

## **Politeness Phenomena in Korean and American Church Business Meetings**

**Bethyl A. Pearson**

**K. Samuel Lee**

*Arizona State University*

### **Introduction**

This paper reports the first stage of an on-going comparative sociolinguistic analysis of one speech event conducted in two cultural settings in two different languages. It compares the protestant church business meetings of American church groups to those of first-generation Korean immigrant church groups.

We attempt to test the claims of researchers in cross-cultural communication who argue that cultural differences in norms and values are reflected in linguistic choice (e.g., Sohn 1983). We also test the claims of Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) that the concept of 'face' is universal, but that strategies for maintaining face are often culture-dependent.

Our analysis will show that differences both in situational and linguistic features in the two settings do reflect different cultural and social systems. In particular we claim that role, status and group consciousness, for example, are differentially viewed in American and Korean cultures. These differences directly influence the occurrences and encodings of face-threatening acts (FTA's) at the church business meetings we observe here.

We hope that our findings will provide a new stepping-off point for further work in cross-cultural communication. By initiating a comparative outline of rules of sociolinguistic behavior in two cultures, we go some way in equipping members of our ever-expanding world culture to better understand each other.

### **Background**

A mushrooming body of research in cross-cultural communication examines how norms and values of different cultures may be reflected in differences in linguistic choice. For example, Sohn (1983:102-3) posits five dimensions of value orientations which he believes capture essential differences between the American and Korean value systems. Americans, he claims, are at the atomistic-mechanistic end of a continuum. They value

individualism, egalitarianism, confrontation (i.e. directness), pragmatism, and rationalism. Koreans are at the holistic end; they value collectivism, hierarchism, indirectness, formalism and emotionalism. These differing systems, he argues, are reflected in differing communicative patterns. To substantiate these hypotheses, he culls evidence from broad lexical, syntactic, and non-verbal patterns of behavior across many social settings and relationships.

In a similar approach, other researchers have proposed an even more general cultural value dimension, low-context culture (LCC) versus high-context culture (HCC). These opposite orientations determine different communication styles. According to Hall (1976; 1983) and Ting-Toomey (1985; 1988), the LCC system, such as that of Germany, Switzerland, or the U.S., places a premium on individual value orientation, fine logic, direct verbal interaction, and individualistic nonverbal style. The HCC system, on the other hand, such as that of China, Japan, or Korea, values group value orientation, spiral logic, indirect verbal interaction, and contextual nonverbal style.

While Sohn and Hall offer a loose framework for generating hypotheses about language use, Brown and Levinson's politeness model offers a more refined, albeit imperfect, tool for correlating cultural values with specific linguistic choices. It is their model which Pearson (1990a,b) chose for her study of American church business meetings. Because her analysis forms the comparative basis for this paper, we turn now to a brief introduction of politeness theory.

In the politeness model, facework is the ultimate determinant of linguistic behavior. Simply defined, facework is the interactional work people do to achieve two inherent complementary desires--negative face (the desire to be unimpeded in action), and positive face (the desire for approval from others).

Brown and Levinson restrict their focus to the linguistic encoding of individual face-threatening speech acts, such as directives and disagreements, and the accompanying types of mitigation (positive and negative politeness features) which speakers use to reduce the force of these coercive acts. They claim that as rational beings, members of a given speech community assess and sum three weights to get an overall face threat value before deciding how to encode an FTA: (1) the relative weight of imposition of the act in the culture, (2) the degree of power the hearer has over the speaker, and (3) the amount of social distance existing between speaker and hearer. Accordingly, a speaker's strategy addresses either the positive or negative face wants of the listener. When face threat is high, but not so high as to avoid the FTA altogether or to use an off-record strategy, negative politeness will be used: e.g., "I'm very sorry, but could you by any chance lend me a dollar?". When face threat is low, but not so low as to invite bald on-record strategies, positive politeness will be used: e.g., "Hey, Mac, loan me a buck, willya?". While what counts as polite may differ from group to group, or from situation to situation, societies everywhere, Brown and Levinson argue, uphold the

essential notion of politeness (1987, xiii).

While this model has had far-reaching influence on research across many disciplines, it has not gone without criticism (e.g., Coupland 1988; Lim 1988; 1989; Matsumoto 1988). Even Brown and Levinson (1987) themselves highlight some limitations and much-needed refinements. Lim (1988), especially, on the basis of an extensive review of the literature and his own theorizing, argues that the model has four main shortcomings: (1) it limits its explanation to one kind of face at a time, disallowing mixing of strategies in one speech act; (2) it centers on face-threat as the immediate predictor of politeness; (3) it limits positive politeness to informality devices and negative politeness to formality devices; and (4) it assumes that satisfying one kind of face want nullifies the threat to the other face want.

Lim argues that social interactions often threaten both positive and negative face simultaneously, politeness behavior can be observed when no FTA is involved, formal language can support positive face and informal language can support negative face, and satisfying one kind of face want does not eliminate threat to the other.

Pearson partially followed the early Brown and Levinson model, restricting her analysis to a speech-act treatment of directives and disagreements and cataloguing positive politeness as informal speech with negative politeness as generally formal speech. She did not examine whether FTA's represented overlapping face threat, either. However, the speech acts she analyzed were not isolated, unrelated utterances from many different speech situations as in the examples of Brown and Levinson, but represented general behavior across an entire series of meetings. Furthermore, like Lim, she also found that many speech acts involved a mixing of strategies of positive and negative politeness, so she coded each politeness feature rather than merely attributing either positive or negative politeness as the only major strategy in the production of each FTA.

Pearson arrived at a taxonomy of politeness features which best represented skillful meeting management by the American ministers. She concluded that the ministers, as rather covert group leaders, used a unique combination of powerful and polite (both negative and positive) language, which gave them better returns on their coercive speech acts than either the meeting chairs or ordinary group members. Most important, despite the fact that the American ministers exhibited the most power in issuing the largest density of FTA's relative to other speakers, they also used the most mitigation. Pearson claimed that this very mitigation actually increased the ministers' power because they did not overtly abuse their rights to power.

Given this broad cultural baseline, detailed aspects of which we will highlight comparatively below, we aimed to discover whether the Korean ministers would also exhibit power and politeness to the same extent as the American ministers did. In addition, we wanted to initiate a descriptive taxonomy of positive and negative

politeness features in Korean.

### Method

We audio-recorded a series of five church meetings, at two protestant Korean churches in a metropolitan area of the Southwestern United States. All of the meetings were general Administrative Board meetings which convened monthly to discuss all issues basic to church management. Approximately 15 people were in attendance at the meetings, including the minister, officers and heads of other committees. Only the first of the five meetings is analyzed here. This meeting lasted for over two and one-half hours, yielding 80 pages of transcript, which we subjected to the following coding procedure.

Initially, following Pearson (1990a,b), by mutual agreement we extracted all directives and disagreements, assigning each to a speaker role. We coded each FTA by its syntactic-type: interrogative, declarative and imperative. Directives include any acts which attempt to influence the behavior of another person, as in this Korean example:

*Yo-lo-bun mo-du ki-do-e cham-lyo ha-syo-so*  
*kyo-hoe-loel wi-hae man-hi ki-do ha-si-gi ba-lam-ni-da.*

('I hope all of you will participate in prayer and pray a lot for the church').

Disagreements include broadly those acts which express any kind of a negative evaluation of another speaker, as in this English example: "I'd be glad to, to follow through on that if you'd like me to, but the trustees are the only ones that can sign for things like that and if we wanna have them make a check out I have a feeling that probably (trails off)".

Second, we identified co-occurring linguistic features of positive and negative politeness and established a taxonomy of features which would allow us to calculate frequency and types of politeness features. We did find, however, that some FTA's were themselves examples of politeness: for example, eliciting applause as a form of approval. Therefore, we recognize the need for further refinement of FTA coding.

Third, we coded the absolute weight of the topic in the culture, although this proved to be very difficult because the threat was hard to separate from the status and role relations within the meeting, as we will note below. Nonetheless, we attempted to judge the degree of inherent threat of the FTA, on a scale of 0 to 3, which represents degrees of lightest to heaviest threat.

Fourth, we established categories for type of face-threat as threat to the speaker (either negative or positive or both), and threat to the hearer (negative or positive or both). These face-threats are directed against both individuals and the communal group comprising listeners at the meeting.

## Results and Discussion

The comparison immediately revealed that there are important differences in the role relationships as well as in how these relationships are realized in the physical settings of the meetings in the two cultures. In the American church meetings, there are three participant roles: minister, chair, and regular group member. While many Korean protestant churches have this same role-structure, others, like the one under observation here, do not. Specifically, the Korean minister assumes the additional role of chair, putting himself officially in charge of directing the general course of the interaction.

Even the physical seating arrangements seem to mirror different inherent social and cultural value orientations, notably a more egalitarian perspective in the American setting versus a more hierarchical one in the Korean. Specifically, in the American meetings, members are seated in a circle around a table. Both the chair and the minister are indistinguishable links in the group. However, in the Korean meetings, the pastor, with his own table, is typically at some distance from other participants, who are seated in a semi-circle. The Korean minister usually stands at a microphone while everyone else generally remains seated except when they rise to speak.

Furthermore, while there is little overt individual ranking among group members in the American setting, there are at least three named rankings, Elders, Kwonsa, and Deacons among the Koreans, ordered according to status, if not power. This kind of ranking parallels Sohn's (1983) observation that the Korean inventory of terms of address and reference is much larger than the American, which he claims is a reflection of the hierarchical dimension. However, it may also be argued that these overt rankings or "role terms" are a means of creating in-group solidarity (Moeran 1988: 430). That is, these special terms may stress that speaker relationships are framed in the group context of the church, much as Asian company workers define themselves in relation to their mutual place of employment and set themselves apart from out-group members.

Finally, while the American meetings were composed of approximately equal numbers of males and females, seated randomly, and almost half of the chairpersons were female, in the Korean meetings men and women either sat on separate sides of the room, or, alternatively, women sat in the back. In addition, gender role distinctions were also observable. Several Korean women moved in and out of the meeting room in order to simultaneously tend children who were playing outside or to maintain supervision over kitchen work. These conditions, however, were not relevant for the American women because the American meetings were scheduled at night when children were at home, while the Korean meetings took place immediately following the church service and communal meal.

In the American meetings participants remained seated casually for the duration of

the meeting. Koreans, however, typically would rise, often half-bowing during their turns at talk, as part of the noticeable chain of deference and condescension within the power hierarchy.

The distribution of institutional power is similar in the two settings. Both American and Korean ministers are in the unique position of having a certain amount of institutional power, while at the same time having to answer to the layperson power structure within the congregation. The Korean congregation, or representative members of that congregation, namely Elders, were solely responsible for choosing and hiring the present minister directly from Korea. For the American minister, who is appointed by the bishop in an episcopal system of administration, there is less direct congregational control. Nonetheless, that congregation also has some power to affect the retention or dismissal of the minister from that appointment. In both cases, the minister dances somewhat precariously between wanting to exercise control over decision-making while appeasing the statusful members of the congregation.

Some differences are also apparent, however. For the American study, all of the ministers had been in the ministry for over 20 years, and were both officially and unofficially recognized as exemplars in their field, while the Korean minister in this study is much younger with less experience, and has yet to prove his competence. Therefore, we might expect more inconsistency on his part in managing the course of the interaction than the American ministers had shown.

Despite the attribution of "expert managers" to the American ministers, however, one of the main findings of the earlier study was that the ministers exercise control very indirectly relative to other group participants. As mentioned, their language was most dense in FTA's, but those FTA's were riddled with features of both positive and negative politeness that neither chairs nor other speakers came close to matching in either quality or quantity.

One of the most salient features of politeness in the American ministers' language was downward lexical style-shifting; many of these instances were humorous. This usage differed markedly from the speech of other participants. That is, the American ministers shifted to a more colloquial style from the generally unmarked consultative style of the meetings when they issued an FTA much more frequently than any other speakers. For example, in urging the committee to comply with a fire inspector's demands, one minister said, "I--I guess we should try to comply but, uh, I don't know what recourse we have as long as we're under contract with them and the person seems to have the authority to close the joint down as far as it being a proper place for children."

Such downward shifts were coded as positive politeness. (However, we now agree with Lim that casual style and humor do not necessarily show approval, even though they do often negotiate closure of social distance.) The overwhelming norm for all

speakers at the American meetings, however, was to use negative rather than positive politeness with their FTA's. Other speakers were more direct than the minister, mitigating their FTA's much less. Nonetheless, they still issued very few unmitigated FTA's, so that overall, indirectness was the norm in this American speech event. Findings from the Korean setting show that indirectness is also the norm there. However, the Korean speakers who were more powerful issued more weighty FTA's and mitigated less than other speakers. Downward lexical style-shifts, in particular, were categorically absent.

A total of 201 FTA's were performed at this Korean meeting: 121 directives and 80 disagreements, with the minister issuing exactly half of all FTA's (74 directives and 26 disagreements). Across the 12 American meetings which lasted 18 hours, (four at each of three churches) only 800 FTA's were performed. This comparison suggests that this Korean meeting is twice as dense in coercive speech acts. However, two other interesting comparisons are necessary.

When we examine the category of FTA's with the lowest weight, (coded 0), we find 43 directives, out of which 41 are turn-assigning and turn-recognizing directives. (Two other 0-threat directives were formal, conventional motions made by group members). Turn-assigning FTA's call on individuals to report:

Jon-do-bu!  
(‘Evangelism!’)

Turn-recognizing FTA's may even be considered as simultaneously face-honoring. These are directive responses by the minister, in his additional role of chair, to members' raising their hands for permission to speak:

Jip-ssa-nim, mal-ssum-ha-se-yo.  
(‘Deacon, go ahead.’)

While turn-assigning directives occurred in the American data, there were no turn-recognizing statements, as Americans did not raise their hands for recognition, opting instead to speak on their own initiative.

This recognition behavior may be one outcome of the fact that parliamentary procedure has been adopted from the West and conventionalized into Korean society. Its execution seems to reflect the hierarchical structure of Korean culture, with the chair overtly in charge, granting group members permission to speak.

Returning to discussion of the 43 low-threat, turn-related directives, we arrive at a second implication. When these low-threat FTA's are discounted, the number of directives and disagreements at the meeting becomes approximately equal (78 and 80, respectively). On the other hand, only one-fourth of the FTA's in the American meetings were disagreements. We do not claim that this is a cultural difference, however. Rather, this measurement suggests a rather high degree of conflict in this particular Korean meeting, unlike the other meetings which comprise the full range of

this project.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, this conflict level may account in part for the lack of downward lexical shifting and other measures of positive politeness. Further data and analysis are required to test this possibility.

As to syntactic type of FTA, we find both similarities and differences in the two cultural settings. In both Korean and in English, directives and disagreements can occur as declaratives, interrogatives or imperatives. In American and Korean meetings alike, declarative forms occurred far more frequently than other forms. However, for Americans, statements comprised 97 percent of all syntactic types, whereas in the Korean meeting, the declarative form comprised only 59 percent of the types, with interrogative forms at 14 percent and imperatives at 26 percent.

In general, impartial judgment rankings place declaratives at the lowest end of the face-threat continuum, interrogatives median and imperatives highest, when topic and speaker-hearer relationships are held constant (Ervin-Tripp 1976). At the same time, all but 12 of the imperatives in the Korean data are of very low face-threat. The majority of these low-threat imperatives (41) occurred in the Korean minister's speech as a legitimate reflex of his role as chair.

For example, the only Korean who issued a disagreement in imperative form was the minister in his attempt, as chair, to shorten a participant's remarks; however, he was careful to mitigate his choice with negative politeness:

Joe-song-ham-ni-da. Gan-tan-hi mal-ssum-he ju-si-ki ba-ram-ni-da.  
(I am sorry. Please speak [express your opinion] briefly.)

Some imperatives of the American ministers, on the other hand, did exhibit qualities unobserved in the Korean setting. For example, one American minister used a joking imperative to close a tense discussion on a particular topic. Specifically, members had been conversing rather heatedly about the difficulties in determining the age of visitors (i.e. prospective members); knowing their ages could help in channeling them into appropriate sub-groups in the church, and, therefore, promote membership. The minister suddenly interjected, "Check their teeth!", a humorous comparison between horses and people that forestalled mounting tension. Another minister, in addressing a group member who was soon to move to another city, said, "So, Susan, receive our love". These imperative types were rare, and may have occurred in the Korean data were we to expand our data base to less conflict-oriented meetings.

In the American church meetings, mitigation of FTA's with negative politeness is the norm. However, there seems to be less mitigation as a whole in the Korean meeting relative to the American setting. Over 90 percent of the FTA's in the American meetings were mitigated, whereas only 70 percent of the Korean FTA's were mitigated.

Furthermore, social rank, which is more apparent in the Korean setting, correlates with the extent of mitigation somewhat differently than in the American setting. While highest-ranking speakers in the American setting, i.e., the ministers, displayed by far the

most mitigation, the highest-ranking speakers in the Korean setting, i.e., the minister and the elders, mitigated less than lower-ranking speakers. The American ministers mitigated 99 percent of their FTA's, chairs, 97 percent, and ordinary group members 78 percent. On the other hand, roughly 50 percent of the Korean minister's FTA's were mitigated, for elders, 72 percent, and for other group members, 94 percent. For Koreans, the lower the status, the more mitigation, the inverse of the Americans.

There is a more noticeable correlation between topic weight, speaker role and mitigation in the Korean setting compared to the American one. That is, in the Korean meeting, more powerful speakers issued topically weightier FTA's and mitigated them less. In the American church meetings, Pearson found that speaker roles were consistently overlapping because speakers in each role issued FTA's on the same topics. Therefore, she did not conduct a refined analysis of topic weight by role, and a complete comparison of the data sets is not possible. For the Korean data, however, more attention was paid to coding topic weight. Here we find that the weightier the topic, the more powerful the speaker role. At the same time, while many weightier topics received more mitigation, if the speaker was powerful, mitigation was less evident.

Specifically, all 3-weight threats were mitigated. Furthermore, 87 percent of the 103, 2-weight threats were also mitigated. However, of the fourteen unmitigated 2-weight FTA's, the majority (12) were issued by the most powerful speakers, the minister (7) and the elders (5). In the Korean system, the inherent authority of these speaker positions may allow such unmitigated linguistic rights. As Lim (1988) puts it, if an act is legitimate due to the role relationship between speakers, then face threat is low, and mitigation is unnecessary. Unlike the American case, the Korean outcome is in line with the prediction of the politeness model that as power the addressee has over the speaker increases, mitigation decreases (Brown and Levinson 1978; 1987; Lim 1988).

We turn now to discussion of the types of politeness features in the two data sets. First, analysis suggests that positive politeness is more frequent in the American data than in the Korean data. Totalling politeness features, Pearson found that 62 percent of the total number of features were negative and 38 percent positive. In the Korean data, 87 percent were negative and only 13 percent positive.

Second, a taxonomy of positive and negative politeness features in Korean shows that negative politeness features are more varied than the positive (see Table 1). The list is exhaustive for the data of one meeting, but as we incorporate other data, we expect to further expand and refine these categories.

---

TABLE 1

**POLITENESS FEATURE TYPES IN KOREAN CHURCH BUSINESS MEETINGS**

Types	Examples
<u>Positive politeness</u>	
Terms of address	hyong-je-nim ('Brother C.')
Reciprocity	da-ga-chi; u-ri-mo-du ('all together'; 'we all')
Lexical repetition	[repeating previous speaker's words]
Seeking agreement	... -noen go-si jo-chi an-ket-ssoem-ni-ka? (('Would it not be good to ...?'))
Humor	no-mu jil-sso-ga op-ta-go ching-chan oel pa-da- so (('We were given compliments that there was no order, [so we'll do it better next time]'))
Partial agreement	Mul-lon ha-noen-gon jo-a-yo. Koe-lot-ta-go-hae-so ... (('Of course it is good to do it, but [it does not mean we must ...]'))
<u>Negative Politeness</u>	
Hedges	a-ma-do, je saeng-kak-e-noen ... (('perhaps, according to my thinking, ...'))
Minimizers	jok-o-do; jo-koem; jom; han-pon; o-noe jong-to (('at least'; 'a little'; 'a bit'; 'once'; 'to a certain extent'))
Minimizing clauses	...-ya-hal-kot ka-ssoem-ni-da (('It appears that [we] might need to ...')) ...-ji an-at-na ha-noen saeng-kak-i toem-ni-da (('A thought occurs whether ...was not ...')) ...-myon o-tol-ka ('how it would be if ...') ...-ke toe-li-la ('[it] might turn out to be ...')
Apology	Sa-kwa-oe mal-ssoem-bu-toe-li-ket-ssoem-ni-da (('I'd like to give a word of apology first.'))
Deference	Mok-ssa-nim, jom hae-ju-syo-yo. (('Pastor, please do this.'))
Self-effacement	Noeng-lyok-i op-noen sa-lam-i ...-loel hae-so (('As someone without ability, I am doing ...'))

Compliment	...i ki-kye-e pal-koe-si-ni-ka jo-oen ja-mun- oel ju-sil ko-la-ko saeng-kak-oel ham-ni-da (‘Since [he] is bright with machines, I think he will give good advice.’)
Analogy	I-ke gok jip-an kat-chi ... (‘This [situation] is just like a household [If a mother and father are not in agreement, then the house is in discord.]’)
Circumstantial voice	...hae ju-ssyo-ssoe-myon; ka-noeng-ha-myon; an-at-ssoe-myon (‘if [you] would do . . .’; ‘if possible’; ‘if [you] do not . . .’)
Unfinished sentence	(sentence trails off)
Ritualizing	Ju-nim-ui i-loem-oe-lo gae-choe-ham-ni-da (‘The meeting will now begin in the name of the Lord.’)

---

With Lim and others we highlight the fact that many FTA's in both data sets involved a mixing of politeness strategies, although many more fell into this category in the American data as opposed to the Korean data. Similarly, our coding for recipient of face threat led us to postulate frequent overlapping categories. We found frequent co-occurrences of threats to an individual speaker or hearer's positive or negative face, or to the communal group face. Specifically, more than half of the FTA's (108) threatened more than one kind of face. Only 75 seemed to be threats to only one face, and a majority of those (51) were threats to the communal negative face. The remaining 18 were turn-recognizing utterances, which were coded as face-honoring of the hearer, rather than threatening at all, as mentioned above.

### Conclusion

We hope it is evident, even from this brief analysis, that the study of how differing cultural values may be reflected in linguistic choice is a fruitful and on-going research direction. More in-depth sociolinguistic analyses of comparable speech events are needed in order to provide the data from which we can draw broader inferences. This study of Korean and American church business meetings has gone some way in uncovering several interesting hypotheses which we hope to further test with a larger set of data.

We have found evidence that facework is a universal phenomenon, yet we have only partial evidence that facework is realized in language and culture-specific strategies. More specifically, we did find that much more negative politeness and much less positive politeness occurred at the Korean meeting. This finding is in line with numerous descriptions of Korean culture as HCC, deferential and formalistic. However, the particular Korean meeting which we have analyzed was a greater conflict situation than any of the American meetings. This contextual factor may have caused more avoidance of positive politeness strategies. At this time, we have no comparable American meeting with such a high conflict level. It would be interesting to test whether this contextual factor has an effect on the politeness strategies. Further analysis of a larger data base may also reveal consequences of such factors.

Despite the variation in strategy, both Americans and Koreans prefer indirect, negative politeness as a main strategy for issuing FTA's. In addition, in both cases, strategies for issuing FTA's are correlated with role and status, although directions of correlations may not be the same. In the American institution, the ministers express both more power and more mitigation than other speakers. In the Korean setting, however, speakers with more status appear to mitigate their FTA's less than speakers with lower status. We explain this as an outcome of the more well-defined role obligations in the hierarchical Korean system which is even reflected in the physical arrangements of the meeting. At the same time, we need more data to explain how exactly role, status, institutional power and other interactional factors affect politeness strategies. The greater emphasis on hierarchy in the Korean system is perhaps also reflected in the fact that typically heavier FTA's were more generally the prerogative of speakers of a higher rank. In the American data, speakers in all roles issued all weights of FTA's. Again, a broader data base will help substantiate these claims.

Despite some unanswered questions, we feel that our taxonomy of linguistic politeness markers for Korean is an important beginning in measuring cultural-linguistic variations. As more data are incorporated, researchers can expand the range of this taxonomy and continue to explore the systematic effects of other variables on linguistic choice.

## Notes

1. Ting-Toomey (1988) offers challenging insight into cross-cultural managing of conflict situations. She combines the concept of LCC and HCC and other value orientations (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism) with a well-articulated theoretical analysis of "facework" in conflict negotiation. In brief, she proposes that in conflict negotiations, HCC members (e.g., Koreans) are more concerned with mutual-face or

other-face maintenance, have greater positive-face need, are more indirect in face-negotiation, use more obliging or smoothing strategies to manage conflict, and are more avoidance-oriented than LCC members (i.e., Americans).

## References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson  
1978 "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness phenomena," in *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, Esther Goody (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 56-310.  
1987 *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan.  
1976 "'Is Sybil there?' The Structure of Some American English Directives," *Language in Society* 5. 25-56.
- Hall, E.T.  
1976 *Beyond Culture*. New York: Doubleday.  
1983 *The Dance of Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Lim, Tae-Seop  
1988 "A New Model of Politeness in Discourse," Speech Communication Association Convention. New Orleans.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko  
1988 "Reexamination of the Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese," *Journal of Pragmatics* 12.403-26.
- Moeran, Brian  
1988 "Japanese Language and Society: An Anthropological Approach," *Journal of Pragmatics* 12.427-43.
- Pearson, Bethyl  
1990 "Power and Politeness in Conversation: Encoding of Face-threatening Acts at Church Business Meetings," *Anthropological Linguistics* 30. 68-93.  
1990 "'Role-ing' out Control at Church Business Meetings: Directing and Disagreeing." *Language Sciences* 11. 289-304.
- Sohn, Ho-Min  
1983 "Intercultural Communication in Cognitive Values: Americans and Koreans." *Language and Linguistics* 9.93-136.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella

- 1985 "Toward a Theory of Conflict and Culture," in *Communication, Culture, and Organizational Processes*, William Gudykunst, L. Stewart and Stella Ting-Toomey (eds.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. pp. 71-86.
- 1988 "Intercultural Conflict Styles: A Face-negotiation Theory," *International and Intercultural Communication* 12.213-35.

