Cooperative Principle and Cohesion in Chinese Social Media Texts:

The Case of Weibo Discussion on Women's Role

Beili Liu

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the

requirement for the degree of

Master of Research

Department of International Studies

Faculty of Arts

Macquarie University

Sydney, Australia

March 2018

Acknowledgments

I own my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Lan Zhang, who has been supported me in various ways on my journey of Master of Research. Her critical and insightful advice enlightened me on how to conduct academic research and what it means to be a researcher. She is not only a source of intellectual inspiration, but also a supportive supervisor. She patiently went through with me in every step of writing the thesis, from developing ideas to the editing of each chapter. Without her help, this thesis would not be in the present shape.

My sincere thanks also go to a number of wonderful people at the Department of Linguistics. I wish to thank Associate Professor David Butt, Associate Professor Annabelle Lukin, Dr. Canzhong Wu and Dr. Deanna Wong, who give me their valuable time to discuss my research project and provide insightful and valuable comments on it.

I am also grateful to my GP, Dr. Kim Chau-Vo, the staff at MRes office and the staff at Campus wellbeing, without their support I could not finish this thesis under my health conditions.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my mother and my friends for cheering me up and offering a sympathetic ear for my endless concerns.

Thank you all.

Abstract

As a growing number of people engaged in online interactions available for public access, conversations take place in social media have drawn the attention of researchers. This study aims to provide an integrated linguistic account on the continuance of social media conversation, focusing on Sina Weibo in particular. Collecting data from message exchanges between two Weibo users discussing Women's role in contemporary China, this research takes Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims, a macro level pragmatic framework, and cohesion, a lexical level linguistic property as key analytical instruments. Under the proposed theoretical framework, five main topics and three ways of non-observance of the maxim in the conversation are identified. According to the functions of the identified topics, they are classified as pre-determined topic and conversational topic. The roles that cohesion, topic and non-observance of the maxims play in keeping the conversation going are investigated. The findings suggest that the topic networks that form various semantic connections and the non-observance of the maxims contribute to the continuance of the conversation. Moreover, cohesive relations among lexical items provide significant guidelines to identify the topics and interpret the non-observance of the maxims.

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Name: Beili Liu   Signature: Date: 09/03/2018

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

The CP: The Cooperative Principle

GIF: Graphics Interchange Format

PDI: Presupposed distance item

UGC: User-generated content

\#   Tagged topic in Twitter

\#\#   Double hashtag topic or micro topic in Sina Weibo

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

1.1.1 The significance of conducting research on social media. Social media has fascinated researchers from diverse disciplines for its impact on our life. The number of social media users worldwide continues to grow rapidly. In 2017, there are 2.46 billion people have access to social media platforms, which is about one third of the world population, and the number of users is expected to reach 3.02 billion in 2021 (Statista, 2017). More importantly, the popularity of social media has driven more and more people to move their social, cultural and professional activities to social media, in other words, the online and offline world are increasingly interpenetrating (van Dijck, 2013).

1.1.2 Defining social media for this research. Social media refers to the communication technologies based on the foundation of Web 2.0, which allow people to create, share and discuss 'user-generated content' (henceforth UGC) online (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre, 2011; Poore, 2014). UGC includes but does not limit to text-based language, multimodal resources (such as image, audio and video files) and the combination of the two (Berger, 2014). Some popular social media platforms in the world are Twitter, Facebook, Wiki and YouTube, where users create and share different forms of UGC that are open to public. The exchange of different forms of UGC makes human interactions through social media possible. As social media play the role of mediating interactions, they can be defined as online services that facilitate social interactions among users (Page, Barton, Unger, & Zappavigna, 2014; Seargeant & Tagg, 2014). This function of social media is also reflected in the fact that many social media platforms are designed primarily to promote conversations among individuals and groups (Kietzmann et al., 2011). For example, Twitter's conversational tagging function is for users

to follow a specific topic and start conversations among those who tag the same topic (Huang, Thornton, & Efthimiadis, 2010).

1.2 Gap Lies in Existing Research

As just mentioned, facilitating conversation is a major function of social media. Current research on social media conversation, especially on Twitter conversation, covers the function of hashtag in Twitter conversations (Huang et al., 2010; Zappavigna, 2015), conversation style on Twitter (Scott, 2015) and social affiliation and identity of Twitter conversation (Zappavigna, 2012, 2014).

However, the research area on the continuance of conversation in social media has not been fully developed. The lack of attention in this area probably links with the speculations that it is very difficult to keep a conversation in online environment (Herring, 1996), as social media users interact without the benefit of extra linguistic cues as to gender, identity, personality or mood (Hiltz & Turoff, 1978) or paralinguistic cues such as gesture, eye-gaze or intonation of their interlocutors. Although conversation in social media does not share the mentioned factors in face-to-face conversation, it does not mean that social media conversation cannot continue. The continuance of social media conversation can be investigated from two aspects. In human society, face-to-face conversation often exhibits cooperative efforts of the interlocutors, and the talk exchanges usually consist of a series of connected topics or remarks (Grice, 1975, 1989). For a conversation in social media to keep going, both cooperation of the interlocutors and relevant topics are required. Different from verbal language in face-to-face conversation, language used in social media conversation possesses 'features in spoken language as well as with planned written language' (Gardner & Alsop, 2016), for it is typed and to be read on a digital screen. Text-based language in social media provides rich linguistic data to investigate topics of a conversation and the cooperative efforts of interlocutors, which can make the conversation going.

Another potential area that is worth developing is the study on Chinese online language. The Chinese language has the largest number of speakers in the world, while the research on English used in online environment is relevantly established, the former has yet to be developed (Herring, Stein, & Virtannen, 2013). Studying Chinese conversation in social media, to some extent, will improve the understanding on Chinese online language.

Drawing the influence of social media, the potential in researching the continuance of social media conversation and Chinese online language, this research aims to investigate the continuance of conversation in Chinese social media, using text-based language as empirically grounded evidence.

1.3 Sina Weibo: an Influential Social Media Platform in China

Before introducing Sina Weibo (hereafter Weibo) in this section, it is necessary to mention the Internet regulation in China. Censorship is enforced on the information transmitted online, and the operation of social media platforms is not exempt from the regulation. Western-based social media services such as Twitter and Facebook are not available to Chinese netizens.

As a counterpart to Twitter, Weibo, the Chinese own social media service, is introduced to Chinese netizens in 2009 by Sina Cooperation (Wang, 2013; Yu, Asur, & Huberman, 2015). Although the Chinese government also allows the operation of other Chinese-indigenous social media platforms, Weibo is the most influential social media in China. As at 2012, 87.67% of the total social media users are registered Weibo users (Data Centre of China Internet, 2012). In 2017, the daily active Weibo users are 165 million, and 84.4% of the users are above the age of 18 (Data Centre of Sina Weibo, 2017). The statistic data reflects the reality that Weibo has become a part of Chinese life. The influential role of Weibo is also reflected in the fact that it is the platform where a large number of businesses,

government departments and non-for-profit organisations deliver new and important information to public (Zhao et al., 2014).

Weibo and Twitter share similar features in terms of availability, word limit per tweet and hashtag. Apart from availability, which means Weibo is open to everyone who has a computer, a smartphone or other mobile device, the other two features in Weibo provide greater support for conversation among users than Twitter does.

Same as Twitter, Weibo also has 140-character limit for each tweet. However, 140 Chinese characters can do more in a tweet (Wang, 2013; Zhang & Kramarae, 2014) than alphabetical characters. For the same amount of characters, Chinese can convey more information than it is possible in English. A report from The Economist ("Which tongues work best for microblogs?," 2012, March 31) compared twelve languages in translating a text consist of 1000 characters in English, concluding that Chinese might be ideal for microblogging. In addition, 140 Chinese characters could be less fragmented in composing a Weibo tweet. Using 140-Character in Chinese, one can write a paragraph or even an entire story (Gu, 2014). The advantage of Chinese character in composing Weibo tweets made these tweets rich in text-based linguistic evidence, which is sufficient to reveal the continuance of Weibo conversation.

Weibo adopts the tagging function of Twitter, which makes a topic searchable on the Internet. The difference of tagging between Twitter and Weibo are twofold. Firstly, Twitter uses single hashtag for tagging a topic, whereas Weibo uses double ones. The most distinct difference between the two is that a double hashtag topic (or 'micro topic' 微话题) in Weibo forms discussion forums where conversations among users takes place on particular topics (Zhang & Kramarae, 2014).

As double hashtag topics contain conversations among Weibo users, this research employs a double hashtag topic as a case to explore the continuance of conversation in Chinese social media.

1.4 The Representative Case of Weibo Discussion: #boycottingbaihe.com#

1.4.1 Background of the double hashtag topic. In 2014, a matchmaking company in China, Baihe.com, broadcasted an advertisement 'Because Love Doesn't Wait' (*因为爱不等待*) (Baihe.com, 2014) on major Chinese television channels and online during the Chinese New Year celebration. In the advertisement, a beautiful young lady, who graduated from University and had a decent job finally got married through the service of Baihe.com as the cause of love to her dying grandmother. This advertisement echoes the traditional Chinese value Xiao'Shun (meaning being grateful and obedient to the elder family members). It is worth noting that Chinese New Year celebration is the time when many single men and women in China will be confronted with the question of 'when will you get married' asked by their families. The embedded traditional value in the advertisement and the confronting situation triggered heated discussion on Weibo, where many Weibo users see the advertisement as 'backward social value' and 'moral kidnapping on women'. A Weibo user Chai Jinning started a double hashtag topic #boycottingbaihe.com# (#*万人抵制百合网*#) for thousands of Weibo users to express and discuss their views on marriage, tradition and women. It should be noted that this research does not aim to investigate the cultural and social factors of the language used in the double hashtag topic. This topic is employed as a representative case among millions of tagged topics in Weibo to reveal the continuance of Chinese social media conversation.

1.4.2 Generality of #boycottingbaihe.com#. The tagged topic is different from other 'micro topics' in Weibo in three ways. Firstly, the double hashtag topic is closely related to the life of Chinese people. It boosts their willingness to participate in the Weibo discussion

and creates opportunities for them to start conversations. Secondly, the topic does not require specific knowledge or language skills of Weibo users to be able to participate, which means the spectrum of the participants in terms of their age and education background is wide. Thirdly, the topic is not targeted by censorship, for it does not contain any politically sensitive information which cannot pass the government's regulation. By analysing conversations in this double hashtag topic, the research aims to answer below research questions.

1.5 Research Question

The main research question of this study is: how a conversation in social media keeps going between interlocutors. In order to answer this question, the following ones need to be addressed.

Part (a): What are the main topics covered in the conversation?

As mentioned before, topic is one of the main characteristics of a conversation. If a conversation in social media can keep going, topics should play an important role. Furthermore, topics do not always remain the same in a conversation, they can be shifted or further developed. It is anticipated that topics in the Weibo conversation also shift or develop, and topic shifting or development may affect the continuance of the conversation.

To answer question (a), other related factors also need to be considered. 1) What are the main topics mentioned in the double hashtag topic? 2) What topics have been kept in the conversation? 3) What new topics have been introduced and developed, and how are they developed?

Methodology required in this research to answer question (a) is cohesion, as it reveals the semantic relations of lexical items in a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The cohesive items reflect not only the relations between topics covered in the conversation, but also the relations between these topics and the topics mentioned in the double hashtag topic.

When a conversation keeps going between interlocutors, multiple conversational turns

are generated. Therefore, it is also important to find out how conversational turns are generated, which is the part (b) of the main research question. The pragmatic framework of Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims is adopted to answer question (b), as this framework governs the progress of a conversation (Grice, 1975, 1989). More detailed review on the combined theoretical framework in this research is provided in Chapter Three.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Social Media Conversation: Twitter and Weibo

In recent years, conversations take place on social media, Twitter conversations in particular, have drawn the attention of researchers to investigate various aspects of such conversations. Several studies have been done on the patterns and structures of social media conversations. In Lipizzi, Iandoli, and Ramirez Marquez (2015), the conversational patterns of Twitter conversation on new products launching events are extracted and evaluated, using the common ground theory from conversational analysis. Concept map of keywords is extracted from the conversation to check the semantic relations of what has been discussed. It is suggested that coordination on UGC by Twitter users require them have mutual understanding on what is the subject of discussion. It should be noted that such study is heavily quantitative-based, which provides large statistic results for the purpose of business analysis and marketing; however, it could overlook the rich linguistic data presented in these Twitter conversations, where the qualitative features may reveal more about how to keep a social media conversation going.

Some studies focus on examining Twitter conversations at structural level. For example, in Boyd, Golder, and Lotan (2010), the practice of retweeting is examined in terms of how, why and what people retweet. The findings suggest that retweets can draw together tweets and provide a valuable infrastructure for Twitter conversation. By retweeting, people place them inside a conversation, thus the retweets can be referred as a conversational practice on social media. However, it is arguable that the content in the retweets contribute to the conversation, for the action of retweeting is simply forwarding (repeating) what other people previously said. Although retweeting does form continuance of conversations at

structural level, it is necessary to investigate tweets that facilitate conversations at content level in order to reveal how conversations develop in social media.

As a counterpart to Twitter, Weibo also has been studied in terms of conversational mechanism. Xia (2011) identifies four types of Weibo tweets as posting main tweet, commenting on the main tweet, forwarding tweet (retweeting), and tagging tweet. Utilising different types of tweets, Weibo conversations exhibit different conversational mechanisms, such as chain reaction conversation and diffusive conversation. In addition, this study touches on the topics in Weibo conversations by investigating what kind of general topics are more likely to form conversation among users. It provides preliminary material on the studies of Weibo conversations; nevertheless, due to the lack of attention on the actual content of the conversations, significant finding cannot be found on the relationship between the topics and the conversational mechanisms.

Apart from investigating the structural aspect of social media conversations, language features in text-based social media conversations form another research area. Zappavigna (2012, 2014, 2015) in particular, studies the language used in Twitter conversations and reveals how tweets under the same hashtag topic create social affiliation. Adopting the interpersonal function of language in Systemic Functional Linguistics, different corpora of tweets are exanimated, especially, the lexical items in the tweets that have appraisal features. The studies argue that those tweets contain a large number of emotional and evaluative language, which makes tweets to orient towards the expression of interpersonal meaning. The interpersonal function of tweets creates social affiliation among Twitter users, as well as enacts social identity.

Extending the investigation on Twitter conversation at lexical level, other linguistic research focuses on pragmatic features in Twitter conversations. Adopting Relevance Theory, Scott (2015) argues that Twitter's hashtag plays the role of activating certain contextual

assumptions and guiding Twitter users' inferential processes in conversation on hashtag topics. Twitter hashtag normally contains a short description about the topic, which is followed by the symbol #. This feature contributes to the relevance of conversation in which the 140-character limit may affect the meaning of the tweets in the tagged conversation.

Few studies on Weibo adopt pragmatic theories. Zhang and Kramarae (2014) investigate framing strategy used in Weibo conversations. They look at interactions generated by feminism protest on Weibo and finds out three prominent frames in the tweets, namely campaigning, debating and playing, which enlarge the public attention to discourses on gender equality.

It can be seen from the mentioned literature, conversation in social media has its research potential in a variety of areas. Despite the methods used and the aims fulfilled, the findings, overall, contribute to the understanding of social media conversations. This research also aims to fill in the gap in studying social media conversation, and the focus is shifted to how to keep a conversation going by investigating topics and conversation development of Weibo conversation.

2.2 Identifying Topics in Text-based Online Conversation

As previously mentioned (see Chapter one), a typical conversation consists of a series of topics or remarks produced by the interlocutors. Without a topic, a conversation could not continue or even start. Despite the important role of topic in a conversation, the definition of it is problematic in the field of linguistics, as there is no unified definition on what is a topic. It could be referred as "any object, person, location, action, state, or time that is mentioned in the sentence to be respond to" (Schank, 1977, p. 422). While others argue that topic should be differentiated by sentence level topic (Chafe, 1976) and local level topic (Walker, Joshi, & Prince, 1998). This research follows Schank's definition because what have been discussed in the tagged topic ('micro topic') are related to women (persons), marriage and tradition

(concepts). Identifying topics in a conversation requires key lexical items as an indicator (McCarthy, 1991), and in this research, cohesion is adopted to examine how semantic cohesion of lexical items across sentences reflect topics (Hoey, 1991).

Some existing research on identifying topics in social media adopts computational approach to predict trending topics (Dang, Gao, & Zhou, 2016; Zhao et al., 2014) or to find out the interests of social media users by extracting key keywords from their conversational topics (Liu, Chen, & Sun, 2012; Vicient & Moreno, 2015). In the former, spreading patterns of hot topics are calculated using different algorithms but the actual content of these topics are not taken into account, which could be considered as a weakness of quantitative research on topics in social media conversation. After all, 'user-generated content' is an essential property of social media, and without the understanding on the content, the frequency of topic spreading might lose its meaning. The later, on the other hand, does consider what have been mentioned in the topics, which result in the extraction of co-occurring keywords from text-based UGC. However, these studies only provide algorithm-methods for topic detection on social media conversation, not much analysis has been done on the content of the topics.

Despite the fact that the above-mentioned studies have overlooked the content of social media conversation, they have significant association with marketing and public relations, where the prediction on topics in social media is vital to the operation of businesses. The attention of social media users contributes to the collective awareness of what is considered important for them. This effect may drive the directions of decision-making of a company. However, there are certain factors may affect the accuracy of computational approach on finding out valuable topics, especially topics in Weibo. A study on Weibo trending topics (Yu et al., 2015) points out that retweets play an important role for the generation and persistence of trending topics. The study argues that public relation companies in China are responsible for the majority of popular topics on Weibo, and the content of these

topics are heavily controlled and manipulated. In this respect, trending topics may not be an ideal object for studying spontaneous conversation among Weibo users; therefore, this research does not employ trending topics for the investigation of the continuance of a Weibo conversation (see Chapter one for more details on the tagged Weibo topic in this thesis).

Topics in online conversation not only interest computational specialists, but also draw the attention of linguists. Using dynamic topic analysis, Herring (2003) tracks the topics that participants in online discussion forums have been talked about as conversations unfold dynamically over time. She compares topics in one pharmacy teaching and learning forum with those in three recreational forums and concludes that the conversations in recreational forums are highly digressive and fragmented, whereas the discussion topics in the pharmacy forum are relatively coherent and structured. The findings suggest that forums that are designed for specific purposes might facilitate topics coherence. This conclusion is confirmed by Stromer-Galley and Martinson (2009), who points out in her research that participants are able to sustain relatively coherent topics in political discussion forums. Despite the fact that topics in particular discussion forums have coherent feature in them, these researches have not investigated the relationship between topics and the continuance of the conversations, for topic is an essential component to any conversation. In addition, topics being investigated in these studies are from conversations that take place in specific communities, for example, people who study pharmacy or people who are interested in politics. In other words, these participants have specific knowledge on certain topics and tend to talk about these topics to people who share the same knowledge. Moreover, they have more control over the topics, which could influence topic coherence. However, most of the social media platforms are diverse places where all sorts of people interact with one and another. In this case, Weibo could be a more suitable to find out features of topics and their relation to the continuance of conversation.

2.3 Grice's Cooperative Principle and Its Four Maxims in Analysing Conversation

As an influential pragmatic framework, Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims has been adopted to investigate both face-to-face conversation and online conversation. In face-to-face context, Tajabadi, Dowlatabadi, and Mehri (2014) analyses courtroom conversations, in which the maxims of quality and manner are frequently followed but relation and quantity are not fulfilled. The authors suggest that the findings on patterns of courtroom conversations provide basis for the analysis on legal communication. In Atifi, Mandelcwajg, and Marcoccia (2011), the quantity maxim, in particular, is examined in newsgroup discussion forums, where the authors argue that online conversations are more likely to violate the quantity maxim due to the lack of contextual cue. By repeating what have been said or providing redundant information, misunderstanding could be reduced, and repetition can direct the participants to the core of the discussion topic, and hence, increases the coherence of the discussion. Since other maxims have not been examined in online conversations, this research aims to find out how Grice's theory works in relation to the continuance of social media conversation.

3. Methodology

3.1 The Conversation in #boycottingbaihe.com#

      3.1.1 Selection on conversations in #boycottingbaihe.com# for this research. The double hashtag topic facilitates conversations among Weibo users who are interested in expressing their ideas on marriage, tradition and women; however, it does not mean that any conversation in that double hashtag is suitable for this study to work on. As this research aims to investigate the continuance of social media conversation in terms of text-based language, selection on the conversations in # boycottingbaihe.com # is necessary. Three selection criteria emerge from the research aim: 'text-based language', 'conversation' and 'continuance'. To satisfy the first criterion, tweets that contain only emoji or multimodal resources are not selected. Retweets, individual tweets that do not initiate conversations are not selected either for the restriction of criterion two. The final selection narrows down to a conversation between two interlocutors which continues for 29 turns, for other conversations in the 'micro topic' do not generate as many conversational turns as the selected one.

      3.1.2 Methods for extracting and organising the texts of the conversation. Unlike Twitter that has a range of applications available for extracting texts from it, there is none for Weibo. After manually copying all texts of the conversation from the Weibo webpage to a text editor, a small corpus of the texts is built (see Appendix A). For analytical purpose, word count is done for the entire texts of the conversation as well as for each interlocutor's texts (also see Appendix A). Although the Weibo names for the interlocutors are available online, for reference purpose, they are referred as MG and FY in this research.

3.2 Clarification on Important Factors of the Conversation

      3.2.1 Background of the interlocutors. Some background information of MG and FY is open to public. As the gender preference in their online profiles shows 'Male' for both

of them, the pronoun selection in this research acknowledges their choices. The education level of MG is tertiary and FY is unknown. The place of residency of MG is Sichuan and FY is Beijing. As social background of the interlocutors is not essential to the analytical process, their profile information will not affect the result of this research.

3.2.2 The time factor of the conversation. The conversation started in 2016, two years after the initiation of the double hashtag topic. For the conversation to continue for 29 turns, the year of its initiation is an irrelevant factor in this research.

3.2.3 The conversational level of the conversation. Another factor that is worth clarifying is the conversational level where the conversation takes place. Two ways for a Weibo user to participate in the double hashtag topic are identified. Tweeting under the double hashtag topic indicates a direct relation to the topic. This type of participation (or tweet) forms the first level of the communicative organisation in the Weibo 'micro topic'. Second, commenting on other users' tweets of the 'micro topic' and that creates a subsequent relation to the topic, it is the level two communicative organisation of the tagged topic. The selected conversation occurs at level two, where it is initiated by a level one tweet from a third Weibo user. The level one tweet does not affect the analysis of the conversation, as the third Weibo user did not interact with MG or FY. For displaying conversational levels of 'micro topic' in Weibo, the level one tweet is also provided in Appendix A.

3.2.4 The missing tweets prior to the conversation. The first tweet in the selected conversation is the last response FY sent to an unidentified Weibo user X rather than to MG. This Weibo user withdrawn from his/her conversation with FY in 2014, and all tweets that s(h)e sent to FY cannot be retrieved. In 2016, MG responses to the last tweet FY sent to user X and starts the conversation with FY. In the meantime, user X does not interact with MG or FY. Hence, the missing tweets from user X have nothing to do with the selected conversation for this research.

3.2.5 The insignificant role emoji plays in the conversation. This conversation is heavily text-based with few emoji used. This fact coincides with research findings suggesting that Weibo users tend to compose tweets in one sentence or in a short paragraph when discussing hot issues (Li, 2014), and emoji is not always an essential component in Weibo tweets, although Weibo does have a range of emoji available (Xia, 2011). Under these circumstances, the role of emoji is not significant or novel in contributing to the development of the selected conversation. Therefore, emoji will not be analysed in this research.

3.3 Translation of the Conversation

The analysis is based on the Chinese texts, while English translation of the texts is provided for essential analytical process. For the purpose of this research, the translation strategy used here is semantic translation, which attempts to maintain the exact contextual meaning of the original language text while the syntactic and semantic structures of the target language allow (Newmark, 1982).

As online conversation can ignore language rules (Barton, 2001), the selected conversation contains several typos that are not relevant to the research questions. Hence, the typos are not reflected in the translation, and the correct characters of the typos are provided in brackets next to them in the Chinese texts. The conversation also contains words created by the interlocutors. The first time when a created word appears, Romanisation of the word is provided, and the meaning of it is explained later in the analysis. For example, "*妇权*" is a word created in the conversation and has no counterpart in English. Therefore, the Romanisation of the word "*Fu Quan*" is shown in translation, and the meaning of it is explained when analysing the texts.

3.4 Theoretical Framework: Cohesion and Grice's Cooperative Principle and Its Four Maxims

3.4.1 Cohesion: definition and justification for this research. Cohesion is a relational concept in linguistics, which shows the grammatical or the semantic relation of one

lexical item and another in a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Cohesion has an objective nature as cohesive items are on the surface of the text, which can be observed, counted and analysed (Tanskanen, 2006). Therefore, cohesive items in a text provide empirical grounded evidences for researching text-based conversation in online environment. It should be pointed out that cohesion relation is better to be analysed across sentences in a text, for this relation connects a series of sentences that makes a text 'hang together' (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

As the definition suggests, grammatical and semantic cohesion are two broad classifications of the cohesion domain, and they refer to different aspects of relation between lexical items. While grammatical cohesion emphases the structural relation between lexical items (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), for example, the conjunction words 'firstly' and 'secondly', semantic cohesion focuses on the relation of meanings in different lexical items (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). As this research interests in topics and topics shifting in a conversation, meanings in these topics are vital. Therefore, semantic cohesion in a series of lexical items is identified in order to reveal the relation of main topics in this conversation. As structural relation of lexical items could not provide any insight on how topics are developed, this research will not investigate grammatical cohesion in the texts.

3.4.2 Semantic cohesion: functions and types. Reference and lexical cohesion are the two categories of semantic cohesion introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They both form semantic connection between different lexical items or between a lexical item and other parts of a text, but reference and lexical cohesion are different according to their functions and types.

Reference signals the direct indication that information where a reference item appears is to be retrieved from elsewhere, in other words, reference cohesion is realised between the reference item and what they refer to in other parts of the text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). This specific nature of reference will reveal the connection among different topics in the

conversation as well as among conversational turns. The identification of a reference item is straightforward, as personals (e.g. personal pronouns), demonstratives (e.g. this, those, the) and comparatives (e.g. more, the same) are the common types of reference items. However, the interpretation of reference items requires more consideration, as they cannot be interpreted semantically in their own right (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), the other parts of a text where the items appear should be taken into account. For example, '*The icebergs at the South Pole melt at a dramatic rate. This* is caused by global warming.' The lexical item '*this*' is the reference item in the example, and what it refers is not a nearby lexical item, but a statement goes before it.

Compare with reference cohesion, lexical cohesion may play a more important role in identifying main topics and revealing topic shifting in the conversation, for it is the only category of cohesion that regularly forms multiple relationships among different lexical items (Hoey, 1991). Reiteration and collocation are the two types of lexical cohesion, and they work collaboratively to answer research question (a) proposed in section 1.5.

Reiteration of certain lexical items in the conversation plays the role of identifying main topics in the conversation. If certain lexical items are reiterated many times in a conversation compare with others, there is a probability that these items form the main topics. The types of reiteration includes the repetition of the same word (*mushroom-mushroom*), synonym (*sword-brand*), superordinate (*Jaguar-car*), and the use of a general word (We all kept quiet. That seemed the best *move*) (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Apart from the four types of reiteration, Hoey (1991) introduces specification, another type of reiteration, where a lexical item contains some specified information on another (*scientist-biologist*).

Another category of lexical cohesion is collocation. It refers to a more complicated and indirect relation of lexical items. The identifying of collocation will improve the understanding on topic shifting in the conversation. The term 'collocation' is different from

the traditional definition that describes two lexical items normally or conventionally appear together. Here it refers to the semantic association which is achieved by two lexical items that tend to appear in a similar context (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). For the complicated nature of collocation, it cannot be divided into distinct types. The interpretation of collocation is on case-by-case basis. For example, *joke* and *laugh* are collocated cohesively as they have a causal association; *basement* and *roof* are also collocated for they are both a part of a house, the relationship between the two lexical items is indirect (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

3.4.3 Cohesive unit, presupposed distance item and cohesive items. As can be seen from the examples demonstrated previously, lexical cohesive items come in pairs, and they do have specific names for their orders of appearance in a text. Although a cohesive unit has semantic meaning in a sentence, it cannot be cohesive by itself, for the cohesive relation is formed through other presupposed elements in the preceding sentences. The item that has gone before the cohesive unit is called presupposed distance item (hereafter PDI) (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Adopting Halliday and Hasan's example "We all *kept quiet*. That seemed *the best move*", '*the best move*' in the second sentence is the cohesive unit because it refers back to the PDI '*kept quiet*' in the preceding sentence.

In this research, cohesive units and PDIs are referred as lexical cohesive items. Reference items and what they refer to (can be lexical items or an entire tweet) are called reference cohesive items. All items that form cohesive relations are called cohesive items regardless of their classifications.

3.4.4 Minimum unit for selecting cohesive items for analysing purpose. A cohesive item can be as small as a single word or as large as multiple lexical items, such as idioms (Martin, 1992). As previous examples indicate, single words are usually selected as the basic unit in identifying semantic cohesion; however, for the functioning of cohesion in the text, the number of lexical items in a unit is irrelevant (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004;

Martin, 1992). Based on this ground, the selection of cohesive items for analytical propose in this research does not restrict to single word but can be extended to multiple lexical items.

      3.4.5 Selecting nominal groups as cohesive items to answer research question (a). Although there is no restriction on the minimum unit of cohesive items, it does not mean that any class of lexical items should be selected for analytical purpose in this research. As the research involves the investigation on topics in the conversation, nominal groups in the interlocutors' texts are selected in order to identify the cohesive relations among them. Nominal groups carry the information of topics in a conversation, which represents a person (or a group of people), a thing or a concrete or abstract idea, and hence, it is crucial to identify nominal groups in the selected conversation and to find out how they related to each other in the conversation.

      The term 'nominal group' is used interchangeably with 'nominal phrase' by some people; however, they refer to different concept in linguistics. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) make it very clear that a group is "an expansion of a word", whereas a phrase is "a contraction of a clause". This thesis follows Hallidayan tradition of 'nominal group'. Adopted from Fang (2015, p. 5), four criteria are needed to identify nominal groups in this research:

1.   A nominal group must consist of a nominal head.
2.   A nominal group may consist of only one word, which is the nominal head.
3.   Nominal head can be expanded through different types of modification, for example, modification of reference items.
4.   A nominal group must represent a person (or a group of people), a thing or a concrete or abstract idea.

      3.4.6 Overview on the Cooperative Principle and its four maxims. The

Cooperative Principle (hereafter the CP) and its four maxims describe the basic of human conversation. Grice (1975, 1989) realises that human conversations exhibit cooperative efforts of the interlocutors because talk exchanges (even casual conversations) normally consist of a succession of connected topics or remarks. Consciously or not, each interlocutor recognises a common purpose or a set of purposes in the conversation, and as a result, they collaboratively engage in the talk exchange. From the mentioned characteristics, Grice (1989) formulates a general principle as a set of over-arching assumptions that guide the conduct of conversation: "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p.26).

The way that Grice describes the principle makes people take it as a strict set of rules that one must follow, but that is not Grice's intention (Thomas, 1995). As mentioned before, these are assumptions each interlocutor assumes the other party to work on in a conversation. The CP provides guidelines for the use of language in conversation to facilitate cooperative ends (Levinson, 1983). Another misinterpretation of the CP is the way people understand the term 'cooperation' (or 'cooperative'). Davies (2007) states that Grice himself did not provide sufficient explanation on what is 'cooperation' or use this term in his later work; nevertheless, the term in a Gricean's sense is different from the everyday notion of cooperation, and therefore, requires clarification. She points out that some researchers misinterpret 'cooperation' as 'the general atmosphere of cooperativeness and harmony (Stenström, 1994)' of a conversation; however, what Grice actually meant should be 'rationality' (Davies, 2007). It should be made clear that the aim of the research is not about debating terminology of the CP. The reasons to point out the misinterpretations of the CP are: firstly, this research acknowledges the criticism on the framework, and more importantly, it is to show that the criticism on the CP does not affect the result of the research because the selected conversation does not exhibit a harmonious effect between the two interlocutors. This leads to the third

clarification on the CP where the operation of the framework also works for people who have different goals in a conversation. The interlocutors can have an argument with each other, yet still act cooperatively in the talk exchange (Archer, Aijmer, & Wichmann, 2012). In this instance, it is obvious that 'cooperatively' does not mean harmony at all. For the purpose of clarification in this research, 'cooperation' could be understood as 'collaboratively engage in the talk exchange' (adopted from Grice 1975). In the 29-turn conversation, the CP plays an important role. If the interlocutors did not cooperate/engage in the tweet exchanges, the conversation would not last long or even could not exist.

       3.4.7 The four maxims in Grice's Cooperative Principle. The CP includes four maxims, Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner, which offer detailed descriptions on how to use language in a cooperative way. Each of the maxims accompanies with sub-maxim(s) and they are formulated as follows (Grice, 1989, pp. 26-27):

Quantity:	Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
	Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
Quality:	Do not say what you believe to be false.
	Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
Relation:	Be relevant.
Manner:	Avoid obscurity of expression.
	Avoid ambiguity.
	Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
	Be orderly.

These maxims do not summarise all regularities in human interactions; they are only one particular set of regularities for people to engage in efficient and effective conversation (Thomas, 1995). In order to demonstrate how two interlocutors strictly perform a conversation according to the four maxims, Thomas (1995) provides an example between husband and wife:

Husband: Where are the car keys?

Wife: They're on the table in the hall.

In this example, the wife's answer is clear (Manner) and truthful (Quality). She has directly addressed her husband's question (Relation) and has said precisely what she meant, with no more or less information (Quantity).

However, this research is not about investigating the efficiency or the effectiveness of a social media conversation, or how two interlocutors perform conversation on social media according the requirement of the four maxims, because it is an ideal case that people fulfil the four maxims in a conversation from the beginning to the end. In real life, they often break the maxims.

3.4.8 Non-observance of the maxims. There are four major ways which a maxim is not fulfilled (adopted from Grice 1975, 1989):

Flouting: A speaker overtly breaks a maxim with the intention that a hearer will notice this and infer an implicature.

Violation: A speaker covertly breaks a maxim which aims to deliberately mislead a hearer. It is not the speaker's intention to let the hearer notice the breaching.

Infringing: A speaker unintentionally breaks a maxim because he or she might have some degree of imperfect linguistic performance.

Opt-out: A speaker shows his/her unwillingness to cooperate.

Using the husband and wife example, the wife could flout the maxim of Quality by saying " They're somewhere over the rainbow." The car keys could not possibly be in a place over the rainbow; therefore, the wife has intentionally provided an untruthful answer to generate an implicature that she wants her husband to infer, which is "I don't know where they are."

An important clarification should be made here is that the non-observance of the maxims does not necessarily lead to a breakdown in interaction (Levinson, 1983). Even if people do not fulfil the four maxims, a conversation can still goes on. The non-observance of the maxims reveals how interlocutors use language to achieve their communicative goals at the same time keep the conversation going. In the selected conversation, it is expected that FY and MG do not fulfil the four maxims, and by examining how they break a maxim, this research addresses the strategies of making the conversation going.

3.4.9 Clarification on the non-observance of the maxims in this research. It should be noted that in Grice's theory, infringing occurs when an interlocutor have imperfect command of the language. For example, people with aphasia or young children whose language skills have not been fully developed may unintentionally infringe a maxim during a conversation. In this research, the selected conversation shows no evidence that any of the interlocutors has linguistic incapability; therefore, infringing is not considered.

This research strictly follows the Gricean terminology in terms of 'violation' (or 'violate'), although some people use 'violate' and 'break' interchangeably when they refer to any of non-observance of the maxims (Thomas, 1995). As mentioned earlier, the notion of

violation is used to describe a speaker 'unostentatiously' misleads a hearer in the way a maxim requires, and it should not be mixed up with other expressions.

The selected conversation is coded according to the non-observance of the four maxims. Any non-observance of the four maxims is highlighted and marked for analysing purpose (see Appendix F). Examples are given in the data analysis chapter.

4. Data Analysis

This chapter aims to show how analysis is done in compliance with the proposed theoretical framework. The analysis of the conversation starts with the identification of cohesive items in terms of nominal groups in each interlocutor's texts. Following cohesion, the analysis focuses on the identification of non-observance of the maxims in the conversation. Due to word limit of this thesis, the full analysis of the conversation in compliance with the theoretical framework is provided as appendices. Appendices B and C cover the identification of lexical cohesive items of the conversation. Appendices D and E include the identification of reference cohesive items of the conversation. Appendix F presents the identification of non-observance of the four maxims. Each appendix accompanies with a detailed description of the symbols and codes used in the analysis. In each appendix, the texts are marked in terms of conversational turns, for example, the initial tweet posted by FY is marked as T1, and MG's reply to T1 is marked as T2, and so on. All sentences of the conversation in Appendices B, C, D and E are numbered for reference.

4.1 Selecting Sample Texts for Data Analysis

4.1.1 Selection criteria for sample texts to identify lexical cohesion. The selection of a text is based on the number of cohesive units in it and the complexity of their relations to the PDIs. It is expected that when the explanation on more complicated examples is provided, the less complicated ones can be understood. Two pieces of texts from each interlocutor are selected; they are T10 and T18 from MG, and T1 and T23 from FY.

4.1.2 Selection criteria for sample texts to identify reference cohesion. There is no specific rule on which texts should be selected because the identification of reference cohesive items is less complicated than that of lexical cohesive items. Many of the reference items, especially the personals are very straightforward to be located and interpreted.

However, word limit affects the selection. Therefore, if the sample texts selected for identifying lexical cohesion also contain reference cohesive items, these samples are used to explain the relation between reference items and what they refer to. One text is chosen from each interlocutor; they are T10 from MG, and T3 (a) from FY.

4.1.3 Selection criteria for sample texts to identify non-observance of a maxim. Three types of non-observance of a maxim are presented in this conversation (see Appendix F), and they are flouting, violation and opting-out. Opting-out only has one example, which is T28; hence, it is selected for demonstration. The manner maxim is observed in the conversation, but the maxims of relation, quantity and quality are either flouted or violated. T2 contains all three maxims that have been flouted, and it is selected. To demonstrate violation of relation, adjacency pair of conversational turns should be taken into consideration. As T2 is selected as a flouting example, the following turn T3 (a) is selected. Due to word limit, T23 that has been used as a sample for lexical cohesion are re-selected for presenting violation of quantity. T26 is used to demonstrate violation of quality.

4.2 Translation and Coding Scheme

Translation of the selected samples is provided when a sample text first appears in this chapter. Translation of the samples that appear the second time is not repeated due to word limit. Translation for T28 is not provided either, as it is the only example for opting out and does not contribute to the continuance of the conversation (see section 4.4.5 for more details). Therefore, T28 is considered as irrelevant to answer the research questions. Lexical cohesive units are coded to categorise two types of lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation (see Table 1 below as an example). In below table, woman can be reiterated as housewife, for the later carries specific information defining woman's role at home. Reiteration in terms of same word repetition is not explained in the following analysis.

Table 1:

Coding scheme for the types of cohesive units

TYPE	EXAMPLE	CODING
Reiteration	*woman*, *housewife*	R
Collocation	*reproduction*, *population*	C

Coding scheme is not required for identifying reference cohesion. As mentioned previously in methodology, reference items do not form reiteration or collocation relations. In addition, the information that a reference item refers is not necessarily a lexical item but can be an entire tweet. Hence, it is not applicable to have a coding scheme for reference cohesion. The identification of non-observance of the maxims does not accompany with coding scheme either, for the CP framework does not require such.

4.3 Cohesive Relation Identified in the Sample Texts

4.3.1 Lexical cohesive items in MG's texts.

Sample text 1 (T10)

拒绝。(12) 你这是要逼着女孩子们远离你们的理论。(13) 没有任何受过现代教育的女孩子会乐意生这么多！(14) 你以为，生而不养值得骄傲？(15) 你得清楚现在的婚姻法和社保制度有多对不起家庭主妇！(16)

[Reject. (12) You are forcing girls to stay away from your theory. (13) No girl has taken modern education wants to give birth to so many children! (14) You think, giving birth to children without nurturing them is something one can be proud of? (15) You must see the current marriage law and social security system treat housewives very badly! (16)]

Table 2

Cohesion in T10

Cohesive unit	In sentence	Type	Presupposed distance item	In sentence
girl has taken modern education	(14)	R	*girls*	(13)
give birth to so many children	(14)	C	*your theory*	(13)
giving birth to children without nurturing them	(15)	C	*give birth to so many children*	(14)
marriage law	(16)	C	*girls*	(13)
social security system	(16)	C	*girls*	(13)
housewives	(16)	C	*girls*	(13)

In sentence 14, the cohesive unit "*girl has taken modern education*" is a reiteration of the PDI "*girls*" in sentence 13. The PDI is a general term that refers to any female person, while the cohesive unit carries specified information, which defines a particular group of girls who refuse to accept FY's idea. Also in sentence 14, "*give birth to so many children*" refers back to "*your theory*". It should be noted that there is an indirect relation between the two, and the interpretation of the collocation relation should consider the function of reference item in "*your theory*". More detailed explanation on this example is provided in section 4.3.3.

In sentence 15, the cohesive unit "*giving birth to children without nurturing them*" is a collocation of the PDI "*give birth to so many children*" in sentence 14. In this collocation pair, same lexical item "*give birth*" is repeated. However, the repetition does not form reiteration, because in the cohesive unit "*give birth*" is followed by an emphasis on the importance of raising up children, whereas that in the PDI focuses on the number of children to be born.

In sentence 16, the cohesive unit "*housewives*" is a collocation of the PDI "*girls*" in sentence 13. The cohesive unit refers to women's role at home, whereas the PDI is a general term to describe female persons.

In sentence 16, both cohesive units, "*marriage law*" and "*social security system*" are collocations of the PDI "*girls*" in sentence 13. Their relationships are built by another lexical

item "*housewives*" in sentence 16. Housewives have a direct relationship with marriage law and social security system mentioned in sentence 16, where MG argues that the current law and social security system do not treat housewives well. As analysed before, "*housewives*" is a collocation of "*girls*", and moreover, girls are legally bound with marriage law and social security system once they are married and become housewives.

Sample text 2 (T18)

正是因为女孩子看着自己的奶奶外婆妈妈等女性亲属们过的有多艰难！（32）才会远离灾难！（33）你不可否认，在家庭中，父亲角色经常是缺位的！（34）况且女孩子的人生绝不可能就是生生生！（35）你再这么有底气说你的女性的付出时，也请你想想怎么让她们享受到付出后的果实！（36）
[It is just because girls see the difficulties their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives have! (32) Then they stay away from disasters! (33) You can't deny, in a family, the role of father is often missing! (34) And a girl's life is definitely not only about giving birth! (35) When you confidently talk about your (understanding of) women's sacrifices, please also think about how to let them enjoy the harvest for their sacrifices! (36)]

Table 3

Cohesion in T18

Cohesive unit	In sentence	Type	Presupposed distance item	In sentence
family	(34)	C	*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*	(32)
the role of father	(34)	C	*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*	(32)
girl's life	(35)	C	*girls*	(32)
girl's life	(35)	C	*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*	(32)
giving birth	(35)	C	*girls*	(32)
giving birth	(35)	C	*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*	(32)
giving birth	(35)	C	*family*	(34)
women's sacrifices	(36)	C	*family*	(34)
harvest	(36)	C	*family*	(34)
women's sacrifices	(36)	C	*giving birth*	(35)
harvest	(36)	C	*giving birth*	(35)

In sentence 34, two cohesive units "*family*" and "*the role of father*" are collocations of the PDI "*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*" in sentence 32. The women mentioned in the PDI and father mentioned in "*the role of father*" are members of a family, where they are all important parts.

In sentence 35, the cohesive unit "*a girl's life*" is a collocation of the PDI "*girls*" in sentence 32, as the focus of the cohesive unit is shifted from biological identity of female to the social aspect of human existence. "*a girl's life*" is also a collocation of another PDI "*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*" in sentence 32. Their relation is realised through the PDI "*girls*", as both PDIs represent different roles that girls play in certain stages of their lives.

In sentence 35, the cohesive unit "*giving birth*" is collocated with two PDIs, "*girls*" and "*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*" in sentence 32, because the collocation pair indicates female persons, and only female has the biologic ability to give birth to children. "*Giving birth*" is also collocated with the PDI "*family*" in sentence 34. Women who give birth to children become mothers, and both mothers and children are family members.

In sentence 36, both cohesive units, "*women's sacrifices*" and "*harvest*" are collocations of the PDI "*family*" in sentence 34. As mentioned in the text, the difficulties women have is a result of taking full responsibility to look after families, in other words, it is a type of sacrifice they make for their families. Hence, "*women's sacrifices*" and "*family*" collocate with each other. The cohesive unit "*harvest*" is a metaphor MG uses to refer to the payback for "*women's sacrifices*", the lexical item connects "*harvest*" with "*family*". There is a same relation among the cohesive units "*women's sacrifices*" and "*harvest*" and the PDI "*giving birth*".

In sample texts 1 and 2, lexical cohesion can be found across different sentences within one text. Beyond this level, the two texts are also cohesive to each other, for they are connected by the PDIs and cohesive units related to the same semantic domain of women. These lexical items form a chain of cohesion as follows:

girls(13)—*girl has taken modern education*(14)—*housewives*(16)—*girls*(32)—*their grandmothers, mothers and other female relatives*(32)—*a girl's life*(35)—*women's sacrifices* (36)

The lexical items in this chain frequently appear in MG's texts, and they will be further discussed in the next chapter.

4.3.2 Lexical cohesive items in FY's texts. As can be seen from the sample texts 3 and 4 below, FY's tweets are not well organised in terms of sentence structure, especially punctuation (see more examples in Appendix C). Full stops and commas are misused, which creates sentence fragments and makes it difficult to analyse FY's texts, because cohesion in a text is realised across sentences according to Halliday and Hasan (1976). Nevertheless, as online language often ignores language rules (Barton, 2001), if the texts are produced in that way, they need to be analysed accordingly.

Sample text 3 (T1)

就是欺负你这文盲，不懂文化，不懂历史。（1）你要知道，一个社会的发展，女权主义这种自由社会的糟糠，你绝对不该学，你该学的该是叫"妇权主义"，女权和妇权只有一字之差，但女权是自私自利，而妇权是代表责任心。（2）因为妇女(妇权)是在生育孩子的前提下，保证妇女的权益。（3）
[Just to target you illiterate, knows nothing about culture, history. (1) You should know, (for) a society's development, you must stay away from feminism, rubbish from the liberal society, what you should learn is "*Fu Quan Zhu Yi*", Although the spelling of *Fu Quan* and feminism are quite similar (in Chinese), feminism is selfish, *Fu Quan* represents responsibility. (2) It is because with its prerequisite of giving birth to children, *Fu Quan* protects women's rights. (3)]

Table 4

Cohesion in T1

Cohesive unit	In sentence	Type	Presupposed distance item	In sentence
a society's development	(2)	C	*culture*	(1)
a society's development	(2)	C	*history*	(1)
rubbish from the liberal society	(2)	C	*culture*	(1)
rubbish from the liberal society	(2)	C	*history*	(1)
Fu Quan	(3)	C	*feminism*	(2)
Fu Quan	(3)	R	*Fu Quan*	(2)
its prerequisite of giving birth to children	(3)	C	*responsibility*	(2)
women's rights	(3)	C	*feminism*	(2)
women's rights	(3)	C	*Fu Quan*	(2)

In sentence 2 of T1, the Chinese word "主义" (*Zhu Yi*) in "女权主义" (*feminism*) and "妇权主义" (*Fu Quan Zhu Yi*) functions as the suffix "-ism" in English, but it does not affect the meaning in Chinese. In other words, "*Fu Quan Zhi Yi*" and "*Fu Quan*" are interchangeable. As FY chooses to use the shorter version in the rest of this turn, it is analysed accordingly.

In sentence 2, the cohesive unit "*a society's development*" is a collocation of the two PDIs "*culture*" and "*history*", for they focus on different factors of a human society. It is the same collocation relation between "*rubbish from the liberal society*" and "*culture*" and "*history*".

In sentence 3, the cohesive unit "*Fu Quan*" is a collocation of "*feminism*" in sentence 2. Although the two concepts are different to FY, both relate to women's rights in a society. For the same reason, the cohesive unit "*women's rights*" in sentence 3 is a collocation of the PDIs "*feminism*" and "*Fu Quan*" in sentence 2.

In sentence 3, the cohesive unit "*its prerequisite of giving birth to children*" is a collocation of "*responsibility*" in sentence 2, where FY claims that "*Fu Quan*" represents "*responsibility*", yet he does not mention what kind of responsibility he refers to. Later on, he

further explains "*Fu Quan*" by foregrounding women's obligation of reproduction, which is an elaboration on his understanding of "*responsibility*".

Sample text 4 (T23)

承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍)(82)—————以后规定，多生孩子的有抚养金，有福利津贴。(83) 还要成立淑女学校，把一些思想素质好的女孩子培训成为贤妻良母，让她们明白，生儿育女才能维持国家强大，希望她们多做贡献。(84)

[Admitting women's family-bound sacrifices and giving them a better treatment, it is indeed difficult to decide (which one) should be taken action upon (82)——— from now on, (women who) give birth to more children are entitled to childcare payment and social welfare allowance. (83) And school for ladies should be established, (where) certain good-minded girls should be trained to be dedicated wives and ideal mothers, and let them understand, giving birth to children can keep a nation powerful and strong, hope they can make more contributions. (84)]

Table 5

Cohesion in T23

Cohesive unit	In sentence	Type	Presupposed distance item	In sentence
(women who) give birth to more children	(83)	C	*women's family-bound sacrifices*	(82)
childcare payment	(83)	C	*a better treatment*	(82)
social welfare allowance	(83)	C	*a better treatment*	(82)
giving birth to children	(84)	C	*women's family-bound sacrifices*	(82)
certain good-minded girls	(84)	C	*(women who) give birth to more children*	(83)
dedicated wives and ideal mothers	(84)	C	*(women who) give birth to more children*	(83)
giving birth to children	(84)	C	*(women who) give birth to more children*	(83)

In this turn, sentence 82 repeats exactly what MG says in T22. Same strategy is also used in T15, T17 and T27 where FY quotes directly form MG's previous tweets to address certain points that MG mentions. In T23, FY addresses two points "*women's family-bound sacrifices*" and "*a better treatment*" in MG's previous tweet.

In response to the PDI "*a better treatment*" initiated by MG, the cohesive units "*childcare payment*" and "*social welfare allowance*" in sentence 83 are introduced. "*Treatment*" in Chinese can be referred to salary. This meaning is well reflected in "*childcare payment*" and "*social welfare allowance*", both are related to different types of social security payments.

In sentence 83, the cohesive unit "*(women who) give birth to more children*" is a collocation of the PDI "*women's family-bound sacrifices*" in sentence 82. As analysed in MG's sample texts in T18, giving birth to children is a type of sacrifice women make, which is also the same relation between the cohesive unit "*giving birth to children*" in sentence 84 and the PDI "*women's family-bound sacrifices*" in sentence 82.

In sentence 84, both "*certain good-minded girls*" and "*a dedicated wife and an ideal mother*" collocates with the PDI "*(women who) give birth to more children*" in sentence 83. The two cohesive units are both related to women, the former emphasises on the quality that women possessed and the later focuses on women's gender role in a family, whereas the PDI highlights the biologic ability of women.

Cohesion also exists in sample texts 3 and 4, and the lexical items form a chain as follows:

giving birth to children(3)—*(women who) give birth to more children*(83)— *giving birth to children*(84)

The lexical items in this chain are in the semantic domain of reproduction, which frequently appear in FY's texts, and they will be further discussed in the next chapter.

4.3.3 Reference cohesive items in MG's text. As mentioned in section 4.3.1 (T10), the PDI "*your theory*" collocates with the cohesive unit "*give birth to so many children*".

Reference item in the PDI plays an important role in interpreting the relation of the two cohesive items. In the PDI, "*your*" is a personal reference item addresses FY, and it modifies the item "*theory*". This modification indicates that the theory MG mentioned in T10 has a direct relation with FY's ideas in previous turns. From Appendix C, it is not difficult to work out that FY promotes the importance of reproduction and population. Therefore, "*your theory*" refers back to what FY said in previous turns, and indirectly relates to "*give birth to so many children*".

4.3.4 Reference cohesive items in FY's text.

Sample text 5 (T3 (a))

如果按照你们这种做法，我们的生育率就会暴跌，人口减少，缺乏家庭主妇，没人生儿育女，导致人口老化，社会衰退。知道你们这种做法的危害？？
[If (all) follow what you are doing, our birth rate will sharply drop, population will decline, lack of housewives, no one will give birth to children, which leads to population ageing, society declining. Know the harm of your doing??]

Reference items in this text are "*you*" and "*what*" which both modifies "*doing*". The second person pronoun "*you*" (as plural in Chinese) indicates a direct reference to MG and people who share the same view on feminist with MG. Therefore, "*what*" should refer to the information in previous turns of MG's texts. As can be seen from the Appendices, prior to T3 (a), MG only sent on tweet, which is T2; therefore, the information on "*what*" refers should be in T2 only. In T2, MG supports the idea of feminist, and it is the information that "*what*" refers to.

4.4 Non-observance of the Maxims Identified in the Sample Texts

4.4.1 Flouting the maxim of relation, quantity and quality.

Sample text 6 (T2: MG to FY)

你别结婚吧，女孩子长大也不容易。妇权依附男权，女权的发展势不可挡！如果和平的手段无法推进，你们会看到你们想要的彻底对立！
[You'd better not get married, (for) girls do not grow up without any difficulty. *Fu Quan* is dependent on patriarchy, the spread of feminism is unstoppable! If it can't be popularised in a peaceful way, you'll see the complete opposition you want!]

This turn is the first tweet MG sends to FY, where MG flouts three maxims: relation, quantity and quality. To identify the flouting of relation and infer the implicature, here as a showcase, a step-by-step explanation in compliance with Grice's procedure is provided. In the rest of the analysis in this section, general explanations are given.

The sample text above contains three sentences. The first sentence presents a flouting of the maxim of relation. Detailed explanation is as follows: (1) In T1, FY promotes his idea of "*Fu Quan*" and expresses his disagreement with feminism. (2) If MG tries to be cooperative, he should attend to the topic that FY initiated in T1. (3) However, the sentence is irrelevant to the topic which means MG breaks the maxim of relation. (4) On the assumption that the CP is in operation, MG has no reason to be deliberately uncooperative unless he does not want to have a conversation with FY. (5) Hence, it is not MG's intention to suggest that FY should not get married, for girls do not grow up without any difficulty. (6) MG flouts the maxim of relation. (7) There is an implied meaning in the sentence. (8) To infer the implicature, what is said in the previous turn and what is said after the implicature should be checked. (9) In T1, FY creates a term "*Fu Quan*", by using which, he argues that women's rights should be reproduction-bound. (10) In the second sentence in T2, MG suggests that FY's "*Fu Quan*" is subject to patriarchy, which reflects MG's disagreement with FY. (11) In a single turn in a conversation, the interlocutor should keep consistence of what he or she argues for. (12) Therefore, sentence one in T2 is an expression of MG's disagreement in another way. (13) To express the disagreement, MG implies that every girl should stay away from people like FY who advocates "*Fu Quan*", because if a girl marries someone like FY, she will be at the mercy of FY's interpretation of "*Fu Quan*", which in MG's opinion is something girls should definitely avoid. (14) Hence, sentence one is not irrelevant to the topic in the turn. It shows MG's strategy to imply his disagreement. (15) MG expects FY to infer

the implicature. (16) This implicature signals that MG is going to shift the conversational topic to his own interest.

In sentence two, MG repeats FY's "*Fu Quan*" from T1. The repetition bridges what is said in T1 and what is said in T2, which reflects MG's willingness to cooperate in the conversation, even though the two interlocutors disagree with each other. In this sentence, MG flouts the maxim of quantity by not providing adequate information. He does not explain why the spread of feminism is unstoppable, so the link between "*Fu Quan is dependent on patriarchy*" and "*the spread of feminism is unstoppable*" is missing. What MG implies here is while feminism fights for gender equality and encourages women to become independent, "*Fu Quan*", is a dependant of patriarchy, which means there is no equality between men and women. That is why "*Fu Quan*" is not acceptable or sustainable to MG. As this deduction is not provided in the turn, "*the spread of feminism is unstoppable*" is a flouting of the maxim of quantity.

In the last sentence in T2, MG flouts the maxim of quality. In T1, FY fiercely criticises feminism by introducing his self-created concept of "*Fu Quan*", yet he does not mention he wants to see any serious conflict between the advocators of feminism and those of "*Fu Quan*". Therefore, when saying the complete opposition is what FY wants, MG is not telling a truth, which flouts the maxim of quality. By doing so, MG implies the consequence of being against with feminism is not what FY wants, which strengthens what MG stands for.

4.4.2 Violation of relation. The sample text to demonstrate violation of relation is T3 (a), which is the reply to T2. The original text and its translation of T3 (a) are already provided in section 4.3.4, same information will not be repeated. T3 (a) is the first reply FY sends to MG, where FY addresses what MG argues for by using the deixis "*what*" and "*you*" in the clause "*If (all) follow what you are doing*" at the beginning. It shows FY's gesture of observing the CP rules. However, the role this clause plays is only a condition of what is

introduced in the main clause, where FY's real focus is revealed. In the main clause, FY shifts his topic to social issues that are not mentioned before by either of the interlocutors. In other words, FY introduces new topics that are not relevant to the current talk exchange, which means he does not fulfil the maxim of relation. As analysed before, FY's intention is to advocate "*Fu Quan*" that emphasises on women's obligation of reproduction. In T3 (a), FY suggests that feminism encourages women not to have children, of which the consequence is a chain reaction from low fertility rate to society declining. By addressing this chain reaction that may be caused by feminism, FY foregrounds the significance of reproduction and shifts the discussion topic from feminism to the one that interests him. Therefore, FY violates the maxim of relation. His intention of wanting MG to be misled by the consequences of feminism is reinforced by the interrogative sentence in the end of T3 (a) to question MG about the harm of feminism to a society.

4.4.3 Violation of quantity. As mentioned in section 4.3.2 (T23: FY to MG), FY directly quotes a sentence from what MG says in the preceding turn (T22). By quoting, the same information in the current talk exchange has been repeated, and hence, the quantity maxim is not fulfilled. The direct quotation does not generate an implicature to be inferred; therefore, the maxim of quantity is not flouted. It seems that FY observes the information in the preceding turn (T22) by quoting a part of it; however, following the quotation, FY begins to express his own ideas. In other words, FY violates the maxim of quality by quoting.

4.4.4 Violation of quality.

Sample text 7 (T26: MG to FY)

那么可以明确告诉你，没有真正爱孩子的会送他们去所谓的女德班，淑女学校！她们都是人！她们有资格选择自己是一个怎样的人！拥有怎样的人生！你就不用忽悠小年轻了！大家都不傻！没有人会为了迎合你们，就磋磨自己的孩子！
[(I can) tell you clearly, no (one) who loves (their) children will send them to the so-called school for ladies! They are people! They have the rights to choose what kind of person they want to be! What kind of life (they want to live)! You stop lying to young people! We are not fools! No one will let their children suffer for the sake of satisfying you!]

The violation of quality take places at the sentence "*You stop lying to young people*", as MG tells an untrue statement that fails to fulfil the quality maxim. It is observed from the previous turns that FY has never mentioned directly or indirectly that his ideas target young people, for he aims to send his messages across to people who support feminist. MG breaks the quality maxim not for generating an implicature for FY to infer, his intention is to mislead FY that young people are those who support feminist, and they are different from the older generation who can be easily fooled by the so-called tradition.

4.4.5 Opting out. The action of opting out signals the uncooperativeness of an interlocutor, which a maxim requires (Grice, 1975, 1989). The consequence of opting out is straightforward in this conversation, which lead to the end of it. MG is the first one to signal his unwillingness to continue the conversation in T28, the second last turn of the whole conversation. MG clearly states his intention to end his conversation with FY by saying "*No need to argue anymore*" at the beginning of T28, which is irrelevant to any topics discussed, and there is no new topic coming afterwards. In this way, MG opts out the relation maxim. As MG withdraws from the conversation in this turn, the strategy of opting out does not contribute to the continuance in the conversation, further analysis on opting out is not necessary for this research.

4.4.6 Statistic data of non-observance of the maxims in the conversation. As can be seen from Appendix F, the number of times that non-observance of the maxims occurs in the conversation is 67. Some maxims are more frequently violated than others are, whereas some are more likely to be flouted than violated. Concrete evidence is required to verify the observation. Therefore, statistic calculation is needed to find out which maxim is most frequently not fulfilled, and which type of non-observance dominates the conversation. The statistic results (see Appendix G) will provide evidence for discussing the roles that non-observance of the maxims play in continuing the conversation.

It can be seen from Appendix G, violation appears in more turns than flouting does in the selected conversation. In 29 turns, violation occurs in 26 of them, whereas flouting takes place in 8 turns (violation and flouting can both exist in a turn). The number of times that the maxims are violated is 54 compared with 12 times when the maxims are flouted (a maxim can be violated or flouted for multiple times in a turn).

The most frequently violated maxim is relation, followed by quantity. However, violation of relation and quantity exhibit different patterns in each interlocutor's texts. Both interlocutors violate the relation maxim, where MG violates it in 11 turns, and FY does the same in 13 turns. Although the maxim of relation is violated for 20 times in FY's texts compared with 13 times in MG's texts, given the fact that FY's texts is about twice as long as MG's, violation of relation plays an important role in both interlocutor's texts. In the 29-turn conversation, FY uses violation of quantity in 11 turns with the frequency of 18 times. Conversely, none of the quantity maxim is violated in MG's texts.

It should be noted that the statistic results are not for explaining why violation of relation is preferred by both interlocutors or violation of quantity is only used by FY in the conversation, for this research aims to find out how a conversation keeps going between two interlocutors on existing textual evidences. Consequently, the role of statistic results is providing support in answering the research questions.

As the statistic data indicates that violation is a significant type of non-observance of the maxims in the conversation, the following chapter (section 5.4.1 and 5.4.2) discusses more on the roles which violation of relation and quantity play in keeping a conversation going. Although flouting is not a significant strategy compared with violation in this conversation, implicature generated by flouting a maxim is the central idea in Grice' theory. Therefore, section 5.4.3 discusses flouting used in the conversation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Revealing Main Topics in the Conversation

In the preceding chapter, two lexical chains of cohesive items are identified as a result of their shared semantic domains in each interlocutor's sample texts. In the rest of the conversation, certain lexical chains also exist. For discussing purpose, these chains of cohesive items need to be grouped according to their general semantic categories. By screening Appendix B and C, in which all cohesive items are highlighted, certain semantic domains in each interlocutor's texts emerge. Below sections discuss the semantic domains in each interlocutor's texts and the overlaps among them.

5.1.1 Semantic domains as main topics in MG's and FY's texts. There are total 82 cohesive items identified in MG's texts, and 208 in FY's. The large difference in the total number of cohesive items in each interlocutor's texts might due to the fact that FY's texts are as twice long as MG's, with a lot of repetition of certain lexical items (textual repetition will be discussed in section 5.5.2). In order to demonstrate the semantic domains of the cohesive items, seven categories of the domains are identified from the lexical chains of the cohesive items, namely, female-related descriptions, reproduction, population, tradition, society and others. The relations between certain cohesive items and the categories which they belong to are not very straightforward to understand because of the complexity of the collocation cohesion. Female-related category includes lexical items of male, (such as father and man) for female and male sometimes appear together in the same context and form collocation relation. In the society category, the description of family is included, which reflects the idea of collectiveness in the society.

There are some cohesive items, especially metaphorical items, in the conversation which do not form cohesive chains, and these cohesive items belong to the others category.

Although the others category takes 16% of the total cohesive items in MG's texts and 20% in FY's texts, this category is not significant to form the main topics of the conversation. However, it does not mean that the cohesive items in the others category do not contribute to the development of the conversation; they form paired cohesive relation with other lexical items to join sentences as a unified whole.

From below Table 6, the cohesive items related to the description of female takes a major part in MG's texts, whereas the items in the domains of reproduction, population, tradition and society are limited but almost equally distributed. On the contrary, FY's texts consist of a large number of cohesive items related to society; other categories, such as reproduction, population, tradition and female-related take relevantly similar proportions. The semantic domains exhibit different patterns in the interlocutors' texts; nevertheless, they are all reflected in both interlocutors' texts. In other words, the semantic domains are shared between the two. This finding suggests that such overlaps in the conversation show cohesive relation across two interlocutors' texts, and the domains can be regarded as the main topics being discussed in the conversation.

Table 6

Semantic domains of the cohesive items in each interlocutor's texts

Semantic domain	The number of cohesive items in MG's texts	The number of cohesive items in FY's texts
Female	38	25
Reproduction	6	17
Population/people	8	27
Tradition	10	18
Society	7	81
Others	13	40

As mentioned in the Introduction Chapter, the topics in #boycottingbaihe.com# have three major topics: marriage, tradition and women. It is not difficult to find out whether these topics are kept in the conversation, since the main topics in the conversation has been

revealed. By comparing the topics in # boycottingbaihe.com # with the revealed main topics in the selected conversation, the topic on marriage in the tagged topic is not kept in the conversation, whereas women and tradition are preserved in both interlocutors' texts. New topics, in terms of reproduction, population/people and society emerge from the conversation. In this case, it is worth investigating that how a topic is maintained or developed in the conversation.

5.2 Maintaining a Topic in the Conversation

Taking the topic on tradition as an example, this section demonstrates how this topic is maintained in the conversation. Traditional value is initially reflected in the advertisement, where the young woman gets married in order to fulfil the Chinese tradition. In the advertisement, there is no explicit linguistic cue on the word 'tradition'; however, the netizens on Weibo recognise the meaning of it from the advertisement, and makes it a conversational topic under the double hashtag topic.

The topic on tradition is initially kept in T3 in FY's texts, which is the first tweet he sends to MG. In this turn, FY speaks about the loss of 'traditional family values' in some countries. The idea of tradition is maintained as a modifier of the nominal group 'family values' that functions as a PDI to form semantic connection with another lexical item. In the next turn T5, FY explicitly mentions 'tradition', the PDI that connects with the cohesive units 'family responsibility' and 'ethics and moral'. It should be noted that MG does not cover the topic on tradition in T4 but on different expectations of woman and man. Furthermore, MG' T6, the reply to T5, does not mention tradition either. T6 extends the topic in T4, which clarifies what kind of responsibilities man should take. Reciprocally, FY does not continue on any of the topics that MG initiates in T4 and T6. It is until T8, MG speaks about the topic on tradition, which is four turns after FY firstly mentions it. Later in the conversation, the topic is

maintained for another four turns until T13 in which FY gradually shift the topic to population.

From the above analysis on the path of the topic on tradition in the conversation, it can be seen that maintaining a topic requires the cooperative effort of the interlocutors. At the beginning of the conversational turns, each interlocutor holds on their own positions on what topics they want to talk about, which are both relevant to the double hashtag topic. For the conversation to continue, at least one interlocutor needs to be cooperative for accommodating the other one's choice of topic. In the case of maintaining the topic on tradition, FY initiates it and MG adapts to FY's choice, although not immediately, it still signals MG's intention to continue the conversation with FY by using key lexical items in the topic on tradition.

5.3 Developing a Topic in the Conversation

Three new topics emerge from the conversation (see section 5.1), and it is worth knowing how they are developed and their relationship to the continuance of the conversation. This section demonstrates on how the topic on society is developed in the conversation, for this topic has the furthest semantic relation with the topics in the double hashtag topic.

The topic on society is initiated by FY in T3, where he claims that '*society declining*' is a negative consequence of the spread of feminism. In this turn, '*society declining*' is a PDI which form a collocation connection with '*the harm of your doing*'. In his next turn (T5), modifications are added to the lexical item 'society', which create two cohesive units as '*low-fertility society*' and '*aging society*'. They form semantic relations with the PDIs '*population and reproduction*' and '*population balancing*' in the preceding sentence. By adding modifiers to the lexical item 'society', the topic on society form semantic connection with new topics, namely population and reproduction, in the conversation. These topics are kept by both interlocutors, which contribute to the continuance of the conversation.

In T17, the topic on society is shifted by adding the modifier '*benefit*' to the lexical item 'society' (as in '*society benefit*'), and this PDI is collocated with the cohesive units '*jobs*' and '*social security payment*'. This kind of modification can narrow down the general topic to a more specific area that forms a relatively close semantic connection with the mentioned topic.

As can be seen from the demonstration, an interlocutor can develop a topic in two ways by using modification to a key lexical item of the topic. Developing a topic can be achieved by modifying the topic using cohesive devices that form semantic connection with other topics in the conversation. The topics are connected by their semantic relations, which can be further discussed or developed by the interlocutors in the conversation. Alternatively, modification can specify a general topic, which creates relevant sub-topics for the interlocutors to discuss. In this regard, semantic relations play an important role in developing a topic, which contributes to the continuance of the conversation.

5.4 Networked Topics in the Conversation: Cohesion across Interlocutors

In section 5.1, five main topics in the conversation are identified, two of them are old topics from the double hashtag topic and three are newly introduced topics. Although each interlocutor focuses on the topics that they are interested in, they still manage to cover other identified topics in the conversation. In other words, topics overlap with each other and flow between the two interlocutors' texts. The interchange of topics takes place at semantic level rather at structural level. As discussed in section 5.3, topics can form semantic connections with each other or can be specified by cohesive devices that act as modifiers. The complex connections of different topics in the conversation form a network of topics. For example, the female-related topic is connected with reproduction by women's biological role, and reproduction is linked with the topic on population, because reproduction generates population. Moreover, labour, the sub-topic of population has an indirect relationship with

society, which is mediated by economy of a society. The topic on society has an indirect relation with tradition, for they are linked by traditional family values mentioned in the conversation. The network is reflected in the cohesive relation among them. As both interlocutors talk about the identified topics, cohesive relation extends from one interlocutor's texts to both interlocutors' texts.

The networked topics in the conversation enable the conversation to keep going. Each interlocutor can draw a semantic connection between two main topics or between one main topic and a sub-topic derived from it. It should be noted that the networked topics are either directly related to the ones in the double hashtag or further developed from them. This finding leads to another issue that is worth clarifying. The continuance of the conversation is influenced by two types of topics: pre-determined topics from the double hashtag topic and conversational topics that are identified in section 5.1. Although not all pre-determined topics are kept, some of them are semantically connected with conversational topics, which signals that pre-determined topics scaffold the direction of conversational topics. Without the restriction of pre-determined topics, conversational topics could become digressive and difficult to form a continuing conversation.

5.5 Non-observance of the Maxims as Strategies to Keep the Conversation Going

5.5.1 Violation of relation. In the last chapter, the statistic results show that violation of relation frequently occurs in both interlocutors' texts; nevertheless, the conversation still continues between them. Levinson (1983) points out that violation is not a necessary indicator of breakdown in a conversation. In this regard, it is important to find out the role violation of relation plays in keeping the conversation going. One way to examine the function of violation of relation is to see how it works in connecting adjacency turns in the conversation. Violation of relation enables an interlocutor to mislead the other one in the current talk exchange by shifting the degree of relevance of it. In other words, violation of relation does

not exist by itself in a current turn but is connected with what has been said in a preceding turn. As can be seen from the full analysis, this connection is formed at semantic level but not at structural level. Considering the relation maxim is realised through semantic connection of the talk exchange, cohesion can shed light on how violation of relation works in the continuance of the conversation.

   The role cohesion plays in violation of relation for connecting adjacency turns. Comparing cohesive items in Appendix B, C, D and E with the parts contain violation of relation in Appendix F, some cohesive items which have been previously identified are found in the parts that contain violation of relation. This phenomenon shows that lexical items in the parts contain violation of relation form semantic connection with other items in a preceding turn, and the function of violation of relation may be reflected in the cohesive items in it. As cohesive items have two different categories (lexical and reference), each category may have its own role in violation of relation; it is worth examining both of them to draw a clear picture on the functions of them. In 4 out of 24 turns that contain violation of relation, both lexical and reference cohesive items are used in the violation of relation, while the rest, only lexical cohesive items are found.

   In the cases (T4, T7, T18 and T25) that both lexical and reference cohesive items are found in violation of relation, cohesive items can work together or independently to form semantic connection between the part that is violated and what is mentioned in the preceding turn. For example, at the beginning of T4, MG violates the relation maxim by saying, "*What prevent girls from being dependent on (men)?*" The reference item 'what' refers to what MG says in T3, which links the two turns semantically. The reference relation creates an impression that MG is going to continue the topic on what FY has been talked about previously. However, the lexical item '*girls*' in the above mentioned sentence is adopted from MG's own turn in T2, which indicates that MG is going to shift the conversation to his own

interest. This finding suggests that for both lexical and reference cohesive items within the same turn to function as semantic links with previous turns, they need to form independent semantic relation with what have been mentioned previously.

Reference items can be the modifiers of the cohesive items in violation of relation, in which the reference items may loss its function of connecting adjacency turns, depending on what the reference items refer to. For example, in "*girls see their grandmothers, mothers and other female relative*" at the beginning of T18, the reference item 'their' appears before the lexical items of female persons, which refers to the word 'girls' in the same sentence.

For most of the time, only lexical cohesive items are found in violation of relation, which form semantic connection with other lexical items in a preceding turn (T3, T6, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T15, T16, T17, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T24, T26, T27). Drawing on the discussion on the cohesive relation found in networked topics in the conversation, violation of relation occurs when a new topic is introduced, or an existing topic is shifted or developed. This finding shows that the relations among cohesion, topic and violation of relation are intertwined. In the CP framework, Grice did not define what is relation or provide more information on what he meant by 'be relevant' in a talk exchange. It is supposed that interlocutors should not change the topic of a conversation in order to be relevant. However, in real life (as in the selected conversation), it is very difficult to keep talking about one topic from the beginning to the end of a conversation, as topic can be shifted or developed covertly by using cohesive devices. Therefore, to determine whether the relation maxim is violated, both topics and cohesion should be taken into account.

Textual response: connecting adjacency turns at semantic level. From the full analysis (see Appendix F) for non-observance of the maxims, a noticeable feature emerges, which is the use of textual response in a conversational turn. In this study, textual response is located at the beginning of each turn, which bridges a current turn with a previous turn (i.e. a

preceding turn or a distance turn). It should be noted that textual response does not take part in non-observance of the maxims in a text, as it functions independently in terms of linking two turns. In addition, the size of a textual response includes but is not limited to a phrase, a clause or a sentence.

Textual response is used in 15 out of 29 turns to link a current turn with a previous one, which means textual response is used in 52% of the conversation. The turns are T3, T5, T6, T7, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T16, T20, T21, T22, T24 and T26. In the 15 turns that contain textual responses, violation of relation appears in 13 turns, except in T16 and T26, where the quality maxim is flouted. It shows that textual response is a significant feature in the turns which the relation maxim is violated. Therefore, it is important to reveal how textual response works as a bridge in these turns to connect with other turns, and its relation to the part of the texts that contains violation of relation.

To reveal the function of textual response, cohesive items in textual response should be considered. As the previous findings suggest, cohesive items in violation of relation connect two turns in the conversation. Given the nature of cohesion that forms semantic connections of lexical items in a text, it is also worth using cohesion to find out how textual response works. In order to see if cohesive items appear in textual responses, cohesive items identified in Appendix B, C, D and E are matched with textual responses underlined in Appendix F. the result shows that some cohesive items which have been previously identified are found in textual responses. In 13 turns that contain textual response, cohesive items are identified in 10 textual responses. While the textual responses in T5, T7 and T21 have no semantic connection with the preceding turns or the current turns. The 13 turns also contain violation of relation. In 6 of the 13 turns, textual responses show collocation relation to the parts that relation maxim has been violated (T3, T6, T10, T12, T13, and T14). In T5, T7, T11, T20, T21, T22 and T26, no cohesion can be identified with the parts that contain violation of

relation.

Cohesive items in the textual responses play important role in linking current turns with preceding turns and/or distance turns. A textual response can contain reference cohesive items to connect a current turn by one interlocutor to a preceding turn and/or a distance turn by the other interlocutor. A reference cohesive item appears by itself in a textual response (T11, T12, T22), which connects two turns. The reference item can be a second person pronoun to draw the attention of the other interlocutor (T12, T22), which directly links the current turn with the preceding turn. First person pronoun can also be useful in connecting two turns; however, it is considered as indirect compared with second person pronoun (T11). A reference cohesive item can be a part of a nominal group, which works as a modifier in a textual response (T3 and T10). The modification refers to what is mentioned in the preceding turns. For example, the reference cohesive items within the nominal group in T3 clearly refer to the preceding turn T2, because T2 is the first tweet that MG sends to FY, the second person pronoun 'your' and the demonstrative pronoun 'these' in FY's T3 can only refer to what MG says in T2. In addition, the reference modifier can refer to distance turns as well. The reference cohesive item within the nominal group in T10 refers T9, and on top of that, T10 also refers to some distance turns (T3, T5 and T7). In T10, the nominal group 'your theory' refers to the importance of reproduction and population, which FY promotes in T9. Although the lexical item 'theory' does not have a cohesive relation with any other lexical items in previous turns, the second person pronoun clearly indicates that '*your theory*' refers to what FY says in previous turns. Drawing the analysis in Appendix B, 'theory' has an indirect relationship with the cohesive unit 'bearing so many (children)' in the same turn. This cohesive unit and the cohesive items 'reproduction' and 'population' in T9 are all in the categories of reproduction and population identified in section 5.1. The idea that FY promotes are not only included in T9, but also in the distance turns mentioned, because the distance

turns also contain lexical cohesive items which are in the categories of reproduction and population and female-related nominal groups.

A textual response contains only lexical cohesive items to connect a current turn by one interlocutor to a preceding turn by the other interlocutor (T6, T13 and T24). The lexical cohesive items in a textual response of a current turn form semantic connection with other lexical cohesive items in a proceeding turn. The semantic connection is formed when a lexical cohesive item in a textual response in a current turn shares the same semantic domain of another lexical cohesive item in a preceding turn. For example, 'the standard of men' in T6 and 'a dependant husband' in T5 are both in the category of female-related nominal groups, as they are both the collocation items to the category.

A textual response contains both reference cohesive items and lexical cohesive items to connect a current turn by one interlocutor to a preceding turn and/or a distance turn by the other interlocutor (T14 and T20). Each lexical and reference cohesive items works independently in a textual response of a current turn form semantic connection of other cohesive items of a preceding turn.

From the above explanation on the relation of textual response and cohesion, it is suggested that the function of textual response to bridge turns is realised through semantic cohesion. However, as mentioned before, not all textual responses contain cohesive items to connect turns. There are certain turns (T5, T7 and T21) that work as a bridge to connect turns without the help of cohesive items. In the three turns, textual response is used to connect turns but no cohesive relation can be found at the surface of the lexical items; therefore, their relation to the previous turns is not determined by cohesion. Such textual response can be treated as acknowledgement of what is said in the previous turns or as the indication to start a new turn.

Cohesive items in the textual response play an essential role in linking turns to make

the conversation going. This type of textual response signals the relation between a current turn and a preceding turn, and to an extent, indicates the continuance of a conversation. However, textual response of a current turn does not necessarily contain cohesive items in relation to those in a previous turn. It may work as an acknowledgement sent by one interlocutor as a signal of receiving the information from one interlocutor or that of starting a new turn. Although such feature is not significant in this research, the function of acknowledgement could be further investigated in future studies.

5.5.2 Violation of quantity. The quantity maxim regulates an interlocutor to provide no more or no less information than required in the conversation (Grice, 1975, 1989). However, the function of violation of quantity might as well affect the continuance of the conversation, for it is the second frequently used strategy by FY in the conversation. Violation of quantity in the selected conversation is presented as frequently using reiterated lexical items (T3, T5, T7, T11, T21, T29) and direct quotation (T15, T17, T19, T23 and T27). The findings from the data analysis suggest that violation of quantity has three main features in the selected conversation. Direct quotation from the preceding turn links the current turns with the preceding one. By using which, an interlocutor violates the maxim of quantity, because the exact same information has already been provided in a preceding turn. In the current talk exchange, such information is not required. Leading by direct quotation, violation of relation follows. The quotation contains cohesive items that form semantic connection in lexical items in the part that contains violation of relation. This function of violation of quantity is similar to textual response which is discussed previously.

Violation of quantity as reiteration plays an important role to re-introduce topics in previous turns of one interlocutor's texts. Depending on the location where a violation takes place, this strategy has two functions in the conversation. Firstly, if the violation takes place at the end of a turn, the lexical items that contain repeated information have been reiterated

from a previous turn work as a recap in the current turn. For example, in T7, FY mentions girls should be virtuous and reproductive at the beginning, and this turn ends with social consequences related to population decline, in which lexical items have been reiterated from previous turns. Secondly, violation of quantity as reiteration sometimes follows by violation of relation. In this situation, the lexical items that have been repeated are further collocated with other lexical items to shift the focus of the current talk exchange. For instance, in the second sentence of T23, FY violates the maxim of quantity by repeating the idea that women who give birth to more children shall receive social security payments, which he already mentioned in T17 and T21.

No matter where the violation of quantity takes place, it can sustain the topics mentioned in previous turns. According to the analysis on lexical cohesion of FY's texts (see Appendix C), information related to social issues such as population declining, population ageing and society declining are repeated in T3 (b), T3 (c), T5, T7, T11 (a), T15 and T29 of FY's texts, which are reflected in reiteration of same lexical items in the texts. The repeated topics are kept from the beginning to the end of FY's texts. Atifi et al. (2011) argue that, the non-observance of the quantity maxim can preserve the continuity and the consistency of the talk exchanges when a large number of people participate in online discussion forums such as newsgroup discussion. However, those online discussions involve multiple interlocutors, whereas the selected Weibo conversation starts in the form of a dialogue between FY and MG, and there is no other interlocutors join or interrupt during the conversation. It is reasonable to make an assumption that non-observance of the quantity maxim of an interlocutor contributes to his or her own textual continuity when he or she are engaged in a dialogue conversation, and at the same time, this strategy also makes the interlocutor stays on track with his or her main ideas during the conversation.

5.5.3 Flouting: its textual features and a hearer's reaction to a flouting. Grice's

theory (Grice, 1975, 1989) suggests that in a conversation, by flouting a maxim, a speaker generates an implicature and expects a hearer to infer it. There are two aspects which can be further developed in Grice's theory. The role that flouting plays in connecting turns at semantic level is not examined in much detail so far. Grice studies a variety of implicature generated by flouting, for example, metaphor and irony, which has been developed in the area of pragmatics. As Grice's theory suggests, when a speaker produces an implicature using flouting, s(h)he expects the hearer to pick up the implied information in the implicature, which may influence the continuance of a conversation. This provides a new direction in which hearer's reaction could be looked at in responding the flouting. As online conversation is lack of extra linguistic cues and paralinguistic cues, hearer's reaction is to be interpreted through textual evidences.

Analysing flouting. As can be seen from Appendix F, flouting occurs at sentence level, so it can be analysed by identifying cohesive relation with other parts of the turns or other turns. Identifying these cohesive units in Appendices B and C and comparing them with the analysis in Appendix F contributes to the understanding on how a flouting is initiated after the preceding turn and how it is followed by the coming text in the current conversational turn. By doing so, four features related to flouting are found in the conversation. It is not always the case that cohesion exists in the flouting, and if there is a cohesive unit in the flouting, its relation with other sentences in the current turn and the preceding turn(s) can be identified. There is no cohesion can be found in the current turn (T22 and T26), as metaphor is used in the flouting in T22, so it is very hard to identify cohesive relation. No cohesive items existed in T26 either in relation to other part of the turn or other turns.

Relation in a flouting is found with other sentences in the current turn (T2, T3c, T12, T16, T24). For example, in T12, the lexical item "*flesh-eating and blood-drink feudal tradition*" in the sentence being flouted is collocated with "*semi-colonial and semi-feudal*

society" in the preceding sentence as well as "*feudal superstition*" in the following sentence. Cohesive items in the flouting in the current turn form relation with the preceding turn. A flouting can connect a current turn with a preceding turn in one interlocutor's texts (T12), or connect a current turn with a preceding turn in two interlocutor's texts (T2, T3c, T16, T24). In addition, cohesive items in a flouting form relation with both current turn and preceding turn (T2, T3c, T12, T16, T24). For example, in T2, the second sentence being flouted contains cohesive units "*Fu Quan*" and "*feminism*" and they are collocated with the PDI "*girls*" in the first sentence in T2. Moreover, "*Fu Quan*" and "*feminism*" are reiterations that refer back to the same words in FY's T1.

      Hearer's reaction to a flouting. As mentioned before, Grice's framework focuses on the implied meaning generated by a flouting. However, the selected texts cannot show if the implied meaning is picked up or not by a speaker, unless the hearer indicates directly that he or she picked up the implied meaning by saying "I know what you really mean…" or "what you want to say is…" etc. Therefore, in real life conversation, it is difficult to find the indicators showing an implicature is picked up or not.

      Nevertheless, to explore how a conversation continues, texts generated by the hearer that reflects his or her response can be analysed. In other words, it is useful to look at the hearer's reaction to a flouting at the textual level. Identification of flouting shown in Appendix F and locating lexical cohesion units presented in Appendices B and C provide the lenses to screen the hearer's reaction to flouting in the conversation. Moreover, it should be noted that between the two interlocutors, a hearer to a flouting in a turn generated by the speaker is also the speaker of the next turn. For easier understanding of the analysis, "hearer" is used to refer to the person who has any reaction to a flouting, and hearer's reaction refers to what can be found in the text or turn that he generates.

In this section, the hearers' reaction to all 12 floutings in the conversation are categorised and counted according to: 1) If there is a visible textual reply to a flouting, 2) how the hearers respond to flouting in the text. The findings are presented below in this order.

Some of the findings show that there is no visible textual reply used by the hearer to a flouting. This happens when the flouting is companied by another flouting in the same turn and the latter has a visible textual reply by the hearer. For example, it is very hard to tell if T3 reacts to all three floutings in T2. In this case, the hearer reacts to another flouting in the same turn, which shows his willingness to continue the conversation. A hearer can react to other parts of a text other than the flouting by using cohesive items. For example, MG reacts to the idea of 'school for ladies' in T25, rather than the flouting 'your rubbish' in T25.

There is no visible textual reply by the hearer to a flouting, and the hearer quotes textual features from other sentences in the turn where the flouting is located, but there is no textual reply to the flouting. For example, in T23, FY does not response to the two floutings in T22, but he quotes the last sentence of T22, which is not a flouting. The similar case can also be found in T27 where FY partially quotes a sentence in T26 that does not contain the flouting. In these cases, the hearer makes response to other parts of the speakers' texts rather than the flouting.

In six cases, there are visible textual replies to flouting and the hearer can respond to flouting in the following two ways. Firstly, the hearer can respond to flouting using textual reply that quotes the whole flouting. For example, in T17, FY quotes the last sentence in T16, which is flouted. Secondly, the hearer can also use some cohesive items of the flouting in the textual reply to it. For example, in T13, the textual response at the beginning of the turn that suggests "*China was poor and backward*" contain lexical items "*poor*" and "*backward*" that has an indirect relationship with other lexical items "*feudal traditions*" and "*feudal*

superstition" in the preceding turn where two floutings are generated. Similar example of textual reply that contains lexical items from the flouting can be found in T3 as well.

From the findings presented above, it can be seen that 6 out of 12 floutings have visible textual replies by the hearer, whereas 6 out of 12 floutings do not have visible textual replies by the hearer, but the hearer responds to other flouting or lexical items in the turn where the flouting is. Therefore, half of the flouting in the conversation are responded to by the hearer and even a hearer do not respond to the flouting, he still makes responses to other linguistic features in the speaker's turn, which keeps the conversation going.

At textual level, an interlocutor can ignore a flouting in a conversation, but continue the conversation by focusing on other textual features of it. In this case, flouting is an essential feature in the continuance of the conversation. When an interlocutor reacts to a flouting, it is reflected in the cohesive relation of the flouting and the text reaction. However, it should be noted that with or without flouting, a conversation still keeps going as long as both interlocutor use cohesive devices to connect conversational turns.

5.6 Cohesion as a Linguistic Tool to Determine Non-observance of the Maxims

Grice did not provide more information on how to interpret non-observance of the maxims. Non-observance of the maxims is developed from face-to-face conversation, where both interlocutors share the same context, and they are able to utilise all sort of paralinguistic cues. These features in face-to-face conversation can help one to interpret non-observance of the maxims. In the online environment, contexts and paralinguistic cues are reduced to a minimum. In order to determine non-observance of the maxims, text itself plays an important role. However, not any part of a text can be helpful in interpreting non-observance of the maxims, lexical items that form semantic relations are feasible in this circumstance, under which, cohesion can be used to determine violation of relation. Collocation shows the shifting of semantic relations of lexical items in a conversation, which makes a current conversational

turn less relevant to the preceding one. Cohesion can be used in determine violation of quantity. Reiteration of lexical items shows certain information that have been repeated for several times. According to the CP, it means an interlocutor provides more information than it is required in a conversation. Although cohesion cannot be used to determine flouting and infer implicature, it is a valuable tool to check if the flouting and hearer's reaction can keep the conversation going.

6. Conclusion

This study starts with the investigation on the topics in the conversation by identifying semantic cohesion, and later extends the investigation to the whole organisation of the conversation, using Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims, a macro level pragmatic framework. The findings suggest that the continuance of a conversation, in part, depends on the maintaining and development of topics. Non-observance of the maxims, violation of relation, in particular, contributes to the continuance of the conversation as well.

Maintaining a topic in a conversation requires the effort of both interlocutors. The minimum requirement found in this research has two factors. Firstly, one interlocutor should initiate and keep a topic in the conversation, and secondly, the other needs to adapt to the choice of the topic and act cooperatively to continue the conversation. In terms of developing a topic, each interlocutor can modify an old or a new topic using cohesive devices that form semantic connection with other topics in the conversation. To develop a topic, it can be specified using cohesive items as modification, which creates relevant sub-topics for the interlocutors to further discuss.

Conversational topics can form networks which reflect their semantic relations. The networked topics in the conversation enable the conversation to keep going. The interlocutors can produce conversation that is related to the pre-determined topics from the double hashtag topic. Pre-determined topics function as restrictions to the direction of the conversational topics, although not all pre-determined topics are kept. Without the restriction of pre-determined topics, conversational topics could become digressive and difficult to form conversation. The findings provide guidelines for businesses, government departments and other public sectors that rely on their conversations with the public to make decisions or policies. The continuance of a conversation requires a pre-determined topic, and with the

constrain of the pre-determined topic, the conversational topics, to some degree, can be developed. In this regard, solely relying on computational analysis for detecting valuable topics from social media conversation will overlook many linguistic factors in the content of the conversation, and that requires manual analysis to determine the semantic relation of different topics, especially when topic modifiers are attached.

It is confirmed that Grice's maxims is not only a set of assumption applicable to face-to-face conversation, the maxims also exist in online conversations. As mentioned before, non-observance of the maxims does not lead to breakdown of the conversation, and the conversation can continue. The interpretation of non-observance of the maxims is heavily relying on cohesion. Violation of relation and quantity plays an important part in the continuance of the conversation. In addition, hearer's reaction to a flouting is investigated in this research, and the findings suggest that hearer's reaction contributes to the continuance of the conversation by using cohesive devices.

Textual response is another significant finding in this research, as it functions as a bridge to link two turns. Although textual response does not necessarily contain cohesive items in relation to previous turns, it may work as an acknowledgement sent by one interlocutor as a signal of receiving the information from one interlocutor. Such feature is not significant in this research; nevertheless, the idea of 'minimum cue' could be further developed in future studies.

The significance of this research is in threefold. Firstly, social media plays an important role in facilitating conversations among individuals and groups, especially among individuals and business or government. These sectors rely on having conversations with the public to achieve their goals. Even if conversations take place, it does not mean that they can continue. Without the continuance of a conversation, the goals for a conversation may not be fully achieved. The findings in this research can help to guide those who need a continuous

conversation on social media. Secondly, the proposed theoretical framework, cohesion and the Cooperative Principle, is initially designed to answer two sub-research questions separately. During the analysis process, it is found that the two are complementary in answering the research question. The combined framework has its potential in future studies on online conversation or even on face-to-face conversation, since previous researches have not realised the benefit of employing the combined framework. Due to the scope of this thesis, the research investigates conversation takes place on one social media platform. The findings in this research can be used in further studies that focus on comparing the similarity and differences of conversations on the same topic across different social media platforms in China. Thirdly, this research could be extended to future studies on other forms of UGC in social media, cohesion among multimodal resources, in particular. There is a trend currently on social media to post multimodal resources, such as memes, gifs (Graphics Interchange Format) or text-based language accompanied with images. These forms of UGC also facilitate conversations. The proposed theoretical framework in this research could be applied to the mentioned area. The findings in this research together with the potential areas proposed could build a holistic picture on conversations take place in social media.

Reference

Archer, D., Aijmer, K., & Wichmann, A. (2012). *Pragmatics : An advanced resource book for students* New York: Routledge.

Atifi, H., Mandelcwajg, S., & Marcoccia, M. (2011). The co-operative principle and computer-mediated communication: The maxim of quantity in newsgroup discussions. *Language Sciences, 33*(2), 330-340. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2010.10.011

Barton, D. (2001). Directions for literacy research: Analysing language and social practices in a textually mediated world. *Language and Education, 15*(2-3), 92-104. doi:10.1080/09500780108666803

Berger, A. A. (2014). *Media analysis techniques* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Bluebook of microblog. (2012). Retrieved from Data Centre of China Internet: http://www.dcci.com.cn/report/index.html

Boyd, D., Golder, S., & Lotan, G. (2010, 5-8 Jan. 2010). *Tweet, tweet, retweet: Conversational aspects of retweeting on twitter.* Paper presented at the 2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.

Chafe, W. L. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic* (pp. 25-55). New York: Academic Press.

Dang, Q., Gao, F., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Early detection method for emerging topics based on dynamic bayesian networks in micro-blogging networks. *Expert Systems with Applications, 57*, 285-295. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2016.03.050

Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's cooperative principle: Meaning and rationality. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(12), 2308-2331. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.09.002

Fang, J. (2015). *The systemic functional grammar of chinese nominal groups: A text-based approach.* (Doctoral thesis), Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/233661483

Gardner, S., & Alsop, S. (2016). Introduction. In S. Gardner & S. Alsop (Eds.), *Systemic functional linguistics in the digital age* (pp. 1-10). Sheffield, South Yorkshire

Bristol, CT: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gu, Q. (2014). Sina weibo: A mutual communication apparatus between the chinese government and chinese citizens. *China Media Research, 10*(2), 72-85. Retrieved from http://simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=95778835&site=ehost-live

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in english* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Education.

Herring, S. C. (1996). Introduction. In S. C. Herring (Ed.), *Computer-mediated communication : Linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 1-10). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Herring, S. C. (2003). *Dynamic topic analysis of synchronous chat*. Paper presented at the the New Research for New Media: Innovative Research Symposium, Minneapolis, MN. http://info.ils.indiana.edu/~herring/dta.html

Herring, S. C., Stein, D., & Virtannen, T. (2013). Introduction to the pragmatics of computer-mediated communication. In S. C. Herring, D. Stein, & T. Virtannen (Eds.),

Handbook of pragmatics of computer-mediated communication (pp. 3-31). Berlin: Mouton.

Hiltz, S. R., & Turoff, M. (1978). *The network nation : Human communication via computer*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huang, J., Thornton, K. M., & Efthimiadis, E. N. (2010). *Conversational tagging in twitter*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 21st ACM conference on Hypertext and hypermedia, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons, 53*(1), 59-68. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons, 54*(3), 241-251. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, J. (2014). 热点事件中媒体微博的评论话语特征及影响. *今传媒*, 22(11), 127-128.

Lipizzi, C., Iandoli, L., & Ramirez Marquez, J. E. (2015). Extracting and evaluating conversational patterns in social media: A socio-semantic analysis of customers' reactions to the launch of new products using twitter streams. *International Journal of Information Management, 35*(4), 490-503. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2015.04.001

Liu, Z., Chen, X., & Sun, M. (2012). Mining the interests of chinese microbloggers via keyword extraction. *Frontiers of Computer Science, 6*(1), 76-87. doi:10.1007/s11704-011-1174-8

Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text : System and structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Number of social media users worldwide from 2010 to 2021 (in billions). (2017). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/278414/number-of-worldwide-social-network-users

Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford Pergamon Press.

Page, R., Barton, D., Unger, J. W., & Zappavigna, M. (2014). *Researching language and social media : A student guide*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Poore, M. (2014). *Studying and researching with social media*. London: SAGE.

The report of weibo users. (2017). Retrieved from Data Centre of Weibo: http://data.weibo.com/report/reportDetail?id=404

Schank, R. C. (1977). Rules and topics in conversation. *Cognitive Science, 1*(4), 421-441. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(77)80017-7

Scott, K. (2015). The pragmatics of hashtags: Inference and conversational style on twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics, 81*, 8-20. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.015

Seargeant, P., & Tagg, C. (2014). Introduction. In P. Seargeant & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The language of social media: Identity and community on the internet* (pp. 1-22). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stenström, A.-B. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London;New York: Longman.

Stromer-Galley, J., & Martinson, A. M. (2009). Coherence in political computer-mediated communication: Analyzing topic relevance and drift in chat. *Discourse & Communication, 3*(2), 195-216. doi:doi:10.1177/1750481309102452

Tajabadi, A., Dowlatabadi, H., & Mehri, E. (2014). Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments: The case of dispute settlement councils in iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 1859-1865. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.616

Tanskanen, S.-K. (2006). *Collaborating towards coherence : Lexical cohesion in english discourse*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction : An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity : A critical history of social media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vicient, C., & Moreno, A. (2015). Unsupervised topic discovery in micro-blogging networks. *Expert Systems with Applications, 42*(17), 6472-6485. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.04.014

Walker, M. A., Joshi, A. K., & Prince, E. F. (1998). Centering in naturally-occurring discourse: An overview. In M. A. Walker, A. K. Joshi, & E. F. Prince (Eds.), *Centering in discourse* (pp. 1-28). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wang, W. Y. (2013). Weibo, framing, and media practices in china. *Journal of Chinese Political Science, 18*(4), 375-388. doi:10.1007/s11366-013-9261-3

Which tongues work best for microblogs? (2012, March 31). *The Economist*. Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/node/21551466

Xia, Y. H. (2011). 突发事件中的微博舆论: 基于新浪微博的实证研究. *新闻与传播研究*, 5, 43-51.

Yu, L. L., Asur, S., & Huberman, B. A. (2015). Trend dynamics and attention in chinese social media. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(9), 1142-1156. doi:10.1177/0002764215580619

Zappavigna, M. (2012). *Discourse of twitter and social media : How we use language to create affiliation on the web*. London: Continuum.

Zappavigna, M. (2014). Enacting identity in microblogging through ambient affiliation. *Discourse & Communication, 8*(2), 209-228. doi:10.1177/1750481313510816

Zappavigna, M. (2015). Searchable talk: The linguistic functions of hashtags. *Social Semiotics, 25*(3), 274-291. doi:10.1080/10350330.2014.996948

Zhang, W., & Kramarae, C. (2014). "Slutwalk" on connected screens: Multiple framings of a social media discussion. *Journal of Pragmatics, 73*, 66-81. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.07.008

Zhao, J., Wu, W., Zhang, X., Qiang, Y., Liu, T., & Wu, L. (2014). A short-term trend prediction model of topic over sina weibo dataset. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization, 28*(3), 613-625. doi:10.1007/s10878-013-9674-0

Appendices

Appendix A

Full original texts of the selected Weibo conversation (the web version of it can be retrieved from https://www.weibo.com/1677479775/AvDA08gf6?type=comment)

Note 1: the texts in below table is the corpus of the conversation in this research, and the text in *italic* above the corpus is the level one Weibo tweet mentioned in section 3.2.3.

Note 2: the total word count for the conversation is 4290, with 1463 words for MG's texts and 2827 for FY's.

神熊教教主
2014-2-7 18:11 来自 iPad 客户端
#万人抵制百合网#如果所有女性都在适婚年龄乖乖滚去结婚，还需要"逼"婚么？No。逼婚风气日盛说明 what？说明越来越多女性在实现物质精神双独立后，不再满足于依附婚姻实现人生价值，说明女权在觉醒，说明传统男权秩序受到了严重冲击，说明气急败坏的男权维护者们在疯狂寻找继续用婚姻绑架女性的论据。

Conversational turn	The interlocutors	Texts of the conversation	Time sent
T1	FY	就是欺负你这文盲，不懂文化，不懂历史。你要知道，一个社会的发展，女权主义这种自由社会的糟糠，你绝对不该学，你该学的该是叫"妇权主义"，女权和妇权只有一字之差，但女权是自私自利，而妇权是代表责任心。因为妇女是在生育孩子的前提下，保证妇女的权益。	2014-2-11 22:17
T2	MG	你别结婚吧，女孩子长大也不容易。妇权依附男权，女权的发展势不可挡！如果和平的手段无法推进，你们会看到你们想要的彻底对立！	2016-1-8 20:36
T3	FY	(a)如果按照你们这种做法，我们的生育率就会暴跌，人口减少，缺乏家庭主妇，没人生儿育女，导致人口老化，社会衰退。 知道你们这种做法的危害？？	2016-1-8 20:54
		(b)法国，德国，还有日本，北欧国家，人口暴跌已经很严重，大家都是吃喝玩乐的，丢失传统家庭观念，结果生育率暴跌，少子化非常严重，现在他们的政府伤透了脑筋，给奖金给优惠，希望大家能多生孩子，结果没人响应。 你再搞这种没责任心的想法行为，也会把我们国家带入衰败的地步。	2016-1-8 20:58

		(c)唯女子与小人难养也 近则不逊远则怨——这话果然没错，女人天生就是比男性智商低，还缺乏远瞻性，缺乏远大目光，不懂思考前因后果。被你们这样一搞，我们的社会不就衰退了。这种历史罪人，祸国殃民的事情，怎么能干。	2016-1-8 21:01
T4	MG	那是什么不让女孩子们去附和？要求别人附和，起码自己得拿得出手。况且女孩子们的要求不高且拒绝将就，而男孩子们呢，呵呵，做不到罢了。	
T5	FY	不对，该是提倡回归传统伦理道德，提倡夫有担当，妻有依附。注重家庭责任，伦理道德。 把家庭建设，作为社会发展的重点。传仁德，重孝义，以维持人口生育，维持人口平衡。否则国家变成少子化社会，老龄化社会，我们的文明发展，社会发展，也全部会倒退。	2016-1-8 21:05
T6	MG	男生的标准；入得了厅堂，下得了厨房，对儿女要用心，还得爱做家务，个人卫生条件好，无黄赌毒历史，有稳定收入，家庭无家暴历史，家族无精神病患者，少和岳父岳母老婆顶嘴，手脚要勤快，嘴巴要甜，安分守己，做不到，就不要瞎 bb 女生应该怎么样！	
T7	FY	应该的，学校教育里就该提倡这样，女孩子要学会贤良淑德，生儿育女，懂孝顺父母，翁婆；最好每个家庭生育三个子女，以维持社会平衡，人口平衡。 否则一旦人口衰退，国家也跟着走向没落。	2016-1-8 21:09
T8	MG	我是新儒家的坚定反对派，不要和我提传统。等我的 24 孝专题做出来，会圈你出来看看。你们的传统比鲁迅的人吃人还恐怖，爷恶毒百倍！	
T9	FY	(a)反对儒学？？ 不是儒学鼓吹生育，维持人口优势，汉族人在五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，早就被灭了。 否则，你现在已经变成蒙古族的了。笑死。 如果我们的祖宗，也学你一样自私自利，我们的民族早就灭亡了。	2016-1-8 21:10
		(b)为啥需要儒学，需要伦理，需要传统？？就是因为大民族才能建立一个大国家，小民族建立的都是小国家。中国能有这么大的国家，就是因为有一个大民族——汉族人。 如果没有一个稳定统一的大民族，国家早就四分五裂，还能有现在这么好日子让你享受，你真是负义忘本。	2016-1-8 21:13

T10	MG	拒绝。你这是要逼着女孩子们远离你们的理论。没有任何受过现代教育的女孩子会乐意生这么多！你以为，生而不养值得骄傲？你得清楚现在的婚姻法和社保制度有多对不起家庭主妇！	
T11	FY	(a)我认为，该是转变人民的想法，把经济利益当心，改为家庭建设当先。 谁有一个好家庭，谁就是优秀人物，优秀阶级。就如古代举孝廉，奖励仁德一样。才能让人注重家庭生育。 你人口都衰败了，你还能过好生活，你真是无知，为啥日本物价这么贵，就是劳动力短缺。	2016-1-8 21:16
		(b)不是因为中国人口多，汉族努力生育，早五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，就被他们杀光了。我们还能过现在这种好生活？？你又想过好生活，又不想承担社会责任，哪有你这么无耻的。 没有人口生育，没有劳动力，哪来社会发展和经济消费。	2016-1-8 21:18
T12	MG	忘本的是你们。为了让身处半殖民半封建的国民走出深渊，先辈们付出了多少！你们这群人居然还在鼓吹吃人肉喝人血的封建传统？不知所谓！在打破封建迷信上，我万分感谢毛主席挖了孔家庙及孔家祖坟。我们现在是需要能树立精神文明和规范的东西，但这绝不是封建传统复辟的理由！	
T13	FY	中国人落后，那是清朝闭关锁国导致，一旦开始搞经济，以中国人的头脑，马上就发展起来了。 原因就是中国人聪明。古代社会儒学在鼓励知识分子多生育，导致有文化的人生育更多后代。 是古代社会伦理，导致聪明的人生育了更多后代。才能让中国人这么聪明。 （文盲一个，正确道理都不懂	
T14	MG	接近14亿人，你发愁发早了。就算90，00，10，甚至以后一半的女孩子单身，人口也就少个几千万或者上亿而已。你大概没观察过吧。有不婚念头的一般家庭工作样貌收入学历都还行。那么不婚是她们蠢，还是其他原因让她们不婚？这两年重男轻女抬头果然是有铁证的！否则也不会吓得那么多人单身！	
T15	FY	接近14亿人，你发愁发早了。————中国不是人口多，而是老人多，现在的中国人都是50~60后，他们20年后全变老人；如果没有补充新生人口，人口马上暴跌到几亿，我们的国家和民族都衰败了。 现在那些吃喝玩	2016-1-8 21:29

		乐的人，只能将来承受人口老化，经济衰退的后果。	
T16	MG	况且你不用烦心汉人基数减少，很多人都是繁衍派！只是我们这一代（或许还有80后的一部分）的女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！	
T17	FY	(a)女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！————生在这个社会上，享受社会的一切好环境，好生活，就必须承担责任，不愿意承担责任的人，没权享受社会劳动成果。有贡献才能有回报。以后要把工作岗位，社会福利补贴给那些肯生育，肯维护家庭责任的人。自私自利的人就活该~	2016-1-8 21:31
		(b)你就别想了。以后会取消养老金，提倡养儿防老，没生孩子的人，晚年只能凄惨度过。别以为有保险金，人口劳动力衰退时候，人工成本很高，养老金会严重贬值的。自己想想吧~	2016-1-8 21:34
T18	MG	正是因为女孩子看着自己的奶奶外婆妈妈等女性亲属们过的有多艰难！才会远离灾难！你不可否认，在家庭中，父亲角色经常是缺位的！况且女孩子的人生绝不可能就是生生生！你再这么有底气说你的女性的付出时，也请你想想怎么让她们享受到付出后的果实！	
T19	FY	(a)女孩子们在性别压迫上的反应会让你惊喜。————这种不叫压迫，这种叫责任，我们的奶奶，母亲，都是生儿育女这样过来的。爷爷父亲也是靠点工资，养活5~6孩子，他们是这样生活，你们也不能放弃这责任。	2016-1-8 21:37
		(b)但是他们的贡献，也让中国有更多的人口，才能导致我们有足够的劳动力，完成现代化，成为世界工厂。中国能崛起，很大程度就是西方人口衰退，而中国人口劳动力充足，才又生产基地转移到中国，让我们也富裕起来。	2016-1-8 21:44
		(c)我们有现在的好生活，就是靠充足的劳动力，才能变成世界工厂，成为工业强国的。而西方国家的生产订单，早被中国这个世界工厂给取代了。活着在中国你吃香喝辣，从来不知道国家怎么强大起来的？？就知道自私自利，逃避社会责任。	2016-1-8 21:46
		(d)父母辈的生育传承人口，劳动力充足，才	2016-1-8

		导致国家强盛。我们要为将来的中国继续保持强盛的话，每个人都要做贡献。少做贡献的人就少吃福利，没有医保社保，这些福利该给那些多生育的家庭才对。 你既然选择这样，那就自己吃亏吧，应该的。	21:48
T20	MG	别扯那么大，别说社会发展，就是你变成了世界首富，与她们何干？她们的付出得不到回报，就别再想忽悠新一代的女孩子学习她们！你大概不知道，在我们看来，老一辈女性傻乎乎的，特别好骗好欺负，还特别傻白甜，尤其是她们男人说啥就是啥的信仰！	
T21	FY	(a)不要紧，社会制度必须合理分配才对。贡献大的人就回报大。贡献小的人回报就小。[酷] 多孩子，多生育的家庭可以报考名校，也可以优先安排岗位，有福利住房。少生或者单身的，就不该享受这些福利。就让他们自由自在，自生自灭。这也很公平。	2016-1-8 21:51
		(b)国家强大就需要人口，每个家庭都该贡献人口，维持生育。大家都要维持伦理道德，维持家庭观念才行。生育就是为国家贡献，有贡献就有回报。有养老金，有社保，那些懒惰腐败，贪婪腐化，不愿意承担责任的人，就该少点享受社会利益才对。也很公平。	2016-1-8 21:54
T22	MG	你呢？比我高多少？社会建设中我是没添砖头还是没加瓦？别把你们说的那么崇高！说白了就是依旧希望女人单方面付出，最好是无偿的，需要时出现不要就滚的本质！可惜，前进的车轮不会倒退，除非你们想挑起民愤和发起暴力反抗。说起来，承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍	
T23	FY	承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍————以后规定，多生孩子的有抚养金，有福利津贴。还要成立淑女学校，把一些思想素质好的女孩子培训成为贤妻良母，让她们明白，生儿育女才能维持国家强大，希望她们多做贡献。	2016-1-8 21:57
T24	MG	国家强大要人口没错，但如果单身的多了，你就使劲让那些喜欢生的使劲生吧，最好是一年一个，然后每年都生，然后老婆死了换新的，继续生吧......反正在你的观念里，生孩子这种事儿，你们只要动口就一堆女孩子愿意似的......	

T25	FY	还把那些淑女学校的女孩子，通过相亲婚配给官僚家庭，富商家庭，让她努力生育，为国家做贡献，也同时能在好家庭过上好生活。干得好不如嫁得好，哈哈哈哈~（你这垃圾，当然没份了。哈哈~）	2016-1-8 22:00
T26	MG	那么可以明确告诉你，没有真正爱孩子的会送他们去所谓的女德班，淑女学校！她们都是人！她们有资格选择自己是一个怎样的人！拥有怎样的人生！你就不用忽悠小年轻了！大家都不傻！没有人会为了迎合你们，就磋磨自己的孩子！	
T27	FY	(a)爱孩子的会送他们去所谓的女德班、淑女学校！她们都是人！——————如果能嫁入富豪家庭，嫁入干部家庭，你说他们会不会答应呢？？ 哈哈哈现在的女孩子不是喜欢（非诚勿扰，非富勿嫁）吗？相亲不就是找个好家庭。过好日子？	2016-1-8 22:03
		(b)只要能过上好生活，好家庭，大把爱慕虚荣的女孩子会愿意到女德班，淑女学校去当淑女。 当贤妻良母。而且还要进行选秀，成绩，身材相貌好的才能入读淑女学校。哈哈哈~	2016-1-8 22:05
T28	MG	不用争论了，我会挂头条并扩容，让更多的人看到，然后我倒是想看看。我们之间的对话，正常和属于社会主流思想的到底是什么，而且最关键的是，有多少人和你一样！和你一样的人绝对拉黑没商量！你们简直就是阻碍社会进步的毒瘤！封建复辟老僵尸！	
T29	FY	封建复辟老僵尸！———这种叫传统，传承与统一。 这才是最为优秀的社会。因为文明是靠一个民族去传承的，民族衰败，文明也就走向毁灭了。 你好好养好身体，改天给你当秀女，送你读淑女学校，给你嫁个干部家庭，富商家庭。多点生育优秀后代，让他们长大后为国家建设做贡献。	2016-1-8 22:11

Appendix B

Cohesive units and PDIs in MG's texts

Note: All cohesive units and PDIs in the category of nominal group are highlighted. The first PDI in each text is marked as P, and the following ones are marked in the order of their appearance (e.g. P1, P2 and etc.). Reiteration or collocation unit of the first PDI is marked as PR or PC plus the sentence number in which the PDI appears (e.g. [PR15], [PC16] and etc.). Reiteration or collocation unit of the following PDIs in the same text is marked, for instance, as [P1R17], [P2C17] and etc.

T2	你别结婚吧，女孩子 P 长大也不容易。(1) 妇权[PC1]依附男权[PC1]，女权的发展 P1[PC1]势不可挡！(2) 如果和平的手段[P1C2]无法推进，你们会看到你们想要的彻底对立！(3)
T4	那是什么不让女孩子们 P 去附和? (4) 要求别人[PR4]附和，起码自己 P1[PC4]得拿得出手。(5) 况且女孩子们的要求[PC4]不高且拒绝将就，而男孩子们[PC4][P1R5]呢，呵呵，做不到罢了。(6)
T6	男生的标准 P；(7) 入得了厅堂，下得了厨房，对儿女要用心，还得爱做家务，个人卫生条件好，无黄赌毒历史，有稳定收入，家庭无家暴历史，家族无精神病患者，少和岳父岳母老婆顶嘴，手脚要勤快，嘴巴要甜，安分守己，做不到，就不要瞎 bb 女生应该怎么样[PC7]！(8)
T8	我是新儒家的坚定反对派，不要和我提传统 P。(9) 等我的 24 孝专题[PC9]做出来，会圈你出来看看。(10) 你们的传统[PR9]比鲁迅的人吃人还恐怖，爷(也)恶毒百倍！(11)
T10	拒绝。(12) 你这是要逼着女孩子们 P 远离你们的理论 P1。(13) 没有任何受过现代教育的女孩子[PR13]会乐意生这么多 P2[P1C13]！(14) 你以为，生而不养[P2C14]值得骄傲? (15) 你得清楚现在的婚姻法[PC13]和社保制度[PC13]有多对不起家庭主妇[PC13]！(16)
T12	忘本的 P 是你们。(17) 为了让身处半殖民半封建的国民 P1 走出深渊 P2，先辈们[PC17]付出了多少！(18) 你们这群人[P1C18]居然还在鼓吹吃人肉喝人血的封建传统 P3[P2C18]? (19) 不知所谓！(20) 在打破封建迷信[P3R19]上，我万分感谢毛主席挖了孔家庙及孔家祖坟[P3C19]。(21) 我们现在是需要能树立精神文明和规范的东西[P3C19]，但这绝不是封建传统[P3R19]复辟的理由！(22)
T14	接近 14 亿人 P，你发愁发早了。(23) 就算 90，00，10，甚至以后一半的女孩子 P1[PR23]单身，人口[PR23]也就少个几千万或者上亿而已。(24) 你大概没观察过吧。(25) 有不婚念头的[P1R24]一般家庭工作样貌收入学历都还行。(26) 那么不婚是她们[P1R24]蠢，还是其他原因 P2 让她们[P1R24]不婚? (27) 这两年重男轻女抬头[P2C27]果然

是有铁证的！(28) 否则也不会吓得那么多人[P1R24]单身！(29)

T16	况且你不用烦心汉人基数减少，很多人 P 都是繁衍派 P1！(30) 只是我们这一代（或许还有 80 后的一部分）的女孩子们[PC30]拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇 [P1C30]而已！(31)
T18	正是因为女孩子 P 看着自己的奶奶外婆妈妈等女性亲属们 P1 过的有多艰难！(32) 才会远离灾难！(33) 你不可否认，在家庭 P2[P1C32]中，父亲角色[P1C32]经常是缺位的！(34) 况且女孩子的人生[PC32][P1C32]绝不可能就是生生生 P3[PC32][P1C32][P2C34]！(35) 你再这么有底气说你的女性的付出[P2C32][P3C35]时，也请你想想怎么让她们享受到付出后的果实[P2C32][P3C35]！(36)
T20	别扯那么大，别说社会发展 ，就是你变成了世界首富，与她们 P 何干？(37) 她们的付出得不到回报，就别再想忽悠 新一代的女孩子 P1 学习她们 P！(38) 你大概不知道，在我们看来，老一辈女性[PR37/38][P1C38]傻乎乎的，特别好骗好欺负，还特别傻白甜，尤其是她们男人[PC38]说啥就是啥的信仰！(39)
T22	你呢？(40) 比我高多少？(41) 社会建设中我是没添砖头还是没加瓦？(42) 别把你们说的那么崇高！(43) 说白了就是依旧希望女人单方面付出 P，最好是无偿的 P1，需要时出现不要就滚的本质！(44) 可惜，前进的车轮不会倒退，除非你们想挑起民愤和发起暴力反抗。(45) 说起来，承认女性的家庭付出[PP1C44]和给她们更好的待遇[PP1C44]，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍) (46)
T24	国家强大要人口 P 没错，但如果单身的 P1 多了，你就使劲让那些喜欢生的 P2 使劲生吧，最好是一年一个，然后每年都生，然后老婆 P3 死了换新的，继续生吧……(47) 反正在你的观念里，生孩子这种事儿[PP2P3C47]，你们只要动口就一堆女孩子[P1P2P3C47]愿意似的……(48)
T26	那么可以明确告诉你，没有真正爱孩子的 P 会送他(她)们 P1 去所谓的女德班，淑女学校！(49) 她们 P1 都是人 P2！(50) 她们 P1 有资格选择自己是一个怎样的人[P2R50]！(51) 拥有怎样的人生 [P2C50]！(52) 你就不用忽悠小年轻了！(53) 大家都不傻！(54) 没有人[PR49]会为了迎合你们，就磋磨自己的孩子[P1R49/50/51]！(55)
T28	不用争论了，我会挂头条并扩容，让更多的人看到，然后我倒是想看看。(56) 我们之间的对话，正常和属于社会主流思想 P 的到底是什么，而且最关键的是，有多少人和你一样！(57) 和你一样的人 P1 绝对拉黑没商量！(58) 你们简直就是阻碍社会进步的毒瘤 [PC57][P1C58]！(59) 封建复辟老僵尸[PC57][P1C58]！(60)

Appendix C

Cohesive units and PDIs in FY's texts

Note: All cohesive units and PDIs in the category of nominal group are highlighted. The first PDI in each text is marked as P, and the following ones are marked in the order of their appearance (e.g. P1, P2 and etc.). Reiteration or collocation unit of the first PDI is marked as PR or PC plus the sentence number in which the PDI appears (e.g. [PR15], [PC16] and etc.). Reiteration or collocation unit of the following PDIs in the same text is marked, for instance, as [P1R17], [P2C17] and etc.

T1	就是欺负你这文盲，不懂文化 P，不懂历史 P1。(1) 你要知道，一个社会的发展 [PC1][P1C1]，女权主义 P2 这种自由社会的糟糠 [PC1][P1C1]，你绝对不该学，你该学的该是叫"妇权主义 P3"，女权和妇权只有一字之差，但女权 P2 是自私自利，而妇权 P3 是代表责任心 P4。(2) 因为妇女（妇权）[P2C2][P3R2]是在生育孩子的前提[P4C2]下，保证妇女的权益 [P2C2][P3C2]。(3)
T3	(a)如果按照你们这种做法 P，我们的生育率就会暴跌 P1，人口减少 P2，缺乏家庭主妇 P3，没人生儿育女 P4，导致人口老化 P5，社会衰退 P6。(4) 知道你们这种做法的危害 [PP1P2P3P4P5P6C4]？？(5)
	(b)法国，德国，还有日本，北欧国家 P7，人口暴跌[P2R4]已经很严重，大家都是吃喝玩乐的，丢失传统家庭观念 P8，结果生育率暴跌[P1R4]，少子化[P1P2R4]非常严重，现在他们的政府伤透了脑筋，给奖金给优惠，希望大家能多生孩子，结果没人响应。(6) 你再搞这种没责任心的想法行为[PR4][P8C6]，也会把我们国家 [P7R6]带入衰败的地步 [P6R4]。(7)
	(c)唯女子 P9[P3C4]与小人难养也 近则不逊远则怨 (8)——这话果然没错，女人[P9R8]天生就是比男性[P9C8]智商低，还缺乏远瞻性，缺乏远大目光，不懂思考前因后果。(9) 被你们[P9R8]这样一搞，我们的社会不就衰退[P6R4]了。(10) 这种历史罪人，祸国殃民的事情[P6C4]，怎么能干。(11)
T5	不对，该是提倡回归传统伦理道德 P，提倡夫有担当 P1，妻有依附 P2。(12) 注重家庭责任 P3[P1P2C12]，伦理道德[PR12]。(13) 把家庭建设 [P1P2C12][P3C14]，作为社会发展的重点 P4。(14) 传仁德 [PR12]，重孝义[PR12]，以维持人口生育 P5，维持人口平衡 P6。(15) 否则国家变成少子化社会[P5P6C15]，老龄化社会[P5P6C15]，我们的文明发展，社会发展[P4C14]，也全部会倒退。(16)
T7	应该的，学校教育里就该提倡这样，女孩子 P 要学会贤良淑德，生儿育女 P1，懂孝顺父母，翁婆；(17) 最好每个家庭[PC17]生育三个子女 [P1R17]，以维持社会平衡 P2，人口平衡 P3。(18) 否则一旦人口衰退 [P3C18]，国家也跟着走向没落 [P2C18]。(19)
T9	(a)反对儒学 P？？ (20) 不是儒学[PR20]鼓吹生育 P1，维持人口优势

	P2，汉族人 P3 在五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，早就被灭了。(21) 否则，你现在已经变成蒙古族[P3C21]的了(22) 笑死。(23) 如果我们的祖宗[P3R21]，也学你一样自私自利，我们的民族[P3R21] 早就 灭亡[P1P2C21]了。(24)
	(b)为啥需要儒学[PR21]，需要伦理[PC21]，需要传统 [PC21]？？ (25) 就是因为大民族 P4 才能建立一个大国家 P5，小民族建立的都是小国家。(26) 中国[P5R26]能有这么大的国家[P5R26]，就是因为有一个大民族——汉族人 [P4R26]。(27) 如果没有一个稳定统一的大民族[P4R26]，国家[P5R26]早就四分五裂，还能有现在这么好日子让你享受，你真是负义忘本。(28)
T11	(a)我认为，该是转变人民的想法，把经济利益当心，改为家庭建设 P当先。(29) 谁有一个好家庭[PC29]，谁就是优秀人物，优秀阶级。(30) 就如古代举孝廉，奖励仁德一样。(31) 才能让人注重家庭生育 P1[PC29]。(32) 你人口 P2[P1C32]都衰败了，你还能过好生活 P3，你真是无知，为啥日本物价这么贵，就是劳动力短缺 P4[P1C32]。(33)
	(b)不是因为中国人口多[P2C33]，汉族努力生育[P1R32]，早五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，就被他们杀光了。(34) 我们还能过现在这种好生活[P3R33]？？ (35) 你又想过好生活[P3R33]，又不想承担社会责任 P5，哪有你这么无耻的。(36) 没有人口生育 [P1R32][P2R33][P5C36]，没有劳动力 [P4R33][P5C36]，哪来社会发展 [P3C33]和经济消费[P3C33]。(37)
T13	中国人 P 落后，那是清朝闭关锁国导致，一旦开始搞经济，以中国人的头脑 P1，马上就发展起来了。(38) 原因就是中国人[P1C38]聪明。(39) 古代社会儒学 P2 在鼓励知识分子 P3[PC38]多生育，导致有文化的人 P4[PC38]生育更多后代 P5。(40) 是古代社会伦理[P2R40]，导致聪明的人[P3P4R40][PC38]生育了更多后代 [P5R40]。(41) 才能让中国人[PR38]这么聪明。(42) （文盲[P3P4C40]一个，正确道理都不懂 (43)
T15	接近 14 亿人 P，你发愁发早了。(quotation of MG's text in T14) (44) ————中国 P1 不是人口多 P2[PR44]，而是老人多，现在的中国人 P3 都是 50~60 后，他们 20 年后全变老人 P4；(45) 如果没有补充新生人口[P3C45][P4C45]，人口 [P2R45]马上暴跌到几亿[PR44]，我们的国家和民族[P1P3R45]都衰败了。(46) 现在那些吃喝玩乐的人[P3C45]，只能将来承受人口老化，经济衰退的后果[P4C45]。(47)
T17	(a)女孩子们 P 拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇 P1 而已！(quotation of MG's text in T16) (48) ————生在这个社会上，享受社会的一切好环境，好生活 [P1C48]，就必须承担责任 P2，不愿意承担责任的人 P3[PC48]，没权享受社会劳动成果 P4[P1C48]。(49) 有贡献[P2C49]才能有回报[P4C49]。(50) 以后要把工作岗位，社会福利补贴[P4C49]给那些肯生育，肯维护家庭责任的人[P2C49][P3C49]。(51) 自私自利的人[P3R49]就活该~ (52)
	(b)你就别想了。(53) 以后会取消养老金 P5，提倡养儿防老，没生孩子

的人[P3R49]，晚年只能凄惨度过。(54) 别以为有保险金，人口劳动力衰退时候，人工成本很高，养老金 [P5R54]会严重贬值的。(55) 自己想想吧~ (56)

T19	(a)女孩子们在性别压迫 P 上的反应会让你惊喜。(57) ————这种不叫压迫[PR57]，这种叫责任 P1，我们的奶奶，母亲 P2，都是生儿育女这样 P3 过来的。(58) 爷爷父亲[P2C58]也是靠点工资，养活 5~6 孩子[P3C58]，他们是这样生活，你们也不能放弃这责任[P1R58]。 (59)
	(b)但是他们的贡献 P4，也让中国 P5 有更多的人口 P6，才能导致我们有足够的劳动力 P7，完成现代化 P8，成为世界工厂 P9。(60) 中国[P5R60]能崛起，很大程度就是西方人口衰退，而中国[P5R60]人口劳动力充足 [P7R60]，才又生产基地[P9R60]转移到中国[P5R60]，让我们也富裕起来。(61)
	(c)我们有现在的好生活，就是靠充足的劳动力[P7R60]，才能变成世界工厂[P9R60]，成为工业强国[P8C60]的。(62) 而西方国家的生产订单，早被中国这个世界工厂[P5P9R60]给取代了。(63) 活着在中国[P5R60]你吃香喝辣，从来不知道国家[P5R60]怎么强大起来的？？(64) 就知道自私自利，逃避社会责任[P1R58]。(65)
	(d)父母辈的生育[P4C60]传承人口[P6R60]，劳动力充足[P7R60]，才导致国家强盛[P5C60]。(66) 我们要为将来的中国[P5R60]继续保持强盛的话，每个人都要做贡献 [P4R60]。(67) 少做贡献的人[P4C60]就少吃福利，没有医保社保，这些福利该给那些多生育的家庭[P2C58]才对。(68) 你既然选择这样，那就自己吃亏吧，应该的。(69)
T21	(a)不要紧，社会制度(福利) P 必须合理分配 才对。(70) 贡献大的人 P1就回报大[PC70]。(71) 贡献小的人回报就小。(72) 多孩子，多生育的家庭 P2[P1C71]可以报考名校 [PC70]，也可以优先安排岗位[PC70]，有福利住房 [PC70]。(73) 少生或者单身的 P3[P2C73]，就不该享受这些福利 [PC70]。(74) 就让他们[P3R74]自由自在，自生自灭。(75) 这也很公平。(76)
	(b)国家强大 P4就需要人口 P5，每个家庭 [P2R73]都该贡献人口，维持生育 P6。(77) 大家都要维持伦理道德，维持家庭观念[P2C73]才行。(78) 生育[P6R77]就是为国家[P4R77]贡献，有贡献[P5C77]就有回报[PC70]。(79) 有养老金[PC70]，有社保[PC70]，那些懒惰腐败，贪婪腐化，不愿意承担责任的人[P3C74]，就该少点享受社会利益[PC70]才对。(80) 也很公平。(81)
T23	承认女性的家庭付出 P 和给她们更好的待遇 P1，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍)(quotation of MG's text in T22) (82)————以后规定，多生孩子的 P2[PC82]有抚养金[P1C82]，有福利津贴[P1C82]。(83) 还要成立淑女学校，把一些思想素质好的女孩子[P2C83]培训成为贤妻良母[P2C83]，让她们明白，生儿育女[P2C83]才能维持国家强大，希望她们多做贡献。(84)
T25	还把那些淑女学校的女孩子 P，通过相亲婚配给官僚家庭，富商家

庭，让她努力生育，为国家做贡献，也同时能在好家庭过上好生活。(85) 干得好不如嫁得好，哈哈哈哈~ (86)（你这垃圾[PC85]，当然没份了。(87) 哈哈~ (88)）

T27	(a)爱孩子的会送他(她)们去所谓的女德班、淑女学校 P！她们都是人！(quotation of MG's text in T26) (89)——————如果能嫁入富豪家庭 P1，嫁入干部家庭 P2，你说他们会不会答应呢？？(90) 哈哈哈现在的女孩子 P3 不是喜欢（非诚勿扰，非富勿嫁）吗？(91) 相亲不就是找个好家庭 P4[P1P2R90]。(92) 过好日子 P5？(93)
	(b)只要能过上好生活[P5R93]，(嫁入)好家庭[P4R92]，大把爱慕虚荣的女孩子 [P3R91] 会愿意到女德班，淑女学校 [PR89] 去当淑女 [P3R91]。(94) 当贤妻良母[P3C91]。(95) 而且还要进行选秀，成绩好，身材相貌好的[P3R91]才能入读淑女学校 [PR89]。(96) 哈哈哈~ (97)
T29	封建复辟老僵尸！(quotation of MG's text in T28) (98) ——这种叫传统，传承与统一 P。(99) 这[PR99]才是最为优秀的社会 P1。(100) 因为文明 P2 是靠一个民族 P3 去传承的，民族衰败，文明 P4 也就走向毁灭了。(101) 你好好养好身体，改天给你当秀女，送你读淑女学校，给你嫁个干部家庭，富商家庭。(102) 多点生育优秀后代，让他们长大后为国家[P1R100][PC99][P2P3P4C101]建设做贡献。(103)

Appendix D

Reference units in MG's texts

Note: reference units are highlighted in each text. If a pronoun forms a part of a nominal group, the pronoun is marked in bold.

T2	你别结婚吧，女孩子长大也不容易。(1) 妇权依附男权，女权的发展势不可挡！(2) 如果和平的手段无法推进，你们会看到**你们**想要的彻底对立！(3)
T4	那是什么不让女孩子们去附和？(4) 要求别人附和，起码自己得拿得出手。(5) 况且女孩子们的要求不高且拒绝将就，而男孩子们呢，呵呵，做不到罢了。(6)
T6	男生的标准；(7) 入得了厅堂，下得了厨房，对儿女要用心，还得爱做家务，个人卫生条件好，无黄赌毒历史，有稳定收入，家庭无家暴历史，家族无精神病患者，少和岳父岳母老婆顶嘴，手脚要勤快，嘴巴要甜，安分守己，做不到，就不要瞎 bb 女生应该怎么样！(8)
T8	我是新儒家的坚定反对派，不要和我提传统。(9) 等**我的** 24 孝专题做出来，会圈你出来看看。(10) 你们的传统比鲁迅的人吃人还恐怖，爷(也)恶毒百倍！(11)
T10	拒绝。(12) 你这是要逼着女孩子们远离**你们的**理论。(13) 没有任何受过现代教育的女孩子会乐意生这么多！(14) 你以为，生而不养值得骄傲？(15) 你得清楚现在的婚姻法和社保制度有多对不起家庭主妇！(16)
T12	忘本的是你们。(17) 为了让身处半殖民半封建的国民走出深渊，先辈们付出了多少！(18) **你们**这群人居然还在鼓吹吃人肉喝人血的封建传统？(19) 不知所谓！(20) 在打破封建迷信上，我万分感谢毛主席挖了孔家庙及孔家祖坟。(21) 我们现在是需要能树立精神文明和规范的东西，但这绝不是封建传统复辟的理由！(22)
T14	接近 14 亿人，你发愁发早了。(23) 就算 90，00，10，甚至以后一半的女孩子单身，人口也就少个几千万或者上亿而已。(24) 你大概没观察过吧。(25) 有不婚念头的一般家庭工作样貌收入学历都还行。(26) 那么不婚是她们蠢，还是其他原因让她们不婚？(27) 这两年重男轻女抬头果然是有铁证的！(28) 否则也不会吓得那么多人单身！(29)
T16	况且你不用烦心汉人基数减少，很多人都是繁衍派！(30) 只是**我们**这一代（或许还有 80 后的一部分）的女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！(31)

T18	正是因为女孩子看着自己的奶奶外婆妈妈等女性亲属们过的有多艰难！(32) 才会远离灾难！(33) 你不可否认，在家庭中，父亲角色经常是缺位的！(34) 况且女孩子的人生绝不可能就是生生生！(35) 你再这么有底气说你的女性的付出时，也请你想想怎么让她们享受到付出后的果实！(36)
T20	别扯那么大，别说社会发展，就是你变成了世界首富，与她们何干？(37) 她们的付出得不到回报，就别再想忽悠新一代的女孩子学习她们！(38) 你大概不知道，在我们看来，老一辈女性傻乎乎的，特别好骗好欺负，还特别傻白甜，尤其是她们男人说啥就是啥的信仰！(39)
T22	你呢？(40) 比我高多少？(41) 社会建设中我是没添砖头还是没加瓦？(42) 别把你们说的那么崇高！(43) 说白了就是依旧希望女人单方面付出，最好是无偿的，需要时出现不要就滚的本质！(44) 可惜，前进的车轮不会倒退，除非你们想挑起民愤和发起暴力反抗。(45) 说起来，承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍) (46)
T24	国家强大要人口没错，但如果单身的多了，你就使劲让那些喜欢生的使劲生吧，最好是一年一个，然后每年都生，然后老婆死了换新的，继续生吧……(47) 反正在你的观念里，生孩子这种事儿，你们只要动口就一堆女孩子愿意似的……(48)
T26	那么可以明确告诉你，没有真正爱孩子的会送他(她)们去所谓的女德班，淑女学校！(49) 她们都是人！(50) 她们有资格选择自己是一个怎样的人！(51) 拥有怎样的人生！(52) 你就不用忽悠小年轻了！(53) 大家都不傻！(54) 没有人会为了迎合你们，就磋磨自己的孩子！(55)
T28	不用争论了，我会挂头条并扩容，让更多的人看到，然后我倒是想看看。(56) 我们之间的对话，正常和属于社会主流思想的到底是什么，而且最关键的是，有多少人和你一样！(57) 和你一样的人绝对拉黑没商量！(58) 你们简直就是阻碍社会进步的毒瘤！(59) 封建复辟老僵尸！(60)

Appendix E

Reference units in FY's texts

Note: reference units are highlighted in each text. If a pronoun forms a part of a nominal group, the pronoun is marked in bold.

T1	就是欺负**你这**文盲，不懂文化，不懂历史。(1) 你要知道，**一个**社会的发展，女权主义**这种**自由社会的糟糠，你绝对不该学，你该学的该是叫"妇权主义"，女权和妇权只有一字之差，但女权是自私自利，而妇权是代表责任心。(2) 因为妇女（妇权）是在生育孩子的前提下，保证妇女的权益。 (3)
T3	(a)如果按照**你们这种**做法，我们的生育率就会暴跌，人口减少，缺乏家庭主妇，没人生儿育女，导致人口老化，社会衰退。(4) 知道**你们这种**做法的危害？？(5)
	(b)法国，德国，还有日本，北欧国家，人口暴跌已经很严重，大家都是吃喝玩乐的，丢失传统家庭观念，结果生育率暴跌，少子化非常严重，现在**他们的**政府伤透了脑筋，给奖金给优惠，希望大家能多生孩子，结果没人响应。(6) 你再搞**这种**没责任心的想法行为，也会把我们国家带入衰败的地步。(7)
	(c)唯女子与小人难养也 近则不逊远则怨 (8) ——**这**话果然没错，女人天生就是比男性智商低，还缺乏远瞻性，缺乏远大目光，不懂思考前因后果。(9) 被你们这样一搞，我们的社会就不就衰退了。(10) **这种**历史罪人，祸国殃民的事情，怎么能干。(11)
T5	不对，该是提倡回归传统伦理道德，提倡夫有担当，妻有依附。(12) 注重家庭责任，伦理道德。(13) 把家庭建设，作为社会发展的重点。(14) 传仁德，重孝义，以维持人口生育，维持人口平衡。(15) 否则国家变成少子化社会，老龄化社会，我们的文明发展，社会发展，也全部会倒退。(16)
T7	应该的，学校教育里就该提倡**这样**，女孩子要学会贤良淑德，生儿育女，懂孝顺父母，翁婆；(17) 最好每个家庭生育三个子女，以维持社会平衡，人口平衡。(18) 否则一旦人口衰退，国家也跟着走向没落。(19)
T9	(a)反对儒学？？ (20) 不是儒学鼓吹生育，维持人口优势，汉族人在五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，早就被灭了。(21) 否则，**你**现在已经变成蒙古族的了。(22) 笑死。(23) 如果我们的祖宗，也学你一样自私自利，我们的民族早就灭亡了。 (24)
	(b)为啥需要儒学，需要伦理，需要传统？？ (25) 就是因为大民族才能建立**一个**大国家，小民族建立的都是小国家。(26) 中国能有这么大的国家，就是因为有**一个**大民族——汉族人。(27) 如果没有**一个**稳定统一的大民族，国家早就四分五裂，还能有现在这么好日子让你享受，你真是负义忘本。(28)

T11	(a)我认为，该是转变人民的想法，把经济利益当心，改为家庭建设当先。(29) 谁有**一个**好家庭，谁就是优秀人物，优秀阶级。(30) 就如古代举孝廉，奖励仁德一样。(31) 才能让人注重家庭生育。(32) 你人口都衰败了，你还能过好生活，你真是无知，为啥日本物价这么贵，就是劳动力短缺。(33)
	(b)不是因为中国人口多，汉族努力生育，早五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，就被他们杀光了。(34) 我们还能过现在**这种**好生活？？(35) 你又想过好生活，又不想承担社会责任，哪有你这么无耻的。(36) 没有人口生育，没有劳动力，哪来社会发展和经济消费。(37)
T13	中国人落后，那是清朝闭关锁国导致，一旦开始搞经济，以中国人的头脑，马上就发展起来了。(38) 原因就是中国人聪明。(39) 古代社会儒学在鼓励知识分子多生育，导致有文化的人生育更多后代。(40) 是古代社会伦理，导致聪明的人生育了更多后代。(41) 才能让中国人这么聪明。(42) （文盲一个，正确道理都不懂 (43)
T15	接近 14 亿人，你发愁发早了。(quotation of MG's text in T14) (44) ————中国不是人口多，而是老人多，现在的中国人都是 50~60 后，他们 20 年后全变老人；(45) 如果没有补充新生人口，人口马上暴跌到几亿，我们的国家和民族都衰败了。(46) 现在**那些**吃喝玩乐的人，只能将来承受人口老化，经济衰退的后果。(47)
T17	(a)女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！(quotation of MG's text in T16) (48) ————生在这个社会上，享受社会的一切好环境，好生活，就必须承担责任，不愿意承担责任的人，没权享受社会劳动成果。(49) 有贡献才能有回报。(50) 以后要把工作岗位，社会福利补贴给**那些**肯生育，肯维护家庭责任的人。(51) 自私自利的人就活该~ (52)
	(b)你就别想了。(53) 以后会取消养老金，提倡养儿防老，没生孩子的人，晚年只能凄惨度过。(54) 别以为有保险金，人口劳动力衰退时候，人工成本很高，养老金会严重贬值的。(55) 自己想想吧~ (56)
T19	(a)女孩子们在性别压迫上的反应会让你惊喜。(57) ————这种不叫压迫，这种叫责任，我们的奶奶，母亲，都是生儿育女这样过来的。(58) 爷爷父亲也是靠点工资，养活 5~6 孩子，他们是这样生活，你们也不能放弃**这**责任。(59)
	(b)但是**他们的**贡献，也让中国有更多的人口，才能导致我们有足够的劳动力，完成现代化，成为世界工厂。(60) 中国能崛起，很大程度就是西方人口衰退，而中国人口劳动力充足，才又生产基地转移到中国，让我们也富裕起来。(61)
	(c)我们有现在的好生活，就是靠充足的劳动力，才能变成世界工厂，成为工业强国的。(62) 而西方国家的生产订单，早被中国**这个**世界工厂给取代了。(63) 活着在中国你吃香喝辣，从来不知道国家怎么强大起来的？？(64) 就知道自私自利，逃避社会责任。(65)

	(d)父母辈的生育传承人口，劳动力充足，才导致国家强盛。(66) 我们要为将来的中国继续保持强盛的话，每个人都要做贡献。(67) 少做贡献的人就少吃福利，没有医保社保，这些福利该给**那些**多生育的家庭才对。(68) 你既然选择这样，那就自己吃亏吧，应该的。(69)
T21	(a)不要紧，社会制度(福利)必须合理分配才对。(70) 贡献大的人就回报大。(71) 贡献小的人回报就小。(72) 多孩子，多生育的家庭可以报考名校，也可以优先安排岗位，有福利住房。(73) 少生或者单身的，就不该享受**这些**福利。(74) 就让他们自由自在，自生自灭。(75) 这也很公平。(76)
	(b)国家强大就需要人口，每个家庭都该贡献人口，维持生育。(77) 大家都要维持伦理道德，维持家庭观念才行。(78) 生育就是为国家贡献，有贡献就有回报。(79) 有养老金，有社保，**那些**懒惰腐败，贪婪腐化，不愿意承担责任的人，就该少点享受社会利益才对。(80) 也很公平。(81)
T23	承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍)(quotation of MG's text in T22) (82)————以后规定，多生孩子的有抚养金，有福利津贴。(83) 还要成立淑女学校，把**一些思想素质好的女孩子培训成为贤妻良母，让她们明白，生儿育女才能维持国家强大，希望她们多做贡献。(84)
T25	还把**那些**淑女学校的女孩子，通过相亲婚配给官僚家庭，富商家庭，让她努力生育，为国家做贡献，也同时能在好家庭过上好生活。(85) 干得好不如嫁得好，哈哈哈哈~ (86)（**你这**垃圾，当然没份了。(87) 哈哈~ (88)）
T27	(a)爱孩子的会送他(她)们去所谓的女德班、淑女学校！她们都是人！(quotation of MG's text in T26) (89)——————如果能嫁入富豪家庭，嫁入干部家庭，**你说他(她)们会不会答应呢？？(90) 哈哈哈 现在的女孩子不是喜欢《非诚勿扰，非富勿嫁》吗？(91) 相亲不就是找个好家庭。(92) 过好日子？(93)
	(b)只要能过上好生活，(嫁入)好家庭，大把爱慕虚荣的女孩子会愿意到女德班，淑女学校去当淑女。(94) 当贤妻良母。(95) 而且还要进行选秀，成绩好，身材相貌好的才能入读淑女学校。(96) 哈哈哈~ (97)
T29	封建复辟老僵尸！(98) ———这种叫传统，传承与统一。(99) 这才是最为优秀的社会。(100) 因为文明是靠**一个**民族去传承的，民族衰败，文明也就走向毁灭了。(101) 你好好养好身体，改天给你当秀女，送你读淑女学校，给你嫁个干部家庭，富商家庭。(102) 多点生育优秀后代，让他们长大后为国家建设做贡献。(103)

Appendix F

Non-observance of Grice's maxims

Note: textual response is marked using underline. Any non-observance of the maxims is highlighted using comment function.

T1	FY	就是欺负你这文盲，不懂文化，不懂历史。你要知道，一个社会的发展，女权主义这种自由社会的糟糠，你绝对不该学，你该学的该是叫"妇权主义"，女权和妇权只有一字之差，但女权是自私自利，而妇权是代表责任心。因为妇女(妇权)是在生育孩子的前提下，保证妇女的权益。	
T2	MG	你别结婚吧，女孩子长大也不容易。妇权依附男权，女权的发展势不可挡！如果和平的手段无法推进，你们会看到你们想要的彻底对立！	**Comment [1]:** Flouting: relation **Comment [2]:** Flouting: quantity **Comment [3]:** Flouting: quality
T3	FY	(a)如果按照你们这种做法，我们的生育率就会暴跌，人口减少，缺乏家庭主妇，没人生儿育女，导致人口老化，社会衰退。 知道你们这种做法的危害？？	**Comment [4]:** Violation: relation
		(b)法国，德国，还有日本，北欧国家，人口暴跌已经很严重，大家都是吃喝玩乐的，丢失传统家庭观念，结果生育率暴跌，少子化非常严重，现在他们的政府伤透了脑筋，给奖金给优惠，希望大家能多生孩子，结果没人响应。 你再搞这种没责任心的想法行为，也会把我们国家带入衰败的地步。	**Comment [5]:** Violation: quality **Comment [6]:** Violation: quality
		(c)唯女子与小人难养也 近则不逊远则怨——这话果然没错，女人天生就是比男性智商低，还缺乏远瞻性，缺乏远大目光，不懂思考前因后果。被你们这样一搞，我们的社会不就衰退了。这种历史罪人，祸国殃民的事情，怎么能干。	**Comment [7]:** Flouting: relation **Comment [8]:** Violation: quantity
T4	MG	那是什么不让女孩子们去附和？要求别人附和，起码自己得拿得出手。况且女孩子们的要求不高且拒绝将就，而男孩子们呢，呵呵，做不到罢了。	**Comment [9]:** Violation: relation
T5	FY	不对，该是提倡回归传统伦理道德，提倡夫有担当，妻有依附。注重家庭责任，伦理道德。 把家庭建设，作为社会发展的重点。传仁德，重孝义，以维持人口生育，维持人口平衡。否则国家变成少子化社会，老龄化社会，我们的文明发展，社会发展，也全部会倒退。	**Comment [10]:** Violation: relation **Comment [11]:** Violation: quantity
T6	MG	男生的标准：入得了厅堂，下得了厨房，对儿女要用心，还得爱做家务，个人卫生条件好，无黄赌毒历史，有稳定收入，家庭无家暴历史，家族无精神病患者，少和岳父岳母老婆顶嘴，手脚要勤快，嘴巴要甜，安分守己，做不到，就不要瞎 bb 女生应该怎么样！	**Comment [12]:** Violation: relation

| T7 | FY | 应该的，学校教育里就该提倡这样，女孩子要学会贤良淑德，生儿育女，懂孝顺父母，翁婆；最好每个家庭生育三个子女，以维持社会平衡，人口平衡。 否则一旦人口衰退，国家也跟着走向没落。 |

Comment [13]: Violation: relation

Comment [14]: Violation: quantity

| T8 | MG | 我是新儒家的坚定反对派，不要和我提传统。等我的 24 孝专题做出来，会圈你出来看看。你们的传统比鲁迅的人吃人还恐怖，爷(也)恶毒百倍！ |

Comment [15]: Violation: relation

Comment [16]: Violation: relation

| T9 | FY | (a)反对儒学？？ 不是儒学鼓吹生育，维持人口优势，汉族人在五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，早就被灭了。 否则，你现在已经变成蒙古族的了。笑死。 如果我们的祖宗，也学你一样自私自利，我们的民族早就灭亡了。 |

Comment [17]: Violation: relation

Comment [18]: Violation: relation

| | | (b)为啥需要儒学，需要伦理，需要传统？？ 就是因为大民族才能建立一个大国家，小民族建立的都是小国家。中国能有这么大的国家，就是因为有一个大民族——汉族人。 如果没有一个稳定统一的大民族，国家早就四分五裂，还能有现在这么好日子让你享受，你真是负义忘本。 |

Comment [19]: Violation: relation

| T10 | MG | 拒绝。你这是要逼着女孩子们远离你们的理论。没有任何受过现代教育的女孩子会乐意生这么多！你以为，生而不养值得骄傲？你得清楚现在的婚姻法和社保制度有多对不起家庭主妇！ |

Comment [20]: Violation: relation

| T11 | FY | (a)我认为，该是转变人民的想法，把经济利益当心，改为家庭建设当先。 谁有一个好家庭，谁就是优秀人物，优秀阶级。就如古代举孝廉，奖励仁德一样。才能让人注重家庭生育。 你人口都衰败了，你还能过好生活，你真是无知，为啥日本物价这么贵，就是劳动力短缺。 |

Comment [21]: Violation: relation

Comment [22]: Violation: quantity

Comment [23]: Violation: relation

| | | (b)不是因为中国人口多，汉族努力生育，早五胡乱华，蒙古灭宋的时候，就被他们杀光了。我们还能过现在这种好生活？？你又想过好生活，又不想承担社会责任，哪有你这么无耻的。 没有人口生育，没有劳动力，哪来社会发展和经济消费。 |

Comment [24]: Violation: quantity

| T12 | MG | 忘本的是你们。为了让身处半殖民半封建的国民走出深渊，先辈们付出了多少！你们这群人居然还在鼓吹吃人肉喝人血的封建传统？不知所谓！在打破封建迷信上，我万分感谢毛主席挖了孔家庙及孔家祖坟。我们现在是需要能树立精神文明和规范的东西，但这绝不是封建传统复辟的理由！ |

Comment [25]: Violation: relation

Comment [26]: Flouting: quality

Comment [27]: Flouting: relation

| T13 | FY | 中国人落后，那是清朝闭关锁国导致，一旦开始搞经济，以中国人的头脑，马上就发展起来了。 原因就是中国人聪明。古代社会儒学在鼓励知识分子多生育，导致有文化的人生育更多后代。 是古代社会伦理，导致聪明的人生育了更多后代。才能让中国人这么聪明。（文盲一个，正确道理都不懂 |

Comment [28]: Violation: relation

Comment [29]: Violation: relation

T14	MG	<u>接近 14 亿人，你发愁发早了。</u>就算 90，00，10，甚至以后一半的女孩子单身，人口也就少个几千万或者上亿而已。你大概没观察过吧。有不婚念头的一般家庭工作样貌收入学历都还行。那么不婚是她们蠢，还是其他原因让她们不婚？这两年重男轻女抬头果然是有铁证的！否则也不会吓得那么多人单身！

Comment [30]: Violation: relation

T15	FY	接近 14 亿人，你发愁发早了。————中国不是人口多，而是老人多，现在的中国人都是 50~60 后，他们 20 年后全变老人；如果没有补充新生人口，人口马上暴跌到几亿，我们的国家和民族都衰败了。现在那些吃喝玩乐的人，只能将来承受人口老化，经济衰退的后果。

Comment [31]: Violation: quantity

Comment [32]: Violation: relation

Comment [33]: Violation: quantity

T16	MG	况且你不用烦心汉人基数减少，很多人都是繁衍派！只是我们这一代（或许还有 80 后的一部分）的女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！

Comment [34]: Flouting: quality

T17	FY	(a)女孩子们拒绝继续享受免费奴隶待遇而已！————生在这个社会上，享受社会的一切好环境，好生活，就必须承担责任，不愿意承担责任的人，没权享受社会劳动成果。有贡献才能有回报。以后要把工作岗位，社会福利补贴给那些肯生育，肯维护家庭责任的人。自私自利的人就活该~
		(b)你就别想了。以后会取消养老金，提倡养儿防老，没生孩子的人，晚年只能凄惨度过。别以为有保险金，人口劳动力衰退时候，人工成本很高，养老金会严重贬值的。自己想想吧~

Comment [35]: Violation: quantity

Comment [36]: Violation: relation

Comment [37]: Violation: relation

T18	MG	正是因为女孩子看着自己的奶奶外婆妈妈等女性亲属们过的有多艰难！才会远离灾难！你不可否认，在家庭中，父亲角色经常是缺位的！况且女孩子的人生绝不可能就是生生生！你再这么有底气说你的女性的付出时，也请你想想怎么让她们享受到付出后的果实！

Comment [38]: Violation: relation

T19	FY	(a)女孩子们在性别压迫上的反应会让你惊喜。————这种不叫压迫，这种叫责任，我们的奶奶，母亲，都是生儿育女这样过来的。爷爷父亲也是靠点工资，养活 5~6 孩子，他们是这样生活，你们也不能放弃这责任。
		(b)但是他们的贡献，也让中国有更多的人口，才能导致我们有足够的劳动力，完成现代化，成为世界工厂。中国能崛起，很大程度就是西方人口衰退，而中国人口劳动力充足，才又生产基地转移到中国，让我们也富裕起来。
		(c)我们有现在的好生活，就是靠充足的劳动力，才能变成世界工厂，成为工业强国的。而西方国家的生产订单，早被中国这个世界工厂给取代了。活着在中国你吃香喝辣，从来不知道国家怎么强大起来的？？就知道自私自利，逃避社会责任。
		(d)父母辈的生育传承人口，劳动力充足，才导致国家强盛。我们要为将来的中国继续保持强盛的话，每个人都要做贡献。少做贡

Comment [39]: As MG's previous tweet that links with T19 is no longer available, this turn is not included in the analysis. However, from the previous replies, it is suggested that the first sentence in this turn could be a violation of quantity (see T17)

Comment [40]: Violation: relation

Comment [41]: Violation: quantity

Comment [42]: Violation: relation

Comment [43]: Violation: quantity

献的人就少吃福利，没有医保社保，这些福利该给那些多生育的家庭才对。你既然选择这样，那就自己吃亏吧，应该的。

Comment [44]: Violation: quantity

T20 MG 别扯那么大，别说社会发展，就是你变成了世界首富，与她们何干？她们的付出得不到回报，就别再想忽悠新一代的女孩子学习她们！你大概不知道，在我们看来，老一辈女性傻乎乎的，特别好骗好欺负，还特别傻白甜，尤其是她们男人说啥就是啥的信仰！

Comment [45]: Violation: relation

T21 FY (a)不要紧，社会制度(福利)必须合理分配才对。贡献大的人就回报大。贡献小的人回报就小。[酷] 多孩子，多生育的家庭可以报考名校，也可以优先安排岗位，有福利住房。少生或者单身的，就不该享受这些福利。就让他们自由自在，自生自灭。这也很公平。

Comment [46]: Violation: relation

Comment [47]: Violation: quantity

(b)国家强大就需要人口，每个家庭都该贡献人口，维持生育。大家都要维持伦理道德，维持家庭观念才行。生育就是为国家贡献，有贡献就有回报。有养老金，有社保，那些懒惰腐败，贪婪腐化，不愿意承担责任的人，就该少点享受社会利益才对。也很公平。

Comment [48]: Violation: quantity

T22 MG 你呢？比我高多少？社会建设中我是没添砖头还是没加瓦？别把你们说的那么崇高！说白了就是依旧希望女人单方面付出，最好是无偿的，需要时出现不要就滚的本质！可惜，前进的车轮不会倒退，除非你们想挑起民愤和发起暴力反抗。说起来，承认女性的家庭付出承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍)

Comment [49]: Flouting: quality

Comment [50]: Violation: relation

Comment [51]: Flouting: quality

Comment [52]: Violation: relation

T23 FY 承认女性的家庭付出和给她们更好的待遇，就这么难以决定和宿舍(取舍)－－－－以后规定，多生孩子的有抚养金，有福利津贴。还要成立淑女学校，把一些思想素质好的女孩子培训成为贤妻良母，让她们明白，生儿育女才能维持国家强大，希望她们多做贡献。

Comment [53]: Violation: quantity

Comment [54]: Violation: quantity

Comment [55]: Violation: relation

T24 MG 国家强大要人口没错，但如果单身的多了，你就使劲让那些喜欢生的使劲生吧，最好是一年一个，然后每年都生，然后老婆死了换新的，继续生吧......反正在你的观念里，生孩子这种事儿，你们只要动口就一堆女孩子愿意似的......

Comment [56]: Violation: relation

Comment [57]: Flouting: quality

T25 FY 还把那些淑女学校的女孩子，通过相亲婚配给官僚家庭，富商家庭，让她努力生育，为国家做贡献，也同时能在好家庭过上好生活。干得好不如嫁得好，哈哈哈哈~（你这垃圾，当然没份了。哈哈~）

Comment [58]: Violation: relation

Comment [59]: Flouting: quality

T26 MG 那么可以明确告诉你，没有真正爱孩子的会送他(她)们去所谓的女德班，淑女学校！她们都是人！她们有资格选择自己是一个怎样的

人！拥有怎样的人生！你就不用忽悠小年轻了！大家都不傻！没有人会为了迎合你们，就磋磨自己的孩子！

T27	FY	(a)爱孩子的会送他(她)们去所谓的女德班、淑女学校！她们都是人！——————如果能嫁入富豪家庭，嫁入干部家庭，你说他(她)们会不会答应呢？？ 哈哈哈 现在的女孩子不是喜欢（非诚勿扰，非富勿嫁）吗？相亲不就是找个好家庭。过好日子？
		(b)只要能过上好生活，(嫁入)好家庭，大把爱慕虚荣的女孩子会愿意到女德班，淑女学校去当淑女。 当贤妻良母。而且还要进行选秀，成绩好，身材相貌好的才能入读淑女学校。哈哈哈~
T28	MG	不用争论了，我会挂头条并扩容，让更多的人看到，然后我倒是想看看。我们之间的对话，正常和属于社会主流思想的到底是什么，而且最关键的是，有多少人和你一样！和你一样的人绝对拉黑没商量！你们简直就是阻碍社会进步的毒瘤！封建复辟老僵尸！
T29	FY	封建复辟老僵尸！———这种叫传统，传承与统一。 这才是最为优秀的社会。因为文明是靠一个民族去传承的，民族衰败，文明也就走向毁灭了。 你好好养好身体，改天给你当秀女，送你读淑女学校，给你嫁个干部家庭，富商家庭。多点生育优秀后代，让他们长大后为国家建设做贡献。

Comment [60]: Violation: relation

Comment [61]: Violation: quality

Comment [62]: Flouting: relation

Comment [63]: Violation: quantity

Comment [64]: Violation: relation

Comment [65]: Violation: quantity

Comment [66]: Violation: relation

Comment [67]: Opting-out

Comment [68]: Violation: quantity

Appendix G

Statistics of non-observance of the maxims in the conversation

Type	Frequency total	Frequency in MG's texts	Frequency in FY's texts	The number of turns out of 29	The number of turns in MG's texts	The number of turns in FY's texts
Flouting	12	10	2	8	6	2
Flouting of Quantity	1	1	N/A	1	1 (T2)	N/A
Flouting of Quality	7	6	1	6	5 (T2, T12, T16, T22, T24)	1 (T25)
Flouting of Relation	4	3	1	4	3 (T2, T12, T26)	1 (T3 c)
Violation	54	14	39	26	12	14
Violation of Quantity	18	N/A	18	11	N/A	11 (T3, T5, T7, T11, T15, T17, T19, T21, T23, T27, T29)
Violation of Quality	3	1	2	2	1 (T26)	1 (T3 b)
Violation of Relation	33	13	20	24	11 (T4, T6, T8, T10, T12, T14, T18, T20, T22, T24, T26)	13 (T3, T5, T7, T9, T11, T13, T15, T17, T19, T21, T23, T25, T27)