

styles of talk is that the all-girl and all- boy groups to which they belong interact in vastly different ways. Boys play in larger, more hierarchical groups, while girls play in small groups, often in pairs. Boys' friendship tends to be based on joint activity, while girls' friendship is based on talk. According to Maltz and Borker [18], girls learn to do three things with words: to create and maintain relationships of closeness and equality, to criticize others in acceptable ways and to interpret accurately the speech of other girls, however, boys learn to use words to assert a position of dominance, to attract and maintain an audience and to assert themselves when another speaker has the floor.

The girls' world and the boys' world are embedded in the larger world in society, which is essentially male dominated. Males are expected to possess initiative and demonstrate competence and dominance, females are supposed to display supportiveness, obedience and collaboration. As Tannen observed, for most women, the language of conversation is primarily a language of rapport: a way of establishing connections and negotiating relationships. Emphasis is placed on displaying similarities and matching experiences. [16] From childhood, girls criticize peers who try to stand out or appear better than others. On the other hand, for most men, talk is primarily a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchical social order. This is done by exhibiting knowledge and skill, and by holding center state through verbal performance such as story-telling, joking, or imparting information. From childhood, men learn to use talking as a way to get and keep attention. So they are more comfortable speaking in public.

In China, people have been long influenced by Confucianism which advocated that women's prescribed life status was to serve men, and women were demanded to abide by the ethical code of San cong Si de (three obediences and four virtues). The three obediences are: obedience to father before marriage, to husband after marriage, and to son after husband's death, and four virtues are: morality, proper speech, modest manner and diligent work. This ethical code indeed manifests prejudice against women in ancient China. In general, females behave more sensitive to politeness and use more politeness strategies than male do because of the different subcultures in which they are socialized and gender-appropriately are produced and reinforced through the process of socialization.

4. Conclusion

As for gender differences in the use of disagreement strategies in overall situations, the present study indicates that both males and females use more mitigated strategies than aggravated strategies when show their disagreement towards

others. Females are observed to use more mitigated strategies and less aggravated strategies than males. In examining gender differences in the choice of semantic formulae of mitigated and aggravated strategies, females in the present study tend to choose more Expression of Gratitude plus Avoiding than males, and males tend to choose more Direct Disagreement, Judgmental Vocabulary and Rhetorical Question than females.. Qualitatively speaking, the causes of gender differences in the realization of disagreement strategies are explored from the psychological and socio-cultural perspectives.

References

- [1] Lokoff, Robin, language and women's place, New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- [2] Searle, J. What is a speech act? In Steven, D. (ed.) A Reader. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- [3] Holmes, J. Paying compliments: a sex-preferential positive politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 30:3-15, 1988.
- [4] Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics* 5-3: 196-213, 1984.
- [5] Coates, J. Women, men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language. London: Longman, 1993.
- [6] Miller, R. Power, severity and context in disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 32:1087 -1111, 2000.
- [7] Muntigl, P. and Turnbull, W. "Conversational structure and facework in arguing". *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol.29, 1998, pp. 225-256.
- [8] Wang, W. M. A study on politeness strategies of disagreement in Chinese. Unpublished MA thesis, Shandong University, 2006.
- [9] Liu, S. Pragmatic strategies and power relations in disagreement. Unpublished PhD thesis, Arizona University, 2004.
- [10] Liang, G. D. "A contrastive study on disagreement strategies between American English and Mandarin Chinese". Electronic Resources in Southwest Jiaotong University library, 2003.
- [11] Brown, P. and Levinson, S. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. (ed). *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (PP. 56-311). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [12] Edstrom, A. Expression of disagreement by Venezuelans in conversation: reconsidering the influence of culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36:1499-1518, 2004.
- [13] Liu, P. A pragmatic approach to Chinese EFL learners' realization patterns of disagreement in English. Unpublished MA thesis, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, 2006.
- [14] Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C. Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In Thorne, B. et al. (ed.) *Language and sex: differences dominance*. Rowley, Newbury House, 1975.
- [15] Kalcik, S. Like Ann's Gynecologist or the time I was almost raped. *Journal of American Folklore*. 88:3-11, 1975.
- [16] Tannen, D. *Talking from 9 to 5. Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and Power*. New York: Avon Books, 1990.
- [17] Edelsky, C. Who's got the floor? *Language in Society*. 10:383-421., 1980.
- [18] Maltz, D. N. & Borker, R. A. A cultural approach to male and female miscommunication. In Gumperz, J. (ed.) *Language and Social Identity*. CUP, 1982.