Tables and Figures

т_	_	
ıa	n	les

Table 2.1	Size of the BE and PS data sets	49
Table 2.2	Purposes of email interactions in the BE and PS	
	data sets	49
Table 2.3	Distribution of social variables across the BE and PS	
	data sets	51
Table 2.4	Head act strategies employed in the present study	63
Table 2.5	Internal syntactic downgraders	70
Table 2.6	Internal lexical and phrasal downgraders	71
Table 2.7	External downgrading modifiers	72
Table 2.8	Internal and external upgrading modifiers	74
Table 2.9	Sequencing strategies surrounding the directive	
	head act	75
Table 3.1	Significant cross-cultural differences between BE and	
	PS email directives	82
Table 3.2	Summary of co-occurrence patterns between head	
	acts and modifiers	83
Table 3.3	Cross-cultural distribution of sentence types and	
	subtypes	84
Table 3.4	Sentence type distribution (in %) in previous studies	86
Table 3.5	Cross-cultural distribution of directive perspectives	
	and subtypes	88
Table 3.6	Distribution of head act strategies and subtypes	92
Table 3.7	Comparison of politeness means of English,	
	Spanish, Hebrew and Turkish	96
Table 3.8	Relationship between BE head act strategies and	
	modifiers	114
Table 3.9	Relationship between PS head act strategies and	
	modifiers	115
Table 4.1	Significant effects of socio-contextual variables in	
	email directives	121

Figures

Figure 1.1	Strategies for doing FIAs (Brown & Levinson,	
	1987 [1978])	14
Figure 2.1	Mixed method framework for the study of	
	cross-cultural speech events	40
Figure 2.2	Identification process of directives applied in the	
	present study	58
Figure 3.1	Cross-cultural distribution of head act strategies	91
Figure 3.2	Cross-cultural distribution of modifiers	99
Figure 3.3	Cross-cultural distribution of downgraders	100
Figure 3.4	Frequency distribution of syntactic downgraders	101
Figure 3.5	Frequency distribution of lexical downgraders	102
Figure 3.6	Frequency distribution of external negative	
	politeness downgraders	104
Figure 3.7	Frequency distribution of external positive	
	politeness downgraders	106
Figure 3.8	Distribution of positive and negative politeness	
	downgraders	108
Figure 3.9	Cross-cultural distribution of upgraders	110
Figure 3.10	Frequency distribution of sequencing strategies	113
Figure 4.1	The effect of addressee sex on sentence type use	
	in female directives	123
Figure 4.2	The effect of addressee sex on sentence type use	
	in male directives	124
Figure 4.3	The effect of addressee sex on perspective use in	
	female directives	125
Figure 4.4	The effect of addressee sex on perspective use in	
C	male directives	126
Figure 4.5	The effect of addressee sex on head act strategy	
C	use in BE directives	128
Figure 4.6	The effect of addressee sex on head act use in PS	
O	female directives	129
Figure 4.7	The effect of addressee sex on head act use in PS	
C	male directives	129
Figure 4.8	The effect of social distance on sentence type choice	133
Figure 4.9	The effect of social distance on perspective use	135
Figure 4.10	The effect of social distance on BE head act	
C	strategy use	137
Figure 4.11	The effect of social distance on PS head act	
C	strategy use	137
Figure 4.12	The effect of social distance on downgrader use	139
Figure 4.13	The effect of social distance on upgrader use	141
Figure 4.14	The effect of ranking of imposition on sentence	
-	type choice	145
	· -	

Figure 4.15	The effect of ranking of imposition on perspective use	147
Figure 4.16	The effect of ranking of imposition on head act	
	strategy use	148
Figure 4.17	The effect of ranking of imposition on	
	downgrader use	149
Figure 4.18	The effect of ranking of imposition on upgrader use	151
Figure 4.19	The effect of power on sentence type choice	154
Figure 4.20	The effect of power on perspective use	155
Figure 4.21	The effect of power on BE head act strategy use	156
Figure 4.22	The effect of power on PS head act strategy use	157
Figure 4.23	The effect of power on downgrader use	158
Figure 4.24	The effect of power on upgrader use	160
Figure 4.25	The effect of purpose on sentence type choice in	
	BE email directives	162
Figure 4.26	The effect of purpose on sentence type choice in	
	PS email directives	162