Apologies for Bad English: The Effects of Politeness Modification and Language

Expectancies on Message Recipients

Bob Kakisina

MA International Business Communication

Radboud University Nijmegen

Supervisor: dr. W.F.J. van Meurs

Second assessor: dr. U. Nederstigt

Date: 14/08/2019

Word count: 8810

Radboud Universiteit

Abstract

How the sender of a message is perceived and evaluated by the receiver is affected by both the degree of politeness in the message and the anticipated communication behaviour of the sender. Despite the ever increasing status of English as a lingua franca in business, few studies have investigated the effects of so-called politeness modification or so-called language expectancies on message recipients in non-native (L2) to L2 communication.

This study aimed to investigate the effects of language expectancies and politeness modification on Dutch speakers of English in professional business communication by comparing how Dutch speakers evaluate both native (L1) and Dutch L2 speakers of English. In an online web questionnaire, 120 L1 Dutch speakers were asked to evaluate the sender's politeness, personality, the willingness to comply with their requests, and the perceived requests' imposition in one of four versions of email requests, each version containing a different combination of apparent sender (L1 or L2) and politeness level (high or low level).

Findings indicate that both politeness modification and language expectancies affect sender evaluations. L2 senders were more positively evaluated than L1 senders of the same emails, while L2 senders benefitted more from a higher level of politeness modification compared to L1 senders.

Key words: politeness modification, language expectancies, non-native English communication

Apologies for Bad English: The Effects of Politeness Modification and Language

Expectancies on Message Recipients

English is continuing to be widely used as a lingua franca in multinational corporations. As

such, non-native to non-native (henceforth L2) English communication is occurring more and

more as well, even among speakers with the same native language. In (multinational)

corporations, email remains the most commonly used digital communication medium (Sisko

Maarit Lipiäinen, Ensio Karjaluoto, & Nevalainen, 2014). Email communication in an L2

language can lead to a number of pragmatic difficulties in a business context. Notably,

language violations related to politeness expectations in persuasive emails can lead to

negative perceptions of L2 English speakers by native (henceforth L1) English speakers

(Hendriks, 2010; Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). Persuasive messages that fail to convey the

expected level of politeness can result in negative perceptions by L1 speakers with regard to

the personality and competence of the L2 sender. This can subsequently make the persuasive

message less successful (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011).

It can be expected that a significant number of persuasive email exchanges in a

business context occur between interlocutors that have never, or will never meet face-to-face.

Making a good (first) impression can therefore be important in ensuring successful

communication. Research has demonstrated that these first impressions can be significantly

affected by cultural and sociological expectations. Notably, Burgoon and Miller's (1985)

Language Expectancy Theory (LET) posits that the evaluation of a communicative message is

partly determined by the expectations one has regarding the credibility and competence of the

conversational partner.

Many existing perception studies (e.g. Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Hendriks, 2010;

Vignovic & Thompson, 2010) have focussed on how L2 speakers of English are perceived by

L1 English speakers. Despite an apparent increase in English language usage in corporations

between L2 speakers with the same L1 language, there is still a need to understand what sort of (politeness) expectations L2 speakers have of one another. Moreover, there is a scarcity of recent literature in the domain of language expectancy research. This study aims to be the first to combine theories of politeness and language expectancies. The purpose of this study is therefore twofold: Firstly, to investigate whether variations in politeness modification in email requests affect sender evaluations by Dutch L2 speakers of English and secondly, to investigate whether Dutch L2 speakers' language expectations are different if the sender is believed to be an L1 or L2 speaker of English.

Background

English as a lingua franca in business

Aside from contact between L1 speakers of English and L2 speakers of English, L2-to-L2 communication in English appears to be increasingly prevalent in Dutch corporate life as well. In the Netherlands, English is widely used as a second language in business, with some Dutch-based multinationals such as Philips and Shell going as far as replacing Dutch with English as the official corporate language (Hendriks, 2010). But even though some studies have shown Dutch L2 speakers or learners of English to be highly competent and fully able to make requests (e.g. Hendriks, 2002), other studies have demonstrated that many Dutch speakers overestimate their English-speaking abilities (Van Onna & Jansen, 2006) and communicating in English can cause difficulties within Dutch-based multinational companies (Hemmes, 1994; Nickerson, 2000).

These difficulties are not limited to spoken language. Email has become one of the most important means of electronic communication in business, replacing many sorts of interaction that would previously have occurred in person or via telephone (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). This means that in many instances, business communication takes place without any face-to-face contact, and consequently relationships, impressions, and opinions

are formed based on written communication alone. Several studies have shown that communicating via email in a non-native language can result in pragmatic difficulties. Vignovic and Thompson (2010) revealed that people (in a professional business context) form negative perceptions of the sender of an email which contains technical language violations, such as spelling or grammatical errors. However, the majority of these negative perceptions are reduced when it is made clear beforehand that the sender of an email is from a different culture (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). Conversely, negative attributions stemming from etiquette violations and deviations from etiquette norms (i.e. overly short messages and messages lacking a conversational tone) are not significantly lessened if it is made clear that the sender is from a different or foreign culture (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). If, for example, an email lacks the expected niceties, provides only the necessary information and is overly concise, it can be regarded as rude and curt by some (Western) cultures. This implies that even if it is made known that the sender is not a native speaker, pragmatic difficulties can still arise. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) showed that emails in English sent by Greek Cypriot (L2) students to the native English-speaking university faculty typically omitted appropriate greetings and closings, underused lexical and phrasal downgraders (e.g. downtoners such as 'rather', 'by any chance', 'maybe'), and were perceived as inappropriately direct, especially in submitting requests. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) argues that this might lead to serious pragmatic failures in L2-L1 communication - such as refusal to comply with the request - due to the brusque and impolite tone of the message. It was also found that Dutch L2 speakers of English generally use fewer linguistic and syntactic modifiers in their speech acts than L1 speakers (see Table 2) (Hendriks, 2002) and underuse elaborate modification (e.g. lexical and syntactic modifiers and a more restricted range of modifiers), which was found to have a negative effect on participants' evaluation of the personality of the sender of emails (Hendriks, 2010). The majority of these studies have

explored the effects of L2 speech modification on perceptions by L1 speakers. However, despite the apparent increase of English as a corporate language in the Netherlands, it remains unclear how L2 speakers perceive speech act modifications by other L2 speakers with the same L1.

Politeness in requests

It appears that many pragmatic difficulties that can arise from communicating in an L2 language are due to the manner in which politeness is conveyed by the sender and perceived by the receiver.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) widely used politeness theory posits that there are three universally applicable assumptions (i.e. assumptions regardless of culture): 1) everyone has face (i.e. the image and honour one has in social groups); 2) any speech act can threaten face; and 3) speakers try to minimize this threat by employing a range of linguistic strategies. A request can be viewed as a face-threatening act, because it attempts to get the receiver to do something they would otherwise not do (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011). It is reasonable to assume that a significant amount of email correspondence involves the sender submitting a request to the receiver, and a number of perception studies involving email communication have indeed analysed the linguistic modification of requests (e.g. Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Hendriks, 2010). These types of studies are often based on the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns) framework (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a), which typically segments requests into the 'core' head act (underlined in (1)) and the rest of the request utterance (not underlined in (1)).

(1) John, could I ask you a favour? <u>Do you think you could go the presentation tomorrow?</u> I really can't find the time to do it myself. I promise I'll take care of the next presentation.

The head act includes the request strategy which determines the level of directness (see Table 1). The request strategy can be internally modified with syntactic and lexical/phrasal modifiers (Table 2). The rest of the request utterance usually consists of external modifiers (Table 3).

Table 1 Classification of request strategies (Hendriks, 2010)

request strategy	example
1. imperative	'Clean up that mess'
2. performative verb	'I ask you to clean up that mess'
3. obligation statement	'You must clean up that mess'
4. statement of want or wish	'I want you to clean up that mess'
5. suggestion	'Why don't you clean up that mess?'
6. reference to preconditions	
a. non-obviousness	'Will you clean up that mess?'
b. willingness	'Are you willing to clean up that mess?'
c. ability	'Can you clean up that mess?
7. hint	'I'm really tired …'

Table 2 Categories of syntactic and lexical/phrasal modifiers (Hendriks, 2002)

syntactic modifiers	lexical/phrasal modifiers
interrogatives	*politeness markers;* language-specific means:
Can you help me?	'please'
past tense	*downtoners*; particles that reduce the impositive
I wanted to ask you to help me.	force
	of the request:'possibly', 'maybe'

negation	*understaters*; elements that minimize the effort or
You couldn't help me, could you?	cost involved:'just', 'just for a bit', 'a little'
tag question	*subjectivizers*; expressions of hope, pessimism, etc.;
Help me, will you?	'I was hoping ...'; 'I don't suppose ...'
modal	*consultative device*;
Can you help me?	'Do you know if ...,'
embedding	*hedges*;
I was wondering if you could help me.	'sort of', 'kind of'
aspect	*cajoler/interpersonal markers*; in-group markers:
I am wondering if you could help me.	'you know', 'okay'
subjunctive (for modal auxiliaries)	
Could you help me?	

Table 3 Categories of external modifiers (Hendriks, 2002)

External modifiers	examples
a. preparator; signalling devices	'Could I ask you a question?'
b. getting precommitment; elements that try to secure precommitment before the request is made.	'Could I ask you a favour?'
c. grounders; reasons, explanations or	'You see, I have to hand in the report tomorrow'

justifications for the request.

d. disarmer; elements indicating that the speaker realizes the imposition of the request.	'I know it's a bit of a cheek to ask, but ...'
e. rewards	'I'll do it next time'
f. expressions of thanks/appreciation	'I'd be ever so grateful'
g. cost minimizer	'It'd take you no more than ten minutes.'

The choice of request strategy, the syntactic and lexical/phrasal modifiers, and external modifiers are regarded as determining the overall politeness of a request (Hendriks, 2002).

In a quantitative analysis of (oral) request utterances by L1 English speakers and Dutch L2 English speakers, Hendriks (2002) found that in terms of request strategies, L1 and Dutch L2 speakers were highly similar in employing mostly conventionally indirect ability strategies. Additionally, the L2 speakers employed the same number and largely the same types of external modifiers as L1 speakers. However, Dutch L2 speakers were found to use fewer syntactic and lexical/phrasal modifiers. Hendriks (2010) found that in written (email) communication, the underuse of complex syntactic and lexical/phrasal modification (specifically the combination subjectivizer/tense/aspect 'I was wondering if . . .') may reflect negatively on the sender's agreeableness.

Even though Dutch L2 speakers were found to employ less elaborate politeness modifications in their requests, a number of perception studies (e.g. Carrell & Konneker, 1981; Fraser, Rintell & Walters, 1980; Tanaka & Kawade, 1982) suggest that L2 speakers of English with several different L1's generally do not differ in their politeness perceptions from L1 speakers, and are able to recognize different levels of politeness similarly to L1 speakers.

This implies that even though L2 speakers may not always be able to produce the same politeness modifications as L1 speakers, they may still be sensitive to those modifications.

The present study will not examine the contribution of different categories of modifiers to the overall politeness value and effectiveness of requests, but rather investigate how requests with different overall politeness values are perceived by Dutch speakers. This leads to the first research question of this study:

RQ 1: What are the effects of politeness modification in email requests on the evaluation of the sender by Dutch L2 speakers with regard to politeness, personality, the willingness to comply with requests, or the perceived imposition of requests?

Language Expectancy Theory

A number of pragmatic difficulties that can arise during L2-L1 email communication are related to language proficiency. According to Language Expectancy Theory, however, initial expectations and stereotypes can also determine how the sender of a message is perceived and evaluated.

Refined and extended multiple times in the last few decades, Language Expectancy Theory (LET) (Burgoon & Miller, 1985) is a theoretical framework of persuasion study explaining why certain linguistic formats in persuasive messages (such as requests) influence the successfulness of the outcomes. LET views language as a rule-based system, in which people have certain expectations of what is considered appropriate language use. These expectations are said to depend on three factors: 1) the source (notably source credibility, personality, appearance, social status and gender); 2) the relationship between source and receiver (e.g. social distance, status equality); and 3) context (e.g. private or formal). Research using this framework that focussed on the credibility of the source (e.g. Burgoon, Dillard, & Doran, 1983) has indicated that sources who are perceived as highly credible have more freedom to employ more varied language strategies and compliance-gaining techniques in

developing persuasive messages, while low-credible sources have more limited options. The LET framework furthermore posits that the effectiveness of persuasive messages is influenced by cultural and sociological expectations, or stereotypes, concerning language use. For example, Burgoon and Miller (1985) suggest that for women, verbally aggressive strategies and the use of profanity are generally not expected (at least at the time of their writing). These expectations subsequently affect the successfulness of the persuasive messages, and can be violated both positively and negatively. A positive violation occurs when a persuasive message is perceived as more appropriate, credible, or preferable than that which was expected in a particular situation, or when an initially negatively perceived source conforms more closely to the sociological expectations with their persuasive message. In the latter case, both the persuasive message as well as the source can be evaluated overly positively compared to a situation in which the source is not initially negatively perceived (Burgoon, Denning, & Umphrey, 2002). Conversely, negative violations occur if the source is initially thought to be more competent or credible, but the persuasive message does not align with those expectations. The message can subsequently become less persuasive, and both the message and the source can be evaluated overly negatively compared to a situation in which the source is not expected to be credible.

Based on LET, it could be expected that in one-way English L2-L2 persuasive communication, the receiver may initially have lower expectations of the sender with regard to English language proficiency. If the content of the message, say a request utterance, exceeds those negative expectations (e.g. with regard to politeness), the sender could be evaluated (overly) positively by the receiver, and the persuasiveness of the message would be more successful. In L1-L2 persuasive communication, the L2 receiver may initially have higher expectations of the L1 sender with regard to language proficiency. If the content of the message falls behind those expectations (e.g. if it is not considered polite enough), the sender

could be evaluated (overly) negatively. As a result, the persuasiveness of the message could be less successful.

Overall, there appears to be a scarcity of current literature in the domain of LET. Whether Dutch L2 speakers have certain language expectancies of other Dutch L2 and L1 speakers of English has also not been previously investigated. This leads to the second research question of this study:

RQ 2: Do perceptions of politeness and personality, the willingness to comply with requests, or the perceived imposition of requests differ depending on whether the sender is believed to be an L1 or L2 speaker of English?

Based on previous research into politeness modification and theories of language expectations, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Requests made with a higher level of politeness modification (+politeness) will be evaluated more positively with regard to email politeness, personality of the sender (competence, agreeableness, power), reader's willingness to comply with requests and perceived request imposition than requests made with a lower level of politeness modification (-politeness).

H2a: L2 senders will be judged more positively with regard to email politeness, personality (competence, agreeableness, power), willingness to comply with requests and request imposition than L1 senders of the same emails.

H2b: L1 senders of emails with a lower level of politeness modification (-politeness) will be judged more negatively with regard to email politeness, personality (competence, agreeableness, power), willingness to comply with requests and request imposition than L2 senders of the same emails.

H2c: L2 senders of emails with a higher level of politeness modification (+politeness) will be judged more positively with regard to email politeness, personality (competence,

agreeableness, power), willingness to comply with requests and request imposition than L1 senders of the same emails.

Research suggests that Dutch speakers often overrate their English speaking abilities (Van Onna & Jansen, 2006). An insufficient grasp of the English language could affect how an email is perceived because the subtle differences in politeness might be overlooked, potentially overriding some functionality of politeness modification. Therefore, the following research question was developed:

RQ 3: Is the English language proficiency of Dutch L2 speakers a predictor of sender evaluations?

Method

Materials

Four versions of an email script were constructed which described two work-related requests from a fictional colleague addressed to the participant (Table 4). In order to determine to what extent LET affects perceptions of politeness, personality, request imposition, and willingness to comply, the apparent sender of the emails was manipulated by introducing him/her as either a Dutch colleague from Eindhoven or a British colleague from London (Appendix A). Half of all participants were led to believe the sender of the email to be the Dutch L2 speaker of English. The other half of all participants were manipulated into believing that the sender was the native L1 speaker of English. This independent variable, apparent sender, therefore had two levels: L1 and L2. In all four versions of the email, the sender was given a conventionally unisex first name (Robin) in order to eliminate any bias towards gender. The colleague was also explicitly described as being equal in hierarchy within the company in an attempt to minimize the influence of power distance, which has been found to be an important determinant of politeness expectations (Hendriks, 2010).

The other independent variable, level of politeness, also had two levels: -politeness vs. +politeness. The request strategies and external modification in all versions were identical, reflecting findings by Hendriks (2002) that L1 and L2 speakers both employ mostly conventionally indirect 'ability' request strategies together with an average of two external modifiers. Each email contained two similar requests with the same syntactic modifications to make the politeness manipulations of the requests more prominent for participants. Each of the two requests was modified with one grounder (a justification for the request). Grounders are described as being fairly neutral and non-coercive compliance-gaining strategies compared to more complex and persuasive external modifiers such as disarmers, cost minimizers and rewards (Hendriks, 2002). The aim was for readers to focus on internal rather than external modification and therefore external modification was limited to these neutral grounders. In order to determine to what extent Dutch L2 speakers of English are aware of politeness modification and whether it affects perceptions of politeness, personality, request imposition, and willingness to comply, two versions of the email contained syntactic and lexical modifiers which, on theoretical grounds, resulted in a more polite manner of submitting the requests (+politeness): the combination subjectivizer/tense/aspect 'I was wondering if . . .', modal and past tense (i.e. 'could'). The -politeness versions of the email were formulated with just modal and present tense (i.e. 'can'), resulting, in theory, in less polite request utterances. Aside from politeness modification, all emails contained the same factual information. Care was taken to ensure that any 'filler' information was not substantive (Appendix A).

Table 4 Overview of distribution of apparent sender and politeness level for each version of questionnaire

Version	apparent sender	politeness level
1	L1	-politeness
2	L1	+politeness
3	L2	+politeness
4	L2	-politeness

Participants

A total of 120 participants - 57 females and 63 males - took part in this experiment. Participants' highest educational level ranged from secondary education to university level education, with the majority falling into the highest two categories: higher professional education (42.5%) and university level education (46.7%). Age ranged from 18 to 59 years old ($M = 26.72$, $SD = 5.38$). All participants had the Dutch nationality and were native Dutch speakers. Participants scored an average of 77% correct on the LexTALE test, which translates into an upper intermediate level of English (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012). A Chi-square test showed that gender ($\chi2$ (3) = 1.44, p = .679) and educational level ($\chi2$ (9) = 8.71, p = .474) characteristics were not significantly different for the four different versions into which participants were grouped. A one-way ANOVA showed no significant difference of age between the four versions (F (3, 116) <1). A one-way ANOVA showed no significant difference of LexTALE test scores between the four versions (F (3, 116) = 1.31, p = .275).

Design

This experiment used a 2 (apparent sender) x 2 (politeness level) factorial design. There were two levels of apparent sender (L1 vs. L2) and two levels of politeness level (-politeness vs. +politeness), resulting in four different sender-politeness combinations. For each of these

combinations there was a version of an email script. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of these four versions in equal numbers, resulting in 30 participants for each version. Each version contained either a higher or a lower level of politeness modifications, and was apparently sent by either an L1 or an L2 speaker of English (Table 4).

Instruments

Participants were asked to give their first impression of the email ('What is your first impression after reading this email?'). A quantitative content analysis was performed to see whether terms expressing that the email was direct were more common in some versions than in others. The first impressions were subsequently coded as either 1 (= contains one or more terms or sentiments expressing that the email is direct) or 2 (= contains no terms or sentiments expressing that the email is direct). Examples of terms and sentiments expressing that the email is direct included 'to the point', 'intrusive', 'informal', and 'too casual and quasi-urgent'. The first impressions were coded by two different coders, one of whom coded all 120 first impressions, and one of whom coded 50 first impressions in order to test the reliability of the coding. The interrater reliability of the variable 'first impression directness' was good: $\kappa = .92, p < .001$.

After stating a first impression of the email, participants were asked to respond to 7-point Likert scale items ranging from 1 (= totally disagree) to 7 (= totally agree) concerning 1) the perceived politeness of the email, 2) perceived personality of the sender, 3) the willingness to comply with the requests in the email, and 4) the perceived imposition of the requests. The overall politeness level of the emails was measured by rating the statement 'this email is polite'.

Personality perceptions were measured on the basis of nine items relating to three personality dimensions as used in Hendriks (2010): 1) competence ('This colleague is reliable/competent/intelligent'), 2) power ('This colleague is

controlling/authoritative/dominant') and 3) agreeableness ('This colleague is

sympathetic/tactful/considerate'). The reliability of 'competence' comprising three items was

good: α = .80. The reliability of 'power' comprising three items was well below the

acceptable level (α <.70), but after omitting the item 'authoritative', the reliability of 'power'

comprising two items was acceptable: α = .78. The reliability of 'agreeableness' comprising

three items was good: α = .85. Note that for the personality dimension 'power' a higher score

meant a more negative evaluation while a low score meant a more positive evaluation, seeing

as 'power' was based on negatively charged items ('This colleague is

controlling/authoritative/dominant').

Willingness to comply with the request was measured by asking participants to give

their opinion about three statements, partly based on Hendriks (2010): 1) 'I would do my best

to comply with this colleague's requests', 2) 'This colleague has the right to submit these

requests' and 3) 'I am obliged to fulfil this colleague's requests'. The reliability of

'willingness to comply with the request' comprising three items was acceptable: α = .77.

To determine whether the level of politeness and the assumed native language of the

sender of an email affected the perceived imposition of the requests, participants were asked

to rate the following Dutch statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (= totally

disagree) to 7 (= totally agree): 'Dit zijn zware verzoeken' ('These are imposing requests')

English language proficiency was measured to see whether this was a predictor of

sender evaluations. Participants were asked to rate their self-assessed English proficiency on a

5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (= poor) to 5 (= excellent), based on Ayers (2011). This

was followed by the LexTALE test (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012) at the end of the

experiment to get a more accurate sense of participants' language proficiency.

Appendix B contains the complete questionnaire as it was presented to the

participants.

Procedure

Participants were approached through digital channels and filled in an online questionnaire. Participants were asked to individually participate in a short, 10-minute experiment as part of a MA thesis by completing one of the four versions of the questionnaire. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary, that they were allowed to withdraw at any time, and that the collected data would be treated confidentially and anonymously. Consent was obtained by asking participants to agree or disagree with the following conditions: 1) They had read the aforementioned information, 2) They participated in the experiment voluntarily, and 3) They were at least 18 years of age. No further context was provided, and no incentives or rewards were offered.

At the beginning of the questionnaire, participants were asked to assume the role of a manager at a large multinational who just received an email from a colleague. A short introduction of the colleague was then provided. The emails with 'apparent sender L2' introduced the sender as a Dutch colleague, the email with 'apparent sender L1' introduced the sender as a native English colleague. In an attempt to enhance the participants' immersion in the experiment, they were told that the emails were obtained from a real-life international corporation. After reading the email, an open-ended question was asked to formulate a general impression in order to get a sense of what participants found most salient in the emails. This was followed by the 16 Likert-scale questions, the self-assessment of English language proficiency, and finally the LexTALE test. Participants were thanked for their participation, and not further debriefed after the experiment.

Statistical Treatment

This study used a 2 (apparent L1 sender vs apparent L2 sender) x 2 (-politeness vs. +politeness) between-subjects factorial design. The variables were analysed using several

two-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs), except for the effects of LexTALE scores and self-assessed proficiency, which were analysed using multiple regression analyses.

Results

First impressions

Participants were asked to formulate a first impression directly after reading the email. A content analysis was carried out to determine how common certain words and sentiments were in each version. With 38% of all first impressions, sentiment expressing that the email was direct were the most common (Table 5).

Table 5 Frequencies and percentages of first impressions mentioning directness

Version	First impression mentioning directness		
	frequency	%	n
1 (L1 –politeness)	16	53	30
2 (L1 +politeness)	13	43	30
3 (L2 +politeness)	5	17	30
4 (L2 –politeness)	12	40	30
total	46	38	120

A two-way analysis of variance with politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) and apparent sender (L1/L2) as independent variables showed that politeness level did not have a significant main effect on first impression directness (F (1, 116) = 3.69, p = .057). Apparent sender did have a significant main effect on first impression directness (F (1, 116) = 5.31, p = .023). Irrespective of the politeness level employed, the first impression of emails sent by L1

speakers ($M = 0.48$, $SD = 0.50$) mentioned directness more often than emails sent by L2 speakers ($M = 0.28$, $SD = 0.45$). The interaction effect between politeness level and apparent sender was not statistically significant ($F (1, 16) < 1$).

Email politeness

Table 7 shows the results for the evaluation of email politeness in function of politeness level and apparent sender.

Table 7 Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for the evaluation of email politeness in function of politeness level and apparent sender (1 = not polite at all, 7 = very polite)

	email politeness	
	M (*SD*)	*n*
+politeness		
L1 sender	4.80 (1.50)	30
L2 sender	4.90 (1.47)	30
total	4.85 (1.47)	60
-politeness		
L1 sender	4.23 (1.57)	30
L2 sender	4.20 (1.45)	30
total	4.22 (1.50)	60
total		
L1 sender	4.52 (1.55)	60
L2 sender	4.55 (1.51)	60

A two-way analysis of variance with politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) and apparent sender (L1/L2) as independent variables showed a significant main effect of politeness level on politeness (F (1, 116) = 5.38, p = .022). Irrespective of the apparent sender, emails written with +politeness (M = 4.85, SD = 1.47) were evaluated as more polite than emails written with -politeness (M = 4.22, SD = 1.50). Apparent sender did not have a significant effect on politeness (F (1, 116) < 1). The interaction between politeness level and apparent sender turned out to be non-significant (F (1,116) < 1).

Personality

Table 8 shows the results for the evaluation of the personality dimensions in function of politeness level and apparent sender.

Table 8 Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for the evaluation of personality dimensions (competence, power, agreeableness) in function of politeness level and apparent sender (1 = not competent at all, very low in power, not agreeable at all, 7 = very competent, very high in power, very agreeable)

	competence	power	agreeableness	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	n
+politeness				
L1 sender	4.34 (1.15)	4.65 (1.30)	3.13 (1.29)	30
L2 sender	4.34 (0.89)	3.68 (1.53)	3.88 (1.16)	30
total	4.34 (1.02)	4.17 (1.49)	3.51 (1.27)	60
-politeness				
L1 sender	4.08 (0.63)	4.93 (1.48)	3.13 (1.10)	30
L2 sender	4.14 (0.99)	5.02 (1.16)	3.20 (1.34)	30
total	4.11 (0.82)	4.98 (1.32)	3.17 (1.22)	60

total

L1 sender	4.21 (0.93)	4.79 (1.39)	3.13 (1.19)	60
L2 sender	4.24 (.94)	4.35 (1.50)	3.54 (1.29)	60

Two-way ANOVAs with politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) and apparent sender (L1/L2) as independent variables showed that apparent sender did not have a significant main effect on participants' evaluations of sender's competence (F (1, 116) < 1), agreeableness (F (1, 116) = 3.29, p = .072) or power (F (1, 116) = 3.10, p = .081). Politeness level did not have a significant main effect on participants' evaluation of sender's competence (F (1, 116) = 1.88, p = .173) or agreeableness (F (1, 116) = 2.30, p = .132). Politeness level did have a significant main effect on participants' evaluation of sender's power (F (1, 116) = 10.39, p = .002). Irrespective of their L1, senders of -politeness emails (M = 4.98, SD = 1.32) were evaluated as being higher in power than senders of +politeness emails (M = 4.17, SD = 1.49). However, the interaction effect between politeness level and apparent sender was also statistically significant for power (F (1, 116) = 4.38, p = .039). To disentangle the significant interaction, separate anovas were carried out for L1 and L2 speakers. The one-way ANOVA for L2 speakers only with as between subject factor politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) for power showed a significant main effect of politeness level (F (1, 58) = 14.53, p < .001). L2 senders of -politeness emails (M = 5.02, SD = 1.16) were evaluated as being higher in power than L2 senders of +politeness emails (M = 3.68, SD = 1.53). There was no difference between the two levels of politeness for L1 senders (F (1, 58) < 1). The significant interaction was therefore due to politeness level only having an effect on emails written by L2 speakers and not on emails written by L1 speakers. The interaction effect between politeness level and apparent sender for competence and agreeableness were both not statistically significant (F's (1, 116) < 1).

Willingness to comply

Table 9 shows the results for participants' willingness to comply with the requests in function of politeness level and apparent sender.

Table 9 Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for willingness to comply in function of politeness level and apparent sender (1 = very low willingness, 7 = very high willingness)

	willingness to comply	
	M (*SD*)	*n*
+politeness		
L1 sender	3.99 (1.67)	30
L2 sender	4.01 (0.93)	30
total	4.00 (1.34)	60
-politeness		
L1 sender	3.66 (1.17)	30
L2 sender	3.98 (1.42)	30
total	3.82 (1.32)	60
total		
L1 sender	3.82 (1.44)	60
L2 sender	3.99 (1.19)	60

A two-way analysis of variance with politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) and apparent sender (L1/L2) as independent variables showed that politeness level did not have a significant main effect on participants' willingness to comply with the requests (F (1, 116) < 1). Apparent sender also did not have a significant main effect on participants' willingness to

comply with the requests (F (1, 116) < 1). The interaction effect between politeness level and apparent sender was not statistically significant (F (1, 16) < 1).

Request imposition

Table 10 shows the results for the evaluation of request imposition in function of politeness level and apparent sender.

Table 10 Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for the evaluation of request imposition in function of politeness level and apparent sender (1 = very low imposition, 7 = very high imposition)

	request imposition	
	M (*SD*)	*n*
+politeness		
L1 sender	4.00 (1.89)	30
L2 sender	3.20 (1.88)	30
total	3.60 (1.92)	60
-politeness		
L1 sender	4.23 (1.81)	30
L2 sender	3.73 (1.51)	30
total	3.98 (1.67)	60
total		
L1 sender	4.12 (1.84)	60
L2 sender	3.47 (1.71)	60

A two-way analysis of variance with politeness level (+politeness/-politeness) and apparent sender (L1/L2) as independent variables showed that politeness level did not have a

significant main effect on participants' evaluation of the requests' imposition (F (1, 116) = 1.39, p = .241). Apparent sender did have a significant main effect on participants' evaluation of the requests' imposition (F (1, 116) = 4.00, p = .048). Irrespective of the politeness level employed, requests made by L1 speakers (M = 4.12, SD = 1.84) were evaluated as more imposing than those made by L2 speakers (M = 3.47, SD = 1.71). The interaction effect between politeness level and apparent sender was not statistically significant (F (1, 16) < 1).

English language proficiency as predictor of evaluations

Six multiple regression analyses showed that the two variables, 'LexTALE score' and 'self-assessed proficiency' entered in the model could not explain the variance in the evaluation of email politeness, personality of the sender (competence, agreeableness, power), reader's willingness to comply with requests and perceived request imposition (all F's < 1). Neither LexTALE nor self-assessed proficiency were significant predictors of any of the six outcome variables (p's > .318).

Results summary

The first impressions of emails sent by L1 speakers mentioned the email's directness more often than those sent by L2 speakers. Emails in which the requests included a higher level of politeness modification were evaluated as more polite than those in which the requests included a lower level of politeness modification, regardless of the apparent sender of the email. Level of politeness modification did not affect participants' judgements of the sender's competence or agreeableness, but a higher level of politeness modification negatively affected participants' evaluations of the sender's power if the sender was believed to be an L2 speaker of English. No effect was found of level of politeness on the willingness of participants to comply with the requests, or on participants' evaluation of the requests' imposition. The requests in the emails that were apparently sent by L1 speakers were evaluated as more imposing than those same requests made by L2 speakers. English language proficiency (both

self-assessed and LexTALE score) did not appear to have any effects on the evaluations of the emails and senders.

Conclusion and Discussion

Effects of politeness modification

The purpose of the first research question was to examine the effects of politeness modification on how emails and senders of emails are perceived by Dutch L2 speakers of English. Previous research (e.g. Carrell & Konneker, 1981; Fraser, Rintell & Walters, 1980; Tanaka & Kawade, 1982) indicated that L2 speakers generally, despite not being able to produce the same 'appropriate' modifications, are able to recognize different levels of politeness in English. It was therefore hypothesized that for Dutch L2 speakers of English too, differences in politeness modification would affect perceptions of the email and its sender. The results of this study indicate that Dutch L2 speakers of English indeed perceive emails with a higher level of politeness modification as more polite than emails with a lower level of politeness modification, providing partial support for H1 that requests made with a higher level of politeness modification would be evaluated more positively with regard to email politeness, personality of the sender (competence, agreeableness, power), reader's willingness to comply with requests and perceived request imposition than requests made with a lower level of politeness modification.

Hendriks (2010) demonstrated that underuse of elaborate politeness modification reflected in negative evaluations of the non-native speaker with regard to their personality. It was therefore hypothesized that a higher level of politeness modification would result in more positive evaluations regarding the sender's personality (in this case the sender's competence, agreeableness, and power). The experiment yielded mixed results. Contrary to findings by Hendriks (2010), who found that senders of emails containing more elaborate politeness modification were evaluated as more agreeable than senders of emails containing a lower

level of politeness modification, no differences were found as to how participants judged the sender's agreeableness based on level of politeness modification in the present study. Neither were any differences found as to how participants judged the sender's competence based on level of politeness modification. However the sender of an email with a higher level of politeness modification was judged as being lower in power (i.e. judged more positively) than if the email was written with a lower level of politeness modification, but only if the sender was believed to be an L2 speaker of English. No such difference was found for L1 senders. This result provides additional support for H1 that requests made with a higher level of politeness modification would be evaluated more positively than requests made with a lower level of politeness modification.

Turning to LET (Brown & Levinson, 1987) may offer a partial explanation for the result showing that a higher level of politeness modification negatively affected participants' evaluations of the sender's power if the sender was believed to be an L2 speaker of English. Participants may have had lower initial expectations of the L2 sender. If this sender exceeded those expectations by employing a high level of politeness in the email, he or she would be judged more positively (i.e. overly positively) compared to an L1 sender of whom expectations were already high. LET cannot explain however why this was only the case for power while the other personality dimensions (agreeableness and competence) did not yield similar results. A possible explanation may be found in another result regarding the perceived imposition of the requests: Regardless of the politeness level employed, requests made by L1 speakers were evaluated as more imposing than those made by L2 speakers. In investigating the broader social psychological mechanisms that underlie L2 speaker evaluations of L1 speakers, Ryan (1983) argues that during L2-L1 communication a form of linguistic insecurity is often present in the L2 speaker, who may be concerned that not having a perfect grasp of the L1 language negatively affects the way they are perceived by the L1 speaker. One

possible explanation for these results is that such linguistic insecurity was to some degree present in the L2 participants in this experiment, which may have translated into feeling intimidated by L1 speakers who seemingly did have a perfect grasp of the language, overriding the use of politeness modifications by these L1 speakers. This could explain why L1 senders are perceived as being fairly high in power, and their requests are perceived as more imposing, irrespective of the level of politeness used in the requests.

Participants' willingness to comply with the requests and the perceived imposition of the requests were not affected by politeness modification, adding no support for H1 that requests made with a higher level of politeness modification would be evaluated more positively than requests made with a lower level of politeness modification. The results of this study therefore do not support suggestions by Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) that persuasive messages failing to convey a certain level of politeness can be less successful. A possible explanation could be that participants were asked to assume the role of manager of a large multinational. It would make sense that a manager would comply with these requests simply because they felt it is their job, regardless of how they personally feel about the submitter of the requests, or the way in which requests were formulated.

Effects of language expectancies

The purpose of the second research question was to see whether language expectancies would influence perceptions. In other words, the purpose was to see whether the same exact email would be evaluated differently if the sender was believed to be a native English speaker or a non-native English speaker. As mentioned, the results indicated that regardless of politeness level, requests by L1 speakers were perceived as more imposing, which gives partial support for H2a that L2 senders would be judged more positively with regard to email politeness, personality (competence, agreeableness, power), willingness to comply with requests and request imposition than L1 senders of the same emails. No support was found for H2c that L2

senders of emails with a higher level of politeness modification would be judged overly positively compared to L1 senders of the exact same email. On purely theoretical grounds, L2 speakers who have low initial expectations of another L2 speaker would judge this speaker overly positively if he or she exceeds these expectations when using a high level of politeness. It might be the case that participants did not have such low expectations of L2 speakers after all, so the positive violations of language expectancies were not as strong. One explanation could be that the sender was introduced as a manager of a large multinational. Based on those credentials, it could be that participants assumed this individual was competent regardless of their L1. This is supported by the fact that the personality dimension 'competence' was also unaffected by apparent sender.

The results did not support H2b that L1 senders of emails with a lower level of politeness modification would be judged overly negatively compared to L2 senders of the exact same emails. Similar to the positive violations, it could be the case that negative violations of language expectancies were also not strong enough to have an effect. Hypothesis H2b was partly based on findings by Vignovic and Thompson (2010) who found that some negative attributions could stem from etiquette violations such as overly short messages and a lack of conversational tone. Participants may have felt that even the emails with –politeness, although less polite, did not deviate from any etiquette norms. Participants' first impressions indeed indicated that some Dutch speakers actually prefer short and direct messages, which supports this explanation.

Effects of language proficiency

The purpose of the third research question was to see whether language proficiency could predict participants' evaluations of the emails. It is likely that a low level of English proficiency would mean that the politeness manipulations would be largely overlooked. However, the results suggest that neither self-assessed proficiency nor actual proficiency

predicted the evaluations of the emails or its senders. A plausible explanation might be the high average LexTALE scores. Participants scored an average of 77% correct, which, according to Lemhöfer & Broersma (2012), translates into an upper intermediate level of English (only 3% away from an advanced level of English). This indicates that participants generally had a high level of English proficiency and were therefore proficient enough to be sensitive to politeness modification, which is supported by the fact that participants judged +politeness emails as more polite than –politeness emails.

Email directness

The open-ended question about participants' first impression of the email showed that the most common sentiment was related to the directness of the email. Further analysis revealed that, perhaps surprisingly, the level of politeness did not predict whether the first impression indicated that the email was direct or not. One explanation could be that for the purpose of this study, even the email with +politeness was scripted in such a way that it included as little 'filler' information as possible as to make the politeness modifications more prominent. This may have been perceived by some participants as a 'direct' way of writing an email. Apparent sender did prove to be a significant predictor: Regardless of politeness level employed, the first impression of participants who read an email sent by an L1 speaker reacted to the email's directness more often than participants who read an email sent by an L2 speaker. This would suggest that the directness of the request strategy is more salient when the request is made by a native English speaker. This is in line with other results in which the apparent L1 sender proved to be a significant predictor of perceived power and request imposition.

The first impressions furthermore revealed that participants had mixed feelings about whether 'directness' in email communication was seen as positive or negative. To illustrate: one participant remarked on the -politeness email from an L2 sender: "Vrij direct en efficiënt, op z'n Nederlands"("Quite direct and efficient, the Dutch way"), while another participant

commented on the same email "Te direct, onbeleefd en onoverzichtelijk" ("too direct, impolite and unclear"). Whereas studies by Vignovic & Thompson (2010) and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) found that short, direct messages lacking a certain conversational tone are considered inappropriate by native English speakers, the first impressions suggest that this is not always the case for native Dutch speakers. It could be the case that some Dutch speakers, more often than native English speakers, expect and prefer a higher level of directness from other Dutch conversational partners. However, no statistical analyses were performed to confirm the assumptions related to the preferred level of directness, so this part of the conclusion should be interpreted with caution.

Limitations

The present study had some limitations. Although care was taken to construct email scripts that were as neutral and non-coercive as possible as to keep the focus on the modification of the requests, the open-ended question revealed that some participants focussed more on the credibility of the imagined situation than on politeness modification. For example, some participants expressed their doubt whether financial information should be put on a company website. Others commented on the lack of an introduction of the sender, or the fact that the sender asked the receiver to comply with the requests on the same day. This may have affected subsequent evaluations of the email and the apparent sender, irrespective of politeness level or the sender's apparent L1.

Another potential limitation is that participants were selected on the basis of their educational level, and not necessarily on the basis of having a background in business or communications. This may negatively affect how generalizable the results of this study are in an actual business context. Future research employing a similar method could construct an email with a more plausible script regarding the nature of the requests, so participants do not

get distracted from the relevant manipulations. It would also be best if participants with actual experience in (cross-cultural) business communications were selected for future experiments.

Contributions to theory

This study combined theories of both politeness and language expectancies and in doing so offered new insights from the perspective of L2-L2 and L1-L2 communication and provided a much needed contemporary study using the LET framework. The results of this study imply that, even though politeness in professional communication can affect evaluations of a sender by L2 speakers of English, some evaluations may be based entirely on the native language of the sender. A sender's apparent non-nativeness alone appears to offer some benefits during L2-L2 communication, which may be due to lower initial expectations a receiver might have of a L2 conversational partner, but perhaps also because this takes away some linguistic insecurities the receiver might have when conversing with an L1 speaker. These results furthermore suggest that L2 senders, even more so than L1 senders, can benefit from employing a higher level of politeness modification in their requests. In addition, this study adds Dutch L2 speakers of English to the list of L2 speakers (see Carrell & Konneker, 1981; Fraser, Rintell & Walters, 1980; Tanaka & Kawade, 1982) who appear to be sensitive to politeness modification and can differentiate between different levels of politeness.

Practical implications

This study offers some practical implications for Dutch L2 individuals who work in corporations using English as a lingua franca. The results suggest that people being more polite in their email communications can leave a more positive first impression regarding their personality. Corporate communications training could for example teach how L2 employees can formulate polite requests in English. Also, if a first impression has to be made, it can be beneficial for people to somehow hint at their non-nativeness when making their introduction. These results imply that colleagues are just as willing to comply with polite requests as they

are with less-polite requests. If it is not a priority to come across as a sympathetic colleague, then using a lower level of politeness modification in requests is just as effective as using a higher level of politeness. However, by using relatively simple politeness modifications, L2 senders can appear to be lower in power, meaning they will be regarded more positively by other L2 receivers.

Suggestions for future research

Future replications of this study should consider directly comparing perceptions of L1 and L2 speakers in how they evaluate L2 speech, instead of focussing on perceptions of only one group of speakers. It would be insightful to discover how L2 speakers of English differ from L1 speakers in terms of language expectancies, for instance the expected level of directness.

If English continues to be widely used as a lingua franca in multinational corporations, it would make sense to investigate perceptions and evaluations of a wide range of different L2 speakers. Replications of this study could for example investigate how L2 speakers of English with different L1's are perceived by L1 speakers with different L1's other than English.

Similarly to the present study's question about participants' first impression, additional open-ended question regarding participants' actual linguistic insecurities and language expectancies of L1 and L2 conversational partners would be very illuminating as well, and could provide evidence for some of the possible explanations offered in the present study.

The present study furthermore involved participants with a fairly high level of English language proficiency. It is understandable that many people, Dutch or otherwise, who work in corporations that use English as a lingua franca, are not as proficient as the participants in the present study. Future research should therefore also compare whether receivers with a lower level of English proficiency evaluate emails differently from receivers with better English language proficiency.

References

Ayers J. W. (2010). Measuring English proficiency and language preference: Are self-reports

valid? *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(8), 1364–1367.

doi:10.2105/AJPH.2010.194167

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2005). Communication topics and strategies in e-mail consultation:

Comparison between American and international university students. *Language*

Learning & Technology: A Refereed Journal for Second and Foreign Language

Educators, 9(2), 24-46.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests*

and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgoon, M., Denning, V., & Umphrey, L. (2002). Language expectancy theory. In J. Dillard,

& M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Theory and practice.* (1st ed.). Sherman

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J., & Doran, P. (1983). Friendly or unfriendly persuasion. The effects

of violations of expectations by males and females. *Human Communication Research*,

10 (2), 283-294. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1983.tb00018.x.

Burgoon, M., & Miller, G. R. (1985). An expectancy interpretation of language and

persuasion. In H.Giles & R. N.St. Clair (Eds.), *Recent advances in language*

communication and social psychology (pp. 199–229). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carrell, P., & Konneker, B. (1981). Politeness: Comparing native and nonnative judgements.

Language Learning, 31, 17-30.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2011). "Please answer me as soon as possible": Pragmatic

    failure in non-native speakers' e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics,*

    43(13), 3193-3215.

Fraser, B., Rintell, E., & Walters, J. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the

    acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In D. Larsen-Freeman

    (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 75-91). Rowley, MA:

    Newbury House.

Gass, S., & Neu, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Speech acts across cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hemmes, E. (1994). English language competence: Whose business is it? In B. Hendriks & S.

    Wyler (Eds), *Language needs in business, the 18th annual symposium of the*

    international association language and business (pp. 213–219). Nijmegen: Nijmegen

    University Press.

Hendriks, B. (2002). *More on Dutch English . . . please? A study of request performance by*

    Dutch native speakers, English native speakers and Dutch learners of English.

    Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.

Hendriks, B. (2008). Dutch English requests: A study of request performance by Dutch

    learners of English. In M. Pütz & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds), *Developing*

    Contrastive Pragmatics. Interlanguage and Cross-Cultural Perspectives (Vol. 31)

    (pp. 331–350). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hendriks, B. (2010). An experimental study of native speaker perceptions of non-native

    request modification in e-mails in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 7*(2), 221-255.

Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid lexical test

    for advanced learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods, 44*, 325-343.

Nickerson, C. (2000). *Playing the corporate language game: An investigation of the genres and discourse strategies in English used by Dutch writers working in multinational corporations*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Ryan, E. (1983). Social psychological mechanisms underlying native speaker evaluations of non-native speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5(2), 148-159. doi:10.1017/S0272263100004824

Sisko Maarit Lipiäinen, H., Ensio Karjaluoto, H., & Nevalainen, M. (2014). Digital channels in the internal communication of a multinational corporation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 19*(3), 275-286. doi:10.1108/CCIJ-07-2012-0050

Tanaka, S., & Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 18-33.

Onna, B. van, & Jansen, C. (2006). How multilingual are the Dutch really? On proficiency in Dutch, English, French, and German in Dutch organizations. *Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures, New Series 4*. 169–180.

Vignovic, J. A., & Thompson, L. F. (2010). Computer-mediated cross-cultural collaboration: Attributing communication errors to the person versus the situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 265-276.

Appendix A

Survey Introduction and Email (Different Versions)

De volgende e-mail is verkregen uit de interne communicatie van een grote multinational, Delta-Management. De voertaal binnen Delta-Management is Engels: Het is hier gebruikelijk dat er in het Engels wordt gecommuniceerd met collega's uit zowel het buitenland als uit het eigen land.

Stel je de volgende situatie voor:

Je neemt de rol aan van Sam Willemse. Je bent manager bij de financiële afdeling van het Amsterdamse kantoor van Delta-Management. Als financieel manager heb je regelmatig contact met collega's van andere kantoren in binnen-en buitenland. Je hebt zojuist een e-mail ontvangen van je **[Nederlandse/Britse]** collega Robin **[de Jonge/Young]**, de nieuwe communicatiemanager van het kantoor in **[Eindhoven/Londen]**. Robin is verantwoordelijk voor de Delta-Management website.

Dit is de eerste keer dat jullie contact hebben.
Ook zijn jullie als managers van jullie eigen afdeling gelijk in rang binnen het bedrijf.

Dit is de e-mail

_____

Date: Wed, 22 Nov 2018 09:40:12

From: **[R.deJonge/R.Young]**@deltaman.com

To: S.Willemse@deltaman.com

Subject: Check information

_____

Dear Sam,

As you might know, I am responsible for the website of Delta-Management. At the moment the website is undergoing a total revision and on the new website I would like to add a new page with financial information about the Delta-Management department in Amsterdam. **[I was wondering if you could/Can you]** send me the notes of last month's finance committee meeting? I would like to be sure that all the current financial information on the site is correct as well. **[I was wondering if you could/Can]** you check this webpage (see attachment) today and mail possible corrections and additions to me?

Kind regards,

Robin **[de Jonge/Young]**,

Delta-Management, Communications department

_____

Appendix B

Questionnaire for All Versions

Wat is je eerste indruk van deze e-mail?

_____

Geef je mening over de volgende stellingen:

	Zeer oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	Niet eens, niet oneens (4)	(5)	(6)	Zeer eens (7)
Deze e-mail is beleefd (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Het taalgebruik in deze e-mail is gepast (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Deze e-mail is direct (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

POLITENESS MODIFICATION AND LANGUAGE EXPECTANCIES

Geef je mening over de volgende stellingen:

	Zeer oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	Niet eens, niet oneens (4)	(5)	(6)	Zeer eens (7)
Deze collega is bazig (1)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is bekwaam (2)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is sympathiek (3)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is intelligent (4)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega heeft gezag (5)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is dominant (6)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is betrouwbaar (7)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega is tactvol (8)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Deze collega houdt rekening met anderen (9)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

POLITENESS MODIFICATION AND LANGUAGE EXPECTANCIES

Geef je mening over de volgende stellingen:

	Zeer oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	Niet eens, niet oneens (4)	(5)	(6)	Zeer eens (7)
Ik zou mijn best doen om de verzoeken van deze collega in te willigen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Deze collega heeft het recht om deze verzoeken te doen (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik voel me verplicht om deze verzoeken van deze collega in te willigen (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Dit zijn zware verzoeken (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Hoe beoordeel je je Engelse taalvaardigheid?

○ Slecht (1)

○ Redelijk (2)

○ Goed (3)

○ Erg goed (4)

○ Uitstekend (5)

_____

Om dit onderzoek af te sluiten volgt hierna nog een korte test om je Engelse taalvaardigheid te testen.

Deze test bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials. Je krijgt steeds een letterreeks te zien. Jouw taak is om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als je denkt dat het een bestaand Engels woord is klik je op "**ja**", als je denkt dat het geen bestaand Engels woord is klik je op "**nee**". Als je er zeker van bent dat het woord bestaat, ook als je niet precies weet wat het betekent, mag je toch met "**ja**" antwoorden. Maar als je twijfelt of het wel een bestaand woord is, kies dan "**nee**".
In dit experiment wordt de Britse spelling aangehouden in plaats van de Amerikaanse spelling. Bijvoorbeeld: "realise" in plaats van "realize"; "colour" in plaats van "color", etcetera. Laat je hier niet door verwarren. deze test draait niet om het detecteren van deze subtiele verschillen.
Je hebt zoveel tijd als je wilt voor elke beslissing. Dit deel van het experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten. Als alles duidelijk is kun je het experiment nu starten

POLITENESS MODIFICATION AND LANGUAGE EXPECTANCIES

	Nee (1)	Ja (0)
platery (1)	○	○
denial (2)	○	○
generic (3)	○	○
mensible (4)	○	○
scornful (5)	○	○
stoutly (6)	○	○
ablaze (7)	○	○
kermshaw (8)	○	○
moonlit (9)	○	○
lofty (10)	○	○
hurricane (11)	○	○
flaw (12)	○	○
alberation (13)	○	○
unkempt (14)	○	○
breeding (15)	○	○
festivity (16)	○	○
screech (17)	○	○

savoury (18)   ○   ○

plaudate (19)   ○   ○   45

shin (20)   ○   ○

fluid (21)   ○   ○

spaunch (22)   ○   ○

allied (23)   ○   ○

slain (24)   ○   ○

recipient (25)   ○   ○

exprate (26)   ○   ○

eloquence (27)   ○   ○

cleanliness (28)   ○   ○

dispatch (29)   ○   ○

rebondicate (30)   ○   ○

ingenious (31)   ○   ○

bewitch (32)   ○   ○

skave (33)   ○   ○

plaintively (34)   ○   ○

kilp (35)   ○   ○

interfate (36)

hasty (37)

lengthy (38)

fray (39)

crumper (40)

upkeep (41)

majestic (42)

magrity (43)

nourishment (44)

abergy (45)

proom (46)

turmoil (47)

carbohydrate (48)

scholar (49)

turtle (50)

fellick (51)

destription (52)

cylinder (53)

censorship (54)   ○   ○

celestial (55)   ○   ○   47

rascal (56)   ○   ○

purrage (57)   ○   ○

pulsh (58)   ○   ○

muddy (59)   ○   ○

quirty (60)   ○   ○

pudour (61)   ○   ○

listless (62)   ○   ○

wrought (63)   ○   ○