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ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the presentation of and response to face threatening acts (FTA) in tutor-student interaction in British and Japanese academic contexts. The specific FTAs looked at were criticism, suggestion and request. Their location in a specific genre, i.e., the one-to-one tutorial, is an important determinant, both for their occurrence and for their interpretation. We investigated five recurring situations in the authentic data: three which were tutor-initiated with the illocutionary force of criticism, suggestion and request for clarification, and two which were student-initiated requests. These situations were incorporated into a discourse completion test, which was administered to native speakers of English and Japanese. The results revealed that while the British students primarily dealt with their own face needs, both positive and negative face needs, the Japanese students showed more concern for the positive face of the tutor. There was an obvious attendance to negative face in the British context, where both the tutor and the student attended each other's negative face and the students attended their own, whereas there was an attenuation of negative face in the Japanese context, where neither the tutors nor the students tended to attend each other's or their own negative face. This study, therefore, moves face out of the specific realm of politeness, and attempts to demonstrate its wider applicability in contrastive and cross-cultural pragmatics.
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INTRODUCTION

The location of speech acts in a specific genre is an important determinant, both for their occurrence and for their interpretation. In one-to-one academic tutorials and other tutor-student interactions, it is the tutors who make the criticisms and suggestions, whereas either can make requests. We investigated five situations altogether, three of which were tutor-initiated with the illocutionary force of criticism, suggestion, and request for clarification, and two requests which were student-initiated. The linguistic forms of the tutor utterances...
derived from authentic data recorded in tutorials in the arts, specifically, fine art, music, media studies, drama, and dance, in Britain. The request situations for a reference and for the extension of a deadline, were chosen for their frequency of occurrence in academic contexts. The five situations were incorporated into a discourse completion test (DCT) which was administered to 38 native speakers of English in England and 75 native speakers of Japanese in Japan (see Appendix). The informants were college students and tutors. Although the translated versions from English were used in the Japanese discourse completion test, we additionally asked another group of 36 native speakers of Japanese to rewrite the elicitation prompts in a manner that they thought a Japanese tutor was likely to use. In this way, we were able to compare the differences in interaction in the two academic contexts.

We used the definitions of face wants as defined by Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) to assess whose and which face wants were being attended to or defended. Brown and Levinson’s definitions are as follows (1987: 61):

The public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction - i.e., freedom of action and freedom from imposition; and (b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

Specifically, the strategies of uptake to the criticism, suggestion, and request for clarification, and the strategies of presentation of the student-initiated requests were coded and compared. The use of strategies over the different situations allowed the characterisation of psychological types of responders and an assessment of the prevailing types in the British and Japanese data was made. The predominance of particular strategies is seen as related to underlying value systems and different kinds of strategies is analysed as sociopragmatic variables. In so doing we have built on the pragmalinguistic sociopragmatic distinction first mooted by Thomas (1985) and used extensively in the discussion of pragmatic transfer and interlanguage pragmatics (Kasper, 1992; Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993). The context of one-to-one student-tutor interaction is itself a culturally motivated one, one which has evolved within a particular educational culture. Values underpinning that educational culture will play a role both in how students and tutors interact and in the kinds of things they expect each other to say.1 Where those expectations diverge, there is likely to be a problem of cross-cultural communication. We maintain that it is at the level of sociopragmatic variables that the motivation for such divergences lies and that in isolating such variables and making them explicit, potential problems of cross-cultural miscommunication or communication breakdown can to some extent be pre-empted.

**FACE IN BRITISH AND JAPANESE TUTORIALS**

**Tutor-Initiated Exchanges**

The three tutor-initiated exchanges were based on authentic data occurring in the British context between British tutors and Japanese students, where it was perceived that the Japanese students experienced pragmatic difficulties. Often, elicitations from the tutors in the disciplines of fine art, music, media studies, drama, and dance, were linguistically fairly simple, at least in their initial form, but seemed to cause difficulty for the student in terms of delivering the kinds of content that was required. This emerged fairly dramatically in the following extract from a fine art tutorial where the Japanese student was being asked about her work which was on display. This extract also usefully included a statement made by the tutor at the end, which made clear the rationale for the initial elicitation.

E.g.  
BT (British Tutor). Which is the best one?  
JS (Japanese Student). Mm, I can’t say that because...  
BT. Which is the worst one?  
JS. ... Parson?  
BT. Are there any that are not here because they were no good?  
JS. ... Mm-m.  
BT. Are there any of these...  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. which have not been put on the wall because you did not think they were very good? ... Have you done any that failed?  
JS. ... I’m really trying to find out wh, what, how you can distinguish between...  
BT. Something which enables you to say, I, I, like this more than that; this is the way forward, this is the way to go.  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. You know. All these ar, all these are OK.  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. All these are good.  
JS. Mm.  
BT. But some are better than others.  
JS. ... Mm-m.  
BT. They’re not all equal.  
JS. ... I don’t know that (?)  
BT. They’re not all of the same value.  
JS. Yeah?  
BT. Understand... Mm, if we were to say, I, I’m going to ask you to choose four...  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. Let’s say. And I’ve got a big bonfire over here, I’ve got a big fire, over here...  
JS. Mm, right.  
BT. Right. We’ve got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. We’ve got 12.  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. And I’m going to put eight of them on the bonfire, on the fire.  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. And save four.  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. Right, and you’re going to be very sad.  
JS. Mm.  
BT. Because your work is going on the fire. Which four would we keep?  
JS. Mm-m.  
BT. Which four? Show me.  
JS. I cannot choose.  
BT. Yes you can. You must.  
JS. Why do you know, why do you want to know that? Because, ...  
BT. Because it will tell me something...  
JS. ... Mm. It’s a... mm, universe, they’re part of the universe. I like to... I like to show... eh, construction of the universe. How...  
BT. Yes, yes, yes, yes. You’ve made these, haven’t you?  
JS. Mm.  
BT. You have made each one.  
JS. Mm.

---

1 An emphasis on the role played by cultural values in faceworks is also made by Morisaki and Ohyakun (1994), and Ting-Toomey and Cooref (1994).
open the possibility of the student proffering a reason. Prefacing what might be construed as a criticism with a positive statement in Situation B along with hypothetical modality for the introduction of the suggestion alleviates the tension and distances the effect of criticism. In Situation C, the use of less sharply pointed lexis such as ‘implies’ and the either/or question to ease the focus onto the problem area have similar tentative and indirect effects. Brown and Levinson (1987: 70) include as possible reasons for the use of positive politeness redressive action the acknowledgment of hearer’s in-group membership. It therefore seems that there is a tendency for British tutors to view their students as members of the academic discourse community, albeit with less experience and lesser powers of judgment than themselves.

This has wider ramifications than the tutor’s attendance to the positive face of the student. It has implications also for the conduct of the student as a student member of the discourse community. It is incumbent for her/him also to exercise judgment, as was brought out in the extracts above, and failure to do so or not to perceive the necessity to do so, may result in a negative assessment. This is echoed in Kress and Fowler (1979: 75) who emphasise the dual role of the students. On the one hand, they are subordinate and must be polite, modest, and unrebellious, while at the same time, they need to show independence of opinion in order to affirm their status as members of the discourse community. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990) also found that graduate students had a tightrope to walk between respecting the advice of their academic advisors, i.e., ‘compliance’ and showing initiative. Those students who did not show any initiative with regard to choosing their course options in the academic advisory session were not highly rated by their advisors. The tension between conflicting orientations of the academic counsellor is also highlighted by He (1993: 513) who notes that counsellors use the same frequency of low modality, where ‘the speaker constructs less truth value of the utterance and lower discourse status’ as the students, and a higher frequency of high modality than the students. The use of low modality by the counsellors is consistent with that of creative and performing arts discipline tutors in Britain with regard to the advice and signals of approbation/disapprobation that they give students.

As in our discourse completion test, we were interested in how our different informant bodies would respond, the prompts were translated into Japanese in accordance with the modality used in English. However, we were also interested in ascertaining to what extent Japanese tutors would use similar prompts. As a means of going some way towards this (we are still in the process of gathering authentic data from Japanese student/tutor interactions), we asked 28 Japanese students to write the prompts in the manner they thought Japanese tutorials would be most likely to use.

This produced some interesting results. For the most part, changes made were in the direction of more forthrightness and high modality (cf. Takahashi and Beebe, 1993). For example, in Situation A, the reformulations range from a direct criticism, ‘Kore-ja budamada tarinai-yo’ (this is far from what is required), a direct instruction, ‘Toku-ni bunseki-ga fukushiki-te imasu. Sukanukutomo A, B, C koomoku-no bunseki-ga hitohyo-nanomi, A-dake shika kake-te inai-ne’ (Your essay particularly lacks analysis. You need to analyse at least items A, B, ad C, and yet, you have written about A only), to a strong recommendation, ‘Mada amari kake-te imasan-ne. Gambarinasai’ (You haven’t written very much, have you? Work hard).

2 The degree of authority shown by the Japanese tutors was also subject to gender differences. Female respondents tended to use softer ways of expressing criticisms and suggestions, which included the use of homophonic expressions (e.g., ‘Koudashite’ (please), hedge expressions (e.g., sukoshi alimashite desu ne) or verbal or non-verbal state (I think it’s a bit ambiguous, but...). and sympathetic remarks (e.g., ‘Roobou-su taiken desu-kat? (Is it hard work to write an essay?) ‘Unakku desu-_desu-kat? (Is it going well?)’ It should be noted that the softening is intended as the level of interpersonal behaviour and not at the level of ideological context.)
A clearer definition of the role of the tutor as authority figure also comes out in the formulations for this situation when the expressions used demand the student use the tutor as problem solver or specific advice-giver. E.g., "Dokoka muzukushii tokoro-ga arimasu-ka?" (Do you have any difficulty?), "Nanika adobau-ka hitusuyo desu-ka?" (Do you need some advice?), "Nanika adobau-ka hitusuyo desu-ka? Nanika komatteiru, wakaranai tokoro-ga arimasu-ka?" (Do you need some advice? Do you have any problems or anything that you don’t understand?), "Dokoka mayotara, tsuzanaitai shite koto-ga arunodesu-ka?" (Do you have any problems that trouble you?). Expressions are used which impose on the student’s negative face, for example as exhortations to work harder. E.g., "Moo sukoshi gambatte mimasen-ka?" (‘Don’t you try to work a little harder?’), ‘Gambatte-te. Demo sukoshi monotarai yoo-desu?‘ (‘You worked hard, didn’t you? But, you need to work a little harder.’). It may be argued that such expressions are commensurate with the point in the system operating in Japan in relation to the notion of shame (Skelton, 1991; Hiraga and Turner, forthcoming) usually referred to in English as the value of perseverance, and are therefore unlikely to be taken adversely. However, such an exhortory style is what the British tutors and the academic advisers in the American contexts mentioned above seem at pains to avoid. There is therefore a contrasting ethos in operation here which relates both to tutor-student interaction, and more widespread cultural values.

On the one hand, the relationship between tutor and student is hierarchical and authority-based in the Japanese context and more fluid, with the tutor sometimes lowering her/his own ‘discourse status’ (He 1993) in the British context. On the other hand, there are differing value systems in operation which sociopragmatically determine the kinds of things tutors can be expected to say would be immediately understood by students. The socio-cultural status of ‘gambare’, for example, means that tutors can exhort students to ‘work hard’ whereas an equivalent kind of exhortation in the British context would demean the students’ standing as independent adults capable of determining for themselves how they should go about their studies. This would be a case where the underlying value of independent-minded students would play a more prominent role in the interpretation of what was said. It does not mean that independence in students is not valued in the Japanese context. The complexity of sociopragmatic structuring is such that identifying bipolar variables is unhelpful. Nonetheless, variability in the prominence of cultural values operating in particular situations can lead to contrasting sociopragmatic interpretations.

As well as imposing on students’ negative face, which the Japanese ‘work hard’ ethic appears to emphasise, the prompt in this situation also threatens their positive face. While there is an underlying assumption in the British context that the student should write more in a quantitative sense and is therefore being imposed upon, the tutor’s prompt is suitably ambiguous and implies that the student hasn’t really got grips with the argument being pursued in the essay. This might be for a number of reasons, such as not fully comprehending the subject matter or not yet having got down to the necessary preliminary research. This is reflected in the students’ responses in the DCT, e.g., ‘No, I’m afraid not. I find the whole thing a bit overwhelming and was hoping that if I discussed it with you, I would be able to clarify my ideas a little’, or ‘No—but I have unearthed a lot of references, done a lot of reading and have extensive notes. It shouldn’t take me long to finish now’. In these examples the students were responding to the potential threat to their positive face, on the one hand accepting it because recognising its validity and on the other hand, defending against it, because ultimately the student had the process under control. In neither case, as with the responses was the student, conscious of your intention of writing a sociopragmatic assumption shared by the British tutors and the Japanese students is that the students must behave like a competent critical analyst of ideas and tutors’ comments do not need to be explicitly framed in this light to remind the students openly of that role, as the students are nonetheless perceived as members of the academic discourse community.

The need to be critical and to demonstrate critical analysis indeed appears to be a prioritisation of the British academic context. In their study into lecturers’ perceptions of what they expected students to learn by studying their discipline, Entwistle (1984) found that ‘critical skills’ came up frequently regardless of discipline. The expectation that students should show independence of thought is mentioned by Kress and Fowler (1970) as the reverse of their institutional role as relatively powerless, and relates also to the expectation that students ‘show initiative’ in Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford’s study (1990). Turner and Hiraga (forthcoming) showed the predominance of analytical elaboration via structuring of comparison and definition in DCT responses of fairly open-ended tutor elicitations. The prevailing values of critical appraisal in academic contexts in Britain, then appears to be another sociopragmatic determinant of how tutors’ elicitations are interpreted.

The valuation of independence of thought appears to be operating in Situation B also, where the decision is left to the student whether to take up the suggestion or not. In leaving the ball in the student’s court as it were, the tutor is attending to the positive face needs of the student in this very specific context, to the arbiter of critical judgment. The tutor may give advice, but ultimately, it is up to the student to make the final judgment. Provided this was well reasoned, there need be no implication of loss of face for the tutor if the student ultimately decided not to take the advice. It is likely, however, that there would be an interplay between the relevant content and interpersonal relations, whereby the student argued his/her case ideationally, but attended to the positive face wants of the tutor at the same time. For example, ‘Well, I expect I could cut it down a bit. But I’m surprised you should say that, because I thought I’d argued it quite tightly’ or ‘Well, I would say that I felt it balanced the essay. Do you think it’s weakly?’ The words ‘rigid’ and ‘weakly’ signal attention to the relevant ideational context in this situation and in a significant number of the answers, the British students used words in this same lexical field, showing an awareness of the concern in academic writing for concision.

In this situation, a significant number of the Japanese informants who were asked to rewrite the prompt if they thought it did not conform to what they thought a tutor would say, made their suggestion much more directive. For example, ‘Ketsuranoo no tokoro wa mousoku koki jikakusshi, essensu no bunbu da-ke ni shite kudasai!’ (Please make your conclusion a little shorter by keeping only the essence of it), ‘Ketsuranoo no tokoro wa suoshi kikaku shihataaa-ga ii-o-omousu-ya’ (‘I think it better that you should make your conclusion shorter’), or ‘Ketura no tokoro ga nagai yoo ni omousu-ya, moo suoshi jikaku dekimase-ka?’ (‘I think your conclusion is long; couldn’t you make it a little shorter?’). This appears to show a greater willingness to impose on negative face than in the British context.

In Situation C, it is particularly interesting that only one of the 38 informants retained the either/or question form, although that informant reduced the dichotomous effect by including a third possibility, e.g., ‘were you implying that you agreed with the author or were you criticizing him, or do you have a different opinion?’ This could be seen as a ‘cambri-dispreferred’ attitude to dichotomous thinking, as opposed to its cultural embeddedness in the British (Graeco-roman derived) context.

In most other cases, the prompts were changed to direct yes-no questions such as ‘Kimi-wa kono gakusha ni sahitte dous ka gankaettai innaka-ca?’ (what do you think about this scholar?), ‘Koko-o kaita toki, anata-wa donoyaona tumordere kikumashita-ka?’ (what did you intend to say when you wrote this?) or direct requests: ‘Koko-o kaita ito-oo setsume shite hoshii’ (I’d like to explain it with direct admonishment). ‘Kono budo to koko bunbu no setsume-ya fusoku atete kimi-no shougakko-kai kikaku dekimai no da-ga-ne’ (I couldn’t follow what you said, because your explanation of this part and that part is insufficient), and ‘Koko-o kaita toki, kimi-no kange-o hakkuri kujutsuhara’ (you should describe your thought clearly). ‘Motto shooken-o shibotte kikumashita’ (you should focus your point).
In all the three situations tested, the reformulations seemed to be indicative of there being less need to attend to the positive and negative face of the student in the Japanese context. A possible explanation for the differences in face attendance between the British and the Japanese contexts is that in the British context, the students are treated as inexperienced members of the discourse community, whereas in the Japanese context, the students are outside the discourse community of experts, constituted by the academic tutors. In the one case, membership status demands a certain degree of respect which is manifested by attendance to the positive and negative face of the students. While in the other case, non-membership obviates the need for such attention by the higher status members. In a vertical society where such hierarchical relationships are taken for granted, no rudeness is perceived and the interactions run along the expected lines.

Strategies in Response to Criticism and Suggestion

In order to see the workings of face in the response to FTAs by the students, the DCT answers were analysed within a shared analytical framework by the authors. The coding schema is based on the four-way combination of whether acknowledgment of or resistance to the speech act X, Y, Z, ..., either explicitly or implicitly. Each take-up was interpreted either as an admission or threat to the positive or negative face of the interlocutors, according to the nature of the speech act in question. The basic formulation is as follows:

**PROMPT** speech act X, Y, Z ...
**RESPONSE** explicit acknowledgment of X, Y, Z ...
 implicit acknowledgment of X, Y, Z ...
 explicit resistance to X, Y, Z ...
 implicit resistance to X, Y, Z. (In our data there was no instance of 'implicit' resistance)

Strategies deployed by the students in the realisation of acknowledgment of or resistance to X, Y, Z, ..., fell into similar patterns with some variations, according to the situations and the speech acts, as indicated below:

In Situation A, by asking an indirect tag question concerning the amount of achievement, 'You haven't written very much, have you?' the tutor was communicating (1) an explicit criticism about the student's inadequate display of achievement (attending the positive face of the student); and (2) an implicit suggestion of doing more work (attending the negative face of the student).

The students' answers showed a combination of the following patterns:
(1) explicit acknowledgment of criticism (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the positive face of the student him/herself)
   a) by agreeing with the tutor, e.g., 'No, I haven't written much'.
   b) by apologizing, e.g., 'I'm sorry' and/or by showing regret, e.g., 'I should have done more'.
   c) by admitting inability or difficulty, e.g., 'I did my best; but, this was all I could' (inability), 'I've been busy as I had other projects to finish too' (difficulty on personal and/or practical grounds).
(2) explicit resistance to criticism (defending the positive face of the student at the cost of threatening the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by giving justification, e.g., 'Actually I have done a lot of reading and have extensive notes, or I didn't want to waffle (strong defence and/or counter-attack on academic grounds);
   b) by seeking instruction, e.g., 'Could you tell me how I could pad it out?'

(3) explicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the negative face of the student)
   by showing commitment, e.g., 'It shouldn't take me long to finish it now'.

(4) implicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by seeking clarification and/or advice, e.g., 'How long do you think I should write?'
   b) by requesting a remedy, e.g., 'Could I have some more time to finish?'
(5) explicit resistance to suggestion (threatening the positive face of the tutor and defending the negative face of the student)
   a) by stating reluctance and/or difficulty, e.g., 'I find it difficult to pad it out and make it longer'.
   b) by resigning, e.g., 'I couldn't write any more'.

In Situation B, by an hypothetical question prefaced by a compliment, 'I think you're doing good work. What would you say if I suggested you made the concluding section a bit shorter?': the tutor was conveying: (1) an explicit suggestion to rectify (threatening the negative face of the student); and (2) an implicit criticism about the student's inadequate rhetorical structure (attending the positive face of the student).

The students' answers showed a combination of the following patterns:
(1) explicit acknowledgment of criticism (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the positive face of the student him/herself)
   a) by agreeing with the tutor, e.g., 'Yes, that seems appropriate';
   b) by apologizing, e.g., 'I'm sorry' and/or by showing regret, e.g., 'Well, I'm not satisfied with it myself';
   c) by admitting difficulty, e.g., 'That's the kind of thing I have problems with, trying to encapsulate the main points in a concise way as possible';
   d) by resigning, e.g., 'I couldn't do what to do about it'.
(2) explicit resistance to criticism (defending the positive face of the student at the cost of threatening the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by giving justification, e.g., 'Well, I would say that I felt it balanced the essay. Do you think it's waffly? (strong defence and/or counter-attack on academic bases). (Scored as (6) a, too);
   b) by transferring to a different option, e.g., 'I'm usually told that I haven't written enough! [Jocular counter-attack, saying that other people usually criticize her in an opposite way, implying that this criticism of the tutor may not be appropriate] (counter-attack on the bases of someone else's opinion).
   c) by seeking instruction, e.g., 'What do you think could be left out? It all sounds relevant to me'. (Scored as (6) b, too).
(3) explicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the negative face of the student him/herself)
   a) by showing commitment, e.g., 'That's no problem -- it's always easier to shorten something than it is to expand';
   b) by thanking, e.g., 'Thanks for that'.
(4) implicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by suggesting advice, e.g., 'What do you think could be left out?' (Different from (3)b in that the tone of the student is more of a request than a resistance);
   b) by requesting a remedy, e.g., 'Could I have some time to rewrite?';
   c) by suspending strong commitment, e.g., 'I'll think about it'. (Applies to the Japanese data only)
(5) explicit resistance to suggestion (defending the negative face of the student at the cost of threatening the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by stating reluctance and/or difficulty, e.g., 'I don't know how to shorten it, I'd like to keep it as it is if you don't mind';
   b) by stating criticism of the tutor's suggestion, e.g., 'I'll try but I cannot think of any part that could be left out without jeopardising the balance of the essay';
   c) by giving an alternative, e.g., 'I could shorten introduction instead'.
criticizing him? the tutor was: (1) explicitly requesting for clarification (threatening the negative face of the student); and (2) implicitly criticize the student's inadequate argument (attending the positive face of the student). In the Japanese academic context, this prompt was also conveying (3) an implicit suggestion to rectify (attending the negative face of the student).

The students' answers showed a combination of the following patterns:

(1) acknowledgment of request
   by explicit acknowledgment, e.g., 'I was criticizing him'.
   by hesitant acknowledgment, e.g., 'Well, let me see ... I was basically saying that I agreed with him' (avoiding to lose the positive face of the student).

(2) explicit acknowledgment of criticism (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the positive face of the student)
   a) by admitting ambiguity (agreeing with the tutor), e.g., 'I was ambiguous'.
   b) by apologizing, e.g., 'I'm sorry' and/or by showing regret, 'I should have written more clearly'.
   c) by admitting difficulty, e.g., 'Oh, dear. Not a very successful sentence then, is it?'

(3) explicit resistance to criticism (defending the positive face of the student at the cost of threatening the positive face of the tutor)
   a) by giving justification, e.g., 'I did it on purpose, so I didn't have to commit myself or I am rather skeptical of his interpretation as I point out later in the essay' (strong defence or counter-attack on the academic grounds).
   b) by transferring to a different option, e.g., 'I was really just stating what X had actually found' [i.e., saying that it's X's fault], 'I think if you look at the sentence in the context of the paragraph, my overall view is definitely in agreement with the author' [i.e., putting the argument on a larger scope], 'I'm not sure that I could not agree with him fully, I was describing it more in detail in the latter half of the paragraph' [i.e., avoiding dichotomic interpretation].
   c) by seeking instruction, e.g., 'How could I have made my argument clearer?'

(4) explicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor at the cost of losing the negative face of the student himself/herself) [Applies to the Japanese data only]
   a) by showing commitment, e.g., 'I'll rewrite it'.
   b) by thanking, e.g., 'Thank you for pointing it out'.

(5) implicit acknowledgment of suggestion (attending the positive face of the tutor) [Applies to the Japanese data only]
   a) by seeking clarification and/or advice, e.g., 'If I elaborated here, do you think I'd make myself clearer?'

The coded results revealed that the differences in strategies used by the two student populations were quite marked and seemed to correspond broadly to the assumptions underlying the reformulations made to the tutors' prompts in Japanese. Table 1 shows the percentage of the strategies chosen by the informants in each situation. Bold-face numbers indicate frequency larger than 50%.

As seen in Table 1, resistance to criticism and resistance to suggestion are a British characteristic across the situations, whereas explicit acknowledgment of the suggestion is typically Japanese, particularly in Situation B. It can be interpreted that the British tendency to resist criticism reflects the attendance by the students to their own positive face, and the tendency to resist suggestion the attendance by the students to their own negative face. By contrast, the Japanese tendency to acknowledge the suggestion is interpreted as attendance by the students to the positive face of the tutor, as well as accepting the threat of their own negative face.

Table 1. Strategies Employed by Situations (%) (B: n=23, J: n=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B=British; J=Japanese; n=number of informants; Sit=Situation; Inf=Informant; Ack=Acknowledgment; Resist=Resistance; ex=explicit; im=implicit; hist=hesitant.

Also being made clear by the table is that each informant used more than one strategy per situation. The average number of strategies used by the British informants was 2.2 and 1.6 by the Japanese informants across the situations. This means that the informants deployed the strategies in some combinations. We identified five characteristic scenarios, comprised of such strategies, which correspond to the weighting of face attendance deployed by the students in the three situations of criticism and/or suggestion as follows:

1) CONCILIATORS basically follow what the tutor was saying. Their notable characteristic is that they do not show resistance to criticism. Instead, they either acknowledge the criticism or show commitment to the suggestion.

2) NEGOTIATORS try to balance the attendance and the threat towards the positive face of the tutor and towards their own positive face. The most typical negotiation scenario is that they use acknowledgment of criticism and/or suggestion as a softener to mitigate the force of a potential threat to the positive face of the tutor, while defending their own positive face by resisting the criticism.

3) DEFENDERS are primarily concerned with protecting their own positive and negative face, and attend to the positive face of the tutor only secondarily. Hence, they tend to show resistance to criticism.
4) **RESIGNERS** give up trying to develop their ideas or projects by resistance to suggestion, although they acknowledge criticism in order to show their attendance to the positive face of the tutor.

5) **NON-ELABORATORS** simply respond to a question at its face value. They neither acknowledge criticism, nor resist criticism or suggestion.

Table 2 indicates the distribution of the types of the students as described above in percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>British (n=23)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Japanese (n=60)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCILIATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGOTIATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIGNER</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-ELABORATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the British data and the Japanese data display a sharp contrast in the dominant type of the students in Situations A and B, which are marked by bold-face numbers. In what follows, we will consider the differing patterns of face attendance in the British and the Japanese data as formed by the types of the students in the three situations tested.

**CONCILIATORS** are those who do not show resistance to the tutor's criticism. They tend either to acknowledge the criticism explicitly by agreeing with the tutor, apologizing or regretting, or admitting difficulty, or to show commitment to the suggestion. In the British context, the conciliators basically concede to the loss of their positive face and there is no threat at all to the positive face of the tutor. Typically the British conciliators would say, in Situation A, 'Yes, I'm sorry [acknowledgment of criticism by apologising]', I found it hard to understand the question, and spent a lot of time reading around the subject [acknowledgement of criticism by admitting difficulty]; in Situation B, 'I am not surprised. I know I have a tendency to waffle [acknowledgment of criticism by agreeing with the tutor]. Perhaps I should try to make it more succinct [acknowledgment of suggestion by showing commitment]'; and in Situation C, 'It was a criticism, really [acknowledgment of request], but may be I haven't made that clear enough [acknowledgment of criticism by agreeing with the author]'.

In the Japanese context, however, by acknowledging and accepting the criticism, the students are conveying that what the tutor has said was right, and they agree with it, often at the cost of losing their own positive face wants. The students might further indicate their attendance to the positive face of the tutor by threatening their own negative face wants, such as indicating their commitment to following the tutor's suggestion or advice on how to improve what was criticised. For example, the Japanese conciliators tended to respond to the criticism either by agreeing with the tutor, 'Hai, soto-nan-desu' (I agree), by apologising for the lack of their achievement, 'Suzume' (I'm sorry), or by admitting inability, 'So, desu-nai' (I agree, I find difficulty organising my thoughts...). They rarely showed resistance to criticism by giving a justification or seeking instruction, nor displayed resistance to suggestion by stating their reluctance to follow the tutor's suggestion. Even when they did not openly acknowledge the criticism, they were likely to state their commitment, 'Kijitu made-niwa-ma-e-awa-nasu' ('I'll finish it in time') in Situation A, 'Hai, kekkou-o moosaokushii yooyaku-shite mimasuu' (Yes, I will try to condense the results a little further) in Situation B, or to seek further clarification or advice, 'Moo sukoshi kakkikoue mimasuu. Kakekubi noyo undo, oshie-te itadake-masen-ka?' (Will you try to write a little further. Could you suggest which points I should write on?) in Situation A, 'Domo yoo-ri matome-ku iku oshie-te kudasai (Please instruct me how I can summarise) in Situation B, or 'Watashi-wa hikan-site koto-o shinshita-ni-desu-ga, domo hen-ga wakari-zurai-desu-ka? oshie-te kudasai (I intended to show that I was criticising, but where do you find difficult to understand? Please tell me) in Situation C. In the DCT results, more than 60% of the Japanese informants are classified into this category in Situations A and B, as indicated graphically in Figs. 1 and 2.

The notion of 'commitment' is often an accompaniment of the conciliator. A sense of commitment may be linked to non-attendance to the students' own negative face wants as well as attendance to the positive face wants of the tutor in the Japanese context. Moreover, the demonstration of commitment is linked to the uptake of the prompt as advice or suggestion, relating to the Japanese data in Situation C, where an either/or question of an explicit request for clarification was interpreted as an implicit suggestion to rectify, and therefore, replied by showing commitment or seeking clarification or advice. This ties in also with the reformulation of the prompt to a more directive expression. A likely reason for this 'committal' attitude in both Japanese tutors and students is drawing on arguments put forward by Ito (1989), Matsumoto (1988, 1989), and Mao (1994) that negative face does not exist in group-oriented cultures. In other words, negative face may be construed as an effect of the consciousness of individuality. Where this consciousness does not exist, negative face is not there to be offended in the first place.
NEGOTIATORS’ both acknowledge the criticism or suggestion and show resistance to criticism. They are trying to weigh up attendance to and the threat towards the positive face of the other party as well as their own positive face. They tend to see an acknowledgment of criticism and/or suggestion as a softener to mitigate the force of the potential threat to their positive face of the tutor, while defending their own positive face by resisting the criticism.

About a quarter of both British and Japanese respondents were negotiators in Situation A, where the largest number of informants responded to the tutor’s implicit criticism by explicitly acknowledging it as well as resisting it (particularly in the British data) (see Tables 1 and 2). In Situation A, a British student would say something like: ‘Well, yes, I suppose what you say is a bit on the short side’ [acknowledgment of criticism by agreeing with the author] but I thought’ the most essential points and that ‘I tried to explain clearly [resistance to criticism by displaying justification].’ I mean, which bits do you think should have been expanded [acknowledgment of suggestion by seeking further instruction]?’ Commitment was also aligned with negotiation in the British context, but seemed to be oriented more towards defending the student’s own positive face. A comment such as ‘It shouldn’t take me long to finish, now’ is indicative of this use of commitment. In the Japanese context, the negotiators also showed a tendency to commitment. For instance, in Situation A, they would say things like: ‘Sumimasen [acknowledgment of criticism by showing regret].’ Iroiro shiryō-o yonda-nada-ga, nakanaka matomara-nai-nada-ga [resistance to criticism by justifying the process of development].’ Demo, kanarazu kijutsu-made-ni hitori-hitori sumi-tori-desu [explicit acknowledgment of suggestion by showing commitment] (‘I’m sorry. I’ve done a lot of reading but I haven’t been able to incorporate it into the essay. However, I intend to meet the deadline for sure’), and ‘Shiryō-o hotoado yonda-nada-ga, jitoro-o kaita-dake-ga [resistance to criticism by justifying the process of development].’ Ato gamatte ookomi-masu [explicit acknowledgment of suggestion by showing commitment] (‘I’ve done the introduction. I’ll do the rest of the assignment.’), or simply, ‘Tanka koto arimasen’ (It’s not true). The Japanese informants tended to resist the criticism and suggestion but did not justify their resistance.

At this point it seems important to say something about the use of justification in the two cultures. In the British academic context, it functions virtually as an imperative. British students tend to perceive a need to justify their actions and their understanding even when the critical comment is more of a question. In turn, the justification is therefore the strongest way of defending their positive face. By contrast, in the Japanese culture, the concept of justification (‘szetouka’) tends to be negatively evaluated, functioning more like the connotation in English of ‘making excuses’ (‘liwakke sozu’). In English, ‘making excuses’ affirms the idea of an excuse, in as much as it points up the poor quality of the justification. Contentual or contextual relevance is what enhances an ‘excuse’ to a justification. In Japanese there is a countervailing value system to the justificatory one in English. It revolves around the notion of ‘izogirai’, that is being stolid or admitting defeat gracefully. Such an attitude is often found in justifying one’s actions or attempting to compensate for what has gone wrong. In other words, it militates against the defense of positive face even in the academic context. This could explain why the majority of Japanese students in our data were ‘conciliators’ whereas the British students were ‘defenders’.

In Situation B, while the Japanese students found reasons for keeping their conclusion as it was, these reasons were at the level of personal opinion rather than being drawn from what was generally considered good practice in the genre as in the British context. This was the basis of the British students’ appeal to ‘concision’ mentioned above. For this reason, it seemed that defense of positive face for the British student depended on justifying their actions in terms of relevant criteria for the topic of discussion, whereas the defense of positive face for the Japanese students related more to the interpersonal intention involved. They were in a sense asking for the indulgence of the tutor. ‘Dame, mono-ni nobeto-monoo-ko kekkō-o matomarue-o dooshimite kono kurai-ni nacchuum-desu [resistance to criticism by justifying the process of writing]’ (But if I summarise the results I mentioned before, it needs this amount), ‘Ketsuruo-no tokoro-ga ichiban itai bunbu-nano-desu-ga [resistance to criticism by justifying on personal basis].’ Dono-noo-ki, ketsurua yoi-ko yoku wakaranai-koto [resistance to suggestion by stating difficulty] (‘I’m afraid the conclusion is really just that part I would like to stress most. I don’t know how I could cut it down’).

‘Watsahi-no iken-o ketsuruo-no tokoro-ni jibun-no iken-o yoyuyu-saemashi-ta. Ichiban taizenuta tokoro-desu-node, kono nagaanai-chata saimai-mashi-ta [resistance to criticism by justifying the validity of writing this way].’ Dekirukana kono-tei-kouryoshite iadashi-ni-
In general, in Situations A, B, and C, the British students paid more attention to their ideational role as critical analysts with secondary attention only to the interpersonal situation and attention to the face wants of the tutor. This was in marked contrast to the Japanese students who were predominantly focussed on the interpersonal situation and the need to attend the face wants particularly positive face wants of the tutor.

**Student-Initiated Requests**

In the situations where students are making requests, the predominant focus is on the negative face of the tutor, as they are being imposed upon by the request. For the two request situations in the DCT, namely a request for the extension of a deadline for an essay (Situation D) and a request for a reference (Situation E), we used a slightly revised version of the coding scheme elaborated by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) to detail the kinds of linguistic use. The answers were coded according to the two sets of strategies -- supportive moves and illocutionary acts of request. Supportive moves were further divided into two groups -- strategies relating to an interpersonal orientation and those relating to a contentual orientation. The former strategies include a preparatory move, which asks about the potential availability of the hearer for carrying out the request (e.g., 'Do you have a few minutes? There is something I want to ask you'), getting a precommitment, which checks on a potential refusal (e.g., 'I wonder if you could do me a favour?'), and concern for the inconvenience of the hearer (e.g., 'Sorry to bother you,' I know you must be busy'). The latter strategies are giving an explanation of the situation (e.g., 'I don't think I can finish my essay on time' in Situation D); I'd like to apply to this college' in Situation E), justification or reason for request (e.g., 'Unfortunately, I also had to do two other essays' in Situation D); I have a found a very good college which does exactly what I have wanted to concentrate on' in Situation E), and regret or apology for the case of refusal (e.g., 'I'm afraid I haven't had time to finish my essay, I'm sorry about this'). The illocutionary acts were also divided according to the directness of the utterance into direct requests (e.g., 'If I was you, I would do it' (Please give me one more week)), conventionally indirect requests (e.g., 'I wondered if it's possible to extend the deadline at all,' 'Could you please write me a reference for the college tutor?'); and hints or non-conventionally indirect requests (e.g., 'Well, I thought I ought to come and see you because I don't think I'm going to get my essay finished on time' with no follow-up remarks).

In terms of the workings of face attendance, it is assumed that the conventionally indirect request with a greater number of mitigating supportive moves of interpersonal orientation would mark a higher degree of attendance to the negative face wants of the tutor. On the other hand, giving supporting supportive moves of contentual orientation would show attendance to the negative face wants of the tutor as well as to the positive face wants of the student. Table 3 below indicates the frequency percentage of the strategies of request deployed by the British and Japanese respondents. Strategies employed more than 50% are shown in bold-face numbers.

The most notable difference between the British and Japanese data is the extent to which the situations made a dependence to the choice of strategies. The British data tended to be independent of the situations, while the Japanese data were situation-sensitive. On the one hand, the British informants unanimously used conventionally indirect requests regardless of the size of imposition in the two situations tested, with a similar high frequency of supportive moves of contentual orientation. Only one exception was the use of apology in Situation D. On the other hand, the Japanese informants deployed different types of request strategies and supportive moves according to the situation. In Situation D where the imposition was relatively small, they tended to use hints as perceived conventionally indirect requests and supportive moves of contentual orientation. In Situation E where the imposition was relatively large, they tended to employ conventionally indirect requests with supportive moves of interpersonal orientation.
Table 3. Strategies of Request (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>British (n=15)</th>
<th>Japanese (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Sit D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conv. Ind.</td>
<td>Sit E</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sit D</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hint</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep. Move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter.</td>
<td>Procomm</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentual</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 is a graphic representation of the use of request strategies by the two informant groups in each request situation. The hint strategy was at variance between the two populations, being used more widely in the Japanese data. For example, a Japanese student might say: 'Donno kijitsu-ni manaisoomo nal-no-desu-ga...' (I don't seem to finish the essay by the deadline, but ...) and leave it at that. The cause of interpretation is therefore on the tutor. This seems a considerable imposition on the negative face of the tutor from the British perspective, but in the Japanese context is acceptable. The hint strategy occurred also in Situation E, as in: 'Daigakukino jukensuru-koto-ni shimasu-ta. Sokode onegai shital koto-ga aru-no-desu-ga, yoroshidesu-ka?' (I decided to apply for a graduate school. So, I have something to ask you, but would it be all right?) The acceptability of strong hints as an appropriate way of making request by the student to the tutor in the Japanese context seems to indicate that they may not be perceived as being impolite, contrary to what has been claimed in the politeness literature (Blum-Kulka, 1987; 1989; Weitzman 1989). They say that what appear to be opposing strategies, the strategy of directness and the hint strategy, have similar effects as regards the imposition on negative face. That is, the direct strategies threaten the negative face of the hearer because of their coerciveness, while the hint strategy could be perceived as a threat, too, because of its lack of pragmatic clarity. However, what our results demonstrate seems to indicate that the degree of conventionality as manifested in certain linguistic forms and associated with indirectness to measure what is polite or impolite is culture specific rather than universal (cf. Beebe and Takahashi, 1989; Rose, 1994). Strong hints in our Japanese data could be 'conventionally indirect' and therefore a safe option to use for a request to the tutor. Another notion that we should be careful about is pragmatic clarity. In a culture where negative face wants are felt foreign, a certain amount of imposition on the hearer to decode ambiguity is taken for granted as contextualized convention. Nevertheless, the non-conventional indirectness such as hints that results from non-attendance to negative face, if transferred to a cross-cultural context such as interaction between a Japanese student and a British tutor, could appear rude.

Comparison of Figs. 5 and 6 leads that there is a marked difference between the British and the Japanese contexts as for the type of supportive moves they used. The Japanese informants displayed more use of supportive moves of interpersonal orientation in Situation E in which imposition of the request is much larger than that in Situation D, where they did not use this type of supportive moves at all. By contrast, the British respondents used interpersonal strategies in both situations, though less frequently than contextual strategies. Indeed, the British respondents tended to deploy supportive moves of contentual orientation.
more often than the Japanese counterparts in both situations tested. Supportive moves of 
contextual orientation serve both towards the attendance of the negative face of the tutor and 
the positive face of the student. It seems that this latter tendency is felt stronger in the 
British data, in which ‘defenders’ were the most salient type. The use of an apology can be a 
supportive move towards defending the student’s positive face. This occurred more 
frequently in the British context in Situation D, when the students often prefaced their 
request with an apology for having to make it, or introduced their justification for requiring 
an extension with one. Examples include: ‘I’m afraid I haven’t had time to finish my essay. 
Would you have time to mark it if I gave it to you a bit late?’, ‘I’ve got a problem with 
handing in my essay on Friday. Unfortunately, I’ve also had to do two other essays and so 
I was wondering whether I could hand it in a bit later, perhaps next week?’. 

Another contrastive factor is the extent of justification deployed by the two informant 
populations. In the Japanese data, justification occurred less than that made by the British 
students in both Situations D and E as indicated in Fig. 6. It might be that the Japanese 
students did not perceive a very strong need to justify their actions, possibly because it 
would be negatively evaluated as explained in the previous section (see explanations about 
why there were few ‘defenders’ in the Japanese data). It seems that when the students 
initiate FTA (such as requests) as well as respond to FTA (such as criticism), differing 
cultural values attached to justification render contrastive manifestations. In the British 
context, where critical appraisal works as a sociopragmatic variable, justification could be 
perceived as a strong and favoured way to defend students’ positive face in both criticism 
and request situations, and to mitigate the threat to the negative face of the tutor in request 
situations. By contrast in the Japanese context, where stokal attitude is situated in a 
recursive hierarchy of student-student relationship, justification could be perceived as 
being inappropriate both culturally and sociopragmatically. It would work against the 
positive face wants of the students to appreciate and approved of as a respectful member 
of their cultural community, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by constituting 
a challenge by a non-member of the academic community to the sociopragmatic norm of 
authority, would be a potential threat towards the positive face of the tutor in criticism 
situations.

![Graph showing Supportive Moves of Contextual Orientation (%)](image)

**Fig. 6.** Supportive Moves of Contextual Orientation (%)

**CONCLUSION**

To sum up briefly, our observation of the authentic data and the DCT results showed that 
while the British students primarily dealt with their own face wants, both positive and 
negative wants, the Japanese students showed more concern for the positive face of the 
tutor. This is by the fact that the majority of the British students in Situations A, B, and C 
were defenders whereas the majority of the Japanese students are conciliators.

There was an obvious attending to the negative face in the British context, where both the 
tutor and the student attended the student’s negative face, and where the students attended 
the tutor’s negative face. In the Japanese context, the tendency for the students to stress 
their commitment and to expect rather a high degree of commitment from the tutor 
manifested in their minimal mitigation of requests, and also in the tutor’s own voluntary 
ofers of advice (i.e., effort generating) in the criticism situations seemed indicating of 
‘effacement’ of negative face.

It seems that the metaphor of face lends itself well to contrastive pragmatic analysis, both in 
terms of its contours and its complexity. On the one hand, its contours are defined by 
sociopragmatic variables which lend prominence to particular features in a particular 
interaction, as when the demand for critical analysis makes the need to defend one’s positive 
face in the role of critical analyst prominent, or alternatively when the demand to be stokal 
highlights a different structure for positive face. On the other hand, the interactants display 
different complexions according to whether they are predominantly ‘stake-faced’ (losing 
positive face), ‘bold-faced’ (defending own or threatening other’s face), or ‘effaced’ (where 
there is no face to attend to). Complexions vary within cultures as well as across cultures, 
and this translates to different individual reactions in the same situation, although each 
situation usually throws up a dominant type, as was shown in the data analysed in this 
paper.
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Perceptions of Face in British and Japanese Tutorials

C. You're discussing with your tutor the essay you have written about the work of a certain author.

Tutor: When you wrote this [pointing to a particular sentence], were you implying that you agreed with the author or were you criticizing him?

Student:

D. You have a deadline for your essay. However, you haven't been able to finish it on time. You go to see your tutor.

Tutor: Hello (name). What can I do for you?

Student:

Tutor: Well, I suppose I'll have to say yes. But you really must make an effort to get it in to me by next Friday.

E. You want to apply to another college and you would like your tutor to write you a reference. You approach her at the end of the lesson.

Student:

Tutor: Yes, of course. That's no problem. Give me the form when you're ready.

Appendix

Discourse Completion Test

A. You're reaching the end of your course and are discussing the final term paper with your tutor.

Tutor: You haven't written very much, have you?

Student:

B. You're having a discussion with your tutor about your recent work.

Tutor: I think you're doing good work. What would you say if I suggested you made the concluding section a bit shorter?

Student:
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