Cross-Cultural Advertising Strategies in
Japanese vs. American Women's Magazines

Yuko Koga   **Bethyl A. Pearson**

Arizona State University

Abstract

Applying a model of politeness derived from an interlocking of Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) and Ting-Toomey (1988), this paper measures the politeness strategies of advertisements in comparable Japanese and American women's magazines. We claim that in addition to negative and positive facework, at least two other aspects of face, individual versus social facework, and self- versus other-facework, are evident in the advertisements examined here, and must be taken into account in drawing meaningful cross-cultural comparisons. Coding of strategies according to these criteria in 80 ads suggests that Japanese advertisers use more 'social' strategies, which correlate with collectivistic, vertical and high-context culture, while the American advertisers use more 'individual' strategies, which correlate with individualistic, horizontal, low-context culture.

Introduction

Lines in the international communication network are proliferating at a tremendous speed. A growing body of research in such areas as intergroup diplomatic communication (e.g., Ting-Toomey and Cole, forthcoming) and cross-cultural speech styles, both for children (e.g., Clancy, 1986) and for adults (e.g., Thomas, 1983) attest to this explosion. Furthermore, the dramatic increase in attention given to corporate language programs in the U.S. and in the larger world-community firmly remind us of our new and inevitable world citizenship. The area of advertising, until recently principally a domain of business, economics and marketing, has now begun to be examined in its own right as a source of insightful correlations between culture and language (e.g., Takashi, 1990).

In this paper we further the connections between the cultural and the linguistic dimensions of advertising. Specifically, the purpose of this paper is two-fold: (a) to investigate the cross-cultural linguistic strategies for selling a specified range of products in a corpus of advertisements selected from comparable Japanese and American magazines and (b) to test the efficacy of an integrated model of politeness in analyzing and accounting for the observed cross-cultural similarities and variations. We will argue that a full application of at least three aspects of 'face,' as these aspects are situated in established cultural structures, is necessary for an accurate analysis.

Cultural Structures

Cultural structures are a grounding point for much work in intercultural communication. Specifically, Asian cultures such as Japan have been described along three dimensions as (a) collectivistic in value orientation, (b) high-context in communication style, and (c) vertical in social structure, while Western cultures such as the U.S. have been described in opposite terms as (a) individualistic, (b) low-context and (c) horizontal (Hall, 1983; Ting-Toomey, 1985) .

Collectivistic/individualistic. Collectivistic cultures are believed to draw upon the 'we' as a group identity (Okabe, 1983; Ting-Toomey, 1988), while individualistic cultures are thought to draw upon the 'I' as an individual identity. It is argued that the difference in the self-identity unit parallels the tightness or looseness of social relationships between the members. In terms of cultural evolution, most Asian cultures have been obliged to be organized and cooperative, while Western cultures have emphasized individual's territory and competition; self-identity has been extended to a person's values (Boldt, 1978). Individualistic cultures are said to emphasize individual goals over group goals, individualistic concerns over group concerns, and individual rights and needs over collective responsibilities and obligations (Ting-Toomey, 1988).

High-low-context. Communication style is believed to mirror the collectivistic/individualistic dichotomy. It is argued that, in general, individualistic cultures encourage self-assertion and direct expression of opinions, and that people in such cultures express their wants straightforwardly. Collectivistic cultures, on the other hand, appreciate more indirect, implicit, impersonalized expressions for group harmony. These preference differences in communication style reflect low- versus high-context culture, respectively (e.g., Hall, 1983; Ting-Toomey, 1985). In low-context cultures, people convey messages directly with little need for context; in high-context cultures, on the other hand, much information remains unspoken and dependence on the context is very high.

Vertical/horizontal. Nakane (1970) defines Japan as 'vertical' and the U.S. as 'horizontal' in terms of primary social ties. Vertical cultures are divided into numerous

groupings, each structured along multiple status layers. This vertical, hierarchical arrangement is quite evident in most institutional organizations in Japan---government bureaucracies, business firms, schools, shops, and even families. Okabe (1983) claims that the vertical organization of the society is related to the unique homogeneity of Japan.[1] The members of Japanese society share a great many aspects of their daily life, consciousness, and homogeneous values as a group. This enables them to locate each person in the group along a common linear scale, and to say one individual ranks higher than another.

By contrast, where heterogeneity in race, language and habits is predominant, as in the U.S., the social structure is based on the principle of assumed equality and respect for distinct values, beliefs or behaviors of one's own and others. Interpersonal relations are typically horizontal, conducted between presumed equals.

Politeness

Among the ways to explore the link between language use and cultural structures is through the study of speakers' strategies for encoding politeness. The seminal work of Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987), including the well-known categorizations of negative and positive politeness,[2] has triggered much research in politeness, although most currently agree that what counts as polite behavior is both language and culture (if not situation) specific (Gu, 1990). Politeness strategies are said to work toward preserving face from the point of view of all interactants, while socially influencing the listener (e.g. gaining his or her compliance).

In this paper we prefer to use the terms association and dissociation (Ting-Toomey, 1988) over negative and positive politeness. Both a desire for personal approval and a desire for ingrouping emphasize the human need toward association of self (the speaker) with others (the hearer). Both a desire for personal territory or freedom and a desire for social distancing (in a vertical and a horizontal direction) emphasize the human need toward dissociation of self from others. The difference between the two items in association and dissociation categories is whether the concept of 'self ' is viewed as an individual or as a member of a group.

Researchers have further refined these concepts, arguing that face-negotiations involve two aspects in addition to the association/dissociation face dimension that improve the basis of cross-cultural comparisons. The first is individual- versus group-face and the second is self- versus other-face.

<u>Individual-</u> <u>versus</u> <u>group-face</u>. Lim (1988, 1989) posits two aspects of negative face, individual- versus group-face. Specifically, he claims that avoiding imposition, protecting one's personal freedom and territory, is individual-based, while giving

deference, protecting one's social distinctness, is collectively-based. It is the latter that is more important, "given the collective rather than individualistic orientation of Japanese culture" (Kasper, 1990, p. 195).

In a typical hierarchical culture such as Japan, (explained more fully below) it is acknowledgement and maintenance of the relative position in the social hierarchy, rather than preservation of an individual's property, that governs most social interaction (Clancy, 1986; Gu, 1990). Kasper (1990, p. 195), referring to Lebra (1976) argues that "For Japanese society...the overarching principle of social interaction has been conceptualized as 'social relativism,' comprising concerns about belongingness, empathy, dependency, proper place occupancy and reciprocity."

Thus, it is not rude, but even polite, for a lower status individual (e.g., a newly employed worker in an office) to impose on the higher status individual (e.g., a group manager) the responsibility for taking care of him or her because such an act acknowledges the higher status of the addressee. Matsumoto (1988, p. 410) calls such politeness "deference imposition," exemplifying this type of politeness in Japanese as: "Doozo yoroshiku onegai simasu" ("Please treat/take care of me well"). Such deference imposition cannot be captured within the framework of traditional "negative politeness." Individual-versus group-oriented self-identity cannot be ignored in describing face in Japanese culture.

<u>Self-</u> <u>versus</u> <u>other-face</u>. Ting-Toomey (1985, 1988), Brown and Levinson (1987) and Craig et al. (1986) also rightly distinguish whose face is preserved in the facework, self or other, that is, the speaker's or the addressee's. Interactants do not depend entirely upon others' acts as a means of soliciting satisfaction of their face wants. They claim their own face wants, using strategies of self-presentation and self-defense that may or may not also involve either supporting or attacking the hearer's face. Examples of other- versus self-face concern are "I hope I haven't caused too much problem in being late" (other-face concern) as opposed to "I tried as much as possible to meet the deadline, but it was not my fault that my car broke down" (self-face concern).

In sum, two other perspectives to analyze face have been proposed in addition to association/dissociation face, yielding three suprastrategies, as outlined below:

> (1) Association vs dissociation face
>> (a)   Association: approval (minimize the distance between the speaker and the addressee)
>> (b)   Dissociation: distancing (maximize the distance between the speaker and the addressee)
> (2) Individual vs collective face
>> (a)   Individual: personal approval; personal autonomy (avoiding   imposition)
>> (b)   Collective: ingrouping, intimacy, approval as a group

member; deference, distancing the social status of the
speaker and the addressee.

   (3)   Self- vs other-face
       (a)   Self-: concern for one's own face
       (b)   Other-: concern for the addressee's face

Hypotheses

We expect these suprastrategies (and various sub-strategies outlined fully in the appendix) to correlate with the previously noted cultural structures in the context of advertising in women's magazines in Japan and the U.S. We believe that not only association/dissociation facework, but also individualistic/collectivistic and self-/other-face strategies will be instrumental in distinguishing politeness in the two cultural settings. Accordingly, we propose and test three hypotheses:

   (1)   Japanese ads will contain more collectivistic-based strategies (e.g., approving other as a group member or giving the reader deference) than American ads; American ads will contain more individual-based strategies (e.g., giving the reader more choice to refuse) strategies than Japanese ads.

   (2)   Because Japan is a high-context culture, Japanese ads will contain more implicit and indirect strategies (e.g., metaphor or off-record (pictures only) strategies) than American ads; American ads will contain more direct and persuasive strategies (e.g. use of imperatives, directly mentioned action of buy, get, try, etc.) than Japanese ads.

   (3)   Japanese ads will more often address the reader's (other-) face (e.g. state benefits of buying the product to the reader) than will American ads; American ads will more often address the advertiser's (self-) face (e.g., exaggerate the product's high quality) than will Japanese ads.

In this study we extend a dynamic model of conversation to written text (cf. Johnson & Roen 1992), gaining control not always possible in the analysis of naturally-occurring spoken interaction. That is, by selecting comparable magazine-texts, we generally fix the social identities of the ad writers and the reader audiences by age, gender, and occupation. In addition, the degree of face threat of the advertisement is easily measurable by the given product price.

Method

Design and Procedure

Two American women's magazines (<u>Glamour</u>; <u>Mirabella,</u> August, 1990) and three Japanese women's magazines (<u>JJ, CanCam</u>, and <u>With,</u> August, 1990)[3] were selected according to equivalent expected readers' groups (based on personal telephone interviews with the publishers): college-educated women in their twenties and early thirties.

A total of 80 advertisements, 40 U.S., 40 Japanese, were selected according to four arbitrarily set comparable product price cells:

(1) $10 or less/Y1,500 or less
(2) $20-$50/Y3,000-Y6,000
(3) $100-$300/Y15,000-Y50,000
(4) $700 or more/Y100,000 or more.

Any identical advertisements collected from different volumes of magazines were eliminated from the data. Distinct ads for the same product were counted separately.

Coding

Three coding strategies were followed. First, each sentence, (or phrase if there was no complete sentence), was identified both for its function (e.g., declare the product's name, present its merits, thank, apologize, compliment) and style level (e.g. formal, informal and honorific).

Second, the functions were coded into eight subset combinations of the three face perspectives cited above (e.g., association/individual/other face strategy etc.): (a) whether the function attempts to associate or to dissociate the reader and the writer; (b) whether face is individual or collective; (c) whether the reader (other) or the advertiser's (self) face is preserved.[4] (The eight combinations are exemplified in either Japanese or in English in Appendix (categories A-H)). These eight subsets enable us to point out the cultural contrast of individual-collective dimension precisely as we will see in the results and discussion section.

Third, for each ad, the frequencies of face negotiation features coded by the above criteria (association/dissociation; individualistic/collectivistic; self/other) were summed in order to obtain the frequency score for each face dimension in each culture. Each face negotiation feature was awarded one point. However, using no verbal expression at all was awarded six because we felt that not performing the FTA verbally was more indirect than any of the other five tactics of indirectness listed under dissociation/individual/other face strategies (see DIO 1 through 5 in the appendix), even though illustration constituted the ads.

Mean frequencies for each type of politeness strategy used per ad across the four price groups were calculated. The <u>t-</u>test procedure was applied in order to determine the significance of cross-cultural difference in frequency of each strategy type and each of the

three suprastrategies (or three sets of dichotomy for the three dimensions: association, dissociation, individual, collective, other, and self) at a significance level of p<.05. Thus, there were 14 t-tests (eight for substrategies and six for dimensions) conducted in the analysis. For more conservative and precise statistical validity, the probability level p=.05 was divided by the number of t-tests (i.e., p=0.05/14=0.004). Therefore, cross-cultural differences were considered as significant only when p<.004.

By using two levels of strategy categories, supra- and substrategies, we are able to discern cross-cultural differences at each level. For instance, difference in self/other dimension can be viewed from a macro view at the supra-level while that of the individualistic/collectivistic dimension can only be captured from a micro view at the sub-level. This point will be clearly explained in the following section.

Results and Discussion

Overall, all three hypotheses were supported. Table 1 on the next page lists the subsets of facework categories for which the t-test resulted in significant differences between U.S. and Japanese cultures. (All other tested correlations are omitted here).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the contrast in individual versus collective value orientation of the U.S. versus Japan would be reflected in each culture's preferred choice of strategies. This hypothesis was strongly supported. As the last entry in the table shows, the total amount of collective face concern, including association, dissociation, self- and other-face, was significantly different. Japanese ad writers used more collective face work (p=0.000).

Taking a closer look at the subcategories of collective strategies we found that the difference in collective face strategy use is caused primarily by the extreme difference in Dissociation/Collective/Other face strategies (DCO: t=-8.62, p=0.000), not in the combinations of ACO, ACS, or DCS. These strategies were used so as to give the reader deference (e.g., "With your permission, we can request your prescription from your doctor."; "katarogu sashiagemasu. (We humbly give your our catalog)").

Dissociation/collective/other-face strategies (DCO) were significant while association strategies (ACO and ACS) were not significant, most likely because the verticality of Japanese society tends to emphasize the power of the customer over the seller, acknowledging that the two parties belong to socially distinct groups.

Furthermore, cross-cultural difference regarding DCS strategies was not significant (p=0.077), but these strategies occurred in greater frequency in the U..S. data than the Japanese data (e.g., "Available at selected fine stores";"Ooshitsu mo mitometa kihin o ima anata ni okurimasu." [We send you this noble quality which the King of England has acknowledged.]).

Of the four subcategories of the collective suprastrategy, the frequency of DCO and DCS increased as the price of the product increased (See Figure 1 on page 91). This means that in the U.S. ads, the writer signaled the equally high status of both the manufacturer and the customer when the product was expensive. This contrasts with the Japanese use of deference, in which high status was acknowledged only to the customer.

[Image not available online.   Contact ICS editor for image use.]

Hypothesis 2 predicted that high- versus low-context communication style would be reflected in the directness of the magazine ads. In other words, Japanese ad writers were expected to use more dissociation/individual/other (DIO) face concerns. As Table 1 shows, this prediction was supported (p=0.002).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that Japanese ad writers would show more consideration toward others (e.g., state the benefit to the reader of buying the product, show sympathy and care, be humble or indirect), and U.S. writers would be more concerned with self (e.g., exaggerate the product's high quality, justify the writer's persuasive tactics). This hypothesis was also supported for self-face, as shown in Table 1 (p=0.003). These are strategies in which the manufacturer claims the product has higher status than other brands (e.g., "Europe's number one moisturizer"), and which posit the manufacturer's expertise, originality or uniqueness (e.g., "Pond's knows your skin more than anybody else").

In sum, the Japanese used more collective and indirect facework, and more facework tried to save the addressee's face rather than the manufacturer's. Especially, the level of deference in the Japanese ads, that is, the frequency of DCO face, stayed consistent regardless of the price. In the American ads, on the other hand, more self- and less collective facework was observed.

These findings reflect cross-cultural differences between Japan and the U.S. in terms of value orientation, preferred communication style and direction of social ties. This contrast between Japan as a collectivistic/high-context/vertical culture and the U.S. as an individualistic/low-context/horizontal culture corroborates findings in the literature of intercultural communication.

Conclusion

These findings lead to some considerations for further research. Although it was not the main focus of this study, the product price seemed to influence the use of facework. In Japanese ads, the use of DCO stayed constant regardless of the price. In the U.S. ads, deference strategies, addressed both to other and to self,   positively correlated with each other and with the price. These tendencies were not tested for statistical significance and would be interesting to test in future research.

Methodologically, there are some limitations in this study. First, it deals with only female readers, and gender is often found to be an influencing variable (e.g. Johnson & Roen, 1992). Second, the data are taken from written materials in particular cultures, so we cannot unreservedly extend the findings to face-to-face, intercultural situations. Lastly, a more precise approach in categorizing face strategies should be pursued. Ours were emically derived, (and matched in eight subsets, defined by three perspectives). Some items were present only in one language, yet if we had examined only common

features in both cultures, we would have lost a large portion of an important cross-cultural contrast embedded in the language systems.

Despite these limitations, we do feel our two-level approach (supra- and sub-strategies) did reveal new perspectives on cross-cultural contrast of face negotiation phenomena. These perspectives are also tied to the previous theoretical frameworks of cultures, such as individualistic/collective value orientation, horizontal/vertical structure, and high-/low-context communication styles.

We believe that the findings in this paper reflect important, different cultural norms in the U.S. and Japan. It is time for all members of our highly internationalized culture to more fully recognize and articulate cultural differences and similarities in order to improve cognitive, affective and behavioral capacities to handle intercultural diversity or conflict in communication styles. We each must welcome broader concepts of intercultural communicative competence and more fully integrate them into our daily living.

95

Notes

1 Although Okabe (1983) attributes Japanese vertical social structure to its homogeneity, there are a variety of ethnic groups in Japan such as Ainu (in the northern islands), Ryuukyuu (in the southern islands), Chinese and Korean. Generally these minority groups have been ignored and coerced to assimilate to the majority by the dominant Japanese, resulting in the relative homogeneity in cultural values compared to the U.S.

2 Brown & Levinson (1987) define positive face as a desire to be approved as a desirable person. Negative face is a desire to have freedom from other people's imposition. Ting-Toomey (1985;1988) uses the parallel terms of association and dissociation which will be adopted here.

3 The asymmetrical number of sample magazines for the two cultural groups is a result of two facts: (a) Japanese magazines contain only one third the number of ads contained in American magazines; therefore, for some price cells two Japanese magazines did not contain enough sample ads, and (2) the expected reader groups for each magazine were more narrowly specified in Japan (e.g. college students in their early 20's for JJ and Can Cam and college-graduate working women in their late 20's for With) than in the U.S. (e.g. college-educated working women in their 20's and early 30's), so a greater variety of Japanese magazines was needed in order to cover a comparable reader group range.

4 The functions in English were coded by mutual agreement of one of the researchers and an assistant. The functions in Japanese were coded by one of the researchers.

References

Boldt, E. D.
    1978   Structural tightness and cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psvchology*, 9 , 1 51 -165 .
Brown, P., & Levinson, S.
    1978   Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. (ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in social interactions* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Brown, P., & Levinson, S.
    1987   *Politeness: Some universals in lanquaqe usage.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Clancy, P.

& Pearson
   1986   The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schiefflin & E. Ochs
           (eds.), *Language socialization across cultures.* New York, NY: Cambridge
           University Press.
Craig, R., Tracy, K., & Spisak, F.
   1986   The discourse of requests: Assessment of a politeness approach. *Human
           Communication Research,* 12 , 437-68.
Gu, Y.
   1990   Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Praqmatics,* 14, 237-357.
Hall, E . T .
   1983   *The dance of life : The other dimension of time.*   Garden City, NY: Anchor.
Johnson, D. M., & Roen, D. H.
   1992   Complimenting and involvement in peer reviews: Gender variation. *Language
           in Society,* 21, 27-57.
Kasper, G.
   1990   Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 193-217.
Lim, T.
   1988   A new model of politeness in discourse. Paper presented at Speech
           Communication Association Convention, New Orleans, LA. November.
Lim, T.
   1989   Politeness behavior in social influence situations. Draft chapter submitted for J.
           Dillard (ed.), *Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages*.
           Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch-Scarisbrick Publishers.
Matsumoto, Y.
   1988   Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese.
           Journal of Pragmatics, 12, 403-26.
Nakane, C.
   1970   *Japanese society.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Okabe, R.
   1983   Cultural assumptions of East and West: Japan and the United States. In W. B.
           Gudykunst (ed.), *Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives* (pp. 21-
           44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Takashi, K.
   1990   A sociolinguistic analysis of English borrowings in Japanese advertising texts.
           World Englishes, 9, 327-41.
Thomas, J.
   1983   Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
Ting-Toomey, S.

    1985   Toward a theory of conflict and culture. In W. Gudykunst, L. Stewart, & S.
            Ting-Toomey (eds.), *Communication, culture, and organizational processes* (pp. 71-
            86). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S.
    1988   Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim, & W. B.
            Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-35). Beverly
            Hills, CA: Sage.
Ting-Toomey, S., & Cole, M.
    (forthcoming). Intergroup   diplomatic   communication: A   face-negotiation
            perspective. Chapter prepared for F. Korzenny & S. Ting-Toomey (eds.),
            Communicating for peace: Diplomacv and negotiation across cultures. Newbury
            Park, CA: Sage.

Appendix

List of Politeness Features
A.   Association/Individual/Other face-concern (AIO):
                        Approving the reader as a favorable, appreciated individual
1.   Exaggerated approval/appreciation/compliment of the reader (R), e.g., 'What looks
      best on a conditioned body?' (Tone, soap)
2.   Approve the after-use stage of the R, e.g., 'Because you can look better than ever.'
      (Nice'n Easy, hair dye)
3.   Presuppose knowledge of the reader's wants and needs, e.g., 'If you're looking for
      an effective, safe and convenient birth control.' (Today, birth control sponge)
4.   Offer/ promise/ state the benefit/effect of using the product, e.g., 'Diminish Puffy
      Eyes. Soften Fine Lines.' (Clarines, facial lotion)
5.   Be optimistic about the satisfaction/ happiness of the R with the product (P), e.g.,
      'You'll love what it does for you, no matter how you look at it.' (Toyota, car)
6.   Be willing to be taken advantage of the R, e.g., 'We'll be glad to help.' (Today, birth
      control sponge)
7.   Offer help/counseling, e.g., 'Have any question? Ask your doctor or give us a call at
      the Today Talk Line.' (Today, birth control sponge)
8.   Show the consideration for the R, e.g., 'Buckle up--together we can save lives.' (Ford,
      car)
9.   Personalized care, e.g., 'It was made just for you.' (Ban, deodorant powder)
10.   Personalize inanimate part/belonging of the R, e.g., 'Hontooni kami ga hosigatteiru
      mono dake de tukurimasita.' [We made it with only the things that your hair wants.]
      (Befree, shampoo)

11. Give gift/discount, e.g., 'Your free gift with any Obsession fragrance purchase of 30.00 or more.' (Obsession, perfume)

12. State the necessity of the P for the R, e.g., 'A morning MUST.' (Clarines, facial lotion)

B. Association/Collective/Other face-concern (ACO):
            Approving the reader as a member of the same social community

1. Presuppose the reader's values are the same as the writer (W), e.g., 'Keep that shower fresh feeling. '(Ban, deodorant powder)

2. Use inclusive 'we ' referring to both R and W, e.g., 'Oscar, how you indulge us!' (Oscar de la Renta, long coat)

3. Involve/ invite R to do something with W, e.g., 'Let's get it together--buckle up.' (Buick, car)

4. Use of informal language and slangs, e.g., 'You've come a long way, baby.' (Virginia Slims, cigarettes)

5. Emphasize mutual dependency/mutual benefit, e.g., 'If you don't look good, we don't look good.' (Revlon, hair styling items)

6. Use patriotism,e.g., 'Introducing great American beauty.' (Buick, car)

7. Document/recommendation from the consumer's side, e.g., 'Fresh, clear, dry. That's the way I want to feel every day...' (Always, maxipads)

8. Use the first person referring to the R or a member of R, e.g., 'Watashi no mooningu-setto A.' [My morning set A.] (Kanebo, honey yogurt drink)

9. Appreciate for R's assistance, e.g., 'Okagesamade rokujyussyuunen.' [With your support, it's our 60th anniversary.] (Pariimiki eye-glasses)

10. Talking about personal life, e.g., 'Even though I'm busy, I still find time to spin my wheels. If I miss even a day of working out, I'm impossible to live with.' (document by Chris Evert, Converse, tennis shoes)

C. Dissociation/Individual/Other face-concern (DIO):
            Avoiding imposition of W's want on the R. Being indirect

1. Avoid imperative sentence patterns such as 'Try it and see.' (Pond's facial cleansing foam)

2. Avoid/omit R's action of accepting the FTA (i.e., buy, use, get, try etc.), e.g., 'Sukitootte utsukushiku' [Clear and beautiful] (Band-aid clear type)

3. Avoid direct association to the R's use of the product (direct result etc.), e.g., 'Mukashi kuwaeta kugi wa donna aji deshita ka?' [How was the taste of the nails you put in your mouth long time ago?] (Shiimakkusu, mineral drink)

4. Avoid the first person ('we', 'our' etc.) referring to the manufacturer, e.g.,'Its special hybrating complex.' (Elizabeth Arden, lipstick)

5. Avoid the second person ('you') referring to the reader, e.g., 'Designer ShapeUp is specially created for fashionable women...' (ShapeUp, bra)
6. Use hedge: verbs such as recommend, offer, hope, wish and auxiliaries such as may, might, would etc. instead of imperatives, e.g., 'It might be the best choice for you.' (Today, birth control sponge)
7   Limit to the specific audience, e.g., 'Konna ashi ni naritai to iu hito no tame no kookoku desu.' [This is for someone who wants to have legs like these."] (COMBI, exercise equipment)
8. Give the situation when the R would need the P, e.g., 'Not all acne problems are the same.' (Neutrogena facial cleansing items)
9. Question to ask the reader's decision/opinion, e.g., 'Ever have skin this dry? (Jergens, skin lotion)
10. Implicit messages: metaphor, symbolic expressions, pun etc., e.g., 'Just between friends.' (Coors, light beer)
11. Use the third person's statement/document, e.g., 'Fresh, clear, dry. That's the way I want to feel every day...' (Always, maxipads)
12. State FTA as a general rule: Avoid the second person referring to the R as the subject of a sentence, e.g., 'The most unforgettable women in the world wear Revlon.' (Revlon, make-up base)

D. Dissociation/Collective/Other face-concern (DCO):
    Acknowledge the R as a member of different community from the W. The R could be   higher status than the W and/or socially distant (such as a stranger).
1. Deference address term, e.g., '600 mei sama ni puresento.' [Present for 600 of YOU.] (Nissan, car)
2. Ask permission from R, e.g., 'With your permission, we can request your prescription from your doctor.' (Contacts For You, contact lenses)
3. Beg (or use please),e.g., Mazu sanpuru de otameshi kudasai.' [Please try our sample first.] (Kaoo, skin lotion)
4. Use honorific words which higher the relative status of R to W, e.g., 'Ohada ni awasete dochiraka ippin otsukai kudasai.' [Use one to fit your skin type.] (Kaoo, skin lotion)
5. Use humble words which lower the relative status of W to R, e.g., 'Katarogu sashiagemasu.' [We will humbly give you our catalog.] (SONY, car stereo)
6. Use formal speech style to imply social distance. (A formal indicator of Japanese verb suffix is underlined in the example.), e.g., 'Konna asi ni naritai to iu hito no tame no kookoku desu.' [This is for someone who want to have legs like these.] (COMBI, exercise equipment)

7.   State the dependency of the W on the R, e.g., 'Okagesamade rokujyus-syuunen.'
       [With your support, it's our 60th anniversary.] (Pariimiki eye-glasses)

E.   <u>Association/Individual/Self</u> <u>face-concern</u> <u>(AIS)</u>:
           Self-approve the manufacturer as a favorable individual.
1.   State the necessity of the product, e.g., 'A morning MUST.' (Clarines, facial lotion)
2.   State the potential harm caused by R's not following the FTA, e.g., 'Some skin
       problems don't fit the usual solutions. Because the solutions cause more problems'
       (Clineque, skin lotion)
3.   Be optimistic about the R's satisfaction/happiness for the P/brand, e.g., 'You'll love
       what it will do for you.' (Toyota, car)
4.   State the effort, consideration, or risk that the manufacturer's paying for the R, e.g.,
       'Clairol bent over backwards to bring you a roller that comes to grips with the slips.'
       (Clairol, hair curler)
5.   Mention award or recommendation by profession, e.g., Seal of Approval from the
       American association, committee on cosmetics.' (Allercreme, make-up items)
6.   Exaggerated self admire, e.g., 'Designed in heaven. Made in paradise.' (High Society,
       ski wear)
7.   Minimize the FTA: use onlv or iust do X, e.g., 'Metro XFi's just $5995.' (GM, car)
8.   Justify the FTA by mentioning the P is worth it, e.g., 'All of which will raise the
       price somewhat.' (Mazda, car)
9.   Warranty/guarantee, e.g., 'A look that has lasted a century deserves a warranty that
       lasts more than a year.' (Noblia, watches)

F.   <u>Association/Collective/Self</u> <u>face-concern</u> <u>(ACS)</u>:
           Self-approve the W as a favorable member of the R's community.
1.   Presuppose the reader's values are the same as the writer, e.g., 'Keep that shower
       fresh feeling.' (Ban, deodorant powder)
2.   Use inclusive we referring to both R and W, e.g., 'Oscar, how you indulge us!'
       (Oscar de la Renta, long coat)
3.   Involve/invite R to do something with W, e.g., 'Let's get it together--buckle up.'
       (Buick, car)
4.   Use of informal language and slang, e.g., 'You've come a long way, baby.' (Virginia
       Slims, cigarettes)
5.   Emphasize mutual dependency/mutual benefit, e.g., 'If you don't look good, we
       don't look good.' (Revlon, hair styling items)
6.   Use patriotism, e.g., 'Introducing great American beauty.' (Buick, car)
7.   Document/recommendation from the consumer's side, e.g., '"Fresh, clear, dry.
       That's the way I want to feel every day...' (Always, maxipads)

8. State the W's contribution for public, e.g., 'Hana no bannpaku ni kyoosan shite imasu.' [We are participating the flower expo.] (Toyota, car)

9. State the public value (moral, etc.), e.g., 'Osake wa hatachi ni nattekara.' [Drink after you have reached twenty] (Kirin, beer)

G. Dissociation/Individual/Self face-concern (DIS):
    Preserving he W's territory and avoiding the R's imposition.

1. State the W's professionalisms on the situation. Use jargon, e.g., 'A laboratory fact, not an empty promise.' (Revlon, shampoo)

2. State the W knows/does more than other brands, e.g., 'Pond's knows your skin more than anybody else.' (Pond's, facial cleansing foam)

3. Use the brand as power, e.g., 'Toyota Quality. Who could ask for anything more.' (Toyota, car)

4. Document that the W is correct/right/real/authentic etc., e.g., 'It just feels right.' (Always, maxipads)

5. Document that the P is new, original, unique, special, exclusive etc., e.g., 'This unique ability to pamper your skin with moisture.' (Lancome, skin lotion)

H. Dissociation/Collective/Self face-concern. (DCS):
    Insist the prestigious status of the W or P in the society.

1. Use superlative degree for high quality, e.g., 'From Nivea. Europe's number one moisturizer.' (Nivea, skin lotion)

2. Refer to prestigious position of the P or W,.e.g., 'Ooshitsu mo mitometa kono kihin o ima anata ni okurimasu.' [We send this noble quality which the King of England has acknowledged.] (Royal Asscher Diamond, rings)

3. Criticize other brand, e.g., 'Roomier, in fact, than a MercedesBenz 190E.' (Mazda, car)

4. Limit the audience to the people in high society, e.g., 'Sekai no toppuredii tachi o miryoo suru' [The glare fascinates top ladies of the world] (D&D, diamonds)

5. Use prestigious/exotic image, e.g., 'An idea born in the spas of Europe---' (Halsa, shampoo)

6. Inform that the P is available only at fine stores, e.g., 'Available at selected fine stores.' (Tiffany & Co., watches)

7. Impose the correctness of the W's value, e.g., 'Is a two-month salary too much to spend for something that lasts forever?' (American Gem Society, diamond rings)

8. Use exclusive/prestigious speech style, e.g., 'Oscar, how you indulge us!' (Oscar de la Renta, long coat)

[Image not available online.   Contact ICS editor for image use.]