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ABSTRACT

Of the various news genres, the editorial is perhaps the one that represents most explicitly a news writer's and newspaper's stance toward a certain event. Due to the newspaper's political orientation, its regional and national background, the rhetorical form and linguistic features in editorials might vary among cultures (van Dijk, 1988). However, despite the growing research on the genre of editorials, few contrastive studies either of Chinese and English editorials or of Chinese editorials across different national contexts have been done. My purpose in this thesis is to examine how editorial writers in U. S, China, and Taiwan approach on a set of two topics reflecting insider and outsider perspectives in terms of their structural moves and politeness strategies. Forty-two editorials, written in Chinese and English, were collected from three newspapers. This study might help us better understand and realize how editorial writers in different national cultures represent their stances in editorials. The results reveal that structural moves and politeness strategies utilized in the Chinese and English editorials have both similarities and differences across the three newspapers and the set of two topics. One finding is that
the overall organization of Chinese and English editorials on a set of two topics is similar; however, the three sets of editorials differ in sub-moves used within their editorials. In terms of politeness strategies, one noteworthy result is that the Chinese editorials tend to use questions and sarcasm more, whereas the English editorials seem to utilize more modals. In addition, the results also may confirm Pak's findings (1997 and 2000) that news discourse can even vary within a pluricentrality of cultures sharing the same languages, in this case, Chinese in Taiwan and China.
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CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Due to globalization, more frequent contacts happen among cultures, creating a greater need to understand the inevitable differences existing across diverse cultures. One area where cultural differences are reflected is in news reporting. In news discourse, as van Dijk (1988) notes, the ways of reporting an event can depend on "whether newspapers from different countries and regions of the world and produced in different political and ideological contexts would provide equally variable types of description of such a world event" (p. ix). In addition to the influence from countries and regions, as van Dijk (1988) states further, despite the fundamental homogeneity of the foreign news, the way news writers approach the issue could be affected by other factors such as the issues that are more relevant to the sociopolitical or cultural situation of one's region. Within news discourse, the editorial is the genre that represents most explicitly the news writer's and the newspaper's stance toward a topic. Thus, the degree of concern a newspaper and its national
cultures have for "domestic" or "foreign" issues may influence the way editorial writers approach issues discussed in their editorials. Thus, it may be interesting to investigate the way editorial writers use linguistic and organizational features in their texts in order to represent their perspective toward the issues around the world.

My purpose is to investigate how editorial writers in three national cultural (U.S.A., China, and Taiwan) construct editorials responding to topics that have different degrees of proximity to the concerns of the country of the newspaper, that is, editorials that are written from "insider" or "outsider" perspectives in relation to the topic. I focus especially on how editorialists use discourse moves and politeness strategies and on how these vary in terms of the national cultural context of the writer and the relationship of this context to the topic. This study might help us better understand editorials from different national cultures and realize how editorial writers in different national cultures represent their stance. In this thesis, I begin with a literature review of previous research regarding the structure of editorials and politeness strategies. The following chapter
explains the data set I collected and my methodology for analyzing the structural moves and politeness strategies. In chapter three, I will analyze and discuss the findings from the data. Chapter four will discuss implications of the analysis for understanding editorial discourse produced in different national cultures.

The Structural Moves in Editorials

Recent linguistic research on editorials has analyzed this genre in terms of its organizational "moves." This scholarship highlights how editorial writers use organizational moves as a map to present their information and to lead readers to follow the map in order to further persuade readers to accept their viewpoints. Bolivar (1994) analyzed British editorials in one newspaper and found a three-part structure: 'lead,' 'follow,' and 'valuate.' And this three-part structure also was found to fit the structure of editorials from other British newspapers. The first turn, lead, introduces the brief summary of the following text. The second turn, follow, keeps the same topic and evaluates the preceding piece of information. The third turn, valuate, closes the triad with an evaluation of the preceding two turns. Importantly, lead and follow may
be repeated based on the writer’s assumption of how much knowledge readers already hold. Also, valuate is the third and obligatory move in which writers may show their opinions towards the issues, demonstrating the critical role of evaluation in editorials.

Drawing on Bolivar’s research results, Hasan and Esmat (2004) investigated English editorials written in English from The Washington Times and offered more extensive results about the elements, either obligatory or optional, that form the “moves” in editorials and have a canonical order: headline, providing background information, addressing an issue, argumentation, and articulating a position. The obligatory structural elements include a headline, addressing an issue, argumentation, and articulating a position, while it is optional to provide background information. Through their findings could provide clear understanding about editorial organizational pattern written in English. However, the findings about editorial organizational pattern from only one English newspaper may be not convincing. For example, the position of the newspaper in Hasan and Esmat seem to be shown at the last in editorial. However, Pak’s study (1996) showed that editorial writers in The New York Times usually express
their positions at the very beginning of the editorials. This may tell us that different newspapers might have different preferences approaching the issues in editorials. Gun usekera (1989) analyzed 30 editorials from three English newspapers from south Asia and suggested that a model of the general organizational structure of editorials contained five obligatory categories: a title, preparatory comment, main topic (example/past events), analysis, and directives (i.e. predictions, warnings, and advice). In this model, the editorial writers may further offer their clearer opinions or intentions (i.e. predictions, warning, and advice) at the end of editorial about the issue discussed in editorials. But, we cannot see this move in Hasan and Esmat's study. Consequently, based on their findings, the editorial organizational pattern written in English but published in different areas or newspapers may be various.

In addition to analyze editorials written in English, some previous research on editorials across cultures has been also done. Hinds (1983), for example, analyzed editorials from a Japanese newspaper which were translated into English but maintained Japanese organization. The results revealed that a common organization framework, ki-
shoo-ten-ketsu, was recognized: 'ki' introduces the topic, 'shoo' develops the topic, 'ten' forms an abrupt transition or a vaguely related point; and 'ketsu' concludes the topic" (p.193). This form was highly valued by Japanese authors, but seemed to confuse English readers since 'ten' as "an abrupt transition or a vaguely related point" goes out of their expectations for the organization of editorials. Also, Bolivar made a comparison with Hinds' finding about ki-shoo-ten-ketsu, noting that unlike British editorial organization, the Japanese pattern is missing an evaluation section since Japanese writers may attempt to avoid making recommendations and suggestions in order to follow implicit rules of politeness. However, comparing Bolivar's western structure, 'lead,' 'follow,' and 'valuate', to Hinds' Japanese structure, ki-shoo-ten-ketsu, it appears that the concepts of Bolivar's "lead" and "follow" seem to be equivalent to Hinds' "ki" and "shoo" since both "lead" and "ki" aim to initiate the topic while "follow" and "shoo" focus on giving detailed information about the issue in the preceding "lead" and "ki".

In addition to studies of editorial organizational patterns used across cultures, some previous studies also examine the ways editorialists in different cultures
approach the issues in their texts. Pak (1997), for instance, examined one important device of argumentation, the use of attribution, in American, Spanish, and Mexican newspaper editorials and found that this varied across national cultures. For example, the American newspaper (The New York Times) tended to reflect the argumentative nature of editorials while in Spanish and Mexican newspapers the informative functions of editorials were as important as argumentative functions. Moreover, the study also showed that The New York Times highly valued citing specialists and experts while the Mexican and Spanish newspapers preferred to use other sources, such as influential political individuals, to convince their readers. The results suggested that it is possible to use different methods of source attribution to convince editorial readers in different national cultures.

Pak (2000) also examined editorials from one newspapers in three countries: The New Times (America), EL Pais (Madrid), and EL Universal (Mexico city) by multiple dimensions to analyze the ways that editorial writers give recommendations to people linked to issues discussed in editorials. She found that giving suggestions varied in terms of recommenders/recommendees, types of
recommendation, and lexical realizations of recommendations. The New York Times editorialists tended to identify specific recommendations and provide concrete solutions for current and potential problems; Mexican editorials favored being more general and global in making recommendations; and Spanish editorials were somewhere in between. Moreover, Mexican editorials also tended to "employ indirect speech" (p. 26). That is, Mexican editorial writers liked to make recommendations through the voice of society, the nation, and citizens. Particularly, the study showed that even though Spaniards and Mexicans are both Spanish speakers, different persuasive strategies may occur.

Politeness Strategies

In addition to structural moves, previous research has also considered how evaluation is accomplished in editorials. Evaluation is a special linguistic dimension in the editorial discourse which might bear possible risks of conflict. Fowler (1991) stated that both vocabulary and modality are significant linguistic features in editorials for achieving such evaluation. However, such vocabulary (e.g., evaluative adverbs and adjectives) might impose Face
Threatening Acts (FTAs) on the people linked to the issues in the editorial.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), “face” refers to an individual’s self-esteem about himself or herself in public or in private. “Face needs” occur while interacting with people, and two types of face needs are discussed: “positive face needs” are associated with the desire that the individual has to be accepted, to be agreed with, and to belong in a group, and “negative face needs” are connected to an individual’s preference to be independent and not feel impeded by others. Once a person’s face need has been offended, “face-saving” will arise in the form of “politeness strategies” in an effort to mitigate the force of FTAs towards speakers and hearers. Thus, as Brown and Levinson (1987) note, positive politeness may shorten social distance since “positive politeness techniques are usable not only for FTA redress, but in general as a kind of social accelerator, where S (the speaker), in using them, indicates that he wants to come closer to H (the hearer)” (p. 103). In contrast, negative politeness is “specific and focused; it performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects” (p. 129).
In terms of how these concepts apply to editorial writing, since editorial writers communicate viewpoints which may cause possible Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) to editorial writers themselves, readers, and people linked to the issues discussed in their editorials, it may be necessary to use positive or negative politeness with the aim of mitigating or softening Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). Although not addressed in previous editorial research, some of the politeness strategies that editorial writers may use include the first person pronoun we, hedges, questions, and sarcasm-linguistic features that have been linked to politeness strategies in other genres.

The First Person Pronoun "We" as a Politeness Strategy

Drawing on Brown and Levinson's (1987) study, previous research has shown that the pronoun we is a positive politeness strategy that is used often in many genres such as advertisement and medical research articles in order to establish solidarity with readers (Myers, 1989; Hyland, 1998; Kuo, 1999; Le, 2004; Olivera, Sacristan, Bano, and Fernandez, 2001). In addition, according to van Dijk's research (1999) on news discourse, the pronoun we can express implicitly ideologies of being part of the in-
Thus, the pronoun *we* carries an inclusive sense as a positive politeness strategy to readers. In scientific writing, Kuo pointed out that "either inclusive or exclusive we can be used for a number of discourse functions: hedging a proposition or claim, justifying a proposition, and giving a reason or indicating necessity" (p. 133). Also, in studying advertising field, Olivera, Sacristan, Bano, and Fernandez, (2001) elaborated that the advertisers project themselves as members of their target group by using the pronoun *we* in slogans and headlines in an attempt to call for empathy toward a certain product. In other words, the advertisers portray themselves as the potential customers by using the first person pronoun *we* in order to generate solidarity with potential customers. Le (2004) also investigated the way editorial writers in the French newspaper Le Monde employed the pronoun *we* to establish its authority by presenting themselves as representatives of public opinions, being members of the public in order to hide Le Monde somewhat, imposing less on its readers as a positive politeness strategy.

Kuo (1999) elaborated on how inclusive we can refer to readers and peers in scientific journal articles. Inclusive we may be considered as a positive politeness strategy
since "the references of inclusive we are identified: we referring to both writers and readers and we referring to the discipline as whole" (p. 136). In other words, the use of inclusive we functions as a positive politeness strategy, helping writers shorten their distance from readers and stressing solidarity "to invite readers to draw inferences on a hedged condition" (p. 133) and "to seek agreement from readers" (p.134).

However, the pronoun we could be a negative politeness strategy. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finnegan (1999) pointed out that the first person pronoun we may leave readers space. Since "the meaning of the first person plural is often vague" (p. 329) leaves readers freedom to decide whether readers themselves are included or excluded, functioning as a negative politeness strategy. Hyland (1996) also asserted in research articles that the pronoun we could serve as a negative politeness device to soften the criticism since "reference to the writer explicitly marks a statement as an alternative view rather than as a definitive truth; the hedge signals a personal opinion, allowing the reader to choose the more persuasive explanation" (p.447). Similarly, as Kuo (1999) also noted, exclusive we may serve as a negative politeness strategy
since “exclusive we referring to writers themselves is most frequently used to explain what writers did in research and reveals distributional variability of exclusive we” (p. 136).

Applying this concept to editorial writing, we may think that the first person pronoun we may be a good way to establish solidarity and bridge the gap between editorial writers and readers as a positive politeness strategy, or to create distance between the writer and reader or the writer and the parties discussed in the editorials as negative politeness strategy.

The Use of Hedges as a Politeness Strategy

Hedging is another linguistic feature used as a politeness strategy while expressing an attitude or opinion and may have a crucial part in editorial writing. Although hedges have been studied little if at all in editorial writing, a number of studies have been done on hedges in scientific writing. Salager-Meyer (1994) stated that hedging is expressed through several strategic features, such as modal auxiliary verbs (e.g., may, might, can, could, and would), modal lexical verbs (e.g., seem), probability adjectives (e.g., possible, probable, and likely), and probability adverbs (e.g., perhaps and
possibly). Myers (1989) suggested that "hedging is a politeness strategy when it marks a claim, or any other statement as being provisional, pending acceptance in the literature, acceptance by the community—in other words, acceptance by the readers" (p. 12). Since making a claim is trying to impose one's opinion on others, s/he may use hedges as a negative politeness strategy to avoid making readers have a face threatening act (FTA). As Salager-Meyer (1994) confirmed, hedges "could be better understood as positive or negative politeness strategies" (p. 151) since the function of hedges could establish solidarity with readers and show criticism indirectly and respect towards the scientific community.

Hedges may serve as a positive politeness strategy to writers; as Salager-Meyer (1994) pointed out, "hedging is a process whereby authors tone down their statements in order to reduce the risk of opposition and minimize the threat-to-face that lurks behind every act of communication" (paragraph 6). Since evaluation by using a critical adjective or adverb may become a negative face threatening act, hedges might serve as a positive politeness to moderate the strength of a "Face Threaten Acts" (FTAs) in evaluation. Meanwhile, Salager-Meyer (1994) also asserts
that researchers use compound hedges as a negative politeness strategy in order to "avoid absolutes and thus indicate exactly the degree of certainty with which they present their conclusions and also how strongly they want to align themselves with their claims. Room for disagreement is provided in this way" (p. 163). Thus, hedges as a positive or negative politeness strategy may leave a negotiable space for the purpose of maintaining the face needs of writers as well as readers, including those whom the editorial writer may be criticizing in the editorial. Specifically, as Olivera, Sacristan, Bano, and Fernandez (2001) suggested, hedges may give readers freedom since "hedges assure addressees that copywriters do not intend to infringe on their freedom to act" (p. 1301).

Although concentrating on scholarly rather than news editorials, Salager-Meyer (1994) proposes that because of their evaluative nature, "on a scale from general to particular, editorials and review articles, which evaluate, persuade or argue and appeal to a broad audience, will have many hedged statements" (paragraph 10), the use of hedges could be an important rhetorical device for avoiding offending the face-needs of people linked to the issue discussed in editorials. Based on Salager-Meyer’s study,
since the editorial is a genre with heavily hedged argumentative, persuasive, and evaluative writing, it could be interesting to find out how editorial writers in different cultures use hedges in an effort to maintain the parties' face needs involved in editorials.

The Use of Questions as a Politeness Strategy

The use of questions is considered an indirect strategy in communication and thus a means of expressing negative politeness. As Johnstone (2002) writes, "the negative politeness strategies include being indirect ...and phrasing things as questions rather than as statements" (p. 126). Webber (1994) examined the function of using questions in medical journals and found that when the writer discussed the issue that is yet little known questions may be a negative politeness strategy, distancing and hedging technique in order to avoid having face threatening acts (FTAs). It shows that the answer of the question can be considered open to the public, serving as a negative politeness strategy. Moreover, she also suggests that the questions as a hedging technique seem to be "more frequent in the more overtly personal genres such as editorials and letters and less so in research articles" (p.267). However, Hyland (1996) argues that questions may
act like hedges, serving as a positive politeness strategy. The use of questions may cause readers to be considered as fellow scientists involved in the problems of research and drawing readers into the deductive process in the same logical inferences (Hyland, 1996, p. 448). Hyland (2002) also asserts that writers may use questions to “further invite readers to engage with the argument” (p.553).

The Use of Sarcasm as a Politeness Strategy

Drawing on Brown and Levinson (1987), we might also expect irony to be a positive politeness strategy for editorial writers because it shows disapproval, criticism, and contempt in an indirect way and thus softens the force of evaluative vocabulary. As Sperber and Wilson (1981) note, it is easier for people to comment ironically on a failure than to comment ironically on a success since people are expected to have a success but not a failure. A person could become the “victim” of an ironical comment if s/he fails to achieve the expected goal that is set up by the other. If we apply this concept to editorial writing, the people linked to the issue discussed in editorials would be the “victims” if they fail to reach the expectation held by the editorial writers. Their failure through irony could be discussed in an ironic way. Such
irony, though, can mitigate the force of the negative commentary. After examining sarcasm in speech, Jorgensen (1996), for instance, concluded that irony in speech could be a negative politeness strategy that softens the force of positive face threatening acts to the hearer since it can cause amusement or can be perceived as a joke. Even though sarcastic irony is perceived as showing a strong negative emotion to the hearer, it could have a function of lessening the force of a negative face threatening acts. Further, Bruck (1989) stated that the irony is used in editorials and commentaries more frequently than that in hard news since editorials are supposed to express an opinion (as cited in Refaie, 2005, p. 787).

Quotation marks can be a way editorial writers use to signal sarcasm in editorials as a negative politeness strategy. Kreuz (1996) suggests that the use of quotation mark is one of way to show indirectly a clear discrepancy between an utterance and reality. In addition to the use of quotation, the question also could perform the disagreement implicitly as a politeness strategy. As Webber (1994) noted, in medical journals including editorials, if a question carries the writer's opinions instead of raising
curiosity only, the use of question could perform sarcasm in order to show writer’s disagreement indirectly and tease the people involved. Thus, showing their opinions indirectly by questions may mitigate the FTAs to function as a positive politeness strategy, helping writers avoid not having a cruel impression from parties involved in editorials. For example, 這是一個愛好和平的超級強國所應該做的事? (Is this [the Iraq war] what a super-power country that promotes peace should do?). In this example, the writer implied his/her opinions -- America promotes peace so much in the world and is supposed not to start war in Iraq -- in a question through which the writer teases America about being inconsistent with what they did in Iraq in terms of peace.

Based on the previous research about editorial organizational pattern, editorials written in English published in different English newspapers may have different moves. Also, editorials written in English but published in different countries may have various moves. Moreover, editorials written in other language (e.g., Japanese) might have a preference to use other organizational pattern. As for the politeness strategies in the previous research, politeness strategies (e.g.,
inclusive nouns, hedges, questions, and sarcasm) could mitigate the force of FTAs toward all parties involved in any kind of communication. Thus, these politeness strategies seem to be used in common while communicating. However, editorials could be representative of the "political and ideological attitude of the newspapers and their regional and national background" (Van Dijk, 1988, cited in Pak, 1997, p. 106). In other words, the rhetorical form and linguistic features in editorials might vary among cultures.

Interesting, despite the growing body of research on the genre of editorials, few contrastive studies of Chinese and English editorials have been done. In addition, no scholarship has yet compared Chinese editorials across different national contexts, such as Taiwan and China. Especially, after separating over 60 years China and Taiwan still share the same national language and similar cultures but have different government systems. It might be interesting to make a comparison between editorials published in China and Taiwan in terms of organizational pattern and politeness strategies.

In the present study, I will investigate and contrast the way editorial writers in two languages, Chinese and
English, in three national cultures - China, Taiwan, and U.S., approach topics that are either close to or distant from their national concerns in terms of their structural moves and politeness strategies, considering the extent to which the editorials vary across the two languages in three countries and whether news discourse can even differ within a pluricentrality of national cultures sharing the same languages, in this case, Chinese in Taiwan and China. This study might help us better understand editorials from different national cultures and realize how editorial writers in different national cultures represent their stances through the use of politeness strategies and organizational patterns.

Chapter Two will describe the data set and methodology of the present study, drawing on previous frameworks for analyzing structural moves and politeness.
CHAPTER TWO
DATA SET AND METHODOLOGY

The Data

The purpose of this study is to investigate the way editorialists in three newspapers (one from China, one from Taiwan, and one from the U.S.) approach issues that are both close to or distant from the concern of the newspapers. I focus particularly on organizational moves and politeness strategies in these texts. As data for this thesis, I collected 42 editorials on a common set of two topics, 14 from each newspaper in three different countries, with seven for each topic. Each newspaper in three countries I used in this study is one of the major newspapers in each own country. The three newspapers are The New York Times (U.S.), The People Daily News (China), and The China Times (Taiwan). The two topics are the Iraq war and the controversy over Taiwan's official status in relation to China, topics which have different "proximity" to the three newspapers and the countries the newspapers represented. The editorials published in The New York Times will represent insider (emic) and outsider (etic) perspectives regarding Iraq and the controversy between...
Taiwan and China, respectively. In contrast, the editorials published in The China Times and The People Daily News regarding Iraq and the controversy over Taiwan’s national status in both Taiwan and China will represent the outsider and insider perspectives, respectively. However, each newspaper has each own political orientation; The New York Times (U.S.) seems to be considered more liberal, The People Daily News (China) may tend to support any China governmental policies, and The China Times (Taiwan) is believed to favor the major opposition party, Kuomintang (KMT). Due to the different political orientation hold by individual newspaper, the finding I found in this study may cause by the newspaper specific.

The time-spans of the set of topics in the editorials are different: the span of the issue of the Iraq War in editorials is three years, the duration of the war thus far, and the span of the issue of Taiwan’s official status in relation to China ranges from two years to five years. In The New York Times covers the Taiwan status topic over five years (2001-2005) while its span in The People Daily News is four years (2001-2005), and in The China Times it is two years (2005-2006).
Framework for Analysis

To examine and compare the different moves in the data, this study applied Gunesekera's (1989) model for editorial structure as the framework. Her model includes a title, preparatory comment, main topic (example/past events), analysis, and directives (i.e. predictions, warnings, and advice). Also, I adopt two elements, articulating a position and providing background information, from Hasan and Esamt's model (2004), as well as integrate move patterns I observed in my initial readings of the texts. Combining these frameworks, I developed a five-move framework for my analysis, described below.

Move 1: A Title

A Title is an obligatory move and could function as either a comment or just as a topic in each editorial. After reading the title, readers would have a basic understanding of what the editorial is about. Specifically, readers may be able to know the editorial writer's stance if the title functions as a brief comment or have a basic idea of what this editorial will be about if the title serves as a topic summary.
Sub-move 1  Topic
Sub-move 2  Comment

Move 2: Establishing Background Information and Expectations

Move 2 contains two optional sub-moves: a brief comment and background information related to the issue. Through Move 2, readers can either build a basic understanding about this editorial in order connect to the following text in editorials.

Sub-move 3  A summary of the relevant news
Sub-move 4  An initial comment

Move 3: Taking a Position

The purpose of Move 3 is to take a clear stand or position on the issue at hand. This may be realized through or both of two sub-moves: taking a position or making a recommendation. Through Move 3, readers can have clear expectations about editorial writer’s stances and what claims they may see in the following text.

Sub-move 5  Taking a position
Sub-move 6  Providing a suggestion

Move 4: Providing Support for Arguments

In Move 4, editorial writer provides more examples or evidence in order to support their comments, issues, or
suggestions offered in the preceding move. It has several sub-moves.

Sub-move 7  Presenting information about the current situation and evaluating it
Sub-move 8  Prediction
Sub-move 9  Evaluating, refuting and opposing
Sub-move 10 Providing background information related to the issue
Sub-move 11 Connecting to history

Move 5: Conclusion

Move 5 is the last move of editorials through which editorial writers may reiterate their viewpoints about the issue discussed in editorials: as Harris (1992) says, ‘it is the chance the writer has to impress the reader on the points being made in the editorial” (as cited in Pak, 199, p. 54).

Sub-move 12 Reiterating the position
Sub-move 13 Offering suggestions/ wishes
Sub-move 14 Offering predictions/warnings/threats
Sub-move 15 Appealing to empathy
Sub-move 16 No Answer
Politeness Strategies

Regarding the second focus of this study’s analysis, politeness strategies, I will examine the way editorial writers in the three newspapers approach their topics in terms of four politeness strategies: the pronoun we, hedges, question and irony.

Procedure for Analysis

In the present study, I used different approaches in analyzing the moves and politeness strategies. In the move analysis, the editorials were marked manually for their moves and sub-moves in each of the 42 texts. The existences of each move and sub-move in each editorial were calculated. I counted the occurrences of each move and sub-move and then compared their occurrences across newspapers and a set of two topics. An example is given below in Table 1.
Table 1. An Example: Frequency of Sub-Moves of Move 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insider/Outsider Perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move 1: Topic</th>
<th>Sub-move 2: Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China) 4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq) 3/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 7/14</td>
<td>7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq) 1/7</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China) 1/7</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2/14</td>
<td>12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq) 0</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China) 0</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 0</td>
<td>14/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N.Y. Times is *The New York Times* (U.S.)*
*P.D. News is *The People Daily News* (China)*
*C. Times is *The China Times* (Taiwan)*

As for the analysis of politeness strategies, I marked the words performing each politeness strategies, calculated the occurrence each per 1000 words in the editorials, and compared them across newspaper and a set of two topics. For example, Inclusive nouns included the first person pronoun we and the proper non American, Chinese, Taiwanese, 人們 (people), and on one were marked and counted together. And, the occurrence of per 1000 words was calculated in order to make comparisons across the newspapers and a set of two topics. Similarly, the modals in English (e.g., would, could, may, might, and seem) and the modals in Chinese (e.g., keneng 可能 (may, might, can) and neng 能 (can), keyi
可以 (may), 似乎 (seem) were marked and counted together. The modals carrying an obligation tone in English (e.g., must, should, and need) and in Chinese ((bixu 必须 (must), 應該 yinggai (should), 該 gai (should), 一定 yiding (must) and 需要 Xuyao (need)) were marked and counted together. The occurrence per 1000 words in editorials was calculated in order to make comparisons across the newspapers and the set of two topics. Also, I marked questions and sarcasm used in editorials as politeness strategies and counted their occurrences per 1000 words. A comparison of how editorial writers employed questions and sarcasm to approach issues across newspapers and the set of two topics were made. An example is given below in Table 2.

Table 2. An Example: Frequency of Inclusive Nouns Used in Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Total number words in editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorials using inclusive noun</th>
<th>Total number of inclusive nouns</th>
<th>Occurrence of inclusive nouns per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Out (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In(Iraq)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Out(Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In(Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Out(Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In(Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then the frequencies of politeness strategies used were analyzed for the preferred strategies in each newspaper and topic. The results of these two analyses are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of my data analysis. It begins by showing the frequencies and realizations of each move and sub-move in the six sets of editorials from three newspapers. This is followed by a description of the politeness strategies in the editorials. Throughout the chapter, the similarities and differences between the Chinese and English editorials and between editorials on issues that are closer or more distant to the concerns of the newspapers will be discussed.

The Analysis of Editorial Structural Moves

Basically, the moves in editorials from three newspapers in the set of two topics are very similar. All editorials from the three newspapers contain the five moves. However, sub-moves in each move seem not to be the same in three newspapers. Perhaps interestingly, sub-moves in each move in editorials published in The People Daily News (China) and The China Times (Taiwan) are more similar to each other than to those in The New York Times,
signifying that editorials in Taiwan and China might share more similarities in the ways they are organized. Throughout this chapter, the examples are coded with an abbreviation of their source newspapers (NY for The New York Times, PDN for The People Daily News and CT for The China Times). Similarly, the examples are coded with an abbreviation of their topics (I for the topic of Iraq war and T for the topic of Taiwan’s status topic). Each editorial is also numbered from one to seven based on the topic of Iraq or Taiwan’s status, respectively.

**Move One**

One interesting finding, as shown in Table 3, across the newspapers and topics is that Move one seem to be an obligatory move in all editorials. However, editorial writers in different national cultures seem to value sub-move 1 or 2 differently.
Table 3. Frequency of Sub-Moves of Move 1: A Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insider/Outsider Perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move 1: Topic</th>
<th>Sub-move 2: Comment</th>
<th>Number of editorials using question in title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, regardless of whether the issue is a "domestic" or "foreign" issue, 26 out of 28 Chinese editorials (including 12 out of 14 in The People Daily News and all editorials in The China Times) have a title that gives a comment as the title (sub-move 2), whereas only half of the 14 English editorials contain sub-move 2 and the rest of the 14 English editorials have sub-move 1, that is, only a topic as a title. In other words, unlike Chinese editorial writers who prefer to have a brief comment as a title, English editorial writers do not show a significant difference of having either a comment or just a topic as a title. Moreover, as can be seen from table one, it seems that the issue of distance to the concerns of the country
does not affect the preference of using either sub-move 1 or 2. Examples of topic-type titles are shown below.

1. [NY T 4] Weapons for Taiwan
2. [NY T 3] Toward a recount in Taiwan
3. [NY I 6] A timetable for Mr. Bush

As shown in examples above, a title could be considered as a topic and a summary without having any judgment about the issue. Thus, readers are given information about what this editorial will be about but cannot tell the editorial writer’s viewpoints toward the topic. However, most of the titles in my data, especially those from the Chinese and Taiwanese editorials, function simultaneously as a brief comment and a summary at the very beginning of editorials.

4. [NY T 5] Getting it right on Taiwan
5. [NY I 3] Difficult Days in Iraq
6. [PDN I 6] (A War That Shall Not Happen)
7. [PDN T 3] The Contact Between Taiwan And China Is Increasing; Taiwan Administration Is Busy Building Obstacles

As can be seen in the examples above, these examples contain a few titles serving as brief comments in terms of the use of adverbs or modals. For instance, in example 4, the adjective “right” may show the editorial writer’s
opinions about selling weapons to Taiwan. Also, in example 6, the modal *shall* seems to show the editorial writer's opinions about the Iraq war. After reading this kind of title, readers can get a basic understanding about the editorial writers' opinions at the very beginning. Moreover, unlike English editorial writers, the use of a question in a title is sometimes found in *The China Times*. This is especially true among the editorials in *The China Times*. Examples containing a question as a title are shown below.

8. [PDN I 3] 伊戰兩年 美國是得是失? (Does America Gain Or Lose After Two Years Of The Iraq War?)

9. [CT I 4] 美軍究將在伊待多久? (How Long On Earth Will American Troops Stay In Iraq After All?)

However, the use of a question also may or may not be able to show editorial writers' opinions. For instance, in example 8, readers may be not able to know editorial writer's opinion by this question, but, in fact, the usage of a question as a title can raise the readers' curiosity to read the editorial. According to Webber's (1994) statements, the use of a question in a title often "attracts attention and challenges the reader into thinking about the subject" (p. 261). In contrast, in example 9,
readers would understand the editorial writer’s viewpoints by the word “究” in the title even though the editorial writer used a question as a title. The use of “究” (whose meaning in Chinese is equivalent to the meaning of “what on earth” in English) may suggest a comment: American troops should not stay there that long.

Move Two

One similarity across the issues in Move 2 (establishing background information and expectation), as shown in Table 4, is found in sub-move 3, a summary of the relevant news, which over ten out of fourteen editorials written in both Chinese and English contained. However, a different preference seems to exist in these three newspapers about whether to include sub-move 4, an initial comment. Regardless of whether it is a “domestic” or “foreign” issue, the sub-moves found in this move seem to be different in Chinese and English editorials.
Table 4. Frequency of Sub-Moves of Move 2: Establishing Background Information and Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/Outsider Perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move3: A summary of the relevant news</th>
<th>Sub-move4: An initial comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider(Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4, compared to English editorials, 13 out of 14 editorials in The People Daily News and all editorials in The China Times begin with sub-move 3, a summary of the relevant news. Examples are given below.

10. [NY I 5] Addressing the National Endowment for Democracy on Thursday, President Bush sought to look beyond the current bloody chaos in Iraq. . . .

(Based on a group of Kuomintang [the Nationalist Party] visiting Mainland China, the contact between both sides of the Taiwan Strait is increasing.

As these examples show, editorial writers may initiate a summary of relevant news as background information. But four out of 14 English editorial writers begin with sub-move 4, a comment, and then offer a summary of relevant news, whereas only one Chinese editorial in The People Daily News contains sub-move 4, and none of editorials in The China Times has this sub-move. Examples are given below.

12. [NY I 1] Isn’t this about where we did not want to be at this point? While the Bush administration says things are going well in Iraq, the news from the American-led occupation is looking like a catalog of easily predictable, and widely predicted, pitfalls.


(Situations of the Iraq war are almost out of the world’s expectations. The one who is the most surprised and embarrassed will probably be President Bush. . . . At first, the American and the British were optimistic. . . )
As shown in the examples above and Table 4, most editorial writers in the three newspapers highly value using sub-move 3 first, a brief summary of the relevant news. A reason for this pattern may be that editorial writers want to use the already reported news as a bridge and connect to the issues discussed in the editorials. Moreover, Love and Morrison (1989) also stated that editorial can be regarded as "the type of compressed writing which focuses on and evaluates events which have already been reported as news, and they therefore rely upon a degree of given information and supposition" (p. 141). However, Chinese editorial writers tend to utilize sub-move 3 (providing a brief summary about the related news) more than those in The New York Times. In her observations of Chinese students' writing in China, Matalene (1985) noted, that Chinese writing seems to have a standard pattern which begins with an opening description of a specific incident. The sub-move 3 seems to be the same as an opening description of a specific incident in a few sentences.

**Move Three**

Move 3 (Taking a position) seems to play a crucial role in editorials. Move 3 might be acting as a transition, helping readers move from a summary of either an editorial
or the already reported news to Move 4, detailed argumentative information. Move 3 consists of two sub-moves in Table 5, taking a position or offering a suggestion.

Table 5. Frequency of Sub-Moves of Move 3: Taking a Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/Outsider Perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move 5: Taking a position</th>
<th>Sub-move 6: Offering a suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to English editorials, as Table 5 shows, regardless of whether the issue is a "domestic" or "foreign", taking a position (sub-move 5) seems to be an obligatory move in all Chinese editorials including those in The People Daily News and The China Times. Similarly, editorial writers in The New York Times tend to use taking a position (sub-move 5) often but not as an obligatory move. Examples are shown below.
14. [PDN T 3] 似乎台灣海峽的春天真的已經來到了 可是轉眼之間 剛剛轉軟的海面上又出現了厚厚的“冰層”讓有心行走於兩岸之間的人免不了心有餘悸。...

(It seems like spring across the Taiwan Strait is really coming. However, the situation suddenly is changing back, having more obstacles again, and making some people who intend to do something good about both sides between the Taiwan Strait scared.)

15. [CT I 4] 但按照布希在新聞記者訪問的答覆，美軍顯然不會提前撤走，控制權也許能提早交出，伊拉撤軍恐怕是另外一回事。

(But based on Bush’s answer to the journalist’s interview, American troops will not withdraw earlier. The hand over of control in Iraq might be able to be earlier but the withdrawal of American troops probably will be another thing)

16. [NY I 1] While the Bush administration says things are going well in Iraq, the news from the American-led occupation is looking like a catalog of easily predictable, and widely predicted, pitfalls.

As the examples show above, the editorial writers just expressed their opinions only or what they want to say next without further offering any suggestions. For instance, in example 14, the editorial writer just expressed his/her
viewpoint only (disagreement) with the Taiwan administration trying to stop the increasing contact between China and Taiwan. Similarly, the editorial writer in example 16 merely showed his/her opinions about the pitfalls in Iraq alls but s/he didn’t offer any suggestion to solve these situations.

Unlike Chinese editorial writers, English editorial writers in The New York Times seem to change the use of sub-moves in Move 3 when writing from an insider or outsider perspective. For instance, as shown in Table 3, regardless of the issue it is, editorials in The New York Times have no significant difference in terms of having sub-move 5 (taking a position), whereas when writing from an outsider perspective, six out of seven English editorials have sub-move 6 (offering a suggestion). In contrast, none of the Chinese editorials contains the sub-move 6.

17. [NY T 5] As China upgrades its military capacities, Washington must honor its commitment to provide adequate defensive weapons to Taiwan. But it needs to avoid sales that would be likely to raise tensions or upset the military balance across the Taiwan Strait.
As shown in example 17, the editorial writer expressed his/her opinions about Bush's governmental decision of selling weapons to Taiwan that could balance military power across the Taiwan Strait. Also, s/he offered a suggestion to President Bush not raise tensions.

The Confucianism's influence in Chinese society may be the reason for the difference between Chinese editorial writers who seem not to offer a suggestion and English editorial writers who tend to offer a suggestion. For example, "不在其位，不謀其政" (If you are not in that position, you would not have legitimacy or right to interfere the policy-making) suggests that the importance of the legitimacy to involve anything. Consequently, editorial writers tend to analyze or criticize the current problems causing by the inappropriate policies in order to remind governors their derelictions of duty. Also, the governors are supposed to be capable of fixing the problems since he/she is on the position.

Move Four

In terms of Move 4 (providing support for arguments), which is where the editorial writers provide support for their positions in the preceding Move 3, the results in Table 6 show that the sub-moves in this move are varied.
Table 6. Frequency of Sub-moves in Move 4: Providing Support for Arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insider/Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move 7:</th>
<th>Sub-move 8:</th>
<th>Sub-move 9:</th>
<th>Sub-move 10:</th>
<th>Sub-move 11:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub-move 7: Presenting information about the current situation and evaluating it
*Sub-move 8: Prediction
*Sub-move 9: Evaluating, refuting and opposing
*Sub-move 10: Providing background information related to the issues
*Sub-move 11: Connecting to history

As Table 6 shows, an interesting finding is sub-move 7 (presenting information about the current situation and evaluating it) seems to be used often not only in English editorials but also in Chinese editorials in *The People Daily News* and *The China Times*. However, it should be noted that Chinese editorial writers (12 out of 14 editorials in *The People Daily News* and 10 out of 14 in *The China Times*) use this sub-move more than English editorial writers (eight of 14 editorials). Specifically, Chinese editorial
writers tend to use this sub-move 7 more when writing from an outsider perspective (all Chinese editorials) than from an insider perspective (8 out of 14 Chinese editorials), whereas there is no difference existing in English editorials (four out of seven editorial in the two topics). Examples are shown below.

18. [NY I 1] The reconstruction effort is tangled up in charges of overbilling by Vice President Dick Cheney’s former company, Halliburton. European allies, who had been making friendlier noises, are angry again, this time about President Bush’s misguided decision to turn the rebuilding program into a way to punish nations that did not agree with the war by excluding them from reconstruction contracts.

19. [CT I 5] “請注意，布希說的是“敵人們”，凡是與美國為敵者，就不允許擁有大規模武器。換句話說，假如是朋友，那就另當別論。所以，以色列可以擁有核武但伊拉克不行；印度可以發展核武，但北韓不行。假如要違反這原則，那就有害伊拉克的例子存在” (Please notice, what Bush said is “an enemy.” Anyone who is an enemy to America cannot be allowed to have Weapons of Mass Destruction. In other words, if he is a friend, it is an exception. Thus, Israel can have nuclear weapons but not Iraq; India can develop nuclear weapons, but North Korea cannot be allowed to do so. If
someone violates this rule, then there’s a case like Iraq.)

As shown in example 18, for instance, the editorial writer stated a current situation of the reconstruction contracts in Iraq first and reactions from European allies as evidence for the writer’s point. Also, s/he gave evaluation disagreeing with what the Bush’s administration has done. Similarly, as shown in the example 19, the editorial writer quoted Bush’s statement as a ground, interpreted it and did the evaluation as well.

In addition to the similarity of using sub-move 7 in the three newspapers, the different preference of using sub-move 8 (prediction) is obvious. Compared to Chinese editorials (including editorials in The People Daily News and those in The China Times), English editorialists in The New York Times seem to use sub-move 8 (prediction) much more often. As can be seen in table 4, half of 14 editorials in The New York Times contain sub-move 8, whereas only one editorial has this sub-move in The People Daily News and The China Times, respectively. Examples are shown below.

20. [NY I 3] Mounting American casualties and the approach of next year’s presidential election could create
pressure for a hasty military withdrawal, a course the administration rightly vows to resist. A rush for the exits now would leave Iraq chaotic and a danger. . . .

21. [NY T 5] Beijing will be particularly unhappy about the inclusion of eight diesel submarines in the Taiwan package. Previous administration refused to sell these on the grounds that they could be used for offensive as.

Making predictions may be a more characteristic strategy of American editorial writers than Chinese or Taiwanese.

In addition to making a comparison in Chinese and English editorials, a remarkable finding in Move 4 only existing in the People Daily News is the use of sub-move 11 (connecting to history). Sub-move 11 may serve to call for empathy from readers and people linked to the issue. As can be seen in Table 6, two out of seven editorials in The People Daily News contain sub-move 11, connecting to history that relates to the correct situation, whereas none have this in The New York Times and The China Times. Two examples are below.

22. [PDN T 6] 兩岸分裂乃中華民族的心腹之痛。50多年來，我們為此付出的代價是極其沉重。這種不幸的歷史必須結束。
(The separation between Taiwan and China is all Chinese pain. For more than fifty years we have paid a very huge price. . . . this unfortunate history has to end)


(That year, the southern states declared themselves to be independent. President Linton decisively led northern troops and residents to squash rebellion and made America to be unified. . . . If they (Americans) didn’t want to have that happen to them, do not make that happen for us. . . .)

As shown in example 22, the editorial writer tries to remind all Chinese of the pain from separation between Taiwan and China. Further, s/he may hope readers will have empathy and accept their viewpoints that both sides of the Taiwan Strait should be re-unified. Similarly, the editorial writer in example 23 tried to remind Americans of their civil war history, which is the same situation in her/his eyes that China has now. Thus, using history to evoke empathy may be considered a special persuasive strategy as a sub-move in Move 4 in editorials published in The People Daily News.
Matalene’s (1985) observations about Chinese students’ writings in China may explain why editorials in The People Daily News contain this sub-move 11 (connecting to history). As Matalene stated, “Chinese discourse as we have seen, depends on appeals to history, to tradition, and to authority, but not to our notion of logic, that is, arguing from premises to conclusions” (p. 800), Chinese writing seems to have a different strategy to call for empathy in order to bring all parties involved in editorials together.

**Move Five:**

In Move 5 (conclusion), the use of each sub-move is optional and seems to be used differently in Chinese and English editorials, as shown in Table 7.
Table 7. Frequency of Sub-moves in Move 5: Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Sub-move 12:</th>
<th>Sub-move 13:</th>
<th>Sub-move 14:</th>
<th>Sub-move 15:</th>
<th>Sub-move 16:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Y. Times</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. D. News</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>2/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Times</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12/14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub-move 12: Reiterating the position
*Sub-move 13: Offering suggestions/wishes
*Sub-move 14: Offering predictions/warnings/threats
*Sub-move 15: Appealing to empathy
*Sub-move 16: No answer

Regarding the use of sub-moves in Move 5, editorial writers in The New York Times and The People Daily News seem to use a similar pattern when writing from insider and outsider perspective, whereas those in The China Times are drastically different. One similarity across the three newspapers and the set of two topics is found in sub-move 12 (reiterating the position). In other words, editorial writers across newspapers and the set of two topics tend to reiterate their conclusion which may elaborate briefly. As Table 7 shows, nine out of 14 editorials in The New York Times and The People Daily News individually and 12 out of
14 editorials in *The China Times* contain sub-move 12. Examples are given below.

24. [NY T 2] Over all, it is a balanced package that honors Mr. Bush’s desire to help Taiwan’s democratic...

25. [CY I 1] 這問題是：伊拉克哈山與基地組織及九一一事件有沒關係

(The question is whether or not Saddam Hussein has any connection with a terrorist group and the 911 event)

As can be seen in example 24, the editorial writer summarized their viewpoints to reiterate his/her position about President Bush’s selling weapons to Taiwan. Similarly, in example 25, the editorial writer repeated his/her issue about whether Saddam Hussein has connections with a terrorist group and the 911 event.

In addition to the similarities found across the newspapers and topics, a difference in the three newspapers is found in sub-move 13 (offering suggestions/wishes). As can be seen in Table 7, 11 out of 14 English editorials contain sub-move 13, whereas eight out of 14 and four out of 14 in *The People Daily News* and *The China Times* do, respectively. That is, English editorial writers may like to give a suggestion while those in *The China Times* seem to rarely give a suggestion and those in *The People Daily News* are somewhere in between. Examples are given below.
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27. [NY T 1] The Bush administration should step back from its foolhardy missile shield obsession, which dates back to the 2000 campaign. We hope that Vice President Dick Cheney, traveling in Asia this week, will re-evaluate the wisdom of a missile shield and decide to put the project on the back burner.

28. [NY I 1] Instead of driving sway France,...the President should be creating room for compromise that will lead to those countries' sending money and troops to Iraq. That would help to create a secure enough environment for the United Nations to come in. . .

In the examples above, editorial writers in The New York Times tend to give clear suggestions to the American administration. However, as Table 7 shows, this sub-move13 is rarely used in editorials published in The China Times. This difference may reflect the more collectivist tendencies of Asian cultures which, prefer to keep harmony, while the individualism embraced in the U.S. may lead writers to make clear declarations of what other should do. (Triandis and Singelis, 1998, p. 36).
Regarding the use of sub-move 14 (offering predictions/warnings/threats) in the three newspapers, the findings are diverse. For example, when writing from an insider perspective editorial writers in *The People Daily News* tend to use sub-move 14 more, conversely, when writing from an outsider perspective those in *The China Times* prefer to utilize sub-move 14 more, whereas there may be no significant difference in *The New York Times* using sub-move 14 regardless of the issue it is. As can be seen in Table 5, five out of seven editorials from an outsider perspective and two out of seven editorials from an insider perspective in *The China Times*, conversely, three out of seven editorials from an outsider perspective and five out of seven editorials from an insider perspective in *The People Daily News* contain sub-move 14. However, three out of seven editorials in *The New York Times* contain sub-move 14 when writing from an outsider perspective as well as an insider perspective.

29. [NY T 6] Until that happens, selling China weapons that might be used to shoot down United States aircraft assigned to defend Taiwan is a terrible idea. And one that could lead Congress to restrict....

30. [NY I 3] Instead, it seems that more terrible days like
Sunday lie ahead.

31. [CT I 1] If they cannot find the evidence, the invasion of Iraq would not eliminate terrorism but would increase the terrorists’ determination and scale of the attack. There will be no end to trouble in the future. . . .

32. [CT I 3] America’s new Iraq ambassador already said something. . . . This statement is clear enough. Iran, of course, will ignore it. However, Iraq’s temporary government under the American troops’ control can ignore it too? If not, will America do something next?)

As can be seen in examples above, editorial writers utilized the sub-move 14 to predicting the future. However, editorial writers in The People Daily News and The China Times seem to use a stronger tone to convey their warnings or threat as sub-move 14 than those in The New York Times.

33. [NY I 6] If the president fails, the American public has a timetable of its own. Elections for the House and the Senate are less than a year way.

34. [CT T 2] 我們在此正告民進黨，做為掌握執政權力的政黨，對人民是有責任的.
(We warn Democratic Progressive Party sternly here, being a ruling party with the authority has the responsibility for people.)

35. [PDN T 2] 他必定要為這種賭徒行徑付出可怕的代價。

(He [President Chen] must pay a horrible price for this gamble.

36. [PDN T 5] 陳水扁所謂的“台灣自己的路” 只能是一條災難之路

(Chen Shui-bian so called “Taiwanese own road" can only be a disastrous road.)

Editorial writers seem to use warnings or threats as a persuasive strategy to remind people who have the duty to think about editorial writers’ warnings or threats. As can be seen in example 33, the editorial writer reminded President Bush that the American public has its own timetable as a warning. Yet, the editorial writer in example 34 warned directly the Democratic Progressive Party that they have the responsibility for people as the ruling party in Taiwan. However, as we can see in example 35 and 36, the editorial writers emphasized the possible consequences as strong threats to President Chen in Taiwan since his tendency of promoting Taiwan to be an independent country which is completely against China whose final strong goal is to unify Taiwan. In the editorial writer’s
eyes, China may consider President Chen Shui-bian as an obstacle of unifying Taiwan; thus, they utilize a strong threat as a strategy to tell him that it is impossible for China to accept Taiwan’s independence.

Matalene (1985) found a standard pattern of ending with a moral exhortation in Chinese student writing. This may explain Chinese editorial writers seem to use a warning or threat as a persuasive strategy which functions as the exhortation in order to build patriotism to readers in China and threaten the Taiwanese regarding the horrible consequences they may have.

Unlike editorial writers in The New York Times and The China Times, those in The People Daily News seem to like to use sub-move 15 (appealing to empathy) when writing from an insider perspective. It seems that editorial writers in The People Daily News like to call empathy for the parties involved. Examples are given below.

37. [PDN T 4] 中美兩國人民有過並肩抗及日本軍國主義的珍貴歷史....
(The Chinese and the Americans have a precious history of fighting against Japan [in the World War II]....

38. [PDN T 2] 世界上只有一個中國 台灣自古以來就是中國不可分割的一部份.
(Only one China exists in the world. Taiwan is always an indivisible part of China.)
39. [PDN T 7] 我們對台灣民衆寄以厚望 希望台灣同胞三思而行... 

(We have a great expectation on the Taiwanese and wish Taiwanese compatriots to think carefully...)

In example 37, the editorial writer may be trying to remind Americans that the same history of fighting against Japanese; thus perhaps hoping to create a sense of empathy in American for the Chinese struggle with the Taiwanese. Similarly, in example 38, the editorial writer was attempting to tell readers that Taiwan has always been a part of China. Also, in example 39, the term 台灣同胞 (Taiwanese) means that Taiwanese are brothers and call for the unity with the Taiwanese because we are Chinese and share the same history and language. Both editorial writers in example 38 and 39 seem to remind Taiwanese that Taiwan had been a part of China before 1949. Due to the civil war, Taiwan and China are separated since then and the ultimate goal of China is to unify Taiwan. Thus, editorial writers may hope to build a sense of empathy in Taiwanese and Chinese that we share the same language and cultures.

The characteristic of Chinese rhetoric may explain why Chinese editorial writers in *The People Daily News* tend to use sub-move 15 (appealing to empathy), whereas we can not
see this sub-move used in The New York Times and The China Times. That is, Matalene (1985) asserted that “for Chinese the primary function of rhetoric is to preserve the general harmony and to promote social cohesion; and therefore, its appeal is always to history and to tradition” (p. 795).

Thus, sub-move 15 could function as a strategy to bring all parties involved together. Editorial writers in The China Times share the same history and culture with China; thus, appealing to history seems to be a feature of Chinese writing. However, as Table 5 shows, no editorials in The China Times contain this sub-move and it may be interesting to investigate further.

One special finding in sub-move 16 (no answer) is that two out of seven editorials in The People Daily News contained this when writing from an outsider perspective, whereas none of editorials in The New York Times and The China Times have this sub-move. Examples are below.

40. [PDN I 3] 得也？失也？留待歷史評說吧！

(Was it a good thing or a bad thing to America? Leave it to the future and let the people judge.

41. [PDN I 6] 戰爭之後的局勢是否會按照美國的如意算盤發展 人們還要拭目以待。

(People will see whether the development of the Iraq war will go in the way that America wants.)
As shown in example 40, the sentence could serve as sub-move 16 (no answer). Even though the editorial writer already showed his/her comment in the preceding sentence, he/she still did not give a clear answer. Similarly, in example 41, the editorial writer just said that we need to wait without offering clear answer to readers.

A possible reason for this special sub-move 16 that only exists in The People Daily News may be found in Hinds’ (1983) study showing that in Japanese composition a conclusion “need not be decisive. All it needs to do is to indicate a doubt or ask a question” (p. 190). However, based on my personal understanding about Chinese writing style, this type of conclusion seems to be also accepted by Chinese. In contrast, the conclusion in English seems to differ from Asian style.

The Analysis of Politeness Strategies

In this section, I discuss the differences and similarities in the use of politeness strategies when the editorial writers in the three newspapers write about issues from an insider and outsider perspective.
The Use of the Inclusive Nouns Including the First Person Pronoun We

Koutsantoni (2004) stated that "the first person pronoun verbs are inclusive which are used to include mostly to include readers in the making of claims" (p. 127). Based on my data and findings in this study, editorial writers in the three newspapers seem to use the inclusive pronoun we to unifies readers and signals a sense of excluding the people linked to the issue discussed in the editorial. In addition, inclusive proper nouns such as American, Chinese, and Taiwanese, or the generic noun people or no one can also be seen in editorials and might be also able to build solidarity with readers. In other words, editorial writers could replace the inclusive pronoun we with proper nouns such as American, Chinese, and Taiwanese to achieve the goal of unifying readers and building a sense of being part of the in-group who naturally should share the editorial writers’ viewpoints.

As shown in Table 8, one striking finding across the newspapers is that when writing from an insider perspective editorial writers in the three newspapers seem to commonly use the inclusive pronoun we and other inclusive nouns as positive politeness strategies more. However, English
editorial writers may use this positive politeness strategy less than those in both Chinese newspapers. Especially, editorial writers in The People Daily News tend to the pronoun inclusive we and proper noun more.

Table 8. Frequency of Inclusive Nouns Used in Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/ Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Total number words in the editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorial containing the inclusive noun</th>
<th>Total number of inclusive nouns</th>
<th>Occurrence of inclusive nouns per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Out (Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inclusive nouns in The New York Times (N.Y. Times) include the inclusive pronoun we, American, and no one.
* Inclusive nouns in The People Daily News (P. D. News) include the inclusive pronoun we, Chinese, and 友 (people).
* Inclusive nouns in The China Times (C. Times) include the inclusive pronoun we, Taiwanese, and 友 (people).

Five out of seven editorials in the three newspapers use the inclusive pronoun we when writing from an insider perspective, whereas when written from an outsider perspective only one English editorial contained the
inclusive pronoun we twice and no Chinese editorials had them. Examples showing the use of the pronoun we and proper nouns are given below.

42. [NY I 2] We've lost track of the number of times President Bush has told Americans to ignore their own eyes and ears and pretend everything is going just fine in Iraq.

43. [CT T 3] 我們要對陳總統說，這句話其實也是所有台灣民衆的想望啊！（We want to tell President Chen that this sentence, in fact, is also the wish of all Taiwanese!)

44. [PDN T 6] 兩岸分裂乃中華民族的心腹之痛。50多年來，我們爲此付出的代價是極其沉重。（The separation between Taiwan and China is all Chinese pain. For more than fifty years we have paid a very huge price.)

As shown in the examples above, the pronoun we and the proper nouns American, Taiwanese, and Chinese seem to include the editorial readers and thus could be viewed as devices the writer uses to create a sense of solidarity with the readers. Meanwhile, by the use of the first person pronoun we, President Bush in example 42 and President Chen in example 43 are the persons who are excluded from being included with editorialists and readers.
In addition to the proper nouns *American*, or *Taiwanese*, or *Chinese* as a positive politeness strategy, another noun 人们 (people) seen in both Chinese newspapers and the pronoun no one seen in English newspaper may also function as persuasive positive politeness strategies. 人们 (people) and no one may include everyone without showing the editorial writers' identities clearly and thus implicitly suggest that any reader should naturally believe the same way as the editorial writer. Examples are shown below.

45. [NY I 6] No one wants that to happen, but Americans must ask themselves every day. . . .

46. [PDN I 4] 人们也因此看出 美国政府是想推廣民主制度 但這個民主還是要以親美為前提的

(Therefore, people also can see that American government wants to popularize the democracy [in Iraq]. However, this democracy has to be based on a condition; it is close to America.)

47. [CT T 2] 我們在此正告民進黨，做為掌握執政權力的政黨，對人民是有責任的。

(We warn the Democratic Progressive Party sternly here, being a ruling party with authority means having the responsibility for people.)
As shown above, the editorial writers used no one in example 45 and 人々 (people) in example 46 and 47 to unify readers instead of the pronoun we.

A reason for the high frequency of using inclusive nouns, especially we, across three newspapers from an insider perspective may be that editorial writers in the three newspapers might have more knowledge about the issue which is closer to their national concerns. The use of first person may show the writer's authority about his/her claims, as Hyland (2002) stated, "first person then, is a powerful means by which writers express an identity by asserting their claim to speak as an authority" (p. 1093), which may show their knowledge about the issue as expert. Moreover, drawing on "expert writers were more willing to make a solid personal commitment to the most authorially powerful aspects of their texts" (Hyland, 2002, p. 1099), we can know why the high frequency of using inclusive nouns when writing from an insider perspective. Thus, high frequency of using inclusive nouns from an insider perspective, as shown in Table 8, may show us that editorial writers across cultures express themselves as experts about issues which are closer to their concerns.
Unlike English editorial writers, Chinese editorial writers seem to use the inclusive pronoun we and proper nouns more as a politeness strategy to establish solidarity with readers in editorials. As Table 8 shows, regarding the frequency of we and Chinese, Taiwanese, American, 人們 (people) and no one, it should be noted that the frequency of using these nouns in The New York Times when writing from an insider perspective (3.83%) is much less than that of The People Daily News (7.08%) and that of The China Times (6.28%).

Cultures may cause the different preferences to Chinese and English editorial writers who utilize these inclusive nouns in the different frequency. As Triandis and Singelis (1998) show, "east Asian collectivists are especially eager to maintain harmonious relationships while individualists from the U. S. A. are more concerned with clearly giving opinions" (p. 36). Moreover, Liang and Han (2005) further asserted that in an individualism-oriented country such as U.S.A., an I will be utilized more often than the we. Also, as Samovar, Porter and Stefani (1998) pointed out that individualism-oriented cultures value individual decision making, while "in a society like China where collectivism is highly appreciated, a we
consciousness prevails" (p. 68). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that Chinese editorial writers in The People Daily News and The China Times employ these inclusive nouns with aim to establish harmony in group more so than those in The New York Times.

One striking finding shown in Table 8 is that when writing from an outsider perspective editorial writers in the New York Times editorial writer used the pronoun we, whereas none of the Chinese editorials in The People Daily News and The China Times do. As can be seen in Table 8, the pronoun inclusive we was used twice in one English editorial whose topic was distant from the concern of the newspaper. Yet, this pronoun we in this editorial actually might be considered an expression from an insider perspective. The two examples excerpted from The New York Times are given below.

48. [NY T 1] ..theoretically protected from any missiles -- we say "'theoretically'" because of the technology's poor track record -- is that it would unnecessarily isolate and antagonize China.

49. [NY T 1] We hope that Vice President Dick Cheney, traveling in Asia this week, will re-evaluate the wisdom of a missile shield and decide to put the project on the
back burner.

In fact, the examples above still represent the editorial writers using the pronoun we as a positive politeness strategy to show a sense of the readers and the editorial writers together being a part of an in-group even when writing about the issue which was more distant from the concern of the newspaper. Strictly speaking, the pronoun we in example 48 and 49 still showed the writer's eager concern about the American missile shield plan, actually writing from an insider perspective even the issue was more distant from the concern of the newspaper since s/he tried to do an effort of persuading the American government to reconsider more about the missile shield covering Japan, Taiwan, and possibly also including India.

The Use of Modals as Hedges

In addition to the use of inclusive nouns establishing solidarity with readers, hedges may be another linguistic feature seen often while doing evaluation in the editorials. As Salager-Meyer's (1994) suggested that the editorials is a genre with heavily hedged argumentative, persuasive, and evaluative writing. Consequently, in order to moderate the strength of “Face Threatening Acts” (FTAs) in evaluation, hedges might serve as a positive or negative politeness
strategy to all parties involved in the editorials. As shown in Table 9, an interesting finding across the newspapers and two topics is that editorial writers in the three newspapers may use modals as a politeness strategy to protect face-needs for all parties involved in the editorials. But the results seem to be diverse because of cultural influences.

Table 9. Frequency of Modals Used in Editorials Published in Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/ Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Total number words in the editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorials that use modals</th>
<th>Total number of the modals</th>
<th>Occurrence of modals per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Out (Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The modals in the table include the modals (e.g. *may, might, could, would, can*) and the lexical modal verb *seem*.

* The Chinese modals in the table include the modals (e.g., *keneng* 可能 (*may, might, can*) and *neng* 能 (*can*), *keyi* 可以 (*may*), 似乎 (*seem*).

Compared to Chinese editorial writers in *The People Daily News* and *The China Times*, English language editorial
writers may generally use modals more regardless of the set of topics. For instance, the occurrence of modals per 1000 words in The New York Times is 14.4%, higher than 6.0% in The People Daily News and 5.9% in The China Times when writing from an outsider perspective. Similarly, when writing from an insider perspective, the occurrence of modals per 1000 words in The New York Times is 10.5%, higher than 3.5% in The People Daily News and 6.8% in The China Times. However, when writing from outsider perspectives editorial writers in The New York Times (14.4%) and The People Daily News (6.0%) employ the modals more than from insider perspectives (10.5% and 3.5% respectively). In contrast, editorial writers in The China Times seem to use modals more when writing from an insider perspective (6.8%) than from an outsider perspective (5.9%). Examples are below.

50. [NY T 1] The greatest folly would be to make Taiwan part of such a system

51. [NY T 4] The Bush administration seems headed toward a sensible decision on arms sales to Taiwan

52. [PDN I 2] 布希好像忘記了兩件事... ...

(American President) Bush seems to forget two things.......

53. [CT T 1] 我們不知道陳水扁新春談話是否有「興邦」之意 但是類此發言可能有「喪
(We don't know whether Chen Shui-Bian's talk for the Chinese New Year has a meaning of "establishing a country," but this kind of talk might have a result of "destroying a country")

As the above examples show, editorial writers in the three newspapers express the uncertain possibility in their statements by the modals (e.g. would and might) and seem as a hedge which may function as a politeness strategy to save the positive face toward the people being criticized (e.g., President Bush in example 52) and the negative face desire of not having direct opinions imposed on them of the editorial readers.

One reason why editorial writers in The New York Times and The People Daily News seem to use the modals more when writing from an outsider perspective than the insider perspective is as Koutsantoni (2004) states the reason suggested "claims with high externality can be 'risky as they will give more grounds for possible criticism', and that claims with "low externality" are 'less risky and more likely to gain acceptability' (p. 116, quoting Pinch, 1985, p.23). Hedging, therefore, through modals may be an effort to lower the risk of a claim when writing from an outsider
perspective. Conversely, the editorial writers in The China Times may use another politeness strategy such as questions and sarcasm instead when writing from an outsider perspective as discussed more fully below.

The concept of autonomy in western societies may also explain the higher frequency of modals used in The New York Times than those used in Chinese editorials. Koutsantoni (2004) suggested that the reason native speakers of English use more hedges in scientific community may be that “the individual nature of western societies oriented the formulation of face in such societies toward individual autonomy, and concern with imposition and freedom of action” (p. 133), and autonomy in most Western cultures is achieved by not imposing on the hearer. Since this concept of autonomy exists in Western societies, western writers may use hedges to soften their claims and thus help preserve the autonomy of their readers.

In addition to the use of modals as hedges in editorials, as Table 10 shows, one interesting finding that should be noted is that some modals carry a stronger tone and may serve as a face-threatening act while editorial writers make suggestions to people linked to the issues discussed in editorials.
Table 10. Frequency per 1000 Words of Modals (Must, Should, and Need) Used in Editorials Published in Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/ Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Total number words in the editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorials that use modals</th>
<th>Total number of the modals</th>
<th>Occurrence of modals per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.Y. Times</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.D. News</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Times</strong></td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The modals in the table include the modals (e.g. must, need and should).
*The Chinese modals in the table include the modals (e.g., bixu 必須 (must), yinggai (should), gai (should), yiding (must) and Xuyao (need)).

As shown in Table 10, unlike the figures of Chinese editorials (including 0.17% and 0.29% in The People Daily News and 0.17% and 0.22% in The China Times), English editorials (0.76% and 0.59%) seem to use these strong modals more of must, should, and need frequently, especially when writing from an outsider perspective. This kind of verbs may function as a negative face threatening act which might impose some pressure to people linked to the issue. Examples are below.

54. [NY T 5] As China upgrades its military capacities, Washington must honor its commitment to provide adequate
defensive weapons to Taiwan. But it needs to avoid sales that would be likely to raise tensions or upset the military balance across the Taiwan Strait.

55. [PDN I 7] 美英兩國在伊拉克戰爭問題上應該反省.

(America and Britain should be introspective about the Iraq war issue)

56. [NY T 2] Washington must adjust to a rising China

57. [NY T 6] Independence-minded political leaders in Taipei need to restrain their rhetoric and gestures, while mainland leaders need to stop brandishing threats.

As shown in the examples above, editorial writers in the three newspapers used a stronger tone in their suggestions, urging the people (e.g., President Bush, Washington, President Chen, and mainland leaders respectively) linked to the issue to notice what editorial writers suggest. The modal should in examples 54 and 55 carry a strong tone in “President Bush” and “America and Britain”. Similarly, the word “must” in example 56 and 57 also has a strong express a sense obligation for “Washington” or “leaders in Taipei and mainland China” to do something.

This result may echo to Pak’s findings (2000) about the way editorial writers in American, Mexican, and Spanish used when making suggestions. She noted that editorial
writers in The New York Times tend to use more direct language (e.g., obligation modals including must, should and need) more than that in EL País (Madrid) and EL Universal (Mexico City). She argues that American editorial writers “employ direct/explicit language” as a persuasion strategy “to engage the reader in order to argue for and clarify the position the newspaper takes” (p. 34). Thus, her findings may suggest that when making suggestions the way of utilizing the explicit or implicit language as a persuasion strategy are various among different national cultures.

The Use of Questions

As shown in Webber’s (1994) study of medical texts, questions can also serve as a politeness strategy. For instance, questions can function as attitudinal markers that express distancing and hedging functions. Moreover, questions also could be used as a way of expressing doubt or caution as well as criticizing or attacking opponents in an indirect way. Consequently, in light of these three functions, the use of the questions in editorials might serve as a politeness strategy to save face-needs for all parties involved in editorial writing. For instance, it could be acting like a positive politeness strategy for
editorial writers themselves by allowing them to express criticism implicitly and thus avoid coming off as cruel critics. Also, a question could serve as a negative politeness strategy by giving freedom to think about the editorial writer's views rather than having them imposed upon them. Moreover, a question could avoid a positive face threatening acts toward the people linked to the issue since questions can attack opponents in an indirect way.

An interesting similarity across three newspapers in Table 11 is that editorial writers in three newspapers tend to use questions more when writing from an insider perspective.

Table 11. Frequency of Question Used in Editorials Published in the Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insider/ Outsider perspective</th>
<th>Total number words in the editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorials that use modals</th>
<th>Total number of the modals</th>
<th>Occurrence of modals per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Iraq)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 11 shows, when writing from an insider perspective the occurrences of question per 1000 words in three newspapers (e.g., 1.9% in The New York Times, 2.7% in The People Daily News, and 8.3% in The China Times) are higher than those (e.g., 0% in The New York Times, 0.8% in The People Daily News, and 7.7% in The China Times) when writing from an outsider perspective.

A difference in Table 11 may tell us that editorial writers in three newspapers tend to use questions in a different level. As Table 11 shows, the frequency of using questions from an outsider perspective in The China Times is 7.7%, much higher than 0.8% of The People Daily News, and no questions used in The New York Times. Similarly, when writing from an insider perspective the frequency of using questions in The China Times is 8.3%, much higher than the 2.7% in The People Daily News and 1.9% in The New York Times. Editorial writers in The China Times seem to highly value the use of questions as a politeness strategy, whereas those in The New York Times and The People Daily News are much less frequent. Examples are given below.

58. [CT T 4] 這種雙重尺碼的困局,用最簡單的話說就是,處理兩岸關係,到底是要選擇對抗,還是要選擇交往?
(This dilemma based on double standards can be explained clearly by the simplest way. That is, when dealing with the relationship between both sides across the Taiwan Strait why on earth does [the government] choose either to be against [China] or in contact with [China]?

59. [CT T 1] 明知兩岸局勢險峻，仍要不假思索出驚人之語；同時撩撥北京與華盛頓，陷人民於驚恐危殆之地，不是魯莽是什麼？

([President Chen] knows this real, dangerous situation between Taiwan Strait well but still wants to say something surprising without thinking which is not only to tease Beijing and Washington but also to put people in a terrified and dangerous situation. What is it if it is not unwise?)

60. [CT T 5] 還是因爲主政者以其極端的意識形態強加於人民？答案恐怕事情楚不過的了”

(Is the administration trying to impose his extreme ideology on people? The answer probably is clear enough)

61. [CT I 1] 這對美國及全界有什麼好處？按最近伊拉克境內發展情勢，以及西班牙的大爆炸等是看起來，實情很近於此。

(Is there any benefit to America and the whole world of the [Iraq war]? According to the developments in Iraq lately and the Spanish explosion, the fact is close to this)
As the examples above show, a question might serve as a
politeness strategy when showing the criticism or
disagreement indirectly in order to save face for all
parties involved in editorials. As can be seen in example
58, the editorial writer did not use the assertion to make
statements but provided two options instead, giving him/her
a space to negotiate that neither of the suggestions is
absolutely the correct one. Yet, sometimes, even though
editorial writers use a question to express their opinions
indirectly, readers still may truly get their intentions.
For instance, in example 59, even though the editorial
writer used a question, readers still could understand the
writer’s intention -- it [the speech] was not a wise at
all. Similarly, as can be seen in example 60, the real
opinion of the editorial writer was implied in the
question—“Is the administration is trying to impose his
extreme ideology on people?” The answer “the answer
probably is clear enough” following the question confirmed
the implied view.

Moreover, as can be seen in example 61, the editorial
writer still addressed a question first to invite readers
to think about the issue and then offered the developments
in Iraq lately and the Spanish explosion to imply the
editorial writer's answer—"there is no benefit to American and the whole world." The word 此(this) as a politeness strategy because readers need to infer the implied meaning themselves from sentences. The pattern reflected in these examples is of the editorial writer asking a question and then following with a statement that still only hints the answer. Both the question and the following statement, therefore, serve to mitigate the force of the writer’s claims by expressing them only indirectly. Thus, this pattern functions as a negative politeness strategy toward the readers.

Unlike editorial writers in The China Times who highly valued the questions, some questions are also used, albeit less frequently, in The New York Times and The People Daily News. Examples are given below.

(America already lost its reputation because of the war and is being isolated. Is it a good thing or bad thing for America? Leave it to the future and people judge.)

63. [NY I 1] Isn't this about where we did not want to be at this point?

The reason for Chinese editorial writers employing questions more frequently than those in The New York Times
may be that Chinese tend "to be indirect in both spoken and written discourse, to expect the audience to infer meanings rather than to have them spelled out is a defining characteristic of Chinese rhetoric" (Matalene, 1985, p. 801). As Ge Geo (1998) stated, Chinese editorial writers may use "the notion of han xu (含蓄) which is an indirect approach to emphasize what is implied or not said rather than what is said" (p. 170) Drawing on Kasper's study (1994), the use of questions can be considered a politeness strategy since "the notion of indirectness is, in fact, so integral to the most influential theoretical conceptualizations of politeness" (p. 3209).

The Use of Sarcasm

Unlike English editorial writers in The New York Times, editorial writers in The China Times seem to value the use of sarcasm most, whereas those in The People Daily News seem to be in-between, as shown in Table 12.
Table 12. Frequency of Sarcasm Used in Editorials Published in the Three Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number words in the editorials</th>
<th>Number of editorials that use modals</th>
<th>Total number of the modals</th>
<th>Occurrence of modals per 1000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Y. Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>10729</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>11578</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider (Iraq)</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider (Taiwan/China)</td>
<td>12737</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 12, from insider and outsider perspective, English editorial writers use sarcasm less than Chinese editorial writers do. When writing from an outsider perspective, the occurrence of using sarcasm per 1000 words in The New York Times is lowest (1.3%), whereas that of The China Times (14.2%) is highest and that of The People Daily News (6.6%) is somewhere in between. Similarly, when writing from an insider perspective, the occurrence of using sarcasm (6.5%) in The New York Times is lowest, whereas it is 13% in The China Times and 8.3% in The People Daily News.

In term of the way performing sarcasm in editorials, unlike English editorial writers Chinese editorial writers
tend to use questions to show sarcasm, as seen in the examples below.

64. [CT T 3] 要「擴大對立」有什麼困難？過去五年多不早就是這樣？如今不過是「維持現狀」罷了！

(What difficulty about expanding the opposition will be? Isn’t the last five years already this way? It just keeps the “current situation”!)

65. [PDN T 3] 問題是 台海 “冰層” 已破 兩岸交流已成大勢 台當局此時卻在忙著“造冰” 豈不好笑？

(The problem is that the “iceberg” between the Taiwan Strait has broken and the contact between both sides is increasing and becoming a trend. However, the Taiwan administration is even busily “building the ice” at this point. Is that not funny?)

66. [CT I 7] 這是一個愛好和平的超級強國所應該做的事？

(Is this [the Iraq war] what a super-power country that promotes peace should do?)

As shown above, editorial writers use questions to perform sarcasm as a politeness strategy in order to show their real claims indirectly. For instance, as shown in example 64, the editorial writer’s opinions is that President Chen in Taiwan is good at “expanding the antagonism,” and in fact, he already did that in the last
five years. But, the editorial writer used a question performing sarcasm to show their real opinions indirectly.

The editorial writers also use a particular term 明眼人 (implying brilliant people) in The People Daily News and The China Times to express sarcasm. This term 明眼人 (implying brilliant people) implies that readers are so smart to notice some problematic things done by people linked to the issue discussed in the editorials. In their use of this term editorial writers in The People Daily News and The China Time satirize people linked to the issue as not being that smart. For example,

67. [CT I 4] 明眼人都知道用這種武力壓制效果非常小 反而激起伊拉克人更大的憤怒更多的反抗
(Brilliant people all know that the effect of weapon suppression is very small, but it is provoking in Iraqis more anger and more opposition).

68. [PDN T 3] 明眼人一看便知所有這些都是衝著國共達成的‘十二項成果’去的
(Brilliant people can easily see that all these (reactions) go toward the “twelve accomplishments” done by the Nationalists and Communists.)

As can been in example 67, the term 明眼人 is used to satirize the Americans as not being smart enough (in
contrast to brilliant people) to recognize that weapon suppression has only a small effect. Similarly, as shown in example 68, the editorial writer in *The People Daily News* use the term 明眼人 to satirize the Taiwan administration as not recognizing that it is so obvious that all reactions done by the Taiwan administration focus on being against the "twelve accomplishments."

One reason why editorial writers in *The People Daily News* and *The China Times* seem to use the sarcasm more than those in *The New York Times* may be the long-lasting influence from the ancient China since civilians or scholars in ancient China were forbidden to criticize the emperor, they used these two ways as politeness strategies to criticize the emperor indirectly. Another reason for high frequency of utilizing sarcasm to show Chinese editorial writers' viewpoint indirectly may be that Chinese are familiar with an indirect approach in communication since the Chinese expression pang qiao ce ji (beating around the bush), which implies a skill that nurtures a sense of an implicit understanding” (Ge Gao, 1998, p. 172). Also, Chinese tend to give other face by not arguing or disagreeing overtly with others in public. Doing evaluations in editorials may cause possible face-
threatening acts, as Ge Gao (1998) stated, “public disagreement is a face-losing act to Chinese” (p. 181). Consequently, in order to protect face for others Chinese editorial writers prefer to use an indirect approach to express their viewpoints in editorials.

In contrast, English editorial writers in The New York Times may use a different way to satirize people linked to the issue. Unlike Chinese editorial writers who prefer to use questions performing sarcasm, English editorial writers tend to quote someone’s statements in order to further perform sarcasm or use a word which has an opposite meaning to the editorial writer’s real opinion to satirize the people linked to the issue. Examples are given below.

69. [NY I 4] Mr. Bush said last Friday that he welcomed debate, even in a time of war, but that "it is deeply irresponsible to rewrite the history of how that war began.” We agree, but it is Mr. Bush and his team who are rewriting history.

70. [NY I 5] Mr. Bush proclaimed a new “forward strategy” for advancing freedom in the Middle East, rightly declaring that 60 years of excusing and accommodating dictatorships there “did nothing to make us safe” because stability cannot be purchased at liberty’s
expense.

71. [NY I 6] Only loyalists who had bought the fantasy about dancing Iraqis throwing flowers before American tanks dismissed it as unlikely.

As shown in example 69, the quotation was clearly signaled what President Bush said in order to make it easier for readers to notice. Then, the editorial writer used “we agree, it is Mr. Bush and his team who are rewriting history” as a sarcasm to refute the President Bush’s statement. In example 70, the editorial writer quoted “did nothing to make us safe” to perform sarcasm and implied the meaning which is opposite to what the editorial writer’s intention. Similarly, as can be seen in example 71, the editorial writer used “loyalist” to satirize people who follow President Bush’s steps.

Conclusions

The results of my move and politeness strategies analysis utilized in the three newspapers reveal a number of similarities and differences between the three newspapers and between the set of two topics. These similarities in the way editorial writers in different national cultures approach issues may tell us that the
similarities might be common in editorial genre no matter what language editorial writers employ and how close to or distant from their concerns. However, the differences may also notify us that national cultural influences play an inevitable role in the way editorial writers approach the issue in editorial writing. In particular, the results also may confirm Pak’s (1997 and 2000) findings about the pluricentrality of cultures sharing the same languages, in this case, Chinese in Taiwan and China.

Regarding the similarities in move analysis across cultures, editorials basically consist of five general moves: A title (Move 1), establishing background information and expectations (Move 2), taking a position (Move 3), providing support for arguments (Move 4), and finally the conclusion (Move 5). These similarities across the three newspapers might suggest that these basic structural moves are universal for the editorial genre.

However, national culture also seems to have a role of influencing the sub-moves containing in each move. For instance, Chinese editorial writers tend to utilize sub-move 3 (providing a brief summary about the related news) more, whereas those in The New York Times might like to contain sub-move 4 (an initial comment). Besides, among the
Chinese cultures, the use of sub-move 15 (appealing to empathy) seems to be employed as a persuasive way in The People Daily News (China) but editorial writers in The China Times (Taiwan) tend not use this sub-move.

Regarding the use of inclusive nouns, hedges, question, and sarcasm, editorial writers in the three newspapers prefer to utilize these politeness strategies in different levels. Especially, more similarities existing between editorials published in The People Daily News (China) and The China Times (Taiwan) may be more than those existing between any Chinese newspaper and The New York Times (U. S.). For example, Chinese editorial writers in The People Daily News (China) and The China Times (Taiwan) tend to use the inclusive nouns and sarcasm as politeness strategies more, whereas those in The New York Times (U.S.) prefer to use modals as a politeness strategy more. However, national cultures also influence the use of questions. For example, editorial writers in The China Times (Taiwan) prefer to use questions as a politeness strategy more than those in The People Daily News and The New York Times (U. S.)

As Pak (1997, 2000) suggests that persuasive strategies used in editorials not only can vary among cultures but also across a “pluricentrality” (p. 23) of cultures sharing
the same language, the findings in the present study about organizational structures and politeness strategies analysis seem also to echo to Pak's findings. The study reveals national cultures may influence the use of politeness strategies and organizational pattern in editorials written in the two languages, English and Chinese, but published in two Chinese speaking countries across the Taiwan Strait. Even though the findings could be a reference of the way editorial writers approach the issues discussed in editorials in the three countries (U.S., China, and Taiwan), the data in this study were collected from only one newspaper from each country. It may be an interesting issue to investigate the way of language use utilized by editorial writers in different national cultures from more newspapers.
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