.57%), pre-announcement marker (20.77%), degree marker (17.39%), affirmative (16.91%), question (11.84%), and modal

(7.48%), in this order. Statistic results reveal six pairs of linguistic markers are of significant differences by hearer's age. Among these six pairs of linguistic forms, YH show two pairs of significant differences between negation and question (P= .000) and between negation and degree marker (P= .011), while OH gives 4 pairs of significant differences found between question and affirmative (P= .012), question and modal (P= .021), affirmative and pre-announcement marker (P= .038), and affirmative and degree marker (P= .031). In total, in E-disagreement, when addressing to OH, more pairs of significant differentiations between linguistic markers need to be made than addressing to YH. The result suggests the speaker differentiates more clearly when speaking to OH than YH, and the need for the minute distinctions may result from the need for politeness. Again, the hearer's influence on the speaker's linguistic choice is observed (Bell, 1984).

4.6.4.3.3. Linguistic Markers in E-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

From linguistics' perspective, the markers perceived by the four age groups (namely, O-O, Y-Y, O-Y, and Y-O) do not reveal any significant differences except that O-O and O-Y are in significant difference in their use of affirmative (P= .035). Nor does the comparison between the same-age group (i.e., O-O and Y-Y) and cross-age group (i.e., O-Y and Y-O) show any significant age differences in their linguistic choices for E-disagreement.

From speaker and hearer's perspective, same-grouped interlocutors display similar priority orders of linguistic choice: the order given by O-O is negation (26.56%), pre-announcement marker (22.92%), degree marker (17.71%), question (17.19%), modal (8.33%), and affirmative (7.29%), in this order; that by Y-Y is negation (27.65%), pre-announcement marker (24.62%), degree marker (19.32%), question (12.12%), affirmative (10.61%), and modal (5.68%). However, for speaker and hearer of cross-age,

the priority orders are quite different: O-Y adopts affirmative (28.00%), negation (24.67%), pre-announcement marker (14.00%), degree marker (14.00%), question (11.33%), and modal (8.00%); while Y-O requires the order of question (27.91%), pre-announcement marker (20.16%), negation (17.05%), degree marker (14.73%), affirmative (13.95%), and modal (6.20%). Table 38 reveals significant differences between linguistic markers by speaker's and hearer's age.

Table 38.Significant differences between linguistic markers in E-disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
NEG--QUE		.002*	.019*	
NEG--AFF	.015*	.000*		
NEG--DM		.036*		
NEG--MOD		.005*		
AFF--Pre-Ann		.023*		
AFF--DM	.031*	.044*		
AFF--MOD				.030*
Pre-Ann--MOD		.030*		
DM--MOD		.036*		.035*

According to Table 38, O-O and Y-Y resemble each other in showing significant difference between negation and affirmative, negation and degree marker, and between affirmative and degree marker. In same-age groups, negation, affirmative, and degree marker differentiate between one another. A closer look at this finding shows same-age interlocutors makes clearer distinction between syntactic forms. Y-Y and O-Y identify between negation and question. Thus, when the hearer is young, regardless of the speaker's age, a differentiation on syntactic form is needed. Y-Y and Y-O differentiate between degree marker and modal. Therefore, when the speaker is young, regardless of

the hearer's age, lexical markers need to be differed. In individual type of interlocutors, Y-Y shows three pairs pragmatic strategies significantly differentiated: negation and modal, affirmative and pre-announcement marker, and modal and pre-announcement marker. Y-O differentiates between affirmative and modal.

All in all, Table 38 shows that multiple significant differences are found by Y-Y, which means Y-Y is very delicate in using linguistic markers in E-disagreement. O-O, Y-O and O-Y have fewer distinctions between linguistic markers. Distinctions to different linguistic markers are rough. Especially O-Y, only one pair of linguistic markers is found to be significantly different. The results indicate that when OS disagree with YS, he/she needs not be dedicated to any linguistic form. The free variation of linguistic choice shows that when the speaker is more powerful (i.e., old speaker), no convergence is needed when disagreeing with the less powerful hearer (i.e., young hearer).

4.6.5. Pragmatic Strategies by Age

This section discusses pragmatic strategies under the influence of age. Pragmatic strategies in disagreement are discussed first. Their distributions in C-disagreement and E-disagreement are discussed secondly and thirdly.

4.6.5.1. Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Age

Age difference in pragmatic strategies in disagreement is analyzed in this section. Age difference from speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age are examined. Table 39 shows the result of data collected.

Table 39. Disagreement by pragmatic strategies and age differences

AGE \ PG		COR	ACC	CHA	DEF	PD	CLA	CON	SUG	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(222) **44.40%** 55.50%	(73)14.60% 34.11%	(77) 15.40% 38.31%	(41) 8.20% 53.25%	(31) 6.20% 70.45%	(27) 5.40% 42.86%	(18) 3.60% 32.14%	(11) 2.20% 61.11%	(500) 100.00% 46.60%
	Y	(178) **31.06%** 44.50%	(141) **24.61%** 65.89%	(124) **21.64%** 61.69%	(36) 6.28% 46.75%	(13) 2.27% 29.55%	(36) 6.28% 57.14%	(38) 6.63% 67.86%	(7) 1.22% 38.89%	(573) 100.00% 53.40%
	Total	(400) **37.28%** 100.00%	(214) 19.94% 100.00%	(201) 18.73% 100.00%	(77) 7.18% 100.00%	(44) 4.10% 100.00%	(63)5.87% 100.00%	(56) 5.22% 100.00%	(18) 1.68% 100.00%	(1073) 100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(177) **37.82%** 44.25%	(78) 16.67% 36.45%	(112) **23.93%** 55.72%	(19) 4.06% 24.68%	(22) 4.70% 50.00%	(24)5.13% 38.10%	(29) 6.20% 51.79%	(7) 1.50% 38.89%	(468) 100.00% 43.62%
	Y	(223) **36.86%** 55.75%	(136) **22.48%** 63.55%	(89) 14.71% 44.28%	(58) 9.59% 75.32%	(22) 3.64% 50.00%	(39)6.45% 61.90%	(27) 4.46% 48.21%	(11) 1.82% 61.11%	(605) 100.00% 56.38%
	Total	(400) **37.28%** 100.00%	(214) 19.94% 100.00%	(201) 18.73% 100.00%	(77) 7.18% 100.00%	(44) 4.10% 100.00%	(63)5.87% 100.00%	(56) 5.22% 100.00%	(18) 1.68% 100.00%	(1073) 100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(123) **41.41%** 30.75%	(40) 13.47% 18.69%	(55) 18.52% 27.36%	(13) 4.38% 16.88%	(20) 6.73% 45.45%	(22)7.41% 34.92%	(17) 5.72% 30.36%	(7) 2.36% 38.89%	(297) 100.00% 27.68%
	Y-Y	(124) **30.85%** 31.00%	(103) **25.62%** 48.13%	(67) 16.67% 33.33%	(30) 7.46% 38.96%	(11) 2.74% 25.00%	(34)8.46% 53.97%	(26) 6.47% 46.43%	(7) 1.74% 38.89%	(402) 100.00% 37.47%
	O-Y	(99) **48.77%** 24.75%	(33) 16.26% 15.42%	(22) 10.84% 10.95%	(28) 13.79% 36.36%	(11) 5.42% 25.00%	(5)2.46% 7.94%	(1) 0.49% 1.79%	(4) 1.97% 22.22%	(203) 100.00% 18.92%
	Y-O	(54) **31.58%** 13.50%	(38) **22.22%** 17.76%	(57) **33.33%** 28.36%	(6) 3.51% 7.79%	(2) 1.17% 4.55%	(2)1.17% 3.17%	(12) 7.02% 21.43%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(171) 100.00% 15.94%
	Total	(400) **37.28%** 100.00%	(214) 19.94% 100.00%	(201) 18.73% 100.00%	(77) 7.18% 100.00%	(44) 4.10% 100.00%	(63)5.87% 100.00%	(56) 5.22% 100.00%	(18) 1.68% 100.00%	(1073) 100.00% 100.00%

4.6.5.1.1. Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Speaker's Age

From pragmatic perspective, OS and YS yield close percentages in their uses of the 8 pragmatic strategies for disagreement in general. Among the 8 pragmatic strategies, significant age difference between OS and YS is found in account (P= .025). That is, YS explains more than OS in showing disagreement. Although OS (70.45%) uses more partial disagreement than YS (29.55%), statistic result does not verify the influence of the speaker's age (P= .158).

From speaker's viewpoint, OS and YS adopt correction, account, and challenge more often than the others. OS uses correction (44.40%) more often than challenge (15.40%) and account (14.60%); while YS adopt correction (31.06%), account (24.61%), and challenge (24.61%) evenly. Table 40 shows the significant differences between pragmatic strategies by OS and YS in disagreement. In addition, Table 40 given below indicates that there are complementary distributions by OS and YS, in their choices of the pragmatic strategies.

Table 40.Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's age in disagreement ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's Age	Old	Young
COR--ACC	.000*	
COR--CHA	.001*	
ACC--DEF		.000*
ACC--PD		.000*
ACC--CLA		.000*
CHA--DEF		.003*
CHA--PD		.000*
CLA--SUG		.036*
CON--SUG		.033*

To be specific, for OS, the distribution between correction and account and that between correction and challenge are significant, but not for YS. However, an opposite pattern is located in the two age groups' choices of the other six pairs of pragmatic strategies, with YS showing significant differences, while OS showing none. It seems that OS cares more about the differentiation between correction and other strategies, but YS relies on the versatility of contrasts among the strategies. Fewer requirements for OS to distinguish between pragmatic strategies may be explained as the power to perform social acts regulated by the age system in a society (Bernardi, 1985). OS need not to care about the p's and q's in disagreement because the age allows him/her to perform pragmatic strategies freely. On the contrary, YS's age has not obtained such freedom and they need to be careful in performing appropriate pragmatic strategies according to the situation.

4.6.5.1.2. Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' perspective, OH (43.62%) and YH (56.38%) perceive nearly equal pragmatic strategies in disagreement. Among the 8 pragmatic strategies, significant difference is found in defense (P= .029).

From hearer's perspective, although correction, account and challenge are the pragmatic strategies most frequently perceived to OH and YH, their priority orders are slightly different. For OH, correction (37.82%), challenge (23.93%) and account (16.67%) are the top three priority orders, but for YH, correction (36.86%), account (22.48%) and challenge (14.71%) are the top three priority orders. That is, when disagreeing with OH, challenge is more preferred; but when disagreeing with YH, account would be a better choice. Six pairs of significant differences between pragmatic strategies by OH and YH are found in disagreement. For OH, significant differences lies in challenge and defense (P= .005), and in partial disagreement and suggestion (P= .028); for YH, more significant

differences are found—in correction and challenge (P= .002), account and challenge (P= .043), defense and suggestion (P= .011), and clarification and suggestion (P= .045). It seems that pragmatic strategies are used more distinctively when the hearer is young.

4.6.5.1.3. Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' perspective, same-aged and cross-aged speakers and hearers show significant difference in clarification (P= .023). As shown in Table 39, same-aged interlocutors (O-O: 34.92% and Y-Y: 53.97%) use clarification more frequently to disagree than cross-aged interlocutors (O-Y: 7.94% and Y-O: 3.17%). When the four types of interlocutors are compared, no significant difference is found in each of the 8 pragmatic strategies.

From speaker's and hearer's viewpoint, correction, account, and challenge are the top three strategies used in disagreement by all types of interlocutors. However, their percentage and priority orders differ. First, O-O uses more frequently in correction (41.41%), challenge (18.73%), and account (13.47%); Y-Y uses correction (30.85%), account (25.62%), and challenge (16.67%); O-Y adopts correction (48.77%), account (16.62%), and challenge (10.84%). In addition, defense (13.79%) is used more frequently than challenge; for Y-O, challenge (33.33%) and correction (31.58%) are more preferred than account (22.22%). One thing worth noticing is that no suggestion is used whenever young speaker disagree with old hearer. Since providing alternatives implies superiority, this pragmatic strategy is less likely to be act out by less powerful speaker to more powerful hearer (i.e., Y-O).

Also, Table 41 shows the significant age differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age for disagreement.

Table 41.Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age in disagreement ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
COR--ACC	.013*		.025*	
COR--CHA	.027*	.030*	.022*	
COR--PD	.003*	.000*		.041*
COR--CLA	.004*	.001*	.026*	
ACC--DEF		.004*		
ACC--PD		.001*		
ACC--CLA		.003*		
ACC--CON		.006*		
ACC--SUG	.046*	.001*		
CHA--DEF				.019*
CHA--PD		.003*		.021*
CHA--CLA				.030*
CHA--CON		.002*		.020*
CHA--SUG		.006*		.027*
DEF--CLA			.031*	
DEF--CON			.018*	
DEF--SUG			.043*	
PD--SUG	.048*			
CLA--SUG		.048*		

According to Table 41, O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y resemble one another in distinguishing between correction and challenge, and between correction and clarification. In the same-age groups, O-O and Y-Y further share in differentiating correction and partial disagreement, and between account and suggestion. Also, O-O and O-Y further share in differentiating between correction and account. For O-O, Y-Y, and Y-O, all three age groups resemble one another in showing significant difference between correction and partial disagreement. Y-Y and Y-O further distinguishes between challenge and defense, between challenge and confirmation, and between challenge and suggestion. A major

finding shared by the four age groups is that correction and challenge are the two pragmatic strategies that have clear distinctions between the other pragmatic strategies. In individual type, all four types of interlocutors have unique differences from one another. O-O distinguishes between partial disagreement and suggestion. Y-Y shows significant differences between account and defense, between account and partial disagreement, between account and clarification, between account and confirmation, and between clarification and suggestion. For Y-Y, the distinction between account and the other pragmatic strategies is crucial. O-Y differentiates between defense and clarification, between defense and confirmation, between defense and suggestion. Dedication to defense is a signature mark for O-Y. As for Y-O, it identifies between challenge and defense, and between challenge and clarification. For Y-O, challenge needs to be differentiated from other pragmatic strategies.

4.6.5.2. Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Age

Age difference in pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement is analyzed in this section. Age difference from speaker's age, hearer's age, and speaker's and hearer's age are examined. Table 42 shows the result of pragmatic strategies collected in data.

Table 42. C-disagreement by pragmatic strategies and age differences

AGE \ PG		COR	ACC	CHA	DEF	PD	CLA	CON	SUG	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(104) **65.82%** 53.61%	(23) 14.56% 42.59%	(6) 3.80% 23.08%	(3) 1.90% 42.86%	(7) 4.43% 87.50%	(11) 6.96% 40.74%	(4) 2.53% 18.18%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(158) 100.00% 46.75%
	Y	(90) **50.00%** 46.39%	(31) 17.22% 57.41%	(20) 11.11% 76.92%	(4) 2.22% 57.14%	(1) 0.56% 12.50%	(16) 8.89% 59.26%	(18) 10.00% 81.82%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(180) 100.00% 53.25%
	Total	(194) **57.40%** 100.00%	(54) 15.98% 100.00%	(26) 7.69% 100.00%	(7) 2.07% 100.00%	(8) 2.37% 100.00%	(27) 7.99% 100.00%	(22) 6.51% 100.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(338) 100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(87) **59.18%** 44.85%	(20) 13.61% 37.04%	(16) 10.88% 61.54%	(1) 0.68% 14.29%	(5) 3.40% 62.50%	(9) 6.12% 33.33%	(9) 6.12% 40.91%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(147) 100.00% 43.49%
	Y	(107) **56.02%** 55.15%	(34) 17.80% 62.96%	(10) 5.24% 38.46%	(6) 3.14% 85.71%	(3) 1.57% 37.50%	(18) 9.42% 66.67%	(13) 6.81% 59.09%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(191) 100.00% 56.51%
	Total	(194) **57.40%** 100.00%	(54) 15.98% 100.00%	(26) 7.69% 100.00%	(7) 2.07% 100.00%	(8) 2.37% 100.00%	(27) 7.99% 100.00%	(22) 6.51% 100.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(338) 100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(64) **60.95%** 32.99%	(17) 16.19% 31.48%	(6) 5.71% 23.08%	(1) 0.95% 14.29%	(5) 4.76% 62.50%	(8) 7.62% 29.63%	(4) 3.81% 18.18%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(105) 100.00% 31.07%
	Y-Y	(67) **48.55%** 34.54%	(28) **20.29%** 51.85%	(10) 7.25% 38.46%	(4) 2.90% 57.14%	(1) 0.72% 12.50%	(15) 10.87% 55.56%	(13) 9.42% 59.09%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(138) 100.00% 40.83%
	O-Y	(40) **75.47%** 20.62%	(6) 11.32% 11.11%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(2) 3.77% 28.57%	(2) 3.77% 25.00%	(3) 5.66% 11.11%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(53) 100.00% 15.68%
	Y-O	(23) **54.76%** 11.86%	(3) 7.14% 5.56%	(10) **23.81%** 38.46%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(1) 2.38% 3.70%	(5) 11.90% 22.73%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(42) 100.00% 12.43%
	Total	(194) **57.40%** 100.00%	(54) 15.98% 100.00%	(26) 7.69% 100.00%	(7) 2.07% 100.00%	(8) 2.37% 100.00%	(27) 7.99% 100.00%	(22) 6.51% 100.00%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(338) 100.00% 100.00%

4.6.5.2.1. Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Speaker's Age

From pragmatics' viewpoint, no significant difference is found between OS and YS. Although in challenge, partial disagreement, and confirmation, the discrepancy between OS and YS is high in percentage, statistic results reveal no significant differences.

From speaker's viewpoint, correction is adopted most frequently by OS (65.82%) and YS (50.00%). Account is also emphasized by OS (14.56%) and YS (17.22%). For YS, challenge (11.11%) and confirmation (10.00%) are also used in higher frequencies. Table 43 below presents the 8 pairs of pragmatic strategies that would illustrate age differences reflected in the speaker's choice of pragmatic strategies.

Table 43.Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's age in C-disagreement ("*" = P< 0.5)

Speaker's Age	Old	Young
ACC--CHA	.004*	
ACC--CON	.005*	
PD--SUG	.046*	
CHA--PD		.025*
CHA--SUG		.025*
DEF--CON		.012*
PD--CON		.014*
CON--SUG		.012*

Again, as found in Table 40, complementary distributions between OS and YS in their uses of the eight pairs of pragmatic strategies are identified in Table 43. For OS, significant differences appear in account and challenge, in account and confirmation, and in partial disagreement and suggestion. On the contrary, YS shows significant differences in the other five pair of pragmatic strategies. It seems that YS are more demanding than

OS in choosing pragmatic strategies. The less powerful status of YS makes delicate distinctions in pragmatic strategy necessary because his/her choice in pragmatic strategies needs to conform to the power difference between him/herself and the hearer. Also, social actions expected by age system in the society may also account for YS's careful manipulation of pragmatic strategies (Bernardi, 1985).

4.6.5.2.2. Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' viewpoint, no significant difference is revealed by statistic result. Although defense shows wide discrepancy between OH (14.29%) and YH (85.7%), statistics indicate no significant difference (P= .253).

From hearer's viewpoint, correction is highly perceived by OH (59.18%) and YH (56.02%). Account shows similar pattern too: OH (13.61%) and YH (17.80%). In addition, challenge is used to OH (10.88%), and there are significant differences between OH's uses of challenge and suggestion (P= .047). On the other hand, YH has significant difference in confirmation and suggestion (P= .041).

4.6.5.2.3. Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' perspective, speaker and hearer of the same age and cross age do not show significant difference among the 8 pragmatic strategies. And among the 4 types of interlocutors, no significant difference in their uses of each pragmatic strategy is found. Something worth noticing is that challenge and confirmation are not used by O-Y, and defense and partial disagreement are not adopted by Y-O.

When taking both the speaker's age and the hearer's age into consideration at the same time, their ordering of the four age groups' preferences among the pragmatic strategies are different, First, correction is taken as the first priority pragmatic strategy by all of the four age groups: O-O (60.59%), Y-Y (48.55%), O-Y (75.47%) and Y-O

(54.76%). Account is also used more frequently than the others by O-O (16.19%), Y-Y (20.29%), and Y-O (11.32%). Y-O adopts challenge (23.81%) as the second choice in pragmatic strategy. In addition, clarification is preferred by Y-Y (10.87%), and confirmation is preferred by Y-O (11.90%). Table 44 shows the significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age in C-disagreement.

Table 44. Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age in C-disagreement ("*" = P< .05; "—" = significant value cannot be computed due to 0 frequency)

Speaker and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
COR--ACC	.034*		.044*	
COR--CHA	.022*	.002*	.028*	
COR--DEF	.013*	.003*	.023*	
COR--PD	.012*	.001*	.035*	
COR--CLA	.037*	.008*	.044*	
COR--CON	.011*	.006*	.028*	
COR--SUG	.034*	.006*	.029*	
ACC--CHA	.020*			
ACC--DEF	.015*			
ACC--PD		.027*		
ACC--CON	.024*			
ACC--SUG	.018*	.021*		
DEF--CON		.026*		
PD--CON		.040*		
CON--SUG		.035*	—	

According to Table 44, Y-O does not differentiate between pragmatic strategies. O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y resemble one another in showing significant differences between correction and challenge, between correction and defense, between correction and partial disagreement, between correction and partial disagreement, between correction and

clarification, between correction and confirmation, and between correction and suggestion. A major finding here is that correction is significantly distinguished from all the other pragmatic strategies, which indicates the uniqueness of correction in C-disagreement. In same-age groups, O-O and Y-Y further shares in differentiating account and suggestion. O-O and O-Y further identifies correction from account. In the uniqueness of individual type of speaker and hearer, O-O and Y-Y also identifies itself from the other three groups. O-O differentiates between account and defense, and between account and confirmation, which shows the dedication to account is strong. Y-Y also distinguishes between account and partial disagreement, between defense and confirmation, between partial disagreement and confirmation, and between confirmation and suggestion. The significant differences indicate Y-Y has strong dedication to confirmation.

4.6.5.3. Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Age

In this section, age differences on pragmatic strategies for E-disagreement are presented in Table 45, and analyzed afterwards.

Table 45. E-disagreement by pragmatic strategies and age differences

AGE \ PG		COR	ACC	CHA	DEF	PD	CLA	CON	SUG	Total
Speaker's Age	O	(118) **34.50%** 57.28%	(50) 14.62% 31.25%	(71) **20.76%** 40.57%	(38) 11.11% 54.29%	(24) 7.02% 66.67%	(16) 4.68% 44.44%	(14) 4.09% 41.18%	(11) 3.22% 61.11%	(342) 100.00% 46.53%
	Y	(88) **22.39%** 42.72%	(110) **27.99%** 68.75%	(104) **26.46%** 59.43%	(32) 8.14% 45.71%	(12) 3.05% 33.33%	(20) 5.09% 55.56%	(20) 5.09% 58.82%	(7) 1.78% 38.89%	(393) 100.00% 53.47%
	Total	(206) **28.03%** 100.00%	(160) **21.77%** 100.00%	(175) **23.81%** 100.00%	(70) 9.52% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(34) 4.63% 100.00%	(18) 2.45% 100.00%	(735) 100.00% 100.00%
Hearer's Age	O	(90) **28.04%** 43.69%	(58) 18.07% 36.25%	(96) **29.91%** 54.86%	(18) 5.61% 25.71%	(17) 5.30% 47.22%	(15) 4.67% 41.67%	(20) 6.23% 58.82%	(7) 2.18% 38.89%	(321) 100.00% 43.67%
	Y	(116) **28.02%** 56.31%	(102) **24.64%** 63.75%	(79) 19.08% 45.14%	(52) 12.56% 74.29%	(19) 4.59% 52.78%	(21) 5.07% 58.33%	(14) 3.38% 41.18%	(11) 2.66% 61.11%	(414) 100.00% 56.33%
	Total	(206) **28.03%** 100.00%	(160) **21.77%** 100.00%	(175) **23.81%** 100.00%	(70) 9.52% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(34) 4.63% 100.00%	(18) 2.45% 100.00%	(735) 100.00% 100.00%
Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	(59) **30.73%** 28.64%	(23) 11.98% 14.38%	(49) **25.52%** 28.00%	(12) 6.25% 17.14%	(15) 7.81% 41.67%	(14) 7.29% 38.89%	(13) 6.77% 38.24%	(7) 3.65% 38.89%	(192) 100.00% 26.12%
	Y-Y	(57) **21.59%** 27.67%	(75) **28.41%** 46.88%	(57) **21.59%** 32.57%	(26) 9.85% 37.14%	(10) 3.79% 27.78%	(19) 7.20% 52.78%	(13) 4.92% 38.24%	(7) 2.65% 38.89%	(264) 100.00% 35.92%
	O-Y	(59) **39.33%** 28.64%	(27) 18.00% 16.88%	(22) 14.67% 12.57%	(26) 17.33% 37.14%	(9) 6.00% 25.00%	(2) 1.33% 5.56%	(1) 0.67% 2.94%	(4) 2.67% 22.22%	(150) 100.00% 20.41%
	Y-O	(31) **24.03%** 15.05%	(35) **27.13%** 21.88%	(47) **36.43%** 26.86%	(6) 4.65% 8.57%	(2) 1.55% 5.56%	(1) 0.78% 2.78%	(7) 5.43% 20.59%	(0) 0.00% 0.00%	(129) 100.00% 17.55%
	Total	(206) **28.03%** 100.00%	(160) **21.77%** 100.00%	(175) **23.81%** 100.00%	(70) 9.52% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(36) 4.90% 100.00%	(34) 4.63% 100.00%	(18) 2.45% 100.00%	(735) 100.00% 100.00%

4.6.5.3.1. Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Speaker's Age

Statistic results show significant difference in the choice of account (P= .019) between OS and YS. That is, YS explain significantly more often than OS in E-disagreement.

From speaker's viewpoint, OS use correction (34.50%) and challenge (20.76%) in larger proportions than they use account (14.62%) and defense (11.11%). YS, on the other hand, use these three pragmatic strategies evenly frequently: account (27.99%), challenge (26.46%) and correction (22.39%). Table 46 shows the significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's age in E-disagreement.

Table 46.Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's age in E-disagreement ("*" = P< 0.5)

Speaker's Age	Old	Young
COR--ACC	.009*	
ACC--DEF		.000*
ACC--PD		.000*
ACC--CLA		.001*
ACC--CON		.000*
CHA--DEF		.005*
CHA--PD		.001*

Complementary distributions of OS's and YS's uses of some of the pragmatic strategies are located. First, significant difference between correction and account is only found to be done by OS, not by YS; whereas, it is YS, not OS, that make significant distinctions in each of the following pairs: account and defense, account and partial disagreement, account and clarification, account and confirmation, challenge and defense, and challenge and partial disagreement. Therefore, for YS, major distinctions between different pragmatic strategies are account and challenge.

4.6.5.3.2. Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' viewpoint, no significant difference is found among the 8 pragmatic strategies by hearer's age. The discrepancy between OH (25.71%) and YH (74.19%) in defense, although looks wide, is statistically insignificant. Statistic results show that hearer's age does not affect speaker's pragmatic choice in E-disagreement.

From hearer's perspective, correction, account and challenge are used more frequently than the others by OH and YH. However, their priority orders differ by age. When addressing to OH, challenge (29.91%) and correction (28.04%) are used more frequently than the others. Account (18.07%) is in third priority order. When addressing to YH, correction (28.02%) and account (24.64%) are used more often than challenge (19.08%) and defense (12.56%), which are followed by clarification (5.07%), partial disagreement (4.59%), confirmation (3.38%), and suggestion (2.66%). In addition, among all, only one significant difference is found between challenge and defense (P= .010). In addressing to YH, there are more strategies showing significant difference: account and defense (P= .020), account and partial disagreement (P= .003), account and clarification (P= .001), defense and confirmation (P= .020), and defense and suggestion (P= .016). Statistic results indicate when speaker addresses to hearer of different ages, he/she has to pay attention to the influence of hearer's age in choosing pragmatic strategies (Bell, 1984).

4.6.5.3.3. Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

From pragmatics' viewpoint, statistic results reveal no significant difference between the four age groups. However, within same-age group (i.e., the combination of O-O and Y-Y) and cross-age group (i.e., the combination of O-Y and Y-O), significant differences are found. For same-aged interlocutors, account is used significantly more often by Y-Y than by O-O (P= .009). For cross-aged interlocutors, defense is used significantly more often by O-Y than by Y-O (P= .026). Table 47

further shows the significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age in E-disagreement.

Table 47.Significant differences between pragmatic strategies by speaker's and hearer's age in E-disagreement ("*" = P< .05)

Speaker's and Hearer's Age	O-O	Y-Y	O-Y	Y-O
COR--DEF	.006*	.017*		
COR--PD	.049*	.003*		
COR--CLA	.006*	.008*		
COR--CON	.016*	.009*		
COR--SUG	.009*	.011*		
ACC--DEF		.009*		.043*
ACC--PD		.003*		
ACC--CLA		.010*		
ACC--CON		.008*		
ACC--SUG		.002*		
CHA--DEF				.035*
CHA--PD		.006*		.044*
CHA--CLA	.042*	.021*		
CHA--CON		.001*		.040*
CHA--SUG		.006*		.055
DEF--CLA		.500	.032*	
DEF--CON			.032*	

According to Table 47, O-O and Y-Y resemble each other in showing significant differences between correction and defense, correction and partial disagreement, correction and clarification, correction and confirmation, and correction and suggestion. A major finding here is that to same-age groups, it is necessary to distinguish between correction and the other pragmatic strategies. Y-Y and Y-O differentiate between account and defense, between challenge and partial disagreement, and between challenge and confirmation. Thus, when the speaker is young, regardless of the hearer's age, challenge is a major differentiation. Individual

significant differences are found by Y-Y, O-Y and Y-O. For Y-Y, account is significantly different from partial disagreement, clarification, confirmation, and suggestion. In addition, challenge and suggestion is significantly distinguished as well. The results indicate Y-Y makes clear differentiation between account and other pragmatic strategies. For O-Y, defense is in significant difference with clarification and confirmation. And to Y-O, only one pair of pragmatic strategy that is in significant difference: challenge and defense. No difference is solely significant to O-O.

4.6.6. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies by Age

This section examines, interactions between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in disagreement in general, in C-disagreement, and in E-disagreement by the speaker's age, the hearer's age, and both the speaker's and the hearer's age.

Since the original data based on frequency is relatively hard to read, not to mention analyzing it, correlation coefficient tests are applied to examine the relationship between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies. Tables of significant correlations are shown in text for analysis and discussion while tables of frequency are listed in Appendix for reference. Due to statistic problems, question marker (?) before correlation coefficient r value indicates frequency of linguistic markers in individual pragmatic strategies is zero, but statistic tests shows significant correlations. Thus, the significant correlations indicated by question markers (?) are excluded from further discussion. In addition, "—" indicates no token is found, and thus, the frequency is zero.

4.6.6.1. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Age

This section discusses the correlation between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in disagreement in general.

4.6.6.1.1. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Speaker's Age

According to Table 48, old speakers (OS) and young speakers (YS) show similar and different significant correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in general disagreement. The similarities are found in correlations between correction and negation, between challenge and question, between defense and affirmative, between clarification and pre-announcement marker, and between suggestion and modal. Only differences between OS and YS are analyzed and discussed below.

Table 48.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in general disagreement by speaker's age

AGE		LX / PG	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
Speaker's Age (General Disagreement)	O	COR	.758**		.745**			
		ACC			.713**			
		CHA	.691*	.804**		.724**	.633*	
		DEF			.718**			
		PD						
		CLA				.800**		
		CON		.725**				
		SUG						.827**
	Y	COR	.849**				.772**	
		ACC	.763**			.736**		
		CHA		.899**				
		DEF			.739**		.703*	
		PD						
		CLA				.775**		
		CON						
		SUG						.647*

1. Correction. In correction, OS shows significant correlation with negation and affirmative, but YS shows significant correlation with negation and degree marker. As can be seen, negation is shared by speaker of both ages due to the conventional link between correction and negation. However, OS also adopt affirmative, which is considered more direct and forceful than lexical degree marker in correction. Thus, speaker with more power (i.e., OS) prefers more direct and forceful marker when making correction while the speaker with less power (i.e., YS) adopts more indirect and less imposing marker.

2. Account. In account, OS shows significant correlation with affirmative, but YS shows significant correlation with negation and pre-announcement marker. Speaker of both ages adopt syntactic patterns, but in different way. Affirmative may be more direct than negation because when giving explanation, conventionally, positive statement is used more often. Thus, the form chosen by OS is more direct than YS, which also resembles the power they possess when making disagreement. In addition, YS also use pre-announcement marker, which is a lexical marker less direct than syntactic forms. The use of pre-announcement marker indicates YS are more obliged to signal disagreement before making it, and more delicate differentiations need to be made.

3. Challenge. In challenge, OS shows various significant correlations with negation, between question, with pre-announcement marker, and with degree marker. However, YS is only dedicated to question in challenge. Thus, OS and YS share the same syntactic form of challenge. Since the nature of challenge is to question, the conventional link between question and challenge is reasonable. However, a variety of negative form, pre-announcement marker, and degree marker used by OS shows that OS is more dedicate to forms when the intrinsic nature of challenge is more face-threatening. Although OS is socially more powerful and need less to make

distinctions between forms, the value system shared by OS emphasizes adequate politeness, which makes them become more delicate in choice when more face-threatening challenge is used. That is, a social requirement from the value system owned by OS result the delicate linguistic choice in disagreement.

4. Defense. In defense, OS shows significant correlations with affirmative while YS shows significant correlations with affirmative, and with degree marker. Speaker of both ages show significant correlation with defense and affirmative. Since the nature of defense is to protect the speaker him/herself, logical relationship between defense and affirmative is reasonable without age difference. However, degree marker is further differentiated by YS, which indicates that when disagreement is made to protect the speaker own self, he/she is careful in modifying the strength of the proposition. Otherwise, when defense is rejected by further attack YS, strong and forceful force is placed on YS.

5. Confirmation. In confirmation, OS shows significant correlation with question while YS does not show any significant correlation. This means YS is not dedicated to any linguistic marker when making confirmations. But OS follows the conventional link between confirmation and question, which indicates OS has strict order in following the convention.

6. Suggestion. Speaker of both ages show significant correlation with modal and suggestion. Suggestion has the lowest face-threatening force in disagreement. When disagreeing by suggesting, OS and YS use modal, which is lexically weak and indirectly forceful due to its less imposing meaning.

In disagreement in general, partial disagreement does not show significant correlation with any one of the linguistic markers, and this result is shared by speakers of both ages.

4.6.6.1.2. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Hearer's Age

According to Table 49, OH and YH have different significant logical combinations. YH (9 correlations) show slightly more significant correlations than OH (6 correlations). Hearers of both ages share significant correlations between correction and negation, between correction and affirmative, between challenge and question, between clarification and pre-announcement marker, and between confirmation and question. Different significant correlations are discussed below.

Table 49.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in general disagreement by hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant)

Hearer's Age (General Disagreement)	AGE	PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
	O	COR	.798**		.585*			
		ACC						
		CHA		.826**			.611*	
		DEF						
		PD						
		CLA				.621**		
		CON		.624*	(?).746**		(?).735**	
		SUG						
	Y	COR	.708**		.710**			
		ACC	.695*			.683*		
		CHA		.966**				
		DEF			.752**			
		PD						
		CLA				.877**		
		CON		.695*				
		SUG						.870**

1. **Correction.** Hearer of both ages show significant correlations between correction and negation, and between correction and affirmative. That is, syntactic patterns of statements are received whether the hearer is old or young. That age is not significantly related to the forms used in correction suggests the link between correction and two types of statements are so strong hearers of both ages are dedicated to them.

2. Account. Although no significant correlation is found by OH, account is significantly correlated with negation and with pre-announcement marker. When the hearer is young, more negative statement and pre-announcement marker are received.

3. Challenge. In challenge, OH shows significant correlations with question and with degree marker while YH shows significant correlation with question. OH and YH share the linguistic form of question because the nature between challenge and question is alike. However, when addressing OH, lexical modification is required other than syntactic patterns. This means when addressing OH, the dedication to linguistic forms are more restricted. The power of OH has on the speaker may be the reason for the differentiation.

4. Defense. In defense, OH does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker, but YH shows significant correlation with affirmative. This means the conventional link between defense and affirmative is only followed by YH. But for OH, any linguistic markers can be adopted to defense. When addressing hearer of different age, dedication to linguistic marker is clear by YH, but not by OH.

5. Clarification. Hearer of both ages shows significant correlation between clarification and pre-announcement marker. Age is not a significant factor to the choice of linguistic marker in clarification.

6. Confirmation. Hearer of both ages show significant correlation with confirmation and with question. No significant age influence is found in confirmation since

confirmation and question are conventionally correlated with each other. Also, the offensive force of confirmation is lower and the meaning of disagreement is implied.

7. Suggestion. In suggestion, OH does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker, but YH shows significant correlation with modal. This means when addressing OH, any linguistic form can be used to suggest. But when addressing YH, modal is considered more preferable than the other linguistic markers. Modal indicates degree of possibility, but it can also carry meaning of authority. When suggesting with modal, the authority carried by suggestion is significantly stressed on YH because of his/her relatively low power. But if the hearer is old, the danger to use modal is the uncertainty of which meaning will be received. Thus, in order to be secured, modal is not significantly correlated with suggestion by OH.

Partial disagreement, again, does not show significant correlation with any one of the linguistic markers. The result is shared by hearers of both ages.

4.6.6.1.3. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in General Disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

In this section, significant correlations among four types of interlocutors are analyzed and discussed. According to Table 50, O-O and Y-O both have 7 significant correlations; Y-Y follows with 3 significant correlations, and O-Y has 2 correlations. From Table 50, it is clear that O-O and Y-O are more dedicated to different linguistic markers in pragmatic strategies while Y-Y and O-Y show more freedom to the choice of linguistic markers in pragmatic strategies.

Table 50. Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in general disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

AGE / PG / LX			NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
Speaker's And Hearer's Age (General Disagreement)	O-O	COR	.718*					
		ACC						
		CHA	.778*	.772*		.772*	.759*	
		DEF						
		PD						
		CLA				.846**		
		CON						
		SUG						.931**
	Y-Y	COR	.921**				.878**	
		ACC						
		CHA						
		DEF						
		PD						
		CLA				.889**		
		CON						
		SUG						
	O-Y	COR						
		ACC		(?).971*				
		CHA		.991**	(?).986*			
		DEF						
		PD						
		CLA						
		CON						
		SUG						
	Y-O	COR			.919*	.950*		
		ACC	.999**					
		CHA						
		DEF						
		PD					.984*	.964*
		CLA	(?)-.956*		(?)-.953*			.994**
		CON					.955*	
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

Generally speaking, when the hearer is old, speakers of both ages are more careful in their choices of linguistic markers. But when the hearer is young, the choice of linguistic markers has more freedom. Thus, hearer's age is a major reason to the correlation between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in disagreement in general. Detailed analyses are given below.

1. **Correction.** Different age groups show different preferences of linguistic marker when correcting. In correction, O-O shows significant correlation with negation; Y-Y shows significant correlation with negation and with degree marker; Y-O shows significant correlation with affirmative and with pre-announcement marker, but O-Y does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. When speaker and hearer are of the same age, both O-O and Y-Y share negative form in correction. Since the conventional link with correction is negation, the significant correlation is reasonable. Also, since no power differences created by age lie between O-O and Y-Y, direct linguistic marker can be used without the concern for politeness. However, when affirmative used by Y-O is compared with the negation used by O-O and Y-Y, it is clear that when there is power difference between the speaker and the hearer, different linguistic choice must be made in order to suit the role in this relationship. Thus, when the less powerful YS disagrees with the more powerful speaker (namely, OH), more indirect statement of affirmative is adopted. Lexically, Y-Y prefers degree marker and Y-O prefers pre-announcement marker. Significant correlations indicate that when the speaker is young, different lexical markers are adopted to suit the power difference. When no power difference is found between Y-Y, comparing to pre-announcement marker, the more direct degree marker, which could modify the strength of the content, is used. But when the power difference is widely apart in Y-O, less direct and peripheral, which does not touch upon the content, pre-announcement marker is adopted.

2. Account. In account, only Y-O shows significant correlation with negation. O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y do not differentiate with any linguistic marker in account. The power difference between Y-O is significant. Realizing the distance, when explaining to OH, YS chooses negative statement, which is less direct than affirmative in account. As for the other three types of interlocutors, no power difference lies between O-O and between Y-Y, and in O-Y, OS is more powerful than YH, which suggests no conversion is needed. Thus, their free choice of linguistic markers also indicates the power relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

3. Challenge. In challenge, O-O shows various linguistic markers with significant correlation: negation, question, pre-announcement marker and degree marker; O-Y shows significant correlation between question; Y-Y and Y-O do not show significant correlation between any linguistic marker. When speaker is old, whether the hearer is old or young, question form is significantly correlated. Since a direct link is between challenge and question, the preference for question only shows OS prefers using direct linguistic markers in challenge regardless of the hearer's age . When the speaker is young, whether the hearer is young or old, no significant linguistic marker is used with challenge. The interesting part of O-O is that more linguistic choices are used in challenge. Since the nature of disagreement is to compete, disagreeing with interlocutors of the same age may be more serious because no power differences can set a barrier between them. Besides, OS and OH belong to a value system that if disagreement can be avoided, avoided. But if the nature of the pragmatic strategy is high in tension and once it erupts, opposition become drastic. The competition between OS and OH may explain why they are dedicated to more linguistic markers than the other interlocutors.

4. Partial disagreement. Y-O shows significant correlations with partial disagreement and two linguistic markers—degree marker and modal. No significant

correlation is found by O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y. The power difference between young speaker and old hearer is wide and needs to be handled carefully. Therefore, lexical markers, which are considered less direct and face-threatening than syntactic patterns, are preferred by young speaker. For other types of interlocutors, the power relationship is either in equal status—O-O and Y-Y—or the speaker has much more power over the hearer—O-Y. Thus, they need not dedicate to any linguistic marker when making partial disagreement.

5. Clarification. In clarification, O-O and Y-Y both show significant correlation with pre-announcement marker; Y-O shows significant correlation with modal, but O-Y does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. When speaker and hearer are of the same age, where no power difference lies in between, old and young are converted to the conventional marker used to show clarification. The competition between the same age interlocutors may also explain the use of direct linguistic form. But when Y-O and Y-Y are compared, it is noted that hearer's age influences YS's choice of lexical markers. Hearer's age determines the lexical choice of clarification. It is considered that pre-announcement marker is more indirect and less face-threatening than modal. But when pre-announcement markers, such as casual marker, contrast marker, and expressive marker, are usually used before clarification, modal becomes a more indirect linguistic form, and thus, it is used by speaker who is in less powerful situation than the hearer, namely, Y-O.

6. Confirmation. Confirmation is only significantly correlated with degree marker by Y-O. O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y do not differentiate any linguistic marker in confirmation. The conventional link with confirmation is question. However, when young speaker confirms with old hearer, more indirect form is needed due to the significant power difference. Thus, degree marker is adopted because it is lexically more indirect than syntactic structures and the strength of the propositional content can be modified by it.

7. Suggestion. In suggestion, only O-O shows significant correlation with modal. Y-Y, O-Y and Y-O do not have any preference for linguistic marker. Disagreement carried out by suggestion is less face-threatening because the oppositional meaning is implied. As mentioned previously, although no power difference is between O-O, the nature of disagreement makes O-O compete with each other. Although suggestion is less direct in disagreement, modal with extra authoritative meaning could intensify the offensiveness to the hearer. Since the competition between O-O is intense, the use of modal may mark the authoritative reading instead of the possibility reading.

In disagreement in general, no significant correlation is found in defense among all types of interlocutors.

4.6.6.2. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Age

In this section, significant correlations be linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement is analyzed and discussed by the speaker's age, the hearer's age, and both the speaker's and the hearer's age. Since the nature of suggestion—providing personal opinion—is against the nature of C-disagreement, no token of suggestion is found in C-disagreement, and thus, it is excluded from further discussion. As stated previously, "—" indicates no token is found, and thus, the frequency is zero.

4.6.6.2.1. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Speaker's Age

Significant correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement are found more by OS than by YS. 9 significant correlations are found by OS and 5 significant correlations are found by YS. 4 significant correlations are shared by speakers of both ages: correction and negation, correction and degree marker, account and pre-announcement marker, and confirmation and question.

Similarities in correlation are not further discussed.

Table 51.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement by speaker's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

Speaker's Age (C-disagreement)	AGE	PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
	O	COR	.781**		.601*		.700*	
		ACC		(?).712**		.656*		
		CHA				.891**		
		DEF			(?).694*			
		PD	(?).826**				.815**	
		CLA				.604*		
		CON		.924**	(?).588*			
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Y	COR	.787**				.578*	
		ACC				.688*		
		CHA		.728**				
		DEF						
		PD						
		CLA						
		CON		.635*				
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

1. Correction. In correction, OS shows significant correlation with negation, with affirmative, and with degree marker while YS shows significant correlation with negation, and with degree marker. OS and YS overlap in negation and degree marker, which suggest no age influence can be found in the two linguistic markers. Other than that, OS shows additional preference in affirmative. The demand for extra syntactic pattern indicates OS has clear distinction between negation and affirmative of their

roles in correction. The reason for the need of two syntactic patterns may imply the significant influence of hearer's age.

2. Account. Both OS and YS show significant correlation between pre-announcement marker and account. The shared linguistic marker indicates no significant age difference can be found in account.

3. Challenge. In challenge, OS shows significant correlation with pre-announcement marker while YS shows significant correlation with question. YS adopts question due to its conventional link with challenge. In other words, YS adopts the more direct linguistic form in challenge. On the contrary, OS makes use of pre-announcement marker, which is the least direct lexical marker aiming not to show directness in challenge. Why does YS perform more directly but OS performs less directly in a pragmatic strategy that is intrinsically direct and face-threatening? This shows the value system between YS and OS are not the same. While OS still avoids confrontation if it can be avoided, YS shows direct challenge when being confronted. OS and YS have shown different value system with distinctive differences in the choice of linguistic marker in challenge.

4. Partial disagreement. In partial disagreement, OS shows significant correlation with degree marker, but YS does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. The use of degree marker suggests while OS has clear dedication to certain linguistic form in partial disagreement, but YS shows free choice in partial disagreement. Partial disagreement often shows agreement before making disagreement. For OS, he/she may worry that his/her hearer misunderstands his/her disagreement for agreement. Thus, OS's concerns makes degree marker, which modifies the strength of the propositional content, a preferred linguistic marker in intensifying the strength of the disagreed part in partial disagreement.

5. Clarification. In clarification, OS shows significant correlation with

pre-announcement marker, but YS does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. OS adopts the direct conventional linguistic marker used in clarification because the social power of OS allows him/her to deliver disagreement directly.

6. Confirmation. Confirmation is significantly correlated with question by OS and YS. The result indicates no significant age difference is found in confirmation.

In C-disagreement, no significant correlations can be located in defense by speakers of both ages.

4.6.6.2.2. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Hearer's Age

According to Table 52, hearers of both ages have similar numbers of significant correlations in C-disagreement. OH has 9 significant correlations and YH has 7 significant correlations. Similarities in significant correlations are found between correction and negation, between correction and degree marker, between account and pre-announcement marker, between challenge and question, and between degree marker and partial disagreement. Detailed discussion for the differences are given below.

Table 52.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement by hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

Hearer's Age (C-disagreement)	AGE	PG \ LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
	O	COR	.821**		.646*		.722**	
		ACC			.617*	.798**		
		CHA		.618*				
		DEF			(?).715*			
		PD	(?).774**			.664*	.889**	
		CLA				.667*		
		CON						
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Y	COR	.633*				.600*	
		ACC				.611*		
		CHA		.819**				
		DEF						
		PD					.728**	
		CLA	.592*					
		CON		.979**				
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

1. Correction. In correction, OH shows significant correlation with negation, with affirmative, and with degree marker while YH shows significant correlation with negation, and with degree marker. Negation and degree marker are shared by hearer of both ages, which indicates the preference is not related to age difference. OH further shows differentiation with another syntactic structure—affirmative. Significant correlation with affirmative suggests hearer's age is an influential factor in the speaker's linguistic choice in correction (Bell, 1984).

2. Account. In account, OH shows significant correlation with affirmative, and with pre-announcement marker while YH only shows significant correlation between pre-announcement marker. Pre-announcement marker is shared by hearer of both ages, which implies no significant age difference. However, OH further shows significant correlation with affirmative. Account is considered to be conventionally linked with affirmative statement. Thus, using affirmative to explain is considered more direct and face-threatening. However, OH is socially more powerful, which is in contradiction to receiving the direct linguistic marker of affirmative. This correlation cannot be fully explained unless speaker's aspect is put into consideration.

3. Challenge. Challenge is significantly correlated with question by hearer of both ages. The conventional link with challenge is conformed by OH and YH. Thus, no significant age difference is found.

4. Partial Disagreement. In partial disagreement, no significant correlation is found by OH, but significant correlation with degree marker is found by YH. When addressing to OH, the choice to linguistic marker is free. But when addressing to YH, degree marker which shows the strength of the disagreed part of partial disagreement is preferred. The less powerful characteristic of YH makes degree marker, either to intensify or mitigate the disagreed proposition, more likely to be used.

5. Clarification. In clarification, no significant correlation can be found by OH, but significant correlation with negation is found by YH. When addressing OH, the choice of linguistic marker is free. But when addressing YH, speakers are more dedicated to negative form. Using negation to clarify suggests more face-threatening force is delivered. Since YH has relatively low power, more direct and face-threatening linguistic marker can be adopted without having problem in politeness.

6. Confirmation. Confirmation is significantly correlated with question by hearer of both ages. The conventional link between confirmation and question is shared by OH

and YH, which indicates no significant age difference lies in question used with confirmation..

No significant correlations are found in defense by hearers of both ages in C-disagreement.

4.6.6.2.3. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in C-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

According to Table 53, different types of interlocutors show different number of significant correlations. O-O has 7 correlations; followed by Y-Y with 4 correlations; next comes Y-O with 1 correlation. O-Y does not show any significant correlation between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies. Statistic results show same-age interlocutors (namely, O-O and Y-Y) are more dedicated to multiple linguistic markers in C-disagreement, while cross-age interlocutors (namely, O-Y and Y-O) are less dedicated to linguistic markers used in pragmatic strategies.

Table 53. Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in C-disagreement by speaker's and hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

AGE / PG / LX			NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
Speaker's and Hearer's Age (C-disagreement)	O-O	COR	.789*				.827*	
		ACC		(?).812*		.852**		
		CHA				.905**		
		DEF		(?).922**	(?).798*			
		PD	.918**				.899**	
		CLA						
		CON		.922**	(?).798*			
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Y-Y	COR					.735*	
		ACC						
		CHA		.786*				.794*
		DEF						
		PD						(?)1.000**
		CLA						
		CON		.973**				
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—
	O-Y	COR		—				
		ACC		—				
		CHA	—	—	—	—	—	—
		DEF		—				
		PD		—				
		CLA		—				
		CON	—	—	—	—	—	—
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Y-O	COR			.954*			
		ACC	(?).951*					
		CHA						
		DEF	—	—	—	—	—	—
		PD	—	—	—	—	—	—
		CLA						
		CON				(?)-.968*		
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

1. Correction. In correction, O-O shows significant correlation with negation and with degree marker; Y-Y shows significant correlation with degree marker; Y-O shows significant correlation with affirmative, but no significant correlation is found in O-Y. Lexically, degree marker is shared by O-O and Y-Y. When speaker and hearer are of the same age, more indirect lexical markers are used. O-O and Y-O both adopt syntactic statements in correction. This means when hearers are both of old age, OS and YS adopts different statement. Direct and face-threatening negation is used between O-O because the competition between the interlocutors may be the most intensive among the four types of interlocutors. Y-O uses affirmative statement, which is less direct than negation, because the social distance and power difference between Y-O is wide apart. O-Y does not conform to any linguistic marker because no imposition can be set on old speaker when his/her hearer is the less powered young hearer. Thus, no dedication to any form must be used.

2. Account. In account, significant correlation is found only by O-O. Y-Y, O-Y, and Y-O do not show significant preference of any linguistic marker. Pre-announcement marker adopted before giving explanation suggests when the hearer is also of old age, old speaker would adopt pre-announcement marker to signal the following explanation. O-O's dedication to pre-announcement marker suggests the signal is crucially viewed because preparing the hearer of the upcoming disagreement is considered more appropriate than not to do so.

3. Challenge. In challenge, O-O shows significant correlation with pre-announcement marker; Y-Y shows significant correlation with question and with modal. No significant correlation is found by Y-O and O-Y. Thus, it is clearly cut that only speaker and hearer of the same age group show significant differences between different linguistic markers. The result also indicates that the competition in challenge is more intensive by same-age interlocutors; thus, dedication to certain linguistic

forms needs to be made. Both O-O and Y-Y show significant correlation with lexical markers. O-O prefers pre-announcement marker and Y-Y prefers modal. Pre-announcement markers used in challenge are mostly emotional markers or performative verb, which implies serious competition between O-O. The competition between Y-Y may be less serious, and thus, less serious modal is adopted. In addition, Y-Y conforms to the convention that question form is significantly preferred. The use of both syntactic forms and lexical markers suggest Y-Y has more choices to express challenge than O-O. O-O's dedication in challenge is stronger because the value system O-O has is less flexible.

4. Partial Disagreement. In partial disagreement, significant correlation is found only by O-O. Partial disagreement is significantly correlated with degree marker. Y-Y, O-Y, and Y-O do not show significant preference for any linguistic marker. However, only 1 degree marker out of 105 linguistic token is found used in partial disagreement and the frequency is extremely low, degree marker in partial disagreement by O-O is excluded from discussion.

5. Confirmation. In confirmation, O-O and Y-Y both show significant correlation with question. Y-O and O-Y do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. This means when speaker and hearer are of the same age, they are more dedicated to a single linguistic form than speaker and hearer of cross age. Also, when both old and young interlocutors adopts question in confirmation, age is not an influential factor to the linguistic marker. Whether old or young, speaker and hearer of the same age follow the conventional use of question in confirmation.

4.6.6.3. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in E-Disagreement

In this section, significant correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement is analyzed and discussed by the speaker's age, the

hearer's age, and both the speaker's and the hearer's age.

4.6.6.3.1. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Speaker's Age

According to Table 54, more significant correlations between linguistic marker and pragmatic strategies are found in E-disagreement by age. Correlations found by OS (10 correlations) and YS (13 correlations) are nearly the same. Speakers of both ages share 6 significant correlations: correction and negation, correction and affirmative, account and affirmative, challenge and question, defense and affirmative, and suggestion and modal.

Table 54.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement by speaker's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

AGE / PG / LX			NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
Speaker's Age (E-disagreement)	O	COR	.884**		.872**			
		ACC			.721**			
		CHA	.774**	.907**		.779**	.753**	
		DEF			.843**			
		PD						
		CLA	.622*			.849**		
		CON						
		SUG						.757**
	Y	COR	.786**		.865**	.685*	.868**	
		ACC	.613*		.642*	.797**	.699*	
		CHA		.787**	.583*			
		DEF	.726*		.728**			
		PD						
		CLA		(?)-.593*				
		CON						
		SUG						.702*

1. Correction. In correction, OS shows significant correlation with negation and affirmative while YS shows significant correlation with negation, affirmative, pre-announcement marker and degree marker. Two syntactic patterns, negation and affirmative, are shared by speaker of both ages, which indicate no significant age difference. In addition, YS show significant preference for pre-announcement marker and degree marker in correction. The two lexical markers are relatively less direct than syntactic forms. Adopting lexical markers shows YS needs to be more delicate in using linguistic markers in correction than OS does. The consequence may be caused by the relatively low power in age. Thus, instead of using pure syntactic forms, lexical modifiers need to be adopted in order to serve more adequate expression in correction.

2. Account. In account, OS shows significant correlation with affirmative, but YS shows significant correlations with negation, with affirmative, with pre-announcement marker, and with degree marker. More varieties are adopted by YS than by OS. Speaker of both ages share the conventional affirmative statement in account. In addition, YS adopts negation, pre-announcement marker and degree marker in account. This means when YS gives explanations, he/she cannot solely rely on affirmative statement. Multiple choices of linguistic markers suggest YS needs to alter the choice of linguistic marker because of the relatively less power he/she has.

3. Challenge. In challenge, OS shows significant correlation with negation, with question, with pre-announcement marker, and with degree marker while YS shows significant correlation with question and affirmative. Speaker of both ages conform to the conventional question used in challenge. Speaker of both ages also shows significant preference in syntactic forms. OS prefers negation and YS prefers affirmative. Since negation is conventionally considered more direct and forceful in disagreement, OS's preference for the more direct and forceful negation is reasonable because OS is socially more powerful than YS. OS further use two lexical markers in

challenge. Pre-announcement markers used in challenge are emotional markers and performative verbs. Also, degree markers, such as intensifiers, are more likely to be adopted by OS because degree marker can strengthen the degree of content, and thus, shows attitudinal meanings to the content. These forceful and aggressive markers are more likely to be used by OS because of the higher status of power owned by OS. Since challenge in E-disagreement is even more face-threatening than in C-disagreement, the linguistic choices used by OS are various.

4. Defense. In defense, OS shows significant correlation with affirmative while YS shows significant correlation with affirmative and with negation. Both OS and YS prefers affirmative in defense. Since the conventional syntactic structure used in defense is affirmative, the conformation to the convention shows both OS and YS follow the norm. Negation is further preferred by YS. This means in defense, YS needs to change between the more direct affirmative and the less direct negation when making defense. That YS needs to distinguish between negation and affirmative, two syntactic forms, indicates that the reason behind it cannot be located unless the hearer is considered.

5. Clarification. In clarification, OS shows significant correlation with negation and with pre-announcement marker, but YS shows no significant correlation with any linguistic marker. OS adopts the conventional pre-announcement marker in Clarification. In addition, negative form is used by OS because the conventional force of negation in disagreement is more direct and face-threatening. Thus, negation can be used by the more powerful OS because only the more powerful can handle the direct force brought about by negation.

6. Suggestion. In suggestion, significant correlation with modal is found by both OS and YS. Thus, no significant difference is found by speaker's age.

No significant correlation in partial disagreement and in confirmation by

speakers of both ages is found.

4.6.6.3.2. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Hearer's Age

According to Table 55, OH (17 correlations) shows more correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies than YH (10 correlations). The age of the hearer is influential to the choice of linguistic markers used in individual pragmatic strategies. Hearers of both ages show 5 similarities in significant correlations between correction and negation, between correction and affirmative, between challenge and question, between defense and affirmative, and between clarification and pre-announcement.

Table 55.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement by hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant)

Hearer's Age (E-disagreement)	AGE PG / LX	NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
	O COR	.909**		.865**	.678*	.815**	.651*
	ACC						
	CHA	.698*	.878**	.680*	.746**	.840**	
	DEF			.790**		.851*	
	PD						
	CLA	.627*			.618*		
	CON		.628*		.634*	(?).651*	
	SUG						
	H COR	.766**		.878**			
	ACC	.679*			.751**	.658*	
	CHA		.835**				
	DEF	.603*		.844**			
	PD						
	CLA				.693*		
	CON						
	SUG						.876**

1. Correction. OH shows 5 linguistic markers significantly correlate with correction: negation, affirmative, pre-announcement marker, degree marker, and modal. YS shows 2 linguistic markers significantly correlate with correction: negation and affirmative. OH receives more linguistic forms than YH in correction. Negation and affirmative is shared by YH and OH, and thus, age is not influential in correction. However, when disagreeing with OH, all lexical markers are adopted, which means when disagreeing with the more powerful OH, lexical modification is a must. But for YH, to correct through syntactic patterns is enough.

2. Account. In account, OH does not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker, but YH shows significant correlation with negation, pre-announcement marker, and degree marker. This means when the hearer is old, the choice of linguistic marker is rather free, but when the hearer is young, the choice of linguistic marker shows significant preference. Negation is more frequently addressed to YH because of the conventional link with disagreement. Since YH is less powerful, it is fine to explain with negation. Lexical markers, such as pre-announcement marker and degree marker, are addressed to YH. Pre-announcement markers are often placed before the explanation and degree marker could intensify the strength of the explanation. Both markers are significantly used when addressing YH.

3. Challenge. OH shows 5 linguistic markers that are in insignificant correlations with challenge: negation, affirmative, question, pre-announcement marker and degree marker. YH only shows significant correlation with question. Hearers of both ages prefer the conventional question in challenge. Instead of question, OH shows dedication to two syntactic statements and two lexical markers. This means when the strategy is more direct and more face-threatening, when disagreeing with the more powerful OH, various markers are needed and less direct linguistic markers need to be adopted in order to be less offensive, and thus, maintain politeness.

4. Defense. In defense, OH shows significant correlation with affirmative and with degree marker while YH shows significant correlation with negation and with affirmative. Affirmative is shared by hearers of both ages because of its conventional link with defense. The difference between OH and YH is that the former shows significant correlation with degree marker and the latter shows significant correlation with negation. In disagreement, negation is considered more direct and face-threatening than all the other markers. Also, syntactic patterns are more direct and forceful than lexical markers. Thus, when addressing the less powerful YH, more direct and forceful negation is used. But when disagreeing with the more powerful OH, the force of the alternative linguistic marker needs to be reduced into less direct lexical modifier—degree marker.

5. Clarification. In clarification, OH shows significant correlation with negation and with pre-announcement marker, but YH shows significant correlation only with pre-announcement marker. Since pre-announcement is conventionally used before giving clarification, the shared norm between OH and YH is reasonable. In addition, OH further shows preference of negation in clarification.

6. Confirmation. In confirmation, OH shows significant correlation with question and with pre-announcement marker. No significant correlation is found by YH. This means when confirming with hearer of young age, no fixed form needs to be followed. Question is conventionally used to confirm. Thus, although question form is a direct form in confirmation, coping with the convention would be less offensive to OH. Pre-announcement marker is also significantly correlated with confirmation when the hearer is old. Pre-announcement markers are lexical markers, which are more indirect and less forceful than syntactic forms, attach to the peripheral of the proposition. Thus, it is less influential on the content than the other lexical markers. Since the power of OH is high, posing less direct and face-threatening lexical marker could create a better

choice in showing disagreement.

6. Suggestion. In suggestion, no significant correlation is found by OH, but significant correlation with modal is found by YH. When disagreeing with OH, any linguistic marker can be used (i.e., free variation). But when disagreeing with YH, suggestion is significantly used with modal, which could simultaneously indicate possibility and authority. The dual meanings—authoritative and possible—carried by modal could be used when the hearer is young and less powerful, however, when the hearer is old and more powerful, to avoid targeting the authoritative, imposing, meaning may explain why modal is not preferred.

No significant correlation is found in partial disagreement.

4.6.6.3.3. Interaction between Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Strategies in E-disagreement by Speaker's and Hearer's Age

According to Table 56, more significant correlations are found by O-O (11 correlations), Y-Y (7 correlations), and Y-O (8 correlations). Only three significant correlations are found by O-Y.

Table 56.Correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in E-disagreement by speaker's age and hearer's age ("?" = 0 token of linguistic marker in individual pragmatic strategy, but statistically significant; "—" = 0 token)

AGE PG LX			NEG	QUE	AFF	Pre-Ann	DM	MOD
Speaker's and Hearer's Age (E-disagreement)	O-O	COR	.941**		.778*			
		ACC						
		CHA	.807*	.902**		.768*	.865**	
		DEF			.956**			
		PD						
		CLA	.818*			.894**		
		CON		.747*				
		SUG						.919**
	Y-Y	COR	.767*				.922**	
		ACC				.776*	.759*	
		CHA		.778*				
		DEF			.831*			
		PD						
		CLA						
		CON						
		SUG						.961**
	O-Y	COR						
		ACC	.989*	(?).997**				
		CHA		.991**	(?).966*			
		DEF			.963*			
		PD						
		CLA						
		CON						
		SUG						
	Y-O	COR	.957*		.996**		.958*	.968*
		ACC						
		CHA						.977*
		DEF			.995**			(?).980*
		PD			(?).987*		.968*	(?)1.000**
		CLA						
		CON			(?).994**		(?).986*	.977*
		SUG	—	—	—	—	—	—

1. Correction. In correction, O-O shows significant correlation with negation and affirmative; Y-Y shows significant correlation with negation and degree marker; U-O shows significant correlation with negation, affirmative, degree marker and modal; O-Y shows no significant correlation with any linguistic marker. Except for O-Y, negation is shared by all the other three types of interlocutors. The conventional link between negation and correction may be the reason for the preference. Syntactically, Affirmative is found in O-O and Y-O. This means when the hearer's age is old, speakers of both ages adopt affirmative statement. Although affirmative is an indirect linguistic marker in correction, yet, comparing to the other linguistic markers except negation, its force is more direct and face-threatening than the others. The intrinsic nature of disagreement makes O-O compete with each other. Serious competition between O-O explains why affirmative is adopted. However, affirmative is also adopted by Y-O, where power difference and social distance is relatively wide apart between the speaker and the hearer. Due to the western influence of individualism, YS becomes more likely to speak for him/herself. Also, the nature of E-disagreement makes disagreement more face-threatening than C-disagreement. Thus, affirmative adopted by YS is to correct OH. Lexically, degree marker is found by Y-Y and Y-O. This means when the speaker is young, regardless of the hearer's age, degree marker is preferred. Thus, young speaker shows significant correlation with degree marker in correction. YS are intrinsically less powerful. When both speaker and hearer are less powerful, more indirect and less face-threatening linguistic marker is used. The use of less face-threatening linguistic marker by Y-Y also suggests disagreement is not taken as serious as it is between O-O. And when YS disagrees with OS, although individualism prevail YS's mind, the legacy of power difference in age is still seen visible in the use of more indirect degree marker. In addition, another lexical marker, modal, is adopted to show further dedication to different linguistic marker in

correction. More linguistic markers need to be used with correction when there shows power difference.

2. Account. In account, Y-Y shows significant correlation with pre-announcement marker and degree marker; O-Y shows significant correlation with negation; O-O and Y-O do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. This means, when hearer is young, significant preference for linguistic marker is found, but when hearer is old, linguistic choice is free. This means, YH is the reason for the dedication of linguistic marker in account. When explaining to YH, different linguistic markers are used by speaker of different age. YS uses lexical markers of pre-announcement marker and degree marker, and OS uses syntactic pattern negation. In Y-Y, no power difference lies in between and under the influence of western individualism, they care more about themselves. Thus, less direct lexical markers are adopted. But in O-Y, the imposition set by OS's power on YH may explain the syntactic choice in account

3. Challenge. In challenge, all four types of interlocutors have significant correlation with certain linguistic marker. O-O significantly correlates with negation, question, pre-announcement marker, and degree marker. Y-Y and O-Y significantly correlate with question. Y-O significantly correlates with modal. Except for O-O, the three types of interlocutors only show one significant linguistic marker with challenge. Four linguistic markers is significantly used by O-O in challenge indicate more dedication must be made. However, when examining the linguistic markers used by the interlocutors, except for Y-O, question form is shared by O-O, Y-Y and O-Y. Question is directly and conventionally linked to challenge because of the intrinsic nature of challenge is to question. Thus, it can be seen that except for the less powerful YS to disagree with the more powerful OH, question is directly adopted by the other interlocutors. Modal is adopted by Y-O in challenge because lexical modal is more indirect than syntactic pattern, which shows the power difference between the speaker

and the hearer. Other than question, the competition between O-O makes other linguistic markers to be adopted in challenge. Syntactically, negation is a better choice because negation has been a conventional use in disagreement. Lexically, pre-announcement marker and degree marker are used to further illustrate that in challenge, even the less direct markers need to be dedicated to serve the serious competition between O-O.

4. Defense. In defense, significant correlation with affirmative is shared by O-O, Y-Y, O-Y, and Y-O. The intrinsic nature of defense is for the current speaker to protect what he/she has previously said. Affirmative statement is conventionally used with defense. Moreover, the protection needs less to care for the hearer perspective. Thus, the age of the hearer will not influence the use of linguistic marker in defense. Thus, the significant correlation between affirmative and defense is shared by all four types of interlocutors.

5. Partial Disagreement. In partial disagreement, only Y-O shows significant correlation with degree marker. O-O, Y-Y, and O-Y do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. However, since the frequency of the significant correlation is relatively low (1 out of 129 tokens), it is excluded from further discussion.

6. Clarification. In clarification, significant correlations with negation and pre-announcement marker are found by O-O. The other three types of speaker and hearer, namely, Y-Y, O-Y, and Y-O, do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. Although no power difference lies between O-O, the competition brought by the nature of disagreement in old value system makes O-O more competitive than the other types of interlocutors. Pre-announcement marker is conventionally used before giving clarification. The negative structure used to emphasize the disagreement is also favored by O-O. Also, negation in disagreement is

often considered less indirect and more forceful. Thus, the use of negation in clarification can be explained by the tension between O-O.

7. Confirmation. In confirmation, O-O shows significant correlation with question; Y-O shows significant correlation with modal; Y-Y and O-Y do not show significant correlation with any linguistic marker. When hearers are both old, linguistic marker is adopted. When hearers are both young, no significant correlation is found. This means OH is the reason for the used of linguistic marker with confirmation. When OS and YS both confirm with OH, they prefer different linguistic marker. The former prefers question and the latter prefers modal. The conventional linguistic marker used in confirmation is question. Thus, when OS confirms with OH, direct linguistic marker is used because the intrinsic competition between O-O is strong. However, when YS confirms with OH, power difference and social distance between old and young do not allow YS to use direct question form. Thus, the more indirect lexical marker, modal, is chosen.

8. Suggestion. Suggestion is significantly used with modal by O-O and Y-Y. No significant correlation is found by O-Y and Y-O. Only speaker and hearer of the same age show significant preference for linguistic marker. O-O and Y-Y both shows significant correlation with modal, which suggest age is not an influential reason in the correlation between modal and suggestion. Suggestion is frequently used with modal because modal shows degree of possibility, which indicates the possibility of suggestion.

4.6.7. Summary of 4.5.

In this section, types of disagreement, linguistic markers, pragmatic strategies, and the interaction between linguistic marker and pragmatic strategies are analyzed under the influence of age. First, in types of disagreement, considering solely from the speaker or by the hearer, age does not revel significant differences. When the

speaker's age and the hearer's age are interacted, same-age groups (i.e., O-O and Y-Y) disagree more often than cross-age groups (i.e., O-Y and Y-O) in disagreement in general and in C-disagreement. But, in E-disagreement, the four age groups show nearly even percentages.

Second, in linguistic markers, speakers and hearers of both ages have similar choices except that speakers of different ages show slightly different choices in general disagreement while hearers of different ages receive linguistic markers slightly different from each other in E-disagreement. Other than that, speaker and hearer of different ages show similar linguistic choices. When linguistic markers are compared for their significant differences, YS show stronger dedication and more distinctions between linguistic markers in all types of disagreement. Although YH distinguishes between linguistic markers in disagreement in general and C-disagreement, it is OH who receives more significant differences in E-disagreement. When four age groups are compared, speaker and hearer of same-age groups (namely, O-O and Y-Y) display similar linguistic choices in all types of disagreement; contrary to same-age groups, speaker and hearer of cross-age groups (namely, O-Y and Y-O) show different linguistic preferences in all types of disagreement. For differentiation between linguistic markers, same-age groups (i.e., O-O and Y-Y), especially Y-Y, has stronger dedication to certain linguistic markers than the others. Linguistic differentiations are most clearly made by Y-Y.

Third, in pragmatic strategies, choices of pragmatic strategies for speaker and hearer of different ages display different orders except for in C-disagreement. When pragmatic strategies are compared for their significant differences, YS shows more distinctive dedications to account and challenge in all types of disagreement. Fewer distinctions between pragmatic strategies are made by hearers of both ages. When four age groups are compared, preferences for different pragmatic strategies differ

from one another in all types of disagreement. When significant differences between pragmatic strategies are compared, in all types of disagreement, Y-Y has the much more distinctions than the other groups. In C-disagreement, Y-O shows no differentiations between pragmatic strategies. When the four age groups are further combined into same-age and cross-age groups, statistic results indicate more delicate differentiations are made by same-age groups.

Fourth, when linguistic marker interacts with pragmatic strategies, more significant correlations are found in E-disagreement than in C-disagreement. The results indicate finer and more delicate distinctions between linguistic markers in pragmatic strategies need to be considered. Significant age difference in linguistic and pragmatic correlations is found in the hearer, but not in the speaker, which suggests hearer's age is the reason for more delicate linguistic choices. Bell's (1984) theory of style as a hearer's design may be a possible explanation. When speaker's age and hearer's age are both considered, more significant correlations are found by O-O than the other three age groups. The tension of the competition and the requirement for distinction of linguistic forms and pragmatic strategies in traditional value system make O-O more dedicated to multiple correlations between linguistic markers and pragmatic strategies in disagreement.