

Conversational Analysis of Conflict Talk between Family Members Based on Downton Abbey

Jing Zhao

Chongqing Business Vocational College, Chongqing, China

Abstract: Through investigating the conflict talks between family members based on Downton Abbey, this paper aims to promote mutual understanding when conflict talk happens and find out how conflict talk start, maintain and terminate, finding out what methods that deserve close attention of family members to avoid conflict or solve the conflict. Based on the theory of Conversational Analysis, the author investigated modes and methods adopted in initiating, maintaining and terminating stage respectively, pointing out that in initiating stage, family members prefer to use position statements-negative response and opposing questions-confrontational response modes to order-refusal mode. Interruption and repetition are two main features of conflict talks usually occur in maintaining stage. During verbal conflict, participants usually interrupt or repeat the utterance of themselves or the other party's. In terminating stage, submission, intervention of third party, and leave of one party are frequently adopted in conflict talk between family members. The third party who intervenes is usually people with higher status.

Keywords: Conflict Talk; Initiating Stage; Maintaining Stage; Terminating Stage; Modes; Methods

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Conflict, which is defined by Malloy & McMurray (1996) as a relationship when two people have incompatible goals and use a variety of methods to influence each other [1], exists everywhere at any time among different people due to various reasons. It has been popularly researched by different disciplines from a variety of perspectives, often been seen as destructive, hostile and aggressive behavior.

Qin (1997) divided conflict into three groups: conflict in ideas, conflict in desires and conflict in personalities, regarding desires as driven force for opposition and conflict [2]. When different people communicate, it is very easy to have conflict with each other. That is to say, conflict talk is a common occurrence in human communication, arising from differences in personal worldviews, values, and attitudes toward the same issues. Additionally, factors such as individual personality traits, habits, and other interpersonal differences can lead to uncooperative behavior during interactions. Conflicts can arise in various aspects of life—whether at work with colleagues and supervisors, in school with classmates and teachers, or in daily interactions with family, friends, or even strangers. When people have different opinions or viewpoints towards the same things, insisting on own opinions and wanting to persuade others, then they may argue or quarrel, that's how conflict talk occurs. As far as Kuo (1992) was concerned, "Conflict talk is ubiquitous, normal, and integral to the workings of every society" [3].

Conflict talk which happens between family members is pervasive and ubiquitous; Even within close-knit families, it is rare for every member to agree on every issue. Despite shared values, deep affection, and strong interdependence, differences in interests, habits, and personalities can still lead to disagreements. If conflict talk becomes too frequent, it can strain family relationships and create tension, ultimately undermining the happiness of all involved. As family is the basic unit of society, it is necessary to maintain family harmony.

Conflict talk is one of the inevitable and complex speech acts, frequently occur but not easy to research. Just as Briggs (1996) noticed that "conflict constitutes a type of disorderly discourse and owing to the disorder, researchers did not venture into this form of language behavior" [4]. The natural data for conflict talk in real life is difficult to collect, since it is

disordered, accidental and private. Therefore, in this paper, the author chooses English TV series *Downton Abbey* as the data source. Although they are not natural data from real life, they represent distilled and authentic reflections of real-life conflict talk.

Downton Abbey is a critically acclaimed British period drama that chronicles the lives of the aristocratic Crawley family. Set in the fictional Downton Abbey, the series masterfully captures the social dynamics of the post-Edwardian era. Created by Julian Fellowes, it garnered widespread praise, earning prestigious awards such as a Golden Globe for Best Miniseries and a Primetime Emmy for Outstanding Miniseries. With record-breaking viewership on ITV and PBS, it remains one of Britain's most successful costume dramas in television history. By the third series, it had become one of the most widely watched television shows in the world. Due to problems of possession inheritance and marriages, various disputes and friction occur in Crawley family, thus conflict talk is common.

1.2 Research Questions and Significances

Through investigating the conflict talks between family members based on *Downton Abbey*, this paper aims to promote mutual understanding when conflict talk happens and find out how conflict talk start, maintain and terminate, finding out what methods that deserve close attention of family members to avoid or solve conflict. Research questions are:

(1) How does conflict talk occur, maintain and terminate?

(2) What are the characteristics of conflict talk between family members? How to mitigate or terminate conflict talks?

By finding out the characteristics and terminating methods of conflict talk between family members, the paper might be able to give some advice on how to deal with it and increase the awareness of it. Participants may develop strategies to prevent or properly resolve conflicts. This fosters greater harmony within families, ultimately contributing to social harmony.

1.3 Layout of the Paper

This paper contains five parts, with part one mainly about research background, research questions, significance and structure, part two is literature review, focusing on findings about conflict talk discovered by scholars from home

and abroad, meanwhile the gap which needs to be filled will be indicated. Part three provides a theoretic foundation to this paper; especially the conversation analysis theory will be explained. In the fourth part, methodology of this paper will be introduced, including how data is collected. What's more, as the main body of the paper, discussion and analysis will be presented in this part. Part five is the conclusion, summarizing the findings and providing the limitations of the present paper.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition and Classification

Grimshaw (1990) was the first people who used the term "conflict talk", referring to the verbal interaction known as arguments, disputes, quarrels, etc. [5]. As far as Nelson (2001) was concerned, conflict talk is a very "ambiguous term" usually employed with "arguing, dispute, opposition and disagreement" [6]. According to Zhao (2004, 2006), when one party opposes the other people's words, deeds or manners, or when two parties have different viewpoints toward someone or something, it is very difficult to stop conflict talk from arising [7,8]. In addition, she categorized conflict talk into two types: non-aggressive conflict talk, which focuses on challenging positions the others taken rather than personal attack, and aggressive conflict talk, involving verbal aggressiveness and irrational behaviors [7,8].

2.2 Studies on Conflict Talk Abroad

At the very beginning, the conflict talk research foreign scholars conducted were mainly on argument from the perspective of speech acts, for example, Jacobs & Jason's (1981) research on argument [9]. Zimmerman & West (1975) researched on the interruptions and silences in conversation through analyzing data collected by recording couple's conversations, finding that "men made the overwhelming majority of interruptions in these conversations" [10]. Schiffrin (1985) regarded argument as potential behavior of displaying different opinions and viewpoints, and researched on it [11]. Generally speaking, before 1990s, scholars abroad in linguistic field are more concerned about conflict event and conflict behavior, neglecting the linguistic features of conflict talk itself. After 1990s, scholars gradually research on it from the perspectives of sociolinguistics and

sociological study, regarding conflict talk as a social process. Grimshaw (1990) collected several research papers of conflict talk and made it a thesis collection, demonstrating that “the social variables, such as power, gender, and contextual constraints (e.g. settings, institutional rules), all contribute to the variation of conflict talks” [5]. Besides, research on verbal disputes among children was very popular. O’Keefe and Benoit (1982) wrote their papers about children’s argument. Eder (1990) has investigated several different groups of children, for example all-female students in grades six through eight, finding that young women were learning communication strategies about how to resolve conflict [12]. Many studies have followed the analytic approach of ethnomethodology to study on organization patterns of verbal conflict, which mainly focuses on ways in which a particular task, such as turn-taking or error-correction is accomplished. Lucía (2025) conducted a study on conflict talk in Spanish digital interactions by analyzing digital discourse on Blogs, YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp, etc. [13].

2.3 Studies on Conflict Talk in China

The research of conflict talk in our country started very late compared with foreign countries. Due to the late start of research on conflict talk in China, there are fewer researches than the abroad studies. In our country, the first person who introduced conflict talk to China is Chen Xiaochuan when he published his article named “Coherence in Dispute Conversation” in the journal *Foreign Language* in 2001[14]., thus “research on conflict talk is still an uncultivated land” [7]. She also researched on the “sequential organization” of conflict talk in Chinese, concluding that the moves of conflict talk are “initiation, escalation and termination” and listing models of each move [7]. Jia (2004) studied on conflict management, especially the “strategic choices”, from the pragmatic view [15]. Zhao and Zhang (2005) approached the reasons for the occurrence of conflict talk with the help of Relevance Theory and conclude that lacking relevance is the main cause of conflict talk [16]. Li and Zhang (2007) analyzed the features and terminating ways of conflict talk from cognitive perspective [17]. Li et al. (2022) used conversation analysis to study workplace conflict talk with data collected from TV series *The Newsroom* [18]. Gong and Ran (2024)

researched on teasing utterances from the perspective of identity theory, and found that the teaser constructs teasing utterances by invoking the identity attributes of the teased, forming a mock conflict orientation of interpersonal relationship [19]. There are also some graduation papers written by some students about conflict talks. For example, Wang (2006) conducted a pragmatic research on conflict talks in verbal communication between couples in China [20]. Zou (2025), based on the theory of conversation analysis, used conflict talk in 62 U.S. State Department daily press briefings from June 2023 to March 2024 as the data source to explore the conversational structural characteristics of diplomatic settings [21]. While conflict talk has been examined from diverse sociological, linguistic, and interdisciplinary perspectives in both domestic and international research, current scholarship still lacks a comprehensive analytical framework capable of addressing all its multifaceted dimensions. In fact, there are only limited researches conducted about family members’ conflict talk. On the basis of the previous studies on conversational analysis and conflict talk, this paper attempts to analyze conflict talk between family members in *Downton Abbey*, exploring its features, causes and solving strategies, thus to facilitate mutual understanding in families.

3. Theoretical Basis

Conversation Analysis is an empirical approach to studying naturally occurring social interactions through detailed examination of beginning with Harvey Sacks's first work in 1964 [22], it focuses on not only casual conversations, but also task- and institution-centered interactions. It seeks to describe the underlying social organization, which is conceived as an institutionalized substratum of interactional rules, procedures, and conventions [23].

The research of Conversation Analysis mainly includes the following aspects: turn-taking structure, adjacency pairs, preference organization, sequence organization, repair mechanism, and so on so forth, exploring how participants produce and evolving social contexts, uncovering what the conversations reveal about social and cultural practices. This thesis mainly involved the theory of turn-taking, adjacency pairs and preference organization.

Each time, there is only one party speaking, the other party begins to talk until the former stops. At the initiation of any conversational interaction, participants inherently lack prescience regarding topic selection, sequential organization, turn duration, potential interlocutor involvement, or the subsequent distribution of speaking rights among participants. During conversation, overlap, interruption and silence also are possible to occur. Overlap of turns mean that the next speaker interrupts in before the former speaker finishing his/her words, which might be caused by the next speaker's strong will to communicate, expression of strong emotion, or conformation due to failure of hearing clearly. Silence occurred usually to show people's embarrassment or due to some other reasons.

It is quite common that some kinds of utterances are preferred to others. Similarly, there can be actions or response that preferred and dispreferred. On the basis of adjacency pair, Pomerantz (1978) discovered the existence of preference organization in it [24]. For examples, for question, the preferred response is answer rather than another question; for apology, the preferred response is forgiveness rather than neglect; for invitation, the preferred activity would be an acceptance rather than a refusal.

This paper attempts to analyze conflict talk between family members in *Downton Abbey* from the perspective of conversational analysis, exploring its features, causes and solving strategies.

4. Methodology and Discussion

4.1 Data Collection

Although conflict talk between family members commonly occurs, it is difficult to collect natural data since it often takes place instantly in disordered form in private place, making the data confidential and exclusive to outsiders. That might be the reason that few studies conducted about it though it deserves more attention as it is important for building harmonious family.

In light of the research purpose, this paper mainly adopted qualitative method based on the data collected from English TV series *Downton Abbey* season 3. The whole story happened in an aristocratic Crawley family with three daughters. The father is the owner of Downton Abbey, who is a duke with a rich wife from America.

According to the law, their daughters have no right to inherit the big house and the wealth. In order to protect their wealth and Downton Abbey, they want to marry their elder daughter to the legal heir, one of their distant nephews as the formal heir was dead. Due to problems of possession inheritance and marriages, various disputes and friction occur in Crawley family, thus conflict talk is common. Data are collected following the four steps: first, getting the conversations from compact disc; second, transcribing the data from the subtitles; third, analyzing the collected data, and lastly, reporting the findings.

4.2 Discussion

On the basis of Conversational theory, Zhao (2004) divided conflict talk into three stages: initiating, maintaining, and terminating stage [7]. In addition, she discovered frequent modes for each stage. For initiating stage, the most frequent modes are position statements-negative response, order-refusal and opposing questions- confrontational response [7]. In the second stage, people tend to use argumentation, non-compliance, repetition, interruption, etc to maintain or escalate the conflict [7]. For terminating stage, submission, reconciliation, interruption of third party, silence, topic-shifting, leaving etc to end the conflict [7]. In total, 67 conflict talks were collected. Based on her categorization, this paper will discuss conflict talk between family members in English TV series *Downton Abbey* stage by stage.

4.2.1 Initiating stage

In the first mode of initiating stage, speaker makes a statement to show his/her opinion, while the hearer responds negatively with disagreement. Making statement is the most frequently used speech act in verbal interaction since it is widely adopted no matter when describing an event, making attitude clear, or even reasoning. The hearer would either hold the same opinion or opposite opinion toward what the statement contains, and then response to it. As for order-refusal, it is easy to understand, once a speaker gives an order to a hearer and the hearer expresses a refusal to take action according to he/she, conflict occurs. Generally, it is people who have higher status to deliver orders. In mode of opposing questions-confrontational response, the speaker challenges the hearer provocatively with questions; naturally the hearer might response

with confrontation.

Table 1. Frequency of Modes in Initiating Stage

modes	position statements- negative response	order-refusal	opposing questions- confrontational response
numbers	45	2	20
frequencies	67%	3%	30%

From the table 1, it is obvious to find out that the first mode is adopted far more frequently with a proportion of 67%, compared with the other two modes, which respectively account to 3% (order-refusal) and 30% (opposing questions- confrontational response). Examples are show below.

Example 1:

Mathew: I shan't keep it (the money) if I get it

Mary: well, actually, you will, because something rather terrible has happened. You see, apparently Papa has lost a great deal of money...

Mathew: God, I'm sorry. I'm so sorry.

Mary: Yes, but ...surely if Mr. Pullbrook did die before Swire, then we're saved.

Mathew: Darling, I don't think you understand. Reggie Swire put me in his will because he believed I was his daughter's one true love.

Mary: So you were.

Mathew: Yes, but...I broke Lavinia's heart and she died. He never knew that. How could I possibly allow myself to profit from her death to, to, to dine in splendor because I took away a woman's will to live?

This example of conflict talk happens when Mary gets to know that her father has lost all his fortune, while Mathew occasionally has the chance to inherit a big amount of money from his ex-girlfriend Lavinia's father. Since Mathew feels so guilty of Lavinia's death, he doesn't want to inherit the money. In this conversation, Mathew makes his opinion clear by saying that "I shan't keep it (the money) if I get it"; it is obvious that his response is a dispreferred one. While Mary insists that he should accept the money so as to save Downton. Later, after Mary expresses her opinion, he does not agree by telling her that "I don't think you understand." and "but..."

Example 2:

Sybil: they didn't try to stop me, but it doesn't mean they won't come after us, unless Papa can persuade them otherwise.

Cora: (to Tom) Tom, how could you have left her all alone to fend for herself?

Sybil: it wasn't like that. We thought this might happen and decided what to do.

The question is what now?

Cora: You mustn't travel anymore, not before the baby's born.

Sybil: but Tom wants it to be born in Dublin.

Mary: he won't hold you to that now.

This conversation happens when the pregnant Sybil is finally escaped from danger alone after Tom, her husband, run away to Downton. Her mother Cora blames Tom for leaving her alone at risk under no protection, and delivers her order that both of them cannot leave Downton. Since Cora is Sybil's mother, with higher status, it is acceptable for her to give orders. In addition, she hopes for compliance while her daughter responds negatively with a dispreferred one. On the contrary, if people with lower status give orders to people whose status is much higher, it would be violation to social norms. The order-refusal mode occurs 2 times only in total, much less than the first and second mode, which might be caused by comparatively democratic atmosphere in British society, as it unlike China, parents might be more likely to control their children by giving orders.

Example 3:

Mary: So, you're prepared to destroy us in payment for your destroying her?

Mathew: Darling, please. You know I would do anything for this family.

Mary: (crying) anything except for helping us, except for saving Papa from living out from rest of his days in humiliation and grief, and what about us? What about our children? God, Mathew, how can you be so disappointing?

Mathew: Mary, please...

Mary: No! Don't you see what this means? Don't you see what a difference this makes? It means you're not on our side, Mathew. It means that deep down you're not on our side! (Leave)

In this example, Mary is angry with her husband's not giving her a hand to save Downton, so she intentionally asks opposing questions even though she knows that Mathew loves her very much and he won't destroy their family. While in the other side, Mathew is unwilling to take Mr. Swire's heritage and won't change his mind easily, even though Downton is at the risk of being sold out. In the data collected, the percentage of opposing questions-confrontational response is 30%, the reason for which might be that this mode is very aggressive, once a party asks this kind of

question; it is very hard for the other to calm down and avoid conflict talk.

4.2.2 Maintaining stage

In this stage, people tend to use argumentation, non-compliance, repetition, interruption, etc to maintain or escalate the conflict. According to the data collected, the above methods are all involved, with repetition and interruption the two most frequent methods. As mentioned in the last chapter, the organization of conversation in

Table 2. Frequency of Methods in Maintaining Stage

methods	argumentation	non-compliance	interruption	repetition
numbers	25	28	50	56
frequencies	37%	42%	75%	84%

It is common to see from the data collected that many pieces of conflict talks contain more than one method in this stage. From table 2, it can be concluded that interruption and repetition are two most frequently used methods, accounting for 75% and 84% respectively. Due to the limit of word numbers, the author will only elaborate on interruption and repetition. Examples are displayed below:

Example 4:

Mathew: what do you mean you have read it?

Mary: I don't think it is right to destroy a man's last words without reading them. I felt it was wrong.

Mathew: it wasn't your decision.

Mary: well, I made it my decision. Do you want to hear what he says?

Mathew: no.

Mary: To start with, Lavinia must have written to him on her last days, only hours before she died.

Mathew: that's nonsense. There was no letter found in her room.

Mary: be that as it may, she wrote to him after she tried to persuade you to call off the wedding and you wouldn't.

Mathew: this is quite impossible.

This example happens when Mary secretly read Mathew's letter, which is from Lavinia's father about the heritage. Mathew doesn't want to read the letter because feels so guilty of breaking Lavinia's heart that he thinks there is no reason for him to take the money. However, Mary won't allow that and read his letter to persuade him to accept the money. Mathew is angry to know the truth and addresses directly to Mary that "it wasn't your decision". Mary is anxious about Downton, and disappointed about her husband's refusal of the money. Thus, she repeated Mathew's words to show her

terms of turns does not mean that there are no interruptions or silences at all. Interruption is an important character of conflict talks since in conflict talks, people all eager to take the turn to show their opinions. In the cases of interruption, what the speaker says is usually ignored by the listener. Repetition is also widely adopted to avoid silence, embarrassment, to emphasize what one has said, or to take advantage of what the speaker said as weapons to attack.

disagreement, taking Mathew's words to emphasize and attack back.

Repetition almost exists in all conflict talks collected, with only a few does not contain this method.

Example 5:

Lord: why were you? For the fun of seeing private property destroyed?

Tom: those places are different for me. I don't see charm and gracious living. I see something horrible. But when I saw it torn down

Lord: good god almighty! You abandon a pregnant woman in a land that's not her own. You leave her to shift for her while you run for it?!

Cora: you have to go to London, for Sybil's sake, if not for his. You have to see Mr. Shortt

Lord: I don't have to do anything!

Tom: I never meant....

Lord: go to bed! I'll give you my answer in the morning.

Tom left, saying nothing, weep.

In this piece of conflict talk, the Lord, Robert, is furious about Tom's selfish behavior of running away, while leaving his pregnant wife (the Lord's daughter) alone in danger. The lord is so worried about his daughter and so furious that he interrupted and ordered Tom to go to bed without listening to Tom's explanation. The interruption not only shows the strong will to take the turn to talk, but also demonstrating the Lord's enormous feeling. In the process of conflict talk, both the speaker and listener just say what he/she wants to say and refuse to listen to the other.

4.2.3 Terminating stage

For terminating stage, submission or compromise, reconciliation, interruption of third party, silence, topic-shifting, leave of one party etc to end the conflict. Submission or

compromise indicates that one party gives up his/her opinion, persuaded by the other party. Reconciliation needs both parties' compromise and reaches agreement. Third party intervene means there is a third party who is not involved in the conflict talk who helps to end it. Conflict talk may be ended if one party withdraws from conversation or physically leaves the area, or chooses to shift topic or simply keep silence. In this paper, methods including submission, intervention of third party, and leave of one party will be researched since other method are rarely found. These methods also can be used mixed.

Table 3. Frequency of Methods in Terminating Stage

Methods	submission	intervention of third party	leave of one party
Numbers	25	27	19
Frequencies	37%	40%	29%

Table 3 displays that intervention of third party has the highest percentage, 2% higher than submission and 11% percent higher than leave of one party method, which might cause by the existence of other family members. Examples are as follows:

Example 6:

Edith: (weeping)

Lord: my darling girl, what's this

Martha: (hold Edith in her arm) I think you know what it is, since you asked Sir Anthony to write.

Lord: Edith, you do understand that I only ever want what's best for you.

Edith: and you're the judge of that?

Lord: in this, I think I am.

Edith: Sybil marries a chauffeur and you welcome him to Downton, but when I love a gentleman, you cast him into the outer darkness.

Martha: she has a point, Robert.

Lord: Strallan is certainly a gentleman.

Martha: well, besides which, Edith tells me he has a house, he has money, he has a title, everything that you care about.

Lord: you make me sound very shallow.

Edith: aren't you? When you make me give him up because he has a bad arm?

Lord: that's not the only reason. He's quarter of a century too old. (to Martha) did she tell you that?

Martha: your daughter is sad and lonely, Robert. Now I don't mean to interfere, but...

Lord: don't you?

Edith: if you ban him from Downton, I'll only

go to his house. I mean it.

Lord: I don't believe he'd see you.

Edith: I'll wait outside until he does. How can you not like him because of his age, when almost every young man we grew up with is dead? Do you want me to spend my life alone?

Lord: I didn't say I don't like him. I like him very much.

Edith: So do I, Papa. So do I. please, ask him back. He writes he's not coming to Mama's dinner. But please make him. Please, please, please.

Lord: oh, all right, then.

This example is a mixture use of submission and intervention of third party. It happens when the lord does not agree on Edith's wish to marry a much older man, Sir Anthony and asks him to keep distance with Edith, while Edith insists on marrying him. Martha, the Lord's mother-in-law and Edith's grandma, intervened into the conversation. In the end, the Lord makes a compromise and promises he will ask Sir Anthony back because of his love for her daughter as well as the interference of his mother-in-law. Although Martha says that she does not want to interfere, she does interfere into this conversation.

Example 7:

Lord: I thought I might move back in here tonight, if you'll have me.

Cora: not yet. I think I'd rather sleep alone for a while yet.

Lord: well, if you're sure

Cora: I'm sure.

Lord: Cora....

Cora: let's not go through it all again.

Lord: but I'm not arguing. You listened to Clarkson and so should I have done, but Tapsell has a reputation as an expert.

Cora: (weeping) and you believed him, when Dr. Clarkson knew Sybil's history and he did not. You believed Tapsell because he's knighted and fashionable. And has a practice in Harley Street. You let all that nonsense weigh against saving our daughter's life, which is what I find so very hard to forgive.

Lord: do you think I miss her any less than you?

Cora: I should think you miss her more since you blocked the last chance we had to prevent her death.

Lord is sad but says nothing, just leaves.

In this example, Cora is blaming her husband for their daughter Sybil's death. After several turns of communication, the Lord just leaves

since he knows that Cora needs time to forgive and forget. In this kind of situation, the conflict is never actually solved. It is only settled or suspended temporarily, and will one day occur again. This method is also a highly adopted one since it might be a wise way to calm down first. In the data collected, leave of one party accounts to 29%.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Findings

This paper chooses English TV series *Downton Abbey* season three as the data source and analyzes the conflict talk between family members with the theory of Conversational analysis. Major findings are as follows:

First, for each stage of conflict talk, several modes or methods exist respectively to initiate, maintain and terminating it. In initiating stage, family members prefer to use position statements-negative response and opposing questions-confrontational response modes to order-refusal mode. Interruption and repetition are two main features of conflict talks usually occur in maintaining stage. During verbal conflict, participants usually interrupt or repeat the utterance of themselves or the other party's. In terminating stage, submission, intervention of third party, and leave of one party are frequently adopted in conflict talk between family members. The third party who intervenes is usually people with higher status. Second, the reason for the occurrence of conflict talk is that dispreferred responses are given intentionally or unintentionally. Thus, if people could reduce adoption of dispreferred response, conflict talk will be decreased largely. Third, leave of one party can often suspend the conflict talk, but it cannot completely settle it, so further actions and other methods of ending conflict talk are needed.

5.2 Limitations and Recommendations

This paper only chooses one season of a TV series, therefore, the quantity and the representativeness shall be enlarged and tested further. Second, the data is collected from TV plays, which is not as natural as daily conversations. Besides, this paper only conducts a general, not a detailed research on conflict talk between family members; only part of its modes and methods are tackled; detailed as well as comprehensive study is needed and welcomed.

References

- [1] Malloy, H. & McMuray, P. (1996). Conflict strategies and resolutions: Peer conflict in an integrated early childhood classroom. *Early Children Research Quarterly*, 11:195-206.
- [2] Qin, J X. (1997). *The Art of Dramatic Conflict in Television Dramas*. Beijing Broadcasting Institute Press.
- [3] Kuo (1992). Formulaic Opposition Markers in Chinese Conflict Talk. In: Alatis J.E. (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- [4] Briggs, C. (1996). *Disorderly discourse: Narrative conflict and inequality*. Oxford: New York.
- [5] Grimshaw, A.D. (1990). *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Nelson, C.K. (2001). If it sounds too good to be true, it is: Wittgensteinian approach to the conflict literature. *Language and Communication*, (21):1-22.
- [7] Zhao Y L (2004). Conflict Talk Analysis. *Foreign Language Research*, (5):37-41.
- [8] Zhao Y L. (2006). *A Pragmatic-rhetoric Study of Conflict Talk in Chinese*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Northeast Normal University.
- [9] Jacobs, S. & Jackson, S. (1981). Argument as a Natural Category: The Routine Grounds for Arguing in Conversation. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, (45):118-132.
- [10] Zimmerman, D. West, C. (1975). Sex Roles, Interruptions, and Silences in Conversation. In B. Thome and N. Henley (eds). *In Language and sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [11] Schiffrin. (1985). Everyday argument: The organization of diversity in talk. In T. v. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol.s). London: Academic Press.
- [12] Eder, D. (1990). Serious and Playful Disputes: Variation in Conflict Talk Adolescents. In A.D. Grimshaw (eds), *Talk: among Female Sociolinguistic investigations in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- [13] Lucía Fernández-Amaya. (2025). An introduction to conflict talk in Spanish

- digital interactions. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, (13):1-15.
- [14] Chen X C. (2001). Coherence in Dispute Conversation. *Foreign Language*, (4):33-37.
- [15] Jia F. (2004). A pragmatic study on Conflict talk in Chinese verbal communication. Unpublished dissertation for Master's degree. Shan Xi University.
- [16] Zhao Z D, Zhang, Lin (2005). Analyzing Verbal Conflict from the Perspective of Relevance Theory. *Foreign Language Education*, (1), 17-21.
- [17] Li X Y, Zhang D L. (2007). A Study on the Structural Features of Quarrel Discourse. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, (12), 4-7.
- [18] Li H X, Liu H G, and Liu D L. (2022). Gender/power relationships in fictional conflict talk at the workplace: Analyzing television dramatic dialogue in *The Newsroom*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (187):58-71.
- [19] Gong L L, Ran Y P. (2024). Identity Approach to the Interpersonal Orientation of Mock Conflict via Teasing Utterances. *Foreign Languages Bimonthly*, (03): 21-30.
- [20] Wang M L. (2006). A pragmatic Study on Conflict Talk between Couples. Unpublished dissertation for Master's degree. Shan Xi University.
- [21] Zou Y. (2025). A Study of Conflict talk in U.S. Press Briefings from The Perspective of Conversation Analysis. Unpublished dissertation for Master's degree. Dalian University of Foreign Languages
- [22] Sacks, H. (1987). On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversations. Button, G.& J.R.E.Lee. *Talk and Social Organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1987.54-69.
- [23] Heritage, J.C. (1984). Current developments in conversation analysis, Roger and Bull (eds.)
- [24] Pomerantz, A. (1978) Compliment Responses: Notes on the Cooperation of Multiple Constraints. 1A2 in Schenkein, J. (ed.). *Studies in the Organization of conversational Interaction*. 1C2. New York: Academic Press.