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This study investigates how (im)politeness strategies are used in the performance of four different speech acts in modern Korean business correspondence. The data consists of 194 authentic business texts of internal (77 e-mail message) and external correspondence (117 formal letters) collected from two Korean companies: a food company (corporation A) and a pharmaceutical company (corporation B). The corpus of Korean business correspondence provides evidence for four different types of speech acts: disagreement, giving bad news, request, and compliment. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness was revised and applied to examining text data. A three-level text analysis is used as the primary data analysis method in this study: (1) a hand-tagged moves-analysis; (2) a qualitative method; and (3) a quantitative method.

Major findings in my investigation of (im)politeness strategies realized in Korean business correspondence are summarized as follows:

1. To conventionalize rhetorical structures in Korean business correspondence (i.e. Ki (beginning)-Sung (development)-Kyul (end)) can be inadequate for politeness reasons and corporate culture. On the one hand, the rhetorical style in Korean business correspondence can be disconnected by ‘external modifications’ for politeness concerns. On the other hand, corporate culture can also make the conventional rhetorical structure inadequate (e.g. the placement of face-threatening acts; repetition for exhibiting disagreement).

2. Bald on record, solidarity enforcement, conflict avoidance, and off record strategies appear in Korean business correspondence. Solidarity enforcement strategies are divided into two types of strategies: ‘show interest’ and ‘use in-group language’. Conflict avoidance strategies are divided into three groups: ‘be conventionally indirect’, ‘mitigating devices’, and ‘defocusing the writer/reader or action from the face-threatening act’. Off record strategies are divided into two types: ‘reasonableness’ and ‘act in question’.

3. Regarding a preference or frequency ranking of (im)politeness strategies in Korean business correspondence, the most frequent (im)politeness strategy across corporations and genres is ‘conflict avoidance’. The second most frequent strategy (internal communication of corporation B being the only exception) is ‘solidarity enforcement’. The least frequent strategy is ‘off record’ in the internal communications of both corporations and ‘bald on
record' in the external communications of both corporations.

4. A static or traditional view of culture cannot be always adapted to accommodate the data from Korean business correspondence. It is because each corporation has its own distinctive corporate culture/norm (which might be different from national culture), and each corporate culture/norm affects the choice of (im)politeness strategies (e.g. the heavy use of bald on record strategy by less powerful people in corporation B; the heavy use of conflict avoidance strategy by more powerful people in corporation B; and the heavy use of off record strategy by more powerful people in both corporations).

A most important message I convey in this study is that it is dangerous to make any generalizations about the characteristics of languages and cultures using cross-cultural data (e.g. the conventional rhetorical structure in Korean business correspondence; hierarchical Korean society in the realization of (im)politeness strategies). Since results can be substantially different from the expectations one might have from conventional or traditional perspective of a culture, we need to overcome cultural stereotyping in dealing with politeness phenomena or any other pragmatic phenomena.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. An overview of the study

Some time ago, I was supposed to deliver a paper at a conference. However, since I was unable to join the conference due to private reasons, I emailed the program chair of the conference to cancel my participation. The program chair sent me an e-mail a couple of days later and said: “That’s bad news! I will leave out your paper from the schedule but keep it. If situations change, please let me know. I will reinstall your paper.” I was thinking about the e-mail message for some days after I got it. Finally, I changed my mind and decided to go to the conference, because the program chair of the conference showed his interest in my (work) ability. Furthermore, he gave me an option to choose. In this context, one of Brown and Levinson’s (1987, henceforth B&L) politeness strategies (i.e. show interest) and one of Lakoff’s (1973) politeness rules (i.e. give options) work very well as a persuasive tactic. From this perspective, suffice it to say that politeness is of crucial importance to perform a goal-oriented activity, such as business. For example, politeness plays a crucial role in looking for a buyer, making the buyer respond favorably to sales letters, or having the buyer purchase the product for sale. If a seller is not polite to a buyer, the buyer is unlikely to react in a favorable way to what the seller requests. Furthermore, politeness seems to be of special importance in the business context because it may help both parties build trust and respect in order to maintain long-term business relationships. In this respect, politeness is seen as a necessary avenue for establishing a productive business atmosphere. In addition, politeness may serve the important function of handling negotiation-processes and managing conflicts successfully. Therefore, politeness seems to be of vital importance in business settings to achieve a goal successfully. This present
study investigates how Korean business professionals use politeness strategies in Korean business correspondence to achieve a goal successfully.

Globalization of business operations has been increasing for the last few years. In the wake of this development cross-cultural business communication has grown rapidly, because proper understanding of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences is significant background knowledge for successful international business, and academic studies of linguistic and cultural dimensions to cross-cultural business communication have been carried out (cf. Gesteland 1999; Hofstede 1994). In spite of growing understanding of the importance of languages and cultures for efficient cross-cultural business communication, however, some areas of cross-cultural differences have often been overlooked. One of these areas is conflict management in conflict situations. Collectivism is regarded as the basis for interaction in Korean society (see chapter 3 for more detail). That is why Koreans strive to maintain interpersonal harmony by avoiding conflict. Politeness strategies play a crucial role in avoiding conflict by attenuating or reducing the strength of conflict talk in order to maintain interpersonal harmony. Besides avoiding conflict, interpersonal harmony can also be maintained by enforcing solidarity between interactants through different politeness strategies from those in conflict situations. The factors of setting and social identity linked with the addressee/reader are of vital importance for the speaker/writer to take into consideration in the choice of politeness strategies. By showing how Korean business professionals enforce solidarity and avoid conflict with the reader, I aim to provide a general picture of politeness principles that they follow in writing Korean business letters. Although this is not an authentic cross-cultural study on politeness strategies, studies of Korean politeness strategies will provide background knowledge that enables us to do in-depth cross-cultural studies on politeness strategies. Now let us discuss the scope of the study in more detail.
As Yli-Jokipii (1994) points out, there are several dimensions or aspects to business communication (e.g. the corporate dimension; the cross-cultural dimension; the linguistic dimension; the educational dimension). Among these dimensions, this study investigates the corporate and linguistic dimensions of business communication. The corporate dimension includes social context factors such as status, power, distance, and medium selection. The social context factors describe the situational context in which language is used. These social context factors are group knowledge (rather than individual knowledge) shared among individuals in a particular context, such as the workplace. For example, the knowledge that medium selection is dependent on different types of tasks (i.e. electronic form for internal communication and print form for external communication) is shared among Korean business professionals in any given Korean company. Furthermore, to succeed in communication, the use of the proper amount and type of politeness in the right speech act is of crucial importance. In the linguistic dimension, this study investigates the realization of politeness strategies used by individuals in an organization (i.e. which types of politeness strategies do Korean business professionals use?; how do they create solidarity with the reader; how do they keep appropriate distance thereby avoiding face-threatening acts (FTAs) and mitigate their assertiveness in performing FTA?). The following figure illustrates the dimensions of this study.

Figure 1.1. Dimensions of this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate dimension (context factors)</th>
<th>Linguistic dimension (politeness strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Korean business communication
However, it seems problematic to consider these two dimensions separately, because they operate simultaneously. Writers take into consideration context factors in choosing appropriate politeness strategies. For example, writers prefer the use of politeness strategies for making solidarity when participants have low distance and low power. Whereas politeness strategies for avoiding conflict are preferred when the writer has low power over the reader and the writer and the reader have high distance. Therefore, there is an interface between the two dimensions. These social context factors are affected by social norms or rules. For example, although the rank of a subcontractor may be higher than a contractor, s/he is in the negative power position in the workplace. So subcontractors may make heavy use of politeness strategies for creating solidarity and politeness strategies for avoiding conflict with contractors for his/her own company's benefit. The amount and type of politeness is calculated by individuals based on social context factors such as power and distance, and the social context factors are subject to social/cultural norms. However, do these contextual factors always affect the choice of politeness strategies in a conventional way (e.g. the heavy use of politeness strategies for avoiding conflict by a less powerful writer; the heavy use of politeness strategies for creating solidarity by a less powerful writer)? Are there any exceptions to the conventional patterns of politeness strategy distribution? If there are exceptions to the patterns, how shall we explain them? In this study, I argue for the role of social norms (organizational norms, in particular) in realizing politeness strategies in order to explain the exceptions. Fraser (1990) claims that there are standards or norms of behavior in any society against which one is measured as having been polite or not. He calls the way of viewing politeness the "social norm view". In this respect, social norms or rules can determine the appropriateness of realizing politeness strategies in a particular situation. We may assume that the writer does not always follow the conventional patterns of politeness strategy distribution in order to meet particular social norms such as
organizational norms. That is probably why exceptions to the conventional patterns of politeness strategies can be explained from the social norm view. Although the exceptions might seem odd to out-group members, it is natural for in-group members to follow the exceptions because they share common social norms. As will be discussed in chapter 3, numerous linguists claim that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between discernment politeness (e.g. social norm view) and volitional politeness (e.g. B&L's face-saving view). It is true that the distinction between the two is necessary because they are totally different aspects of politeness. However, without considering the interface between the two, politeness phenomena cannot properly be explained.

We cannot explain potential exceptions to the conventional patterns of politeness strategy distribution if we only refer to volitional politeness. Basically this study will investigate aspect of volitional politeness. However, it also tries to bridge the gap between discernment politeness and volitional politeness by demonstrating that these two different kinds of politeness can operate simultaneously. Figure 1.2. illustrates this claim.

Figure 1.2. Revised dimensions of this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social norms (organizational norms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate dimension (context factors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic dimension (politeness strategies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Korean business communication
After investigating numerous types of politeness strategies (e.g. their forms and functions) used by Korean business professionals (i.e. the linguistic dimension in figure 1.2), the study will explore how contextual factors (which are influenced by social norms (i.e. arrow 1 in figure 1.2)) affect the appropriateness of politeness behaviors/strategies for a specific situation such as a business setting (i.e. arrow 2 in figure 1.2.). Furthermore, in the process of investigating the influence of organizational norms on realizing politeness strategies (i.e. arrow 3 in figure 1.2.), it will investigate whether national culture (e.g. power is very important in determining variation in linguistic behavior in Korean culture) always affects the choice of politeness strategies used in a particular context (i.e. a business setting) and different genres (i.e. e-mail and formal letters) in a particular culture, because of the possibility of organizational culture differing from national culture.

This study will also look at impoliteness (e.g. bald on record strategy) to investigate the full range of behaviors in Korean business settings. In the linguistic dimension, as will be discussed in chapter 2, face-threatening act (FTA) redress is considered polite. Politeness as FTA redress implies that FTA without redress (i.e. bald on record) is considered impolite. We may also be able to conceive of impoliteness phenomena in terms of figure 1.2. As in the case of politeness, bald on record strategy used by individuals in society may be appropriate or justified in a particular situation depending on social norms or rules, if the social norms or rules (for the use of bald on record strategy) are shared between interactants. In this case, the use of bald on record strategy (i.e. performing FTA without redress) might not necessarily imply authentic impoliteness (e.g. insulting) because it is an objective standard shared between participants in a particular situation and participants do not have a negative attitude towards the use of bald on record strategy. Based on figure 1.2, therefore, this study investigates whether there is a case of being impolite (i.e. performing FTA without redress) in order to follow social norms or rules. In
order words, this study will also explore whether social norms or rules affect the use of impoliteness strategy (i.e. bald on record strategy).

1.2. The contribution of the study

The study of politeness has revealed various cross-cultural differences in business communication (cf. Akar 1998; Bilbow 1997; Mulholland 1997; Neumann 1997; Yli-Jokipii 1994, 1998). Maier (1992) is probably the first scholar to incorporate B&L’s politeness model drawn from spoken data into the study of business letter writing. In her study, Maier found that non-native speakers of English use less varied politeness strategies than native speakers of English due to lack of linguistic competence. Her data is comprised of 18 letters written by native and non-native speakers of English in response to a fictional situation in which the writer has unavoidably missed a job interview and asks for another interview. Although her work is of importance in that it is probably the first attempt to apply B&L’s model to written business communication, it has some limitations. Firstly, she uses a small amount of data. Furthermore, her subjects are partly composed of university students, who are not professional business letter writers. In contrast, this study, like the works of contemporary business discourse analysts (Akar 1998; Pilegaard 1997; Yli-Jokipii 1994; Yeung 1997, among many others), uses a large amount of real life data written by professional business letter writers. Theoretical research on discernment politeness systems in Korean (e.g. honorifics) has been done (Cho 1982; Sohn 1994, 1999, among many others). However, in that there has been little or no previous or current research on (written) business communication in Korea using a large amount of natural data with particular reference to the theory of volitional politeness such as B&L’s theory of politeness, this study represents a contribution to theoretical and applied research on Korean
volitional politeness systems performed in Korean business communication. The examination of politeness in a culture other than a Western one will certainly help us to understand the differences and similarities in politeness behavior of people from different cultures. This may help us to reduce miscommunication and make intercultural communication much easier. Furthermore, this present study will show that many of the established beliefs about the Korean culture/society (e.g. hierarchical Korean society in the realization of politeness strategies) need to be reexamined in light of the politeness principles of B&L’s (1987) model. By investigating the role of social norms (organizational norms, in particular) in realizing politeness strategies (i.e. arrow 3 in figure 1.2), this study tries to overcome cultural stereotyping in dealing with politeness phenomena, because the results may be very different from the expectations one might have from conventional or traditional perspective of a culture.

1.3. The organization of the thesis

The thesis is organized in the following way. Following the overview of the study in this chapter, chapter two provides a review of the literature on politeness and speech acts. The initial sections provide critiques of speech act studies and Gricean maxims, and a review of major theories of linguistic politeness, including Lakoff’s (1973), Leech’s (1983), and B&L’s (1987) theories of politeness. The second half of the literature review examines four main speech acts in which I have a particular interest (i.e. disagreement; giving bad news; request; compliment). A review of the literature on business communication will also be provided under the literature review on the speech acts. Chapter three provides critiques of universality in linguistic politeness from two different aspects (i.e. arguments for the two different aspects of politeness (e.g. discernment politeness vs. volitional politeness; first-order politeness vs. second-order politeness; social
politeness vs. tact; politic behavior vs. polite behavior); research on non-Western politeness (e.g. Chinese; Japanese; African)). There follows a discussion of Korean culture and linguistic behavior from the perspective of worldview (i.e. Buddhist fatalism; collectivism, hierarchism, and indirectness in Confucianism), the Korean concept of face (i.e. cheymyen, myenmok, nach) and its relation to politeness, and an application of B&L’s politeness theory to the Korean data.

Chapter four, five, six, and seven are devoted to detailed linguistic analysis. Chapter four presents research questions, a detailed description of data, an account of the data collection process, and data analysis method. Chapter five provides a description of data analysis in a wider context than a single move such as a speech act. The initial sections describe rhetorical structure in Korean business correspondence (i.e. Ki (beginning)-Sung (development)-Kyul (conclusion)), a relationship between rhetorical structure and politeness strategies, and the placement of four main speech acts in the text. The second half of the chapter investigates three distinct moves (i.e. non-essential business talk; tyings; repetitions for exhibiting disagreement).

In contrast, chapter six provides a more detailed and localized view of data analysis procedures. That is, chapter six investigates (im)politeness strategies used in the main speech acts in ascending order based on their indirectness, from the least indirect to the most indirect (i.e. bald on record, solidarity enforcement strategies, conflict avoidance strategies, and off record).

Chapter seven discusses the overall results of data analysis (e.g. the frequency ranking of (im)politeness strategies) and a number of contextual factors affecting the results (e.g. status; power; distance; speech acts, medium; corporate culture). The thesis concludes with chapter eight. This chapter summarizes the major findings of the thesis, including patterns of strategy distribution in Korean business correspondence and a model of Korean (im)politeness, presents pedagogical implications, and discusses future research to overcome the limitations of the present study.
CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON MAJOR THEORIES OF
POLITENESS AND THE MAIN SPEECH ACTS IN THE STUDY

The context of speech acts is of crucial importance in conducting research into FTAs in that such face threats are inherent properties of illocutionary acts (B&L 1987; Leech 1983). In this chapter, I will not describe the speech act theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1999) and the Gricean (1975) Cooperative Principle, which are already well known. Instead, I will discuss the problem of speech act theory and Gricean maxims, before expanding our discussion to linguistic politeness theories.

2.1. Critiques of speech act theory and Gricean maxims

Speech act theory has been contested by a number of scholars (Kasper 1989; Levinson 1981, 1983; Schmidt and Richards 1980; Thomas 1983). The main criticism against speech acts is that it is difficult to clearly identify the intended speaker meaning because of speech acts’ multiple illocutionary forces. For example, the utterance, ‘There are some dishes in the sink’ can carry several illocutionary forces of informing information, requesting that the dishes be washed, or complaining about them not having been washed. Furthermore, since speech act analysis is normally focused on intuitive claims about isolated utterances, if they are taken out of context, it is hard to account for how a particular remark is classified as a speech act. Likewise, since speech act theory mainly focuses on the speaker’s intention or single utterance, it is also hard to explicate interaction between speaker and hearer (Hymes 1974). The term ‘speech act’ is exclusively associated with the illocutionary act, in that the illocutionary act is the unit of meaning in utterances (Searle 1999). However, since a perlocutionary act is a consequence of
the illocutionary act (van Dijk 1977), it is of particular importance in considering transactional phenomena in a certain speech act, such as requests and request responses. For example, in business contexts, positive face-threatening acts, like disagreement, complaint, etc, are not solely enacted for the sake of performing positive face-threatening acts, but to find a solution. Therefore, resolution (i.e. persuading, getting someone to do something, and so on) mostly tends to follow the statement of a positive face-threatening act (see chapter 5 for more detail).

To achieve a goal successfully (i.e. the reader’s acceptance of the writer’s request), it is important for the writer to minimize the force of the preceding positive face-threatening acts. An effect such as persuading somebody of something or getting someone to do something should also be polite to effect a successful business transaction. Therefore, perlocutionary effect seems to be of necessity in business context in that it pertains to a ‘transaction’, comprising S’s speech act and H’s response (Gu 1993).

Wierzbicka (1985) warns against the creation of influential theories of speech acts based largely on data drawn from English. She (ibid.;145-146) claims that English conversation strategies have been frequently interpreted as manifestations of a universal ‘natural logic’ (Gordon and Lakoff 1975). Grice (1975) has written of a “universal ‘logic of conversation’”, and Searle (1975) of “universal rules of politeness” (Wierzbicka ibid.:172). As Wierzbicka points out, although in English it might be awkward to issue flat imperatives, this is not a universal conversational requirement, but rather an English requirement. Therefore, she (ibid.:173) rejects the term ‘natural logic’ and replaces it with Gumperz’s (1982:182) ‘cultural logic’. By the same token, the universality of Gricean maxims is attacked on the grounds that the maxims are not applicable to all cultures (Clyne 1994; Ochs 1976). There exist profound differences between East and West (de Bono 1995). For example, our concept of truth has a major impact on our thinking style and methods. Grice’s truth maxim seems to be problematic
to apply at least in the East Asian context because the European notion of ‘truth’ as an absolute is not necessarily the same in East Asian cultures (Clyne 1994). Therefore, the Maxim of Quality may not be applicable to the East Asian context.

2.2. Some major theories of linguistic politeness

From the linguistic perspective, a number of linguists have endeavored to define politeness in terms of universal rules, strategies, principles, or maxims. Now let us review some representative proposals.

2.2.1. Lakoff

Lakoff (1973:296) states her conceptual motivation for the development of a politeness framework as follows:

Just as we invoke syntactic rules to determine whether a sentence is to be considered syntactically well- or ill-formed... we should like to have some kind of pragmatic rules, dictating whether an utterance is pragmatically well-formed or not, and the extent to which it deviates if it does.

So she formulates two rules of pragmatic competence: ‘Be clear’ and ‘Be polite’. The first rule ‘Be clear’ is based on the four Gricean maxims. As in the case of Grice’s maxims, if an interlocutor’s purpose in speaking is conveying information, s/he will attempt to be clear rather than be polite. Conversely, if an interlocutor aims to reaffirm and strengthen relationships, s/he will be more concerned with being polite than with being clear. However, Lakoff asserts that
politeness usually supersedes clarity in most informal conversations because it is considered more important to avoid offense than to achieve clarity. Lakoff (1973:298) forms three rules of politeness.

Rule 1. Don’t impose.
Rule 2. Give options.
Rule 3. Make A feel good, be friendly.

Rule 1, which means not intruding into other people’s freedom of action, is the most formal politeness rule. Rule 2 leaves options open to the addressee and allows him/her to make his/her own decisions by giving deference to him/her. Rule 3 makes the addressee feel good by making a sense of equality and camaraderie between interactants. Although all the rules given above are present across cultures, an emphasis may differently be given depending on each culture. For example, Asian cultures tend to keep more distance or be relatively more deferential than Western cultures.

2.2.2. Brown and Levinson

Following Lakoff’s rules of politeness, B&L (1987) investigated politeness phenomena and established the relationship between the principles governing language usage and the principles governing social relationships. Taking up Goffman’s (1967) ‘face-want’, B&L (1987:61) propose that every competent adult speaker in a society (i.e. a Model Person (MP)) has face, which is the “public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself”. The concept of face is central to B&L’s theory of politeness. Face is composed of two aspects: positive and negative face. Positive face is defined as ‘the want of every MP that his wants be desirable to
others’, while negative face is defined as ‘the want of every MP that his actions be unimpeded by others’. They name certain kinds of acts that challenge face wants ‘the face-threatening acts (FTAs)’. Some acts (e.g. requests, orders) impose on the hearer’s negative face by showing that the speaker gets the hearer to do something. Other acts (e.g. disagreements, complaints) threaten the hearer’s positive face by indicating that the speaker does not share the hearer’s wants. B&L establish five strategies for linguistic politeness. These are ranked in terms of degree of indirectness with 1. being least indirect (bald on record) and 5. most indirect (don’t do the FTA).

1. Bald on record
2. Positive politeness
3. Negative politeness
4. Off record
5. Don’t do the FTA

Bald on record strategy involves performing the FTA in the most direct way without redress, as stated in Gricean maxims of conversational cooperation (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner). The circumstances for this strategy include cases when the speech act is used for emergency or efficiency. Positive politeness is oriented toward the hearer’s positive face wants. Positive politeness strategies tend to imply that the speaker is a cooperator or seeks common ground with the addressee. Fifteen positive politeness substrategies are proposed, among them: notice, attend to hearer’s wants, needs; use in-group identity markers; include both speaker and hearer in the activity; exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer; seek agreement; and use of slang. B&L (ibid.:130) claim that negative politeness may be qualified as “the stuff that fills the etiquette books”, in that it is oriented towards hearers’ negative face and their desire to be unimpeded by others. B&L propose ten negative politeness substrategies, some of which are: be conventionally indirect; hedge; apologize; impersonalize speaker and hearer; nominalize; and
go on record as incurring a debt. Off record strategy is used to perform speech acts nonconventionally indirectly. Therefore, it can be interpreted as expressing more than one communicative intention. In this respect, off record strategies flout Gricean maxims. Fifteen off-record strategies are proposed, some of which are: give hints; presuppose; be ironic; use metaphors; use rhetorical questions; and be ambiguous. B&L’s last level of strategy, ‘Don’t do the FTA’, is just to keep silent, without performing any speech act.

The dimensions of social reality proposed by B&L to explain the variations in politeness are Power (P), Distance (D), and Degree of Imposition (R). This theory prescribes the weightiness (seriousness) of an FTA in the following way:

\[ W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x \]

\( W_x \): the weightiness of the FTA
\( D(S,H) \): the social distance between the speaker and the hearer
\( P(H,S) \): the power that the addressee has over the speaker
\( R_x \): the degree to which the FTA is rated as an imposition in that culture

As the weightiness of an FTA increases, so the speaker is required to mitigate the FTA. B&L suggest that \( R_x \) leave room for distinctive cultural ethos. That is, behavior which is seen as a big imposition to others in one culture may only be a small imposition in another culture. They also maintain that cultures may differ in the relative weights given to social factors in determining variation in behavior. For example, in a more hierarchical society, relative power may be given more weight than distance, whereas relative distance may be a more determining factor in a more egalitarian society.
2.2.3. Leech

Leech (1983) proposes an elaborate model, relating both the Cooperative Principle (CP) and the Politeness Principle (PP), and politeness and indirectness. Leech places politeness within a framework of ‘interpersonal rhetoric’ (i.e. realistic and effective talk exchanges in conversation). Leech contends that Gricean CP is necessary but insufficient because it cannot explain why people are often indirect in delivering what they mean, or what the relation is between literal and intended meaning, and that indirect illocutions and politeness must be dealt with by means of scales. Therefore, he presents the PP as a first order concept of the same rank as the CP. He also introduces other principles such as the Irony Principle, Banter Principle, Interest Principle, and Pollyanna Principle to explain irony, exaggerations, metaphors, and other nonliteral illocutions such as euphemisms.

Leech formulates the PP as ‘Minimize the expression of impolite beliefs’ and ‘Maximize the expression of polite beliefs’. He defines polite and impolite beliefs as beliefs which respectively are favorable and unfavorable to the hearer or a third party. Besides taking up the Gricean maxims, he adds six more maxims to form the PP. Leech maintains that the most important kind of politeness in English-speaking countries is that which is covered by the operation of the Tact Maxim, which reads ‘minimize cost to other, maximize benefit to other’. Besides, there are the other PP maxims (generosity: minimize benefit to self, maximize cost to self; approbation, which may address B&L’s positive face: minimize dispraise of other, maximize praise of other; modesty: minimize praise of self, maximize dispraise of self; agreement: minimize disagreement between self and other, maximize agreement between self and other; and sympathy: minimize antipathy between self and other, maximize sympathy between self and other). We may suppose that the maxims do not all apply to all cultures equally.
Some cultures may give politeness a higher rating than cooperation or give precedence to one maxim rather than another. For example, some cultures, such as Korean, may value the Modesty Maxim (i.e. rejection) more highly than the Agreement Maxim (i.e. acceptance) and the reverse appears to be true with other cultures, like America, in adopting compliment responding strategies, respectively.

Leech proposes three scales, which involve determining the amount and kind of politeness: cost-benefit, optionality/indirectness, and authority/social distance. The cost-benefit scale is relevant to the propositional content of an utterance. For example, ‘Peel these potatoes’ is costly to the hearer and thus much less polite than saying ‘Enjoy your holiday’. The optionality/indirectness scale concerns illocutionary force. Leech argues that indirect illocutions tend to be more polite because they increase the degree of optionality, and because the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its illocutionary force tends to be. In this respect, this scale may be reminiscent of Lakoff’s rule 2: ‘Give options’. The authority/social distance scale consists of vertical and horizontal subscales which are reminiscent of power and solidarity (Brown and Gilman 1960). Generally speaking, Leech’s theory of politeness is concerned with avoiding conflict. That is why he pays special attention to the Tact Maxim. In this respect, the Tact Maxim is consistent with B&L’s negative politeness strategy.

2.3. The main speech acts in the study

Recently a comprehensive literature on speech acts in politeness enactment has been built up: requests (House 1989; Blum-Kulka and House 1989; Blum-Kulka, Gerson and Danet 1985), apologies (Bergman and Kasper 1993; House 1989; Olshtain 1989; Trosborg 1995; Meyerhoff
1999), complaints (Olshtain and Weinbach 1993), giving bad news (Beebe and Takahashi 1989), disagreements (Beebe and Takahashi 1989), thanks (Bodman and Eisenstein 1988), and compliments (Pomerantz 1978; Wolfson 1981, 1989; Wolfson and Manes 1981; Manes 1983; Holmes 1986, 1995; Herbert 1991). Among these, this section will review the literature on the main speech acts in which I have a particular interest.

2.3.1. Disagreement

In work on the speech act of disagreement, linguists have researched aspects like speech act moves or the sequence of disagreements in everyday conversations and in institutional settings. In particular, most of the work on disagreements focuses on either children’s disagreements or adult disagreements. On the one hand, much research has been done on children’s disagreements (Adger 1986; Allen 1995; Boggs 1978; Corsaro and Rizzo 1990; Eder 1990; Killen and Naigles 1995). In general, data used in children’s disagreements are taken from everyday conversations (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987, 1990), play context (Brenneis and Lein 1977), or environments which are intended to mimic casual conversational contexts (Eisenberg and Garvey 1981). Special attention has been paid to the structure and label of individual moves within children’s disagreements (Brenneis and Lein 1977; Eisenberg and Garvey 1981; Kochman 1983; Maynard 1985; Goodwin 1983; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987, 1990). Brenneis and Lein (1977), for example, analyzed 70 role-playing arguments among elementary school children from white American, black American, and Hindi-speaking Fiji Indian communities. By classifying argument moves and sequential patterns, they contend that children’s disagreements are a rule-governed activity. In children’s disagreements, for example, assertions are answered by other assertions, and insults are answered by insults. By observing verbal
conflicts among pre-school children in a laboratory setting, Eisenberg and Garvey (1981) describe patterns for an adversative episode and types of responses to opposition. Like the findings of Benneis and Lein, they state that the form of an opposition influences the following responses. Maynard (1985) investigates first-grade reading group interactions to look for the relationship between antecedent events and opposition. He claims that argument moves can occur in both verbal and nonverbal activities. He also claims that serious arguments are more frequent among 4- to 6-year olds than among older children. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987, 1990) investigated the arguing of 44 black urban 4-14 year olds. In their data, opposition shows markers of a preferred discourse type. It is placed towards the beginning of a turn, through a response of polarity (i.e. ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to a prior comment). Goodwin and Goodwin also note that repeats are frequent in child disagreements.

On the other hand, the data for adult disagreements tends to pertain to institutional settings. That is, disagreements have been investigated in legal settings (Fairclough 1989; Philips 1990); in news interviews (Clayman 1992); in counselling interviews (Candlin 1987); in church business meetings (Pearson 1989); in family settings (Mutigl and Turnbull 1998); and in university settings (Rees-Miller 2000). Clayman (1992), for example, explicates how adults avoid confrontation and thereby achieve neutrality in news interviews. Based on the investigation of two counseling interviews (i.e. a police-witness interview; a family planning counselling interview), Candlin (1987) has found that counsellors realize numerous politeness strategies to avoid conflict. Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) maintain that there are conventional turn exchanges or moves in arguments drawn among university students and family members for face-saving purposes. Beebe and Takahashi (1989) report differences in ways of disagreements between Americans and Japanese ESL speakers. They claim that status plays a significant role in the choice of politeness strategies. Furthermore, in the work on adult
disagreements, special attention has been paid to the beginnings of disagreements. In her work on disagreement openings, Pomerantz (1984) claims that disagreements do not always develop immediately but are often delayed. Labov (1972) looks for the boundary which distinguishes between a form of play called ‘sounding’ and ‘nonplay’ in black teenagers’ verbal dueling. Play can take the form of “an excited argument” when it breaks down (Labov ibid.: 297). He also notes that when a speaker uses insulting language the shift from sounding toward argument occurs. Kochman (1983), however, maintains that denial against insult starts an argument, not insult. Therefore, it is up to the hearer whether a play frame is maintained or broken.

2.3.2. Giving bad news

In comparison with the speech act of disagreement, the literature on the speech act of giving bad news is much more limited. Beebe and Takahashi (1989) exemplify differences in ways of giving embarrassing information between Americans and Japanese ESL speakers. They have found that Japanese ESL speakers tend to directly mention the components of bad news when they convey it, but they also overwhelmingly use verbal hints in giving bad news especially in lower to higher status interaction. Du (1992) expands Beebe and Takahashi’s (1989) formulas of giving bad news in his cross-cultural data of Chinese, Japanese, and American university students. Unlike the findings of Beebe and Takahashi (1989), his data show that Japanese are the most direct and Chinese are the least direct in giving bad news. Hints are widely used by Chinese but Japanese do not frequently use hints in his data. Instead, Chinese prefer a ‘tell + suggest’ strategy. Akar (1998) claims that corporate culture can affect the choice of strategies in making requests in her work on Turkish business correspondence. In particular, giving bad news can be used as a strategy to justify making requests depending on corporate culture. That is, a
company with a medical or pharmaceutical background uses negative consequences as a pressure tactic when a request is made urgently. Ambady et al. (1996) note that the Korean and the American subjects prefer indirect politeness strategies when communicating bad news in their data of the communication of good and bad news from employees of a Korean brokerage firm and American graduate students.

2.3.3. Request

There is a comprehensive literature on the features of the linguistic speech act of request on: American English (Ervin-Tripp 1976); Spanish and English (Fraser et al. 1980); English and Hebrew (Blum-Kulka 1982, 1983); Polish (Wierzbicka 1985); Igbo (Nwoye 1989); Akan (Obeng 1999); Ojibwa (Rhodes 1989); Danish and English (Trosborg 1995); Greek and English (Sifianou 1992); Finnish and English (Yli-Jokipii 1994, 1998); Turkish (Akar 1998); English (Pilegaard 1997); English and Chinese (Bilbow 1997; Yeung 1997); German and Norwegian (Newmann 1997); Australian and Asians (Mulholland 1997).

Ervin-Tripp (1976) claims that contextual factors, like age, social status, distance, degree of tension, the hearer’s obligation, affect the request form, making it more indirect, in her American English data. For example, request forms are more indirect when the relationship between the interlocutors is not familiar. Fraser et al. (1980) maintain that Spanish requests use relatively less direct and more deferential forms than do English requests when the hearer is older than the speaker. Blum-Kulka (1982, 1983) investigates contextual factors influencing the choice of request forms by comparing sociolinguistic rules among the speakers of Hebrew and English. For example, she claims that more indirect requests are made to superiors but contrary to Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) findings, social distance between Hebrew interlocutors affects the
choice of request forms less than do other contextual factors. She also found that native
speakers of Hebrew use more direct requests than do English-speaking learners of Hebrew.
universalistic claims with regard to negative face wants in Polish, Igbo, Akan, Ojibwa, and
Greek data, respectively. Trosborg (1995) compares request strategies used by English and
Danish speakers and finds that Danish speakers tend to modify their requests more than
English speakers. Yli-Jokipii (1994) investigates how requests are made in her cross-cultural
data of British, American, and Finnish business writing. Akar (1998) examines requests in
Turkish in her data consisting of memoranda and fax messages collected from four different
Turkish companies. Pilegaard (1997) explains how the distribution of positive and negative
politeness varies in requests in British business letters. He maintains that the quantity of positive
politeness strategy decreases when the realization of negative politeness strategy increases
during the course of business. Bilbow (1997) and Yeung (1997) examine requests in English and
Chinese business and contextual factors affecting the choice of politeness strategies. Neumann
(1997) has found that German managers are more direct in making requests than Norwegian
counterparts in business discourse. Mulholland (1997) maintains that national cultures
significantly affect the selections of request forms through examining requests made between
Australians and Asians.

2.3.4. Compliment

The speech act of compliment has been extensively cross-culturally explored: American English
(Pomerantz 1978; Wolfson 1983, 1989; Wolfson and Manes 1981; Manes 1983); Polish
(Herbert 1991); South African (Herbert and Straight 1989); New Zealand English (Holmes
1986); Hawaii Creole English (Lee 1990); Chinese (Chen 1993); Jordanian Arabic (Farghal and Al-Khatib 2001).

Pomerantz (1978) focuses on compliment responses by means of constraint systems: the agreement/disagreement system, the acceptance/rejection system, and the self-praise avoidance system. Furthermore, she claims that compliment responses should be classified into the following categories because they are sensitive to the constraint systems: acceptance, including tokens of appreciation and agreement, rejection, implying disagreement, and self-praise avoidance mechanisms where praise is downgraded and referent shifts occur. Wolfson and Manes (1981) note that the majority of American English compliments are formulaic. They have found that three syntactic patterns (i.e. \( NP \) is/looks (really) \( ADJ \); \( I \) (really) like/love \( NP \); \( PRO \) is (really) (a) \( ADJ \) \( NP \) ) account for 80% of the compliments they collected. Manes (1983) and Wolfson (1983, 1989) claim that there is consistency in the topic of the compliments in American English: appearance, possession, and public ability. They also contend that the speaker expresses approval or admiration toward the hearer by offering compliments, and thereby solidarity between interlocutors is created or established. Herbert (1991) shows that compliments are paid mostly on the hearer’s possessions in his Polish data. Herbert and Straight (1989) found that American English compliments function as a negotiation strategy (i.e. they offer a chance to the hearer to accept an offer of solidarity), whereas South African English compliments function as a way of affirming such solidarity in conducting a comparative study on American and South African English compliments and compliment responses. In her study on New Zealanders, Holmes (1988) found that: 1) women pay compliments to each other more often than to men or men do to each other or to women; 2) women prefer using syntactic devices to boost the force of the compliment; 3) women compliment directly more often than men; and 4) women compliment each other and more often receive compliments on appearance
or possessions. In her Hawaii Creole English data, Lee (1990) found that the most frequent positive semantic carriers are adjectives (i.e. good, nice) and the verb 'like' occurs overwhelmingly in compliments. She also demonstrates that the majority of compliment topics have to do with accomplishments, skills or food. Regarding compliment responses in Hawaii Creole English, denial is the most common response due to the influence of Asian culture on Hawaii Creole English. Consistent with Lee’s finding on compliment responses in Hawaii Creole English, Chen (1993) points out that his Chinese subjects mostly reject compliments because the compliment responses in Chinese are motivated by Leech’s Modesty Maxim. Contrary to Lee’s and Chen’s findings on compliment responses, Farghal and Al-Khatib (2001) found that Leech’s Agreement Maxim (i.e. acceptances) dominates in their Jordanian Arabic data on compliment responses.

2.4. Summary and discussion

Speech act theory and the Cooperative Principle have been contested by a number of linguists because they mainly focus on single utterance by highlighting the illocutionary force and neglect cross-cultural differences.

Some linguists have attempted to draw up universal rules or strategies of politeness. Lakoff (1973) forms three rules of politeness (i.e. Don’t impose; Give options; Make A feel good, be friendly). B&L (1987) propose the face-saving principle and establish five strategies of linguistic politeness (i.e. Bald on record; Positive politeness; Negative politeness; Off record; Don’t do the FTA). In addition to the four Gricean maxims, Leech (1983) adds six more Politeness Principle maxims (i.e. Tact; Generosity; Approbation; Modesty; Agreement; Sympathy).
This chapter also provided a review of the literature on the main speech acts in the study. In work on the speech act of disagreement, much research has been done on children’s disagreements or adult disagreements. The speech acts of giving bad news, request, and compliment have been extensively cross-culturally explored.
CHAPTER THREE: ASPECTS OF NON-WESTERN POLITENESS

This chapter describes aspects of non-Western politeness, including the Korean concept of politeness. The initial section provides critiques of universality in linguistic politeness. The second half of the chapter gives some background information on the Korean concept of politeness.

3.1. Critiques of universality in linguistic politeness

The major criticisms of universality in theories of politeness may be summarized as follows. On the one hand, universal accounts of linguistic politeness fail to explore the discernment aspect of politeness. On the other hand, they neglect sociocultural differences.

3.1.1. Arguments for two different aspects of politeness

3.1.1.1. Discernment politeness vs. volitional politeness

Regarding the social indexing aspect of politeness, Ide (1989) suggests that B&L’s politeness theory is not universal, because it neglects part played by non-FTAs. Although Ide accepts the validity of positive and negative face, she adds Discernment (wakimae). She defines linguistic politeness as the language usage concerned with smooth communication realized through the speaker’s use of intentional strategies (i.e. Volitional politeness), and through the speaker’s choice of expression to confirm to the expected and prescribed social norms (i.e. Discernment politeness). Ide’s development of Discernment is based on the use of honorific forms. The use
of honorific forms is determined by social conventions (ibid: 227). She identifies four conventional rules: be polite to a person of a higher social position, be polite to a person with power, be polite to an older person, be polite in a formal setting determined by the factors of participants, occasions or topics.

Hwang (1990) also makes a similar distinction in Korean. He contends that 'deference' differs from 'politeness' in that deference reflects the relative status of the participants on a hierarchical social dimension, while politeness is a linguistic strategy which the speaker uses for pragmatic purposes. Fraser and Nolen (1981) also differentiate deference from politeness because deference conveys relative status in English.

### 3.1.1.2. First-order politeness vs. second-order politeness

Watts et al. (1992) make a distinction between first-order politeness and second-order politeness. First-order politeness is politeness considered as a folk notion: How do members of a community perceive and classify action in terms of politeness? Such assessments and classifications manifest themselves in etiquette manuals, the do’s and don’t in socializing interaction, metapragmatic comments on what is and is not polite behavior, and so forth. In this respect, first-order politeness is a commonsense notion (e.g. saying thank you or excuse me). In contrast, second-order politeness is a theoretical or scientific concept (e.g. Leech’s (1987) conversational-maxim view, B&L’s (1987) face-saving). Therefore, the basic distinction between first-order politeness and second-order politeness is methodological. Problems occur when first-order politeness is considered the same as second-order politeness in language use. Thus, some linguists highlight the need to differentiate between a commonsense notion of politeness (first-order politeness) and a scientific notion of politeness (second-order politeness)
3.1.1.3. Social politeness vs. tact

Janney and Arndt (1992) make a distinction between 'tact' and 'social politeness'. Both types of politeness are culturally acquired, and are interrelated in speech. Tact is understood to define forms of social behavior when the speaker shows consideration for the concerns of the addressee. Therefore, tact is pertinent to people's face-saving needs. Being tactful is "a matter of behaving in an interpersonal supportive way" (Janney and Arndt ibid.:23). It involves empathizing with others, and avoiding threatening them. Thus, in this respect, it approaches the idea that conversational partners will abide by some form of conversational contract (Fraser 1990). According to Janny and Arndt (ibid.:23), being tactful in one's own culture requires "subtle modification of verbal and nonverbal activities". That is, it means each culture has its own ways being tactful. From this perspective, tact pertains to volitional politeness proposed by Hill et al. (1986) and Ide (1989). On the other hand, the function of social politeness is to smooth social interaction by following conventions (e.g. socially appropriate communicative forms; norms; routines; rituals, etc) of social politeness. In this respect, social politeness is associated with the social-norm view of politeness discussed by Fraser (1990) and discernment politeness introduced by Hill et al. (1986) and Ide (1989).

3.1.1.4. Politic behavior vs. polite behavior

Watts (1992) introduces the term 'politic behavior' to refer to a broader concept of social appropriateness. He sees a distinction between marked and unmarked forms of behavior. He
depicts polite behavior as marked behavior in contrast to unmarked politic behavior. He asserts that politeness is a kind of marked social behavior which "masks the real intentions of ego, some of which may not be altogether altruistic" (Watts et al. 1992:13). In this view, politeness may be perceived negatively. This egocentric nature of politeness behavior is also observed by Jary (1998). Jary (ibid.:6-7) maintains that politeness behavior will only result in an additional layer of communication if: (a) it provides evidence for the hearer that assumptions he had considered mutually manifest were not in fact so, (b) it is the speaker's intention that this is the case, (c) this intention is mutually manifest. Thus, Watts alternatively suggests 'politic behavior'. He considers politic behavior as an unmarked form of interaction. He (1989, quoted in Watts 1992:50) defines politic behavior as "socio-culturally determined behavior directed towards the goal of establishing and/or maintaining in a state of equilibrium the personal relationships between the individuals of a social group, whether open or closed, during the ongoing process of interaction". Watts (ibid.:51) also observes that "polite behavior depends on features of the interaction which are socio-culturally marked by the speech community as being more than merely politic". From this observation, B&L's positive and negative politeness strategies are explicable as polite behavior and conversely the use of terms of address, honorifics, ritualized expressions, etc are interpretable as politic forms. In this view, we can link polite and politic behavior with volitional and discernment politeness, respectively. For this suggestion, Watts (ibid.:52) presents an example where "In a situation in which form A is replaced by a higher form B when form A would be adequate politic behavior, we may well be justified in considering form B a polite form, since the strategy of "volition" has taken precedence over that of discernment". In this view, the strategic use of polite forms and strategies appears to be an exploitation of the expectation that certain sociocultural constraints or rules on behavior will be observed.
3.1.2. Research on non-Western politeness

B&L (1987) claim that the exact limits they propose for personal territories, both interactants’ mutual knowledge of face and the social necessity to orient themselves to it in spoken interaction, are universal. Their claims to universality amount to the following points (ibid.: 244): (1) the universality of face, which is describable as two kinds of basic wants; (2) the potential universality of a set of strategic resources from which individual cultures choose, and of certain principles and their rational development; and (3) the universality of the mutual knowledge between (1) and (2). Some aspects of the universal model of politeness have been challenged (cf. Gu 1990; Mao 1994; Matsumoto 1988; Rhodes 1989; Wierzbicka 1985; Nwoye 1992; de Kadt 1998).

Gu (1990) has argued that the Chinese notion of negative face differs from that defined by B&L. In Chinese, offering, inviting, and promising are not, under ordinary circumstances, considered as threatening the hearer’s negative face, because Chinese interlocutors do not consider such speech acts as intruding on other people’s personal territory. For example, a Chinese person may express his/her sincerity with insistence when inviting or offering, and yet s/he will not be considered to have threatened H’s face or impeded H’s freedom of action. On the contrary, s/he will be considered genuinely polite. Gu also argues that politeness in a Chinese context is a phenomenon relevant to the level of society, imposing its normative constraints on each individual.

Mao (1994) demonstrates that Chinese face, mianzi and lian, differ distinctively from B&L’s characterization of negative and positive face because the social and moral connotations evidenced in mianzi and lian lie well beyond the semantic boundary marked by negative and positive face. That is, mianzi identifies a Chinese want to secure ‘public’ acknowledgment of
one’s prestige or reputation, while B&L’s negative face only refers to an individual’s desire to be free of external imposition. Besides, lian is more socially situated than positive face. Mao, instead, proposes the ‘relative face orientation construct’, which is based on the assumption that “face is a public image that every individual member wishes to claim for him- or herself, and it suggests that such an image embodies an underlying direction that either emulates an ideal social identity or aspires toward an ideal individual autonomy” (Mao ibid.:484). Mao’s face constructs thus embrace the relative placement of individuals in social hierarchies.

Matsumoto (1988) views the notion of face and place as mutually exclusive. She claims that the concept of negative face want is alien to Japanese culture because it is based on the assumption that the basic unit of a society is the individual, while that of the Japanese society is a relevant group. In general, a Japanese must understand where each individual stands in relation to other members of the group or society, and must acknowledge his/her dependence on the others. Matsumoto (ibid.:405) claims that “acknowledgment and maintenance of the relative position of others, rather than preservation of an individual’s proper territory, governs all (Japanese) social interaction”. This view of face and the concept of self have clear linguistic manifestation. Japanese is a language typified by expressions of deference. She (ibid.:409) argues that deference in Japanese culture does not function to minimize imposition (i.e. negative politeness), but to represent a positive relationship between the interlocutor (i.e. positive politeness), as in doozo yorosiku onegaisimasu ‘I ask you to please treat me well’. This example is employed when someone is introduced to someone and expresses a wish that the relationship will be a beneficial one. Therefore, it is an honor to be asked to take care of someone, and this confers status on the person being so asked. It enhances the hearer’s positive face and also the speaker’s positive face by putting himself in a positively valued relationship of interdependence. Therefore, it is not negative versus positive face but just face, which is viewed as positive self-
Rhodes (1989) examines polite usage in Ojibwa. She argues that positive politeness strategies predominate over negative politeness strategies in Ojibwa. Besides, contrary to B&L’s assumptions, the Ojibwa data show that positive politeness can be conventionalized. She introduces a number of conventionally polite requests in Ojibwa, for instance, *Giin idash, Amik, abwiin, giga-babaabigwandaanan* ‘And, Beaver, why don’t you go around and chew up the paddles?’ (lit. ‘And you, Beaver will go around and chew up the paddles’) (Rhodes ibid.:250). Rhodes (ibid.:254) claims that “Since distance and power differential make up most of what constitutes threat to face, most requests can be negotiated without concern for redressing face. What would be requested in a language like English, is normally commanded with simple imperative form in Ojibwa”. Similarly, Rosaldo (1982) argues that directives used in Illongot in the Philippines are not considered as a threat to the addressee’s face but a way of invoking cooperative bonds. It is because directives in Illongot are viewed as expressing reasonable social expectations, norms, which continue social interactions rather than impositions of the addressee’s negative face wants. Consequently, Rosaldo’s data also suggest a revision of B&L’s model of politeness is required.

Wierzbicka (1985) too raises objections to B&L’s model of politeness in her studies of Polish verbal interaction. She hypothesizes that the concept of privacy is a characteristically Anglo-Saxon one, reflective of one of the central values of Anglo-Saxon culture by means of associating linguistic differences with cultural differences such as spontaneity, directness, intimacy and affection (in Slavic and Mediterranean cultures) vs. indirectness, distance, tolerance and anti-dogmatism (in the Anglo-Saxon cultural tradition). In this respect, she argues that certain features of English that have been claimed to be an outgrowth of universal politeness, are really language-specific and culture-specific. She further extends her argument
that "what is at issue is neither universal rules of politeness nor even English-specific rules of politeness...[but rather]...English conversational strategies, and Anglo-Saxon cultural values" (Wierzbicka ibid.:173).

Critiques of universal politeness have also been developed in relation to African languages. Nwoye (1992) shows that Igbo politeness differs from politeness in Western societies. He maintains that B&L's notion of face is different from the ways the Igbo of Nigeria conceptualize face. Besides, he says no translation equivalent for the English polite exists at all in Igbo. Igbo can only approach it through the notion of ezigbo omume 'good behavior'. Thus, Nwoye alternatively asserts that the conversational-contract view introduced by Fraser (1990) adequately accounts for politeness phenomena in Igbo, because politeness in Igbo is a form of social contract existing between the group and the individual members of the group. Furthermore, he claims that some speech acts (e.g. requests, offers, thanks, criticisms) in Igbo are not face-threatening at all, even when performed in the most bald-on-record manner. So these speech acts are rarely regarded as impositions in Igbo. de Kadt (1998) also talks about problems in B&L's face-concept in dealing with Zulu data. Rather than reject the face-construct out of hand, she develops Zulu politeness strategies on the basis of a broader construct based on Goffman's analysis. B&L's notion of face is the public 'self'-image that MP wants to claim for himself, while Goffman (1967) describes face as a 'public' rather than personal property. According to de Kadt, the central concept in societal interaction is denoted by the verb hlonipha 'to pay respect' and the respect strategies are mutual in Zulu society. Thus, the interpersonal orientation of Goffman's face concept is deemed more compatible with the Zulu culture.

In conclusion, linguists who have studied politeness in non-Western cultures claim that the non-Western notion of face is different from B&L's characterization of negative and positive face
and requests are not considered as a threat to the addressee's negative face but a way of creating solidarity in non-Western societies.

3.2. Background information about Korean concept of politeness

Based on our discussion about critiques of universality in linguistic politeness, we can now discuss the Korean concept of politeness. The initial sections provide a discussion of Korean culture and linguistic behavior from the perspective of worldview in order to explain social norms and cultural values in Korea. There follows a discussion of Korean concept of face and its relation to politeness. The second half of the section provides a discussion of an application of B&L's politeness to the Korean data.

3.2.1. Worldview shaping Korean culture and linguistic behavior

Cultures are distinguishable by numerous factors. When combined these factors create unique cultural identities. One of the factors is worldview. Each culture has its own worldview. Although worldview is not totally the same as philosophy, philosophies current within a certain culture tremendously affect worldview (Klopf and Park 1994; Park 1997). Therefore, the study of philosophically influenced worldview helps explain both the Korean people's subconsciousness and Korean culture and language behavior. Two main philosophies, Buddhist fatalism and Confucianism, have fundamentally shaped the intellectual life of Korea. Now let us talk about Korean cultural values and linguistic behavior in terms of the worldview of these two philosophies.
3.2.1.1. Buddhist fatalism

The Korean individual tends to see his/her self-identity as anchored in a cosmic law (i.e. inyen ‘fate, destiny’) embedded in the Buddhist belief system. According to fatalism, everything in the world is predetermined to occur by an endless chain of causes (in) and effects (yen) from the unknown past, through the present, to the future, in a sequence which is beyond human control (cf. Thompson 1999). In Buddhist doctrine, in refers to the inner, direct cause, while yen refers to the outer, indirect, facilitating cause, which produces an effect. Based on Buddhist fatalism, a person who must give up a particular goal due to an unavoidable reason is likely to be told by others, ‘There was no inyen’. Likewise, friends or members of older generations may offer their condolences to a person who has failed a university entrance exam, ‘Probably, you may not have inyen with the university’. In addition to inyen, the Koreans also refer to fate (wun) as an explanation for success or failure. The successful person is described as a man of good or happy wun, or simply as a man with wun, whereas the unsuccessful person receives condolence with such a statement as wuni epsessta ‘You had no wun’ or wuni ttalacwuci anhassta ‘Wun was not with you’. Phalca can be an equivalent of wun to some extent. For instance, someone who frequently gets in trouble or is usually unlucky with or without any specific reason may be described as a person of bad or dirty phalca, or he himself may blame his bad phalca with such a statement as aiko, nay phalcaya ‘Alas, my phalca’.

3.2.1.2. Confucianism

Because of the geographic proximity of the Korean peninsular to China, and the relationship that developed between Korea and China, the cultural development of the Korean people has
been influenced by Chinese cultural patterns in many ways, creating numerous similarities between the cultures of these two countries. Over the centuries this Confucianism came to constitute the basis of the political ideal and to account for the mainstream of pre-modern philosophy in Korea, and thereby it exerts a great influence on various facets of Korean history, culture, and social life. Confucianism is one of the chief factors that have determined traditional Korean patterns of thinking and action.

Representatives of the Confucianization process are Koreans’ preference for sons, age-conscious relationships, a male-oriented society, and in-group oriented interpersonal interaction, etc. Furthermore, Confucianism prescribes ideal human social relations across age, generation, gender, and status, establishing clear hierarchies between older and younger, and male and female. This nature of Confucianism leads Koreans to be sensitive to the concepts of cheymyen ‘face’ and yeuy ‘decorum’ (see 3.2.2. for more detail). In this respect, although Confucianism in Korea has made a great contribution to the development of Korean culture, it has also slowed economic growth. However, the opposite interpretation is prevalent today – the miracle economies of East Asia are said to be successful owing to the influence of Confucianism. When it is given some of the credit for the development of Korea, it is the orderliness and hierarchical order that is quoted as the reason why people work hard and follow directions and rules. It is certain that Confucianism continues to play an important role in Korea.

The primary generational ideology in Confucianism is ‘filial piety’. Filial piety assumes the enormous debt of children to their parents and by extension of people to their ancestors (Park 1997). It demands strict obedience, respect for authority, and careful care of parents and ancestors by offspring. Keeping this basic generational principle in mind, let us turn to patrilineal kinship ideology. Korean patrilineal ideology maintains strict hierarchy according to generation, birth order, and age. These hierarchies are observed not only through kinship
terminology but also through language use generally. The Korean language observes age hierarchy: verbs, forms of address, and vocabulary vary depending on who you are speaking to. Therefore, norms and values originating from Confucianism are able to account for how speakers make inferences about talking and for the construction of roles in interaction with others in Korea. In the light of Confucianism, the basic Korean cultural values/norms may be seen as collectivism, hierarchism, and indirectness. Let us consider these values in terms of Korean linguistic behavior.

3.2.1.2.1. Collectivism

Korean is called a ‘macro-to-micro’ language, because “the universe is represented in the order of a set (macro) and then its members (micro)” (Sohn 1999: 16). For example, Koreans put the family name first and then the given name second. Likewise, they write a postal address in the sequence of bigger to smaller units. This ‘macro-to-micro’ order reflects the collective nature of the Korean language. Numerous Korean terms carry the sense of interdependence and interrelatedness based on collectivism. For example, the concept of hyoto ‘filial duty’ refers to a particular relationship between parents and their children. Terms like hakyen ‘school ties’, eiyen ‘regionalism’, and hyelyen ‘ties of kinship’ function as basic units of many social activities in Korea (e.g. business transaction; operations of companies; administrative culture). Due to the collectivistic nature of Korean society, Koreans commonly use kin terms even between non-siblings. This is because a strong family tie extends into social life. Koreans also prefer to use ‘we’ instead of ‘I’, as in ‘our school’ instead of ‘my school’, ‘our house’ instead of ‘my house’, and ‘our department’ instead of ‘my department’. Using ‘my’ may give an impression that the speaker is arrogant. It may also be consistent with the lack of a
sense of possessiveness stemming from collectivism in many Asian languages (Mulholland 1997). We can also observe Koreans’ emphasis on mutual involvement and interest in others’ business according to conversational routines, such as common greetings (e.g. etikaseyyo? ‘Where are you going?’; etikassta oseyyo? ‘Where have you been?’; cinci capswusyesseyo? ‘Did you eat your meal?’). Koreans tend to read the in-group members’ feelings to maintain affective relations with in-group members in many interpersonal settings by following an affective communicative style (Sohn 1983), as shown in hanpencwumyen ceng epsta ‘Affection cannot be had by giving only once’, cengttaymwnuey ‘Because of affection’. Similarly, Korean value nwunchi ‘reading other’s face or feeling (lit. eye measures)’ not to hurt other’s feeling or face. A variety of nonverbal patterns also reflect collectivism in Korea. Rather than following the custom of dutch treat, one person normally pays for others in Korea. In having a meal, Koreans share a pot stew, called ccikay.

3.2.1.2.2. Hierarchism

Koreans are sensitive to hierarchy, as the saying goes, chanmwulto wi alayka isstta ‘There is order even when drinking cold water’. Based on hierarchism in Korea, an inferior will never use first name to a superior as a term of address in normal Korean settings. Instead, the inferior may use title + last name or title only to the superior. Koreans try not to use any of the second person pronouns to superiors, either. An inferior tends to avoid using ‘we’ to include a superior. Suggestive expressions are not normally used to one’s superior in Korea. Normally superiors rarely express certain acknowledgements, such as thanking, to their inferiors. By the same token, Koreans view age as one of the primary criteria for showing deference and in the choice of honorifics, speech levels (i.e. six addressee honorific levels: -ta (plain); -e (intimate); -
ney (familiar); -(s)eo/- (s)wu (blunt); -(e)yo (polite); -(su)pnita (deferential)), and address terms. For example, using proper kin terms is strictly observed even between twins. Nonverbal behavior also reflects hierarchical communicative patterns in Korea. When having a meal, a lower status person should wait until a higher status person starts eating and a lower status person should not finish eating earlier than does a higher status person. When drinking with a superior, a subordinate hides his glass and turns away from the superior, and smoking in front of a superior is not allowed. Koreans use both hands when giving to or receiving something from a superior. Bowing to a superior is a common greeting in Korea.

3.2.1.2.3. Indirectness

Koreans are rather indirect in communicative behavior. Any disagreement made baldly may imply hostility in normal Korean context. Instead, it is considered a virtue not to explicitly express one’s opinions or feelings, but to show humility or modesty. It may be consistent with Sohn’s (1987) claim that the ‘expressive’ acts in Korea (e.g. thanking, congratulating, condolences, etc.) are not as expressive as in English in the frequency of use. Therefore, for example, thanking is quite limited among Koreans. Koreans are most likely to reject the positive evaluation, such as compliment. Overt condolences are also quite rare. At best, one may indirectly say, ‘I have no words to express’. As Kim (1975) mentions, due to the prevalent tendency of indirectness in Korea, instead of saying ‘no’, one may use such expressions as kulsseyyo him tulkeyssnuntessy o ‘Well, it seems to be difficult’ and twukopopsita ‘Let us wait and see’. Furthermore, Koreans’ ‘yes’ does not necessarily signal agreement, but may imply the meaning of ‘I see’, depending on context. Koreans understand such responses as saving each other’s face and thereby maintaining harmony. Maintaining the other’s ‘face’ or self-esteem
may require attention to the state of the hearer’s inner feelings. Besides, modesty is highly valued in Korea. Certain expressions based on modest social norm in Korea are superficially illogical but pragmatically well-formed (Cho 1982). Such expressions imply that Koreans consider humbleness as a social virtue. For example, when inviting someone into one’s own house, s/he may say nwuchwuhaciman tuleoseyyo ‘Although the house is dirty, please come in’, before dinner, Koreans also say masun epsciman manhi tuseyyo ‘The food does not taste good, but help yourself’ or mekulken epsciman manhi tuseyyo ‘There is nothing to eat, but help yourself’, and when offering a gift, the gift-giver may say yaksohaciman patacwuseyyo ‘This is nothing good but please take it’. Furthermore, the most frequent compliment response with a simple negative ‘no’ in Korea also denotes the complimentee’s modesty, not the matter of the face-threatening act. Status difference also affects indirectness in linguistic behavior in Korea. When an inferior asks a question to a superior about private matters (e.g. age), s/he does so in terms of indirect speech acts which are idiomatized (Sohn 1999: 418). For example, olhay ettehkey toyseyyo? ‘What is...this year? (lit. ‘How does it become this year?’)’ is a formula for asking the superior’s age indirectly.

It is true that Korea is undergoing a cultural change. American dominant cultural values are threatening the Korean traditional values (Park 2001). For example, many Confucian customs are no longer prevalent among Korean youngsters. Furthermore, although, in general, silence is sacred in Korean society due to the influence of Confucianism, language has been considered sacred recently because of the influence of the Western thought on modern Korean society (Yamada 1997). Therefore, Koreans are becoming accustomed to expressing themselves verbally or nonverbally instead of considering taciturnity as a virtue. In particular, younger Koreans are more achievement-oriented than senior members who prefer to stick to formalism and conservative tradition (Park 2001). However, it is certain that the principles of
Confucianism are still deeply embedded in the everyday life of Korea as a source of social norms and cultural values. These social norms and cultural values reflect the aspect of discernment politeness in Korea. Therefore, as discussed in 3.1.1., being polite means generally conforming to socially agreed codes (i.e. collectivism, hierarchism, and indirectness).

3.2.2. Korean concept of face and its relation to politeness

Since knowing how to attend to other’s face is essential to understand politeness in Korean discourse, we now develop a general definition of the Korean notion of face based on our discussion of Korean culture and language behavior in the previous section. In this section, I first propose the Korean notion of face by making an overview of problems in defining the notion of face and then expand the discussion to numerous expressions of face in Korea to support a definition of face in Korean culture.

One of the common problems in defining the notion of face is that people have confused ‘face’ with something else, which is closely related with it but is not face itself. For example, Hu (1944) defines the Chinese concept of face, mianzi and lian, by means of ‘reputation’. That is, mianzi is a reputation that is achieved through getting on in life, while lian is a good moral reputation. In similar vein, Yu (2001) defines face in Chinese as ‘dignity’ and ‘prestige’. Although face can be interpreted as reputation, dignity, or prestige, it is more than just reputation, dignity, or prestige and varies with the situation. For example, when a mother scolds her child, the child may lose his/her face but it may be incorrect to say that s/he loses reputation, dignity, or prestige.

Another group of researchers defines face as a type of ‘self-image’ (Goffman 1955; B&L 1987). Goffman (1955: 213) defines face as
the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes.

Likewise, according to B&L, face is “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (1987: 61). However, it is necessary to note that the notion of self varies across culture (Kasper 1997). Since people in collectivist societies are sensitive to face and its relation to politeness because they are relatively more gregarious, group-oriented or relation-focused than Westerners, one’s self-image depends very much on how one is looked on by others. Therefore, public evaluation of self is strongly perceived by him-/herself, producing a feeling of saving face or losing face. To be sure the individual may be able to affect the public evaluation of him-/herself by elaborating the sense of how s/he is viewed by others. However, the problem lies in the fact that how one thinks of oneself does not count in one’s saving face or losing face.

I describe face as ‘positive public image’ (cf. Goffman 1967). The ‘positive public image’ as a definition of face fits a number of expressions of face in Korea. Unlike Indo-European languages, the Korean language has a wide variety of expressions to do with face. In Korean, not only terms borrowed from Chinese, but also indigenous terms are used in connection with face (i.e. positive public image): Chinese loan words cheymyen and myenmok; Korean indigenous term nach.

The following expressions pertain to the raising of people’s self-evaluation (e.g. when A does a good job in giving a presentation at postgraduate conference, A’s face is saved):

- cheymyen-i sal-ta ‘to save face’
- cheymyen-i se-ta ‘to save face’ (lit. one’s face stands up)
In the above context, A’s supervisor’s face is also saved because the supervisor is given face by his/her student’s good presentation.

\[ \text{cheemyen-ul sallye-cwu-ta} \quad \text{‘to save one’s face’ (lit. to save and give face)} \]

The following expressions pertain to the lowering of people’s self-evaluation (e.g. when an invigilator finds that an examinee A cheats in the exam and thereby A should leave the classroom, A’s face is lost in front of other examinees):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{cheemyen-ul ili-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’} \\
\text{cheemyen-ul kwuki-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’ (lit. to crush or collapse face)} \\
\text{cheemyen-ul telep-hi-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’ (lit. to dirty face)} \\
\text{cheemyen-ey mekchil-ha-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’ (lit. to paint face)}
\end{align*} \]

In particular, the following expressions are normally made when someone acknowledges his/her fault and face-loss (e.g. when a company pays for damage done to other parties because an employee A in the company fails to fulfil contractual obligations, A loses his face):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{myenmok-i eps-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’ (lit. no face)} \\
\text{pol nach-i eps-ta} & \quad \text{‘to lose face’ (lit. there is no face to see)}
\end{align*} \]

Korean expressions of ‘face’ (i.e. cheemyen; myenmok; nach) in the above examples, are interpreted as positive public image, as defined above. To be polite in Korea is to know how to
take into consideration interactants’ face and “to enact speech acts appropriate to and worthy of such an image” (Mao 1994: 463).

3.2.3. An application of B&L’s politeness theory to the Korean data

Based on our discussion on Korean culture and linguistic behavior, now let us discuss whether B&L’s (1987) model of politeness can explain the Korean data. In this study, I accept the validity of positive and negative face. However, I elaborate and revise B&L’s model, because of a genuine problem with trying to apply the notion of negative and positive politeness to all speech acts. B&L’s distinction between positive and negative politeness is based on the approach-avoidance distinction. Let me represent B&L’s formulation in table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Approach strategies</th>
<th>B&amp;L’s positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Show interest</td>
<td>politeness or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Use of in-group language</td>
<td>Leech’s Approbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avoidance strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Positive face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Negative face</td>
<td>B&amp;L’s negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>politeness or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leech’s Tact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 3.1., B&L classify ‘approach strategies’ (e.g. ‘show interest’, ‘use of in-group language’) alongside ‘avoidance strategies in consideration of others’ positive face’ in positive politeness. This claim is also consistent with Leech’s (1983) ‘approbation’ (i.e. minimize blame and maximize praise of the other). B&L’s negative politeness (‘avoidance strategies’ in
consideration of others' negative face) is addressed by Leech's 'tact' (i.e. a speaker respects the other's freedom of action). B&L's distinction between positive and negative politeness is clear-cut when we deal with FTAs that threaten negative face (e.g. request). For example, in the sentence (kumpen silcey senceekkhoca hasinun lotkwa tongilhan lotuy saymphulul cuksi songpwuhay cwusiki palapnita 'I hope you will immediately send a sample with the exact same type that you actually intend to ship' [BL38]), the writer uses a positive politeness strategy (English code (lot)) and three negative politeness strategies (hedge (cwu 'do for'); nominalization (kt); want statement (palapnita 'I hope')). In this case, a clear-cut distinction between 'approach' (i.e. using in-group language (code-mixing)) and 'avoidance' (i.e. hedge; nominalization; want statement) is made. Probably, that is why B&L's (1987) model concentrates heavily on the speech acts which threaten the other's negative face such as request.

Positive politeness is oriented to positive face, whereas negative politeness is oriented to negative face. This distinction seems clear enough at first sight but is somewhat problematic. B&L's distinction between positive and negative politeness is not clear-cut when we deal with FTAs that threaten positive face. Let me explain why. Some devices can be used to reduce the force of positive FTAs (e.g. disagreement). B&L consider those devices to be positive politeness strategies, because they are oriented to positive face (see table 3.1). However, classifying these mitigating devices alongside other devices to satisfy others' positive face (e.g. 'show interest' and 'use of in-group language') in the single category of approach-oriented positive politeness seems problematic. Although the mitigating devices are oriented to the reader's positive face wants, they are basically (conflict) avoidance strategies. If we classify 'approach strategies' alongside 'avoidance strategies in consideration of others' positive face' in positive politeness, a fundamental proposition of B&L's model, the approach-avoidance distinction, does not reflect the whole function of the model. That is, a clear-cut distinction between 'approach' and
‘avoidance’ is not made, because ‘avoidance strategies’ (in consideration of others’ positive face) are classified together with ‘approach strategies’ in the single category of approach-oriented positive politeness. For example, in the sentence (SB Project kemuy kyeevakkan yencangi pwulthwumyeng hal kes kathsupnita ‘It seems unclear if the contract term for SB Project will be extended’ [BL35]), two positive politeness strategies are employed in order to satisfy the reader’s positive face (i.e. using in-group language (English code (SB Project))) and a conflict avoidance strategy in consideration of the reader’s positive face (hedge: -kes kathsupnita ‘It seems that’)). In this instance, it superficially seems that a clear-cut distinction between approach (i.e. using in-group language) and avoidance (i.e. hedge) is made. However, since these positive politeness strategies are oriented to two different aspects of positive face wants (i.e. approach and avoidance) within the single category of approach-oriented positive politeness, taking quantitative measures of the (positive) politeness strategies is problematic. Probably, that is why B&L (1998) also claim that intrinsic problems in taking quantitative measure of politeness strategies in natural data can possibly emerge. In conclusion, classifying approach strategies alongside avoidance strategies within the single category of positive politeness is qualitatively and quantitatively problematic. To solve this problem, I use two terms ‘solidarity enforcement strategies’ and ‘conflict avoidance strategies’ instead of ‘positive politeness strategies’ and ‘negative politeness strategies’. I propose the approach-avoidance distinction in table 3.2.
Table 3.2. Revised formulation of politeness strategies in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Approach strategies</th>
<th>Solidarity enforcement strategies or Holmes's positive politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Show interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Use of in-group language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avoidance strategies</td>
<td>Conflict avoidance strategies or Holmes's negative politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Positive face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Negative face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 3.2., the distinction between 'solidarity enforcement strategies' and 'conflict avoidance strategies' is also addressed by Holmes's positive and negative politeness. Holmes identifies a problem with trying to apply the notion of negative and positive politeness to different types of speech acts. She (1984) discusses this issue with respect to what she calls 'negatively affective speech acts' (e.g. disagreement) and 'positively affective speech acts' (e.g. compliment). In this respect, she modifies B&L's positive and negative politeness. She (1995:5) defines positive politeness as "social behavior expressing warmth towards an addressee", while negative politeness is "behavior which avoids imposing on others (or avoids 'threatening their face')" (emphasis given). The distinction between 'solidarity enforcement strategies' and 'conflict avoidance strategies' is also addressed by other scholars (Kasper 1990; Wierzbicka 1985). As Goffman (1967) points out, negative politeness is essentially avoidance-based to allow 'social/ritual distancing' to be maintained. Non-imposition plays an important role in explaining negative politeness in the Anglo-Saxon culture where it is highly valued. However, this appreciation of non-imposition is not necessarily shared with other cultures (Kasper 1990;
Wierzbicka 1985). As discussed in 3.2.1.2., what is important in defining negative politeness in some non-Western cultures, including Korean, is that the act of avoidance is achieved by *restraining the display of emotions* (Wierzbicka 1985). In this respect, one needs to take into account more than just non-imposition to explain negative politeness in non-Anglo-Saxon cultures. This claim is consistent with Holmes’s (1995: 154) definition of negative politeness as “expressions or strategies which reduce the effect of face-threatening speech acts such as directives, threats, insults, complaints, disagreements or criticisms.” Therefore, I do not immediately classify individual redressive actions as either positive or negative politeness strategies based on solely on their occurrence in a positive FTA or a negative FTA. Instead, I use the formulation in table 3.2. for data analysis. In this study, I use two terms ‘solidarity enforcement strategies’ and ‘conflict avoidance strategies’ in order not to use terms, such as positive and negative politeness, confusingly. For example, in the sentence (*Commission kuncwuanulo mosnakal kes kathsupnita* ‘It seems that commission is not going to be paid within this week’), two positive politeness strategies are used (i.e. English code (*commission*) and a hedge in consideration of the reader’s positive face (*-kes kathsupnita* ‘It seems that’)) according to B&L’s formulation. However, according to my preferred system, a solidarity enforcement strategy (i.e. using in-group language (English code)) and a conflict avoidance strategy in consideration of the reader’s positive face (i.e. a hedge) are used. Solidarity enforcement strategies are used to build up or intensify solidarity between participants, while conflict avoidance strategies are used to reduce the force of a positive FTA or a negative FTA. The concepts of ‘solidarity enforcement strategies’ and ‘conflict avoidance strategies’ make the politeness framework more balanced because they allow us to classify two different politeness strategies distinctively. Furthermore, these new concepts may solve intrinsic problem in taking quantitative measures of (positive) politeness strategies. However, it is necessary to note that
although I classify ‘conflict avoidance strategies in consideration of other’s positive face’ in juxtaposition to ‘conflict avoidance strategies in consideration of other’s negative face’ under the single category of conflict avoidance strategies, they remain distinct, since they are used to minimize two different types of FTAs (i.e. positive FTAs and negative FTAs). They just share the feature of being conflict avoidance strategies.

3.3. Summary and discussion

Universality in politeness theories is challenged for the following two reasons. Firstly, besides volitional or strategic politeness, linguists claim that politeness can take another form, which is discernment or normative politeness. Secondly, the universal model of politeness does not apply to all cultures equally. For example, in non-Western societies, requests are not considered as a threat to the addressee’s negative face. To sum up these two aspects, politeness in the West is more a matter of interactional strategy which arises from face concerns, while social indexing is as important as strategic conflict avoidance in the East.

The two philosophies of Buddhist fatalism and Confucianism mainly affect the formulation of the underlying cognitive values of Koreans (i.e. fatalism from Buddhism; collectivism, hierarchsim, indirectness from Confucianism). In particular, Confucianism exerts a significant influence on formulating Korean cultural values and social norms. These cultural values and social norms reflect the aspect of discernment politeness in Korea. In general, being polite means conforming to these norms and values.

In this chapter, I define face as a positive public image. Knowing how to attend to other’s face is essential to understand politeness in Korean discourse.

Furthermore, two terms ‘solidarity enforcement strategies’ and ‘conflict avoidance
strategies' (instead of 'positive politeness strategies' and 'negative politeness strategies') are used in this study in order to make the politeness framework more balanced (i.e. the approach-avoidance distinction). These new concepts may also solve intrinsic problem in taking quantitative measure of (positive) politeness strategies.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1. Research questions

I shall approach the analysis of my data in two distinct ways: (a) globally and (b) locally.

In the broader perspective, this study attempts to explicate the rhetorical structure of Korean business letters first and then the influence of politeness strategies on a rhetorical structure in Korean business correspondence. I also investigate if corporate culture affects the rhetorical structure (Research question 1).

From the local perspective, the main aim of the study is to explore some of the politeness strategies used in four different types of speech acts (i.e. disagreement; giving bad news; request; compliment) performed in Korean business letters (Research questions 2 and 3).

I am also concerned with contextual factors affecting Korean business texts in realizing politeness strategies. Furthermore, I explore if the contextual factors always affect the choice of politeness strategies in a conventional way (Research question 4). Therefore, the following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. Is there a relationship between politeness strategies and the rhetorical structure in Korean business correspondence? Does corporate culture affect the rhetorical structure?
2. Which types of politeness strategies appear in Korean business correspondence?
3. Is there a preference or frequency ranking of politeness strategies in Korean business correspondence?
4. Which variables are influencing the choice of politeness strategies realized in Korean business correspondence? If there are exceptions to the (B&L’s) conventional patterns of
politeness strategy distribution, how shall we explain them?

The following sections provide an overview of (1) the corpus of Korean business correspondence and (2) the methods of data collection and types of analysis.

4.2. Data

4.2.1. Texts

The distinction between business and personal communications is sometimes not clear because it depends on a number of factors including style, familiarity between both parties, or medium. That is, personal communications can be incorporated into business communications depending on the factors. For example, we may assume that e-mail messages include personal communications more than formal letters do. Therefore, I consider business correspondence as letters involving work related discourse, even though personal communications are sometimes included in the business texts. Texts only for personal communications without work related communications are excluded from this study.

The primary data for this study is composed of 194 business texts of internal (77 e-mail messages) and external (117 formal letters) correspondence collected from two Korean companies, a food company (corporation A) and a pharmaceutical company (corporation B), from different departments (e.g. design department; accounting department; trading department). The number of the texts in the data is given in tables 4.1 and 4.2. The total number of sentences I examine is 699 (143 in AE; 87 in BE; 251 in AL; 218 in BL).
Two different types of companies were expected to show distinctive corporate cultures, as in some other business communicators’ findings (e.g. Akar 1998). Although I cannot reveal much detail about these companies due to reasons of confidentiality, I can say a few things about them. Corporation A is a private food company producing curry, instant food, vegetable oil products, canned tuna fish, and so on. Corporation B is a private pharmaceutical company specializing in the exporting and importing of both finished pharmaceuticals like medicines, medical equipment and machinery, and raw materials used for making medicines. Both companies are one of the top ten firms in their sectors in Korea, and their foreign business includes substantial export volumes to a number of countries.

E-mail messages and formal business letters were selected as representative of internal and external correspondence respectively, because they are used relatively frequently for internal and external communications. E-mail is becoming the most common medium of communication for business people due to the recent technological advances. Therefore, despite the historical dominance of the formal business letter printed on paper for external use, e-mail has replaced traditional media for internal communication, such as the memorandum. Due to the distinctive features of company-internal communication, e-mails are expected to reflect a more company-specific culture (e.g. use of in-group languages). Forwarded messages are not included.
in my data because there could be multiple recipients and because the original messages are not written to the recipients of forwarded messages. On the other hand, I consider formal business letters as representative of company-external communications. They represent only V(ous) level discourse in this study. That is, formal business correspondence is conducted only between unfamiliar people for external use. Despite the prevalent trend towards paper-free organizations in the modern business world, the paper-based business letter is still the medium of choice for external communication because of its formal character, its role as legal evidence, and its role in reducing the possibility of miscommunication. That is why the use of e-mail is limited to internal communication. Some official business letters sent to and received from external parties via fax are also included in the data as formal business letters. They are not fax messages but letters that are sent via fax because of having both the formal characteristics of conventional business letters (e.g. the inside address of the receiver, the use of both parties’ full names with their titles) and the manifestations of intertextuality (i.e. attempts to contextualize the present text in relation to the previous communication). Of course, texts modified by the features of fax are excluded in the data.

The corpus of authentic Korean business letters provides evidence for the four different types of speech acts chosen for study here: disagreement, giving bad news, request, and compliment. The most basic problem of B&L’s (1987) model is that it concentrates heavily on the speech acts which threaten the other’s negative face, such as request and order. Furthermore, since positive face wants override negative face wants in Korea, this study focuses more on acts threatening the positive face of the other. That is why I deal with two positive FTAs (i.e. disagreement and giving bad news), as opposed to only one negative FTA (i.e. request) in this study. Among several positive FTAs, giving bad news and disagreement are the most common positive FTAs
in business context (cf. Akar 1998; Rogers et al. 2001; Cramer 1997). As I mention in chapter 2, the overall purpose of doing these positive FTAs in a business context is to find a solution. The most explicit way of proposing a solution may be making a request. Therefore, pursuing a successful business goal can depend to some extent on how the requester makes a request. Probably that is why special attention has been paid to the speech act of request in written business communications across cultures (Akar 1998; Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris 1996; Pilegaard 1997; Yeung 1997; Yli-Jokipii 1994, 1998, among many others). In order to compare the realization of solidarity enforcement strategy and conflict avoidance strategy, I also deal with the compliment speech act, which is the most representative of the face-enhancing acts (FEAs). The main speech acts in this study are defined in the following way.

(1) Disagreement

It seems that the majority of disagreement researchers consider that the concept of ‘opposition’ is a key feature in defining disagreements (Eisenberg and Garvey 1981; Maynard 1985; Goodwin and Goodwin 1990, among many others). The same is true for defining disagreements in Korean, in that the concept of pantay ‘opposition’ is most frequently employed in the definition of disagreements in Korean. Besides pantay ‘opposition’, the Korean terms describing the speech act of disagreement are iuy, caynglon, noncayng, piswulak, and kecel. The first three terms are normally used in the sense of disagreeing with prior opinion (e.g. cehuy pwiseysenun cemseungmles sikkwenuulo taychiasiekeystanun ukyeneymun com pantayipnita ‘Our department slightly disagrees with the opinion that you substitute lunch expenses for vouchers’ [AE1]; inun kacang kiponeckiek senipsekhuwulc mwusihan cayko kwanli pwusillo palseynghan mwunceyici phwumcilmwunecye anilako sayngkakhapnita ‘I think it happens not
because of the quality of product but because of the unreliable stock control procedure which ignores the basic order of acquisition' [BL13]). The last two terms denote disapproval or refusal (e.g. kumpen yochenghasin kyelceycoken(D/A)un tangsalosemun swuyonghaki elyeptanun cemul allyetulipnita 'We inform you that we are unable to accept the settlement condition (D/A) you request' [BL5]; kwisaeyse Owel Oil ceysihasyessten OOthatpecyphwumul tangsaeyesenun sayonghal swu epsumul allyetulipnita 'We inform you that we are unable to use the product of OO type that you propose in O' [AL5]). These definitions of disagreements are supported and complemented by the content of disagreements. That is, it is of importance in defining disagreements to address the issue of which items can be 'opposed' to decide whether a discourse unit is a disagreement. Based on my corpus, several items able to be opposed are listed: an opinion, statements of intent (e.g. a policy), and requests for action (e.g. request for re-estimation; request for price reduction). Therefore, disagreements are defined as acts disagreeing with both truth/fact and action in this study.

(2) Giving bad news

In this study, giving bad news is defined as an act conveying purely 'objective' information that embarrasses the reader (e.g. product withdrawal; cancellation of a foreign business trip; bid withdrawal; informing the reader of inferior products, etc.). Therefore, in this study, the Korean term describing bad news nappunsosik does not denote 'genuine' conflict, such as opposition or refusal. For example, the sentence, 'OO' ceyphwumuy kyocengsulisangey isangi palkyentoyesssupnita 'The problems in the revised mock-up of 'OO' product have been found' [AL46], is bad news, because it only delivers purely objective information that embarrasses the reader. Indeed, disagreement can to some extent be bad news. However, if a sentence denotes
opposition or refusal, I consider it as a disagreement, not bad news. For example, in the sentence, *kumpenuy kwisanuy kakyekinhayochengul swuyongpwulkahamul alyetulioni* ‘We inform you that we are unable to accept your request for a price reduction at this time’ [BL12], the writer conveys bad news to the reader, but the sentence basically denotes refusal, thereby it is a disagreement. Request can also be bad news. However, if a sentence denotes request, I consider it as a request, not bad news. For example, in the sentence, *manil sangki ciceng kiilkaci ipkumchi anhulsinun ponuynunaniona pwutuki kwihakkeyse ceykonghasin tamponwuley tayhaye wypepochilo hoyswuhakeyssaoni* ‘If you don’t pay by O assigned, we will be obliged to redeem the collateral offered by you by law’ [AL25], the writer gives bad news to the reader, but the sentence basically denotes request, thereby it is a request. Bad news can also be given for the benefit of the addressee, depending on context. In this case, bad news can satisfy the reader’s positive face wants. For instance, letting the reader know that the price of raw materials will be sky-rocketing in the next financial year sounds superficially like bad news, but in fact it is not bad news that threatens the reader’s face, because it shows the writer’s concern about the reader and implies that the writer suggests the reader watch out and take proper action to cope with the event before it happens. Such letters conveying bad news are in effect goodwill letters (Taylor 1998).

(3) Request

A request is made in business contexts when the requested act is desirable to continue business. The content of requests may support this claim. Some contents of requests in my corpus are a request for shipping, a request for replacing damaged stock, a request for paying the amount receivable, etc. In these cases of making requests, unless the requested acts are performed,
business cannot be continued. Therefore, these requested acts are necessary conditions to be able to continue business and thereby they are for the benefit of the company, not only the person who writes the request letter. For example, in the sentence, *kwisauy napktiil cwunswulul tasi hanpen yochenghapnita* ‘We once again ask you to meet the payment deadline’ [BL45], without performing the requested act (i.e. meeting the payment deadline), business cannot be continued. Likewise, the requested act (*miswukum cenaykul ipkum wanlyo* ‘paying the full amount receivable for the transaction’) in *Onyen Owel Oilkaci miswukum cenaykul ipkum wanlyohaye cwusimyen kamsahakeysssupnita* ‘I would appreciate it if you pay the full amount receivable for the transaction by O’ [AL24], is a necessary condition to continue business. In sum, requests are described in this study as acts by which the writer gets the reader to perform an act, which is for the benefit of the company or the requester, to continue core business or affiliated activities.

(4) Compliment

A compliment is one of the positively polite speech acts that allow interactants to create solidarity. Except for some exceptional cases (e.g. compliments implying some element of envy of the addressee’s/reader’s ability or possessions), compliments in general enhance the addressee’s/reader’s face by explicitly showing interest in what reader has done (e.g. *sangkikenulo inhay pon picinisuny cisokyepwuka maywu pwulthwumyenghayessuna kwisauy cosokhan cochilo motun keni kkaykkusi haykyeltayesssupnita* ‘Although it was unclear if we could continue to do business because of the claim, the situation is resolved due to your quick action’ [BL57]). As in the case of defining other speech acts, it is necessary to address the issue of what kinds of compliments can be paid. In my corpus, compliments are paid to the reader’s
(work) ability (e.g. OOsissimany thakwelhan epmwu nunglyek ttaymwunilako sayngkakhapnita ‘I think it is entirely due to your outstanding work ability’ [AE35]) or product (e.g. sinceyphwum OOlamyenuy kakyek celyemhanyense mas ttohan siwenhan kamul cwumye phocang hyengthayka cayhwalyongtoy ye maywu panungi cohtako sayngkakhapnita ‘The reaction to new product OO ramen is very positive, because the price is reasonable, the taste is good, and the packaging is recycled’ [AL55]). Therefore, in this study, I define a compliment as a positive speech act performed to make solidarity between both parties in terms of paying attention to the reader’s (work) ability or product.

Under investigation the total number of speech acts that I examine is 363 (69 are tokens of disagreements; 76 are tokens of giving bad news; 163 are tokens of requests; 55 are tokens of compliments), as shown in table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving bad news</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writers of letters are entirely educated in Korea and have less than one-year experience abroad in order to avoid collecting letters where the pragmatic strategies are transferred from other cultures. As shown in table 4.4, I collected business correspondence conducted between both same-status and different-status parties to examine the pattern of speech act strategies realized by same-status or different-status parties. Senders’ and receivers’ age ranges from the mid twenties to the late fifties. Interviewees revealed that sometimes a business letter is written
by a subordinate on behalf of a superior and then it is revised and signed by a superior. In this case, I group this letter under the senior person, because a superior makes final revisions to the letter and makes it his letter. Because of the small sample size, gender differences are not explored in this study. I also include some incoming external correspondence to investigate the influence of power on the choice of politeness strategy. Since corporation A and corporation B are more powerful than the companies corresponding with them because they are contractors, if we deal with outgoing letters only, we cannot properly explore the role of power in the choice of politeness strategy. When I give examples pertaining to each strategy, I label the context of each example (e.g. 'outgoing message', 'incoming message', 'W>R, W=R, W<R' for status, '(+-)D' representing distance, etc.). This information was elicited during the interviews. Other information such as power and age was also elicited during the interviews. In this study, status is determined by position in the company. In general, status (i.e. official rank) and power operate simultaneously in internal communication. Therefore, the higher the status, the greater the power, and the lower the status, the less the power. Status is also generally linked to age in internal communication. Therefore, in most cases, the higher the status, the older the age, and the lower the status, the younger the age. In contrast, status and power do not always operate simultaneously in external communication. For example, although the status of a subcontractor may be higher than a contractor, s/he is less powerful. That is to say that a contractor is in a position to exert power over a subcontractor, even where the subcontractor has higher status within the overall business culture. Distance is defined as familiarity in this study (e.g. how long did they work together?; how well do they know each other?). Based on my data, distribution of status for Korean subjects is shown at table 4.4. I group some letters (e.g. letters addressed to departments or companies not to people; letters conducted to and from customers; letters sent to multiple receivers) under etc in table 4.4.
Table 4.4. Distribution of Status for Korean subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W>R: the writer is higher in status than the reader
W=R: the writer is the same as the reader in status
W<R: the writer is lower in status than the reader

Since this is a synchronic study, the total time period during which the texts are written only covers the years from 1996 to 2000. Older texts than that may not reveal the prevailing condition of the modern business world, because genres are dynamic and thereby gradually changing to meet sociocognitive needs of individuals in a discourse community (cf. Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995). Therefore, only the most recent data manifests the linguistic practices in the contemporary business world. Because these two companies already promised to release materials in April 2000 and thereafter filed them, data collection has only been carried out over the two months between August and October 2000. The request for letters was primarily made face-to-face. The requested data was released based on the understanding that the contents were treated with proper discretion, all names in letters were omitted due to reasons of confidentiality. I inputted these texts into the computer in Word format in Korean.

4.2.2. Interviews

Interviews constitute a secondary data source supporting and complementing the text-based research. I visited the companies at least three times to collect interview data. During the first
visit, the main questions I asked were about the management of routine business, corporate culture, the roles of the writer and the reader, the medium of communication, and so on (cf. Appendix G). During the second visit, I asked follow-up questions based on my initial probes, and detailed information about contextual factors (e.g. status, age, power, distance). During the third visit, after finishing the preliminary analysis of my text data, I conducted interviews, using the text data as an interview basis, in order to obtain more detailed information about a particular manifestation of a linguistic choice in a particular setting. For example, in text-based questions, I asked the types and meanings of in-group languages and exceptions to the conventional patterns of politeness strategies, and so forth. Since the interviews tend to reveal social parameters (Davies et al. 1999), I interviewed two employees (one man, one woman) of different ages, status, and gender, one from each company. Their age ranged from the late twenties to the mid thirties. The interviews lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. In case I was unable to record the interviews on audio tape, I took detailed notes. Shortly after finishing the interviews, I saved the notes on the computer without editing.

4.3. Analysis of the data

This study adopts an integrating data analysis method. Since intrinsic problems in taking quantitative measures of politeness strategies in natural data can possibly emerge (B&L 1998: 508), qualitative analysis is conducted first and then quantitative analysis is performed to seek support for the qualitative analysis. As the quantitative analysis focuses on subjects’ choice of politeness super-strategies (i.e. frequency ranking of politeness super-strategies), specific attention in the qualitative analysis is paid to their use of politeness sub-strategies for the main speech acts in this study. Specifically, a three-tiered analysis is used as the primary data analysis
method: (1) a hand-tagged moves-analysis; (2) a qualitative method; and (3) a quantitative method. Data analysis in terms of several methods in various levels is expected to provide a "thicker" description (Geerts 1983; Swales 1990) of Korean business correspondence.

(1) A hand-tagged moves-analysis

In the first stage of the hand-tagged moves-analysis, after careful reading and re-readings of the text data, I selected a unit of analysis. The unit of analysis selected for this study is the clause consisting of subject, a finite verb, and the complements of the verb. However, not all clauses are units of analysis (e.g. conditional clauses; restrictive relative clauses; cause adverbial clauses). For example, in the sentence, *cwunglyangey maywu khun chaika isssupnita. ieytayhan wenin kyumyengul pwuthaktulipnita* ‘Since there is a very big difference in quantity, I ask you to find the reason for this’ [BL49], a cause adverbial clause (*cwunglyangey maywu khun chaika isssupnita* ‘There is a very big difference in quantity’) is subordinate to its main clause (*ieytayhan wenin kyumyengul pwuthaktulimye* ‘I ask you to find the reason for this’). Without the subordinate clause, the main clause cannot exist. Furthermore, in the sentence, *kumpen silcey sencekkhoca hasinun lotkwa tongilhan lotay saymphulul cuksi songpwuhay cwusiki palapnita* ‘I hope you will immediately send a sample with the exact same type that you actually intend to ship’ [BL38], without a restrictive relative clause (i.e. *kumpen silcey sencekkhoca hasinun lot* ‘the type that you actually intend to ship’), the main clause cannot exist. Likewise, in the sentence, *manil chwisosi kwisaeyse sonsil palsayngey tayhan posangi isseya hal kesulo salyetoypnita* ‘If you cancel, I think you should compensate us for our losses’ [AL33], a conditional clause (i.e. *manil chwisosi* ‘If you cancel’) is subordinate to its main clause. Without the conditional clause, the meaning of the whole sentence is changed. The function or
intention of each clause is contextually decided (Connor et al. 1995; Upton and Connor 2001). As I have mentioned in chapter 2, because utterances can simultaneously carry multiple meanings when they are taken out of context, the main speech acts in which I have interest are contextually determined. If necessary, previous or following text or both is added to each example in order to avoid the ambiguity of an isolated utterance. The total number of units that I examine is 981 (215 in AE; 99 in BE; 358 in AL; 309 in BL). Although the average number of units in each text of external communications does not seem to vary greatly (i.e. average six units in each text of external communication), the average number of units in each text of internal communications seems to be different (i.e. average 5 units in AE and 3 units in BE, each). I follow the Yale romanization system in transcribing Korean examples. Morpheme boundaries are marked by hyphen.

The data is analyzed in a wider context first. According to major genre analysts (Swales 1990; Bhatia 1993), the arrangement of text constitutes the rhetorical moves. Moves are functional units of texts and describe their communicative purposes. Therefore, moves can be basic elements of a certain genre. Furthermore, the arrangement of text is different cross-culturally and it becomes conventionalized. Given this claim, I first examine if there is a major rhetorical pattern in Korean business writing. And then I identify moves which are characterized by devices of linguistic politeness. If there is a conventional rhetorical pattern in Korean business correspondence, I also investigate if some moves which are characterized by devices of linguistic politeness affect the Korean rhetorical pattern. Additionally, I investigate if the placement of the main speech acts that I am interested in yields any variation and whether there are distinct moves other than the main speech acts.
(2) A qualitative method

I adopt a qualitative method. In the FTA situations, politeness strategies arise as important issues structuring the texts. Although I partly disagree with their model, the theoretical basis for the study is B&L’s (1987) theory of politeness. Since face-threats are inherent properties of illocutionary acts, B&L believe that it is necessary to study the threats to face wants in the context of speech acts. Therefore, more than others, B&L’s model explicitly provides how facework is reflected in politeness strategies used in the performance of speech acts. That is the reason why I adopt B&L’s model for this study. Though B&L’s work provides the main theory basis for my analysis, I shall where necessary draw in other approaches (e.g. Leech’s Modesty maxim). Other approaches may to some extent explain the cases that B&L’s patterns of strategy distribution are not consistent with the corpus of Korean business letters. Among B&L’s superstrategies, excluding ‘no FTA’, the four strategies are sequentially considered from being least indirect (bald on record) to most indirect (off record). However, as discussed in chapter three, I elaborate and revise B&L’s model (i.e. solidarity enforcement politeness; conflict avoidance politeness), because of a problem with trying to apply the notion of negative and positive politeness to different type of speech acts.

Because the corpus of Korean business letters does not include instances of all strategies defined by B&L and is not completely applicable to B&L’s categories of politeness strategies, a ‘bottom-up approach’, forming strategies from the data, rather than a ‘top-down approach’, forming strategies from the theory, is adopted for data analysis (Ambady et al. 1996: 1001). I also include exceptions under each related heading in order to not only provide the proper procedure for classifying only directly related data under each strategy but also to show that politeness strategies are determined in context.
In this level of data analysis, this study is considered related to register analysis (Biber 1995), in that it correlates certain grammatical structures and contexts. Grammatical structures such as passivizations and nominalizations frequently used in Korean business correspondence will be discussed.

(3) A quantitative method

I employ a quantitative approach in order to investigate the preference or the frequency ranking of politeness strategies and contextual factors affecting the choice of politeness strategies. In addition to analyzing the overall distribution of politeness strategies, in this level of the data analysis, I also look at whether politeness markers are reduced or absent in e-mails due to minimalism or brevity in e-mail messages. In other words, I examine if bald on record strategy is preferred in e-mail messages to make the reader respond immediately, because an utterance made baldly looks urgent.

Among many other contextual factors that I consider in this study, attention is paid to ‘status’ because it is context-dependent. That is, although status (i.e. official rank) is normally inherent within a company, it is relative between enterprises that are different in size. On the one hand, I will see if solidarity enforcement strategies are mainly used between status equals. On the other hand, I also look at whether solidarity enforcement strategies are heavily used between status unequals in that more solidarity and in-group identity are required between status unequals in office settings where common goals need to be achieved. In this respect, I pay special attention to the effect of organizational context (i.e. corporate culture) on the choice of politeness strategy. Regarding the distance (i.e. familiarity) variable, I consider it only in internal communications because formal letters representing external communications are
conducted only between unfamiliar people in my data. Also in talking about the medium variable, I only deal with the characteristics of e-mail genre without comparing e-mails with formal letters because there are neither e-mail messages for external communications nor formal letters for internal communications in my data. In this stage, I also apply B&L’s pattern of strategy distribution, based on four kinds of dyads specified by two polar values (high/low) on the two dimensions of P and D, to my data. For example, the writer prefers the use of positive politeness strategies when participants have low distance and low power. Whereas negative politeness strategies are preferred when the writer has low power over the reader and the writer and the reader have high distance. If there are exceptions, which are not properly applicable to B&L’s pattern, I tend to explain them by means of other variables to show that politeness is a function of more than one variable. In dealing with variables, I usually consider them separately, but I also illustrate that they operate simultaneously.

The following table illustrates all the procedural steps in my analysis.
Table 4.5. Progression of data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: The hand-tagged moves-analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A selection of a unit of analysis and a decision of the function of the unit of analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: The data analysis in a wider context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An investigation into a relationship between a major rhetorical pattern in Korean business writing and moves which are characterized by devices of linguistic politeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: The data analysis in a narrower context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A full investigation of the specific politeness strategies that appear in the moves which are characterized by the FTAs (i.e. disagreement; conveying bad news; request) or the FEA (i.e. compliment) based on degree of indirectness from being least indirect to most indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: A compilation of the overall results according to the approach outlined in step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An investigation of the preference or the frequency ranking of politeness strategies and contextual factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS FROM A GLOBAL VIEW

The data analysis chapters are divided into two groups to avoid combining two different perspectives (i.e. global view (data analysis in a wider context than a single move) and local view (a more detailed and localized view of data analysis)) into a single chapter. In this chapter, data is analyzed from a global view first. First, I shall discuss traditional rhetorical structure in written Korean and consider its application to the corpus of Korean business letters. I shall then describe three distinct moves found in the letters within the framework of politeness theory.

5.1. The rhetorical structure in Korean business correspondence

Text structure can be described in terms of rhetorical moves. Moves are functional units of texts and are determined by their communicative purposes. In this respect, moves can be basic elements of a certain genre (Swales 1990). Genres may be framed by cultural expectations (Upton and Connor 2001). That is, the arrangement of text is different cross-culturally and it becomes conventionalized (cf. Clyne 1981, 1983; Kachru 1983; Kaplan 1966, 1996). For example, Kaplan (1966) maintains that Arabic has a series of parallel constructions in paragraph development, paragraph development of Chinese follows a style of “turning and turning in a widening gyre” (Kaplan ibid.: 10), and French and Spanish are less linear than English. Kachru (1983) claims that Hindi texts show digressions and Clyne (1981, 1983) also investigates whether German is less linear or digresses more than English.

As Bhatia (1993: 32) claims, a genre has a ‘typical’ cognitive structure composed of rhetorical moves to achieve the overall communicative goal of the particular genre. Therefore, moves can be seen as a series of persuasive tactics to properly get to the overall purpose of the
genre. Shaping the particular move-structure is dependent on “the communicative purpose(s) that it serves in the genre” (Bhatia ibid.: 32). For instance, promotional letters, according to Bhatia’s analysis, consist of seven moves: establishing credentials, introducing the offer, offering incentives, enclosing documents, soliciting response, using pressure tactics, and ending politely. By the same token, Kamberelis (1995, cited in Kaplan 2000) claims that “…[texts] are constructed for specific purposes by speakers and writers, and they always embody sets of generic conventions.” Based on the claim that the strategic nature of move-structure depends on the communicative purposes, Eggington (1987: 156) argues that most non-bilingual Koreans follow the following pattern: (1) beginning a certain argument (Ki) – (2) developing the argument (Sung) – (3) abruptly changing the direction of the argument (Chon) – (4) coming to the conclusion (Kyul) framework in Korean writing. This pattern is seen in example 1 (adapted from Eggington ibid.: 155-156).

**Example 1. A Ki-Sung-Chon-Kyul framework in Korean writing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ki</th>
<th>Sung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Home Affairs is planning to lengthen the period of training for public officials from 3 days to 6 days per year in order to solidify the spirituality of the public officials. The training is to be conducted at the Spiritual Cultural Institute which is rendered in English as the Institute for Korean Studies.</td>
<td>A new meaning of “national” is attached to the word “spiritual.” Perhaps this comes from the term “spiritual culture.” A member of the Korean Alphabet Society complained that the architectural design of the Institute for Korean Studies resembles a Buddhist Temple and thus is not Korean. This is not so because Buddhism, though imported from India, is a Korean religion. Likewise Christianity is a Korean religion. Any attempt to label what is national and what is foreign fails. Perhaps too much emphasis on nationalism may do more harm than good. Instead of inspiring nationalism we should be appealing to universal reason and proper moral conduct. The civil spirit must take precedence over the national spirit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am reminded of this when, changing trains at the subway, I witness the rush to occupy seats on route to the sports center where the Olympic Games are to be held. How do we enhance the nation’s prestige through a sports event? As a teacher I am partly responsible for this situation. Spiritual poverty is best observed in a metropolitan area like Seoul. Why is our public transport system so multi-layered with standing buses at the bottom, then regular buses charging three times more than standing buses, and finally taxis which move constantly to catch more passengers? Once you catch a taxi you have to listen to the loud radio controlled by the driver.

Dear administrators please do not talk about spiritual things unless you are interested in implementing concrete ethical conduct.

However, this framework is not applicable to the Korean business discourse community. Although there are certainly some rhetorical structural differences in Korean business texts depending on the main purpose of each text, a particular rhetorical style in business writing in Korea consists of the three-part patterns, *Ki-Sung-Kyul*, the major exception being the letter of compliment, in my corpus. Usually the *Chon* (change) stage is left out in *Ki-Sung-Chon-Kyul* style. Therefore, it creates a structure of beginning, development, and end in Korean business writing with the exception of the letter of compliment. As we can see in example 2, the rhetorical framework of three-part patterns in Korean business writing is composed of a *reason* (beginning) - *certain positive FTA* (development) - *request* (end) sequence (i.e. 67% (22/33) in AE; BE being the only exception; 70% (33/47) in AL; 78% (31/40) in BL).
Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>annyeng-ha-si-p-ni-kka</strong>&lt;br&gt;hi-do-HON-AH-IN-Q&lt;br&gt;‘How are you doing?’</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>kumpen OOO30kg swachwul-ken-kwa kwanyenhan nayyong-i-p-ni-ta</strong>&lt;br&gt;this time OOO30kg export-job-with concern content-is-AH-IN-DC&lt;br&gt;‘This concerns an export of OOO.’</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>pon ken kyesyak-si tangsa yochen delivery time-un cinan O-wel</strong>&lt;br&gt;this job contract-when our firm request delivery time-TOP last O-month&lt;br&gt;ches-cwu-kkaci yess-una, kwisa-uy yochen-ey O-wel O-il-kkaci-first-week-unti PST-but your firm-’s request-since O-month O-day-unti&lt;br&gt;lo yenki-ha-nun kes-ey hapuy-ha-n pa-iss-sup-ni-ta&lt;br&gt;as postpone-do-RL thing-to agree-do-RL way-is-AH-IN-DC&lt;br&gt;‘When we signed the contract, although delivery time we request was the first week of last O, we have come to an agreement on the postponement of the delivery time until O at your request.’</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>kulentey, icowyase taskikum O-wel ches-cwu-kkaci-lo delivery time-ul</strong>&lt;br&gt;however, now again O-month first-week-unti-AS delivery time-AC&lt;br&gt;yenki-hay talla-nun kwisa-uy yokwu-nun maywu ihay-ha-postpone-do request-RL your firm-’s request-TOP very understanding-do&lt;br&gt;ki elyep-sup-ni-ta&lt;br&gt;NOM difficult-AH-IN-DC&lt;br&gt;‘However, it is very difficult to understand your request to postpone again the delivery time until the first week of O.’</td>
<td>Complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>kwisa-uy napkiil cwunswu-lul tasl hanpen yochen-ha-p-ni-ta</strong>&lt;br&gt;your firm-’s delivery time meet-AC again once request-do-AH-IN-DC&lt;br&gt;‘Once again we ask that you meet the delivery deadline.’</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Korean rhetorical pattern of beginning, development, and end may superficially look similar to the English counterpart of introduction, body, and conclusion (Swales 1990), it is different because Korean rhetorical structure is inductively oriented. This claim is exactly consistent with what Hinds calls ‘delayed introduction of purpose’ (Hinds 1990). Let us consider Nickerson’s (2000) analysis of a situation-problem-solution pattern in her corpus of British business correspondence written by Dutch employees. The three-part pattern in Korean, *Ki-Sung-Kyul*, is equivalent to her situation-problem-solution pattern (cf. example 3).

Even though there is sometimes repetition of a single move in the text (e.g. *Ki* (reason) - *Sung* (complaint) - *Ki* (reason) - *Sung* (complaint) in Appendix C; *Ki* (reason) - *Sung* (disagreement) - *Ki* (reason) - *Sung* (disagreement) in Appendix D), no examples of repetition of
the linear move sequence (i.e. *Ki-Sung-Kyul-Ki-Sung-Kyul*) within a single text are found in the Korean corpus (see example 3 for an example of the repetition of the linear move structure in one text, adapted from Nickerson ibid.: 113)

Example 3. Repetition of move structure in one text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move 1: Situation</th>
<th>Move 2: Problem</th>
<th>Move 3: Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herewith we confirm the fax (ABC/123) in which the new item rates are announced of several stores in the Netherlands.</td>
<td>However statements for item rates of Shop A, Shop B, and Shop C were not listed, although this was requested in our fax (DEF/789), dated 20 September 1994.</td>
<td>We therefore kindly ask you to verify this issue and confirm the rates for these three shops within short notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated in your fax the items of the shops listed below have been increased since 1st January 1994.</td>
<td>As the new rates were processed in August 1994 in your system, the prices of the listed shops have been paid using the “old” rates. This should be corrected in retrospect:</td>
<td>Could you please send us a credit note of the difference in payments between the time the new rates were processed in your system and 01-01-1994. (List of shops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the meanwhile corrective payments also apply for Shop A, Shop B and Shop C, as stated above, of which we did not receive yet a statements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Move 3: Solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1. A relationship between the rhetorical structure and politeness strategies

Although rhetorical style in Korean business correspondence consists of the three-part patterns, strictly speaking, the three-part patterns made in Korean business letters are not authentic linear sequences (i.e. 59% (13/22) in AE; 88% (29/33) in AL; 77% (24/31) in BL). This is due to politeness concerns to some extent. The linear sequence of three-part patterns is frequently disconnected by ‘external modifications’ (Faerch and Kasper 1989; see also 6.3.2.3. for ‘external modifications’), such as supportive reasons for the head act implying the FTA. Many
genre analysts (cf. Connor 1995; Nickerson 2000; Swales 1990, among many others) tend to stick to conventional rhetorical structures in certain professional genres without considering moves which are characterized by devices of linguistic politeness, such as ‘external modifications’. However, to conventionalize rhetorical structures can commonly be inadequate for politeness concerns, as in the case of flouting the Gricean ‘cooperative principle’ for politely performing the FTA. For instance, in example 4, ‘partial agreement’ and ‘reason’ moves are inserted between Sung (i.e. complaint) and Kyul (i.e. request) to minimize the force of the following request. Consequently, writers use different rhetorical structures depending on both different genres and politeness strategies to achieve their overall communicative goal in each text.

Example 4

[BL43-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old business partner cancel his request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>annyeng ha-si-p-ni-kka hi-do-HON-AH-IN-Q ‘How are you doing?’</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pon ken-ey tayhayse-nun kyelecykihan il-cwuil cen tangsa-ka this job-to about-TOP final settlement one-week before our firm-NM kwisa-ey i cem-ul mili allyetuiri-n pa iss-umye, i-ey tayhay your firm-to this point-AC in advance inform-RL way is-and, this-to about kwisa-uy yanghay-rl kwuha-n pa iss-sup-ni-ta your firm-‘s agreement-AC seek-RL way is-AH-IN-DC ‘We previously informed you of this job a week before the final settlement and sought agreement with you about this.’</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ilen sanghwaying-eyse imi motun kyelecy-ka kkuthnanci han-tal-i this situation-in already all settlement-NM finish once-month-NM nemun hyen sicem-eyse sangki-ken-eytayhan ciyenica-lul chengkwu-over current situation-in above-job-about delayed interest-AC charge-ha-si-n kwisa-uy yokwu-nun tangsa-lose-nun mwuchek do-HON-RL your firm-‘s request-TOP our firm-as-TOP very nankam-ha-n silceng-i-p-ni-ta confuse-do-RL situation-is-AH-IN-DC ‘Your request to charge accrued interest on the above job in this situation where a month has already passed since the completion of all settlements is very confusing to us.’</td>
<td>Complaint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2. The placement of four main speech acts

Regardless of the media or any other variables, requests in my data are normally placed towards the end of the text as in Turkish (Akar 1998), Finnish (Yli-Jokipii 1994), and Chinese (Kirkpatrick 1991). The occurrence or non-occurrence of this particular rhetorical structure is probably due to differences in communicative style varying from culture to culture. As Toyama (1992, quoted in Yamada 1997: 117) argues, Japanese use a “conclusion-oriented” (i.e. inductive) style. Positive FTAs (e.g. disagreement, complaint) are sometimes an end in themselves (i.e. 33% (11/33) in AE; 30% (14/47) in AL; 22% (9/40) in BL), but are performed mostly to find solutions in business settings. The overt way of suggesting a solution to the reader is obviously making a request. In other words, making a request might be the overall purpose to sending business documents with positive FTAs. So the writer sets aside the request, which is a sort of overall conclusion of the text, until later. The placement of requests made in Korean business correspondence is as follows. As can be seen in table 5.1., the majority of requests are placed towards the end of the texts. The reason why slightly more requests are made in the medial position of BE is that a requestive hint, ‘act in question’, is extensively used
as a pre-request in the medial position. The function of 'act in question' as a nonconventionally indirect request will be discussed in 6.4.2. in great detail.

Table 5.1. Placement of requests in the Korean business texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>28 (93%)</td>
<td>22 (76%)</td>
<td>47 (92%)</td>
<td>49 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
<td>53 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the placement of positive FTAs in business texts yields some variation, depending on variables. In table 5.2., it can be seen that most of the disagreements in internal communications come at the beginning of the text. Although disagreements in the external communication of corporation A are usually placed in the medial position of the text, equivalents in corporation B still prefer placement at the beginning of the text. Besides, in table 5.3., the tendency to place the speech act of giving bad news at the beginning of the internal and external communications of corporation B is obvious. Corporate culture has a significant effect on the placement of the particular speech act in the body of text. Since people in corporation B to some extent deal with health and disease, they must be sensitive to any bad news. They rush to give bad news by placing it at the beginning of the text, because bad may become worse (cf. Akar 1998). This finding is consistent with the frequency of (im)politeness strategies realized in corporation B in chapter 7. There is no preferred place to put compliment sentences in Korean business texts. Compliments are paid quite equally in initial, medial, and final position of the texts as shown in table 5.4.
Table 5.2. Placement of disagreements in the Korean business texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Placement of giving bad news in the Korean business texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>13 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>19 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. Placement of compliments in the Korean business texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>8 (45%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed explication of the rhetorical structure of Korean business correspondence is far beyond the scope of the current study. Instead, let us focus our attention on distinct rhetorical moves. They may boil down to 'non-essential business talk', 'tyings', and 'repetition for exhibiting disagreement'.

5.2. Three distinct moves

5.2.1. Non-essential business talk

This expression does not mean that non-essential business talk is useless talk in the workplace. What I mean by 'non-essential business talk' is phatic communion, social talk, or work related talk, but not core business talk. The primary function of non-essential business talk is
'interactional' to maintain social interactions rather than 'transactional' to convey information (Brown and Yule 1983). Non-essential business talk is different from small talk in that it includes work related talk as well. Therefore, small talk, including phatic communion and social talk, can be a part of 'non-essential business talk'. Figure 5.1. illustrates this point (Holmes 2000: 38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core business talk</th>
<th>Work related talk</th>
<th>Social talk</th>
<th>Phatic communion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-Small talk--&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-Non-essential business talk--&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some research on small talk has been done (cf. Coupland et al. 1992; Coupland 2000; Laver 1975, 1981; Malinowski 1972). In general, we might be able to define small talk as talk digressing from the main function of a certain discourse context. Small talk consists of social talk and phatic communion (Holmes 2000). According to Coupland et al. (1992: 209), phatic talk is "aimless, prefatory, obvious, uninteresting, sometimes suspect, and even irrelevant, but part of the process of fulfilling our intrinsically human needs for social cohesiveness and mutual recognition". Holmes (2000) also claims that phatic communion is not topical, less informative, context-free, non-task talk, and irrelevant to the company's 'core business talk'.

In the workplace, since overt switches normally occur either from non-essential business talk (e.g. certain acknowledgements) to the beginning of core business talk or from core business talk to non-essential business talk (i.e. talk serving as "doing collegiality" (Holmes ibid: 48)) or both, it seems to be fairly straightforward to identify non-essential business talk. These two different types of non-essential business talk display no conflict with one another (Bhatia 2000). In the corpus of Korean business letters, non-essential business talk can be classified into two groups, 'initial non-essential business talk' and 'final non-essential
business talk’, based on its placement. Certain acknowledgements, such as greetings, appreciation, and wishes, represent initial non-essential business talk. Whereas non-essential business talk serving the function of collegiality represents final non-essential business talk. Now let us examine non-essential business talk occurring naturally in the Korean corpus.

5.2.1.1. Initial non-essential business talk

The writer sometimes begins his message with certain acknowledgements, such as greetings, appreciation, wishes, etc. An acknowledgement in an opening phase is closely associated with “phatic communion” (Malinowski 1972). The following remark by Malinowski (1972: 151, quoted in Coupland 2000) is pertinent to the ritual greeting in example 5 (annyenghasipnikka? ‘How are you? (lit. Are you peaceful)’) in that it is a sort of inquiry about well-being (see Coupland et al. 1992 for “how are you?” (HAY?):

Are words in phatic communion used primarily to convey meaning, the meaning which is symbolically theirs? Certainly not!... A mere phrase of politeness... fulfils a function to which the meaning of its words is almost completely irrelevant. Inquiries about health, comments on the weather, affirmations of some supremely obvious state of things – all such are exchanged, not in order to inform, not in this case to connect people to action, certainly not in order to express any thought.

In example 5, the acknowledgment placed toward the beginning of the text seems to play a role in making solidarity and claiming common ground in order to serve the company’s goals in a much easier or more natural and comfortable way by placing it before core business talk (i.e. units from 2 to 7). Besides devices carrying referential or indexical meanings for solidarity enforcement (e.g. show interest strategy), the ‘atopical’ talk in example 5 seems likely to be a
sort of tactic to mitigate the following FTA (i.e. disagreement) by making a convivial atmosphere in an opening sequence. Although the acknowledgement is basically a mere conversational routine in the normal (non-FTA) context or when we think of it independently of the immediately following FTAs, it serves a mitigating function in FTA situations. Without the atopical talk, the aggravation to the reader’s positive face is increased.

Example 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>annyeng-ha-si-p-ni-kka hi-do-HON-AH-IN-Q ‘How are you doing?’</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kumpen yocheng-ha-si-n kyelceyoken (D/A)-un tangsa-lose-nun this time request-do-HON-RL settlement condition-TOP our firm-as-TOP swuyong-i elyepta-nun cem-ul aliyeye-tul-p-ni-ta accept-NM difficult-RL point-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC ‘We inform you that we are unable to accept the settlement condition (D/A) you requested.’</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ikhi a-si-nun pa-wa kathi kwisa-uy yocheng-ey titala already know-HON-RL way-with like your firm-’s request-in according to 60-il coken-ul swuyong-haye yele chalyey kelay-ha-n po 60-day condition-AC accept-do several time deal-do-RL way iss-ta kyelceyikan cwonswu-ey manh-un mwuncey-ka is-but settlement date meet-in many-RL problem-NM iss-ess-sup-ni-ta is-PST-AH-IN-DC ‘As you know, although on numerous occasions we have conducted business based on the condition of 60 days requested by your firm, there are numerous problems in meeting the settlement date.’</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>i len sanghwang-eyse kicon-uy 60-il coken-ul 90-il-lo this situation-in existing-’s 60-day condition-AC 90-day-to yencang-ha-nun mwuncey-nun tangsa-lose-nun swuyong-i pwulka-ha- extension-do-RL matter-TOP our firm-as-TOP accept-NM impossible-do m-ul aliyeye-tul-p-ni-ta NOM-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC ‘We inform you that it is impossible to extend the existing condition of 60 days to 90 days in this situation.’</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>taman, kukan-uy kwisa-wany kelaykwankyey-lul kaman only meanwhile-’s your firm-with relation of business-AC consider ha-i tay kicon-uy 60-il coken-un swuyong-tholok ha-keyss-unit do-will when existing-’s 60-day condition-TOP accept-to do-will-since ‘When we consider our historical relationship with regard to business transactions, since we will accept the existing condition of 60 days,’</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likewise, in example 6 ritual appreciation *sukohasipnita* ‘You are making an effort’ seems to tone down the force of the following disagreement by making the shift to the positive FTA (i.e. disagreement) more gradually and naturally. This ritual appreciation does not exactly pertain to small talk but to non-essential business talk, because it might not be irrelevant to work related talk as well. That is, the writer encourages the reader by signaling his acknowledgment of the reader’s busy or difficult situation in the workplace. In this respect, initial non-essential business talk does not make much sense in compliments letters, because letters of compliments intrinsically function to maintain social relationships.

Example 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>kyeycang-nim swuko-ha-si-p-ni-ta</em> chief-Mr.  <em>effort-do-HON-AH-IN-DC</em> ‘Chief, you are making an effort.’</td>
<td>Positive appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>cehuy pwuse-eyse-nun cemsim piyong-ul sikkwen-ulo</em> our department-in-TOP lunch cost-AC voucher-as <em>taychi-ha-si-keyss-ta-nun tyyken-ey-nun com pantay-i-p-ni-ta</em> substitute-do-HON-will-DC-RL opinion-to a little against-is-AH-IN-DC ‘Our department slightly disagrees with the opinion that you substitute lunch expenses for vouchers.’</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>sikkwen sayong-ulo siktang-to cenghaycin kos-man ka-ya-ha-kwuyo</em> voucher use-as cafeteria-also assigned place-only go-must-do-POL ‘We also have to go to the cafeterias stated in the vouchers.’</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>sikphwamhysa-lose tayanghan siktan-ul cep-ha-l swu iss-key</em> food company-as various menu-AC try-do-will way is-to ‘to encourage various menus as a food company.’</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial non-essential business talk reflects the influence of variables such as corporate culture. Corporate culture has an influence on the use of non-essential business talk in corporation A. Although the total occurrences of initial non-essential business talk used in BE are much fewer than AE (i.e. 64% (20/33) in AE vs. 7% (2/29) in BE), no big differences are found in external communication (i.e. 91% (43/47) in AL vs. 90% (36/40) in BL). However, most initial non-essential business talk used in external communication of corporation A is much longer and much more complicated in format (e.g. *kwisauny sengweney kamsatulipnita* ‘Thanks for giving me your constant support’ [AL9]; *kwisauny penyengul kiwenhapnita* ‘I wish for the prosperity of your firm’ [AL19]) than that of corporation B (i.e. *annyenghasipnika*? ‘How are you?’). That is, initial non-essential business talk in corporation A is distinguished by longer sentences and sentential elaboration. The writer’s endeavor to convey that the reader’s wants are also shared by the writer is to some extent shown by means of making non-essential business talk much longer in AL. In contrast, the external communication of corporation B sticks to a shorter and simpler form of phatic talk (i.e. *annyenghasipnika*? ‘How are you?’).

5.2.1.2. Final non-essential business talk

Unlike the case of phatic communion occurring in the first paragraph, the following text ends with non-essential business talk functioning as social talk. It is worth referring to Edmondson’s (1981, quoted in Dow 1999: 89) claim explaining non-essential business talk in closing sequences:
after transacting a Business – perhaps one involving much difficult face-work – speakers can and do revert to phatic talk as if to ratify their social standing.

The propositive sentence in example 7 (i.e. unit 5) functions as a drastic remedy for the damage to the reader’s face by reconsolidating relationships between participants after FTAs are performed. As shown in example 7, among the main FTAs in the study, disagreements mostly precede final non-essential business talk in the Korean data (i.e. 66.6% (2/3) in AE; 100% (1/1) in BE). After FTAs are performed, normal social relations return in social talk in the closing phase. So social talk in this case also serves the solidarity enforcement function. On this occasion, the person who proposes something like drinking or eating out should normally treat the addressee in Korean culture. Therefore, the act of proposing to eat or drink at least implies the intention or promise to treat the addressee in Korea. From this perspective, a remark by Holmes (2000: 49) is applicable to this kind of social talk. Holmes claims that “in the workplace the exchange of greetings, complaints about how busy life is, promises to get in touch for lunch, coffee and so on, are examples of small talk tokens that serve this positive politeness function” (emphasis mine; see also 6.2.1.3 for ‘promise’ as a solidarity enforcement strategy).

Example 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE5] (W−R; D)</th>
<th>A 30-year-old man does not accept a 30-year-old man’s request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>uyjoy-ha-si-n kwangko phosuthe eycakken-ey tayhay request-do-HON-RL advertisement poster making-to about malssumm-tuli-ikkkey-yo talk-give-will-POL ‘I am writing concerning an assignment to make some advertising posters.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ticain-thim-uy koyu empwu-wa-nun taso talun empwu-la design-team’s unique work-with-RL more or less different work-because ‘Since it is a bit different from the design team’s unique office responsibility,’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>cepshan-ki himku-ney-yo approach-do-NOM difficult-IN-POL ‘it is hard to do it.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, after performing the positive FTA, a proposal performed by the face-threatening actor might imply apology. In this respect, this social talk can be an extension of work related talk. The propositive sentence placed after the positive FTA seems to be relevant to a convivial act and has a remedial function like an apology. In this respect, although this non-essential business talk is not an authentic apology, its function of apologizing can also be relevant to solidarity enforcement. Nevertheless, it is different from ‘apology’ acting as conflict avoidance strategy in that it does not have a function to tone down the force of the FTA. Apology serving the function of conflict avoidance will be discussed further in 6.3.2.2. Since this non-essential business talk has a remedial function, it seems significant for future interactions. Performing the positive FTAs between intimates or acquaintances is as difficult as performing the positive FTAs between unfamiliar people. However, there are many situations where one unavoidably has to perform the FTAs in the business context. After the unavoidable positive FTAs are performed between intimates or acquaintances, providing a chance to get together for remaking solidarity serves the function of solidarity enforcement. Consequently, the final non-essential business talk is a more strategic choice as opposed to the initial non-essential business talk.

As is the case of initial non-essential business talk, this social talk also seems to reflect variables. That is, it is normally used between close interactants within internal communication (i.e. 100% (3/3) in AE; 100% (1/1) in BE). It also reveals corporate culture. Bigger numbers of final non-essential business talk moves are used in corporation A (i.e. 9% (3/33) in AE vs. 3%...
(1/29) in BE). It partly shows that people in corporation A tend to make more solidarity between participants.

5.2.2. Use of 'tyings'

To understand systemic structurings is of vital importance in analysis of (written) business discourse, because the systemic structurings shape conventionalized social practices such as genres (Bargiela-Chiappini and Nickerson 1999). An important systemic structuring constructed in written business texts is that of temporal and spatial dimensions which are constructed by 'acting subjects' through 'tying' devices. In his structuration theory, Giddens (1987) claims that 'acting subjects' construct texts and they 'bracket time and space' in organizations. By referring to prior written texts through 'tyings', actors make sequential text to bracket time and space. That is, 'tyings' are acts which enable the writer to link the current text to prior written texts to create a contextual sequence (Firth 1991, 1995; Loos 1999). In example 8, 'tying' sentence refers to previous events or texts. Then why do actors want to make intertextual networks? Boden and Zimmerman (1991: 10) argue that "the resources for mutual understanding are found in the fundamental nature of sequencing." Based on their argument, I maintain that the motivation to make sequential text at the beginning of the text as in example 8 is partially motivated by solidarity enforcement politeness. By letting the reader know that common knowledge is established between participants at the beginning of the text through tying devices, the writer tries to claim common ground with the reader. Because of the lack of immediate sequential written texts, the writer can show that shared knowledge is fully established between the two by means of 'tyings'. Reference to prior things which happened to the reader (i.e. 'old information') in initial tying sentences allows participants to share meaning and helps them to communicate much faster and easier. In this respect, 'tyings' serve a function of 'involvement'
rather than ‘detachment’ (Chafe 1982). The sequence functioning as ‘tyings’ at the beginning of the text establishes the context for shifting to the main content. The function of ‘tyings’ as ‘Coherence Tool’ (Rogers and Rymer 2001) will be discussed in 6.2.1.2.2. in more detail. Consequently, ‘tyings’ allow actors in organizations to share knowledge, meaning, and understanding. From this perspective, it is certain that ‘tyings’ become a kind of device for claiming common ground by establishing the frame of reference.

Example 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AL3-incoming] (W&gt;R; +D) A 40-year-old male subcontractor does not accept a 40-year-old man’s request for reestimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3. Repetition for exhibiting disagreement

As with repetition for seeking agreement (see 6.2.1.2.2. for the positive function of using repetition), repetition can be used as a strategy for exhibiting disagreement (cf. Pomerantz 1984). I put this section here not in chapter 6 (local view) in order to talk about this device along with the placement of disagreements discussed in 5.1.2. Repetition is sometimes used to refocus the writing on something the writer wants topicalized. The emphatic use of repetition may have a strong rhetorical effect as the writer attempts to get the reader to focus on his topic of choice, or a topic which does not correspond to the reader’s wants. In this case, the writer’s positive face wants override the reader’s positive face wants. Repetition seems normally to serve the function of protecting the writer’s own face in my corpus, because it is used in disagreements more frequently than in agreements overall. For instance, in example 9, disagreement is stressed by repeating part of what the writer has disagreed with (i.e. kwisaeyse ceysi hasin OOthaipul sayonghal swu epsum ‘We are unable to use OO type you propose’). A clause the writer repeats for a disagreement is placed a couple of moves later (i.e. unit 6 in example 9). In this case, the use of repetition supports the observation that disagreements are also heavily made at the end of the texts of external communications in corporation A and B (i.e. 36% (9/25) in corporation A; 28% (7/25) in corporation B, see table 5.2). It is certain that repetition in this case increases the aggravation to the reader’s positive face (Muntigl and Turnbull 1998).
5.3. Summary and discussion

Unlike the traditional rhetorical structure in Korean, *Ki-Sung-Chon-Kyul*, rhetorical style in Korean business correspondence is basically comprised of three-part patterns, *Ki-Sung-Kyul*, with insertion devices, such as ‘external modifications’ for politeness concerns, interspersed in the three-part patterns. An overall purpose of performing the positive FTAs is to find a solution and an explicit way of proposing a solution is making a request. In my corpus, most requests are
placed towards the end of the text. It supports the hypothesis that rhetorical structure of Korean
is inductively oriented. Furthermore, the placement of positive FTAs in the body of the text may
reflect a certain corporate culture.

Three distinct moves are investigated. Certain acknowledgements at the beginning of
the text function as strategies to make solidarity and a comfortable atmosphere to naturally
achieve the corporation’s goals. The use of initial non-essential business talk in AL mirrors the
relatively collective nature of its corporate culture. In contrast, like apology, ‘non-essential
business talk’ can serve a remedial function at the end of the text. After performing the FTAs,
the writer’s proposal to go out together to eat or drink something implies an apology for
performing the unavoidable FTAs. Unlike sentence initial phatic talk, social talk serving as
‘doing collegiality’ at the end of the text is used only in internal communications and between
intimates. Besides ‘non-essential business talk’, the writer may claim common ground by using
‘tyings’. At the beginning of the text, repeating old information originally given by the reader
enables participants to share content. In contrast to these two moves, repetition is used as a
strategy for exhibiting disagreement. That is, disagreement is stressed by repeating part of what
the writer disagrees with. The emphatic use of repetition for disagreements can have a strong
rhetorical impact in that it emphasizes the writer’s assurance. The use of repetition might
suggest why disagreements are heavily made in the end of the texts of external communications
in both corporations.
CHAPTER SIX: (IM)POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE MAIN SPEECH ACTS

As we have already seen in chapter two, according to B&L's (1987) politeness theory, the speaker goes on record or off record in doing the FTA. In doing the FTA, the speaker can do it with or without redress. In doing the FTA with redress, the speaker can take redressive action for the sake of being polite. Although considering others may be the universal definition of politeness, redressive action taken to be polite may be different from culture to culture. It means that B&L's politeness strategies realized as redressive action to avoid potential face damage to the reader may be culture-specific. Furthermore, the sub-strategies under politeness super-strategies may also differ depending on the culture. Now let us examine politeness strategies used in the overall corpus of Korean business correspondence. Four strategies will be considered in ascending order based on their indirectness, from the least indirect (bald on record) to the most indirect (off record). There are fewer examples of bald on record, solidarity enforcement politeness, and off record strategies than examples of conflict avoidance politeness strategy in my data, so only samples of bald on record, solidarity enforcement politeness, and off record strategies are represented in this chapter. In the examples given, detailed context or background information of each example is provided to show how each speech act functions in real-life situations and if necessary the preceding or following text of each example is also included. Although a quantitative approach will be discussed in chapter seven in great detail, I will provide a rough count for each kind of strategy found in the data.

6.1. Bald on record

We call utterance bald-on-record when the FTA is done baldly. Since written business communication is a goal-oriented activity, bald-on-record strategy can be used for maximum
efficiency by letting the reader know the urgency based on mutually shared knowledge. Namely, due to the goal-oriented characteristic of a company, the writer's wants or needs are able to override face concerns about the reader in order to achieve the corporate goal. Therefore, the writer chooses to observe the Cooperative Principle or the 'C(larity)-B(revity)-S(incerity) style' (cf. Scollon and Scollon 2001: 106) rather than the requirement of politeness in business context by using bald on record utterances. In particular, the writer can frequently utilize bald on record strategy in order to get someone of lower status to do something (as in example 1), despite the risk that the reader may not want to be asked. In example 1, the writer makes a request without redress due to the urgency, although distance between parties is big. Performative verbs, such as yochenghata or yokuwhata 'request' in Korean, are used in order to make a request baldly as shown in examples 1, 9, and 10. In principle a superior tends to put less effort into reducing the threat to the face of a subordinate in business settings.

Example 1

[AE18] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man requests the full details of why a mistake was made from a 30-year-old man

piyong-kwa sikan nangpi-ka yaki-toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
cost-and time loss-NM occur-become-PST-AH-IN-DC
'Money and time were lost'

i-ey kyengwise-lul yocheng-ha-p-ni-ta
this-in full particulars-AC request-do-AH-IN-DC
'I request the full details of what happened'

However, since business is an activity to achieve a corporation's goal, sometimes the lower status person performs the FTA baldly to the higher status person if it is necessary to achieve the goal, even though distance between the two is great. In examples 2 and 3, bad news is conveyed by people from lower to higher status. Bad news in corporation B is mostly conveyed baldly by
subordinates to superiors even when distance between them is large. It is due to two reasons. On the one hand, it is due to corporate culture. Since people in corporation B deal with people’s health and illness at work, they are relatively sensitive to bad news. For them, bad becomes worse (Akar 1998). Therefore, they prefer bald on record strategy particularly in giving bad news. On the other hand, besides corporate culture, it is also related to ‘organizational voice’ (Rogers et al., 2001; Rogers 2002) in that it manifests subordinate-superior reporting relationships. Bad news is mostly delivered or reported by a subordinate to a superior in business contexts. When the lower status person conveys bad news to the higher status person, he gives the news baldly to deliver it urgently. ‘Organizational voice’ can explain this phenomenon because it is related to “the content and patterns of written and spoken interactions that a group develops over time in an effort to work together efficiently and effectively” (Rogers et al., 2001: 7). In general, the distribution of bald on record strategy in internal communications shows more directness in the corporate culture of corporation B (i.e. 10% (3/33) in AE vs. 45% (13/29) in BE).

Example 2

[BE14] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man conveys bad news to a 40-year-old man

khulleyim na-ss-sup-ni-ta.
claim occur-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘A claim has been made’
Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BE15] (W&lt;R; +D)</th>
<th>A 30-year-old man conveys bad news to a 40-year-old man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OO-hwahak-i pwuto-na-ss-sup-ni-ta</td>
<td>OO-chemistry-NM dishonor-happen-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The chemistry corporation OO did not honor the cheque’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahaynghi chaykwen-tung mwulli-n ken eps-sup-ni-ta</td>
<td>fortunately bond-etc. affect-RL thing no-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Fortunately, bounced cheque did not have an effect on our bonds, et cetera’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, unlike the above examples, in general the majority of bald on record strategy instances in internal communications across corporations occur when distance is small between participants (66.6% (2/3) in AE; 62% (8/13) in BE). It is compatible with B&L’s pattern of bald on record strategy distribution. On the one hand, bald on record is used when distance is small between same-status parties as in examples 4 and 5. On the other hand, bald on record is also used if only distance is small in spite of status differences between parties as in examples 6, 7, and 8. In realizing bald on record strategy, the writer frequently uses an imperative sentence-type suffix -la to make the status difference clear between the writer and the reader as in examples 6 and 7. In general, the writer uses the suffix only when power is great but the distance is small between interlocutors. Bald on record strategy is used by people from higher to lower status, but an exception also occurs as in example 8. In this example distance between participants is very small, although the writer’s status is lower than the reader’s. Probably, the fact that the interactants are the same age also affects the choice of bald-on-record strategy in this case. In my data, bald on record disagreements are made in BE when distance between interactants is small as shown in examples 4 and 8.
### Example 4

**[BE28] (W=R; -D)**
A 30-year-old man rejects a 30-year-old man’s request

\[
i-ke\ onul-kkaci\ cheli\ an-toy\n\]
this-thing today-until process no-become
‘I cannot process this by today’

\[
\text{thoykunsikan ta-toyse\ cwu-ko-nun\ onul-kkaci\ hay-tal-la-kuw?}
\]
finishing work for the day almost-become give-and-TOP today-until do-request-IM-Q
‘Are you asking me to process this, even though you are giving me this work just before the end of my work day?’

### Example 5

**[BE6] (W=R; -D)**
A 30-year-old man makes a request to check some work again from a 30-year old man

\[
niney-ccok-eyse\ ttel-eya-hay\n\]
your-side-in deduct-should-do
‘You have to deduct yours’

\[
tasi\ alapwa\n\]
again check
‘Check it again’

### Example 6

**[BE2] (W=R; -D)**
A 30-year-old man makes a request to get documents ready from a 20-year old man

\[
ne\ ciwen-thim-ey\ hwakin\ hay\ pwa-ss-e?\n\]
you support-team-to check do try-PST-Q
‘Did you check it with the support team?’

\[
kwanlyen\ calyo\ chayngkye-la\n\]
concerned document prepare-IM
‘Get those documents ready’
Due to its high risk of threatening face, bald on record strategy is mainly limited to the internal use, despite its low frequency even in internal communications. In the FTAs, excluding face-enhancing acts such as compliments, three and thirteen examples of bald on record utterances are found in AE and BE respectively. This is in contrast to the few examples found in external communications (i.e. 2 examples in AL; 5 examples in BL). This result is not exactly consistent with Yli-Jokipii's (1994) claim that imperatives especially used in requests occur at 'tu' level, but not at 'vous' level, in that, despite its low frequency, bald on record strategy is used also in the 'vous' level external communications of Korean business letters. In external communications, power seems to play a significant role in the use of bald on record strategy. That is, the majority of bald on record strategy instances are carried out by the more powerful writer (i.e. 100% (2/2) in AL; 80% (4/5) in BL). In examples 9, 10 and 11, although the writer's status is lower than the reader's, the FTAs are performed baldly. It is because the writers from
corporation A and corporation B (i.e. contractors) are greater than the readers in power. The writer with greater power makes less effort to consider the less powerful reader's face in external communications. As I have discussed in examples 2 and 3, the most common speech act done baldly in BL is also giving bad news (i.e. 80% (4/5)). The variables influencing the use of bald on record strategy will be discussed in great detail in chapter seven.

Example 9

[AL39-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A requests an answer from a 50-year-old male subcontractor.

`chaykim-iss-nun hoytap-ul yokwu-ha-p-ni-ta`
responsibility-is-RL answer-AC request-do-AH-IN-DC
'We request a responsible answer'

Example 10

[BL45-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests to meet the payment deadline from a 40-year-old male subcontractor.

`kwisa-uy napkiil cwumswu-lul tasi han-pen yocheng-ha-p-ni-ta`
your firm-'s payment date meet-AC again one-time request-do-AH-IN-DC
'We once again ask you to meet the payment deadline'

Example 11

[BL30-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B conveys bad news to a 40-year-old business partner

`OOceyphwum kongkup kyeyyakse-uy manlyo-ka tolay-ha-p-ni-ta`
OO product supply contract-'s expiration-NM come-do-AH-IN-DC
'The contract to supply 'OO' product will expire.'

`ilpon OO-sa-nun cheum kyehoyk-chelem te isang-uy kyeyyak yencang-ul`
Japan OO-corp.-TOP first plan-like more beyond-2's contract extension-AC
`wenchi anhko iss-sup-ni-ta`
want no is-AH-IN-DC
'Japanese corporation O does not want to extend the contract'
Needless to say, in business settings, formality is of crucial importance in that it enables the writer to show his respect for the reader, thereby a cooperative business atmosphere can readily be maintained. An interview with an employee from corporation B illustrates how serious Korean businessmen are about politeness in doing business: *thasaka kongsŏnhaci anhunyŏn yeykilul anhaypelicyo* ‘If other companies are not polite to us, we stop talking to them’. In general, the Korean perceptions of politeness depend heavily on the formality level of utterances based on social factors such as age, status, etc. In this respect, bald on record functions in contradiction to formality and politeness. Presumably, that is why bald on record strategy is strongly avoided in Korean business settings. To some extent bald on record utterances can be adopted to save the addressee’s positive face (cf. Ervin-Tripp 1976; Thomas 1983) in that ‘overdoing’ politeness between intimates can be an FTA. Although an FTA can be done baldly between intimates, it can also potentially be risky enough to threaten the reader’s face. Therefore, when the FTA is done, redressive acts are performed through politeness strategies even between socially and psychologically close people because of politeness concerns. These are the major reasons why the frequency of bald on record strategy is low in Korean business correspondence.

6.1.1. Summary and discussion

In business settings, bald on record strategy can be preferred for maximally efficient communication. However, in business settings in Korea, which require maximally efficient communication, the frequency of bald on record strategy is low for face-saving purposes thereby maintaining a cooperative business atmosphere, especially in external communications. In this respect, formality instead of clarity generated by bald on record strategy is still necessary in business settings to maintain long-term business relationships particularly in external
communications.

The use of bald on record strategy reveals corporate culture and ‘organizational voice’ because of the preference for bald on record in performing a specific speech act (e.g. giving bad news in corporation B).

6.2. Solidarity enforcement strategy

Solidarity enforcement strategy is used to build up or intensify solidarity between participants by satisfying either the reader’s positive face wants that his/her abilities be attended to or respected or the reader’s positive face wants to be included. In this study, solidarity enforcement strategies to claim common ground between interactants are divided into two types: ‘show interest’ and ‘use of in-group language’. These two strategies may satisfy two distinctive dimensions of positive face wants: (1) the want that one’s abilities be recognized or respected (i.e. ‘show interest’); (2) the want to be included (i.e. ‘use of in-group language’) (cf. Lim and Bowers 1991). Of course some subgroups of these solidarity enforcement strategies do not inherently function as making solidarity in my data. For example, although ‘boosters’ and ‘repetition’ increase solidarity between participants in face-enhancing acts, such as compliments, they also make (more) distance when they are used in face-threatening acts such as disagreements, complaints, and so on (Holmes 1995). In the process of explaining each solidarity enforcement strategy, I will also include those exceptions under each related heading in order to show the proper procedure for classifying only directly relevant data under solidarity enforcement strategy.
6.2.1. Show interest

One of the most commonly used ways to decrease the distance between participants is to show that the writer also shares a common interest in what the reader wants. It satisfies the reader’s positive face wants or needs that his/her abilities be respected. By simply showing or further emphasizing interest in something good that happened to the reader or what the reader has done, or by showing or emphasizing that the writer also seeks to the same goal and things that the reader wants to obtain or has already obtained, the writer can share common ground with the reader. In my data, four substrategies are adopted to show the writer’s interest in the reader and his intention to share common wants, needs, etc: (1) notice, attend to R; (2) emphasis; (3) offer, promise; (4) anticipation statements.

6.2.1.1. Notice, attend to R

One of the fundamental solidarity enforcement strategies to claim common ground is employed by noticing or attending to the reader’s wants, needs, and interests to increase solidarity between participants. By noticing or showing interest in something good, which happens to the reader, or reader has done and furthermore giving compliments, the writer intends to let the reader know that he shares common ground with the reader. In principle the writer has less inclination to pay attention to the reader, in situations when the social distance is wide. Therefore, this strategy is realized when the social distance between participants is not wide as in example 12. In example 12, the writer notices something good that has happened to the reader (i.e. promotion), although an overt compliment has not been paid. This sentence precedes the writer’s compliments to the reader as will be shown in example 28. It means that the writer intends to claim common ground with the reader before he compliments the reader. In other words, notice R strategy can lay the
groundwork for compliments.

Example 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE35</th>
<th>W=R; -D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man recognizes a 30-year-old man’s promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

onul sungcin palphyo ttay ilum-i myengtan-ey iss-te-kwun-yo
today promotion announcement when name-NM list-on is-RT-APP-POL
‘Your name was on the list in the announcement of promotions’

However, contrary to our expectations, in internal communications, this solidarity enforcement strategy is used most frequently when distance is great between both parties in corporation A (i.e. 75% (3/4)) as in example 13. In this case, it is because the superior makes solidarity with the subordinate by complimenting the subordinate on his work. More than just taking notice of good news for the reader, the writer can sometimes congratulate the reader on something good that has happened to the reader to show that he notices and also shares the reader’s wants as in example 14. This offer of congratulations acts as the onset of the following compliment. It is also worthwhile to consider the social factor of ‘power’ with this strategy in external communication. Regardless of ‘distance’, in external communications of corporation A (AL) the less powerful writer/company has a tendency to notice and pay more attention to the more powerful reader/company for the purpose of keeping good business relationships (i.e. 100% (2/2)) as shown in example 14. This claim is only applicable to corporation A. Although ‘notice, attend to R’ strategy is frequently used by superiors to subordinates in AE when the distance between the two is great, less powerful writers prefer to use it in AL. Therefore, its use can be indicative of a ‘power play’ in corporation A (Holmes 1995). No examples of this solidarity enforcement strategy are found in corporation B.
Example 13

[AE38] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man compliments a 30-year-old man on his ability

sicang-eyse i-pen OOO-ssi-ka ticain-ha-n chamchikhayn-uy panung-i acwu coh-sup-ni-ta
market-in this-time OOO-Mr-NM design-do-RL tuna can-’s reaction-NM so good-AH-IN-DC
‘There is a very positive reaction in the market to the tuna fish tins that you design’

Example 14

[AL52-incoming] (W=R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor recognizes what a 50-year-old man in corporation A or corporation A itself has accomplished

kwisa-uy sinsangphwum Oo-ka hankwuknunglyulhyephoy senceng
your firm-’s new product OO-NM the Korean association of industrial efficiency selection
OO-nyen-to 10-tay hithusangphwum-ulc senceng-toy-m-ul cinsim-ulc
Oo-year-in 10-th hit products-as selection-become-NOM-AC heartfelt-as
chwukha-tuli-p-ni-ta
congratulation-give-AH-IN-DC
‘Heartfelt congratulations on the selection of your new product OO as one of the top ten hit products by the Korean Association of industrial efficiency’

Besides noticing something good, however, the writer also sometimes notices something bad that has happened to the reader as in example 15. In this case the writer identifies with the reader’s hurt feelings brought about by the bad news (i.e. sungcinwulak ‘failing to get a promotion’). That is, by noticing bad news for the reader, the writer tries to understand the reader’s bad situation, feelings, and so on. The writer’s effort to empathize with the reader shows that they are close enough to share some common bond. Additionally, two other moves in example 15 (i.e. an overwhelming reason; doing collegiality) also support the writer’s extension of heart-felt empathy. The writer gives an overwhelming reason (i.e. the IMF ‘International Monetary Fund’) why the reader unavoidably missed a chance at a promotion, immediately after giving bad news in example 15 in order to minimize the damage of the reader’s face. A propositive sentence (i.e. cenykey suthancan hapsita ‘Let’s go for a drink in the evening’) follows the overwhelming reason. This propositive action is a Searlean (1979) ‘commissive’.
That is, in Korea, if someone proposes something to eat or drink, it is a promissive action to treat the addressee to build up solidarity between the two. Accordingly, this commissive illocutionary act also plays a significant role in empathizing with the reader in this context. However in spite of the writer’s positive intention of empathy, attending to something bad that happened to the reader can possibly be risky enough to damage the reader’s positive or negative face wants. Probably, that is why very few examples of noticing something bad are found in the corpus.

Example 15

[AE11] (W>R; -D)
A 30-year-old man recognizes that a 30-year-old woman has failed to get a promotion

5 weltal sungcin myengtan-eyse nwulak-toy-si-n kes-ul palphyocen-ey
5 month promotion list-in fail-become-HON-RL thing-AC before announcement-in
mill pokey toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
already see become-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘Before the announcement I became aware of your name not being on the list of promotions’

IMF yenghyang-ulo manhunpwuntul-i ipensungcin-ttay nwulak-toyn-cila
IMF effect-since many people-NM this time promotion-when fail-become-since
nemwu sinkyengssu-si-ci ma-si-ko
too care-HON-NOM no-HON-and
‘Since many people fail to get a promotion at this time because of the IMF, do not worry about it too much’

cyenyek-ey swul hancan ha-p-si-ta
evening-in drink a cup do-AH-RQ-PR
‘Let us go for a drink in the evening’

6.2.1.2. Emphasis

The solidarity enforcement strategy ‘emphasis’ is subdivided into two groups: ‘boosters’ and ‘repetition’. Despite their emphatic functions, ‘asides’ (i.e. asinun pawa kathi ‘As you know’).
are not put under the strategy of ‘emphasis’ together with ‘boosters’ and ‘repetition’. Before considering substrategies of ‘emphasis’, the reason why ‘asides’ are excluded in this strategy will be explained first.

According to Hyland (1998, quoted in Nickerson 2000: 130), asides are devices to claim “common ground with the reader, triggering agreement on the claims discussed by presenting oneself as a person with similar views, interests and objectives as the reader”. Asides are relational markers, because they can be used to demonstrate relational metadiscourse by showing the writer’s wants to emphasize his partnership with the reader and tend to attracting the reader to the current text by drawing the reader’s attention. In this respect, ‘asides’ seem to be substantially different emphatic devices from ‘boosters’ and ‘repetition’ in that the former functions as seeking agreement by showing the writer’s own interest and the latter serves emphatic purposes to claim common ground by showing interest in the reader’s wants, needs, etc. Primarily asides have emphatic functions to highlight or supplement information or advance a point of view (e.g. hyencay OOepkyeyuy pwulhwang ‘Current downturn in the OO industry’ in example 16). Asides can be used to highlight existing facts (i.e. old information) by placing them immediately behind asides as in example 17 (i.e. pon phwummokuy hyencay kwukey sicangkakyekun US$400/KG ‘The current international market price is around US$400/KG’). This claim is supported by that ‘emphatics’ certainly or obviously can be used in place of ‘asides’ in example 17 (see also example 25 for the example of ‘asides’ supported by emphatics). The writer tries to persuade the reader to agree with him and tries to reduce the possibility of unexpected results, such as disagreement or rejection by using asides. Therefore, asides can be the groundwork for making the reader agree with the writer’s line of reasoning by agreeing on the assumptions in advance.
Example 16

[BL3-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 50-year-old male business partner gives a reason for rejecting a request made by a 40-year-old man in corporation B

tangsa-lose-nun yukansulepkey-to kwisa-uy yocheng-ul kutaylo swuong-ha-l swu-ka
our firm-as-TOP regrettably-also your firm-’s request-AC as it is accept-do-will way-NM
eps-sup-ni-ta
no-AH-IN-DC
‘Regrettably we cannot accept your request as it is’

Example 17

[BL11-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B gives a reason for rejecting a 40-year-old male business partner’s request for price reductions

kwisa-eyse ikhi alko kyey-si-nun pa-wa kathi pon phwummok-uy hyencay
your firm-in already know is-HON-RL thing-with as this product-’s current
kwukceysicangkakyek-un US$400/KG sen i-p-ni-ta
international market price-TOP US$400/KG around is-AH-IN-DC
‘As you know, the current international market price is around US$400/kg’

ilen sicem-eyse kwisa-eyse yocheng-ha-si-n kakyek (US$370/KG)-un tangsa-lose-nun
this situation-in your firm-in request-do-HON-RL price-TOP our firm-as-TOP
swuong-ha-l swu eps-nun coken-i-m-ul allye-tatl-p-ni-ta
accept-do-will way no-RL condition-is-NOM-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC
‘We inform you that we are unable to accept your price of $370 USD per Kilogram’

Asides can be devices coded from the writer’s perspective. In this regard, we need to think about the pitfalls of incorrect use of asides. The use of asides may reflect the writer’s good intention to seek the reader’s agreement by emphasizing the involvement of the reader and showing that common ground is established between the writer and the reader. However, they can also be risky strategies in that the writer can increase damage to the reader’s negative face
wants by manipulating the reader to have the reader follow and accept his idea or assertion, or the writer can increase damage to the reader’s positive face needs by telling him and emphasizing unwelcome facts to the reader. It will pressure the reader. Probably, that is why the corpus of Korean business correspondence shows a small number of asides (i.e. a total of five examples only in external communications of corporation B). On the other hand, asides enable the writer to protect his own face against the mistake of repeating old information. That is, without asides, the writer is likely to be considered silly by the reader, because the information the writer gives is old and the reader already knows it. Therefore, asides can imply that ‘I am not too stupid to forget old information’. Therefore, ‘asides’ can also be devices to protect the writer’s own face, rather than politeness strategies.

6.2.1.2.1. Boosters

 Boosters are devices for intensifying the illocutionary force of speech acts. By putting stress on what the reader wants or needs rather than just noticing them, the writer tends to highlight common ground and build up solidarity, so that the reader’s positive face is enhanced. This claim goes hand in hand with the remark made by Hyland (2000). He (ibid.: 87) mentions the function of boosters in dealing with scientific letters as follows:

 Boosters (e.g. clearly, obviously, of course) allow writers to express their certainty in what they say and to mark involvement and solidarity with their audience, stressing shared information, group membership and direct engagement with readers (emphasis given).

 Boosters are composed of the words for exaggerations and emphatics in the Korean corpus. The writer exaggerates interest with the reader to convey that the reader’s wants or goals are also shared with the writer by choosing words at the extremes, for example, maktayhan ‘enormous’,
thakwelhan ‘outstanding’, choytayhan ‘optimum’, mwukwunghan ‘eternal’, pyenhamepsnum ‘unchanging’, and so on. By exaggerating some want, goal, or value of the reader, the writer can save the reader’s positive face through explicitly stating his high interest in the reader. Besides, emphatics (e.g. maywu ‘very’; cengmal ‘really’; cenghwakhi ‘precisely’; pantusi ‘definitely’) also play a role in strengthening interpersonal solidarity by assuming common ground with the reader. Let me show you some examples of boosting face-enhancing acts. In examples 18 and 19, as a part of paying a compliment, the writer is also able to explicitly express and boost his high degree of interest in a job well done by the reader in terms of boosters (i.e. thakwelhan ‘outstanding’ in 18; khun ‘big’, kiphun ‘deep’ in 19) to certainly enhance the reader’s positive face. In particular, it is necessary to pay special attention to example 18. Another boosting device is used in example 18. The delimiter particle man ‘only’, which normally functions as a hedging device to downsize the writer’s request, as will be mentioned in 6.3.2.1, also plays a role in boosting the reader’s positive face by maximizing the reader’s work ability (i.e. due to only your work ability). In this respect, politeness strategies should be determined within context (Holmes 1995).

Example 18

[AE35] (W=R; -D)
A 30-year-old man compliments a 30-year-old man on his work ability

| OOO-ssi man-uy thakwelhan epmwu nunglyek ttaymwen-i-lako sayngka-ha-p-ni-ta |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| OOO-Mr only-’s outstanding work ability because-is-QT think-do-AH-IN-DC |
| ‘I think it’s entirely due to Mr. OOO’s outstanding work ability’ |
Example 19
[AL58-outgoing] (etc.)
A 50-year-old man in corporation A compliments another 50-year-old man on what he has done

```
kangyen-hay cwu-si-n cwucey 'kiep makheything cenlyak' ey-tayhayse cikweniltong-i
lecture-do give-HON-RL topic 'company marketing strategy' to-about all staffs-NM
khun kwansim-ul kackey toy-ess-ko, kiphun kammyeng-ul pat-ass-sup-ni-ta
big interest-AC have become-PST-and, deep impression-AC receive-PST-AH-IN-DC
'We have much interest in the topic of your lecture, 'the corporate marketing strategy', and it
made a good impression on us '
```

As in the case of ‘notice, attend to R’ substrategy, boosters are used most frequently by
superiors in AE (i.e. 86% (6/7)) as shown in example 20 (maktayhan ‘huge’) and by less
powerful writers in AL (i.e. 55% (6/11)) as shown in examples 21 and 22 (maywu ‘very’;
kuktayhwa ‘maximum’). That is, superiors make more efforts to make solidarity with
subordinates in AE, whereas subcontractors endeavor to get closer to corporation A for their
own benefit by intensifying what the reader has done. This claim supports Pilegaard’s (1997)
finding to a certain extent. According to him, lower status people (e.g. seller) use more amount
of positive facework than higher status people (e.g. buyer) because buyer is in the positive P
position. Interestingly, in example 21 a compliment is made by dubitative word
sayngkakhapnita ‘think’. In this case, the reason why the writer uses a hedging device is to be
modest in expressing her opinion (i.e. cey sokyenulonun ‘in my humble opinion’) rather than
functioning as attenuating the force of face-enhancing acts, compliments. Actually, this claim is
also supported by the fact that cey sokyenulonun ‘in my humble opinion’ can precede the
sentence in example 21, like ‘In my humble opinion, I think the reaction to new product...’.

Therefore, the primary function of using hedging devices in paying compliments is to save the
writer’s own face by showing his/her modesty or by being less assertive in expressing his/her
opinion. Furthermore, in example 21, the writer solely expresses her opinion in a humble way
because otherwise, there is a possibility that compliments sound overly flattering. Moreover, the
dubitatively word in example 21 is not used to confirm her certainty or to share the opinions of her counterpart at all. Therefore, the use of a hedging device in this occasion functions as a self-face protective device, because it is only used to display the writer’s humbleness or modesty.

Example 20

[AE39] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man compliments a 30-year-old man on his work ability

\[pwuse\ yeysan \ celkam-uy \ maktayhan \ hyokwa-lul \ kacye-wa-ss-sup-ni-ta\]
department budget reduce-‘s enormous efficiency-AC have-come-PST-AH-IN-DC

‘It led to huge cuts in the departmental budget’

Example 21

[AL55-incoming] (etc)
A 30-year-old female subcontractor compliments corporation A on its new product

\[sinceyphwum \ OO \ lamyen-uy \ kakyek-i \ celyem-ha-myense \ mas \ ttohan \ siwenhan \ kam-ul\]
new product OO ramen-‘s price reasonable-do-and taste also good feeling-AC

\[cwu-mye \ phocang \ hyengthay-ka \ cayhwalyong-toye \ manyum \ panung-i \ coh-ta-ko\]
give-and wrapping shape-NM recycle-become very reaction-NM good-DC-QT

\[sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta\]
think-do-AH-IN-DC

‘I think the reaction to new product OO ramen is very positive, because the price is reasonable, the taste is good, and the packaging is recycled’

Example 22

[AL51-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor compliments a 40-year-old man on his work ability

\[tangsa-ey \ wenka \ celkam \ hyokwa-lul \ kuktayhwa \ ha-l \ swu \ iss-ess-sup-ni-ta\]
our firm-in price cut effect-AC maximum do-will way is-PST-AH-IN-DC

‘It led to a huge reduction in our production costs’

No examples of boosters are found in the internal communications of corporation B (BE). Only four examples of boosters are found in the external communications of corporation B (BL).

Unlike the external communications of corporation A (AL), more powerful writers mostly use boosters in the external communications of corporation B (i.e. 75% (3/4)) as in example 23
In general, solidarity enforcement strategies are used most frequently by more powerful writers in BL (i.e. 84% (27/32)). Therefore, as in ‘notice, attend to R’ strategy, the use of boosters can be a ‘power play’ (Holmes 1995), because although more powerful people use more boosters in AE and BL, less powerful people use more boosters in AL.

Example 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BL57-outgoing] (W&lt;R; +D)</th>
<th>A 30-year-old man in corporation B compliments a 40-year-old male business partner on his work ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ipen kwisa-uy cochi-lo inhay paie-lapwuthe kwisa-ey tayhan twuthewun</td>
<td>this time your firm’s action-by cause buyer-from your firm-to about thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinim-uy sesin (saponchempwu)-ul pat-ass-sup-ni-ta</td>
<td>trust’s letter (a photocopy enclosed)-AC receive-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust’s letter (a photocopy enclosed)-AC receive-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
<td>‘Due to your firm’s action at this time, we have received a letter expressing solid trust in your firm (a photocopy enclosed) from a buyer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without a doubt, face-enhancing acts, such as compliments, function to make solidarity between participants. Furthermore, it is certain that increasing the force of compliments by means of boosters makes the bonds between them much closer. In spite of the positive function of boosters to intensify solidarity, however, boosters sometimes fail to achieve their positive function. For example, on the one hand, in Korea if the addresser keeps complimenting the addressee’s good job, belongings, and so on, it can threaten the addressee’s negative face, because those complimenting acts can imply that one is requesting to buy or give the objects of those compliments to the addressee. Besides, in business context, if the subcontractor keeps paying great compliments or keeps over-complimenting by using boosters to the contractor, it may damage the contractor’s face, because it sounds overly flattering. On the other hand, based on the Korean corpus, in the same way that boosters intensify the effect of utterances with positive intentions, they also equally strengthen face-threatening utterances (Holmes 1995). Boosters can also increase distance (Holmes 1984) as in example 24 (i.e. maywu pwulhapli
‘very unreasonable’.

Example 24

[BE25] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man complains to a 50-year-old man about action taken for something done in the office

\textit{kumpen ken-ey tayhan cochi-nun maywu pwulapli-ha-tako sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta}
this time matter-to about action-TOP very unreasonable-do-saying think-do-AH-IN-DC
‘I think the action taken in response to this situation is very unreasonable’

When boosters are used outside the FTAs, they function as devices for seeking agreement by emphasizing the writer’s assurance or certainty as in examples 25 and 26 (i.e. cenghwakhi myengki ‘specified clearly’; celtaycekin pikyowuwi ‘vast quality’). However, the use of boosters for this function seems to be more like saving self-face, because it threatens the reader’s negative face by leaving little room for the reader to disagree or reject. Interestingly, besides the function of seeking agreement, in examples 26 contrary to Pomerantz’s (1978) self-praise avoidance constraint, emphatics celtaycekin ‘absolutely’ boost self-praise. Overpraising oneself is a serious self or other face-losing act in Korea. It also flouts ‘the Modesty Maxim’ (Leech 1983). However, in this instance, an individual member represents the collective face of a group of individuals. This representation exists in public perception. In this respect, self-praise in business transactions is triggered by the intention to maintain ‘corporate face’ (Scollon and Scollon 2001) rather than private face. By the same token, where there is a negotiation, there can be a ‘maximise-praise-of-own-company’ tactic (Dow 1999: 95) to enhance corporate face. Therefore, social entities, such as a work unit, also have face and need to save face and avoid losing face.
Example 25
[BL14-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B gives a reason for rejecting a 40-year-old male business partner’s request for a recall

kwisa-eyse ponay-cwu-si-n saymphul-ul sihem-ha-n kyelkwa cwungtayhan pokwan-sang-uy
your firm—from send-give-HON-RL sample-AC test-do-RL result important keep-in—’s
silswu-ka iss-ess-ta-nun kos-i tangsa-uy kyehay-i-p-ni-ta
mistake-NM is-PST-DC-RL thing-NM our firm—’s opinion-AH-IN-DC
‘The results of an experiment with the sample you have sent show us that there has been a serious problem in storing the item’

Example 26
[AL16-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 40-year-old man in corporation A gives a reason for rejecting a 50-year-old male business partner’s request for a price reduction

kwisa-eyse thasa-uy tongcongceyphwum-kwa pikyo-lul ha-sye-ss-ta-
your firm—in other firm—’s the same kind of product—with compare-AC do-HON-PST-DC-
ci-man cehuy-nun phwumcil-myen-eyse cellaycekin pikyowni-lul cem-ha-ko
SUP—but we-TOP the quality of product-aspect-in absolutely superior-AC occupy-do-and
iss-ta-ko capwu-ha-p-ni-ta
is-DC-QT proud-do-AH-IN-DC
‘You said you compared similar products from other firms with ours, but we pride ourselves upon the vast quality of our product’

6.2.1.2.2. Repetition

Rhetorical devices, such as repetition, can also be boosting devices for emphasis. B&L (1987: 112) argue that seeking agreement is a way of showing positive politeness, and that agreement can be expressed through repetition because “agreement may also be stressed by repeating part
or all of what the preceding speaker has said”. In business correspondence, repetition seems to function as a device to carry out various other intentions of writers, and serve as a means of creating ‘involvement’ rather than ‘detachment’ (e.g. ‘tyings’) (Chafe 1983). In argumentative writing in particular, repetition of the overall purpose of the prior turn at writing serves the functions of connection and interaction more than those of production and comprehension. That is, by tying the previous things to the now, the writer can claim that his argument is relevant (Brown 2001). Therefore, repetition plays a crucial role in establishing discourse coherence. For example, repetition can be an output of the politeness strategy; notice, attend H. In example 27, repetition provides context for the receiver by showing that common knowledge is currently shared. Unlike face-to-face interaction, there is no immediate response in written discourse. In order to remind the reader of ‘old knowledge’ (Kollin 1996), they must correspond with the ‘Coherence Tool’ (Rogers and Rymer 2001) to claim common ground between the writer and the reader. Through repetition, the writer clarifies or elaborates on a prior point. Therefore, repetition produces a kind of sentence cohesion called the ‘known-new contract’ (Kollin, ibid). It runs hand in hand with Kollin’s (ibid: 24) remark about the importance of repetition of old knowledge: “The lack of old information should signal the writer of a possible trouble spot, a weakness in cohesion”. Therefore, repetition may work to allow the writer to elaborate on a prior correspondence emphasizing the repeated part, while also probably giving additional information by ‘parallelism’, which references the duplicated structure. From this perspective, repetition is also used to emphasize a point. In example 27, the writer does repeat what the current reader requests in the prior correspondence by parallelism (i.e. tangmyenuy withakphanmay ‘the consignment sale of the Chinese noodles’). Tannen (1987) calls it ‘allo-repetition’.
Example 27

[AL4-incoming] (W<R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor shows appreciation for a 50-year-old man’s request for the consignment sale of a product

\(kwISA\-eySE \, cinan \, O\-wel \, O\-il-pwu \, sesin-ulO \, tangsA \, ceyphwum-i-n \, tangmyen-\,uy\)
your firm-in last O-month O-day-in letter-by our firm product-is-RL Chinese noodle-s

\(withakphanmay-lul \, ceuyu\-hay \, cWu\-si\-n\-tey \, tayhay \, kiphun \, kamsa-tuli-p-ni-ta\)
consignment sale-AC suggest-do give-HON-RL-thing about deep thank-give-AH-IN-DC

‘Thank you for your letter of request dated O for the consignment sale of the Chinese noodles we produce’

In addition to ‘allo-repetition’, because of the delayed response of written correspondence, ‘self-repetition’ (repeating oneself) is also observed within the Korean business texts as in example 28. In example 28, the writer uses a term sungcin ‘promotion’ as many as three times both to show the writer’s explicit interest in something good which happens to the reader and to emphasize or elaborate on the main point of paying compliments. Likewise, in example 29, the writer shows interest in what the reader has done through repetition (i.e. kwisauy cochi ‘Your firm’s action’).

Example 28

[AE35] (W=R; -D)
A 30-year-old man shows interest in a 30-year-old man’s promotion

\(sungcin-ul \, cinsim-ulO \, chwukha-hay-yo\)
promotion-AC heartfelt congratulation-do-POL

‘Heartfelt congratulations on your promotion’

\(onul \, sungcin-palphyo \, ttaY \, ilum-i \, myengtan-ey \, iss-te-kwum-yo\)
today promotion-announcement when name-NM list-in is-RT-APP-POL

‘Your name was on the list in the announcement of promotions’

\(OOOssi \, manuy \, thakwelhan \, empwununglyek \, ttaymwunilako \, sayngkahapnita\)
‘I think it’s entirely due to your outstanding work ability’

\(sungcin-thek \, encey \, nay-l-ken-ci-yo\)
promotion-treat when pay-will-thing-SUP-POL

‘When will you treat me to celebrate your promotion?’
Example 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BL57-outgoing] (W&lt;R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man in corporation B compliments a 40-year-old male business partner on his work ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ipen kwisa-uy cochi-lo inhay paie-lopwuthe kwisa-ey tayhan twuthewun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this time your firm-’s action-by cause buyer-from your firm-to about thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinim-ty sesin (saponchempwu)-ul pat-ass-sup-ni-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust-’s letter (a photocopy enclosed)-AC receive-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Due to your firm’s action at this time, we have received a letter expressing solid trust in your firm (a photocopy enclosed) from a buyer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sangkiken-ulo inhay pon picinisu-uy cisok-yepwu-ka maywu pwulthwumyeng-ha-yess-uma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>above matter-as cause this business-’s continue-if-NM very unclear-do-PST-but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwisa-uy cosokhan cochi-lo motun kes-i kkaykkusi haykyel-toy-ess-sup-ni-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your firm-’s quick action-by all thing-NM clear solve-become-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Although it was unclear if we could continue to do business because of the claim, the situation was resolved due to your quick action’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although repeated lexical, phrasal, and clausal items in separate sentences normally make up the majority of cases of repetition as above, repetition is also used within a single sentence as an emphatic device for boosting the force of face-enhancing acts as in example 30. In example 30, the writer shows interest in the reader’s work ability by enlarging the size of the reader’s work ability through repetition (i.e. *khukey* ‘big’; *khu* ‘big’).

Example 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE40] (W&gt;R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 50-year-old man compliments a 40-year-old man on his work ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sinceyphwum OOO kaypal-lo wuli hoysa-ey khukey kive-ha-n pa-ka khu-p-ni-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new product OOO develop-by our firm-to big contribution-do-RL way-NM big-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You made a big contribution to our firm through the development of new products’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.3. Offer, promise

Offering can be a negative FTA, in that the recipient should repay something that s/he receives or its equivalent later on (i.e. s/he incurs a debt). Koreans are certainly sensitive to debts. However, they normally offer gifts, which are not heavy enough to threaten the recipient's negative face, to each other to express their appreciation, goodwill, or respect for the recipient. Therefore, the act of giving gifts can be a consideration to the recipient. As shown in the Korean proverbs, cwunun kes silhtanun salam epsta 'There is nobody to reject offer' and kongca silhtanun salam epsta 'Nobody dislikes something for free', giving gifts does not inherently cause the receiver to lose his/her negative face in Korea. In turn, giving gifts basically gives and enhances the recipient's face, and automatically builds up solidarity between interactants, because it can be a sign of the sender's constant awareness of good things which have happened to the recipient or of things that the reader has done. The giver may fully satisfy the receiver's positive face wants by giving materially tangible gifts, which may be the most concrete way of expressing his/her interest in the recipient as in example 31. Interestingly, in example 31, the gift-giver downplays his gift (i.e. chwukha semnwul 'congratulatory gift') with an adjective cocholhan 'small' to be modest, although the gift is big.

Offering can be an indirect way of making a future request. That is, sometimes the giver gives gifts to the recipient in order to put others into his debt in order to prepare the way for a future request. So then, the act of giving gifts can reduce the possibility that his future request will be rejected. Therefore, the gift's face-enhancing can be used as leverage by the gift-giver to sway the recipient into granting his request. For example, in example 31 the writer shows his eagerness to maintain a good business relationship with the reader by giving a gift to the reader. That is, the gift-offering sends an indirect message to the reader about the writer's eagerness to maintain a good business relationship with the reader for the benefit of his company in the
future. In this respect, subordinates/subcontractors prefer to use this strategy in business context as shown in example 31. Accordingly, in addition to the function of saving the recipient’s positive face, it can also be used as a tactic to save the writer’s or his company’s positive face.

Example 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AL48-incoming] (W&gt;R; +D)</th>
<th>A 50-year-old male subcontractor sends a gift to a 50-year-old man in corporation A to congratulate him on his promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cicemcang-nim-uy yengcen-ul tasi hanpen chwukha-tuli-myey, branch manager-Mr.-’s promotion-AC again congratulation-give-and</td>
<td>‘Congratulations on your promotion to a branch manager once again’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cocholhan chwukha semmwu-ul sewul-uy tayk-ulo ponay-tuli-ess-sup-ni-ta small congratulation gift-AC Seoul-’s house-to send-give-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
<td>‘I have sent a small congratulatory gift to your home in Seoul’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer may also stress his cooperation with the reader by making a promise on what the reader wants or needs. In Korean promises are indicated by two enders, -(u)l-kkey and -(u)m, a modal suffix, -keyss, or a promissive verb, yaksokhata ‘promise’. This strategy, promise (to offer), seems to function to build and maintain a friendly business atmosphere by increasing solidarity. Probably, due to the cooperative nature of this strategy, examples of this strategy are mostly found in letters containing compliments. Paying a compliment saves the reader’s positive face by showing that the writer also shares common wants with the addressee. By placing the sentence pertaining to the ‘offer or promise’ strategy after paying a compliment, the writer also increases solidarity with the reader in letters containing compliments as shown in examples 32 and 33. In particular, although making a promise to offer something to the recipient can be a tactic to enhance the recipient’s positive face as in examples 32 (i.e. sama ‘I will buy’), it is groundwork to allow his positive face to be properly saved by having real gifts offered later on. That is, only making a promise to offer something good to the recipient can be a strategy to
give or enhance the recipient’s positive face, in that it can be an act of positively acknowledging him, and offering tangible gifts can complete the face enhancing. Besides offering tangible things, offering can also be made using intangible things. For instance, offering a contribution or a benefit to the reader in example 33 can make a promise which saves the reader’s positive face. In this case, the modal suffix -keys carries out the function of making a promise for the benefit of the reader by showing his intention or volition (Sohn 1999).

Example 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE33</th>
<th>W=R; -D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man compliments a 30-year-old man on what he has done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>swuko-hay-ss-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effort-do-PST-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Good job’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tekpwumeckkkuth-na-ss-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>owing to well finish-be-PST-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It was a success thanks to you’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>onul nay-ka swul-hancan sa-m-a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>today I-NM liquid-a glass buy-PRM-INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I will buy a drink today’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 33

[BL55-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A makes a promise to offer a contribution to a 40-year-old male business partner after complimenting him on his work ability

i-nun kwisa-uy noko-tekpwm-i-lako sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta
this-TOP your firm-‘s effort-due to-is-QT think-do-AH-IN-DC
‘I think it is due to your efforts’

tangsa-nun pon ceyphwum-uy hayoy sokay-lul ciskocek-ulo cenkay-ha-ye
our firm-TOP this product-‘s foreign introduce-AC continue-as develop-do-by
hwanghwu pon sinceyphwum-uy ponkyekcekin sangepsayngsan-i kanunghan siki-ey-nun
future this new product-‘s full-scale commercial production-NM possible period-in-TOP
ponkyekcekin phannay-lul ha-l-swu iss-tolok manpan-uy cwunpi-lul ta-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
full-dress sell-AC do-will-way is-to every sort-‘s preparation-AC all-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘We will make every preparation for full-scale marketing of this new product by advertising it abroad, when it is produced commercially in the future’

Besides making a promise to offer tangible things as in example 34 (i.e. chwukahwahwan ‘a congratulatory wreath’), promises are sometimes even ostensible as in example 35. As in example 31, the writer in sentence 34 describes his gift as a small one (i.e. cakum chwukahwahwan ‘a small congratulatory wreath’) to display modesty. It is interesting to note that, like offering a gift in example 31, promise (to offer) can also be a power play especially in the external communications of corporation A in that less powerful subcontractors prefer to use the ‘promise’ strategy (100% (3/3) in AL) as shown in examples 34 and 35. That is, subcontractors endeavor to get closer to contractors for their corporate benefit by showing interest in what contractors have done through the ‘promise’ strategy.

Example 34

[AL50-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor makes a promise to send a gift to congratulate a 40-year-old man in corporation A on what he has been awarded

onul cwung-ey cakun chwukahwahwan-ul ponay-tuli-keyss-sup-ni-ta
today during-in small congratulatory wreath-AC send-give-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I will send a small congratulatory wreath today’
Example 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[AI49-incoming] (W&gt;R; +D)</td>
<td>A 50-year-old male subcontractor makes a promise to visit a 50-year-old man in corporation A to congratulate him on his promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comankan chaca-poyp-ko chwukhainsa-tuli-tolok ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta</td>
<td>soon visit-see-and congratulating-give-to do-will-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I will visit you and congratulate you on your promotion sometime soon’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1.4. Anticipation statements

Anticipation statements realized by a lexical item kitayhata ‘look forward to’ function as devices to increase solidarity between participants in Korean. Korean is a predicate-final language (Sohn 1999). Therefore, an object is placed before anticipation statements. Unlike many anticipation statements in other languages (cf. Akar 1998 for Turkish; Yli-Jokipii 1994 for Finnish), anticipation statements in the Korean data do not express the anticipation of the requested act but they express the anticipation of the reader’s future act which is directly relevant to the reader’s wants. For example, in examples 36 and 37, the writers try to make solidarity with the readers by showing that their interests are the same as the readers’ (i.e. the development of good new products and the start of product sales; their prosperity and activities) in terms of using anticipation statements. Therefore, anticipation statements are not routine declarative requests in the corpus of Korean business correspondence (see 6.3.1.1. for the function of want statements as conventionally indirect requests). Whereas by showing and sharing a common interest (which is the object placed before the anticipation statements) with the reader, and communicating an attitude of cooperation through the writer’s positive acknowledgment made by anticipation statements, the writer can increase solidarity and save the reader’s positive face. Other major solidarity enforcement strategies are non-conventional, but anticipation statements have conventional forms and are conventionalized solidarity
enforcement politeness strategies. Like other solidarity enforcement substrategies such as show interest, anticipation statements can be a power play because less powerful writers, who are subcontractors, prefer the use of anticipation statements (100% (2/2) in AL; 100% (2/2) in BL) as in examples 36 and 37.

Example 36

[AL55-incoming] (etc)
A 30-year-old female subcontractor shows interest in what corporation A wants

aphulo-to sopica needs-ey mac-nun coh-un sinceyphwum kaypal
future-also customer needs-to suitable-RL good-RL new product development
chwulsi-lul kitay-ha-p-ni-ta
start to sell-AC expect-do-AH-IN-DC
‘I look forward to the development of your good new product to meet customers’ needs and the start of the product’s sales in the future’

Example 37

[BL54-incoming] (W=R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor shows interest in what a 40-year-old man in corporation B wants

i-pen cicemcinchwl-ul kihoy-lo tewukte khum palcen-kwa hwalyak-ul
this-time open a branch of a business-AC chance-by more big development-with activity-AC
kitay-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
expect-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘Because your firm took this opportunity to open a new branch, I look forward to the greater prosperity and increased business for your firm’

6.2.2. Use of in-group language

The writer can share common ground with the reader by using certain devices or language to express in-group identity and membership. By using this solidarity enforcement strategy, solidarity is present between interactants in that the writer uses in-group language as a kind of in-group identity marker. On the other hand, unlike the ‘show interest’ tactic serving the function of boosting the reader’s positive face, ‘use of in-group language’ strategy acts to keep
solidarity to satisfy the reader’s positive face wants by intensifying in-group membership normally in the context of the FTAs rather than the face-enhancing-acts (FEA), such as compliments. This claim is supported by the fact that ‘use of in-group language’ strategy occurs infrequently in the FEAs (see table 7.25 in chapter 7 for more detail). By using in-group language, the writer can meet the reader’s positive face wants or needs to be included, and also the writer can justify doing the FTA because doing the FTA to in-group members is more natural and much easier than to out-group members.

B&L claim that the use of address forms can be one of the devices to make solidarity. However, to consider the use of address forms as strategic choices to express in-group membership seems a bit problematic. Let us consider the reason why. Address terms used to claim in-group solidarity in the Korean corpus are occupational titles. Even though occupational titles can be used in formal and informal situations, they indicate both mutual solidarity (i.e. in-group identity marker) and social difference (i.e. status or hierarchy) as in examples 38 and 39 (kwacangnim ‘head of department’).

Example 38

[BE4] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man disagrees with a 30-year-old man

\[ \text{kwacangnim, ku-ken-un imi cinan tal haykyel ha-n ken-i-p-ni-ja} \]
head of department, that-job-TOP already last month solve do-RL job-is-AH-IN-DC
‘Head of department, I already sorted them out last month’

Example 39

[AE30] (W<R; +D)
A 20-year-old man requests that a 40-year-old man revise the production plan

\[ \text{kwacangnim-kkeyse sayngsankyeuyoyk-ul hyepuy hwu cay coceng-hay} \]
Head of department-NM the production plan-AC discussion after again arrange-do
cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ja
give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you will revise the production plan after discussing with us’
Unlike symmetrical address terms in the Tu level (see Brown and Gilman 1960 for Tu (I) and Vous (V) forms), occupational titles index hierarchical power, which is strengthened by the honorific title suffix –nim ‘Mr/Ms’, as in kwacangnim ‘head of department’. So they can signal both social roles and ‘psychological closeness’ simultaneously. They are associated with both dimensions of power and solidarity. They represent the relationships between interlocutors. Those occupational terms with the honorific title suffix –nim show self-denigration and the speaker’s/writer’s respect for the addressee/reader to abide by the social norm. That is, they are used when the speaker/writer is lower in social status or age. Consequently, they perform a social indexing or normative function of politeness rather than a strategic function of politeness. Therefore, they might fall into the category of discernment politeness rather than strategic or volitional politeness in this respect. ‘Use in-group language’ is subdivided into two specific groups of strategies: (1) code-mixing and (2) use of slang.

6.2.2.1. Code-mixing

A speaker may choose a language or a register that is suitable for the hearer (Giles 1973). That is, the speaker chooses different linguistic codes to signal convergence with or divergence from the hearer. This claim is compatible with the notion of codes defined by Alvarez-Caccamo (2001: 23): “Communication codes are general procedures that both senders (speakers or signers) and receivers have to signal the communication of intentions” (emphasis given). Probably, the same is true for the written discourse. Code-mixing, which is also called ‘mixed code-switching’ (Pan 2000), occurs when the writer tries to claim common ground, which is the knowledge participants should have in common to understand each other (Clark 1996), with the reader. Generally speaking, the use of in-group language is based on mutual knowledge and
values. Accordingly, the writer naturally presupposes that the reader should be able to make sense of the language or terms of the language within the in-group society. In other words, we may assume that there is prior correspondence by using those terms or language between the writer and the reader, because the writer directly uses and mentions them without explanation in the future correspondence. Hence if once common knowledge is established and shared by the language or terms used within the language in the previous correspondence, the writer presupposes that the reader also has knowledge shared with the writer. After they share common knowledge, if the writer repeats an explanation of the same knowledge, it is redundant and disruptive to efficient communication. Therefore, after common knowledge is established, knowledge activation seems to be automatic. Without common knowledge shared by the writer and the reader, specific or technical terms used by the writer cannot be properly understood by the reader (e.g. examples 40, 41, and 42). Therefore, mutual, shared or common knowledge is of crucial importance to decode. In other words, code-mixing is also based on social knowledge in the sense of which the writer knows and uses the same language as the members of the same discourse community do. In this respect, this code-mixing is consistent with what Blom and Gumperz (1972) called 'metaphorical code-switching'. Metaphorical code-switching signals a shift in the relationship being enacted (e.g. in-group membership). In particular, specific groups, such as experts in certain areas, have knowledge, which pertains to specific knowledge not to personal or general knowledge, that they share with members of the group through special training or informal processes of acquisition based on old materials under the guidance of seniors. Therefore, this specific knowledge is only used in specific forms of specialized interaction. The same is probably true for business contexts. Therefore, the code seems to be distinctively mixed in the use of specific or technical terms such as jargon, in business settings, to claim in-group membership with the reader or to produce the shared associations between the writer and the reader for achieving common goals. Since business partners can be in-group
members from a global view, mixed codes are also used in external communications. In particular, code-mixing is heavily used in BL (i.e. 26 examples, as opposed to only 2 examples in AL) as shown in examples 40, 41, and 42. This distribution shows that corporation B pays special attention to the reader’s positive face wants to be a member more than the reader’s positive face wants that his/her abilities be recognized. Presumably, people in corporation B not only want to make solidarity between both unfamiliar parties, but also want to protect self-face through code-mixing. That is, the user of English technical terms endeavors to show his/her professional work ability to the unfamiliar reader.

Example 40

[BL35-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B informs a 40-year-old male business partner of the impossibility of extending a contract

SB PROJECT ken-uy kyeyakkikan yencang-i pwulthwumyeng ha-l kes kath-sup-ni-ta
SB PROJECT matter’s contract term extension-NM unclear do-will thing seem-AH-IN-DC
‘It seems unclear if the contract term for the SB Project will be extended’

Example 41

[BL5-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests a certain settlement condition from a 40-year-old male business partner

L/C at sight hokun T/T advance-lo cinhayng-haye cwu-l kes-ul pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta
L/C at sight or T/T advance-to proceed-do give-will-thing-AC request-give-AH-IN-DC
‘We request proceeding to L/C at sight or T/T advance’
Example 42

[BL38-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old male business partner requests a shipment of the exact same type that a 30-year-old man in corporation A actually intends to ship

\[kum\text{pen silcey sencek-k}hoca ha-si-nun lot-kwa tongilha-n \ lot-uy saymphul-ul\]

this time in fact ship-intend do-HON-RL lot-with same-RL lot-'s sample-AC
cuksi songpwu-hay cvu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta
immediately send-do give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
'I hope you will immediately send a sample with the exact same type that you actually intend to ship'

Code-mixing also occurs in internal communications since the use of in-group language conveys in-group values and goals. As shown in examples 43 and 44, in the internal communications of both corporations, code-mixing is mostly used when distance between the writer and the reader is great (i.e. 100% (3/3) in AE; 75% (3/4) in BE). It shows that the writer makes more efforts to make solidarity when distance between parties is big, as in the case of 'show interest' strategy realized especially in AE. In this case, using English codes can also be a self-face protective device in that it shows the writer's professional work ability to the unfamiliar reader.

Example 43

[AE6] (W>R.; +D)
A 40-year-old man objects to a 30-year-old man's request to upgrade computers

\[censansil yeysan-ulo-nun cepeney yoche\text{ng-ha-sye-ss-te-n khemphyu}the \text{ } u\text{pgrade}\]
computing department budget-by-TOP request-do-HON-PST-RT-RL computer upgrade
ken-ul silhaying-ha-ci mos-hakey toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
matter-AC pursue-do-NOM no-do become-PST-AH-IN-DC
'We cannot upgrade the computers you request due to cuts in the computing department's budget'
To some extent, mixed code can also serve an emphatic purpose in that it is visually differentiated, thereby code mixed within the other code can easily be emphasized. Although the use of Korean jargon is unmarked or natural in a certain standard situation (e.g. business context), using English professional terms within the Korean texts is a highly marked and strategic choice. By using English business terms within Korean texts, participants can do business much faster and easier, because they can avoid miscommunication. Therefore, the function of code-mixing can also be pertinent to what Pan (2000) describes as ‘pragmatic code-switching’, which functions to facilitate the business transaction or to avoid miscommunication. Similar examples of code-mixing in business writing are also found in Connor (1999). She (ibid: 122) claims that English-Norwegian (e.g. *mandel fisk* ‘almond fish’) or English-Estonian (e.g. *nahaga* ‘with skin’, *nahata* ‘without skin’) code-mixing occurs in fax communication between an English broker and his Norwegian and Estonian suppliers in order to clarify communication, to have fun, or to create solidarity. From this perspective, code-mixing in the Korean data also does not seem to be inherently restricted only to the FTAs as shown in examples 45 and 46 (cutting; free sample).
Example 45

[AL33-incoming] (W=R.; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor gives a reason why he complains to a 50-year-old man in corporation A about canceling an order

tekwuna phocang cutting (hwukakong) pwupwun-un imi hato kuephey-eyse oycwucakep-i besides wrapping cutting (post-processing) part-TOP already subcontractor-to outside order-NM khulma-n sanghay-i-p-ni-ta finish-RL state-is-AH-IN-DC
‘Besides, as for wrapping cutting parts, outside order work is already being done by subcontractors’

kulemulo hyencay sanghwang-eyse cwumwun-ul chwiso-ha-si-keytoy-myen maktayhan therefore current situation-in order-AC cancel-do-HON-become-if enormous kumcensek sonsil-un mwullon-i-ko kuey itatalu phakuphyokwa-to khul kes-ulo financial loss-TOP of course-is-and that following knock-on-effect-also big thing-as yeysang-toy-p-ni-ta expect-become-AH-IN-DC ‘Therefore, if you cancel an order in the current situation, enormous financial loss is expected as well as pervasive knock-on effects’

Example 46

[BL13-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B makes a promise to offer an alternative after disagreeing with a 40-year-old male business partner’s request for recall

i-nun kacang kiponcekin senipsenchwul-ul mwusi-ha-n caykokwanli pwusil-lo this-TOP the most basic first in first out-AC ignore-do-RL stock control unreliable-because palsayghan mwuncey-i-ci phwumcilmwuncey-ka ani-la-ko sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta happen problem-is-NOM problem of the quality of product-NM no-DC-QT think-AH-IN-DC ‘I think it happens not because of the quality of product but because of the unreliable stock control procedure which ignores the basic order of acquisition’

chwuhwu kwisa-eyse pon phwummok-ey tayhan chwuka cwumwun-i iss-ul kyengwu yak 10%-future your firm-from this product-to about additional order-NM is-AC case about 10%-sen-ty free sample-AC thonghay yengepsonsil-ul posang-hay-tuli-koca-ha-p-ni-ta about-‘s free sample-AC by business loss-AC compensation-do-give-intend-do-AH-IN-DC ‘We intend to compensate you for your business loss by providing approximately 10% free samples if you decide to order this product again in the future’

Some English loan words spelled in the sound pattern of Korean are also found in the Korean data (e.g. example 47). However, I do not consider them code-mixing. In the following example, two English loan words saymphul ‘sample’ and theysuthu ‘test’ are used. They are not English
code but simply phonological borrowings. That is, they are so-called Korean-coded English loan words. Spelling English words in Korean orthography makes the loan words look odd and consequently the writer needs more energy and time to interpret them and there is a possibility of miscommunication.

Example 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BL38-incoming] (W&gt;R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 40-year-old male business partner makes a promise to let a 30-year-old man in corporation B know the results of a test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangsa-nun pon saymphul-ul patnum cuksi thcysuthu hvu ku kyelkwa-lul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our firm-TOP this sample-AC receive immediately test after that result-AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allye-tuli-keyss-sup-ni-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inform-give-will-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘As soon as I receive the sample, I will inform you of the results of the test’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2.2. Use of slang

Slang terms are used as an expression of in-group identity. In general, slang terms are used between intimates. Likewise, in my data, slang terms are used only between familiar parties, as will be shown in the below examples. Using slang is unlikely to be a politeness strategy in formal business texts. Due to the informality of slang, therefore, they are strictly used for internal correspondence only. Slang serves the cohesive social function of reinforcing in-group membership and strengthening solidarity between interactants (Holmes 1995). On the one hand, in Tu level internal texts, the use of slang makes more solidarity between intimates than the use of formal words. In example 48, making a request does not threaten the requestee’s negative face wants. It is because the request is not solely made for the benefit of the requester in this case. In this context, a request made by an intimate acquaintance of requestee can be coded as common heartfelt congratulations to the requestee on something good that happened to him (i.e.
sungcin ‘promotion’). Therefore, requests can save the requestee’s positive face without damaging the requestee’s negative face. The use of slang serves to support this conventional speech act in this instance.

Example 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE35] (W=R; -D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man shows interest in what a 30-year-old man has accomplished by asking him to get together for a celebration of the reader’s promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**sungcin-thek encey nay-iken-ci-yo?**
Promotion-treat when pay-will-SUP-POL
‘When will you treat me to celebrate your promotion?’

Besides lexical words, slang can also consist of verbal expressions as in example 49 and 50. In this case, they become slang terms through a phonological evolution from larger to small units. After voiceless bilabial stop $p$ is nasalized before nasal $n$ (i.e. $-p$-ni-$ta$ → $-m$-ni-$ta$), the nasalized consonant cluster is simplified into a single segment (i.e. $-m$-ni-$ta$ → $-m$-i-$ta$). After nasal consonant cluster simplification, even an unstressed vowel following stressed vowel $i$ is dropped for easier pronunciation (i.e. $-m$-i-$ta$ → $-m$-ta). The phonological evolution in the examples below is mimetic of casual pronunciation.

Example 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BE26] (W&lt;R; -D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man complains to a 30-year-old man about the deadline for shipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**nemwu-ha-si-$p$-ni-$ta$ → nem-ha-si-$m$-$ta$**
too much-do-HON-AH-IN-DC
‘It is unfair’

**i-ke i-tal-kkaci sencek mos-hay-yo**
this-thing this-month-until ship no-do-POL
‘I cannot ship this within this month’
A piece of group knowledge called slang plays a role in making common ground. As in English code-mixing, unless common knowledge has been established with a group or unless people in the group are capable or understanding pre-existing knowledge, the slang terms are inaccessible to the group. After group knowledge is presupposed in-group discourse, slang can be easily coded by in-group members. In this respect, slang acts as an in-group identity marker. This claim is supported by the follow-up questions in the interview. In example 51 and 52, based on follow-up interview questions, we were able to confirm that people in corporation B frequently use those particular slang terms for internal communication almost everyday. However, the same or even similar slang terms are never used in corporation A. Therefore, only after common knowledge needed to make sense of particular slang terms is shared among in-group members, can slang terms act as a signal to highlight in-group identity. Interestingly, as mentioned above, slang terms used in the corpus of business writing manifest the influence of oral language features on the written text (cf. Chafe 1992; Akar 1998; Nickerson 2000). The most common phonological feature for emphasis in Korean is the tensification of a lax consonant in that tensed consonants tend to symbolize “smaller, tighter, more solid, faster and more intensive and urgent actions or states” (Sohn 1994: 497). Word initial consonant clusters indicating stress are also found in slang terms, *telta* → *ttelta* ‘deduct’, *congnata* → *ccongnata* ‘finish’, as in examples 51 and 52. That is, consonants are clustered word initially to signal stress on consonants or for emphatic purposes.
Example 51
[BE6] (W=R; -D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man deduct something

\[\text{wuli-ke imi kyeleeng na-n-ke-ya} \]
our-thing already decision become-RL-thing-INT
‘Ours have already been determined’

\[\text{niney-ccok-eyse tel-eya-hay} \rightarrow \text{niney-ccok-eyse ttel-eya-hay} \]
your-side-from deduct-must-do
‘You should deduct yours’

Example 52
[BE7] (W=R; -D)
A 30-year-old man disagrees with a 30-year-old woman about a clerical assignment

\[\text{keken-un cinan tal-ey connga-n ken-i-yeyyo} \rightarrow \ldots \text{conunga-n ken-i-yeyyo} \]
that work-TOPlast month-in finish-RL work-is-POL
‘That work was finished last month’

6.2.3. Summary and discussion

Solidarity enforcement strategies are used to make solidarity by claiming common ground between participants. In this study, solidarity enforcement strategies are divided into two types ‘show interest’ and ‘use of in-group language’. On the one hand, showing interest in the reader’s wants or needs that his/her abilities be respected readily claims common ground and makes solidarity between participants. ‘Show interest’ strategy is subdivided into four groups: ‘notice, attend to R’, ‘emphasis’, ‘offer, promise’, and ‘anticipation statements’. By attending to something good that has happened to the reader, the writer can save the reader’s positive face. Furthermore, the writer emphasizes his/her high level of interest in the reader by using emphatic devices, such as booster and repetition. By expressing anticipation of the reader’s future act which is directly relevant to the reader’s wants using ‘anticipation statements’, the writer can also explicitly show that he shares common wants with the reader. The most overt way of
showing interest to make solidarity may be the giving of tangible things or at least the making of a promise to give something that the reader wants. As we have already mentioned, the idea that offering gifts threatens the reader’s negative face in Korea because of its debt-sensitive culture is a cultural stereotype. Normally, by placing this strategy (offer or promise) towards the end of a letter containing compliments, it enables the reader’s positive face, which has already been saved by compliments, to be enhanced. The majority of instances of the ‘show interest’ strategy occur in corporation A. It is heavily used by higher status people in AE, whereas less powerful subcontractors prefer the use of ‘show interest’ strategy in AL. In this respect, this positive politeness strategy can be a ‘power play’.

On the other hand, the use of in-group language implies common ground by signaling in-group identity. Therefore, using in-group language satisfies the reader’s positive face wants to be included. In-group language to claim common ground consists of English code mixed within Korean texts and slang terms. Since English code is understood only when there is presupposed knowledge, it can be a code to identify in-group members. Slang generally increases solidarity between intimates and it can be a code to show in-group identity. Slang terms in the Korean data manifest the influence of oral language features on the written text. Unlike corporation A, corporation B pays special attention to the reader’s positive face wants to be an in-group member by heavily using in-group language. Therefore, corporation A and corporation B consider two different dimensions of positive face wants.

In this study, we also found that some of the solidarity enforcement substrategies (e.g. boosters) do not inherently increase solidarity because those substrategies are also used to increase distance in FTAs and the delimiter particle man ‘only’ functions as a solidarity enforcement device to enhance the reader’s positive face in the FEAs.
6.3. Conflict avoidance strategy

Conflict avoidance strategy is used to reduce the force of positive or negative FTAs by avoiding overtly expressing positive or negative FTAs. Conflict avoidance strategies are divided into three groups: (1) be conventionally indirect, (2) mitigating devices, and (3) defocusing W/R or action from the FTA. Each group includes several substrategies. ‘Be conventionally indirect’ is subdivided into two groups: ‘want statements’ and ‘conditional appreciation’. ‘Hedges’, ‘apology’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’ are classified as ‘mitigating devices’. Finally, ‘defocusing W/R or action from the FTA’ has three substrategies: ‘avoid using I/you pronoun, ‘passive’, and ‘nominalize’. As in the solidarity enforcement strategy section of this chapter, I also include counterexamples under each related heading in order to support the claim that politeness should be assessed in context (Holmes 1995).

6.3.1. Be conventionally indirect

Because politeness is a necessary condition both for successful communication and for facilitating interpersonal relationships, and because one of the strong motivations for using indirect speech acts may be the need for politeness, there seems to be a relation between indirect speech acts and politeness. As far as conventionality is concerned, Searle (1975: 77) claims that “In order to be a plausible candidate at all for use as an indirect speech act, a sentence has to be idiomatic. But within the class of idiomatic sentences, some forms tend to become entrenched as conventional devices for indirect speech acts” (emphasis given). In my data, sentences are idiomatized in terms of the two lexical items of ‘want statements’ and ‘conditional appreciation’. Some other semantic devices (e.g. Searlean (1975) query preparatories such as ability (could) or willingness (would)) are not used as conventionally indirect request strategies in the corpus of
Korean business letters.

6.3.1.1. Want statements

Conventionally indirect requests are realized through the semantic device ‘want statements’ (i.e. *palapnita* ‘I hope’) in my corpus as in examples 53, 54, 55, and 56. Want statements mostly occur at the end of texts, as do many other requests in my data (cf. chapter 5). By formulating his request in ‘want statements’ to be indirect, the writer expects that the reader is willing to accept his request. Conventionally indirect requests realized by ‘want statements’ in Korean seem to be closely linked to formality. Their formality is marked by the formal deferential ending *-pnita*, which signals the most deferential level of (discernment) politeness in Korean. Besides the use of the formal ending, the nominal marker *-ki*, which immediately precedes ‘want statements’ *palapnita*, also seems to add to the formality of request illocutions. However, I exclude the nominal marker *-ki* in considering formality of conventionally indirect requests, because it comes from “other sources of variation” (i.e. nominalization) than conventionally indirect requests themselves (i.e. *palata* ‘hope’). Therefore, as Blum-Kulka (1987: 134) claims, conventionally indirect requests in the formulation of ‘want statements’ are characterized both by ‘convention of form’ (using formal ending *-pnita*) and ‘convention of means’ (using ‘want statements’: *palata* ‘hope’). Want statements are heavily used (AL being the only exception), when the writer’s status is lower than the reader’s (i.e. 71% (5/7) in AE; 75% (6/8) in BE; 87% (20/23) in BL).
Example 53

[BE4] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man check some work with the support team

ciwen-cook-ey hwakin hay po-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta
support-side-to check do see-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you will check it with the support team’

Example 54

[AL28-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 50-year-old man in corporation A requests payment for the full amount from a 40-year-old male business partner

cenayk ipkum-ha-ye cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta
full amount pay-do-by give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you will pay the full amount’

Example 55

[BL13-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that the reader (40-year-old man) persuade his business partner to do something

kwisa-uy kelayche-lul seltuk-ha-ye cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta
your firm’s business partner-AC persuade-do-by give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you will persuade your business partner’

Example 56

[BL14-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that the reader (40-year-old man) inform his business partner of the results of an experiment.

i-wa kwantyenhan silhem kyeikwa-lul chempwu-ha-oni,
this-with concern experiment result-AC enclose-do-since
‘I am enclosing the results of an experiment on this’

kwisa-uy kelayche-ey thongpo-hay cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta
your firm’s business partner-to inform-do give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you will inform your business partner of them’
6.3.1.2. Conditional appreciation

In this strategy, the writer mitigates the illocutionary force of his request by claiming his indebtedness to the reader. From this perspective, it can also be classified as B&L’s negative politeness strategy, ‘go on record as incurring a debt’. In examples 57 and 58, a request with an appreciation is made with the phrase –myen kamsahakeysssupnita ‘I would appreciate if...’ to be conventionally indirect.

Example 57

\[\text{[AE1]} (\text{W}<\text{R}; +\text{D})\]
A 20-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man continue to give him cash for lunch

cemsim-un piyong-ulo kyeysok cwu-si-myen kamsa-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
lunch-TOP cost-as continually give-HON-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I would appreciate it if you would keep giving me cash for lunch’

Example 58

\[\text{[BL6-outgoing]} (\text{W}<\text{R}; +\text{D})\]
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old male business partner meet the terms of an existing contract

tangsa-uy ipcang-ul kolye-haye kicon kelaycoken-ul kyeysok yuci-haye
our firm’s situation-AC consider-do existing dealing condition-AC continue maintain-do
cwu-si-n-ta-myen kamsa-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
do-HON-IN-DC-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I would appreciate it if you would consider our situation and continue to comply with the terms of the existing contract’

The writer uses an if-clause in order to hedge the illocutionary force of his request. Because the two-clause construction is more complex than a simple sentence for expressing thanks, it violates the Quantity Maxim. Additionally, it shows that the indebtedness expressed by the writer is conditional and it is entirely dependent on the completion of the reader’s action described in the if-clause. By letting the reader know that the expression of indebtedness is
conditional and is solely dependent on the reader’s intention or future action requested, the writer shows respect for the reader’s negative face wants because he gives the reader the option to choose. In general, thanks are passed from lower status people to higher status people in Korea. Therefore, thanking can be considered an acknowledgement of an asymmetric relation between participants (Leech 1983: 125) as well as a strategy to show deference to the reader. In this respect, thanking can play a significant role in mitigating the writer’s requests. As with apology, Koreans express thanks infrequently in normal contexts. Furthermore, thanking somebody can threaten the speaker’s own face because it is denigrating. Likewise, saying thanks can also cause him to lose his self-esteem as well, because it may possibly be humiliating for him. Therefore, thanking does not seem to be a natural or easy speech behavior in Korean. In this respect, we may consider the semantic origin of thanks in Korean and Japanese. Insofar as appreciation is concerned, B&L claim that the expression of thanks “is likely to have special force in cultures preoccupied with debt, such as Japanese” (1987: 210). The Japanese expression *ari gatou* ‘thank you’ originated from the notion of ‘difficulty’, *ari gatai* ‘difficult it is’. In the same vein, such redress is also implicitly conveyed in Korean reference to ‘difficulty’ buried in the expression for *kamsahapnita* ‘thank you’. The writer especially claims that his debt is causing the reader the difficulty, by encoding explicitly the notion of difficulty as shown in examples 59 and 60 (i.e. *elyewusitelato* ‘difficult it is’). Accordingly, thanking seems to be a sufficient and efficient way to mitigate the force of requests. Unlike Finnish (Yli-Jokipii 1994) and Turkish (Akar 1998) business texts, the corpus of Korean business letters contains expressions of the writer’s conditional gratitude to mitigate the force of request. In particular, the lower status people make heavy use of conditional appreciation in BL (i.e. 100% (8/8)). Conditional appreciation is preferred to make requests in external communications (i.e. 1 example in AE; no example in BE; 4 examples in AL; 8 examples in BL).
Example 59

[AL24-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A requests payment of the full amount receivable from a 40-year-old male business partner

eleywu-si-te-lato O-nyen O-wel O-il-kaici miswukum cencyk-ul
difficult-HON-PRS-even though 0-year 0-month 0-day-until an amount receivable-AC
ipkum wanlyo-haye cwu-si-myen kamsa-ha-kyess-sup-ni-ta
pay complete-do give-HON-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I would appreciate it if you pay the full amount receivable for the transaction by O, even though it is difficult for you to do’

Example 60

[BL36-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests the cancellation of an order from a 40-year-old male business partner.

eleywu-si-te-lato pon phwummok-uy cwumwunchwiso-lul pata
difficult-HON-PRS-even though this item-’s order cancellation-AC receive
cwu-si-n-ta-myen kamsa-ha-kyess-sup-ni-ta
give-HON-IN-DC-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I would appreciate it if you would consider our situation and allow us to cancel the order for this item, even though it is difficult for you to do’

6.3.2. Mitigating devices

Unlike highly conventional devices, such as ‘want statements’ or ‘conditional appreciation’, less conventional mitigating devices can be used to reduce the force of illocutions in many different ways (Labov and Fanshel 1977). For example, although each hedge has a conventional form, hedges vary in form, depending on their functions in different situations. Those mitigating devices can be used to modify the force of both positive and negative FTAs. In this section, mitigating devices include ‘hedges’, ‘apologies’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’.
6.3.2.1. Hedges

Hedges are politeness strategies for minimizing the force of FTAs. Hedges act as mitigators to make utterances sound less coercive or less offensive. Hedges express low certainty or less commitment about what the speaker is saying (‘an epistemic function of hedges’) in order that the speaker keeps an appropriate degree of distance, or reduces the threat to the hearer (‘an affective function of hedges’), thereby weakening the illocutionary force of his assertion, which can be an FTA (Hyland 2000). As Hyland (ibid.) claims, by diminishing certainty in his propositions through hedges, hedges also convey the writer’s modesty and respect for the reader’s opinion. Namely, besides communicating ideas, hedges also function as a medium to signal the writer’s attitude to the reader. In this respect, suffice it to say that hedges play a crucial role in doing successful communication in a modesty-high-value society, such as Korea. In Korea, modesty is one of the most important components of public self-image, which is ‘face’ (cf. chapter 3). By showing the uncertainty of the writer’s proposition through hedges, he denigrates himself and shows respect for other’s opinion. Self-denigration for the sake of modesty does not damage the writer’s self-esteem at all in Korea. In turn, displaying humility or modesty can be an effort to enhance his own face. In Korean hedges are one of the most important communicative devices used for reducing the damage to the relationship between the writer and the reader. They help reduce damage to the reader’s face and suggest respect for his or her opinion. Hedges include: (1) the quantitative hedge cokum/com ‘just, a little’, (2) delimiter particle –man ‘only’, (3) if-clause expression manyak...lanyen ‘if then’, (4) the quotative suffix –tako/-lako hata ‘it’s said that’, (5) dubitative words sayngkakhata/salyetoyta ‘think’, keskathta ‘seems like’, (6) the benefactive auxiliary verb cwuta ‘do for’ (lit. give), and
(7) lexical hedges such as *anthakkapkey* ‘pitiably’, *pwulhaynghito* ‘unfortunately’, *pwutuki* ‘unavoidably’ and *yukamsulepkeyto* ‘regrettably’. Those hedges occur overwhelmingly to mitigate the force of positive or negative FTAs in the Korean texts. Let me explain the use of hedges in Korean within the framework of B&L’s theory of face.

6.3.2.1.1. The quantitative hedge

By using *com/cokum* ‘just, a little’, the writer tries to mitigate the illocutionary force of positive FTAs. In other words, the quantitative hedge functions as a device for avoiding a direct confrontation with the reader. There are two reasons to avoid direct conflict. First of all, there is a difference in the status of the participants. For example, the reader in example 61 is in the higher position. By mitigating the current threat to the reader’s positive face wants, the writer tends to reduce the possibility of potentially critical responses from the more powerful reader. In this respect, hedges also function as self-face protective devices. Since the reader is currently higher than the writer in status and power, if the writer does not reduce the force of his acts which threaten the reader’s positive face, the reader will certainly pay the writer back by doing more serious and harsh FTAs to the writer later on.

Example 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE1] (W&lt;R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 20-year-old man objects to a policy proposed by a 30-year-old man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cehuy pwuse-eyse-nun cemsim piyong-ul sikkwen-ulo taychi-ha-si-keyss-ta-nun uykyen-ey-</em> our department-in-TOP lunch cost-AC vouchers-as substitute-do-HON-will-DC-RL opinion-to-nun <em>com pantay-i-p-ni-ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP a little disagree-is-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Our department slightly disagrees with the opinion that you substitute lunch expenses for vouchers’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of course, the quantitative hedge is not always used by people from lower to higher status. In example 62, the higher status writer avoids direct confrontation using the hedge for face saving purposes. In this instance, distance between participants already exists. Therefore, although the writer’s status is higher than the reader’s, he minimizes his FTA by using a mitigating device to express his opinion with a degree of uncertainty, thereby keeping the existing distance. This claim is also supported by the fact that hedges are heavily used in AE and BE when the distance between participants is great (i.e. 91% (21/23) in AE; 71% (5/7) in BE). Furthermore, in Korea, if someone with higher status or stronger power does positive FTAs in public, he also loses his own face. Therefore, by hedging the force of the positive FTAs for lower status people, the writer can also save his positive face to a certain extent.

Example 62

[AE26] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man complains to a 30-year-old man about a policy

tatun pwuse-ey pihay cennwuncekin cisik-i philyoha-n cehuy-lose-nun com
other department-in compare professional knowledge-NM need-RL we-as-TOP a bit
sepsep-ha-p-ni-ta
disappoint-do-AH-IN-DC
‘We are a bit disappointed with the policy because we need professional knowledge more than the other departments’

Furthermore, in example 63, the writer also uses the quantitative hedge to show respect for the reader’s opinion, doings, and so forth, regardless of whether he agrees or disagrees with the reader. In particular, in this case, the writer tries to avoid or minimize damage to the corporate face of the reader. By respecting the reader’s opinion through the hedge, the writer’s own face is to some extent saved. Another mitigating device is also used in example 63. Partial agreement (i.e. kwisakkeyse ceysikasyessten khaleynta ticainum cakphwumsengi twienia houngi cohasssupnita ‘Reactions to your calendar design were good because of its artistic excellence’)

Example 63

[BE24] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man talks about a policy

tatun pwuse-ey pihay cennwuncekin cisik-i philyoha-n cehuy-lose-nun com
other department-in compare professional knowledge-NM need-RL we-as-TOP a bit
sepsep-ha-p-ni-ta
disappoint-do-AH-IN-DC
‘We are a bit disappointed with the policy because we need professional knowledge more than the other departments’
hedges the force of disagreement. Partial agreement will be discussed in 6.4.1. in more detail.

Example 63

\[ \text{AL11-outgoing} \ (W<R; +D) \]
A 30-year-old man in corporation A does not accept a 40-year-old male subcontractor’s request

\text{kwih\-a\-kkeyse ceysi-ha-sye-ss-te-n khaleynta ticain-un cakphwumseng-i ttwiena}
you-NM propose-do-HON-PST-RT-RL calendar design-TOP artistry-is excellent
\text{houng-i coh-ass-sup-ni-ta-man tangsa imici-wa-nun cokum keli-ka iss-ta-ko}
reaction-is good-PST-AH-IN-DC-but our firm image-with-TOP a bit distance-NM is-DC-QT
\text{salye-tway-ss-sup-ni-ta}
think-become-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘Although reactions to your calendar design were good because of its artistic excellence, we think that it is a bit far from matching our firm’s image’

The quantitative hedge is also used in consideration of the reader’s negative face as in examples 64 and 65. In general, in my data, hedges are used more often in the negative FTA (i.e. request: 65% in AE; 71% in BE; 66% in AL; 87% in BL) than in the positive FTAs (i.e. disagreement and giving bad news). As shown above, the quantitative hedge functions as a communicative device so that the force of the (potential) face threats is softened. Furthermore, by mitigating the degree of imposition or showing that the reader is just partially imposed on, the writer reduces his imposition on the reader’s negative face wants. Probably, the writer’s intention to minimize the burden or debt on the reader can also save his own positive face by fulfilling his goal properly (i.e. the reader’s acceptance of his request).
Example 64

[AE28] (etc.)
A 40-year-old man requests that each person in charge meet the schedule

\[ \text{kak tamtangca-kkeyse cokum sinkyeng sse cwu-sye-se ilceng-ey} \]
\[ \text{each person in charge-NM a little attention pay give-HON-by schedule-in} \]
\[ \text{chacil-epsi cinhayng-toy-l swu isskey pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta} \]
\[ \text{problem-no proceed-be-will way to ask-give-AH-IN-DC} \]
\[ \text{‘I ask each person in charge to pay a little bit more attention to meeting the schedule without any delays’} \]

Example 65

[BE28] (W<R; -D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man consider his current situation

\[ \text{i-ke i-tal-kkaci sencek mos-hay-yo} \]
\[ \text{this-thing this-month-until ship no-do-POL} \]
\[ \text{‘I cannot ship this within this month’} \]

\[ \text{com pwa-cwu-sey-yo} \]
\[ \text{a bit save-give-HON-POL} \]
\[ \text{‘I ask you to please consider my situation a bit more’} \]

6.3.2.1.2. Delimiter particle

Delimiter particle —man ‘only’ also plays a similar role in reducing the writer’s burden on the reader. It tones down the illocutionary force of request as in example 66. By downsizing his request through the hedge (i.e. a request for a slight delay of the shipping date), the writer may minimize the damage to the reader’s negative face wants. The writer can also save his positive face by justifying his request through reducing the size of his request.
Example 66

[BL23-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 20-year-old man in corporation B requests to delay the shipping date from a 40-year-old male business partner

*sensek ilca-lul hyenci saceng-uloh inhay ilcwuil-*man* nucchwu-eya hal kes*

shipping date-AC on the spot circumstance-as because one week-only delay-have to do thing

*kath-sup-ni-ta*

seem-AH-IN-DC

'It seems that the shipping date should be delayed for a week only because of the circumstances on the spot'

6.3.2.1.3. If-clause expression

Another hedging device is if-clause. The writer uses if-clauses to mitigate the force of FTAs. In examples 67, 68, and 69, if-clauses (i.e. *-tamyen*) are used to minimize the force of making requests. The writer shows respect for the reader's negative face wants by checking the possibility of getting a favorable reaction to the writer's request.

Example 67

[BL27-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old male business partner increase the quantity of shipments

*khun mwuli-ka eps-usi-ta-myen, sencekmwullyang-ul nullye-cwu-si-n-to-myen*

big problem-NM no-HON-DC-if, shipping quantities-AC increase-give-HON-IN-DC-if

*kamsa-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta*

thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC

'If there is no problem, I would appreciate it if you would increase the quantity of shipments'

Example 68

[AL58-outgoing] (etc.)
A 50-year-old man in corporation A requests that a 50-year-old man give a lecture once again

*kihoy-ka toy-si-n-to-myen, tasi hanpen ciio-lul pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta*

opportunity-NM become-HON-IN-DC-if, again once lecture-AC request-give-AH-IN-DC

'If it is possible, I ask you to give a lecture once again'
Example 69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BL.25-outgoing] (W&lt;; +D)</th>
<th>A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests an offer from a 40-year-old male business partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*hyencay kicon offer-ka yuhyo-ha-ta-myen, i-tal mal hanulo cay offer hay*
current existing offer-NM effective-do-DC-if, this-month end within again offer do
*cuw-si-myen kamsa-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta*
give-HON-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘If the existing offer is valid, I would appreciate it if you would confirm the offer again by the end of this month.’

Interestingly enough, the writer in example 70 mitigates the force of his request by promising to offer something of equal value or proposing a concrete way or means to pay back the debt incurred by his request (i.e. to amend the established L/C). Furthermore, the writer’s promise to pay off such a debt is expressed as an *if*-clause using the future tense in order to save the reader’s negative face by respecting the reader’s freedom to choose. To some extent, this strategy seems to be related to the theory of ‘reciprocity’. In order to compensate for requests, the writer can convey cooperation and involvement between participants by specifying the reciprocal rights or mutual commitments. Therefore, by claiming a reciprocal relationship between the reader’s response to the writer’s request and the writer’s compensation to the reader, the writer tends to negate or lessen the debt. In this respect, this strategy also sounds like one of B&L’s positive politeness strategies, *assume or assert reciprocity*. As shown in the examples below, although hedges are mostly used by the lower status people in BL (i.e. 82%), people with stronger power in BL use more hedges (i.e. 75%). Since more powerful writers using this strategy insist on symmetrical reciprocity, the existence of real symmetry between power non-equal participants is not plausible.
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old male business partner increase the quantity of shipments.

Example 70

```
[BL27-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old male business partner increase the quantity of shipments
cwungalhay-cwu-si-n-ta-myen, kicon-ey kayse-toye iss-mun
increasing quantity-AC allow-do-give-HON-IN-DC-if, existing-in establish-be is-RL
L/C-lul kotpalo amend-ha-tolok ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
L/C-AC immediately amend-do-to do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘If you allow me to increase the quantity, I will immediately amend the established L/C’
```

6.3.2.1.4. Quotative suffixes and dubitative words

Other hedging devices, quotative suffixes and dubitative words, are also commonly used in Korean. Quotative suffixes and dubitative words are noncommittal sentence-final markers. They are used when the writer is uncertain about his propositions (e.g. 71) or wants to avoid direct reference to the FTA done by the writer (e.g. 72, 73, 74). Furthermore, the writer seeks to soften the force of positive FTAs by withholding his responsibility using noncommittal sentence-final markers, quotative suffixes and dubitative words. For example, the use of the quotative suffix in example 71 (i.e. –tako hapnita ‘It is said that’) also tends to save the writer’s own face by indirectly showing his desire not to take full responsibility.

Example 71

```
[BL27-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B conveys bad news to a 40-year-old male business partner
hyencay kapcaksulen swuyo-hwaktay-lo pon phrumunik-uy hyencayko-ka onun O-wel O-il
current sudden demand-expand-by this product-‘s current stock-NM coming O-month O-day
kyeng-i-myen, patak-na-l kes-ulo yeysang-toy-n-ta-ha-p-ni-ta
around-is-if, out of-turn out-will thing-as expect-become-IN-DC-QT do-AH-IN-DC
‘It is said that this product will go out of stock in O due to unexpected demand inflation’
```

Among the many hedges, dubitative words in examples 72, 73, and 74 (i.e. –kes kathsupnita ‘It
seems that'; sayngkakhapnita ‘think’) are most closely associated with humility or modesty in Korean. They imply that the statement is the writer’s ‘humble’ opinion. By denigrating himself and showing respect for the other, the writer tends to save both the reader’s and his own face.

Example 72

[AE4] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man does not accept a 30-year-old man’s request to meet a deadline

**hoysocioipilceng-ul thongpo-hay-cwusye-ss-nuntey**

deadline-AC inform-do-give-HON-PST-but

cenhv puweye-eyse-rm ku ilceng-ul macwwu-ci mos-ha-l kes kath-sup-ni-ta

our department-in-TOP that deadline-AC comply-NOM no-do-will thing seem-AH-IN-DC
‘Although you set a deadline, it seems that our department cannot meet the deadline’

Example 73

[AL18-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 40-year-old man in corporation A does not accept a 50-year-old male business partner’s request for a price reduction

**kwisa-uy 3% kakyekhalin yocheng-un patatul-i-l swu eps-ul kes kath-sup-ni-ta**
your firm’s 3% price reduction request-TOP accept-is-will no-AC thing seem-AH-IN-DC
‘It seems that we are unable to accept your request for a 3% price reduction’

Example 74

[BL13-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B disagrees with a 40-year-old male business partner’s opinion

**i-nun kacang kiponcekin senipshwul-ul mwusi-ha-n caykokwanli pwusil-lo**

this-TOP the most basic first in first out-AC ignore-do-RL stock control unreliable-because

**palsaynghan mwuncey-i-ci phwumcilmwuncey-ka ani-la-ko sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta**

happen problem-is-NOM problem of the quality of product-NM no-DC-QT think-AH-IN-DC
‘I think it happens not because of the quality of product but because of the unreliable stock control procedure which ignores the basic order of acquisition’

6.3.2.1.5. The benefactive auxiliary verb

Another hedging device is the benefactive auxiliary verb cwuta ‘do for’ (lit. give). A bald on
record utterance, implying a command, turns into a request with redress after adding the benefactive auxiliary verb *cwuta* (cf. Cho 1982). This hedging device makes the writer the recipient and the reader the giver of the speech act. Accordingly, the writer considers the reader as of higher status by putting himself in the position of the recipient to give the reader a choice or rights to accept or reject the writer’s request as in examples 75 and 76. By respecting the reader through the benefactive auxiliary verb *cwu*, the writer mitigates the illocutionary force of his request. Probably, that is why this auxiliary verb is used in many cases with the modal suffix –*keyss* ‘may’ in Korean (e.g. *ikes com hay cwusikeysseyo?* ‘Could you do this for me?’).

Besides a promissive function, the modal suffix –*keyss* also functions as a hedge. In making a request, by assuming that the reader will not be able or want to accept the writer’s request and expressing his request indirectly, the writer can show his effort to minimize his assertions or impositions. The use of the modal suffix –*keyss* seems to be related to the satisfaction of this want. By being pessimistic or hypothetical in making a request through the modal suffix, the writer also tends to lessen or negate the possibility of being rejected.

Example 75

[BE27] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man do an office job

*kumcwumal-kkaci-nun pantusi ceychwul-hay cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta*
end of month-till-TOP definitely submit-do do for-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you definitely submit it by the end of this month’
Example 76

[AL25-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A requests payment of the full amount receivable from a 40-year-old male business partner

\[
\text{sangki miswukum-ul } O\text{-nyen } O\text{-wel } O\text{-il han cenayk ipkum-ha-ye} \\
\text{above the amount receivable-AC } O\text{-year } O\text{-month } O\text{-day by full amount pay-do-by} \\
\text{cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta} \\
\text{do for-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC} \\
\text{‘I hope you will pay the full amount receivable for the transaction by O’}
\]

6.3.2.1.6. Lexical hedge

Lexical items can also be hedging devices to attenuate the force of face-threatening utterances as in examples 77, 78, and 79 (i.e. \textit{pwutuki} ‘inevitably’; \textit{yukamsulepkeyto} ‘regrettably’).

Example 77

[AL25-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A requests that a 40-year-old male subcontractor pay the full amount receivable

\[
\text{manyak sangki ciceng kiil-kkaci ipkunchi anh-ul-si-nan ponuy-nun ani-ona pwutuki} \\
\text{if above assign day-until pay no-will-HON-TOP real intention-TOP no-but inevitable} \\
\text{kwiha-kkeyse ceykong-ha-si-n tampomwul-ey tayhaye tyepecochi-lo hoyswu} \\
\text{you-NM offer-do-HON-RL mortgage-to about law-in redeem} \\
\text{ha-keyss-saoni} \\
\text{do-will-since} \\
\text{‘If you don’t pay by O assigned, we will be obliged to redeem the collateral by law’}
\]

Example 78

[AL21-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor conveys bad news to a 40-year-old man in corporation A

\[
\text{yukamsulepkeyto kwisa-eyse uyloy-ha-sye-ss-te-n OOceyphwum-uy napki-} \\
\text{regrettably your company-in ask-do-HON-PST-RT-RL OO product-’s date for supply-} \\
\text{ka ciyen-toy-I wikit-ey iss-sup-ni-ta} \\
\text{NM delay-become-will crisis-in is-AH-IN-DC} \\
\text{‘Regrettably we face a crisis of failing to meet the deadline for supplying OO product’}
\]
6.3.2.2. Apology

According to B&L (1987: 187), apologies are relevant to negative politeness strategies, in that the apologizer can clearly express and acknowledge his impingement on the apologist’s freedom of action in making requests to mitigate the damage to the reader’s negative face through announcing his overt apology. For example, in Korean, we may say, coysonghaciman changmwan com tatacwusieyseyo? ‘I am sorry but could you please close the window?’ In this sentence, apology is a strategy for mitigating threat to the addressee’s negative face wants. That is, in making a request, the apologizer makes an apology for his imposition by admitting the impingement or conveys his reluctance or lack of intention to impose on the apologist to mitigate the illocutionary force of his request. Apology in this case is not a normal functioned apology (e.g. an apology made to a complainer) to accept his fault, but a so-called ‘pseudo-apology’ functioning as only to mitigate the force of FTA for politeness concerns. In example 80 the writer admits his impingement on the reader’s negative face. In general, Koreans use apologies infrequently. Moreover, a superior is much less likely to make an (overt) apology to an inferior in Korea. Furthermore, due to the strong tendency to avoid overt apologies, apologies can be made indirectly in numerous ways in Korean (e.g. admit impingement, (promise to) offer, acknowledge responsibility, etc). In this sense, example 80 does not show overt meanings for apologies in order to mitigate the force of requests, as in ‘I’m sorry for disturbing you because you are busy at the moment but....’. But even only acknowledging the
superior’s imposition on the inferior (i.e. each person in charge) through understanding and acknowledging the reader’s current difficult situation (i.e. *pappun epmwu* ‘busy work’) also implies an apology in the Korean business context. Therefore, it can be interpreted as an apology.

Example 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE28] (etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 40-year-old man requests that each person in charge meet the schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pappun epmwu-ey-to</em> kak tamtangea-kkeyse cokum sinkyeng sse cwu-sye-se ilceng-busy work-in-even each person in charge-NM a little attention pay give-HON-by schedule ey chacil-epsi cinhayng-toy-l swu isskey pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta in problem-no proceed-be-will way to ask-give-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘In spite of the busy work, I ask each person in charge to pay a little bit more attention to meeting the schedule without any delays’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apology can also be a device to reduce the damage to the reader’s positive face by avoiding facing a direct confrontation with the reader in doing the positive FTA. In fact, apologies are used most frequently to reduce the force of the positive FTAs (i.e. 67% (2/3) in AE; 100% (2/2) in BE; 100% (8/8) in AL) in the Korean data. In this case apology can compensate the apologee for performing the positive FTAs by causing damage to the apologizer’s positive face because the apologizer denigrates himself by apology. Apologies are normally made by people whose status is lower than the apologee to express respect for the apologee in normal context in Korean. In this respect, apologies tend to acknowledge distance between participants for politeness concerns. Indeed, in my data, apologies are heavily used in AE and BE when the distance between participants is great (i.e. 100% (3/3) in AE; 100% (2/2) in BE).

In example 81, the writer apologizes for rejecting the reader’s request to supply him with a product to mitigate the force of his rejection. The writer’s objection to the reader’s request must threaten the reader’s positive face. Thus in this case, apology (i.e. *sakwatulipnita* ‘apologize’)
functions as a way of reducing the damage to the reader’s positive face by avoiding a direct confrontation. Example 82 also supports the view that ‘apology’ can sometimes function as a hedging device depending on context in that it is also used in juxtaposition to another hedging device sayngkakhapnita ‘I think’ to mitigate the force of the writer’s positive FTA even more.

Of course, this dubitative hedge sayngkakhapnita does not act to hedge ‘apology’ (coysongsulepkey ‘sorry’), because even without apology the dubitative hedge itself can also serve a hedging function to mitigate the force of the positive FTA. On the other hand, although it is a ‘pseudo-apology’, making an apology to mitigate the force of the positive FTAs may cause damage to the writer’s positive face, because it shows that the writer is weaker than the reader in power.

Example 81

[AL2-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor informs a 40-year-old man in corporation A of failing to meet the deadline for supplying the product

napkiil-ul macchwucimos-ha-n-ta-n mun cem tasi han-pen allye-tuli-myen date for supply-AC meet no-do-IN-DC-RL point again one-time inform-give-and
kiphi sakwa-tuli-p-ni-ta
deeply apology-give-AH-IN-DC
‘I deeply apologize for failing to meet the proposed deadline for supplying the product’

Example 82

[AL20-incoming] (W=R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor informs a 40-year-old man in corporation A of failing to meet the deadline

mence napki-lul cikhi-ci mos-hay coysongsulepkey sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta
first date for supply-AC meet-NOM no-do sorry think-do-AH-IN-DC
‘I think I am sorry for failing to meet the proposed deadline for supplying the product’

As shown in examples 81 and 82, in the Korea business context, in general an inferior (i.e. a subcontractor) apologizes to a superior (i.e. a contractor) based on power differences. So an
apology implies an acknowledgement of the apologizer's lesser power over the apologee to some extent. The apology itself can be interpreted as accepting the apologizer's inferiority to the apologee. Therefore, (overt) apologies in the Korean business context are used for making distance between participants for politeness purposes by expressing power differences. Holmes's (1995) findings (i.e. apologies in her corpus mostly occur between status or power equals) only seem to be applicable to the internal communications (i.e. 67% (2/3) in AE; 50% (1/2) in BE). In this case, the social distance between participants is great (e.g. example 83).

This finding goes along with Meyerhoff's (1999: 229) remark: "the deference expressed by an apology may be motivated by the social distance between the interlocutors, as well as by a power difference between them."

Example 83

|BE18| (W=R; +D) |
|---|---|---|
|A 30-year-old man conveys bad news to a 30-year-old man|
|i-pen chwucin-hay-ss-te-n O-yakhwum swuip-ken-i mwusan-toy-ss-eyo|
|this-time carry out-do-PST-RT-RL O-medicine importation-job-NM fail-become-PST-POL|
|coysong-hay-yo|
|sorry-do-POL|
|‘I am sorry but the importation of medicines O has been cancelled’|

6.3.2.3. Give overwhelming reasons

Like apologies, reasons or rationales for doing the FTAs can act to reduce the force of the face-threatening speech acts (cf. Condon 2001; Glover 2000; Trosborg 1995). In this sense, reasons serving a mitigating function do not make much sense in ‘face-enhancing acts’, such as compliments. As supportive statements, plausible reasons are ‘external modifications’ because they modify the force of the FTAs within their immediate context without being placed within the FTAs (Faerch and Kasper 1989). When supportive reasons given by the writer are
understandable and reasonable to the reader, they act as mitigators for doing the FTAs. Therefore, in doing the FTAs, the action can be assessed for its underlying motive or reason for politeness purposes. In this respect, proposing proper and overwhelming reasons for doing the FTAs to the reader seems to be a productive and reasonable politeness strategy to mitigate the force of the FTAs. By providing evidence, the writer may also be able to “justify his/her accusation or reprimand so that it appears convincing” (Trosborg ibid: 329, emphasis in the original). Therefore, the writer saves his own face by justifying his unavoidable FTAs through his explicit explanation of difficult situations incurring the FTAs and the implication that he has made every effort to avoid the FTAs. However, if the reasons do not seem to be appropriate to the reader, s/he does not accept the reason as a mitigating device. Instead, the reason possibly increases damage to the reader’s face. In this case, it is the misuse of politeness strategy and only a self-face protective device. In examples 84, 85, and 86, the writers provide the readers with convincing explanations or reasons (i.e. IMF hoysasanghwangi cohci anha ‘business conditions are not good because of the IMF’; phelphu kakyeki kuptung ‘the price of pulp is skyrocketing’; sayngsammunglyek ‘the production capacity’) to show that doing positive FTAs is inevitable and unintentional. As shown in examples 84, 87, and 88, ‘give overwhelming reasons’ is heavily used in internal communications when the distance between participants is great (i.e. 97% (35/36) in AE; 81% (26/32) in BE). Additionally, as in examples 85 and 86, people with less power in AL (i.e. subcontractors) use more ‘give overwhelming reasons’ (i.e. 62% (37/68)).
Example 84

[AE16] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man informs a 30-year-old man of a cancellation of the foreign business trip

\[ \text{IMF-lo hoya-sanghwang-i coh-ci anha i-pen oykwuk chwal-cang-i paykcihwa} \]
IMF-by company situation-NM good-NOM no this-time foreign business trip-NM cancel

toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
become-PST-AH-IN-DC

‘Because business conditions are not good because of the IMF (the International Monetary Fund), the foreign business trip is cancelled at this time’

Example 85

[AL3-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor does not accept a 40-year-old man’s request for a price reduction

\[ \text{kumnven phelphu kakyek-i kuptung-ha-ko iss-nun Kwankye-y-lo tocehi} \]
this year pulp price-NM sky rocketing-do-and is-RL relation-because at all

twisa-uy coken-ul ttalul swu eps-nun sanghwang-i-p-ni-ta
your company-’s condition-AC follow way no-RL circumstance-is-AH-IN-DC

‘Since the price of pulp is sky-rocketing this year, it is impossible for us to comply with your condition’

Example 86

[AL7-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor does not accept a 40-year-old man’s request

\[ \text{tangsa-uy sayngsa-nunglyek-ulo-nun O-wel O-il-kkaci napphwum-ha-n-ta-nun kes-un} \]
our firm-’s production capacity-by-TOP O-month O-day-by supply-do-IN-DC-RL thing-TOP
tocehi mwuli-lako sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta
at all impossible-QT think-do-AH-IN-DC

‘Because of our production capacity, we are unable to supply the product to you by O’

As shown in examples 87 and 88 (i.e. sayngsanlain katonghwu kyelceng ‘decision made after operating the production line’; commission pending), ‘give overwhelming reasons’ is also used to minimize the force of request.
Example 87

[AE7] (W=R; +D)
A 40-year-old man requests that a 40-year-old man conduct an investigation

sayngsantain katong-hwu kyelceng-ha-n sahang-i-oni tasi kemtho
production line operate-after decide-do-RL matter-is-since again investigate
pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta
request-give-AH-IN-DC
‘Since the decision was made after operating the production line, I request that you conduct an investigation again’

Example 88

[BE24] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man gives a reason why he requests that a 40-year-old man pay commission

commission pending-i simha-p-ni-ta
commission pending-NM serious-AH-IN-DC
‘There is a major commission pending’

cosokhan songkumcochi pwuthak-tuli-p-ni-ta
quickly pay request-give-AH-IN-DC
‘I ask you to pay commission as soon as possible’

As in the case of apologies, to some extent this conflict avoidance strategy may also be loosely linked to B&L’s positive politeness in that if the supportive reason conveyed by the writer is also understandable and reasonable to the reader, it could easily bring about agreement with the reader. Nevertheless, seeking agreement on the writer’s FTA has nothing to do with the reader’s positive face wants. Instead, it may only reflect the writer’s positive face wants. Therefore, the primary function of giving reasons in my data is rather to minimize the effect of the writer’s FTAs. However, a reason given by the writer can itself be bad news to the reader, depending on the context. For instance, in examples 89, 90 and 91, reasons (i.e. sikphwumwisayngpepsang isang ‘breaking the Food Sanitation Act; ’phanmaypwucin ‘sales decline'; phwummokuy hayoy phanmaykwenun imi thasaey wiim ‘granting the foreign sales right for the product to other company’), which are bad news for the reader, may double the
damage to the reader’s face. In this respect, giving overwhelming reasons does not inherently function to mitigate the force of the FTAs.

Example 89

[AE22] (W>R; +D)
A 30-year-old man asks a 30-year-old man to discuss a matter with the people in charge

sikphwumwisayngpep-sang isang-i iss-ul-ci moluni, cosokhi tamtangcatul-kwa
the Food Sanitation ACT-in problem-NM is-will-SUP since, quickly people in charge-with
hyeptny-hay-ya ha-l kex-ulo phantam-toy-p-ni-ta
discuss-do-should do-will thing-as think-become-AH-IN-DC
‘Since we are breaking the Food Sanitation Act, I request that you discuss the matter with the people in charge as soon as possible’

Example 90

[AL29-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 20-year-old man in corporation A gives a reason why they withdrew the product to a 50-year-old male subcontractor

phanmay pwucin-ulo inhay sayngsan cwungei toy-l swu pakkey eps-nun
selling inactivity-by cause produce stop be-will way only no-RL
sanghwang-i-ess-sup-ni-ta
situation-is-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘Since sales declined, we had to withdraw the product’

Example 91

[BL8-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old man’s request to be supplied with the product

kwisa-cye-see mwunuy-ha-si-n phwummok-uy hayoy phanmaykwen-un ini thasa-ey
your firm-in ask-do-HON-RL item’s foreign sales right-TOP already other firm-to
wiim-ha-yess-ki (taymwunye) pon phwummok-ul kwisa-ey kongkup-hay-tuli-ki-nun
entrust-do-PST-NOM because this item-AC your firm-to supply-do-give-NOM-TOP
eyep-ta-nun cem-ul allye-tuli-p-ni-ta
difficult-DC-RL point-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC
‘Since we already granted the foreign sales right for this product to other company, we inform you that we are unable to supply this product to you.’

In example 92, a reason does not serve a mitigating function either. The cause adverbial clause
After carrying out a quantity survey, we found that there is a very big difference in quantity. The subordinate clause (I ask you to find the reason for this and request you to take follow-up action) is subordinate to its main clause. Without the subordinate clause, the main clause cannot exist. Therefore, the reason in example 92 does not act as a mitigating device for doing the FTA.

Example 92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BL49-outgoing</th>
<th>(W&lt;R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cinan cwumal sencek-ha-n kwisa-uy OOO 300kg-i hyenci tochak-haye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last weekend shipping-do-RL your firm-`s OOO 300kg-NM on the spot arrive-do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thongkwan-hwu cosa-kyelkwa, cwulyang-ey maywu khan chai-ka iss-sup-ni-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear the customs-after check-result, quantity-in very big difference-NM is-AH-IN-DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘After arriving on the spot, clearing customs, and then carrying out a quantity survey of your OOO 300kg, we found that there is a very big difference in quantity’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3. Defocusing W/R or action from the FTA

Conflict avoidance strategy can be realized by defocusing the agent/patient involved in the FTA or the FTA itself. Since Jenkins and Hinds’s (1987) seminal work on cross-cultural business letter writing, several investigations have been done to explicate strategic choices of subject pronouns in conveying propositional information where volition or intention exists (cf. Akar 1998; Nickerson 2000; Yli-Jokipii 1994). As “orientation devices” (Jenkins and Hinds 1987),
subject pronouns can reflect corporate culture because to a certain extent the use of subject pronouns manifests the relationships between power (non-) equal participants. In a similar vein, pronominal choices can also be associated with the theory of ‘face’, in that pronouns can be chosen strategically to make solidarity or distance between participants. Furthermore, because business correspondence is a sort of ‘self-effacing genre’, special attention is being paid to self-eradication (i.e. the use of inanimate subjects). The claim that business correspondence is a ‘self-effacing genre’ is supported by the overall percentage of the use of subject pronouns in my data. The numbers and percentages of types of subject used in the Korean data are shown in the tables below.

Table 6.1. Frequency of subject pronouns in the internal communication of corporation A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N(%)</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(8%)</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td>46(86%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2. Frequency of subject pronouns in the internal communication of corporation B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N(%)</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3(9%)</td>
<td>2(6%)</td>
<td>29(85%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. Frequency of subject pronouns in the external communication of corporation A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N(%)</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(4%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>91(96%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. Frequency of subject pronouns in the external communication of corporation B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N(%)</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>80(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the Finnish (Yli-Jokipi 1994) and Turkish (Akar 1998) data, the most common pronoun in written business communications in Korea falls into the ‘other’ category. The ‘other’ category consists of inanimate noun phrases, including the firm itself, the issues, department, products of the firm, occupational terms, etc. I assume that the high frequency of the ‘other’ category is basically due to the predominantly task-oriented environment of the business world. It is fair to
say that office work is a highly goal-oriented activity. In addition, needless to say, business writing is a highly self-effacing genre. Therefore, a state (without action) is emphasized much more than an action with a human agent due to the primary transactional functions of official business, such as conveying information, as in examples 93 and 94 (i.e. *swuchwultaykum senipkum yocheng* ‘asking for prepayment of an export fee’ and *taykumkyelceymankiil* ‘the settlement date’).

Example 93

[BL34-outgoing] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner’s request for prepayment of an export fee

*kwisa-eyse yocheng-ha-si-n swuchwultaykum senipkum yocheng-kwa kwanlyenhaye
your firm-in request-do-HON-RL an export fee prepayment ask for-with concerning
*naipwuheyepuy-lul ha-yess-uma, elywul kes kath-sup-ni-ta
inner discussion-AC do-PST-but, difficult-will thing seem-AH-IN-DC
‘Although we had an internal discussion, it seems that your request for prepayment of an export fee is difficult for us to accept’

Example 94

[BL17-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 40-year-old in corporation B gives a reason why he requests that a 50-year-old male business partner urge his business partner to make payments

*pokken-ny taykumkyelceymankiil-i cinan O-wel O-il i-p-ni-ta
this-job’s settlement date-NM last O-month O-day is-AH-IN-DC
‘The settlement date of this job was in last O’

*kwisa kelayche-ey sinsokhi yenlak-ha-sye-se pokken ey tayhan taykuncikup-ul
your firm business partner-to quickly correspond-do-HON-by this job-to about payments-AC
tokchok-hay cwui-ki pala-p-ni-ta
urge-do give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC
‘I hope you quickly urge your business partner to make payments for this job’

That is, ‘what did [non-human agent] happen?’ is more important than ‘what did [agent] do?’ (Brown and Miller 1991) in the business context. The high frequency of referring to human
agents may weaken the objectivity of business discourse. The writer's statements would not be subject to substantial interpretation for efficient communication. Accordingly, the non-human participants increase the coherence of the business texts. The writer can control the use of human subject pronouns in order to deliver information more properly and directly. The heavy use of the passive and topicalization is also another reason for the high percentage of the 'other' category. By defocusing a human participant through placing a non-human participant in the subject position, the writer increases distance from information implying FTAs. Probably, that's why the passive is only used in the speech act of giving bad news, not in any other speech acts. I will discuss the passive voice in greater detail in the next section.

This prevailing tendency towards self-effacement in written business communication is applicable to the theory of politeness to some extent. According to B&L (1987), dissociation or self-effacement from the FTAs may be achieved by impersonalizing speaker and hearer. In particular, one of necessary processes in people's evaluation of face during FTA events may be the attribution of the agent. In a 'face' event, the action must be assessed for its agent (i.e. is the agent fully or at least partly responsible for doing the FTA?) (cf. Lakoff 1977). Therefore, basically assessing the agent for the FTA permits a decision about who gets the blame (i.e. who will be responsible and losing face?). In this respect, the matter of impersonalization might generally be relevant to face-saving purposes (Yamada 1997). The manifestation of the extreme of impersonalization is probably the omission of subject. However, to consider the ellipsis of subject pronoun in Korean as a feature of a face-saving strategy seems problematic, because basically it is triggered by a typological reason (i.e. situation focus language). Sohn (1994: 82) explains the omission of subject in Korean.

A verb must have a subject, which is not dummy in a sentence. However, verbal sentences without overt subjects are very common, since any nominal argument may be omitted if
recoverable from discourse or situational context. This most commonly occurs when the subject is one of the participants in a conversation or when the subject has just been mentioned.

Typologically speaking, Korean is a ‘situation-oriented language’ (Sohn 1999), because contextually understood elements (e.g. subject or object) are frequently omitted as in example 95. When two people talk to each other in normal Korean context, if the subject is naturally predictable and is not ambiguous, using subject pronoun sounds odd or awkward, excluding the special cases in which the subject pronoun is emphasized (e.g. subject contrast) as in example 96. Otherwise, in normal Korean contexts there is no problem in identifying which one is acting as a subject or an object even though it normally does not overtly appear in the sentence.

Example 95
a. Seoul nun seykvey eyse ceyil khun tosi-ipnikka?
   World in first big city-is
   ‘Is it the largest city in the world?’
b. Yey, seykvey eyse ceyil khun tosi-ipnita (Pak 1977, quoted in Jung 1999)
   ‘Yes, (it) is the largest city in the world’

Example 96
a. Ø pay ka kophunteyyo
   stomach hungry-am
   ‘(I) am hungry’
b. Na nun mok ka malunteyyo (Jung 1999: 199)
   I throat thirsty-am
   ‘I am thirsty’

Therefore, using contextually understood elements may make sentences unnatural and it may be redundant in normal discourse situations in Korean. In many cases, contextually understood elements (e.g. 1st person singular/plural pronoun; 2nd person singular pronoun; other noun
phrases) are also dropped even in business letters because the writer or the reader is naturally predictable. For instance, in examples 97, 98, and 99, subjects are omitted. Therefore, regardless of FTA situations, in Korean, omitting subject or object seems more likely to be an unmarked behavior. This claim may be supported by the overall percentage of omission of subject pronouns in my data (i.e. 63% in AE; 61% in BE; 62% in AL; 64% in BL).

Example 97
[AL33-incoming] (W=R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor gives a reason for requesting a solution to a 50-year-old man in corporation A

kwisa kwumay tantangca-lompwute palewu-pat-un kheychap 300g lolci cwumwun
your firm buying and selling person-from order-receive-RL ketchup 300g roll of paper order
-ul chwiso-pat-ass-sup-ni-ta
AC cancel-receive-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘(I) received the cancellation of an order for a roll of paper for the packaging of 300g ketchup which was ordered by the person in charge of buying and selling in your company’

Example 98
[BL44-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B complains to a 40-year-old male subcontractor about a delay in pursuing business

cinan O-wel O-il, tangsa-uy sencek instruction-ey tayhan kwisa-uy epmwu swuhayng-i
last O-month O-day, our firm-’s shipping instruction-to about your firm-’s business pursue-NM
nuceci-n cem-ey tayhay simhi-yukam-i-p-ni-ta
delay-RL point-to about very afraid-is-AH-IN-DC
‘(I) am very worried about your delay in pursuing your business for following our shipping instruction in last O’

Example 99
[BL58-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A appreciates a 40-year-old male business partner’s decision

kumpen kyeyya-k maywu cwungyo-ha-n isyu-yess-te-n kakyekmwncey-wa
this time contract-when very important-RL issue-PST-RT-RL matter of price-with
kwannyen-ha-ye kwisa-uy kyeltan-ey cinsiim-ulo kamsa-tuli-p-ni-ta
concern-do-by your firm-’s decision-to heartfelt-as thank-give-AH-IN-DC
‘(I) express my heartfelt thanks for your decision regarding the matter of price which was a very important issue in this contract’
Unlike B&L’s sub-strategies for impersonalizing S&H, in this study, only two subgroups, ‘avoid using I/you pronoun’ and ‘passivization’, are used to avoid direct reference to the writer or the reader. I classify ‘nominalization’ as ‘defocusing the FTA’, because nominalization in Korean does not seem to work in a manner consistent with the role of defocusing W/R. Defocusing the FTAs through nominalizations does create an impression of formality and distance between participants. In this respect, we can consider defocusing the FTAs as a conflict avoidance strategy.

6.3.3.1. Avoid using I/you pronoun

6.3.3.1.1. Pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun

Among subject pronouns, special attention has been paid to ‘we’ because of its strategic use in business texts (Haverkate 1992). In Korean, there is an exclusive/inclusive distinction in the first person plural pronoun. Inclusive ‘we’ is typically used to present the writer as a member of the group, which includes the reader, and to reaffirm the in-group relationship between the writer and the reader (see Fairclough 1989 for the use of inclusive ‘we’ in newspapers). On the other hand, the exclusive ‘we’ occurring in my data is closely associated with the so-called B&L’s business ‘we’ to a certain extent. B&L (1987: 202) contend that “there is also the widespread phenomenon of ‘we’ used to indicate ‘I’ + powerful which is a corporate identity” (emphasis given). That is, the exclusive ‘we’ signals that the corporation rather than simply the individual is responsible for the utterance (Neumann 1997). From this perspective, I strongly agree with Haverkate’s (ibid) characterization of pronominal choices as mitigating devices. That is, like passivization, we can consider the pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun as a device to
defocalize or mitigate the propositional content, which is the FTA.

Writers also may use the ‘we’ pronoun in place of ‘you’ to mitigate his propositional content and to make solidarity with the reader (Bilbow 1997; Nickerson 2000). In this case, the writer can minimize the force of his request by using the ‘we’ pronoun instead of the ‘you’ pronoun, create solidarity by assuming shared knowledge with the reader through the use of ‘we’, and persuade the reader to agree with the writer. By the same token, in Swales and Rogers’ (1995) work on mission statements, the use of the first-person-pronoun ‘we’, denoting an employee, plays a significant role in making solidarity. In my data, there are no examples of the use of ‘we’ for ‘you’.

In contrast, the function of the exclusive ‘we’ pronoun is directly linked to ‘defocalization’. In this occasion, the writer tends to make distance from the FTA by using the ‘we’ pronoun. For example, in example 100, the ‘we’ pronoun (i.e. cehny) is used instead of the ‘I’ pronoun (i.e. ce) in an FTA situation. In normal Korean context, self-disclosure is uncommon due to the collective nature of the Korean language and society (Hofstede 1994; Mulholland 1997). This observation may be consistent with Bernstein’s (1971) statement on the distinction between closed and open communication systems. That is, in social groups with closed communication systems (e.g. Korea), the interests of the group (i.e. we-orientation) supersede those of the individual (i.e. I-orientation). In this respect, the primary function of using exclusive ‘we’ seems to be motivated by rhetorical considerations. That is, exclusive ‘we’ is used to make texts more formal. By making distance between participants through the collective subject ‘we’, the writer renders his correspondence more formal.
Example 100

[AЕ23] (W<Р; +D)
A 30-year-old man complains to a 30-year-old man about excessive work

\[
\text{wuli-pwuse-eyse-nun yocum 2 myeng-uy inwen-i thoycik-ha-n sangthay-la kayngcanghi pappun}
\]
our-dept.-in-TOP lately 2 people-'s staff-NM retire-do-RL situation-because very busy
\[
\text{epmwu-sokey ppalli cakep-ul hay tulye-ss-nuney}
\]
business-in fast work-AC do give-PST-although
‘Even though we finished the work quickly in spite of being very busy due to the retirement of two people in our department’

\[
\text{celhuy-lose-nun maywu hwangtang-ha-p-ni-ta}
\]
we-as-TOP very confuse-do-AH-IN-DC
‘we are having a very hard time’

The use of the ‘I’ pronoun (i.e. ce) is usually avoided even in less formal e-mail messages due to its self-assertive characteristic, which possibly increases the damage to the reader’s face in the FTA, as in example 101 (see Hyland 2001 for the positive function of self-mention in research articles).

Example 101

[BE27] (W<Р; +D)
A 30-year-old man complains to a 30-year-old man about interfering with his work

\[
\text{cakkwu ile-si-myen ce il mos-ha-p-ni-ta}
\]
keep do this-HON-if I work no-do-AH-IN-DC
‘If you keep doing this, I cannot do my work’

The Korean data does not confirm the presence of the writer’s perspective, due to the low frequency of the ‘I’ or ‘we’ pronoun in the corpus of Korean business letters. Nevertheless, inanimate noun phrases, such as wuli/celhuy pwuse ‘our department’ (e.g. example 100) (20% of the ‘other’ category in the internal communication of corporation A) and tangsa ‘our company’ (35% of the ‘other’ category in the external communication of corporation A; 38% of the ‘other’ category in the external communication of corporation B) indirectly support the ‘we-orientation’.
The major subject in the ‘other’ category, *tangsa* ‘our firm’, is used to present the writer as part of a powerful group to the reader. By adopting writer-oriented noun phrase such as *tangsa* ‘our firm’, the writer tends to support and strengthen both a corporate identity and the writer orientation already established through the use of exclusive ‘we’ emphasizing ‘we + powerful’ over ‘I + powerful’ (Akar 1998). Probably, that is why ‘pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun’ strategy is most frequently used in AL and BL when the writer is more powerful (i.e. 70% in AL; 76% in BL). Example 102 shows explicitly how heavily *tangsa* ‘our firm’ is used within a single text. In addition to the single use of *tangsa* ‘our firm’ as a subject, the possessive forms (i.e. *tangsauy sakyu* ‘our firm’s regulation’; *tangsauy ipcang* ‘our firm’s situation’) are also used to underscore the writer orientation. Pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun strategy is overwhelmingly used to minimize the force of the positive FTAs (i.e. 100% in AE; 100% in BE; 91% in AL; 93% in BL).
Example 102

[BL6-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B objects to a 40-year-old male business partner’s request for an extension of the settlement condition

anmyeng-ha-si-p-ni-kka?
‘How are you doing’

kumpen yocheng-ha-si-n kyelceycoken 120 days-nun tangsa sakyusang swuyong-
this time request-do-HON-RL settlement condition 120 days-TOP our firm regulation accept-
i elyepta-nun cem allye-tuli-p-ni-ta
NM difficult-RL point inform-give-AH-IN-DC
‘I inform you that, because of the our firm’s regulations, it’s difficult to accept the settlement condition of 120 days that you requested’

ilpancekulo tangsa-nun D/A coken-ul pwulheha-na, kwisa-wa-nun yeyoycek-ulo
in general  our firm-TOP D/A condition-AC reject-but, your firm-with-TOP exception-as
D/A coken 60-il kyelceycoken-ul swuyonghay on pa iss-sup-ni-ta
D/A condition 60-day settlement condition-AC accept doing way is-AH-IN-DC
‘We generally reject D/A conditions but we will make an exception and accept the D/A 60 day settlement condition proposed by your firm’

kulena, 120 days-louy yencang-un tangsa-lose-nun tocehi swuyong-ha-ki elyewun
but, 120 days-to extension-TOP our firm-as-TOP at all accept-do-NOM difficult
ceyan-i-oni
proposal-is-since
‘But, since an extension of 120 days is difficult to accept at all’

tangsa-uu ipcang-ul kolye-ha-ye kicon kelaycoken-ul
our firm’s situation-AC consider-do-by existing dealing condition-AC
kyeysok yuci-ha-ye cwu-si-n-ta-myen kamsa-ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta
continue maintain-do-by give-HON-IN-DC-if thank-do-will-AH-IN-DC
‘I would appreciate it if you would consider our situation and continue with the existing contract’

6.3.3.1.2. You-attitude

Now, in relation to the pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun, let us expand our discussion to you-attitude in Korean business discourse. As directly stated in 6.3.3, much attention has been given to the concept of ‘you-attitude’, ‘I-attitude’, or ‘we-attitude’ in business communication theory. Unlike the case of evading responsibility, these notions may apply to politeness. Namely, the
writer can minimize or avoid self-assertiveness by focusing on ‘we’ instead of ‘I’. Furthermore, ‘you-attitude’ is an important part of generosity in that it can maximize benefit to the reader by noticing or emphasizing his/her wants or needs (Locker 1994). Despite its positive function, however, in many cases the reader’s perspective is strongly avoided by some cultures. Yli-Jokipii (1994) asserts that only American culture is sensitive to the concept of ‘you-attitude’ in her cross-cultural study of British, American, and Finnish business writing. In contrast, the Finnish data shows a strong aversion to direct reference to the reader. The same is true for the Korean data. In my data, the reader’s perspective is strongly avoided in external communication in particular, because of its negative function of increasing the force of the FTA. Unlike English, in Korean there is a distinction between the singular and plural form of ‘you’. That is, singular ‘you’ can only be a plural if it is followed by the plural suffix –tul. The use of plural ‘you’ as a subject does not occur in my data. In general, reference to the reader in doing the FTAs is avoided even in the possessive forms in the Korean data. ‘You’ referring to the reader in the FTA situations is normally used in the Tu group (i.e. between very close colleagues) or when distance is not great between participants. The reader-orientation can display the ‘you-attitude’ in a negative way in Korean, as Barbour (1987) warns us. Namely, in dealing with the illocutionary force of the you-attitude, we also have to focus on the negative use of ‘you’. Let us consider example 103 where the reader orientation is realized. Example 103 is not an authentic question to solicit information or an opinion. But it is a nonconventionally indirect request by adopting the strategy ‘questioning hearer’s commitment’ without referring any ‘components’ of the requested act (Weizman 1989, 1993), thereby the requester tends to minimize the force of his request. However, in this case, the ‘you’ pronoun (i.e. ne) seems to contribute “deontic force” to the FTA in that it conveys “obligation or necessity” (Yli-Jokipii 1994: 231). Since the ‘you’ pronoun can increase the threat to the reader’s (negative) face seriously in doing the FTA, the writer tends to avoid direct reference to ‘you’ in occupational terms in example 104 (e.g.
ticaine ‘designer’).

Example 103

[BE2] (W>R; -D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 20-year-old man check some work with the support team

ne ciwen-thim-ey hwakin hay pwa-ss-e?
you support-team-to check do try-PST-Q
‘Did you check it with the support team?’

Example 104

[AE2] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man take certain action

ticaine-kkeyse cakep-si silswu-ha-si n kes-inci hwakin-ha-si-e cokuphan cochi
designer-NM work-when mistake-do-HON-RL thing-if check-do-HON-and quick action
pwathak-tuli-p-ni-ta
request-give-AH-IN-DC
‘I ask you to take quick action after checking if you, the designer, made a mistake in your work’

6.3.3.2. Passive

Certainly it is better not to over use the passive voice when attempting to produce documents in clear, but vigorous prose for efficient communication in business correspondence. However, in Korean business writing, the passive voice seems to be frequently used for politeness concerns. According to B&L, “the passive coupled with a rule of agent deletion is perhaps the means par excellence in English of avoiding reference to persons involved in FTAs” (1987: 194). The writer tends to avoid personal involvement by placing something other than the agent at the sentence-initial position in order to minimize the force of the FTA. Therefore, the passive structure provides the writer with a sort of device for removing the human agents involved the action especially in potential FTA situations. Due to the discourse- or situation-oriented
character of the Korean language, passivization seems to play a role in defocusing rather than removing or deleting subject noun phrases by means of putting the new subject at the sentence-initial position (cf. Sohn 1999), and thereby the FTAs are camouflaged and de-emphasized in passive sentences. For example, in examples 105 and 106, new subjects (i.e. isang ‘a problem’; kwisa pangmwunken ‘plan to visit your firm’) are used instead of real subjects (i.e. ce ‘I’; ilpon Osa ‘the Japanese firm O’). As shown in examples 105 and 106, the lower status people in external communications make heavy use of the passive voice (i.e. 75% (6/8) in AL; 75% (3/4) in BL).

Example 105

[AL46-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 20-year-old man in corporation A conveys bad news about an inferior product to a 50-year-old male subcontractor

‘OO’ ceyphwum-uy kyocengsuli-sangey isang-i palkyen-toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
‘OO’ product-’s revised mock-up-in problem-NM find-become-PST-AHM-IN-DC
‘The problems in the revised mock-up of ‘OO’ product have been found’

Example 106

[BL33-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B conveys bad news to a 40-year-old male business partner

ilpon O-sa-uy kwisa pangmwunken-i heyni saceng-ulo inhay
Japan O-corp.-’s your firm visiting-NM spot reason-by cause
yenki-toy-ess-sup-ni-ta
postpone-become-PST-AHM-IN-DC
‘The Japanese corporation O’s plan to visit your firm has been postponed due to the circumstances on the spot’

i-lo-inhay pon project swuhayngsiki-ka maywu nucchwe-cye
this-from-cause this project pursue-NM very delay-become
‘This project will be substantially delayed because of this’

In internal communications, the passive voice is mostly used when distance between participants is great (100% (4/4) in AE; 75% (3/4) in BE) as in examples 107 and 108.
Example 107

[AE12] (W=R; +D)
A 30-year-old man conveys bad news to a 30-year-old man

\[ \text{sinceyphwum OOO-ka phanmaypwucin-ulo onum O-wel O-il-cal o ceyphwum} \]
\[ \text{new product OOO-NM sales decline-since this O-month O-day-in product} \]
\[ \text{sayngsancwungci chepwun-toy-ess-sup-ni-ta} \]
\[ \text{withdraw process-become-PST-AH-IN-DC} \]
\[ \text{‘The new product OOO was withdrawn because sales declined’} \]

Example 108

[BE17] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man conveys bad news to a 40-year-old man

\[ \text{O-sa-lpwpwuhe commission ipkum-i acik-kkaci toyka iss-ci anh-sup-ni-ta} \]
\[ \text{O-company-from commission pay-is yet-until become is-NOM no-AH-IN-DC} \]
\[ \text{‘The commission from corporation O has not been paid yet’} \]

Besides the placement of a new item other than the main subject in subject position, the passive voice also appears to be connected to the rhetorical effect of the message. Namely, the passive voice tends to make the actions themselves less strong. For example, in example 109 the action involving the FTA is weaker in the passive voice (i.e. chwisotoyta/paykcihwatoyta ‘be cancelled’) than in the active verb (chwisohata/paykcihwahata ‘cancel’), because the intent of the agent of the action is not explicit in the passive voice. That is, the action of giving bad news is de-emphasized in the passive voice (cf. Yli-Jokipii 1994: 204). The passive voice establishes a tone of ‘detachment’ by de-emphasizing the action of threatening face (Chafe 1982). Therefore, passivization makes a sentence formal so that it keeps distance from the FTA that the writer gives. In this respect, it can also be classified as a conflict avoidance strategy. In general, transitive verbs can have passive forms with passive suffixes, -i, -hi, -li, and -ki, in Korean, however, compound passive verbs, the verb toyta ‘become’ combined with verbal nouns, are mostly used for passivization in my corpus (e.g. palkyen-toyta ‘be found’ in 105; yenki-toyta ‘be
postponed' in 106; chepwun-toyta 'be withdrawn' in 107; ipkum-toyta 'be paid' in 108; chwiso-toyta, paykcihwa-toyta 'be cancelled' in 109).

Example 109

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE16] (W=R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man informs a 30-year-old man of the cancellation of a foreign business trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kyeoyk-hay-ss-te-n oywkul cwhulcang kyeoyk-i chwiko-toy-n cem-ul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plan-do-PST-RT-RL foreign business trip plan-NM cancel-become-RL point-AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>allye-tuli-p-ni-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inform-give-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'I inform you that the plan for a foreign business trip has been cancelled'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMF-lo hoysasanghwang-i ehoct anha i-pen oywkul cwhulcang-i paykcihwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMF-because business condition-NM good no this-time foreign business trip-NM cancel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>toy-ess-sup-ni-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>become-PST-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Because business conditions are not good because of the IMF, the foreign business trip is cancelled at this time'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yangci-hay cuw-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>understand-do give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'I hope that you understand this situation'

When we consider the frequency of the passive in Korean business correspondence, interestingly, the passives are used only in a particular speech act giving bad news (i.e. 20 examples in total only in the sentences of giving bad news), as shown in the above examples. In addition to face-saving purposes, probably the use of the passive in the Korean corpus is only limited to this speech act because of its rhetorical effect. Since its propositional content referring to a certain state (of affair) called bad news is basically more important than the illocutionary act, passivization is preferred over explicitly describing the particular state. By the same token, the writer increases distance from information or news s/he gives by defocalizing a human participant through placing a non-human participant in the subject position. This statement is
consistent with the earlier finding that the 'other' category is the most frequently used orientation for subject pronouns in the speech act of giving bad news.

6.3.3.3. Nominalize

Although a verb itself is a word for describing some kind of action, the action can be defocused or obscured and the tense of the action prototypically omitted by nominalizing the verb (Kollin 1996). Nominalization converts an action that pertains to an agent into a nominal construction without agent so that a sentence becomes more abstract and formal. In this respect, as in the case of the passive voice, formality is increased in the sentence by nominalization. Therefore, nominalization can be a convention for constructing formal prose, such as business correspondence. In example 110, by ending the sentence with a nominalized verb (i.e. yomangham 'request'), it becomes a more official or bureaucratic sentence than a deferential declarative sentence with formal deferential ending -pnita (i.e. yomanghapnita 'request'). Probably, that is why the writer in AE and BE makes heavy use of nominalizations when the distance between both parties is great (i.e. 85% (17/20) in AE; 92% (12/13) in BE) as in examples 110 and 111.

Example 110

[BE22] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old woman finish a work assignment

\[
\begin{array}{l}
onul-kkaci \ pantusi \ cheli-ha-ko \ thoykun-yomang-ha-m \\
today-until \ definitely \ process-do-and \ leaving \ work-request-do-NOM \\
'Leave your work after you completely finish this assignment today'
\end{array}
\]
Example 111

\[[AE7\] (W=R; +D)\]

A 40-year-old man informs a 40-year-old man of a clerical error

\[cinan-pen\ \text{cwu-si-n}\ \text{phawuchi}\ \text{khuki-lul}\ \text{kemtho-hay}\ \text{pon}\ \text{kyelkwa}\ \text{mae-ci}\ \text{anh-mun-ta-ko}\]

\text{last-time}\ \text{give-HON-RL}\ \text{pouch}\ \text{size-AC}\ \text{check-do}\ \text{see}\ \text{result}\ \text{suit-NOM}\ \text{no-IN-DC-QT}\]

\[sayngkak-ha-p-ni-ta\]

\text{think-do-AH-IN-DC}\]

\text{‘The size of the pouch that you gave last time is different from what I expected’}\]

B&L contend that “the more nouny an expression, the more removed an actor is from doing, or being something” (1987: 208). Yli-Jokipii (1994: 236) also maintains that “removing the perspective from the writer and the reader to an “alien” item in the discourse helps the writer to “play it safe””. However, one thing that we have to remember in considering Korean nominalization with respect to politeness is that although formality is expressed in the nominalized sentence, because of the situation or discourse oriented character of the Korean language, normally the agent is not placed immediately before the nominalized items. That is, in Korean, nominalized constructions are made with the nominal suffixes, \(-ki\), \(-ci\), and \(-(u)m\).

Nominalization in Korean does not require a possessive construction. Even though there are nominalized possessive constructions in Korean (e.g. \text{kuy\ elisekum} ‘his stupidity’), normally the subject of a nominalized possessive construction and the genitive particle \(-uy\) are omitted altogether. Furthermore a nominalized clause in Korean is normally embedded within the sentence where it is subordinate as in examples 112, 113, 114, and 115 (i.e. \text{cwungtanhaki} ‘cessation’; \text{kyelcenghayessum} ‘decision’; \text{pwulkaham} ‘impossibility’; \text{kongkuphaytuliki} ‘offer’).

As shown in the examples below, the lower status people particularly in BL make heavy use of nominalizations (i.e. 58% (30/52) in AL; 80% (36/45) in BL).
Example 112

[AL27-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 50-year-old man in corporation A conveys bad news to a 50-year-old male subcontractor

*yukamsulepkeyto tangsa-nun i-pen O-wel O-il calo kwisa-wany kelay-lul*
regrettably our firm-TOP this-time O-month O-day in your firm-with dealing-AC

cwungtan-ha-ki-lo kyelceeng-ha-yess-um-ul allye-tuli-p-ni-ta
cessation-do-NOM-as decision-do-PST-NOM-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC

'Regrettably we inform you that we have decided to cease dealing with your firm'

Example 113

[BL5-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner's proposal

*kicon-uy 60-il coken-ul 90-il-lo yencang-ha-nun mwuncey-nun tangsa-lose-nun*
existing'-s 60-day condition-AC 90-day-to extension-do-RL matter-TOP our firm-as-TOP

swuyong-i pwulka-ha-m-ul allye-tuli-p-ni-ta
acceptance-NM impossible-do-NOM-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC

'We inform you that the extension of the existing 60 day condition to 90 days is an impossible proposal to accept'

Example 114

[BL12-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner's request

*kumpen-uy kwisa-uy kakyek-inha-yocheng-un swuyong-pwulka-ha-m-ul*
this time'-s your firm'-s price-reduction-request-TOP accept-impossible-do-NOM-AC

allye-tuli-oni
inform-give-since

'We are unable to accept your request for a price reduction at this time'

Example 115

[BL8-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner's request

*pon phwummok-ul kwisa-ey kongkup-hay-tuli-ki-nun elyep-ta-nun cem-ul*
this product-AC your firm-to supply-do-give-NOM-TOP difficult-DC-RL point-AC

allye-tuli-p-ni-ta
inform-give-AH-IN-DC

'We inform you that we are unable to supply this product to you'
Nominalization is also used in negative FTAs as in the below examples (i.e. *hay cwusiki* ‘reset’ in 116; *chamcohasiki* ‘refer to’ in 117; *caykemthohay cwusiki* ‘reconsider’ in 118).

**Example 116**

[AE3] (W<R; +D)

A 30-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man reset the deadline

`cay ilcengkwanli-lul hay cwu-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta`

again setting the deadline-AC do give-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC

‘I hope you will reset the deadline for the work assignment’

**Example 117**

[BL22-outgoing] (W<R; +D)

A 20-year-old man in corporation B requests that a 40-year-old man refer to the results of the bid

`ipchalkyelkwa-lul chempwu-ha-oni chamco-ha-si-ki pala-p-ni-ta`

the result of a bid-AC enclose-do since refer to-do-HON-NOM hope-AH-IN-DC

‘I hope you will refer to the results of the bid that I am enclosing’

**Example 118**

[BL3-incoming] (W>R; +D)

A 50-year-old male subcontractor requests that a 40-year-old man in corporation B reconsider a price increase

`kakyek insang-ey tayhay caykemtho-hay cwu-si-ki-lul pwuthak-tuli-nun pa-i-p-ni-ta`

price increase-to about reconsider-do give-HON-NOM-AC request-give-RL way-is-AH-IN-DC

‘I ask you to reconsider a price increase’

As shown in above examples, nominalized items themselves are not inherently placed in the subject position but move relatively freely (see Akar 1998 and Yli-Jokipii 1994 for “Communicative Dynamism”). In this sense, nominalized constructions in Korean do not seem to have anything to do with the subject pronoun or its position. Therefore, B&L’s claim about dropping subject pronoun in FTA events as negative politeness does not seem to be applicable to Korean nominalization. Only in the sense that nominalization does create an impression of
formality and distance between the writer and the reader, may it be considered B&L’s negative politeness. Like passivized verbs, nominalizations seem to have a rhetorical effect on the message. Namely, the writer can avoid presenting the action strongly because the action is nominalized. By defocusing the agent’s action by nominalization, the writer can bring distance to the utterance and readily increase its formality.

On the other hand, by topicalizing nominalized action in the subject position, the agent becomes more oblique. When nominalized constructions are topicalized by attaching the delimiter particle –(n)un after them in sentence-initial position, they can function as subjects, so that they defocalize the real agent in the sentence. For example in example 119, a nominalized clause is topicalized to strengthen the defocalization of the agent (i.e. tangsa ‘our company’). Since verbs are not topicalized as they are, they are only topicalized after they become nominalized (e.g. pwutamhalyehata ‘intend to share’ (verb) → pwutamhalyeham (nominalization) → pwutamhalyehamun (topicalization) in example 119 (cf. Sohn 1994).

Example 119

[BL42-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner’s request

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ipchalcoken-ey myengki-toy-n senceknalca-lul macchwu-ci mos-ha-n kes-ey tayhan} \\
\text{bidding condition-in specify-be-RL shipping date-AC meet-NOM no-do-RL thing-to about} \\
\text{chaykim-ul tangsa-wa pwuntam-ha-lye-ha-m-un tangsa-lose-nun tocehi} \\
\text{responsibility-AC our firm-with share-do-intention-do-NOM-TOP our firm-as-TOP at all} \\
\text{naptuk-ha-ki elyep-ta-nun cem-ul allye-tuli-p-ni-ta} \\
\text{understand-do-NOM difficult-DC-RL point-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC} \\
\text{‘We inform you that we are unable to accept your request to share the responsibility for being unable to meet the shipping date specified in the terms of the bid’}
\end{align*}
\]

As shown in example 120, in addition to nominalized constructions which are topicalized as a subject in the grammatical subject position, the real subject (i.e. tangsa ‘our company’) can also
be defocused or camouflaged by placing it immediately behind nominalized items which are


topicalized with the topic marker −(n)un (i.e. kumpen yochenghasin kyelceycokenun ‘the


settlement condition you request at this time’). A nominalized item topicalized before the main


subject functions to avoid the direct reference to the subject doing the FTA. Only in this case,


nominalizations in Korean function to defocalize the agent. In summary, nominalizations in


Korean have two functions: formalizing the sentence and defocusing the agent. Basically,


nominalizations in Korean function to make distance between participants by making sentences


more formal and official. In this respect, nominalizations in the Korean data do not seem to be


inherently restricted only to FTAs as shown in example 121.


Example 120

[BL5-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old male business partner’s request


kumpen yocheng-ha-si-n kyelceycoken (D/A)-un tangsa-lose-nun
this time request-do-HON-RL settlement condition (D/A)-TOP our firm-as-TOP
swuyong-ha-ki elyepta-nun cem-ul allye-tuli-p-ni-ia
accept-do-NOM difficult-RL point-AC inform-give-AH-IN-DC
‘We inform you that it is difficult to accept the settlement condition (D/A) that you request at this time.’


Example 121

[BL44-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation B gives a reason why a work assignment has been delayed to


a 40-year-old male business partner


i-loinhay tangsa-nun cwumalchuwul pal hangkongphyen-ul nohchi-m-ul inhay
this-cause our firm-TOP departing during weekend airplane-AC miss-NOM-as cause
tangsa kelayche-ka yokwuhan delivery time-ul cwunswu-ha-ci mos-ha-nun
our firm business connection-NM request delivery time-AC keep-do-NOM no-do-RL
sathey-ka palsaying-ha-yess-sup-ni-ta
situation-NM happen-do-PST-AH-IN-DC
‘So, it has transpired that, due to missing the air shipment during the weekend, we are unable to
meet our business partner’s delivery time’
6.3.4. Summary and discussion

Contrary to the solidarity enforcement strategy to show interest in something good that happened to the reader or to use in-group language to signal in-group membership, conflict avoidance strategy is mainly used to avoid or minimize conflict between participants. In my data, conflict avoidance strategies include ‘be conventionally indirect’, ‘nonconventional mitigating devices’, and ‘defocusing W/R or action from the FTA’. The writer can make a request in a conventionally indirect way through two different types of routine declarative sentences: ‘want statements’ and ‘conditional appreciation’. ‘Want statements’ make sentences more indirect. In addition, by using formal deferential ending –pnita with want statements, one adds to formality in making a request. Using the ‘conditional appreciation’ strategy for making an indirect request, not only performs the function of mitigation, but also allows the requester to give the requestee an option to choose whether the requestee will accept or reject by using if-clause constructions.

Needless to say, doing the FTAs is far from politeness. Nevertheless it is unavoidable in some situations. In these situations, mitigating devices are used to reduce the force of the FTAs. They include ‘hedges’, ‘apology’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’. Undoubtedly, hedges modify the force of the FTAs. Like hedges, apology usually acts to mitigate the force of the FTAs in my data. In addition, apology is affected by contextual factors, such as P and D. The reasons or rationales for doing the FTAs can be expressed to reduce the force of doing the FTAs because the face-threatening-actor can justify his FTA with a proper reason. However, giving a reason for doing the FTA can also increase the damage to the reader’s face, depending on the context.

The writer can make sentences more formal by defocusing W/R or the action itself from the FTA. This conflict avoidance strategy serving a defocalizing function has three subgroups:
‘avoid using I/you pronoun’, ‘the passive’, and ‘nominalize’. In general, the use of the ‘I’ pronoun, increases the illocutionary force of the FTAs in that it makes sentences more subjective. By the same token, ‘you’ as a subject is also strongly avoided for politeness concerns in Korean business letters. Among the subject pronouns, the most common pronoun in Korean business letters is the ‘other’ category, which indirectly supports the ‘we’ orientation (i.e. tangsa ‘our company’). The frequent occurrence of the ‘other’ category is also due to the use of the passive. By placing a non-human participant in the subject position, the writer makes distance from the action s/he makes. That is, by using the passive voice, action-oriented sentences shift to state-oriented sentences. Naturally they make sentences more objective and conservative, so that they make distance from the utterance implying the FTA. Nominalizations, like passivizations, increase formality by defocusing the agent’s action. However, nominalizations in Korean do not have much to do with the subject pronoun and its position. Only when the nominalized items are topicalized, do they function as defocusing the true subject.

6.4. Off-record

Efforts have been made to understand the relationship between indirectness and politeness (B&L 1987; Lakoff 1973; Leech 1983; Searle 1975). They argue that a higher degree of indirectness increases politeness. Indirect illocutions increase the degree of optionality, and when an illocution is more direct, its force needs to be more diminished and tentative for politeness concerns (Leech 1983: 108). Off record strategies allow the speaker to produce an utterance that leaves it to the hearer to interpret its meaning by speaking nonconventionally indirectly. Therefore, the degree to which the meaning of an utterance is understood determined by the hearer’s pragmatic competence. Without shared knowledge between interlocutors, the
hearer cannot comprehend the true meaning of the speaker’s utterance properly. Off record utterances are typically vague and can be interpreted in more than one way. For example, consider sentence 122, which is basically a request (for price reductions). That’s why the delimiter particle –ma'n ‘only’ is used to minimize the force of making a request (see 6.3.2.1. for discussion of the hedging function of the delimiter particle –ma'n). It also represents the giving of bad news because the business was not conducted successfully due to disagreements with the reader on the current price of an item.

Example 122

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[BL24-outgoing] (W&lt;R; +D)</th>
<th>A 30-year-old man in corporation B requests a price reduction from a 40-year-old male business partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manyak kwisa-eyse kg-tang US$2-man kakyekinha-hay cwu-si-n-ta-myen, pon ken-i</td>
<td>if your firm-in kg-each US$2-only price reduction-do give-HON-IN-DC-if, this job-NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sengsa-toy-l swu iss-ul kes-ulo salye-toy-p-ni-ta</td>
<td>succeed-be-will way is-AC thing-as think-become-AH-IN-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘If you reduce prices by only US$2 per kg, I think that it may succeed’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, I follow the model formulated by Weizman (1989, 1993) to explicate the opacity of off record utterances. Types and degree of opacity for two dimensions (i.e. propositional content and illocutionary device) can be encoded into nonconventionally indirect speech acts. ‘Propositional content’ contains three categories: zero, component, and act. ‘Zero’ does not refer to the reader, the act or its components. ‘Component’ refers to the component of a request. ‘Act’ refers to the act and its components. ‘Illocutionary device’ contains four categories: zero, questioning hearer’s commitment, questioning feasibility, and stating potential grounder. ‘Zero’ does not state any illocutionary intent. ‘Questioning hearer’s commitment’ checks if the hearer is willing or commits to do some act for the benefit of the speaker. ‘Questioning feasibility’ checks some pre-condition for the act. ‘Stating potential grounder’ gives a reason why the act is
In this study, off record strategies are divided into two types: ‘reasonableness’ and ‘act in question’.

6.4.1. Reasonableness

Giving reasons is one hinting strategy. Writers indicate the reason to indirectly do the FTAs without explicitly expressing its illocution (Zhu 2000). This substrategy of hints looks similar to one of the conflict avoidance strategies which also functions as a mitigator give overwhelming reasons, which mainly supports the forthcoming FTA and reduces its force, in that it is also justifies the writer’s FTAs. However, this hinting strategy is different from the conflict avoidance strategy because it presents the FTAs to the reader’s face (i.e. reason itself functions to do the FTA). For example, in sentences 123, 124, and 125, the writers nonconventionally indirectly do the FTAs by showing reasons (i.e. caykoka namaissci anhsupnita ‘It is out of stock’ in 123; sayngsanul cwungtan ‘the product withdrawal’ in 124; sole agentka imi issmun ciyek ‘the area where there is our sole agent’ in 125). Furthermore, the main clause is omitted in each of these examples for politeness purposes. One way to construct a nonconventionally indirect speech act in Korean is to omit the main clause (Sohn 1999: 418). By omitting the main clauses which carry the writer’s assertions (thereby avoiding a direct confrontation) (i.e. ttalase ceysitoyn kakyekulo naphhwumi pwulkanumphapnita ‘therefore, it is impossible to supply at the suggested price’ in 123; ttalase kwisay yochemgul swayonghal swu epssupnita ‘therefore, we cannot accept your request’ in 124; ttalase yochenghasin ciyekeynum pon phwummokul kongkup hay tulil swu epssupnita ‘therefore, we are unable to supply the product in the area’ in 125), the writer can mitigate the illocutionary force of the FTAs. Therefore, politeness, to a certain extent, can be a motivation for adopting an off-record strategy. Because ellipsis renders a sentence
ambiguous, the elliptical sentence violates the Manner Maxim.

There is little or no use for 'reasonableness' strategy in internal communications. As we can see in the examples below, in external communications, the majority of the off record utterances occur in disagreements (i.e. 100% (4/4) in AL; 66.6% (4/6) in BL). Additionally the majority of off record strategy usages are used in external communications (BL, in particular), when the writer's status is lower than the reader's (i.e. 50% (2/4) in AL; 100% (6/6) in BL), as in examples 124 and 125.

Example 123

[AL3-incoming] (W>R; +D)
A 40-year-old male subcontractor does not accept a 40-year-old man's request to reconsider their price

cennyento pwun-uy ceyhwum-i-lymyen ceysi-toy-n kakyek-ulo nappwum-i kamyng-ha-ci-man last year part-'s product-is-if suggest-be-RL price-at supply-NM possible-do-SUP-but yukamsulekeyto tangsa-ey-nun cayko-ka nama-iss-ci-anh-sup-ni-ta regrettably our firm-in-TOP stock-NM left-is-NOM no-AH-IN-DC 'If it is last year's product, it is possible to supply at the suggested price, but I'm afraid it is out of stock'

Example 124

[BL4-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 20-year-old man in corporation B rejects an order made by a 40-year-old man

kwisa-eyseyocheng-ha-si-n phwummok-un hyencay tangsa-ka sayngsan-ul cwungtan-ha-n your firm-in request-do-HON-RL product-RL currently our firm-NM produce-AC stop-do-RL phwummok-i-p-ni-ta product-is-AH-IN-DC 'The product you request is no longer available because we have discontinued production'
Example 125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BL16-outgoing</th>
<th>W&lt;R; +D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 30-year-old man in corporation B does not accept a 40-year-old man’s request to sell a product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although reasons given by writers can be hints to do the FTAs in indirect ways, FTA doers sometimes add a mitigator, such as token agreement, to reduce the force of the nonconventionally indirect FTAs realized by ‘reasons’. It implies that the writer also accepts that giving reasons is for doing the FTAs. Token agreement (i.e. yes but) is a device or a feature of mitigation to feign agreement with the reader by camouflaging direct disagreement. Therefore, the writer may soften the illocutionary force of disagreement through partial agreement with the writer. Some examples of token agreement are in bold type in examples 126 and 127. Furthermore, although giving reasons can be a hinting strategy, to some extent the following examples of token agreement is precisely applicable to what Dow (1999: 95) calls ‘veiled compliments’, in that they include praise and dispraise together in one sentence to mitigate disagreement. Although the compliment is syntactically subordinate to the FTA, the writer can soften the force of his FTA by placing the compliment before the FTA. This is consistent with Hyland’s (2000: 55) findings: “The full illocutionary force of specific criticisms was frequently assuaged by the juxtaposition of polar comments in praise-criticism pairs” (emphasis in the original). Furthermore, the examples below show that the hinting strategy of reasonableness can be used as adequate groundwork or support for more direct FTAs (cf. Trosborg 1995). The two off-record sentences 126 and 127 precede more direct disagreements, kwisaeyse ceysihasin O thaipul sayonghal swu epsumul tasi han pen allyetulpnita ‘We inform
you that we cannot use O type your company proposes’ and olhay khaleynta ceycakey yochenghasin calyonun patatulil swu epsumul ketup allyetulipmita ‘We inform you that we cannot accept your request for the reference documents pertaining to calendar making’, respectively.

Example 126

[AL9-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A does not accept a 50-year-old male subcontractor’s request

| kwisa-uy O-thaip ceypwhum-un cohon quality-wa saykkam-ndo cikwental-ina |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| your firm’s O-type product-TOP good quality-with color-as staffs-or |
| yeloncesawental-uy panung-i mayww coh-ass-sup-ni-ta-man, tankasang-ey mwuncey-ka iss-e |
| polltakers’-s reaction-NM very good-PST-AH-IN-DC-but, price-in problem-NM is-because |
| wisspwuntul-ul selulk-ha-ki-ey mwuli-ka iss-ess-sup-ni-ta |
| people hold high positions-AC persuade-do-NOM-in problem-NM is-PST-AH-IN-DC |
| ‘Although the staff and polltakers have reacted positively to your O-type product owing to its good quality and color, it is impossible to persuade people holding high positions in our company to use it because of its price’ |

Example 127

[AL11-outgoing] (W<R; +D)
A 30-year-old man in corporation A does not accept a 40-year-old male subcontractor’s proposal

| kwihha-kkeyse ceysi-ha-sye-ss-te-n khaleynta ticain-un cakphwumseng-i ttwiena |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| you-NM propose-do-HON-PST-RT-RL calendar design-TOP artistry-is excellent |
| houng-i coh-ass-sup-ni-ta-man tanga imiel-va-mm cokum keli-ka iss-tako |
| reaction-is good-PST-AH-IN-DC-but our firm image-with-TOP a bit distance-NM is-saying |
| salye-tway-ss-sup-ni-ta |
| think-become-PST-AH-IN-DC |
| ‘Although reactions to your calendar design were good because of its artistic excellence, we think that it is a bit far from matching our firm’s image’ |

Reasons are sometimes given in the form of ‘need statements’. In Korean, two grammatical structures are used in need statements. The first one is the nominal predicate philyohata ‘it is necessary’ or sikuphata ‘it is urgently necessary’ with a sentential subject noun phrase which includes the requested act. The second one is the modal suffix -(e)ya which denotes necessity and obligation as in example 128. In example 128, the writer uses a statement of ‘potential
'grounder' (which gives a reason why the requested act is necessary) as an illocutionary device (Weizman 1989, 1993). The writer does not refer to the reader, the requested act, or any components of the requested act. In this case the writer uses the hint strategy of 'potential grounder illocutionary'. The reason why his request is made off record by only using the 'grounder' strategy has something to do with the use of ellipsis. As already shown above, an indirect speech act in Korean is sometimes performed by the omission of the main clause. By omitting main clauses carrying the writer's assertion, the writer tends to mitigate the illocutionary force of doing the FTA. In example 128, the clause obtaining the writer's request is omitted: *kulenikka ppalli ponaycwe* 'Therefore, send them to me soon'.

Example 128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AE27] (W&gt;R; -D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 40-year-old man requests that a 20-year-old man do a work assignment |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chwusek-i o-ki-cen-ey yengepso-ey kacye-ka-yg ha-ketun.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving Day-NM come-NOM-before-in a sales office-to bring-go-need do-since</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'I need to bring them to the sales office before Thanksgiving Day'

From this perspective, necessity statements realized by 'grounder' statement minimize the force of request in that the requested act is done in a nonconventionally indirect way. This is not consistent with Ervin-Tripp's findings. She (1976) claims that the requestive nature of necessity statements is very obvious in case of the request from higher to lower status people. In this occasion, the requestee does not have much room to refuse and is supposed to comply with the request. However, in example 128, although the higher status person makes a request to the lower status one, the force of request is minimized by using a hint strategy, a 'grounder'. Presumably, the reason for making a request indirectly is that the writer wants to make solidarity with the reader by using the 'potential grounder' statement. Participants are supposed to have shared knowledge in a conventional situation, such as an office. In office settings, more
solidarity may be needed to achieve common goals between status unequals. In this context, giving a reason to request is the writer’s way of seeking agreement with the reader by justifying or excusing his request indirectly. Therefore, a ‘potential grounder’ statement plays a role in making solidarity with the reader and stressing in-group identity between status unequals in the Korean business setting in that “by making the job related request more personalized, the higher status speaker can minimize status differences, which in turn allows for both speaker and hearer to pretend that they are equal” (Rinnert and Kobayashi 1999: 1193). By using need statements realized by ‘grounder’ statement as a surrogate for real requests in the omitted sentence, the writer makes solidarity by assuming common knowledge of the office work shared with the reader. Although the writer omits the main clause for politeness reasons, s/he also presupposes that the reader can figure out his real intent from the shared knowledge already established between participants. It also means that the relationship between the writer and the reader is close enough to claim common ground through presupposing shared knowledge. In this respect, the idea of making solidarity and avoiding coerciveness by using the same strategy constitutes a new concept of ambivalent politeness.

However, it seems problematic to consider a sentence in the form of a ‘need statement’ with no reasonableness as an off record utterance. Basically, by using need statements instead of the verbs yochenghata or pwuthakhata ‘request’ in Korean, the writer tries to mitigate the illocutionary force of requests by hiding his real intent. When need statements are used, the writer and the reader are not obviously involved in making a request. That is, normally they are not clearly mentioned in the act of requesting when it is formulated using ‘need statements’. For instance, in 129, neither the writer nor the reader of the request is specified. Instead the requested action is only expressed as a necessity.
Example 129

[AL33-incoming] (W=R; +D)
A 50-year-old male subcontractor requests a solution from a 50-year-old man in corporation A

tangsa ipcang-eyse-nun taychayk-i sikup-ha-p-ni-ta
our firm situation-in-TOP solution-NM urgently need-do-AH-IN-DC
‘We urgently need a solution’

Like example 128, a necessity statement in example 129 also seems likely to be regarded as a requestive hint. However, I do not consider it to be a nonconventionally indirect requestive hint in this case. The requester uses the nominal predicate sikuphata ‘it is urgently necessary’, which implies strong illocutionary force, with a sentential subject noun phrase (i.e. taychayk ‘solution’), which includes a component of the requested act. That is, unlike example 128, the writer uses a ‘component’ in order to show the clarity of his request. It is certainly a more direct request than the hint strategy of ‘potential grounder illocutionary force’. This claim is consistent with Neumann’s (1997: 84) remark that need statements are classified as “unambiguously direct in business encounters”. Besides, even though the request is made by the less powerful writer (i.e. subcontractor) in example 129, it is more direct than the real hints realized by higher status people as in example 128. Again, contrary to Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) claim, the requestive nature of necessity statements can be obvious even in this case of a request made by the less powerful writer. Of course, because a less powerful person makes a request in this case, even though the requested act is something that needs to be done, the requestee (i.e. contractor) has much room to refuse. However, regardless of the possibility of rejection from the more powerful requestee, the requester clearly specifies the requested action that needs to be taken by the reader through more direct necessity statements such as sikuphata which indicates urgency. Furthermore, by overtly stating the requested action and referring to some component of the requested act in the foreground through ‘necessity statements’, the writer also tends to establish the common ground or invoke shared knowledge with the reader to seek agreement in a standard situation, such as
the conventional business transaction. That is, by using the 'component' strategy formulated as 'need statements' to show its situational urgency, the writer tries to seek agreement with the reader to avoid rejection or minimize the possibility of rejection to his request. It may possibly increase the damage to the reader's negative face.

Likewise, in example 130, even though a request is also made by the less powerful writer (i.e. subcontractor), it is done more directly than real requestive hints using the modal suffix -(e)ya which denotes necessity and obligation. Like example 129, although his request is less urgent than if it contained need statements formulated with sikuphata 'urgently need', the writer does not make his request indirect or ambiguous by using the 'component' strategy (i.e. posang 'compensation') for making an overt request. Therefore, this example also confirms that requests formulated using need statements are not considered nonconventionally indirect requestive hints. In particular, the future tense hal 'will do' strongly supports the writer's intent to avoid disagreement with the reader. The message appeared in a context in which a request was made by a subcontractor for compensation for the cancellation of orders. The function of the future tense in a request is to show that making a request is typical or normal in this transactional stage so that the requester deserves compensation from the requestee. In other words, a request is commonly made in this conventional situation, because it is a common business practice. In this respect, the writer also tends to seek agreement with the reader, although it may threaten the reader's negative face.
Example 130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[AL33-incoming] (W=R; +D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 50-year-old male subcontractor requests compensation for losses from a 50-year-old man in corporation A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*manil chwiso-si kwisa-eyse nonsil palsyang-ey tayhan posang-i iss-eyn ha-l kes-ulo*

If cancel-when your firm-from loss happen-in about compensation-NM is-must do-will thing-as

*salye-toy-p-ni-ta*

think-become-AH-IN-DC

'If you cancel, I think you should compensate us for our losses'

6.4.2. Act in question

Besides giving reasons, one of the common ways of indirectly making requests is the ‘question’. If the act in question is not done yet, the utterance aims to request that the reader do the act. Furthermore, on the one hand, questioning whether the act in question has been performed serves as a function for checking the “pre-condition” for request (Haverkate 1984; Trosborg 1995). On the other hand, it also implies that the reader is supposed to be committed to carry out the act in question (Weizman 1989; Trosborg 1995). Questions for indirect requests seem to be common devices normally used in internal communication leaving answers unspecified. In my data, in internal communications, the off record utterances only occur in making requests through the ‘act in question’ strategy (100% (1/1) in AE; 100% (4/4) in BE). Requestive questions do not necessarily solicit information or opinion. Their typical aim is to let the reader know or to remind the reader of the information, which is conveyed indirectly without telling the truth directly or trying to obtain an answer. In this regard, they are also likely to be rhetorical questions and requestive hints. For example, in sentences 131, 132, and 133, by adopting the strategy ‘component + questioning hearer’s commitment’ (Weizman 1989, 1993), the writers try to mirror the lack of clarity for politeness reasons. In particular, by making those requests formulated as questions, the writers try to enable the readers to interpret the intent of their
indirect requests. Unlike need statements, which contain strong illocutionary force, questions are devices to reduce the illocutionary force of requests, because although components are directly referred to, the illocutionary intent is not overtly stated in the sentence. However, in contrast to ‘reasonableness’, it seems that ‘act in question’ is more like a ‘mild hint’ (Blum-Kulka and House 1989), in that the requestive hint is formulated conventionally.

Example 131

[BE20] (W>R; -D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 20-year-old woman do a work assignment

\[
i\text{-pen-tal makam acik an kkuthn-ss-eyo?}
\]
this-time-month closing yet no finish-PST-POL
‘Has this month’s closing balance been calculated?’

\[
onul-kkaci-nun pantusi kkuthnay-sey-yo
\]
today-until-TOP definitely finish-HON-POL
‘Finish it definitely by today’

Example 132

[BE21] (W>R; -D)
A 30-year-old man requests that a 20-year-old man do a work assignment

\[
nayil-kkaci forecast ceychul-hay-ya ha-nun ke al-ci?
\]
tomorrow-until forecast submit-do-should do-RL thing know-Q
‘You know that you should submit forecast by tomorrow?’

\[
onulohwu-kkaci kkuthnay-la
\]
this afternoon-until finish-IM
‘Finish it by this afternoon’
Example 133

[BE23] (W>R; -D)
A 40-year-old man requests that a 30-year-old man ship something

*sencek-i way-ilinuce-ci-ci?*
shipping-NM why-like late-become-SUP
‘How come shipping is delayed?’

*pwuthak-hay*
request-do
‘I am requesting this (i.e. shipping)’

Because they are not genuine questions to obtain answers from the reader, without common or shared knowledge, the reader cannot understand the true intent of asking such a question. However, in most cases, since knowledge is supposed to be commonly shared between participants in a conventional situation (i.e. office), the writer using the question tactic directly refers to ‘components’ (i.e. *makam* ‘closing balance’ in 131; *forecast* in 132; *sencek* ‘shipping’ in 133) of the requested act as a signal of presupposing shared knowledge. From this perspective, requests formulated as questions serve to “express empathy between the participants, symbolizing a high degree of shared presuppositions and expectancies” (Kasper 1990: 200). That is, the interlocutors using this tactic are close enough to share the same kind of presuppositions. Thus, regardless of status differences, using questions within the organization is the writer’s attempt to make solidarity with the reader whose status is lower and to signal ingroup identity. Probably, that’s why the off record strategy is most frequently used in internal communications when distance is small between interactants (i.e. 100% (1/1) in AE; 75% (3/4) in BE), as we can see in above examples. Similar findings are reported in Nickerson (2000). She claims that more questions are used in the British-English messages than in the Dutch-English messages because of the small degree of corporate distance between the British writers. This finding suggests that the use of questions is appropriate “only if the participants involved are in
close proximity to each other within the organisation’s social system” (Nickerson ibid.: 175). As in the case of ‘reasonableness’ strategy, these claims also support the hypothesis of *ambivalent politeness*.

The requests in questions are made only by those from higher to lower status in my corpus. The heavy use of requestive hints formulated in questions by higher to lower status people to make solidarity contradicts earlier findings that lower status people use more hints (Beebe and Takahashi 1989; Takahashi and Beebe 1993). Requests in those contexts are compatible with House’s (1989: 115) notion of ‘standard situation’ quoted below:

role relations are transparent and predetermined, the requester has a right, the requestee an obligation, the degree of imposition involved in the request is low, as is the perceived degree of difficulty in realizing it.

However, in spite of the obligation to comply with requests because requests through questions are made by those from higher to lower status in business settings, we cannot also avoid the possibility of being ignored or rejected by the requestee. This potential for deniability supports the idea that requestive hint statements given through questions can be *pre-requests*. As mentioned earlier, these questions occurring in my data do indeed immediately precede requests done baldly (i.e. *onulkkacinun pantusi kkuthnayseyyo* ‘Finish it definitely by today’ in 131; *onulohwukkaci kkuthnayla* ‘Finish it by this afternoon’ in 132; *pwuthakhay* ‘I am requesting this’ in 133), thereby they can be grounder or pre-requests for authentic requests. As pre-requests, requestive hints allow the requester to “check out whether a request is likely to succeed, and if not to avoid one in order to avoid its subsequent dispreferred response, namely a rejection” (Levinson 1983: 357). Likewise, they function as devices to secure “a high deniability potential” (Weizman 1989: 94). That is, pre-requests realized in the form of questions serve to check the possibility of getting a favorable reaction to the writer’s request.
6.4.3. Summary and discussion

In principle, clarity and politeness can be mutually exclusive elements and thereby the motivation for indirectness in doing the FTA can be politeness. For example, the writer can avoid conflict by giving a reason to avoid an overt FTA. However, since strong hints may be perceived as being deficient in politeness because of the lack of pragmatic clarity (Blum-Kulka 1987), common knowledge between participants is necessary to encode and decode nonconventionally indirect speech acts. Based on common knowledge, questions are also made to make an indirect request. In this respect, the notion of ‘ambivalent politeness’ has been coined. Basically, off record utterances are made to be polite to the addressee. However, off record is also used to protect self-face. The reader gets the writer’s real intent of asking a question so that his proper answer (i.e. accepting the writer’s requests) is undoubtedly expected in ‘standard situation’. However, because of the possibility of being rejected, this off record strategy acts more like the pre-requests or the groundwork for the following overt FTAs to avoid the reader’s rejection. That is, off record can be a strategy for protecting self-face to a certain extent. In this respect, indirectness does not necessarily imply politeness in Korean.

6.5. Overall discussion

Even though business settings require maximally efficient communication, there are only a few examples of bald on record strategy in Korean business correspondence. In the examples, we found that the use of bald on record strategy reflects corporate culture and organizational voice because of the preference for bald on record in performing a particular speech act (e.g. giving bad news in corporation B). Likewise, the use of solidarity enforcement strategy also reveals
corporate culture. That is, corporation A and corporation B take into consideration two distinct dimensions of the reader’s positive face wants, respectively: (1) the want that one’s abilities be recognized or respected (i.e. show interest) (2) the want to be included (i.e. use in-group language). Furthermore, the use of solidarity enforcement strategies can be a ‘power play’ in that less powerful subcontractors prefer the use of show interest strategy. We also found that solidarity enforcement politeness strategies manifest the influence of oral language features on the written text (i.e. slang terms). When we investigated conflict avoidance strategies used in Korean business letters, we found that business correspondence is a self-effacing genre. That is why the most common pronoun in written business communications in Korea falls into the ‘other’ category. In the ‘other’ category, the heavy use of tangsa ‘our company’ as a subject indirectly supports the ‘we-orientation’. Although Korean nominalizations do not have much to do with the subject pronoun and its position, they can be used to save the reader’s face by maintaining his distance from the utterance and increasing formality. We also found that the idea of making solidarity (i.e. solidarity enforcement politeness) and avoiding coerciveness (i.e. conflict avoidance politeness) by using the same strategy (i.e. off record strategy) constitutes a new concept of ambivalent politeness. Furthermore, we investigated the hypothesis that nonconventional indirectness does not necessarily imply politeness in Korean because the writer’s intent of using off record strategy is obvious in ‘standard situation’ and the off record strategy is used as a self-face protective device in many cases.

Blum-Kulka (1987) defines politeness as balance of pragmatic clarity and avoiding coerciveness. In this study, I revise her definition to fit solidarity enforcement politeness as follows: ‘harmony between pragmatic clarity and either expressing cordiality or avoiding coerciveness’. However, it is necessary to incorporate a condition into this definition: ‘The speaker’s/writer’s purpose for expressing cordiality or avoiding coerciveness should meet the addressee’s/reader’s
expectations'. When this condition is not satisfied, politeness becomes a contradiction in terms.

In this respect, it is necessary to argue about how politeness is perceived. Although the speaker/writer tends to minimize the illocutionary force of the FTAs by using conflict avoidance strategies to be polite, whether or not the speaker's/writer's effort is considered polite or not is entirely up to the hearer/reader. Therefore, to some extent, the writers endeavoring to be polite can be perceived as acting impolitely (Fraser and Nolan 1981).

Politeness is also a contradiction, in that saving self-face is as important as saving other-face in many cases. For example, paying a compliment to the more powerful reader (e.g. contractor) to satisfy his positive face wants also saves the less powerful writer's positive face. Since doing the FTAs is as serious a threat to the FTA doer's face as the damage done to the face by FTAs from others, the FTA doer tends to minimize or avoid conflict by means of numerous conflict avoidance strategies. Although requestive hints are given to attenuate the force of the FTA, they can also function as pre-requests to reduce or avoid the possibility of the writer's request being rejected.

It is also important to remember that politeness strategies should be determined within context. For example, although emphatics and repetition are used in the FEAs to save the reader's positive face, they also increase the damage to the reader's positive face wants when they are used in the FTAs. In contrast, among hedging devices, the delimiter particle -man 'only' can function as a booster to satisfy the reader's positive face wants and the dubitative word sayngakhapnita '(I) think' is used as a self-face protective device in FEA situations.
CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION

7.1. Overall results

The overall results in this chapter have been compiled according to the approach outlined in chapter 6. The most frequent strategy in internal and external communications of corporations A (AE, AL) and B (BE, BL) is ‘conflict avoidance’. This result is generally consistent with the description of Korea as a negative politeness culture (Holtgraves and Yang 1990). The second most frequent strategy (BE being the only exception) is ‘solidarity enforcement’ (‘show interest’ in corporation A and ‘use in-group language’ in corporation B, in particular). It to some extent shows that conflict avoidance and solidarity enforcement strategies may not be mutually exclusive categories (Lim and Bowers 1991; Scollon and Scollon 1983). In contrast, the least frequent strategy is ‘off record’ in internal communications of corporations A (AE) and B (BE) and ‘bald on record’ in external communications of corporations A (AL) and B (BL). The frequency ranking of (im)politeness strategies is shown in figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1. Frequency ranking of (im)politeness strategies across companies and genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE: Conflict avoidance&gt; Solidarity enforcement&gt; Bald on record&gt; Off record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE: Conflict avoidance&gt; Bald on record&gt; Solidarity enforcement&gt; Off record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL:</td>
<td>Conflict avoidance&gt; Solidarity enforcement&gt; Off record&gt; Bald on record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL:</td>
<td>Conflict avoidance&gt; Solidarity enforcement&gt; Off record&gt; Bald on record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In more detail, the totals for each (im)politeness strategy will be given in 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3, and 7.1.4, respectively. Now let us discuss these frequencies within the framework of B&L’s politeness strategies.
7.1.1. Bald on record

Bald on record strategy is used more often in internal communications, whereas the least frequent strategy in external communications is bald on record as shown in figure 7.1. People in corporation B use more bald on record strategy in internal and external communications than those of corporation A. Furthermore, they use bald on record more than solidarity enforcement strategy in internal communication (see figure 7.1). In general, not too many examples of bald on record in corporation A are found in comparison with corporation B. To some extent, these findings support the contention that businesspeople in corporation B prefer bald on record strategy to make the reader respond immediately, because an utterance made baldly looks urgent.

Since bald on record is limited to the face-threat situations, I am not including 'compliments' in this investigation, which serve the function of enhancing the hearer’s/reader’s face, in the classification of bald on record (see 6.1. for more detail).

Table 7.1. Distribution of bald on record strategy across companies and genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>13 (81%)</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2. Solidarity enforcement strategies

Solidarity enforcement is the second most frequently occurring strategy, if one excludes internal communication in corporation B (BE). Therefore, in internal communication, corporation A uses more solidarity enforcement strategy than corporation B (i.e. 71% (17/24) in AE; 29% (7/24) in BE). However, in external communications, solidarity enforcement strategy is used more often in corporation B (i.e. 32% (15/47) in AL; 68% (32/47) in BL). It is entirely due to heavy use of
'code-mixing' in BL. The major solidarity enforcement strategy used in AE is 'show interest' (76%) ('boosters' (41%) in particular). In contrast, 'show interest', consisting of 'attend to R', 'boosters', and 'repetition', is not used in BE but only 'use in-group language' strategy, comprising 'code-mixing' and 'use of slang'. The major 'use in-group language' strategy used in BE is 'code-mixing' (57%). Based on the frequency of solidarity enforcement strategy across companies and genres, the use of solidarity enforcement strategy seems to reflect each corporation's culture to a certain extent. In using solidarity enforcement strategies, the writer in corporation A pays special attention to the reader's wants that his/her abilities be recognized or respected (i.e. show interest: 76% in AE; 87% in AL), whereas people in corporation B mainly take into consideration the reader's wants to be included (i.e. use in-group language: 100% in BE; 82% in BL). Corporate culture will be discussed in 7.2.6. in detail.

Table 7.2. Distribution of solidarity enforcement strategy across companies and genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend to R</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (74%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-mixing</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>26 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of slang</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.3. Conflict avoidance strategies

The most frequent politeness strategy across companies and genres is 'conflict avoidance'. The most frequent subgroup of conflict avoidance strategy realized in AE and BE is 'give overwhelming reasons' (i.e. 37% in AE; 49% in BE). However, 'hedge' is the most frequent subgroup of conflict avoidance strategy used in AL and BL (i.e. 31% in AL; 27% in BL). In general, the most frequent 'conflict avoidance substrategy' used across companies and genres is
‘mitigating devices’, consisting of ‘hedges’, ‘apology’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’, (i.e. 63% in AE; 62% in BE; 58% in AL; 52% in BL). In addition, linguistic devices, such as ‘avoid using I/you pronoun’, ‘passive’, and ‘nominalize’, which tend to make texts more formal and official, comprise approximately one third of the total number of instances of the usage of conflict avoidance strategy across companies and genres (i.e. 29% in AE; 26% in BE; 33.5% in AL; 34% in BL). Due to the rhetorical effect of making texts more formal, this subgroup is used slightly more in external communications than in internal communications. Conventionally indirect requests made by ‘want statements’ and ‘conditional appreciation’ comprise only more or less 10% of conflict avoidance strategies (i.e. 8% in AE; 12% in BE; 8.5% in AE; 14% in BL). Conventionally indirect requests are made slightly more often in corporation B. As in bald on record strategy, since the effect of mitigating the FTAs is not properly assessed in the speech act of compliment (Holmes 1995), compliments are not considered in the use of conflict avoidance strategy. In general, conflict avoidance markers seem to be reduced in e-mails due to minimalism or brevity in e-mail messages as opposed to formal letters. The frequencies of conflict avoidance strategies with regard to positive face and conflict avoidance strategies with regard to negative face will be discussed in 7.2.4.

Table 7.3. Distribution of conflict avoidance strategy across companies and genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
<td>23 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>23 (23%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>76 (31%)</td>
<td>61 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons</td>
<td>36 (37%)</td>
<td>32 (49%)</td>
<td>60 (24%)</td>
<td>58 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid I/you</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>21 (8.5%)</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalize</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>52 (22%)</td>
<td>45 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99 (100%)</td>
<td>67 (100%)</td>
<td>246 (100%)</td>
<td>228 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.4. Off record

Although off record strategy is the least frequent strategy in internal communications, it is used more often than bald on record in external communications as shown in figure 7.1. The most frequent use of ‘act in question’ strategy is made in BE. It is limited to internal use only. On the other hand, the use of ‘reasonableness’ strategy is made mostly in external communications of both corporations. There is little or no use of ‘reasonableness’ strategy in internal communications.

Table 7.4. Distribution of off record strategy across companies and genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in question</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.5. Summary and discussion

The fact that conflict avoidance is the most frequently used strategy in Korean business correspondence is to some extent consistent with the claim that Korea is a negative politeness culture. The least frequent strategy used in the corpus of Korean business letters is off record in internal communications and bald on record in external communications.

In general, bald on record strategy is used more often in internal communications than in external communications of both companies. Bald on record strategy is preferred in corporation B in comparison with corporation A. In particular, bald on record in BE surpasses solidarity enforcement strategy in frequency.

In the use of solidarity enforcement strategy, both companies show a distinctive
corporate culture. That is, they respectively focus on two different dimensions of positive face. Corporation A is more concerned about the reader’s desire that his/her abilities be attended to or respected, whereas corporation B is more attentive to the reader’s desire to be included.

Heavy use of conflict avoidance strategy is made in Korean business correspondence. In particular, the major conflict avoidance strategies used in the corpus are ‘mitigating devices’, consisting of ‘hedge’, ‘apology’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’. The second most frequent conflict avoidance strategy is ‘defocusing the agent/patient or action from the FTA’, which allows the writer to make texts more formal. The least used conflict avoidance strategy is ‘be conventionally indirect’.

In the less formal genre, i.e. e-mail, off record is the least used strategy. ‘Act in question’ strategy is preferred in BE and ‘reasonableness’ is a major off record strategy used in external communications of both companies.

7.2. Contextual factors

The prior chapters on data analysis imply that several contextual factors may influence the choice of politeness strategies used in the corpus of Korean business correspondence. In this section, those factors affecting the choice of politeness strategy will be discussed. Contextual factors include status, power, distance, speech acts, medium, and corporate culture. ‘Status’, ‘power’, and ‘distance’ do not differently affect the choice of conflict avoidance strategies with regard to positive and negative face. So I group conflict avoidance strategies with regard to positive and negative face into a single conflict avoidance strategy in discussing these three contextual factors in this section.
7.2.1. Status

In this study, status is determined by position in the company (i.e. rank). It seems that status does not play a crucial role in using bald on record strategy in AE, as shown in table 7.5. Instead, bald on record strategies seem to be sensitive to the ‘distance’ between participants in AE (Blum-Kulka et al. 1985). That is, two out of three examples of bald on record strategies in AE are found when distance is small between participants, regardless of status. On the other hand, in BE, bald on record strategies are used most frequently between status equals. More specifically, baldly on record requests are normally made by higher status people, whereas bad news is conveyed by lower status people in terms of bald on record strategy. It is because higher status people frequently direct the actions of others (Holtgraves 1994), and lower status people report on something bad happening to higher status people or their company. Bald on record is mostly used in external communications when the writer’s status is lower. This finding may be consistent with the claim that contextual factors are not independent variables across a variety of the FTAs (Akar 1998; Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris 1996; Holtgraves and Yang 1992). The effects of status difference in using bald on record strategy do not seem to be as strong as predicted in external communications. Instead, in external communications, the power variable seems to be a good predictor of facework. That is, the writer with stronger power has a tendency to make less effort to mitigate the threat to the face of the reader with less power (see 7.2.2. for more detail).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solidarity enforcement strategies are most heavily used in AE, when the writer's status is higher, as shown in table 7.6. It is not consistent with the conclusion of Holmes (1995) that the majority of compliments are made between status equals in her New Zealand data. This is entirely due to the heavy use of 'show interest' strategy, including 'notice, attend to R', 'boosters', and 'repetition', by the higher status people in the Korean data, as shown in table 7.7 (i.e. 92% (12/13)). It is consistent with the fact that solidarity enforcement strategies are most frequently used in the speech act of compliments in corporation A. These compliments are mostly made by people from higher to lower status. However, when the writer's status is lower in AE, there is no use of solidarity enforcement strategy. Solidarity enforcement strategy is mostly used in BE when status between participants is equal. It is because the use of slang is common between status equals (i.e. 100% (3/3)). The use of solidarity enforcement strategy in BE may be explained by Wolfson's (1989) 'Bulge theory' in that the majority of solidarity enforcement strategies in BE are realized in status equals as opposed to status unequals. Solidarity enforcement strategy is commonly used in BL when the writer's status is lower than the reader's (i.e. 87% (28/32)). It is due to heavy use of code-mixing by the lower status people in BL (82% (23/28)). In contrast, solidarity enforcement strategy is not used in BL when the writer's status is higher than the reader's. This result is to some extent consistent with the observation made by Holtgraves (1997) that higher status people use fewer positive politeness markers.
Contrary to the fact that solidarity enforcement strategies are most frequently used in AE and AL when the writer’s status is higher, conflict avoidance strategy is overwhelmingly used across companies and genres in my data when the writer’s status is lower than the reader’s, as shown in table 7.8. It is mainly due to the heavy use of mitigating devices, comprising ‘hedges’, ‘apology’, and ‘give overwhelming reasons’, by the lower status people (59% (24/41) in AE; 56% (19/34) in BE; 55% (73/133) in AL; 52% (97/188) in BL). In the use of conflict avoidance strategy, Koreans are especially status-conscious, like the Japanese (Beebe and Takahashi 1989). Therefore, the influence of status on the choice of conflict avoidance strategy is consistent and convincing (Pilegaard 1997; Scollon and Scollon 1981).
Table 7.9. Distribution of substrategy of conflict avoidance depending on status by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&gt;R</th>
<th>W=R</th>
<th>W&lt;R</th>
<th>etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>bl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid I/you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalize</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The offrecord strategy is only used in internal communications when the writer’s status is higher than the reader’s as shown in table 7.10 (i.e. 100% (2/2) in AE; 100% (4/4) in BE). In this respect, it is not consistent with the claim that lower status people use more hints (Beebe and Takahashi 1989; Takahashi and Beebe 1993; Holtgraves and Yang 1992). However, their claims do seem to be applicable to external communications. Off record strategies are most frequently used in external communications (BL, in particular) when the writer’s status is lower. In BL off record strategy is not used when the writer’s status is higher than the reader’s. Off record strategy does not occur between status equals across companies and genres.

The reason why off record strategy is only used in internal communications of both companies when the writer’s status is higher than the reader’s is associated with a ‘standard situation’ (House 1989: see also 6.4.2). That is, when the writer is higher in status, the rationale behind off record utterances is understood quickly (Holtgraves 1994; Rinnert and Kobayashi 1999). Therefore, the lower status people may be quicker at understanding hints given by the higher status people in a conventional situation (e.g. office). As far as subgroups of off-record strategy is concerned, ‘act in question’ strategy is used only in internal communications and it is only used by the higher status people as shown in table 7.11. The ‘reasonableness’ strategy is
used in BL when the writer's status is lower than the reader's.

Table 7.10. Distribution of off record strategy depending on status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.11. Distribution of substrategy of off record depending on status by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&gt;R</th>
<th>W=R</th>
<th>W&lt;R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my data, status is generally linked to age in internal and external communications of both companies. Therefore, in most cases the higher the status, the older the age, and the lower the status, the younger the age (Park 2001).

Older people heavily use bald on record strategy in making requests to younger people and younger people prefer the use of bald on record strategy in conveying bad news to older people. However, older people do not use bald on record to younger people in external communications. Older people in corporation A prefer solidarity enforcement strategy due to the heavy use of 'show interest'. It implies that older people pay more compliments to younger people. However, in BE solidarity enforcement strategy is mostly used between people of the same age due to the heavy use of slang terms. However, younger people heavily use solidarity enforcement strategy in BL. It is entirely due to the common use of code-mixing by younger people. Without any exceptions, conflict avoidance strategies are most frequently used by younger to older people (Fraser et al. 1980). Older people prefer the use of off record strategy in internal communications, however, younger people use the majority of off record strategies in
external communications (BL, in particular). Off record is not used between people of the same age.

### 7.2.2. Power

There are two types of 'status': *inherent status* and *relative status* (Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris 1996). 'Inherent status' is context-independent. The higher the status, the greater the power, and the lower the status, the less the power. In contrast, 'relative status' is context-sensitive. The people of higher status can have the less power. The people of lower status can have more power. Although 'relative status' can to a certain extent operate within a corporation under certain circumstances (e.g. department, experience, etc), 'inherent status' is carried under normal circumstances within a corporation in my corpus. However, in many cases of external communication, relative status may operate. In other words, status and power do not operate simultaneously in external communications. For example, although the status of a subcontractor may be higher than a contractor, s/he is less powerful. That is to say that a contractor is in a position to exert power over a subcontractor, even where the subcontractor has higher status within the overall business culture. Now let us consider the overall distribution of politeness strategies in relation to 'power'.

As in the case of status variable, power does not seem to affect the choice of bald on record strategy in AE. Instead, it is a matter of distance. That is, when the distance is small between both parties, bald on record strategy is used in AE (see 7.2.3. for more detail). In this respect, powers and distance are not separate dimensions but are related or complementary to one another (Lee 1993). In contrast, bald on record strategies are heavily used between power unequals in BE as in the case of status variable. It is because bald on record strategy is mostly
used in the speech acts of requesting and conveying bad news. Powerful people make requests baldly and people with less power report bad news to the powerful people without redress in BE. In the bald-on-record strategy used in external communications, power and status seem to be mutually exclusive. In AL and BL, although people of lower status mostly use bald on record strategy, bald-on-record strategies are most frequently used by more powerful people as in table 7.12. Therefore, although the status is lower, if the power is greater, bald on record is preferred in external communications (Fairclough 1989). The powerful writer tends to make less effort to reduce the damage to the reader’s face in external communications (Blum-Kulka et al. 1985; Blum-Kulka and House 1989; Brown and Gilman 1989; Holtgraves and Yang 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In AE, solidarity enforcement strategy is overwhelmingly used when the writer’s power is greater than the reader’s (i.e. 82% (14/17)). It is entirely due to the fact that compliments are mostly made from higher to lower status people (Wolfson 1983). It is consistent with Rees-Miller’s (2000) claim that more powerful people use more markers of positive politeness. In AL, although the higher status people use solidarity enforcement strategies more often (i.e. 46% (7/15)), people with less power use the majority of solidarity enforcement strategies. This is because people/companies with less power want to create more solidarity to maintain a good relationship with the people/companies having stronger power. This finding is consistent with Pilegaard’s (1997) claim that the more the power, the less the need for positive facework. In contrast, in BL the lower status people use more solidarity enforcement strategy, whereas people
with more power prefer the use of solidarity enforcement strategy. It is entirely due to the heavy use of code-mixing by more powerful people to make solidarity in doing core business as shown in table 7.14 (i.e. 81\% (22/27)). It may be related to their type of corporate culture. That is, corporation B treats its business partners as extended in-group members. The matter of corporate culture will be discussed more in 7.2.6.

Table 7.13. Distribution of solidarity enforcement strategy depending on power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>14 (82%)</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>27 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.14. Distribution of substrategy of solidarity enforcement strategy depending on power by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&gt;R</th>
<th>W=R</th>
<th>W&lt;R</th>
<th>etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>bl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-mixing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of slang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In internal communications, conflict avoidance strategy is most frequently used when the reader is more powerful (Fairclough 1989). In AL, conflict avoidance strategies are also most frequently used by people with less power as shown in table 7.15 (i.e. 53\% (130/246): mitigating devices (65\% (85/130)), in particular). However, in BL, more powerful people heavily use conflict avoidance strategy (i.e. 76\% (163/228): mitigating devices (56\% (92/163)), in particular). This might support a statement from an informant in corporation B that 'Regardless of status difference, we give deference to the reader in sending correspondence to other firms.' Therefore, more powerful people in general show respect to the reader whose
power is weaker than the writer’s to some extent in corporation B. This finding is to some extent consistent with Yli-Jokipii’s (1998) claim in her Finnish data that the Finnish writer tends to avoid using linguistic devices which assume power even when the writer’s power over the reader is strong. In this respect, the use of conflict avoidance devices does not necessarily correlate with ‘powerlessness’ (Holmes 1995). People in corporation B also keep their own face by showing their modesty to the people with less power. Therefore, in the use of conflict avoidance strategy, the effects of power difference on facework do not seem to be strong in BL (Baxter 1984; Cherry 1988; Lim and Bowers 1991; Yeung 1997).

Table 7.15. Distribution of conflict avoidance strategy depending on power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>19 (19%)</td>
<td>20 (30%)</td>
<td>81 (33%)</td>
<td>163 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>26 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>23 (9%)</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>41 (42%)</td>
<td>34 (51%)</td>
<td>130 (53%)</td>
<td>46 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99 (100%)</td>
<td>67 (100%)</td>
<td>246 (100%)</td>
<td>228 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.16. Distribution of substrategy of conflict avoidance depending on power by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&gt;R</th>
<th>W=R</th>
<th>W&lt;R</th>
<th>etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>bl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid I/you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalize</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off record strategies are mostly used by more powerful people as shown in tables 7.17 and 7.18 (‘act in question’ in internal communications and ‘reasonableness’ in external communications, in particular). The reason why the powerful writer prefers off record strategy
is that in spite of its indirectness, the less powerful reader may quickly understand nonconventionally indirect utterances made by more powerful people in a ‘standard situation’ (Holtgraves 1994; Rinnert and Kobayashi 1999). It is interesting to note that the less powerful writer does not use off record strategy to the more powerful reader in internal communications. This finding may also imply that indirectness does not imply politeness (Blum-Kulka 1987). Off record strategy is not used at all between power equals.

Table 7.17. Distribution of off record strategy depending on power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.18. Distribution of substrategy of off record depending on power by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W&gt;Ř</th>
<th>W=Ř</th>
<th>W&lt;Ř</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3. Distance

The distance variable is not applicable to external communications because my data consists only of letter correspondence between unfamiliar people for external use. Contrary to Yli-Jokipii’s (1998) claim, the reason why the distance variable is not applicable to external communications is not merely because social distance is a more static or less efficient variable on the V level texts. Therefore, I only take into consideration the distance variable in internal communication. In this study, distance is defined as ‘familiarity’ (Blum-Kulka 1985; Blum-Kulka and House 1989), and it is also recognized and marked in Korean by sentence enders
used in six different types of speech levels which reflect the relationship between both parties: plain, intimate, familiar, blunt, polite, and deferential (Sohn 1999:234). For example, intimate or familiar-level enders are used between (very) close interactants and the writer uses deferential-level enders to the distant reader or a superior. Since distance is defined as familiarity, it plays a significant role in the choice of bald on record strategy. In general, the FTAs are baldly done when distance is small as shown in table 7.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Distance</th>
<th>-Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to many claims that higher levels of solidarity are expressed toward intimates (Brown and Gilman 1960; B&L 1987; Scollon and Scollon 1983), solidarity enforcement strategies are heavily used in AE when distance between participants is big, as shown in table 7.20. This is because show interest strategy is heavily used when distance between participants is big (i.e. 77% (10/13)). In this respect, social distance does not seem to affect the use of solidarity enforcement strategy (Brown and Gilman 1989; Yeung 1997).

In table 7.21, people make more efforts to avoid threatening the other’s face when distance is great. That is, greater employment of conflict avoidance strategy is observed when the relationship is distant (Fairclough 1989; Holtgraves and Yang 1992). In particular, mitigating devices are heavily used when distance is great (i.e. 63% (59/93) in AE; 58% (33/57) in BE).
Table 7.20. Distribution of solidarity enforcement strategy depending on distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>+Distance</th>
<th></th>
<th>-Distance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-mixing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of slang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 (88%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.21. Distribution of conflict avoidance strategy depending on distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>+Distance</th>
<th></th>
<th>-Distance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give overwhelming reasons</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid I/you</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalize</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93 (94%)</td>
<td>57 (85%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in bald on record, off record is also mostly used when distance between participants is small as in table 7.22. I believe the reason why intimates prefer off record strategy is a matter of status because higher status people only use off record in this case (see table 7.10). As I have already mentioned, although the writer with higher status makes off record utterances, the reader with lower status is quicker at comprehending the hints because they share the common knowledge that the nonconventionally indirect speech act is an overt request in a 'standard situation' (Holtgraves 1994; Rinnert and Kobayashi 1994). Because they are close enough to share common knowledge, the majority of off record utterances occur when distance is small in spite of the writer's higher status. This finding is not consistent with the claim made by Ambady et al. (1996) that distance is greater with superior and subordinates than with peers.
Table 7.22. Distribution of off record strategy depending on distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+Distance</th>
<th></th>
<th>-Distance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4. Speech acts

In internal communications of both companies, the most common speech acts done baldly are requests as in Table 7.23. However, there are only a few examples of the bald on record requests in AL and BL. In external communication, only the speech act of giving bad news shows a distinctive distribution in BL (i.e. 80% (4/5)). The overall distribution of giving bad news baldly done is quite high in corporation B. To some extent it shows that corporation B is sensitive to bad news. This finding is contrary to Ambady et al.’s (1996) claim that the strategies of negative politeness and off-record are associated with delivering bad news. Only three examples of disagreements made baldly are found in BE when distance between participants is small.

Table 7.23. Distribution of bald on record strategy depending on speech acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagreements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving bad news</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the internal communication of corporation A (AE), the most common speech act done by the solidarity enforcement strategy is the speech act of compliment as shown in Table 7.24 (show interest (93% (13/14)), in particular). It is consistent with the claim made by Ambady et al. (1996) that the strategy of positive politeness is associated with delivering good news. In contrast, in BE solidarity enforcement strategy is not used in paying compliments at all.
As I have already discussed in 7.1.2., this is because corporation B mainly takes into consideration the reader's want to be included (i.e. use in-group language) on behalf of the reader's want that one's abilities be attended to and respected (i.e. show interest). That is why in BE and BL solidarity enforcement strategies are mostly used in FTAs (i.e. 100% in BE; 81% in BL). In particular, in BL solidarity enforcement strategies are most frequently used in the speech act of request, entirely due to the heavy use of code-mixing in making requests, as shown in table 7.25..

| Table 7.24. Distribution of solidarity enforcement strategy depending on speech acts |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                              | AE   | BE   | AL   | BL   |
| Disagreements                | 1 (4%) | 3 (42%) | 2 (13%) | 9 (28%) |
| Giving bad news              | 1 (4%) | 2 (29%) | 0   | 4 (13%) |
| Requests                     | 1 (4%) | 2 (29%) | 0   | 13 (40%) |
| Compliments                  | 14 (82%) | 0   | 13 (87%) | 6 (19%) |
| Total                        | 17 (100%) | 7 (100%) | 15 (100%) | 32 (100%) |

As shown in table 7.26., conflict avoidance strategies are most frequently used in a negative FTA (i.e. request) across companies and genres. This is due to the extensive use of ‘give overwhelming reasons’ strategy in internal communications and ‘hedges’ in external communications in making requests. In contrast, apologies are most frequently used to reduce the force of the positive FTAs (i.e. 67% (2/3) in AE; 100% (2/2) in BE; 100% (8/8) in AL). ‘Avoid using I/you pronoun’ strategy is also heavily used to minimize the force of the positive...
FTAs (i.e. 100% (5/5) in AE; 100% (1/1) in BE; 91% (19/21) in AL; 93% (27/29) in BL).

The majority of examples of bad news baldly conveyed are found in corporation B. However, the least common use of conflict avoidance strategy (particular in BL) is made in giving bad news. Therefore, it seems to me that corporation B is rather direct in giving bad news as opposed to corporation A.

Table 7.26. Distribution of conflict avoidance strategy depending on speech acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagreements</td>
<td>24 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (17%)</td>
<td>49 (20%)</td>
<td>63 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving bad news</td>
<td>21 (21%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>68 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>54 (55%)</td>
<td>43 (64%)</td>
<td>129 (52%)</td>
<td>137 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99 (100%)</td>
<td>67 (100%)</td>
<td>246 (100%)</td>
<td>228 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.27. Distribution of substrategies of conflict avoidance depending on speech acts by N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagreements</th>
<th>Giving bad news</th>
<th>Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid I/you</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalize</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 7.28, off record strategy is used only in making a request in internal communications. This is due to the common use of “act in question” strategy to make a request, as shown in table 7.29. In contrast, although nonconventionally indirect disagreements are not made in internal communication, in external communications off record strategies are most frequently used in disagreements due to the frequent use of “reasonableness” strategy. No examples of off record strategy are found in giving bad news in corporations A and B. In particular, corporation B seems to be direct and hasty in conveying bad news based on overall
distributions of bald on record, conflict avoidance, and off record strategies.

| Table 7.28. Distribution of off record strategy depending on speech acts |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                  | AE      | BE      | AL      | BL      |
| Disagreements                    | 0       | 0       | 4 (100%)| 4 (66.6%)|
| Giving bad news                  | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Requests                         | 2 (100%)| 4 (100%)| 0       | 2 (33.3%)|
| Total                            | 2 (100%)| 4 (100%)| 4 (100%)| 6 (100%)|

| Table 7.29. Distribution of substrategies of off record depending on speech acts by N |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                  | Disagreements | Giving bad news | Requests |
|                                  | AE | BE | AL | BL | AE | BE | AL | BL | AE | BE | AL | BL |
| Reasonableness                  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 2  |
| Act in question                 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 4  | 0  | 0  |
| Total                           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 4  | 0  | 2  |

7.2.5. Medium

Medium selection is entirely dependent on different types of tasks covered in my data (i.e. electronic form for internal use and print form for external use) (Crystal 2001; Smart et al. 2001; Yates and Orlikowski 1992). As shown in table 7.30, since there is no e-mail message for external communication and no formal letter for internal communication in my corpus, comparing e-mail messages with formal letters in order to consider the effect of medium on choosing politeness strategies would likely to be problematic. Instead, I will discuss the influence of computer-mediated communication (CMC) on realizing politeness strategies based on my e-mail corpus.

| Table 7.30. Distribution of media in internal and external communications of both corporations |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Internal communication         | Yes     | No      |
| External communication         | No      | Yes     |
Chafe (1982) claims that spoken and written texts differ along in two parameters: *fragmentation* vs. *integration*; *involvement* vs. *detachment*. Suffice it to say that the acts of speaking and writing are very different in many aspects (Chafe 1982, 1992, 1994). First of all, there is no immediate feedback in written language, because "in writing, the language producer and receiver usually do not share the same space or time" (Chafe 1994: 44). Therefore, ‘detachment’ from the audience can be typical of written communication. It may be consistent with the preference to detached tone realized by the use of passives in writing. Secondly, in contrast to rich features of prosody in speaking, there is a lack of spoken prosody in writing. Thirdly, unlike the feature of ‘spontaneity’ in spoken language (Chafe 1994), writing is revised and reshaped before what the writer produces is presented to the audience. Basically, making texts more formal and official depends on the number of revisions because the writer employs more and more linguistic devices such as nominalizations and relative clauses to integrate more information into ‘an idea unit’ (Chafe 1982). Therefore, writing is less natural to ‘the human organism’ than speaking (Chafe 1994). Now let us apply these three claims to e-mail messages.

Although e-mail messages are written texts, the interaction between the writer and the reader exists. The introduction of a new technology, called e-mail, enables the writer to communicate with the reader much faster and easier. Therefore, the feedback from the audience is received relatively quickly in comparison to other types of written communication. The relatively short length of the text comprising the body of an e-mail as opposed to the formal letter may allow participants to exchange information much faster. In contrast to formal letters, less conflict avoidance strategy is observed in e-mail messages because of their preference for brevity or minimalism (Mulholland 1999). Furthermore, when both parties communicate to each other via e-mail, shared knowledge has already been established in many cases. The frequent use of in-group language such as ‘English code’ and ‘slang terms’, and the omission of subject
pronouns (Ferrara et al. 1991) support this claim to a certain extent. E-mail messages are not rich in prosody in comparison to spoken communication. However, examples of prosodic features mainly employed in spoken communication are also found in e-mail messages. For example, in slang terms used in my corpus, ideophonic words are reduplicated (e.g. \textit{phak} $\rightarrow$ \textit{phakphak} ‘very’ [AE24]) and lax consonants are tensified for emphatic purposes (e.g. \textit{telta} $\rightarrow$ \textit{ttelta} ‘deduct’ [BE6]). These reflect spoken prosodic phenomena. Besides certain characteristics of spoken communication, properties of written communication are certainly found in e-mail messages too. For instance, ‘integration’ incorporating more information in terms of nominalizations, relative clauses, etc. and ‘detachment’ realized by passives, nominalizations, are major characteristics of written communication (Chafe 1982). Nevertheless, those linguistic devices are employed in e-mail messages less frequently than in formal business letters for external communication, because revisions to e-mail messages are relatively limited (Crystal 2001). Consequently, e-mail texts for business communication have some linguistic features of both spoken and written communications (Herring 1996). Probably, that is why these “‘disposable’ genres borne by the electronic exchange of messages in the business environment” deserve special attention (Yli-Jokipii 1998: 141).

\subsection*{7.2.6. Corporate culture}

Numerous studies have documented the effect of organizational context on the choice of politeness strategy (Akar 1998; Bilbow 1997; Hogge and Kostelnick 1989; Neumann 1997; Nickerson 2000). Likewise, corporate culture has a significant effect on the use of politeness strategy in my corpus.

Bald on record strategy is realized more frequently in corporation B than in corporation
A. Furthermore, bald on record strategy is used more often than solidarity enforcement strategy in internal communication of corporation B. The use of solidarity enforcement strategy manifests corporate culture. Corporation A mainly takes into consideration the reader’s positive face wants that his/her abilities be recognized and respected (i.e. show interest). Whereas corporation B particularly attends to the reader’s positive face wants to be included (i.e. use in-group language). By the same token, in its use of solidarity enforcement strategy, corporation A pays more attention to ‘emotional attachment’ called inceng and corporation B pays more attention to kwanyak, which is a bond or tie between interactants (Billow 1997). In particular, corporation B heavily uses a kind of in-group identity marker called ‘English code’ in external communication. This result may be explained by what Triandis (1986) labels ‘simple collectivism’ and ‘contextual collectivism’. That is, corporation A emphasizes ‘simple collectivism’, in which the in-group influence is limited to the in-group itself or the intra-corporation whereas corporation B emphasizes ‘contextual collectivism’, in which the in-group influence is not bound to the in-group of corporation B. Therefore, corporation B treats other business partners as their expanded in-group. Status does not affect the use of bald on record but distance does in the internal communication of corporation A (AE). In contrast, status does affect the use of bald on record in the internal communication of corporation B (BE). In BE, when higher status people make requests, they commonly use bald on record, whereas lower status people prefer bald on record strategy when they convey bad news. In corporation A, status seems to affect the use of solidarity enforcement strategy especially when the writer’s status is higher than the reader’s. It is because compliments are mostly made from higher to lower status people. In corporation B, status also affects the choice of solidarity enforcement strategy when the writer’s status is lower than the reader’s. It is due to the heavy use of code-mixing by lower status people in the external communication of corporation B (BL). Although
the less powerful people tend to make more solidarity in AL, more powerful people use more solidarity enforcement strategies in BL. The use of conflict avoidance strategies reflect corporate culture when we take into consideration the power variable. In external communications, corporation A uses more conflict avoidance strategies when the writer’s power is weaker than the reader’s. In contrast, power does not seem to affect the choice of politeness strategy in corporation B, particularly external communication, because more powerful people use more indirect strategies, such as conflict avoidance strategy and off record strategies. Speech acts distinctively reveal corporate culture. Since corporation B deals with health and disease, they are extremely sensitive to bad news to a certain extent. The frequent use of bald on record, the uncommon use of both conflict avoidance strategy and off record strategy, and probably the placement of giving bad news in business texts of corporation B in conveying bad news show that corporation B is direct and hasty in giving bad news.

In conclusion, corporation B seems to have a more Western-style corporate culture in that it recognizes to a lesser degree power between participants and therefore it is more task-oriented and less hierarchical in its realization of politeness strategies particularly in external communication. This claim is also supported by the fact that the length of the body of business texts is much shorter in corporation B than in corporation A and initial non-essential business talk in corporation B is distinguished by shorter sentences and less sentential elaboration. It is also interesting to note that corporation B is more oriented to negative face than positive face as shown in table 7.31. In turn, corporation A is (slightly) more oriented to positive face than negative face. This result is not exactly consistent with Hofstede’s (1980, 1994) claim that national culture substantially affects corporate culture.
Table 7.31. Face-orientation in the Korean data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bald on record</td>
<td>-3 (neg)</td>
<td>-7 (pos)</td>
<td>-1 (pos)</td>
<td>-4 (pos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>17 (pos)</td>
<td>7 (pos)</td>
<td>15 (pos)</td>
<td>32 (pos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict avoid</td>
<td>45 (pos)</td>
<td>24 (pos)</td>
<td>117 (pos)</td>
<td>91 (pos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 (neg)</td>
<td>43 (neg)</td>
<td>129 (neg)</td>
<td>137 (neg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off record</td>
<td>2 (neg)</td>
<td>4 (neg)</td>
<td>4 (pos)</td>
<td>4 (pos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (neg)</td>
<td>2 (neg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54% (62 (pos))</td>
<td>33% (24 (pos))</td>
<td>51% (135 (pos))</td>
<td>47% (123 (pos))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46% (53 (neg))</td>
<td>67% (48 (neg))</td>
<td>49% (129 (neg))</td>
<td>53% (138 (neg))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pos: positive face  
Neg: negative face

7.2.7. Summary and discussion

B&L (1987: 250) propose a set of four kinds of dyads specified by two polar values (high/low) on the two dimensions P and D. B&L’s patterns of strategy distribution is re-presented in table 7.32. I also apply B&L’s patterns of strategy distribution to my corpus and present strategic patterns distributed in my corpus in table 7.33. I just mark positive for distance in the external communications of both corporations because there are no examples of external communication between familiar parties. A question mark includes both cases of W>R and W<R.

Table 7.32. B&L’s patterns of strategy distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bald on record</th>
<th>Positive (Solidarity)</th>
<th>Negative (Deference)</th>
<th>Off record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>W&gt;R/W=R</td>
<td>W=R</td>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
<td>W&lt;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>+D/-D</td>
<td>+D/-D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In many cases, B&L's patterns of strategy distribution are not consistent with the corpus of Korean business letters. The existence of numerous exceptions not suitable for B&L's patterns of strategy distribution may be explained if politeness is a function of more than one variable (Holtgraves and Yang 1992). In my data, corporate culture seems to play the most significant role in explaining those exceptions.

The use of bald on record is entirely dependent on distance in AE (i.e. between low D relations) and speech acts in BE (i.e. requests baldly made by higher status people and bad news conveyed baldly by lower status people). In the case of BE, the common use of bald on record strategy in particular speech acts seems to be affected by corporate culture. That is, while higher status people baldly get lower status people to do something, bad news is baldly reported by people from lower to higher status in BE. In AL and BL, bald on record strategy is mostly used by the more powerful writer in accordance with B&L's pattern bald on record distribution, regardless of the positive distance between interactants. In particular, bald on record strategy is preferred in giving bad news in BL. I have already talked about the relative sensitivity of corporation B to the conveying of bad news.

Corporate culture also significantly affects the choice of solidarity enforcement strategy. That is, corporation A pays special attention to the reader's positive face wants that his/her abilities be attended to and respected, whereas corporation B takes into greater consideration the reader's positive face wants to be included. In AE, the pattern of solidarity enforcement strategy
distribution never matches B&L’s claim (i.e. between power equals and low distance relations) because compliments where the majority of solidarity enforcement strategies are used in corporation A are mostly made by people of higher status to people of lower status and between high D relations. B&L’s pattern of solidarity enforcement strategy distribution is consistent with only BE due to the common use of slang between low D and low P relations. Contrary to the use of solidarity enforcement strategy in AE, people/companies with less power tend to make more solidarity with powerful people/companies in AL. It shows a prevalent trend in the business context. However, in contrast to this prevailing tendency in the business context, power does not seem to affect the choice of solidarity enforcement strategy in BL because more powerful people use more solidarity enforcement strategy. Regardless of power differences, people in corporation B show respect to business partners or subcontractors as in-group members by using in-group language.

By the same token, although the use of conflict avoidance strategy in AE, BE, and AL is consistent with B&L’s pattern of negative politeness strategy distribution, the more powerful people in BL give deference to less powerful people irrespective of power differences. It explicitly shows that corporation B is to some extent culturally more Western because of the lower importance of power in realizing politeness strategy.

B&L’s pattern of off record strategy distribution is not consistent with any examples in my data. In the internal communications of both companies, the more powerful people generally use off record strategy. Presumably, it is because off record utterances made by people with high P in a ‘standard situation’ is not ambiguous. Therefore, context is of crucial importance in using a particular (politeness) strategy.

Consequently, despite the small numbers of examples involved, we can make the observation that the variables affecting politeness strategy tend to be interdependent of one
another in the Korean corporate context.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

8.1. Summary of major findings

This study investigated how (im)politeness strategies are used in the performance of four different speech acts (disagreement, giving bad news, request, and compliment) in the Korean business context. The basic argument I present is that each corporation has its own distinctive corporate culture/norm, which might be different from national culture, and each corporate culture/norm affects the choice of (im)politeness strategies. To support this argument, a three-tiered analysis was used as the data analysis method: (1) a hand-tagged moves-analysis; (2) a qualitative method; and (3) a quantitative method.

Chapter five provided a description of data analysis from a global perspective. It was found that the placement of the FTAs in the body of the text reflects a certain corporate culture. For example, disagreements and giving bad news in corporation B were preferentially placed at the beginning of the text. Furthermore, non-essential business talk also reveals corporate culture. The total occurrences of initial non-essential business talk in corporation B are much fewer than those occurring in corporation A. Additionally, initial non-essential business talk in corporation A is distinguished by longer sentences and sentential elaboration. Final non-essential business talk serving as doing collegiality also reflects corporate culture in that it is heavily used in corporation A.

Chapter six provided a more detailed and localized view of data analysis procedures. We have illustrated that the use of (im)politeness strategies reflects corporate culture. For example, in its use of solidarity enforcement strategy, corporation A pays more attention to ‘emotional attachment’ and corporation B pays more attention to ‘a bond or tie between
participants'. Corporation B emphasizes 'contextual collectivism'. Therefore, corporation B treats other business partners as their expanded in-group. The use of bald on record also reveals corporate culture. People in corporation B prefer the use of bald on record when they convey bad news.

Chapter seven discussed the overall results calculated according to the approach outlined in chapter six and a number of contextual factors affecting the results. Contextual factors reflect corporate culture. Corporation B is more task-oriented and less hierarchical in its realization of (im)politeness strategies in that it recognizes to a lesser degree power between interactants (e.g. frequent use of conflict avoidance strategy by the more powerful writer in corporation B; heavy use of bald on record strategy in giving bad news by the less powerful writer in corporation B). Consequently, these overall findings show that corporation A has more group-oriented, oriental, and indirect corporate culture and corporation B has a more Western-style corporate culture.

The major findings in my investigation of (im)politeness strategies used in Korean business correspondence can be summarized as follows:

(1) We have illustrated that the rhetorical style in Korean business correspondence, *Ki* (beginning) – *Sung* (development)– *Kyun* (end), can be disconnected by 'external modifications' (e.g. supportive reasons for the head act implying the FTA) for politeness concerns. Corporate culture also affects the rhetorical structure (i.e. the placement of FTA).

(2) (Im)politeness strategies and their substrategies, which appear in Korean business correspondence, are as follows:
Table 8.1. (Im)politeness strategies which appear in Korean business correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superstrategies</th>
<th>Substrategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bald on record</td>
<td>2.1. Show interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Solidarity enforcement strategies</td>
<td>2.1.1. Notice, attend to R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2. Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2.1. Boosters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2.2. Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3. Offer, promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4. Anticipation statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Use in-group language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1. Code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2. Use of slang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict avoidance strategies</td>
<td>3.1. Be conventionally indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.1. Want statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2. Conditional appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Mitigating devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.1. Hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2. Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3. Give overwhelming reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Defocusing W/R or action from the FTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1. Avoid using I/you pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1.1. Pluralization of the ‘I’ pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1.2. You-attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2. Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.3. Nominalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Off record</td>
<td>4.1. Reasonableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. Act in question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The most frequent (im)politeness strategy across companies and genres is ‘conflict avoidance’. The second most frequent strategy (BE being the only exception) is ‘solidarity enforcement’. The least frequent strategy is ‘off record’ in AE and BE and ‘bald on record’ in AL and BL.

(4) The overall patterns of strategy distribution in Korean business correspondence have been analyzed as shown in table 8.2., according to the approach outlined in table 8.1.
Table 8.2. Patterns of strategy distribution in Korean business correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Bald on record</th>
<th>Solidarity enforcement</th>
<th>Conflict avoidance</th>
<th>Off record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W&gt;R/W&lt;R</td>
<td>W&gt;R/W=R/W=W&lt;R</td>
<td>W&lt;R (W&gt;R)</td>
<td>W&gt;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>+D/-D</td>
<td>+D/-D</td>
<td>+D (-D)</td>
<td>-D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In internal communications, bald on record strategy is heavily used by more powerful people. However, the writer with lower power over the reader also uses bald on record strategy when distance between participants is small. Additionally, the use of bald on record reflects corporate culture. That is, bad news is conveyed mostly by lower status people in corporation B in terms of bald on record strategy, although distance between both parties is great. In this case, bald on record strategy used by subordinates is appropriate or justified because social norms or rules for the use of bald on record strategy in conveying bad news are shared between parties. This is a case of performing FTA without redress (i.e. the use of bald on record strategy) in order to follow social norms or rules (i.e. organizational norms in corporation B). Therefore, participants may not have a negative attitude towards the use of bald on record strategy in this case.

The use of solidarity enforcement strategy manifests corporate culture. Corporation A mainly pays attention to the reader’s positive face wants that his/her abilities be recognized and respected (i.e. show interest). In AE, solidarity enforcement strategy is overwhelmingy used when the writer’s power is greater than the reader’s. This is due to the fact that compliment speech acts are mostly made from higher to lower status. In contrast, people with less power use the most solidarity enforcement strategies in AL. It is because people/company with less power want(s) to create more solidarity to maintain a good relationship with the people/company having stronger power. Corporation B mainly takes into consideration the reader’s positive face wants to be included (i.e. using in-group language). In BE, solidarity enforcement strategies are realized most frequently in power equals because of the overwhelming use of slang between
power equals. Whereas solidarity enforcement strategies are most heavily used by more powerful writer in BL. This is entirely due to heavy use of code-mixing by powerful people.

Conflict avoidance strategy is most frequently used across companies and genres when the reader is more powerful (BL being the only exception). The use of conflict avoidance strategy reflects corporate culture to a certain extent. That is, in BL, the more powerful writer heavily uses conflict avoidance strategy to show respect to the less powerful reader, regardless of power differences.

Powerful people prefer the use of off record strategy across corporations and genres. Probably, this is due to the fact that the less powerful people quickly understand nonconventionally indirect utterances made by more powerful people in a 'standard situation'. Furthermore, off record strategy is used most frequently when distance between interactants is small. It shows the fact that interactants are close enough to share common knowledge.

Consequently, it is dangerous to make any generalizations about the characteristics of languages and cultures using cross-cultural data (Yli-Jokipii 1998). For example, B&L propose that in a more hierarchical society (e.g. Korea) relative power might be given more weight in determining variation in linguistic behavior. However, we have demonstrated that this static or traditional view of culture is not easily reconciled with the data from Korean business correspondence (i.e. the heavy use of bald on record strategy by less powerful people in corporation B; the heavy use of conflict avoidance strategy by more powerful people in corporation B; and the heavy use of off record strategy by more powerful people in corporations A and B). Therefore, we need to overcome cultural stereotyping in dealing with politeness phenomena or any other pragmatic phenomena, because results can be significantly different from the expectations one might have from conventional or traditional perspective of a culture (Louhiala-Salminen 2002). Figure 8.1 illustrates a model of Korean (im)politeness.
In figure 8.1, the writer takes into consideration three components in choosing appropriate (im)politeness strategies: (1) the message that s/he delivers (e.g. letters including FTA or FEA); (2) the social relationship between interactants depending on contextual factors such as status, age, power, distance; and (3) social norms (i.e. organizational norms). First of all, the writer chooses the type of message that s/he will deliver (e.g. letters including FTA or FEA). And then the writer considers the social relationship between interactants depending on contextual factors (e.g. status, age, power, distance). These contextual factors can be affected by social norms or rules. For example, status and power do not always operate simultaneously in external business communication in Korea (cf. the relationship between the contractor and the subcontractor). In this respect, the subcontractor tries to create more solidarity and avoid conflict with the contractor. However, social norms or rules in themselves also directly affect the writer's choice of (im)politeness strategies regardless of contextual factors. For example, powerful people
prefer the use of conflict avoidance strategies in BL. Off record strategy is also used most frequently by powerful writers across companies and genres. Bald on record strategy is preferred by the subordinate when s/he gives bad news to the superior in BE. In using solidarity enforcement strategies, corporation A mainly takes into consideration the reader's positive face wants that his/her abilities be recognized, whereas corporation B particularly attends to the reader's positive face wants to be included. In these cases, contextual factors other than social norms do not affect the choice of (im)politeness strategies but social norms do.

8.2. Pedagogical implications

For pedagogical purposes, general patterns of politeness strategies in Korean, which produce lists of conventional forms, are useful and beneficial. For example, one of the basic conflict avoidance strategies, hedges in Korean are composed of 1) the quantitative hedge, 2) delimiter particle, 3) if-clause expression, 4) the quotative suffix, 5) dubitative words, 6) the benefactive auxiliary verb, and 7) lexical hedges. However, it may be pedagogically beneficial if we show how these hedges are used in social appropriate circumstances (e.g. who should say what to whom; how and when to say it, and so on), instead of producing simple lists of hedges (Flowerdew, 1998; Upton and Connor, 2001). For example, hedges can be used preferably by subordinates as efficient persuasive tactics to get superiors to do something or as mitigators to minimize the force of FTAs in business context. In contrast, hedges cannot be politeness strategies if they are overused between intimates or if they are used in paying a compliment. Therefore, the interpretation of hedges can be different depending on a given context. This shows the importance of Leech's 'sociopragmatics' (Leech, 1983) in that what is appropriate behavior is determined in a context or culture. That is, we need competencies beyond
grammatical competence to make sense of the use of politeness strategies.

Unlike highly conventional conflict avoidance strategies (e.g. want statements, conditional appreciation, hedges), bald on record, solidarity enforcement, and off record strategies are relatively more nonconventional. Therefore, it is hard to give even general patterns for them. For pedagogical purposes, therefore, knowledge of sociopragmatic skills, abilities, norms or rules is of vital importance (Judd, 1999). For example, offering a gift to a superior is an efficient way to enhance the gift-receiver’s positive face in business context. In this case, politeness is not only limited to language but can be related to non-linguistic behavior. Giving unavoidable reasons for performing the FTAs can also be a polite behavior in business settings. In these cases, we should have more than Chomskyan ‘linguistic competence’ to do communicate efficiently in a given context. In other words, Hymesian ‘communicative competence’ is necessary to make sense of appropriateness of language use in particular situations.

A numerous literature has identified cultural values affecting international business communication (Hofstede, 1980, 1994; Ting-Toomey, 1985; Trompenaars, 1993). However, as some other business communicators have recently pointed out (Varner, 2001; Yli-Jokipii, 1998), those major works over-generalize cultural values and norms in explaining corporate culture, to which generalized national culture does not always apply. This conventionalized idea about culture can only result in stereotyping (Varner, 2001). Furthermore, communication patterns can be different even within a single culture (e.g. Corporation B is direct in performing the FTAs in internal communication). Therefore, there is a possibility of making pragmatic misinterpretations when we do business solely based on general culture in inter or cross-cultural business settings. Before conventionalizing culture to apply it to inter or cross-cultural business communication, it is necessary to properly consider ‘appropriateness’ (i.e. suitable
communication *in a given situation* in a particular culture) (Canale and Swain, 1980; Cortazzi and Jin, 1999; Hymes, 1972; Leech, 1983) to improve inter-/cross-cultural business communication skills. Language-for-Business-Purposes instructors need to know what ‘appropriateness’ is in a certain business setting (i.e. organizational norms or rules) for effective communication training (Swales 2000), because “writing in an organization is not only a matter of knowing how to write a certain document for a specific audience but also a matter of how to fit into the organizational structure and how to adapt to the organizational subculture and its norms, attitudes, and values” (Gunnarsson 1997: 141).

8.3 Limitations of the present study

The present study has basically two limitations. The first limitation is related to frequency of strategies. The frequency of bald on record, solidarity enforcement, and off record strategies is relatively lower than that of conflict avoidance strategies. Although we can observe to some extent the trend of the use of strategies in the present study, a more explicit indication of the trend may be given by a higher frequency of strategies.

The second limitation concerns contextual factors. Distance is considered as a contextual factor affecting the choice of strategies only in internal correspondence because there is no external correspondence conducted between long-term business partners. There are also insufficient data to compare the performance of speech acts between men and women. Because of the small sample, it was not possible to explore gender differences. This is mainly because of the custom in Korea that businessmen instead of businesswomen normally write the external letter of FTA, even when businesswomen are in charge of performing FTA. Since there are not e-mail messages for external communication and formal letters for internal communication in
the corpus, it is difficult to see the influences of medium on the choice of strategies in internal and external communications. In other words, since medium is separately selected depending on different types of tasks (i.e. internal vs. external), it is hard to compare between internal and external communications.

8.4. Further research

The present study conducts an initial investigation into linguistic politeness strategies realized in four different speech acts in Korean business correspondence. The following suggestions may be made as guidelines for future research.

1. Although the data is composed of the four different types of speech acts, immediate turns of interaction are not examined. This suggests that investigating immediate speech act exchanges should provide further information about whether the reader’s reaction to the prior communication may be different based on the realization of strategies made by the opposite party in the prior correspondence (i.e. whether or not the reader uses the same type or the equal amount of politeness strategies in their response to the writer).

2. Besides the contextual factors I examine in the present study, other contextual variables, such as those mentioned in 8.3, may also be investigated for further research. In particular, ‘the size of imposition’ seems to be an important variable in dealing with the speech act of request in that research has shown the degree of imposition plays a significant role in making a request and its response behavior (Gonzales et al., 1990; Holtgraves and Yang, 1992). Although, in general, a request is not imposing on other’s freedom of action or territory in Korean culture, in cases where it causes a certain level or degree of face threat or embarrassment to the addressee, regardless of whether participants are intimates, it may be an
imposition.

3. Although the present study is synchronic, it may also be interesting to see the change in trends of using politeness strategies depending on the different periods during which the texts were written and thereby different management techniques.

4. In-depth inter-cultural studies on politeness strategies in performing speech acts are needed based on the present research partly undertaken from the cross-cultural communication perspective. Studies of cultural differences in politeness strategies can give background knowledge that enables us to avoid the miscommunication labeled as 'pragmalinguistic failure' (e.g. the use of ritual greetings) and 'sociopragmatic failure' (e.g. to make a request to pay a compliment) (Thomas, 1983) in inter-cultural communication situations, and thereby to facilitate inter-cultural communication. Furthermore, this background knowledge may play a significant role in the conduct of business contacts or negotiations, and the handling of conflicts in inter-cultural business settings.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

채무 대위 변제 최고장

삼가 귀하의 건강과 사업 변장을 축원합니다.

다음이 아니오라 00년 0월 0일 귀하께서 000에게 제공하신 담보물을 00지법 00등가소 접수 제 0호에 의거 부동산 담보설정을 완료하고 채무자 000와 상거래를 하던 중 거래 중단이 되어 현재 미수된 채무금이 000원 이내 변제를 차일 피일 미루고 있어 채권 권리에 막대한 자장을 받고 있음을 심히 유감스럽게 생각하오며 폐사는 부득이 채무자 000의 미수금이 변제되지 않고 있어 귀하께서 1900년 0월 0일까지 채무 대위 변제하여 주실 것을 당부드립니다.

만일 기한 내 정산되지 않을 경우에는 본의는 아니오나 귀하께서 제공하신 담보물에 대하여 법적 절차를 통하여 회수키로 결정하였사오니 폐사의 고충을 충분히 이해하시고 최종적인 절차를 단행하기 전에 정산될 수 있도록 거듭 당부 드립니다.

19 00. 0. 0

발신

수신
수신: ㅇ ㅇ 상사
참조: ㅇ ㅇ 부부장님 귀하
제목: 반품 요청안

안녕하십니까?

상기 제목과 관련하여 이미 전화상으로 말씀드렸던 바와 같이 귀사의 거래처에서 요구하는 반품문제는 당사로서는 수용하기 어려운 제안이라는 점을 다시 한번 알려 드립니다.

귀사에서도 의외 아시는 바와 같이 본건은 당사가 귀사의 주문을 받은 후 제품을 신규 생산하여 공급해 드렸던 것으로 제품의 SHELF LIFE에 전혀 문제가 없는 제품을 유효기간 (3 년) 한달을 앞두고 전량 반품을 요청한 건으로 일반적인 상거래에 도 어긋나는 무리한 요구라고 사료됩니다.

특히, 귀사의 거래처에서는 상기 반품 요청 건 이후에도 여러 차례 동일품을 구매할 바 있으며 귀사의 정보에 의하면, 상기 반품 요청건은 재고로 쌓아놓은 상태에서 이후 구매한 품목은 모두 판매되었다는 점을 감안할 때 이는 가장 기본적인 신임 신중을 무시한 재고관리 부실로 발생한 문제이자 품질문제가 아니라라고 생각합니다.

다만 당사로서는 원만한 거래관계의 유지를 위해 추후 귀사에서 본 품목에 대한 추가 주문이 있을 경우 약 ㅇ ㅇ % 선의 FREE SAMPLE을 통해 영업손실을 보상해드리고자 합니다.

이런 점을 참고하면서 귀사의 거래처를 설득하여 주시기 바랍니다.

19 ㅇ ㅇ ㅇ ㅇ

ㅇ ㅇ 제약 (주) 무역부
ㅇ ㅇ 배
APPENDIX C

Progression of Data Analysis

1. ○ ○ ○과장님 안녕하세요. 2. 디자인 팀 ○ ○ ○입니다. 3. ‘○ ○카레’ 문안 변 경작업이 완전히 마감되었습니다 4. 여 제 감독스럽게 문안수정 order를 또 받았습니다. 5. 우리 부서에서는 요즘 2명의 인원이 퇴직한 상태라 굉장히 바쁜 업무 속에 빼리 작업을 해 드렸는데, 6. 저희로서는 매우 힘들습니다. 7. 다음번 문안 주설 때는 한번 더 생각하시고 의뢰해 주시기 바랍니다.

1. Head of department OOO, how are you doing? 2. I am OOO in the design department. 3. Even though the work of character changing for ‘OO curry’ is completely finished. 4. We suddenly received a character correction order again yesterday. 5. Even though we finished the work quickly in spite of being very busy due to two people’s retirement in our department 6. We are having a very hard time. 7. When you give the work of character changing, I hope next time you think once more and you will make your request.

<p>| [AE23] (W&lt; R; +D) A 30-year-old man complaints to a 30-year-old man about a work assignment. |
|---|---|---|
| <strong>Unit</strong> | <strong>Text</strong> | <strong>Moves</strong> |
| 1 | OOO kwacang-nim amnyeng-ha-sey-yo OOO head of dept.-Mr. Hi-do-HON-POL | Greetings |
| 2 | ticain-thim OOO-i-p-ni-ta design-team OOO-is-AH-IN-DC | Self-disclosure |
| 3 | ‘OO khaley’ mwunanpyenkyengcakep-i wancenhi OO curry a work of character changing-is completely makam-toy-ess-nuntye finish-be-PST-but | Reason |
| 4 | ecey kapcaksulepkey mwunan swuceng order-lul tto yesterday suddenly character correction order-AC again pat-ass-sup-ni-ta receive-PST-AH-IN-DC | Complaint |
| 5 | wuli pwise-eyse-nun yocum 2 myeng-uy inwen-i our department-in-TOP lately 2 people-’s staff-NM toycik-ha-n sangthay-la koymgeanghi pappun epmuwu-sokey | Reason |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall purpose</th>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaining to a superior about a work assignment</td>
<td>1. Greetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Self-disclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Complaint</td>
<td>Code-mixing (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Complaint</td>
<td>(1) Give reasons (2) Pluralization of ‘I’ pronoun (cehuy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Request</td>
<td>(1) Hedge (cwu) (2) Nominalize (cwusiki) (3) Want statement (palapnita)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall purpose</th>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired-do-RL situation because very busy work-in ppalli cakep ul hay tuli ess-nunty fast work-AC do give-PST-but</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Progression of Data Analysis

1. How are you doing? 2. I inform you that, owing to our firm’s regulations, 3. it’s difficult to accept the settlement condition of 120 days you request. 4. We generally reject D/A conditions but we will make an exception to accept the D/A 60 days settlement condition proposed by your firm. 5. But, since the extension to 120 days is a difficult proposal to accept at all, 6. I would appreciate it if you would consider our situation and continue to maintain the existing terms of business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>amnyeng-ha-si-p-ni-kka hi-do-HON-AH-IN-Q</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kumpen yocheong-ha-si-n kyelceycoken 120 days-nun this time request-do-HON-RL settlement condition 120 days-TOP tangsa sakyu-sang our firm company regulation-on</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>swuyong-i elyepta-nun cem allye-tuli-p-ni-ta accept-NM difficult-RL point inform-give-AH-IN-DC</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ilpancekulo tangsa-nun D/A coken-ul pwulhe-ha-na generally our firm-TOP D/A condition-AC reject-do-but kwisa-wa-nun yeyyoyce-k-ulo D/A 60-il your firm-with-TOP exception-as D/A 60-day kyelceycoken-ul swuyong-hay on pa iss-sup-ni-ta settlement condition-AC accept-do doing way is-AH-IN-DC</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>kulena 120 days-lony yencang-un tangsa-lose-nun tocehi but 120 days-as extension-TOP our firm-as-TOP at all swuyong-ha-ki elyewun ceyan-i-oni accept-do-NOM difficult suggestion-is-because</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tangsa-uy ipcang-ul kolye-haye kicon</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall purpose</td>
<td>Moves</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objecting to a request</td>
<td>1. Greetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>Code-mixing (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reason</td>
<td>Give reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Disagree</td>
<td>Code-mixing (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Give reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Pluralization of ‘I’ pronoun (tangs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Nominalize (swuyonghaki)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Request</td>
<td>1) Hedge (cwy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Pluralization of ‘I’ pronoun (tangsa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Conditional appreciation (-myen kamsahakeyss supni ta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Samples of Business Letters in Company A

[AE35]

1. Heartfelt congratulations on your promotion. 2. Your name was on the list in the announcement of promotions. 3. I think it’s entirely due to your outstanding work ability. 4. When will you treat me to celebrate your promotion.

[AE1]

1. Chief, you are making an effort. 2. Our department slightly disagrees with the opinion that you substitute lunch expenses for vouchers. 3. We also have to go to the cafeterias stated in the vouchers. 4. To encourage various menus as a food company, 5. I would appreciate it if you would keep giving cash for lunch.

[AE5]

1. I am writing concerning an assignment to make some advertising posters. 2. Since it is a bit different from the design team’s unique office responsibility, 3. It is hard to do it. 4. It seems to be better to ask a subcontractor to do the job. 5. Let us drink a cup of coffee.

[AE9]

1. I am worried that problems in the work of character changing for ‘OO’ product have been found. 2. So, money and time were lost. 3. I request the full details of what happened.
1. Before the announcement I became aware of your name not being on the list of promotions. 2. Since many people fail to get a promotion at this time because of the IMF, do not worry about it too much. 3. Let us go for a drink in the evening.

1. I inform you that the plan for a foreign business trip has been cancelled. 2. Because business conditions are not good due to the IMF, the foreign business trip is cancelled this time. 3. I hope that you understand this situation.

1. We heard that you decided on the production plan of mayonnaise without discussing it with our department. 2. Our department was a bit confused. 3. I hope you will revise the production plan after discussing with us.

1. I wish for the prosperity of your firm. 2. I received your letter of request for reestimation today. 3. I can understand your request for a price reduction, however 4. Since the price of pulp is sky-rocketing this year 5. These circumstances make it impossible for us to comply with your condition. 6. If it is last year’s product, it’s possible to supply at the suggested price, but I am afraid it’s out of stock. 7. I hope you understand our situation in this respect.
We wish your firm’s prosperity. 2. Thank you for your letter of request dated O for the consignment sale of the Chinese noodles we produce. 3. Food company OO has already been completed the consignment sale of the Chinese noodles in an OEM way. Therefore, we are unable to accept your request.

1. Thanks for giving me your constant support. 2. The deadline for supplying the OO soup 80g you requested is too tight. 3. Because of our production capacity, we are unable to supply the product to you by O. 4. I am sorry for not accepting your request.

1. We wish for the prosperity of your firm. 2. We inform you that we are unable to accept your request. 3. Although reactions to your calendar design were good because of its artistic excellence, we think that it is a bit far from matching our firm’s image. 4. We inform you that we cannot accept your request for the reference documents pertaining to calendar making.
1. I wish for the prosperity of your firm. 2. Your new product, Chinese noodles OO, was withdrawn. 3. Although we tried our best, because sales declined, we had to withdraw the product. 4. I hope that you understand this.

1. 1. I wish for the prosperity of your firm. 2. Your new product, Chinese noodles OO, was withdrawn. 3. Although we tried our best, because sales declined, we had to withdraw the product. 4. I hope that you understand this.

1. Thanks for giving me your constant support. 2. I received the cancellation of an order for a roll of paper for the packaging of 300g ketchup ordered by the person in charge of buying and selling in your company. 3. I think you must take this action due to unavoidable circumstances but we urgently need a solution. 4. Because it is not only a bulk order but also an order from a long-term business partner, we arranged a production line and were ready even for night work. 5. Besides, as for wrapping cutting parts, outside order work is already being done by subcontractor. 6. Therefore, if you cancel an order in the current situation, enormous financial loss is expected as well as pervasive knock-on effects. 7. We sincerely request you to reconsider by taking into consideration this situation. 8. If you cancel, I think you should compensate us for our losses. 9. I hope you quickly inform me of your clear opinion about this matter.

1. 1. I wish for the prosperity of your firm. 2. The problem in the revised mock-up of ‘OO’ product have been found. 3. I would appreciate it if you would take quick action.
1. I appreciate your constant support. 2. I express my thanks to your company for producing OO ramen whose commercial value is excellent. 3. I think the reaction to new product OO ramen is very good, because the price is reasonable, the taste is good, and the packaging is recycled. 4. I look forward to the development of your good new product suitable to customers' needs and the start of selling in the future.

1. We deeply appreciate your lecture. 2. We have much interest in the topic of your lecture, ‘the corporate marketing strategy’, and it made a good impression on us. 3. If it is possible, I ask you to give lecture once again.
APPENDIX F

Samples of Business Letters in Company B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ○대리님, 금주안으로 선적못할 것 같습니다. 2. 최송합니다. 3. 다음주안으로는 반드시 선적하겠습니다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mr. deputy, it seems that I can’t ship within this week. 2. I am sorry. 3. I will certainly ship within next week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commission 금주안으로 못나갈 것 같습니다. 2. 지원팀에서 좀 늦어지네요. 3. 이해 바랍니다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It seems that commission is not going to be paid within this week. 2. The commission from the support team has been slightly delayed. 3. I hope that you understand this situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 이번달 마감 아직 안끝났어요? 2. 오늘까지는 반드시 끝내셔요.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has this month’s closing balance been calculated? 2. Finish it definitely by today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 내일까지 forecast 제출해야 하는 거 알지? 2. 오늘 오후까지 끝내라.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You know that you should submit forecast by tomorrow? 2. Finish it by this afternoon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ○과장님, commission pending 이 심합니다. 2. 조속한 송금조치 부탁드립니다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Head of department, there is a major commission pending. 2. I ask you to pay commission as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 이거 오늘까지 처리 안돼. 2. 퇴근시간 다되서 주고는 오늘까지 해 달라구? 3. 좀 배려라.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I cannot process this by today. 2. Are you asking me to process this, even though you are giving me this work just before the end of my work day? 3. I ask you to consider my situation a bit more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[BE33]
1. ो ो 아, 수고했다. 2. 덕분에 잘 끝났다. 3. 오늘 내가 출현한 사마.
1. OO, good job. 2. It’s well done thanks to you. 3. I will buy a drink today.

[BL3]
1. 안녕하십니까? 2. 당사로서는 유감스럽게도 귀사의 요청을 그대로 수용할 수가 없습니다. 3. 이는 바와 같이 현재 0 0 업계의 불황으로 당사에서도 생산량 감소와 함께 조업단축이 불가피한 설정입니다. 4. 아무리도 당사의 사정을 헤아리시어 가격인상에 대해 제정ته 주시기를 부탁드리자는 바입니다.
1. How are you doing? 2. Regrettably we cannot accept your request as it is. 3. As you know, there is current downturn in the OO industry. Under these unavoidable circumstances, we are forced to cut production thereby reducing our work load. 4. I hope you will consider our situation and reconsider a price increase.

[BL5]
1. 안녕하십니까? 2. 금번 요청하신 결제조건 (D/A)은 당사로서는 수용하기 어렵다는 점을 알려드립니다. 3. 억제 아시는 바와 같이 귀사의 요청에 따라 60 일 조건을 수용하여 여러 차례 거래한 바 있으나 결제기한 준수에 많은 문제가 있었습니다. 4. 이런 상황에서 기존의 60 일 조건을 90 일로 연장하는 문제는 당사로서는 수용이 불가함을 알리드립니다. 5. 다만, 그간의 귀사와의 거래관계를 감안 하였을 때, 기존의 60 일 조건은 수용토록 하겠으나 6. 금번 거래에 적용될 수 있도록 귀사의 협조를 바랍니다. 7. 아울러 이런 당사 입장은 고려하지시 반드시 결제기한을 지켜주시면 감사하겠습니다.
1. How are you doing? 2. We inform you that we are unable to accept the settlement condition (D/A) you requested. 3. As you know, although on numerous occasions we have conducted business based on the condition of 60 days requested by your firm, there are numerous problems in meeting the settlement date. 4. We inform you that it is impossible to extend the existing condition of 60 days to 90 days in this situation. 5. When we consider our historical relationship with regard to business transactions, since we will accept the existing condition of 60 days, 6. We hope you will cooperate with us and accept the condition in this business transaction. 7. Furthermore, I would appreciate it if you would consider our situation and meet the settlement date.
1. How are you doing? 2. The results of an experiment with the sample you have sent show us that there has been a serious problem in storing the item. 3. As you know, it is specified clearly in the product’s packaging that you should store this item at a temperature below 10 degrees Celsius, and away from direct sunshine. 4. However, the results of an experiment with the sample show us that you stored the item at a temperature above 50 degrees Celsius. 5. Since it happens not because of the quality of product but because of your business partner’s unreliable stock control 6. We are unable to accept your business partner’s request to recall the item. 7. I am enclosing the results of an experiment on this, I hope you will inform your business partner of them.

[BL25]

1. How are you doing? 2. This concerns an offer received from your firm in O. 3. Since confirmation of the order has been delayed due to our business partner’s current situation, 4. the validity of the offer you proposed has expired. 5. If the existing offer is currently valid, I would appreciate it if you would confirm the offer again by the end of this month. 6. After our business partner’s internal problem has been solved, if your firm’s offer is confirmed as valid, it seems that an order will be immediately confirmed.

[BL27]

1. How are you doing? 2. It is said that this product will go out of stock in O due to unexpected demand inflation. 3. Therefore, they requested that you increase the quantity of the shipments by 400kg. 4. If there is no problem, I would appreciate it if you would increase the quantity of the shipments. 5. If you allow me to increase the quantity, I will immediately amend the established L/C. 6. I request your firm’s cooperation.
1. How are you doing? 2. The contract to supply ‘OO’ product will expire. 3. Japanese corporation O does not want to extend the contract.

1. How are you doing? 2. It seems that the extension of the contract term for the SB project is unclear. 3. According to an on-the-spot survey, if the term of this contract has expired, the Japanese corporation OO doesn’t want to extend it any more. 4. During this business trip to Japan, I plan to meet face to face with head of department O. 5. I will let you know the content in detail after coming back from Japan.

1. How are you doing? 2. We previously informed you of this job a week before the final settlement and sought agreement with you about this. 3. Your request to charge accrued interest on the above job in this situation where a month has already passed since the completion of all settlement is very confusing to us. 4. Although it is true that the accrued interest on this job is not high. 5. Since we have never failed to meet the settlement deadline for a business transaction so far, 6. we would appreciate it if you would cancel your request.
1. How are you doing? 2. I am very worried about your delay in pursuing your business for following our shipping instruction in last O. 3. So, it has traspired that, due to missing the air shipment at the weekend, we are unable to meet our business partner’s delivery time. 4. I hope that you will ensure that this kind of trouble does not reoccur in the future.

1. 2. I am very worried about your delay in pursuing your business for following our shipping instruction in last O. 3. So, it has traspired that, due to missing the air shipment at the weekend, we are unable to meet our business partner’s delivery time. 4. I hope that you will ensure that this kind of trouble does not reoccur in the future.

1. How are you doing? 2. This concerns an export of OOO. 3. When we signed a contract, although delivery time we requested was the first week of last O, we have come to an agreement on the postponement of the delivery time until O at your request. 4. However, it is very difficult to understand your request to postpone again the delivery time until the first week of O. 5. Once again we ask that you meet the delivery deadline.

1. Congratulations on your success in developing this new product. 2. I think it is due to your efforts. 3. We will make every preparation for full-scale marketing of this new product by advertising it abroad, when it is produced commercially in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BL57</th>
<th>BL58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thank you for your firm’s action. 2. Due to your firm’s action at this time, we have received a letter expressing solid trust in your firm (a photocopy enclosed) from a buyer. 3. Although it was unclear if we could continue to do business because of the claim, the situation was resolved due to your quick action. 4. Once again thank you for your firm’s action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How are you doing? 2. I express my heartfelt thanks for your decision regarding the matter of price which was a very important issue in this contract. 3. I inform you that we succeeded in the contract owing to your firm’s cooperation about this matter. 4. We appreciate once again your action taken to agree to the price reduction in order to conclude this contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Interview Questions

1. Main questions

1.1. **Background information**: management and organizational structure (e.g. rank), a procedure in business transactions (e.g. the usual office routine), etc.

1.2. **Corporate culture**: a question about a sensitivity to hierarchy (age-consciousness; the use of address terms; the choice of speech levels), general attitude to business partners or subcontractors, a question about sexual discrimination (e.g. promotion)

1.3. **The medium of communication**: the choice of medium in business transactions (e.g. a relationship between medium selection and different types of tasks).

1.4. **Communication training**: how did you learn to write business correspondence?

1.5. **Information about the writer**: who normally write business letters (containing FTAs) (e.g. superior or inferior; man or woman), is there a case which a business letter is written by a subordinate on behalf of a superior

2. Follow-up questions based on initial probes and interviews in order to obtain detailed information about contextual factors (e.g. power, status, age, distance)

3. **Text-based interviews**: Interviews based on texts
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