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1. Introduction

The perception of power within business organization and the means by which it is managed and dealt with is shown to vary across cultures (Hofstede 1980). Some societies, for instance, seek to minimize the hierarchical power relationship between workers, so free power relationship positions are typically implied — Hofstede indicates that this attitude exhibits a low power-distance value system. The data in this paper represent an unequal encounter in which an English urban planning authority negotiates a planning application with a national development company. As the power status of the planners is rarely encoded in overt ways, the participants are claimed to involve the interaction in a way expected in a low power-distance culture. This assumption is explored through the analysis of the pragmatic and sequential categories which construct the negotiation. The methodology, therefore, reflects the conversation analytic notion that an abstract, cultural context, such as power-distance, should be analyzed from the perspective of the participants (Schegloff 1987, Boden and Zimmerman 1991).

In work-related negotiation, the participants of the encounter, the outcome of the talk. In this sense, the planners and developers are seen to discuss the relevance of their own proposed outcome in relation to the other party’s. Even though the data analyzed in this paper represent an unequal encounter, the talk is pragmatically negotiated: the interlocutors conventionally address face-concerns to the extent that the absence of face-address is viewed as noteworthy. To this extent, it is claimed interlocutors holding differential power positions will preserve face to a greater degree in a low power-distance society than in a high one. In particular, it is claimed that power relationships are encoded in implicit ways and that face-address, invoked by both parties in unequal encounters, is prima facie evidence of a low power-distance value system.

The structure of the paper reflects the emphasis on the ‘micro-analysis’ of context, in which the informants must be shown to signal systematically to the contextual matter. As such, the topic of analysis — a power distance index — is introduced as problematic with respect to explicating its procedural relevance (Schegloff 1987, 1991, 1992a, 1992b) to the planning meeting. In particular, the analysis of sequential and pragmatic phenomena is seen to provide the analysis...
methods people use to invoke the content in situational interaction. This perspective rejects the traditional Parsonsian notion that an abstract social order is internalized by social actors, who are then regulated by those norms and values (Hage 1998). Rather, sociality is seen to be accomplished and occasioned phenomena and language use is viewed as a primary means of creating a cultural or social context (Garfinkel and Sacks 1969). As such, the data provided by the planners and developers will illustrate how the behavioral predictions for a low PDI society are relatively invoked by the interviewees’ language in the execution of their everyday work activities.

In this paper, a low PDI is revealed within the ‘formal’ or ‘institutional’ nature of the planning meeting (Akinosin 1982, Boden and Zimmermann 1991, Drew and Heritage 1992, Fish 1995). Institutional or work-related talk is distinct from ordinary conversation — it is often explicitly goal-oriented, where participants roles may be pre-allocated and statutory roles may constrain the content of the talk (Drew and Heritage 1992: 20-21). In addition, work-related talk is typically associated with asymmetry (Drew and Heritage 1992: 49) relations between participants. In view of this, the planners, acting as government officials, have the authority to grant or refuse the planning permission sought by the developers. However, this authority is oriented to and encoded by both planner and developer in implicit ways. As such, even though each party has their own professional perspectives, the talk proceeds with the ‘heteroneous affiliation’ (Anderson et al. 1987: 147) associated with institutional negotiation, which the author argues indicates a low power-distance value system.

This section has raised a methodological problem associated with the analysis of a language and contextual nature, in that a low power-distance index must be shown to be procedurally consequential to the planning meeting. This is to say, the means by which a low power-distance index is demonstrated by the analysis should reflect the means by which the context is demonstrated by the informants. The basic linguistic procedures through which a context is constructed (and thus demonstrated) are sequential and pragmatic methods. While it is assumed that readers are familiar with the pragmatic categories of language use, a brief review of the sequential systems through which pragmatic phenomena operate is provided in the following section (see Levinson 1983: 332-345 for an extensive review of sequential systems).

3. Demonstrating a cultural index

The various interactional strategies (e.g., repair, adjacency pairs, formulations) available to language users operate within a basic turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson
1974). This section glosses the particular sequential mechanisms observed by conversation analysts that are relevant to the data analysis.

The observation of sequences in talk is displayed in *adjacency pairs* -- two adjacent utterances produced by different speakers (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 295). The turns are ordered as a *first part* and a *second part*, so that the first part provides for a particular or expectable second. It is not suggested that the overall organization of talk is continued by consecutive adjacency pairs, but that their recurrent character indicates that they are fitted to resolve common problems, such as initiating/bidding a conversation or accomplishing invitations, offers and requests. Moreover, the notion of *projectability* enables participants to predict the shape or character of a turn so that in the course of its construction, any semantical unit will rapidly (in conversation) reveal projectible directions and conclusions (Sacks et al. 1974: 709). This aspect accounts for the speed at which speaker transition takes place.

The function of utterances in conversation may be typed according to a system of *preference* in which a second part may repart either a preferred or dispreferred response. The concept is associated with interpretations that is, and observed structural features (see below) rather than the psychological notion of preference. Heritage's (1984: 269) Table III below includes preference formats for selected action types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11</th>
<th>(Heritage 1984: 29) simplified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEQUENTIAL ACTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREFERRED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer/Invitation</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-deprecation</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusation/Blaming</td>
<td>Denial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations of talk have revealed particular structural features, in which *dispreference markers* (Parrott 1984) are seen to invoke a dispreferred conversation (Levinson 1983: 334 adapted).

Delays and Pauses: pauses before delivery; markers such as "uh", "um", and "well"; token agreements before disagreements, showing appreciation for offers, invitations, etc., apologies; qualifiers such as "I don't know for sure, but..."; invitation in various forms, including self-editing.

Relevant to this paper is the association of *accounts* with other social interaction concepts such as constituting social solidarity (Heritage 1984: 265-80) and attending to face (Brown and Levinson 1978: 38-43).

In the planning meeting, both planners and developers are seen to invoke *accounts* when discussing their own party's proposed candidate outcome. As Heritage (1988) notes, accounts are particularly attuned to issues of face. In the context of conflicting proposals, the planners and developers are sensitive to their demands for the other party and thus provide accounts for being unable to comply or agree with the proposal. As accounts conventionally accompany a dispreferred response, and in view of low PDI values, opposing positions are treated as disagreements and therefore, dispreferred responses for the other party. In fact, as an unequal encounter, the mere presence of accounts by both parties and the fact that different proposals are allowed to be discussed is seen as encoding a low PDI status.

The participants in the morning are also seen to repair and formulate their talk. Repair represents a procedure by which speakers examine the understanding of turn units, so that trouble sources such as misunderstandings, miscalculations, or non-hearing may be corrected. This also includes self-editing, when no discernible correction is present. As to repair, which provides for the need of on-going qualifications of clarity in talk, is the participants' display of understanding of utterance contexts represented by *formulations*: words that describe, characterize, explain, and summarizing what is going on in talk (Heritage and Watson 1979: 124).

While conversation analysis have revised the organization of sequential system, little attention has been paid to the *pragmatic* method: people use to construct interaction (cf. Bilmes 1993). Thus, the analysis in this paper aims to show how both sequential and pragmatic components of talk organize an orientation to a low power-distance index through the invocation of face-address. For example, the data presents several dimensions of pragmatic inference in which face-address is signaled: in particular, German maxims, in which typical means of demonstrating deference or minimizing perceived impinging. The analysis of pragmatic inference shows how face contexts are signaled rather than overtly expressed, again indicating concern for face. The participants' awareness of their professional status is also implicit by **dove's** categories which organize relative social relationship. For an in-depth analysis of the face-saving orientation of the interactants' use of dove's reference in these data see Glaser (forthcoming). In sum, the presence of certain types of pragmatic inference is seen

Accounts: an explanation for why an act is being done (or is not forthcoming, as in the case of refusing a request)

Relevant to this paper is the association of *accounts* with other social interaction concepts such as constituting social solidarity (Heritage 1984: 265-80) and attending to face (Brown and Levinson 1978: 38-43).

In the planning meeting, both planners and developers are seen to invoke *accounts* when discussing their own party's proposed candidate outcome. As Heritage (1988) notes, accounts are particularly attuned to issues of face. In the context of conflicting proposals, the planners and developers are sensitive to the desires of the other party and thus provide accounts for being unable to comply or agree with the proposal. As accounts conventionally accompany a dispreferred response, and in view of low PDI values, opposing positions are treated as disagreements and therefore, dispreferred responses for the other party. In fact, as an unequal encounter, the mere presence of accounts by both parties and the fact that different proposals are allowed to be discussed is seen as encoding a low PDI status.

The participants in the morning are also seen to repair and formulate their talk. Repair represents a procedure by which speakers examine the understanding of turn units, so that trouble sources such as misunderstandings, miscalculations, or non-hearing may be corrected. This also includes self-editing, when no discernible correction is present. As to repair, which provides for the need of ongoing qualifications of clarity in talk, is the participants' display of understanding of utterance contexts represented by *formulations*: words that describe, characterize, explain, and summarize what is going on in talk (Heritage and Watson 1979: 124).

While conversation analysis have revised the organization of sequential system, little attention has been paid to the *pragmatic* method: people use to construct interaction (cf. Bilmes 1993). Thus, the analysis in this paper aims to show how both sequential and pragmatic components of talk organize an orientation to a low power-distance index through the invocation of face-address. For example, the data presents several dimensions of pragmatic inference in which face-address is signaled: in particular, German maxims, in which typical means of demonstrating deference or minimizing perceived impinging. The analysis of pragmatic inference shows how face contexts are signaled rather than overtly expressed, again indicating concern for face. The participants' awareness of their professional status is also implicit by **dove's** categories which organize relative social relationship. For an in-depth analysis of the face-saving orientation of the interactants' use of dove's reference in these data see Glaser (forthcoming). In sum, the presence of certain types of pragmatic inference is seen...
as evidence of the need to preserve face when a context is invoked as dispreferred. That is, face-address is a conventional tool for negotiating an agreed outcome and demonstrates a low power-distance attitude between the speakers of unequal status.

4. The face of negotiation

The negotiated issue between the planners and developers regards the location of an access road into the developers’ site. The land has recently been contracted from a hospital trust and, because it still owns the adjacent area, the trustees must be consulted with regard to the placement of the access. The authority of the planners to suggest where the access point should be, in part, derives from a departmental document, the planning brief, which describes how the site should be developed. The issue becomes problematic when the developers indicate that a different arrangement from that specified in the brief has been agreed with the hospital trust. While the planners have the authority to refuse to accept this unsatisfactory settlement, their power status is largely implicitly encoded and the developers are provided the opportunity to discuss their proposal as well as suggest a solution.

While the meeting consists of seven members, the participants relevant to the ‘access issue’ include the following.

P.: Senior planner and chair
D.: Developers’ director
Pl: Senior planner
PA: Planning architect
DA: Developers’ architect

The issue of the ‘access’ is introduced by the senior planner (Pl), who indicates its unresolved status. The transcription of the data adapts conversation analytic (CA) conventions and is based on Levinson’s (1983) notations (see Appendix).

(2.0) P.: The (.) now the access to (.) the adjoining site (.) site C (.) and (.) E (.) we are a little unclear and this may now have been (.) dispreferred with the (.) hospital trust as to where the access should be (.) we we felt it should just come straight through at this point

D.: *we (.) before we submitted the bid and certainly after we’d seen yourselves (.) and before we submitted the bid (.) we went - or I went to see the ob (.) the agents asking on acting on behalf of the hospital trust (.) with these points of access (.)

P.: Yeah

D.: and they eventually came back and said that they were happy with a point there and a point there below this one (.) that there’s a cottage down from there and Rose cottage will be down (.) *there as well *

P.: *yeah that’s right

D.: Which is (.) obviously (.) w-w-why it’s not (.) particularly concerned about access to Rose cottage (.) certainly that access (.) I mean can go virtually anywhere

P.: *assuming

D.: (.) they say we were certainly happy with that point and were happy with this point there.

By providing an account, the developer mitigates his position as the proposer of an opposing desired outcome. That is to say, the account represents a dispreferred marker which is successively with regard to the locative context being invoked. A scalar implicature gives rise to the inference that a point higher up on the scale does not obtain: too intensely as it does the developer with “certainly after we had seen yourselves” (597), demonstrates the highest point

The item “the” at line 590 prefacing “access” and “adjoining site”, refers to a speaker-hearer shared one-member set which the existence of the referent is presupposed and so encodes shared membership knowledge. Before announcing the planners’ proposed access point, P. refers to the problematic nature of the situation in that the planners are “a little unclear” (591). This is face-saving in the sense that the planner is predicting a problem. Indeed, he is clear about the planners’ actual proposed outcome as introduced with the verb of recommendation “we felt” (594) accounting for the use of the modal “should”. The exclusive article “we” throughout the turn encodes the membership status of the planners. The hedge “just” as a conventional implicature, entails “exactly” but conveys the implicit meaning “no more than”. Line 594 acts as a hedge introducing the planners’ access point: the conversational implicature being “simply” this point, which has a minimizing effect.

Thus, the issue of ‘access’ is introduced pragmatically because of its unresolved status as indicated by the planners being “a little unclear”. Because the higher status planner addresses the face-concerns of the developers, this turn may be seen to encode Hofstede’s notion of a ‘weak harmony’ between unequal in a low PDI culture. Given that the developers’ desired access is different, the director (D) provides an account of why this is the case.

D.: *we (.) before we submitted the bid and certainly after we’d seen yourselves (.) and before we submitted the bid (.) we went - or I went to see the ob (.) the agents asking on acting on behalf of the hospital trust (.) with these points of access (.)

P.: Yeah

D.: and they eventually came back and said that they were happy with a point there and a point there below this one (.) that there’s a cottage down from there and Rose cottage will be down (.) *there as well *

P.: *yeah that’s right

D.: Which is (.) obviously (.) w-w-why it’s not (.) particularly concerned about access to Rose cottage (.) certainly that access (.) I mean can go virtually anywhere

P.: *assuming

D.: (.) they say we were certainly happy with that point and were happy with this point there.

By providing an account, the developer mitigates his position as the proposer of an opposing desired outcome. That is to say, the account represents a dispreferred marker which is successively with regard to the locative context being invoked. A scalar implicature gives rise to the inference that a point higher up on the scale does not obtain: too intensely as it does the developer with “certainly after we had see yourselves” (597), demonstrates the highest point
on a scale of conviction. The item "certainty" addresses the fears concerns of the planners (i.e., the implicate being the planners should be consulted before plans are presented to the trustees) and simultaneously encodes the memoship status of the participants (i.e., the high status of the planners). Thus, the power of the planner is invoked implicitly via a pragmatic implicature which preserves a low PDI orientation. Once the developer has stated the points agreed upon by the trust, he provides a new account, signaled by the item "because" (605), which explains why the trust agreed on "a point even below this one" (604); the reason being that it would be convenient for Rose cottage. The conventional implicature associated with "even" concerns a scale of probability and in this context, the item gives rise to the conversational implicature that the access was not problematical for the hospital agents while it might have been considered a problem by the two parties present. Furthermore, "even" suggests that the trustees are open with regard to where the access is placed, which preserves the face of the planners, who have in bring different access. Thus, the account beginning at line 605, "because there's a cottage", is provided because of what is implied by the item "even".

It also follows from the implicature associated with "even", that the developer's account concerning Rose cottage is viewed as non-conversational (605-612). For instance, as a repaired sequence, "obviously (.) you () why not (.)", the proposition is not complete, and the hedge "obviously" assumes a common perspective. The hedge "particularly", "certainty", "I mean" and "virtually" are face-preserving in that the information is the account is either not new or not wanted. The classical implicature that arises from "whether or not it's got" (614) shows that the speaker is not in a position to say more; indeed, he does not as the clause is repaired with an assertion, which essentially changes the topic back to what is regarded as relevant: a remnant of the developers' preferred outcome. Thus, the developer's account includes numerous pragmatic and sequential features (e.g., repair, quality intensifiers, assertion following a signal implicature) which act to at once preserve face and establish his party's position. In addition, the developer shows he is subordinate to the hospital trustees, who have higher status because they own the land in question.

The face-address of the developer's talk pertains to the dispreferred nature of accounts. In this case, he mitigates the problematic situation by explaining the historical background of the current conflict. Moreover, the mere presence of this account provided by the less powerful party exemplifies Hoedt's observation that subordinates are less afraid to disagree with higher status figures in low PDI cultures.

The acknowledgments provided by the senior planner (602, 607, 613) function as continuation markers, which is a common informal conversational activity -- in a high PDI situation one might expect the absence of such continuation devices in an institutional setting. However, often the face-address of positive acknowledgment confirms mutual understanding and makes the conversation rather than mutual agreement. And often accounts do not contribute to solving the problem right, so that the developer's response to this situation is structured as a formulation.

P.: right (1.0) but they didn't (...) you didn't discuss any alternatives with them they just said they were you were you know satisfied with those (...) from the reason I ask that is that (...) the brief (...) law access umm I think just coming through at this point

The "right" at the turn's beginning is a sequential acknowledgment which states mutual understanding and preserves the position. However, the conventional implicature associated with "but" challenges the adequacy of the outcome referred to in D's account, in that it conventionally indicates a contrast between two assertions. Therefore, while the planner acknowledges the developer's account, he also aims to (once more) assert the planners' proposed access. At this point, the repair, "they didn't (...) you didn't discuss any alternatives" (617) is significant. In repairing "they" to "you", the planner clearly places the onus of responsibility on the developers for carrying out the plans specified in the brief, even though the developer articulated a difference to the hospital trustees in his previous account (lines 596-619).

However, this manner of reprimand is not overt especially given that P continues with a formulation (617-619), which politely questions the arrangement made by the developers and the hospital agents. The item "just" (618) implies that the information in D's account is not sufficient; the phrase "you know" (619), which appeals to a common status, actually hedges "satisfied", which redresses the challenge to D's account of the trustees being "certainly happy" (615). The indirectness of these pragmatic inferences act to preserve the developer's face in view of this criticism or reformulation. Moreover, formulations typically indicate that a prior context may not be mutually understood or agreed upon: in this case, the developer's account is being questioned, indirectly signifying that it is not altogether accepted by the planner.

At this point, the use of "I mean" (619) intensifies relevance/manner and provides the beginning of a self/formulation which works to restate the planners' desired access. The phrase "the reason I ask" goes on record, in contrast to the other pragmatic features, and demonstrates metapragmatic awareness regarding his own prior formulation. Thus this remark implies that the planner's formulation (617-19) was an indirect means of criticizing D's account, rather than a lack of understanding. P's self/formulation invokes a presupposition context, "the brief" (620), which lends authority to and explains the position of the planners. The hedge on quality, "umm (...) I think" (621), is taken with "just coming through" to preserve the face of the developers in view of the repeated information. However, this time, the planner's desired outcome is invoked with enhanced power status by indicating the "brief".
This restatement of the planners' proposal complicates the situation resulting in overlap (i.e., simultaneous talk indicated by asterisks) by the two senior planners and the director:

D: okay * well what would we [...]
622
P: 
* [coming from] the main
624
P: 
* there was the assumption
625
P: on their part *
626
D: 
that if it was * you know provide
628
* access between points A and B and B and C (*)
629
am which is what we did
630
P: 
right
631
D: 
what you know you could have in fact been
632
* anywhere (*)-(*) but you know I think point A
633
* started around here somewhere
634
* yeah
635
* yeah
636
* and then (*) point B is somewhere down here
637

Here D accepts the planner's prior formulation with the item "okay" and the marker "well" (623) introduces his forthcoming account as a dispreferred. The planner, at line 626, begins to characterize the hospital trust's position as an "assumption" which is important to the status of the planners' desired outcome, but also face-saving for the developers. However, the developer gains the floor at line 628 with a description which answers to the planners' implied complaint above at lines 617-522. In particular, the auxiliary assertion, "which is what we did" (630), shows his awareness that his party's duty has been called into question.

What is taken as a historical fact is then problematized with the modal and quality intensifier "could have in fact", the conventional implication "but" and the quality hedge "I think" starting at line 632. Hedges such as "I think" coordinate with the non-delineic and non-specific item "somewhere" (634) and characterize the situation as ambiguous. The hedge "you know" (628, 632 and 633), which claims kinship to assumes mutual understanding, has underlying face-address in that it makes an appeal for agreement. The hedges work to pragmatically ensure agreement from the planners by assuming a speculative orientation and appealing to a shared point of view.

This response prompts a description by the planners of why the developer's proposal is viewed as problematic -- an action which downplays its own higher power status, in that the conflicting proposal is discussed with reasonable objections rather than refused outright.

D: 
* I think th-that the problem with that one is I
638
* mean if you come this way you're into there's a
639
* road here and there's a circulating ring road and
640
* if you come this way there's a very tight corner
641
* here, I think it's the norm (*) to get any kind of
642
* sort of decent ultra radius * yea
643
P: 
* just looking at it
644

P: goes on record stating a "problem" with the developers' desired access at line 638; the phrase "I think" hedges quality; however this is followed by "I mean", which simultaneously intensifies relevance/planner and acts as a method of self-formulation. The "I" statements (639/641) operate as scalar implicatures at the end of a scale of probability and type the issue as unresolved. This is also reflected in the hedge "I think" on "it's the norm" (642), which functions to verify his description. The item "decent" (643) is face-threatening because it implies a degree of accessibility which explains the use of the plural hedge, "sort of". Moreover, the item "I think" and "sort of" preserve face in that the planner is not being overly direct in his criticism of the developers' proposal.

The relevance of this description is endorsed by the two planners (PA and P). At line 644, the planning architect enters the discussion with the hedge "just lookin at it" and confirms the accuracy of PI's assertion with the quality intensifier "certainly the fact is". Again, these forms are seen to minimize the inherent inequality represented by the planners' authority to potentially refuse planning permission. The developers' response regarding this problem is provided by their architect:

DA: 
that not be anything more than a set of factors of
649
this building now cos that that would be different
650
[for some future *]
651
PA: 
* "yea"
652
?: 
what
653
DA: 
* [ ]
654
P: 
* I'm not I'm not quite sure what that access
655
* would serve then, what its purpose would be (*)
656
* because it might be taken just (*) to get
657
* refuse truck or something like that but [ ]
658

Posing the turn as a question pair part, the speaker addresses face in that it introduces a dispreferred which essentially opposes the planners' suggested problem (638-43). The hedge "not anything more" is a marked variant of "nothing more than", so that the former is far more face-saving than the latter. It is possible that the difficulty of retrieving the entire turn for the transcription relates to the fact that it is a face-threatening act. In response, PI's hedge "quite" in "I'm not quite sure" (656) shows face-address in that, despite understanding the developers' proposal, there is still neither mutual agreement. The presence of these and other hedges do not add much value to the proposition being expressed they have pragmatic value as face-saving strategies and indicators of a speaker's attitude toward the context being invoked.
This turn is slightly overlapped by the director with a question pair part aiming at resolution and begins with the dispreferred marker "well" (660) demonstrating projection of the prior turn. This projection is a result of P's talk (656-659), in which he signaled dissatisfaction by first indicating a positive feature of the scheme with "it might be taken" and then indicating a contrast from positive to negative with the conventional implicature associated with "but" in line 659 (cf. Blume, 1985). However, the planner does not finish the turn, i.e. does not invoke the negative context (face-preservation) and the developer proposes a resolution below:

\[ D: \text{"well..." can we take that up...?}\] 660

\[ P: \text{"and the hospital trust then did..."}\] 661

\[ D: \text{"and the fact..."}\] 664

The sequential placement and content of the turn indicates that the director has priority as a negotiator among the developers. However, he always to the asymmetric planner-developer membership relations by proposing a resolution in the form of a question rather than an offer. The sequential interjection of his suggestion at this presupposes that they will have proposals (662) and then presupposes that there is some goal that they hope to achieve (664). The director's quality intensifier "in fact" (664) alludes to the problematic status of the issue in that neither party can proceed without agreement with the trust.

At this point, the developers' architect provides a comment, presumably as a response to the turn by P at lines 656-59. The sequential placement of this turn is also linked to D's presupposition (664) implying a particular purpose.

\[ D: \text{"I think as long as there..."}\] 665

\[ P: \text{"...sort of a closed..."}\] 671

\[ D: \text{"...in creating..."}\] 672

\[ P: \text{"...is a stop..."}\] 673

\[ D: \text{(1.5)}\] 674

D's remark is invovled with various face-saving hedges such as "I think", "well", "you know", "I mean". The self-repair after the clause "as long as there..." (665) pragmatically orients to changing the context of talk to a description with "it's much better" (666-67), which asserts the developer's view of consequentiality. Although the comment is acknowledged as probably consequential by P and PA, it is too late to discuss the issue as P indicates that the planner will need to "rethink that" at line 684 below.

\[ P: \text{"well then..."}\] 675

\[ D: \text{"yes..."}\] 676

\[ P: \text{"...and what the hospital trust then did..."}\] 677

\[ D: \text{"...we really..."}\] 678

\[ P: \text{"...now obviously we can do that now..."}\] 679

\[ D: \text{"...we know if you..."}\] 680

\[ P: \text{"...the others..."}\] 681

\[ D: \text{"...we..."}\] 682

\[ P: \text{"...in fact..."}\] 683

\[ D: \text{"...we..."}\] 684

\[ P: \text{"...in fact..."}\] 685

\[ D: \text{"...we..."}\] 686

\[ P: \text{"...we..."}\] 687

\[ D: \text{"...we..."}\] 688

\[ P: \text{"...we..."}\] 689

\[ D: \text{"...we..."}\] 690
provides face-address in that "the" presupposes a set scheme as opposed to the more uncertain nature of "all these schemes" at line 677. This final description functions as an agreement with the developer to resolve the present conflict by positioning discussion of it -- indeed, a very face-preserving means of resolution in which the authority of the planning department is not recently recognized.

The discussion of the access issue has shown that the participants in the planning meeting have differential power positions and yet show attention to operating in a low power-distance culture. That is to say, an agreement is achieved in a non-confrontational manner, as evidenced by the presence of dispreferred structures and concern for face-address. This is exemplified in the organization of their account-giving, in that responsibility for the unresolved issue is attributed to an outside source. For example, the resistance to the hospital "trick" imposed and the authority of the "bureaucrat" were accountable contexts invoked by the participants. Heritage (1988: 135) also observes a similar "no fault" quality with regard to the accounts considered in his paper: "All of the responses avoid any threat to the speaker, and they also avoid any threat to the social relationship between the parties". So that accounts with their face-maintaining pragmatic content are significant preference devices used by both parties to invoke a low power-distance index.

5. Conclusion

The nature of work-related negotiation involves accountable members using common-sense understandings to collaboratively solve issues of interest to the participating parties (Fairh 1995). The extent to which this collaboration differs across cultures is abstractly illustrated by Hofstede's (1980) study of power perceptions and values regarding authority. This paper analyzes how Hofstede's abstract power index is demonstrated by the negotiation of a planning application in the way in which they construe the interaction. For example, the dispreferred response of an account is directly associated with conflicting proposals and the participants' attention to face-wants. In providing accounts, the negotiators created an environment in which unequal membership was less differentiated -- illustrating Hofstede's notion of latent harmony between unequal power and the tendency to 'minimize inequality' in low PDI cultures. In this sense, the participants' actions and decisions can be seen to problematize the extent to which the power difference actually exists. That is to say, the interdependent nature of negotiation is emphasized in that both parties have similar interests in reconciling opposition.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

- co-terminous overlap
- ( ) micropause, turns of seconds
- ( ) two syllable duration
- [ ] lengthened syllables
- = inserted utterances with no gap
- ? rising intonation contour
- --- falling intonation
- [f1] uncertain passages of script
- hh audible out-breath, hh inh-breath
- - global-stop self-editing marker
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Notes

1 Here and throughout the paper, the subsequent phenomena of talk, described in conversation analysis literature, are italicized.

2 The planning meeting consists of a series of negotiated topics (e.g., tree preservation, house styles) of which the issue of the access is discussed within the first half of the negotiation.
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