

Lund University  
Centre for Languages and Literature  
Japanese

Bachelor's project  
Spring term 2012  
JAPK11

# The Polite Press Release

---

Politeness in English/Japanese press releases following the Deepwater Horizon  
oil spill and the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear accident

Johan Nordgren  
Supervisor – Lars Larm

## Abstract

This essay attempts to distinguish differences in politeness in Japanese and English press releases, with a specific focus on TEPCO and BP in the aftermath of their respective environmental disasters. Through the use of discourse analysis, PR theory and the Brown and Levinson politeness model I find that the Japanese press releases favour negative politeness, whereas the English favour positive politeness. After having accounted for the use of *keigo* in the Japanese press releases, it concludes that they are the more polite press releases. It further considers the potential impact of this on the perception of the business, suggesting several alternative outcomes.

**Keywords:** Japanese; English; Polite; Politeness; Face; PR; Business Relationships; Keigo; Press Release; Brown and Levinson; TEPCO; BP; Deepwater Horizon; Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill; Fukushima Daiichi; Great East Japan Earthquake

## Conventions

Japanese *hiragana*, *katakana* and *kanji* will be romanized according a modified Hepburn-system. (Shibatani, 1990) Japanese words will be italicised to distinguish them.

## Definitions

In this section I provide a list of terms, and corresponding definitions, that are used frequently, so as to provide the reader with a quick outline of the central concepts.

*Speaker* – The active part in a communicative act; the sender of a message.

*Addressee* – The passive part in a communicative act; the receiver of a message; the hearer.

*Face* – The public image of an individual or organisation; the way in which s/he or it wishes to be perceived by others.

*Negative Face* – The desire to not be imposed upon, not forced to do something: can be associated with individuality, individual freedom, cooperativeness, kindness, and flexibility.

*Positive Face* – The desire to be perceived by others in a positive manner: to find approval for ones actions, abilities and/or values.

*Face-threatening Act (FTA)* – A communicative act that threatens the face of either speaker or addressee, either by indicating that their opinions/values/abilities are less appreciated (threatening positive face) or imposing upon the freedom of action of the individual/organisation (threatening negative face).

*On Record Statements* – A statement that leaves no doubt as to its intent. It requires the use of politeness in order to reduce its effect as an FTA.

*Off Record Statements* – An ambiguous statement that leaves an exit for the speaker, which allows him/her to deny the perceived intent of the statement, should it be received badly by the addressee.

*Bald Expressions* – A Face-threatening act that is uttered without the use of politeness.

*Negative Politeness* – Politeness that is used to soften the effects of FTAs threatening negative face, either by creating a way out of the imposition, apologising for it or transferring face to the other part by indicating that something is owed in return.

*Positive Politeness* – Politeness that is used to soften the effects of FTAs threatening positive face, either by including the addressee in the speaker's group, thus indicating that the addressee is valued equally, or highlighting positive aspects in addition to the FTA.

*Power* – The relative power of the addressee in comparison to the speaker, i.e. whether the addressee is in a position advantageous (great power) or disadvantageous (low power) to the speaker.

*Social Distance* – The social distance between speaker and addressee, e.g. age, wealth, gender.

*Rating of Impositions* – The degree to which an act is considered to impose upon an individual, which may vary over time and/or region.

*Discourse* – The greater context of any language use, which includes language, but also time, place, actors, beliefs and more.

*Conversation* – A commonly known subject; a topic that most members of a society, or a narrower field, are familiar with, e.g. global warming or the financial crisis.

*Social Language* – The use of language to reinforce or enact an identity; a selection of linguistic forms which are used together in order to create an image; it can be described as a form of sub-language, unique to occupations, sub-cultural groups, ages, demographic groups etc.

*Intertextuality* – The allusion to other known texts or speech acts in order to create an association with the perceived values of that text/act.

*Relationship* – A sub-genre of PR theory, relationships are concerned with the multitude of relationships (continual exchanges) that form when consumers interact with an organisation, through its members.

*PR* – It is the organisational practise of both managing and creating relationships with the external world.

## Contents

Abstract .....	i
Conventions.....	ii
Definitions.....	ii
Contents.....	iv
1 Introduction .....	- 1 -
1.1 Background.....	- 1 -
1.2 Historical background.....	- 3 -
1.2.1 BP.....	- 3 -
1.2.2 TEPCO.....	- 3 -
2 Method .....	- 4 -
2.1 Discourse analysis .....	- 4 -
2.1.1 Social Languages .....	- 4 -
2.1.2 Discourses .....	- 4 -
2.1.3 Intertextuality.....	- 5 -
2.1.4 Conversations.....	- 5 -
2.2 Theoretical concerns.....	- 5 -
2.3 Data selection .....	- 6 -
2.4 Methodological concerns.....	- 7 -
3 Theory .....	- 8 -
3.1 Politeness .....	- 8 -
3.1.1 The Brown and Levinson approach .....	- 8 -
3.1.2 Politeness in English and Japanese .....	- 12 -
3.1.3 Keigo.....	- 14 -
3.1.4 Criticism of Brown and Levinson.....	- 14 -
3.2 PR .....	- 16 -
4 Empirical Data.....	- 17 -
4.1 BP Press Releases .....	- 17 -
4.2 TEPCO Press Releases .....	- 19 -

5 Analysis .....	- 22 -
5.1 Discussion.....	- 26 -
6 References .....	- 28 -
6.1 Source material .....	- 29 -
Appendix .....	- 31 -
BP press releases .....	- 31 -
TEPCO Japanese press releases .....	- 43 -
TEPCO English press releases .....	- 56 -

# 1 Introduction

The purpose of this essay is to explore the linguistic differences of press releases in English and Japanese, focusing particularly on the aspect of politeness, and their potential effect on the perception of the business organisation. This will be done with an emphasis on BP and TEPCO, in the wake of their respective disasters.

## 1.1 Background

As society evolved over the years, it brought with it a multitude of changes to the business environment, and businesses either adapted or fell to the wayside. When competition grew fiercer it was no longer enough to simply speak with customers and society saw the birth of advertising. In this way businesses created a myriad of ways in which to communicate with customers, investors, governments, competitors and a whole slew of other external parties. Amongst these methods we find the press release, a tool that, for several reasons, is particularly interesting to those wishing to study a business.

The reason that the press release is set apart in this way is that it has the potential to function as an indicator of the business' culture and perception of self, if one accepts that internal factors might colour the choice of wording, disposition and such in a press release. Why a press release can serve in this way, better than other communicative tools, is due to it not being decidedly shaped to create or increase sales. Where the main goal of a marketing campaign is to generate revenue, the objective of a press release is primarily to disseminate information. As such it has a wider range in regards to target audience, not being specifically directed at consumers, as well as flexibility of purpose. A press release can further inform on a greater spectrum of topics, from financial statements and layoff announcements to new products and charity work.

A press release is also more likely to be created within the confines of the business itself, whereas marketing campaigns, for example, are often outsourced. In addition to this, a press release is often available on the business' website, thereby lessening the risk of it having been edited or filtered, as information found through third parties can be assumed to have been. It is of course reasonable to expect that all external business communication is carefully controlled by the business itself, yet this control can simply be viewed as another indicator of the internal workings of a business, rather than a filter for the same. As such, the press release presents a publically available view into the strategy, culture and self-perception of any

modern business organisation, making it a valuable tool in understanding the business organisation.

If the assumption is that wording and disposition in a press release are important factors in how the internal workings of an organisation manifests, then language immediately becomes a component to consider. Can the differing linguistic tools available to businesses using differing languages impact how these companies present themselves and their views? This is a question that is becoming more and more important as businesses increasingly act on a global scale, thereby working in several different languages, and/or language areas. The different properties of the world's languages reasonably allow for an alteration of the way in which a business is perceived, by itself and the outside world.

In the case of Japanese and English, the two chosen languages of this essay, one difference lies in the varying ability to express politeness. Where Japanese has a distinct system for honorifics and politeness, hereby referred to as *Keigo*, English does not have any counterpart. It then stands to reason that a press release in English may be linguistically less polite than a comparable one in Japanese, given the Japanese use of *Keigo*. Could this then affect the perception of the organisation, both internally and externally? Is an English speaking organisation inherently seen as less polite than a Japanese speaking equivalent, and is a Japanese organisation less polite in English than in its mother tongue?

There are several situations where a difference in politeness could affect the perception of an organisation, yet some circumstances lend themselves to such influence much more than others. Presenting a financial statement or a new product may not gain, nor lose, anything from a more, or less, polite press release, whereas how politely layoffs are announced may grossly impact the perception of both the organisation and the layoffs themselves. Continuing this reasoning one can surmise that the more impact the situation has on any interested party, the more impact the linguistic nuances will have on the reception of the press release. As such, it is logical to find the situation with the greatest influence in order to analyse the use of politeness. Environmental disasters impact a wide range of parties, from customers to governments, in a large way. This makes press releases concerned with environmental disasters ideal for the purposes of this essay. The two chosen businesses, British Petroleum and Tokyo Electric Power Company, were recently the centre of attention of the world's media due to each suffering a major environmental disaster.



## **1.2 Historical background**

### **1.2.1 BP**

On April 20, 2010 the BP controlled Deepwater Horizon drilling rig suffered an explosion, killing and injuring several workers and causing the largest marine oil spill in human history. The leak was not stopped until some three months later, on July 15, being permanently sealed on September 19. The oil spill covered large parts of the Gulf of Mexico, impacting the marine environment severely as well as the coastal and sea-bound industries in the surrounding areas. The disaster brought with it enormous financial costs and seems likely to have negatively affected the eco-system of the Gulf. During, and following, the disaster, the businesses involved have been under intense scrutiny from both media and government with BP eventually being held responsible for a part in the circumstances that eventually led to the disaster.

### **1.2.2 TEPCO**

On March 11, 2011 a magnitude 9.0 earthquake struck just off the coast of North-eastern Japan, causing a tsunami with waves as high as 40 meters to sweep across the eastern seaboard of Japan. In addition to killing and injuring tens of thousands and destroying homes and businesses the tsunami severely damaged the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant, operated by TEPCO. The damage sustained during the tsunami eventually led to a meltdown, causing a disaster akin to the Chernobyl accident of 1986. Over several weeks TEPCO worked to curtail the radiation leak, eventually succeeding in both halting the meltdown and sealing the plant. Consequences include a planned 40 year clean-up, multibillion costs, the area surrounding the plant becoming irradiated and a change in public opinion on nuclear power.

## **2 Method**

For the purpose of this essay there are several methodological factors to take into consideration. In the following section I intend to present these, and my reasoning behind the choices made, in an effort to increase the reliability of the analysis.

### **2.1 Discourse analysis**

In order to analyse the chosen data samples beyond simply noting the existence of polite expressions there is need for some sort of analytical system that works with a greater perspective. For this purpose I have chosen discourse analysis, a method that provides several tools to understand a text as a whole, a result of its constituents, rather than individual components. (Gee, 1999)

The chosen method of discourse analysis, for there are several, provides four overarching, as Gee (1999) refers to them, tools for understanding a text: Social Language, Discourses, Intertextuality and Conversations.

#### **2.1.1 Social Languages**

Social Languages is a term for the use of language to create, reinforce or re-enact identity. A social language is not a language in itself but rather a selection of the linguistic forms available within a language whose combined use serves to express, or reinforce, an identity. English, for example, is made up of hundreds of social languages: A lawyer may use a greater degree of formality in conjunction with a specific vocabulary to enact his/her role as a lawyer, whereas a teenager will most likely use a much lesser degree of formality and an entirely different vocabulary to enact his/her individual role. The lawyer uses a different vocabulary and speech pattern when conversing with his/her significant other than when conversing with the judge, separating a private identity from a workplace identity. This differing use of language exemplifies the distinction of social language and its use to express identity. (Gee, 1999)

#### **2.1.2 Discourses**

Discourses, used with a capital D to distinguish it from discourse in general, as described by Gee (1999), constitute not only the language used at any specific moment but also the greater context of its use. Discourses take into account time, place, symbolism, attitude and a multitude of other factors. The lawyer in the above section does not possess the identity of a lawyer simply by the use of a specific social language, but rather because the language is used in the court room; because the lawyer is wearing a suit; because s/he is presenting a certain

manner or attitude. All these factors constitute the Discourse, the greater identity-carrying function of that specific person, time and language. These factors also limit the use for Discourses as a tool during this analysis, seeing as how the written word carries much fewer of these elements.

### **2.1.3 Intertextuality**

Intertextuality touches upon the ability to refer to other texts or utterances during language use. Not necessarily limited to, but including direct quotations, intertextuality creates meaning by referencing other texts or social languages. The teenager in the above section borrowing from the lawyer's social language and yelling 'Objection!' or something similarly associated would constitute intertextuality. The use of references in this essay is another example, i.e. they either directly or indirectly refer to other texts. My use of intertextuality creates meaning by connecting with more established scientific texts and borrowing some of their associated credibility. (Gee, 1999) This way of alluding to other texts in order to create a sense of authority, or sincerity, becomes highly interesting when looking at press releases.

### **2.1.4 Conversations**

Conversations could in a way be said to be a more general form of intertextuality, no longer borrowing from specific texts or social languages but rather from commonly known subjects of "general societal discussion." (Gee, 1999, p. 49) They are the topics mostly everyone, or everyone within the concerned field, know about. Current global Conversations would perhaps be global warming, the financial crisis, nuclear power or the Arab Spring. As an example of an isolated Conversation we could perhaps have Chomskyan linguistics, then of course within the narrower field of linguistics.

## **2.2 Theoretical concerns**

The primary methodological factor to contemplate is the selection of theoretical material, since this affects the analysis greatly. With much of the theoretical material having been gathered either prior to or in the beginning of data collection there is an inherently deductive approach to the process. For the purposes of this essay the deductive approach does seem reasonable, as the purpose is to test the existence of an already known phenomena, thereby not suffering from the theoretical bias associated with a purely deductive methodology. In addition to this I have adopted an inductive approach during data collection, seeking out new theoretical material to better suit the empirical material as needed, or wanted. I believe that this dual perspective ensures a reasonable validity, as the risk of me either omitting important

theoretical material or forcing data into a prejudiced mould lessens with the increased flexibility. (Johannessen & Tufte, 2003)

Seeing as how the purpose of this essay can touch upon several scientific disciplines there is a point to be made on the choice of theoretical direction. The main focus of the essay is however on the distinctions between politeness in English and Japanese, which prompts the logical theoretical focus to be on linguistic politeness. Since the Japanese *keigo* is so great a part of what is considered Japanese politeness it stands to reason that a theoretical basis to understand it is necessary in an essay like this. This leaves two primary theories that are essential for the successful fulfilment of the essay's purpose: politeness and *keigo*.

Aside from the two primary theories there is one additional, supplemental, theoretical area that I utilize in order to shed more light on the press release as such, and the effect it has on the perception of an organisation. In order to do this I employ PR theory, both from a theoretical and a practical perspective. These theories emphasise the interaction between business and the external world.

The combination of theoretical perspectives that I have strived towards gives a broad view of both politeness and the press release, providing the needed inroads to a successful fulfilment of the purpose. The essay being grounded in a broad theoretical base also lends itself to a heightened validity.

### **2.3 Data selection**

The selection of data has, for the purposes of this essay, already been narrowed down by other choices made previously: first by limiting the available data to press releases, then constricting it to either English or Japanese, narrowing the focus to either BP or TEPCO and, lastly, the subject of their respective environmental disasters. Yet this still leaves a very large group to choose from, requiring another culling. For a press release to have validity in regards to this essay it must contain material that can be altered in regards to politeness, thereby excluding any and all base factual statements. By this I specifically mean the simple bullet list updates that TEPCO has issued concerning the status of its reactors.

Furthermore, the selected press releases should be spread over as wide a selection of topics as is possible within the confines of the other conditions. This for two reasons: firstly the change in material works to stave off routine during analysis, hopefully reducing the risk of having the analysis turn into simple indexing. (Johannessen & Tufte, 2003) Secondly, it ensures a

breadth of analysis and a better chance of illuminating politeness in accordance with the purpose.

Data selection and analysis takes a qualitative approach, with the methodology's ability to create depth a necessity if the essay is to explain effect rather than just existence. Additionally, a quantitative approach is unfeasible given the time constraints, as it would require codification and analysis of a much larger data set. Instead, a set of thirty press releases of varying length is more than reasonable to give a sufficient base for a qualitative analysis. (Johannessen & Tufte, 2003) These thirty will be divided as follows: ten from BP, in English; ten from TEPCO, in Japanese; ten from TEPCO, in English, and to as great a degree as possible corresponding to the ten Japanese TEPCO releases.

## **2.4 Methodological concerns**

There are two main methodological concerns to take into consideration whilst reading this essay, the first and foremost being my ability to analyse the discourse based nuances of the chosen languages. Not being a native speaker of either language, nor a resident of either of the affected countries, I am at a disadvantage as to my ability to find instances of: Intertextuality, since I may not be familiar with referenced texts; Conversations, since regional differences may affect which conversations are current, as well as their specifics. Use of informants could perhaps have remedied this shortcoming to a certain degree, but would have been an exhaustive task, requiring the informant to perform his/her own discourse analysis. As such I have decided to accept this potential weakness, having confidence that it will not greatly impact my analysis.

Secondly, in order to mitigate a disparity between my ability in Japanese and my ability in English that could otherwise have negatively impacted the reliability of the analysis I have paid particular attention to the Japanese text, elicited aid for particular passages, as well as used the corresponding English TEPCO releases as a tool for confirming my translations. Due to these countermeasures I feel that I have mitigated this potential weakness to such an extent that there is no longer a reason to question the validity of this essay based on my ability in the languages.

## 3 Theory

### 3.1 Politeness

#### 3.1.1 The Brown and Levinson approach

Politeness is a fluid concept, one that changes over both time and linguistic borders. A polite expression in one language may not be as polite, if polite at all, in another. Something that was considered polite fifty years ago may not be polite today. Even within the one language we can likely find dialectal differences,<sup>1</sup> specific nuances of politeness and situations where the same expression varies in politeness. Take for example the use of the English titular prefixes Sir, Madam, Mister, Miss and Misses, which were used much more frequently during the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. (Watts, 1992) They are however still used much more frequently than their Swedish counterparts, which no longer carry the same value of politeness. As an example of situational dependency we can take the prefix Madam, which when used to address a younger woman will take on an insulting, rather than polite, air.

In order to understand politeness there is need for three primary questions to be answered. These three being what actually constitutes politeness, how politeness is used and why it is used. Brown and Levinson (1987) outline a motive as to why politeness is used, namely the existence of what they call face.

Face is the amalgamation of all those things that an individual wishes to be associated with, whether they are specific political or religious values, skills, interests, physical attributes or other more esoteric ideals of honour and virtue. It is, simply put, the way in which a person wants to be perceived by the rest of society. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 61) define face as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself.” The authors then continue by defining face in terms of two separate components: negative face and positive face.

Negative face is described as the personal boundaries of the individual, or as Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 62) put it: “the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others.” This definition is perhaps a bit difficult to associate with the previous description of face, but if instead thought of in terms of individuality it makes sense. The degree in which an individual allows itself to be ordered, told, asked or convinced to do something connects with values such as cooperativeness, flexibility, kindness and many

---

<sup>1</sup> See Stewart (2005) for examples of this in British English, and the other chapters in the book for examples from other languages.

others more easily linked to the idea of face. Negative face illustrates another aspect of face that is touched upon, namely that face is a regionally differing phenomenon, where some aspects of face will be more or less important depending on the culture or the situation. A very distinctive example of this is individuality, which for example differs greatly between the U.S.A. and Japan.

Brown and Levinson (1987) present a complex reasoning for their definition of positive face, a reasoning that I have summarised in the following way, considering this as an adequate representation of their concept: positive face is the desire to be perceived by others in a positive manner. In essence, positive face is concerned with the need for approval of one's actions. Take for example the lawyer from some paragraphs previous: s/he most likely wishes to be perceived as competent, wishes his/her actions in the courtroom to be accepted and appreciated by society or, more pertinently, the current conversational partner.

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 61) further describe face as "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced." This statement provides an additional clarification of the nature of face. It is something that is important to the individual, who has a personal stake in their own face. Additionally, it is a concept requiring, but also vulnerable to effort. The effort that face demands is to be seen from a perspective of social contact, since it is in the meetings between individuals that face is either reinforced or unmade. It is also within this interaction that Brown and Levinson (1987) see the motives behind politeness. They reason that every individual wants to maintain their own face and also that the individual is aware that others wish for the same. There exists, therefore, a mutual understanding or agreement within society regarding face, which has all individuals cooperating in order to keep their respective faces. This is perhaps aptly described with a likeness to the concept of mutually assured destruction, where the one part will retaliate immediately should the other attack, ensuring that both would lose face and thereby creating a balance where neither party acts against the other.

The risk to face that necessitates this balance comes in the form of face-threatening acts, hereby referred to as FTAs: acts of communication, spoken or otherwise, that encroach upon face. FTAs can take a multitude of forms, provoking either the negative or positive face of either the speaker or the addressee. Giving someone an order intrudes upon their negative face, as does asking for a favour: the addressee is forced to either perform the request or decline, which can bring with it consequences for face, with the addressee perhaps being seen as uncooperative or unkind. As such there is a covert pressure to accept, limiting the individual's

freedom. The speaker could also simply perform an act, even unbidden, on the behalf of the addressee, creating a debt of gratitude towards the speaker that impacts negative face in much the same way. (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

Acts that would impact positive face instead would be the speaker disagreeing with the addressee's opinions or discussing an aspect of the addressee in a negative manner. Boasting, criticism, impertinence or other traditionally rude behaviours fit within this category. The previous example of using Madam toward a younger woman is a good example of a positive FTA, as this puts one or more of her aspects (e.g. youth, appearance, behaviour) in a negative or doubtful light.

FTAs can also damage the face of the speaker rather than the addressee: in cases where the addressee expresses thanks or willingness to comply, thereby humbling the speaker and creating an expectation of reciprocity or a debt of gratitude, impacting the negative face of the speaker. The speaker expressing guilt or taking responsibility for an action, even the avoidance of an action, acknowledges a fault on the part of the speaker and damages his/her positive face. (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

Brown and Levinson (1987) further provide three dimensions that affect how face is built and threatened in a global context. These are *Social Distance*, *Power* and *Ranking of Impositions*. Social distance is a factor that incorporates the familiarity of the individuals involved in the communicative act, i.e. their relative positions in age and status. E.g. an older, educated, wealthy woman and a younger, untrained, poor man have a great social distance, whereas two younger men in the same neighbourhood have a smaller social distance. Previous interaction between two socially distant parties may close this distance, allowing the older woman and younger man to be socially close, provided that they have met and spoken several times.

Power is a relative aspect that belongs to one part, for the purposes of Brown and Levinson's reasoning the addressee of the communicative act, stemming from either formal or informal authority. In the case of the Japanese business environment a manager will possess a great deal of power due to his/her formal position in the company. As addressee his/her relative power is great; as speaker the addressee's relative power is diminutive.

The ranking of impositions is according to Brown and Levinson (1987) a culturally specific factor concerned with the degree to which differing impositions are considered to encroach upon an individual. Asking to borrow money from a friend, as an example, may be a much greater imposition in some countries than in others. These three factors thereby alter the



severity of FTAs, depending on the cultural context of the conversation in question. These factors are, by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 76), assembled into the following formula, illustrating the effect they have on the severity of any given FTA<sup>2</sup>:  $W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$

The existence of face and FTAs, in addition with the fluctuating risk they entail, provides the motive for politeness: It is impossible to entirely avoid FTAs, since that would entail never asking for favours nor being asked for favours, with both acceptance and denial of a request constituting an FTA. Instead, in order to protect one's face and, by mutual need, the face of others from FTAs one employs politeness, so as to soften the effect of FTAs. (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

There are however a few communicative choices to take into consideration before treating the use of politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe several steps to the communicative process, beginning with the choice of whether or not to employ an FTA. Once it is certain that the act will be face-threatening the speaker has the choice of either going on or off record with his/her statement. On record is defined as clearly stating the intention behind whatever is said, for example overtly asking for something or telling something. An on record statement leaves no doubt as to what the speaker means or wants. Off record is on the other hand a concept where the intention of a statement is unclear or ambiguous. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 212) exemplify the use of metaphor, irony, understatements and hints as off record statements. The key aspect of an off record statement is that the speaker has one or more escape routes in being able to deny the perceived intent of a statement. As an example, consider the following situation: The speaker is hungry, and coincidentally sitting next to a friend in possession of some sort of foodstuff. The speaker utters the following: 'Man, I'm hungry! I should've had breakfast.' The intention is, subtle or not, to elicit some edibles from the friend. It does however leave room to explain it away as a simple exclamation, a statement of fact, should the friend take offence at the attack on his/her negative face (being potentially forced to give up some of his/her food, or be seen as cheap). Since an off record statement leaves room to salvage an otherwise FTA, it requires no use of politeness. It is therefore only on record utterances that require a choice of whether to use politeness or not. However, an off record statement is not an impolite statement; rather being the opposite, since it mitigates any threats to face by providing an out; it does simply not require the use of any specific tools of

---

<sup>2</sup> W=Weightiness of x; x=FTA; D=Social Distance; P=Power; R=Ranking of x; S=Speaker; H=Hearer (Addressee)

politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) do however make the argument that some off record statements can, although ambiguous by nature, become on record if the context leaves little room for interpretation.

An on record statement can either be softened by the use of politeness or uttered baldly, as Brown and Levinson (1987) define it. Bald statements do not necessarily have to constitute a risk to face, for either party. In situations where urgency or need for efficiency supersedes the desire to maintain one's face the use of bald expressions is generally accepted. Take for example an emergency, with paramedics and police; in such a situation few see the need to bother with saving face. Additionally, should one part of the communicative act have vastly greater power than the other, that part may use bald expressions without fear for his/her own face. The Japanese business environment again serves as an excellent example, with managers free to address their employees without honorifics, perhaps even with diminutives.

Once the decision is made to employ politeness, rather than a bald expression, there is a distinction between negative and positive politeness based on which face is threatened. Negative politeness is primarily concerned with creating a situation where the addressee is given either a possible escape, somewhat akin to off record expressions, or has his/her negative face compensated by apologies or other similar mechanisms for transferring face (the addressee has already lost face via the FTA and the speaker reimburses this loss by losing some face itself). Another example of negative politeness that Brown and Levinson (1987) make is that of passives, which "distance [the actors] from the act." Positive politeness, instead, focuses on including the addressee in the speaker's group, thereby associating the addressee with values the speaker finds appealing, or minimizing the face-threatening act by putting a positive light on other aspects of the addressee's face, e.g. "I really do enjoy these cupcakes, but the topping is a bit sweet" rather than "this topping is too sweet."

### **3.1.2 Politeness in English and Japanese**

When discussing politeness in English it is necessary to take the existence of both British and American English into consideration, to say nothing of the multitude of English versions that can be found around the globe. Stewart (2005) focuses on British English, establishing a few features that distinguish it. She comes to the conclusion that speakers of British English are inclined to focus more on negative politeness and off record statements than other strategies. Stewart further notes a tendency to avoid bald statements even when the situation poses little threat to face, instead using some form of politeness. Additionally she indicates that British English favours the use of the Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 145) strategy of hedging:

introducing an element, often an adverb, to an utterance that serves to make the statement less certain. E.g. “It is” could be hedged to become “It would seem to be.” Brown and Levinson (1987) propose that the Japanese sentence-final particle of *ne* acts as a hedge, with this hedging role sometimes filled by other sentence-final particles.

Ide et al. (1992) discovered that speakers of American English and Japanese, respectively, have a differing impression of the concept politeness. Allowing speakers of the particular languages to associate phrases with relevant adjectives they were able to show that speakers of American English associate the word ‘polite’ closely with the word ‘friendly,’ drawing the conclusion that these two concepts are somewhat interchangeable. Japanese speakers on the other hand found these to be separate, with the authors arguing that this difference in conceptualization might point towards a cultural aspect that needs to be taken into account when discussing politeness.

A further distinction between English and Japanese politeness is the existence of the Japanese honorific system, collectively referred to as *keigo*. As Coulmas (1992) explains: the use of *keigo* is widespread and inherent to the linguistic construction of Japanese, with specific grammatical functions for politeness, the particulars of which will be discussed in a later section. Coulmas provides two examples of the degree to which *keigo* permeates Japanese society: First is the case of one man beating a colleague to death on their way home from a bar after having been referred to with the *-kun* suffix. (1992, p. 299) Secondly is the transcript of the final moments of a Japanese flight crew as their plane is about to crash into a mountain. Even in an emergency situation the crew continues to use *keigo* as appropriate, the captain using base forms and the flight engineer instead using much more polite forms. (1992, p. 303) This speaks to the all-pervasive nature of *keigo*.

A secondary aspect of *keigo* is that all users of Japanese must continually assess certain conditions, in order to correctly use the different forms of *keigo*. Ide and Yoshida (1999) denote this function as *wakimae*. *Wakimae* is the individual heeding their place relative to others, in a social context. This includes such factors as the type of relationship between the speaker and those spoken to, their age, gender, status, power, profession and the situation in itself. In a strict sense it is the speaker conforming to societal norms. Mizutani (1981, p. 123) exemplifies this by saying that:

*While it is usual to call one’s subordinates Yamada-san or Ito-kun, it is difficult to call a superior [...] Yamada-san. In exceptional cases [...] when an underling is close in age to*

*the superior, it is possible. However, in most cases, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to call a section or division chief by name.*

In addition to the aspects of what to say, which form to use, Ide and Yoshida (1999, p. 455) point out that it is also a question of whether to speak at all: “Students in a seminar in a university keep listening to the professor without uttering a word until the professor yields the floor to the students.”

### 3.1.3 Keigo

The system of *keigo* can be divided into three subcategories depending on their individual function: *sonkeigo*, *kenjōgo* and *teineigo*. *Sonkeigo* is a higher level of politeness that acts on a speaker-referent level, often referred to as ‘respect’ language. I.e. *sonkeigo* elevates the person either spoken to or about. *Kenjōgo*, also a higher level of politeness acting on the speaker-referent level, instead serves to humble the speaker (thereby elevating the referent). *Teineigo*, however, acts on a speaker-addressee level by showing politeness towards the addressee. (Shibatani, 1990) Both *sonkeigo* and *kenjōgo* are characterized by a purpose-specific lexical differentiation, in addition to specific prefixes and/or suffixes. *Teineigo* is characterized by the copula (*desu*) and the inflection of verbs (*masu*-form).<sup>3</sup> Worth noting is that the dictionary forms of both copula and verbs are not included in the concept of *keigo* but have bearing on the concept of politeness, expressing familiarity and both a low social distance as well as a low power difference.

How the different subcategories of *keigo* relate to the use of negative and positive face is likely dependent on the communicational context. E.g. the humbling effect of a *kenjōgo* statement can work both toward negative face by apologizing for an inconvenience, as well as positive face by putting the addressee in a superior position, thus appeasing ego and creating the sense that the speaker thinks highly of the addressee (i.e. sees him/her in a positive light).

### 3.1.4 Criticism of Brown and Levinson

There are three main critiques of the Brown and Levinson approach to politeness that are pertinent in regards to this essay. There are, firstly, voices that claim that the model is dependent on an unreasonably, even impossibly rational speaker that carefully considers each step of the process before ending up with an utterance: “FTA or not? Well then, on record it is; what’s next?” In addition, this perceived rigidity precludes the choice of more than one

---

<sup>3</sup> For a more in depth explanation of *keigo* and the grammatical realisation of the concept I refer you to the *Nihongo Hyakka Daijiten* (Kindaiti, Hayasi, & Sibata, 1988) or one amongst the multitude of other books on the subject, instructional as well as descriptive.

strategy for any given statement. (Watts, 2003) This criticism is then compounded, in the case of Japanese, by the distinction between *wakimae* and volition. Volition, in contrast to the involuntary *wakimae*, is instead the intentional use of politeness: the ability of the individual to choose whether to be polite or not. (Ide & Yoshida, 1999).

With the supposed focus on choice and rationality (volition) Matsumoto, as referenced by Usami (2002), suggests that the approach does not take the honorific aspects of Japanese into sufficient consideration. She proposes that speakers of Japanese use, and must use, honorifics even in cases where there is no FTA in the utterance, whereas speakers of English can utter non-FTA statements freely, making the Brown and Levinson model inapplicable in regards to the Japanese language. Usami (2002), however, argues that the aspects of social distance, power and ranking of impositions can explain this discrepancy. In a Japanese setting the three social dimensions can be weighted stronger than in a comparable situation in English, resulting in a higher threat from an FTA and thereby demanding a higher level of politeness. This reasoning becomes even more plausible if one postulates that no utterance can have a 0 value for the aspect of  $W_x$ , and instead consider non-FTA statements to simply approach 0, thus negating the need for any politeness. Usami (2002) does nonetheless concede that Brown and Levinson could pay greater attention to the concept of *wakimae*.

Brown and Levinson comment on this branch of criticism in the introduction to their reissue, with a reference to a study of Japanese children, discovering that they

*used no referent honorifics, and only one used addressee honorifics (the desu/masu formal style), but all demonstrated the ability to use several degrees of politeness, constructed of things like tone of voice, sentence-final particles (hedges), and preference for agreement.*

(1987, p. 37)

This, they go on to suggest, indicates that the honorific system is not the only way of expressing politeness in Japanese and that there thereby exists a greater degree of volitional use of politeness than their critics maintain.

Matsumoto and others, again referenced in Usami (2002), also proclaim that the Brown and Levinson concepts of face and politeness are inherently westernized and thereby incompatible with similar Asian concepts of face and politeness. Usami (2002) disputes this, considering the critique of these concepts to be based on a misinterpretation of Brown and Levinson. She proposes that their original concepts are not cultural at the core and therefore allow for adaptation to any culture, even to collectivist cultures (the weight of individuality being one of the contested aspects) as those described in Watts (2003).

### 3.2 PR

The practice of Public Relations, PR for short, is a field that encompasses a cornucopia of definitions, concepts, models and theories. Long a practical and management oriented discipline; one of the many new directions that PR is heading towards is the concept of relationships. (Larsson, 2002) Seemingly an obvious part of PR it has, according to Larson, been neglected for much of the subjects history.

Relationships as defined by Larsson (2002) are mutual exchanges between two human parts, continually created within the social context. In the case of an organisation relationships can form with sales personnel and employed friends/family as easily as it can with a spokesperson, executive officer or advertising campaign (in which case the relationship would be with the person/people behind the campaign). Thus, any individual can have several relationships with an organisation that all intersperse, the resulting mixture becoming the individual's opinion of the organisation. (Larsson, 2002) PR, from the perspective of the organisation, then becomes the practice of creating and improving relationships with the outside world in order to augment an image/brand, something that can be achieved through the use of several different communication strategies. (Jonsson, 2002) Such communication strategies will aim to affect one or many of the following parameters, which Larsson (2002) suggests are relevant in discussing relationships: trust, commitment, investment, involvement, openness, control mutuality, satisfaction, commonality and benefit.

A press release is but one of many available communication strategies, yet it comes with its own set of conditions. Perhaps a throwback to the more practical era of PR, Jefkins (1985, pp. 89-91) prescribes a set of rules to maximise the potential of a press release, a selection of which state that: "Puffery must be avoided," "Never generalize" and "Dates. Be specific." Seen from a relationship perspective these rules would serve to affect qualities of trust, openness and satisfaction. Unnecessary, obscure and arrogant press releases could function to strain a relationship. For this reason it is paramount to carefully consider the phrasing and contents of a press release, in order to not detrimentally influence the business' relationships.

## 4 Empirical Data

Within this section I aim to provide a view of the textual data that serves as the basis for this essay, with focus towards patterns, recurring word choices and otherwise relevant aspects. All the press releases that constitute this empirical base are to be found in the appendix, both in order to ensure ease of access for the interested reader as well as to serve as an archive, since the businesses themselves are not required to store the originals. As they are publically accessible works intended for distribution I have found no reason not to include them.

The press releases are named as BP, TEPCOJP (releases in Japanese) and TEPCOEN (releases in English) with numbering according to chronological order. Henceforth I will refer to press releases by their lettering/numbering. In the case of Japanese examples a rough translation will be provided together with the example.

Worth noting is that many TEPCOJP releases correspond with, i.e. were released on the same date and deal with the same subject matter, TEPCOEN releases. The corresponding pairs are as follows: 1-1, 4-4, 5-5, 6-6, 7-7, 8-8, 9-9, and 10-10.

### 4.1 BP Press Releases

There are several significant tendencies to be found in BP's press releases. First and foremost, they tend to focus on illustrating the efforts on BP's part, as can be clearly seen in BP2 ("BP is assisting," "BP had also initiated" and "BP has mobilized"), BP4 and BP5.

Furthermore, these examples lean towards showcasing figures, as can be seen in BP2, where the sentence "BP has mobilized" continues with "a flotilla of vessels and resources that includes: [...] 32 spill response vessels [...] 500,000 feet of boom increasing to 1,000,000 feet of boom by days end." Another example of this is found in BP8: "Approximately 25,200 personnel, more than 2,600 vessels and dozens of aircraft." In addition to presenting actual numbers, BP press releases feature the use of powerful adjectives/expressions in concordance with descriptions of their efforts: "world-class facilities" (BP2), "We are doing absolutely everything" and "massive offshore operation." (BP4) Yet another instance of the apparent propensity for presenting numbers is seen when BP announces the costs of their efforts, in BP4 ("are costing [...] owners about \$6 million per day."), BP5 and BP8.

I have taken much of this use of exemplification to be what I refer to as assurances, i.e. intended to comfort/promise targets (of the press release) that BP is working/doing everything possible. Direct examples can be seen in BP2: "We are determined to do everything in our power." Another aspect of assurances, as I see it, is that there are several instances where BP

focuses on their acceptance of responsibilities, either alone or in contrast with the failure of others to do so, as in BP6: “Andarko [...] has announced it is refusing to accept responsibility for oil spill removal,” which is later followed by BP announcing that it “will not allow the allegations to diminish its commitment.” Thus BP assures the target audience that they are, and will continue to, put effort into resolving the situation.

There are several instances of hedging expressions, where things are “expected to take,” “expected to be ready” (BP4) and when the coastal regions in the path of the oil spill are referred to as “the potentially affected states.” (BP5) It is also possible to find use of passives in regards to the cause of the disaster, as in this passage from BP7 that deals with BP’s part in the accident, specifically in regards to pressure readings: “[they] were incorrectly accepted by BP and Transocean.” On the whole, the BP press releases are rife with what I denote as distancing, i.e. the use of hedging, passives, and pushing of blame on to others in order to lessen association with the disaster. Examples can be found easily in BP7: “No single factor caused the [...] tragedy,” “the Transocean rig crew failed to recognise and act,” “Multiple parties [...] were involved” and “[it] was a shared responsibility.” That BP on numerous occasions distances itself from complete responsibility (in the sense of guilt) becomes more noteworthy in the light of the following statements: “We are taking full responsibility for the spill” (BP5) and “BP has accepted its responsibility for responding to the spill.” (BP9)

There are three additional aspects of note, the first being the references to claims, i.e. compensation for damage suffered due to the disaster. BP refers to them as going to be “efficient and fair”, although also noting that they will only pay “legitimate claims.” Secondly, BP, on several occasions references the assistance they have received from external sources, as seen in the following examples: “BP, operating with” (BP3), “BP has called on” (BP5) and finally in BP8: “BP, the federal government scientific team and National Incident Commander.” These references all show BP in an active role, either cooperating equally or instigating the alliance. Finally there is an occurrence of intertextuality in BP4, which in this case references a famous speech by Sir Winston Churchill during World War II: “We are determined to fight this spill on all fronts, in the deep waters of the Gulf, in the shallow waters and, should it be necessary, on the shore.”



## 4.2 TEPCO Press Releases

TEPCO's press releases contain some of the same tendencies as BP's, more specifically those of assurances. TEPCO exemplifies their efforts in much the same way as BP, although somewhat less frequently. One example is found in TEPCOJP7 (concerning TEPCO workers assisting evacuees/emergency shelters):

*“Hinan kaishi chokugo yori hatsudenjo shoin-tō ga kaku hinansho e jōchū shi”* –  
Staff members were sent to shelters immediately after evacuation started.

Moreover, there is a frequent use of reassurances that they are doing their best/working continuously, with the use of *“torikunde mairimasu”* in both TEPCOJP3, 5, 7, 9 and 10. As exemplified by TEPCOJP5:

*“Jitai no shūsoku ni mukete zenryoku o agete torikunde mairimasu.”* – We will continue working with all our power towards the resolution of the situation.

There is also concordance to be found on the topics of claims and cooperation, although some differences that bear illumination do exist. Concerning the handling of claims TEPCO states the following, which roughly corresponds to BP's efficient and fair:

*“Higaisha no minasama ni taisuru kōsei katsu jinsokuna baishō no jissai ni tsutomete mairimasu.”* – We will endeavor to implement fair and prompt payment to all victims [of the disaster]. (TEPCOJP8)

TEPCO does however not refer to claims in terms of legitimacy. When referencing their cooperation with other organisations and/or government they use terms of receiving cooperation and/or working together, as in TEPCOJP3:

*“Kore made tōsha wa, hoka no denryokukaisha kara no ōen yūzū juden nado ni yori, denryoku no antei kyōkyū kakuho ni zenryoku de torikunde mairimashita”* –  
Due to receiving assistance from other power companies we have so far been able to work toward securing a stable power supply.

Aside from these slight commonalities there are major differences to be found in TEPCO's press releases. Firstly, TEPCO assumes responsibility and blame for the events, even though it was due to an unexpected natural disaster, as seen in the following example:

*“Watakushidomo to shimashite wa, kore made wagakuni ga keiken shita koto no nai, ōkibo jishin ni tomonau tsunami to itta shizen no kyōi ni yoru mono to wa ie, kono yōna jitai ni itatte shimatta koto wa tsūkon no kiwamidearimasu.”* – Even

though these events were caused by the natural threat of earthquakes and tsunami, the likes of which we have never seen before, we regret these events deeply.  
(TEPCOJP5)

In addition to accepting blame, TEPCO often apologises for the inconvenience and anxiety caused, with several press releases (5, 6, 8, 9 and 10) containing a similar phrasing to TEPCOJP5:

*“Hatsudesho no shūhen chiiki no minasama o hajime, kenmin no minasama, sarani hiroku shakai no minasama ni taihen'na goshinpai to gomeiwaku o okake shi, kokoro yori fukaku owabi mōshiagemasu.”* – To all those in the areas surrounding our power plants, the citizens of the prefecture and the greater society we again apologize most sincerely from the bottom of our hearts for the worry and inconvenience.

We also find an apology for the confusion caused by the claims process in TEPCOJP9:

*“Tadaina gomeiwaku ya konran o maneita koto o, awasete owabi mōshiagemasu.”*  
– We apologise for [the documents] having caused much confusion and inconvenience.

On two occasions, TEPCOJP6 and TEPCOJP10, TEPCO press releases contain passages in which prayers/thoughts go out to the deceased and to those otherwise affected by the disaster, as exemplified by:

*“Shinsai ni yori o nakunari ni nara reta katagata no go meifuku o oinori suruto tomoni, hisai sareta minasama ni kokoroyori o mimai mōshiagemasu.”* – I pray for the souls of all those who died as a result of the earthquake and sympathise deeply with the surviving victims of the disaster. (TEPCOJP 10)

There is a general propensity for asking customers to be patient, reduce electricity usage and otherwise assist TEPCO during the emergency, much done through the use of *kenjōgo*, as in this example from TEPCOJP2:

*“Okuyaku-sama o hajime hiroku shakai no minasama ni wa taihen gomeiwaku to go shinpai o o kakeshi, makotoni mōshiwakegozaimasen ga, denki no goshiyō o kyokuryoku o hikae itadakimasu yō onegai mōshiagemasu.”* – We apologise deeply for the increased worry and inconvenience that we cause both our customers and society but we humbly wish for you to reduce electricity usage.

The humble form permeates the texts, with several instances of the *kenjōgo*-specific *mairu*, *oru*, *itadaku*, *itasu*, *mōsu* and *mōshiageru*, as seen in the examples above. *Teineigo* is present both in usage of *desu/masu* form but also in the frequent usage of beautification-prefixes *go-* and *o-*, also found in the examples above. Use of *Sonkeigo* is limited, with the respectful form of dead, *o-nakunari ni naru*, used when referencing the deceased, as seen in the TEPCOJP10 example. It might also be pertinent to point out that the suffix *-sama* is used rather than *-san*, found amongst others in TEPCOJP8, as well as people being referred to with the more polite *katagata* (TEPCOJP10), rather than base forms.

Concerning TEPCO's English press releases, we can see many of the same inclinations as in the Japanese versions: Use of apologies, asking customers for patience, receiving support, and assurances all reoccur in the English press releases. We find, for obvious reasons, a lack of *keigo*, although some phrasings seemingly allude to the humility of *kenjōgo*: "We deeply apologize [...] for the great inconvenience and anxiety" (TEPCOEN 8) and "I must express my sincerest appreciation to all those [...] who provided much support and assistance to us during this time of tribulation." (TEPCOEN10) In addition there are instances of both passives and hedging, as seen in TEPCOEN4: "It was believed to be" and "it is estimated." Yet another example of both of these can be found in TEPCOEN8: "there have been no confirmed radioactivity impact to external environment." There are some expressions that indicate a perhaps direct translation, where the sentence is awkward in English, as in this example from TEPCOEN5: "We are taking this reality as an extreme regret, although it was caused by the marvels of nature such as tsunami due to large scale earthquake that we have never experienced before." There are several such instances where grammar, structure or semantics seem odd.

## 5 Analysis

Of primary concern for the ability to distinguish differences in politeness between English and Japanese is the use of *keigo*, since this phenomenon becomes a nigh insurmountable obstacle if considered as a tool for politeness on par with Brown and Levinson's (1987) models. Instead, taking into consideration the ubiquitous nature of *keigo* one could perhaps claim that the use of *keigo* is a base level of politeness, akin to normal English speech. I.e. since not using *keigo* for an otherwise non-face-threatening act would constitute an FTA (asking a superior if s/he would like some coffee is a non-FTA in English, but would in Japanese require the use of *keigo* lest it threaten the superior's negative face). Thus it can be construed that the use of *keigo* simply serves the function of approximating 0 for statements that without the presumably higher levels of D and P<sup>4</sup> of Japanese society would have been non-FTAs. Given such reasoning the concept of *wakimae* would then mean that this base level, or minimum requirement, varies according to the situational context and thereby accounting for the differing levels of *keigo*. It seems unreasonable to entirely discount *keigo* as politeness, especially given the potential for volitional use of non-required forms, but it does imply that the use of humble forms in TEPCOJP releases should not automatically be deemed super polite; or even polite at all.

Another necessary presumption for this analysis is that the Brown and Levinson (1987) concept of face can be applied to not only human beings but also business entities. Given the definition of face it seems a logical leap to consider that a business' image/brand could be seen as its face. It is what is both seen and known of a business, created by its actions and representatives, as well as being the result of the organisations efforts to communicate outwards. The organisations negative face would realistically be its freedom of action, i.e. lack of constraint and scrutiny by the media, government and public.

There is then need for a discussion on what constitutes the FTA in the current context, necessitating the use of politeness. BP and TEPCO are logically the speakers in this context, leaving the intended target as addressee. For our purposes we will consider society as addressee, since we cannot know if the press releases were specifically written for a narrower target audience. BP and TEPCO have not threatened society's negative face directly, but it could perhaps be construed that the respective disasters are, already performed, negative FTAs (in the sense that they severely limit the negative face of the affected areas, with long term environmental impact and sometimes to the extent of causing injury/death) and that BP

---

<sup>4</sup> I reiterate the Brown and Levinson (1987) formula:  $W_x = D(S,H) + P(H,S) + R_x$

and TEPCO are perceived as speakers of these acts. Furthermore, there is a negative face threat (from addressee to speaker) to BP and TEPCO in the societal pressure to alleviate their respective situations. When instead considering positive face one could conceive that by having part in these disasters the two companies have insinuated that those who trusted them; believed in them; allowed them to operate were mistaken and thereby less competent, thus perpetrating a positive FTA. In such a case the frequent assurances by both companies could serve as positive politeness, insinuating that the individual really was right to trust them by showing how reliable/diligent the company is.

BP especially uses this tactic, with a further focus on numbers to indicate just how much of an effort they are making. In addition, the use of both strong adjectives and intertextuality (associating with Churchill's speech and thereby alluding that the company is akin to a brave and tireless soldier fighting an enemy; a just battle) suggest that BP has a strong focus towards positive politeness. Instead of negative politeness BP frequently uses hedging and distancing to separate themselves from the negative FTA (the disaster), thereby lessening the damage to their positive face (and by extension the individuals positive face). With the exception of negative politeness BP show many of the signs of English politeness suggested by Stewart. (2005)

In concurrence with little or no use of hedging/distancing TEPCO's Japanese press releases are decidedly weighted towards negative politeness: they apologise frequently and for a variety of reasons; they accept the blame and responsibility for the disaster without question (even though it was caused by factors outside of their control); they express debts of gratitude both toward customers and cooperating partners. There is ground to reason that some of these apologies may indicate volitional use (and thereby actual politeness) rather than societal imperative, although this is of course culturally dependent (in this case on whether Japanese culture prescribes apologies of this type; in this situation).

Much of the same can be seen in TEPCO's English press releases, making them the perhaps most interesting, since they contain many more instances of linguistically polite expressions than the press releases from BP. Likely a result of translating *keigo* directly, the existence of these expressions (sincerely, humbly, deeply and so on) in addition to the preference towards negative politeness make TEPCO's English press releases significantly more polite than either of the two other categories. However, with the likeliness that this is the result of translation artefacts rather than volitional use, as indicated by the odd grammar, semantics and direct translations of *kenjōgo*, it is unreasonable to compare these with BP and TEPCOJP

press releases. Since even extremely polite English would not use these same techniques, to this extent, and the likely involuntary use is very much akin to the use of *keigo*, English TEPCO Press Releases cannot be measured in regards to politeness and are therefore of little interest in regards to the purpose of this essay. They do however provide an interesting insight into the differences between English and Japanese press releases, as well as the stylistic function of *keigo*.

For this particular situation, analysing politeness becomes a question of deciding how to weight positive politeness and face in comparison with negative politeness and face. Considering the nature of the supposed FTAs it would seem reasonable to propose that the negative FTA is more severe than the positive, what with it having grave consequences both for many people and over a long period of time. In light of this BP's use of distancing and hedging could perhaps even be construed as impolite. Their refusal to profess guilt, as illustrated by the following quote where they accept responsibility, not for the spill itself but only for responding to it: "BP has accepted its responsibility for responding to the spill" (BP9) could be a factor in creating the potential for misfire in BP's politeness strategy. As such, it stands to reason that TEPCO, although perhaps losing some positive face both for themselves and for their customers (they might instead gain this by showing actual accountability), has authored the more polite press releases.

If instead taking the perspective of Larsson's (2002) ten factors to the relationships of PR it is possible to interpret BP's lack of admission as a lack of openness in the relationship between BP and society, as well as negatively impacting the trust aspect (since it is likely that some already hold BP responsible and see this as them escaping/avoiding the truth). TEPCO instead gains on both of these aspects, in addition to pressing points of involvement and commonality with their references and prayers to the victims of the disaster (i.e. expressing that they both understand and share the relationship partners' feelings). Both of the companies emphasise their commitment with frequent assurances, again with BP as the more fervent user of this strategy. BP also plays on the aspect of investment by showcasing costs and numbers of everything they have put into the effort. Depending on the aforementioned issues with the trust aspect this investment focused strategy may backfire, should the public interpret it as BP attempting to buy their way out.

In regards to the three practical aspects presented by Jefkins (1985), neither of the companies follows his prescribed guidelines. BP's use of adjectives and other powerful expressions, for example, go against the "no puffery" rule. TEPCO expresses that they are taking all necessary

countermeasures, which can easily be interpreted as a generalisation. Neither company presents specific dates for all times; rather, they use vague terms of weeks or months. Given the nature of Jefkins' guidelines it seems unreasonable to ascribe much effect to whether they are followed or not, but perhaps the use of "puffery" on BP's part may affect aspects of trust and investment. For example, a flotilla seems a much greater investment than a specific number of boats and some strong adjectives may either be interpreted as either dependable or boastful.

As the two concepts of relationships and face both influence the public view of a business it seems reasonable that press releases have the potential to influence this perception, through the manipulation of relationships and/or face. In the case of TEPCO and BP it seems likely that the more polite TEPCO press releases will more positively influence the company's image than the somewhat ambiguous BP press releases. The influence of BP's press releases is to a greater extent dependent on external circumstances, such as the Conversations concerning the disaster. If the relevant Conversation is one of suspicion towards BP then their press releases will flounder to a greater extent than if it were one of trust and respect. In the same way, TEPCO may be influenced by a Conversation focusing on them covering up the severity of the disaster, which was a very hot topic during the weeks following the accident, with Japanese nationals turning to foreign news in order to get a truer or at least more nuanced picture of the events. Whether TEPCO were obfuscating the facts of the disaster or not is irrelevant. It is instead the spread of the Conversation that is interesting, which if extensive could negate the positive effect of TEPCO's politeness entirely. In addition to this, TEPCO may be affected by contemporary Conversations on, for example, nuclear power and environmental issues.

An additional factor that may influence both of the companies, but perhaps BP to a greater extent, is the legal framework of the country/countries affected by the disasters. Depending on the construction of these systems an admission of guilt could carry with it both legal and financial consequences, perhaps opening the business up to, for example, lawsuits or financial claims.

The above reasoning is of course entirely contingent on whether politeness in Japanese and English can be successfully compared, given the different connotations of the word politeness as shown by Ide et al. (1992) A further aspect that may have influenced the analysis is that of social language, a likely factor in the creation of press releases. External business communication carries certain connotations and it is reasonable that a particular social

language has formed around this field. Such a social language might contain specific leanings in regards to politeness, differing between English and Japanese that may have influenced the analysis in a non-discernible way.

In conclusion, given a strict set of stipulations that, amongst other things, discount much of the perceived politeness of *keigo* as simple societal imperative, a comparison between English and Japanese press releases becomes possible. There are apparent differences in use of positive and negative politeness, with the Japanese favouring of negative politeness leading to the conclusion that the Japanese press releases are more polite, even with consideration for the use of *keigo*. Both politeness strategies may influence the perception of the respective businesses, as well as allow external parties to glimpse their inner workings (by allowing a view of which aspects of face that the organisation prioritises).

## 5.1 Discussion

The concept of politeness is both interesting and, obviously, multifaceted. As such I believe that there are several aspects of this essay that could bear either expansion or further scrutiny. In regards to general politeness, and Asian politeness in particular, Watts, Ide, Usami and Matsumoto would all be well served with further exploration, especially in regards to their views of Brown and Levinson's models. There is also reason to consider a more thorough examination of the external factors of the two countries, both in regards to Conversations as well as legal, cultural and financial aspects, since all of these may affect politeness. Additionally, a more current and expansive view of PR theory would provide a better understanding of press releases and the work behind them.

In regards to source material one could either expand the spread of material, incorporating more press releases from BP and TEPCO, as well as adding additional sources. This would provide a stronger base for conclusions regarding English/Japanese politeness. Instead, one could also go into more detail with the already chosen press releases, perhaps delving into semantics and/or rhetoric.

Since much of the analysis hinges upon specific conditions an assessment of their reasonability would be beneficial to this essay. Particularly the viability of equating face with image/brand and the feasibility of discounting *keigo* as social imperative rather than politeness demand further attention.

As an expansion of the discourse analysis model, press releases could be examined more closely from the viewpoint of social languages, in order to discern any patterns or phenomena.



In regards to Discourses, which have not been touched upon here, one could perform a more exhaustive study of the companies themselves, so as to put a context with the press releases. I feel that Conversations are of particular interest, if one were to examine how the press releases and/or disasters have influenced existing Conversations. E.g. has the nuclear power Conversation become more negative to the power source since the disaster?

## 6 References

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness - Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1992). Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In S. Ide, R. J. Watts, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language - Studies in its History, Theory and Practice (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 59)* (pp. 299-323). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis - Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Ide, S., & Yoshida, M. (1999). Sociolinguistics: Honorifics and Gender Differences. In N. Tsujimura, *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics* (pp. 444-480). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Ide, S., Hill, B., Carnes, Y. M., Ogino, T., & Kawasaki, A. (1992). The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In S. Ide, R. J. Watts, & K. Ehlich (Eds.). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jenkins, F. (1985). Timing and Handling of Material. In W. Howard (Ed.), *The Practice of Public Relations* (pp. 86-104). London, UK: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Johannessen, A., & Tufte, P. A. (2003). *Introduktion till Samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Malmö: Liber AB.
- Jonsson, J. (2002). Strategier i public relations - dilemman och möjligheter. In L. Larsson (Ed.), *PR på svenska - Teori, strategi och kritisk analys* (pp. 131-152). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kindaiti, H., Hayasi, O., & Sibata, T. (Eds.). (1988). *Nihongo Hyakka Daijiten (An Encyclopaedia of the Japanese Language)*. Tokyo, Japan: Taishukan Publishing Company.
- Larsson, L. (2002). En publik relation - vad innebär det? In L. Larsson (Ed.). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Mizutani, O. (1981). *Japanese: The Spoken Language in Japanese Life*. Tokyo, JP: The Japanese Times Ltd.
- Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stewart, M. (2005). Politeness in Britain: 'It's Only a Suggestion...'. In L. Hickey, & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 116-129). Tonawanda, NY, USA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Usami, M. (2002). *Discourse Politeness in Japanese Conversation*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing Ltd.

Watts, R. J. (1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality. In S. Ide, R. J. Watts, & K. Ehlich (Eds.). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## 6.1 Source material

*BP*. Retrieved 05 13, 2012, from BP.com Press Archives:

(20100421) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7061458>

(20100422) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7061490>

(20100426) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7061537>

(20100430) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7061565>

(20100430) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7061712>

(20100618) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7062995>

(20100908) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7064893>

(20100919) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7065079>

(20110902) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7070802>

(20110914) <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7070986>

*TEPCOJP*. Retrieved 05 13, 2012, from TEPCO.co.jp Press Archives:

(20110311) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031102-j.html>

(20110312) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031212-j.html>

(20110313) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031315-j.html>

(20110314) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031407-j.html>

(20110318) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031812-j.html>

(20110318) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11031811-j.html>

(20110331) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11033108-j.html>

(20111003) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11100306-j.html>

(20111011) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/11101102-j.html>

(20120311) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/cc/press/2012/12031102-j.html>

*TEPCOEN*. Retrieved 05 13, 2012, from [TEPCO.co.jp](http://www.tepco.co.jp) Press Archives:

(20110311) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031101-e.html>

(20110311) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031104-e.html>

(20110312) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031225-e.html>

(20110314) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031401-e.html>

(20110318) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031808-e.html>

(20110318) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11031806-e.html>

(20110331) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11033107-e.html>

(20111003) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11100308-e.html>

(20111011) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/11101111-e.html>

(20120311) <http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/press/corp-com/release/2012/12031103-e.html>

## **Appendix**

### **BP press releases**

#### **BP1**

Release date: 21 April 2010

BP today offered its full support to drilling contractor Transocean Ltd. and its employees after fire caused Transocean's semisubmersible drilling rig Deepwater Horizon to be evacuated overnight, saying it stood ready to assist in any way in responding to the incident.

Group Chief Executive Tony Hayward said: "Our concern and thoughts are with the rig personnel and their families. We are also very focused on providing every possible assistance in the effort to deal with the consequences of the incident."

BP, which operates the licence on which Transocean's rig was drilling an exploration well, said it was working closely with Transocean and the U.S. Coast Guard, which is leading the emergency response, and had been offering its help - including logistical support.

Transocean reported the fire earlier today on the rig, located approximately 41 miles offshore Louisiana on Mississippi Canyon block 252, saying that a "substantial majority" of the 126 personnel on board were safe, but some crew members remained unaccounted for. A number of personnel were reported to be injured.

#### **BP2**

Release date: 22 April 2010

BP today activated an extensive oil spill response in the US Gulf of Mexico following the fire and subsequent sinking of the Transocean Deepwater Horizon drilling rig 130 miles south-east of New Orleans.

BP is assisting Transocean in an assessment of the well and subsea blow out preventer with remotely operated vehicles.

BP has also initiated a plan for the drilling of a relief well, if required. A nearby drilling rig will be used to drill the well. The rig is available to begin activity immediately.

BP has mobilized a flotilla of vessels and resources that includes: significant mechanical recovery capacity; 32 spill response vessels including a large storage barge; skimming capacity of more than 171,000 barrels per day, with more available if needed; offshore storage

capacity of 122,000 barrels and additional 175,000 barrels available and on standby; supplies of more than 100,000 gallons of dispersants and four aircraft ready to spray dispersant to the spill, and the pre-approval of the US Coast Guard to use them; 500,000 feet of boom increasing to 1,000,000 feet of boom by day's end; pre-planned forecasting of 48-hour spill trajectory which indicates spilled oil will remain well offshore during that period; pre-planned staging of resources for protection of environmentally sensitive areas.

"We are determined to do everything in our power to contain this oil spill and resolve the situation as rapidly, safely and effectively as possible," said Group Chief Executive Tony Hayward. "We have assembled and are now deploying world-class facilities, resources and expertise, and can call on more if needed. There should be no doubt of our resolve to limit the escape of oil and protect the marine and coastal environments from its effects."

As part of its planning and approval requirement prior to offshore activity, the area was evaluated for use of dispersants and the plans approved by the US Coast Guard which has now given the go-ahead for their use.

### **BP3**

Release date: 26 April 2010

BP is accelerating offshore oil recovery and continuing well control efforts in Mississippi Canyon Block 252 (MC252) following improvements in weather conditions in the Gulf of Mexico yesterday. "The safety of the people working offshore is our top priority and the improved weather has created better conditions for our response," said BP Group Chief Executive Tony Hayward. "This, combined with the light, thin oil we are dealing with has further increased our confidence that we can tackle this spill offshore."

BP, operating with the U.S. Coast Guard and other agencies, has launched its comprehensive, pre-approved oil spill response plan following the April 22 sinking of the Transocean Deepwater Horizon drilling rig 130 miles south-east of New Orleans.

According to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) experts participating in the spill response, the spill is "very thin" and consists of "97 per cent sheen."

In Houma, Louisiana where the field operations response is being coordinated, more than 1,000 personnel on and offshore are deployed to coordinate the oil spill response.

BP, as lease operator of MC252, also continues to work below the surface on Transocean's subsea equipment using remotely operated vehicles to monitor the Macondo/MC252 exploration well, and is working to activate the blow-out preventer.

The Transocean drilling rig Development Driller III will arrive on location today to drill the first of two relief wells to permanently secure the well. A second drilling rig, Transocean's Discoverer Enterprise, is en route.

#### **BP4**

Release date: 30 April 2010

BP announced today it has launched the next phase of its effort to contain and clean up the Gulf of Mexico oil spill, with a significant expansion of onshore preparations in case spilled oil should reach the coast.

The company is today ramping up preparations for a major protection and cleaning effort on the shorelines of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. To supplement its Houma, Louisiana incident command post, which oversees the offshore containment effort and onshore response in Louisiana, BP is now establishing a similar onshore incident command post in Mobile, Alabama to oversee the onshore response in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida.

Work will continue to complete installing marine protection booms along the coast. As well as 180,000 feet of boom already in the water, an additional 300,000 feet is staged or in the process of being deployed, with more on the way.

BP is mobilizing its full resources to fight the oil spill, which follows the sinking of the Transocean Deepwater Horizon drilling rig in the Mississippi Canyon 252 block. This includes efforts to stem the flow of oil into the water from the sub-sea well, to contain the spill offshore and to protect the Gulf coast.

"We are doing absolutely everything in our power to eliminate the source of the leak and contain the environmental impact of the spill. We are determined to fight this spill on all fronts, in the deep waters of the Gulf, in the shallow waters and, should it be necessary, on the shore," said BP Group Chief Executive Tony Hayward.

"In the past few days I have seen the full extent of BP's global resources and capability being brought to bear on this problem, and welcome the offers of further assistance we have had

from government agencies, oil companies and members of the public to defend the shoreline and fight this spill. We are determined to succeed."

The massive offshore operation that has been running for a week has been addressing the spill on the surface offshore, both by skimming and collecting oil and by applying dispersants. There is concern, however, that weather and current patterns will shift and move the sheen closer to shore or onshore in the coming days.

The new onshore activity is focussed on five locations in the potentially affected states: Venice, Louisiana; Pascagoula and Biloxi, Mississippi; Mobile, Alabama; and Pensacola, Florida. Staging posts are in place stocked with people and material, including about 100,000 feet of boom, to protect the shoreline in each area.

Each of the states has oil spill response plans already in place and trained community groups and volunteers will also be available to aid the response to the oil spill and deploy resources.

Parallel to these, BP is today setting up offices in each of these communities manned by company staff to provide information on what is happening, what is being done and any developments. These will connect with local government officials, community and other groups to provide information on developments.

To harness the many offers of help BP has received, these offices will also collect names of any people wanting to assist with the response, and will co-ordinate identification of activities with which untrained personnel may be able to assist.

These efforts are in addition to the ongoing work with Transocean, MMS, the US Coast Guard, and the other organizations within the Unified Command to do everything possible to stop the flow of oil on the sea bed.

Efforts to stem the flow of oil from the well, currently estimated at up to 5,000 barrels a day, are continuing with six remotely-operated vehicles (ROVs) continuing to attempt to activate the blow out preventer (BOP) on the sea bed.

By this weekend the Transocean Development Driller III is scheduled to spud a relief well intended to secure the existing well. Drilling of this well is expected to take two to three months.

Work is also continuing to produce a subsea collection system capable of operating in deep water to funnel leaking oil to the surface for treatment. This is expected to be ready for deployment in the next few weeks.



Preliminary estimates indicate that current efforts to contain the spill and secure the well are costing the MC252 owners about \$6 million per day. This figure is expected to rise as activity increases. It is too early to quantify other potential costs and liabilities associated with the incident.

## BP5

Release date: 30 April 2010

BP today continued to ramp up its response to the oil spill in the US Gulf of Mexico. Over 2,500 personnel are now involved in the response effort and well-advanced preparations are being made for a major protection and cleaning effort on the shorelines of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. A fourth onshore command centre, in Mobile, Alabama, opened yesterday.

"In the past few days I have seen the full extent of BP's global resources and capability being brought to bear on this problem, and welcome the offers of further assistance we have had from government agencies, oil companies and members of the public to defend the shoreline and fight this spill," said Tony Hayward, BP Group Chief Executive. "We will be judged by the success we have in dealing with this incident and we are determined to succeed."

Work is progressing to install marine protection booms along the coast. As well as almost 220,000 feet of boom already in the water, an additional 300,000 feet is staged or in the process of being deployed, with more on the way.

The onshore activity is focused on five locations in the potentially affected states: Venice, Louisiana; Pascagoula and Biloxi, Mississippi; Mobile, Alabama; and Pensacola, Florida. Staging posts are in place stocked with people and material, including about 100,000 feet of boom, to protect the shoreline in each area. In addition, a sixth staging post is now being set up in Port Sulphur, Louisiana.

Hayward added: "BP is fully committed to taking all possible steps to contain the spread of the oil spill. We are taking full responsibility for the spill and we will clean it up, and where people can present legitimate claims for damages we will honour them."

The oil spill follows the sinking of Transocean's drilling rig Deepwater Horizon in the Mississippi Canyon 252 block.

BP continues to attack the spill on many fronts – making continuing attempts to prevent oil escaping from the subsea well, 5,000 feet below the surface; collecting and separating the oil

which enters the water; deploying innovative technology to disperse the oil at its seabed source; and drilling a relief well to permanently isolate and secure the leaking well.

In parallel, at the surface, BP's response is expanding to mobilise shoreline protection teams and equipment, and numbers of community liaison staff, while planning for in-situ burning several miles offshore. BP has called on expertise from other companies including Exxon, Shell, Chevron and Anadarko to help it activate the blow out preventer, and to offer technical support on other aspects of the response.

Preliminary estimates indicate that current efforts to contain the spill and secure the well are costing the MC252 owners about \$6 million per day. This figure is expected to rise as activity increases.

## **BP6**

Release date: 18 June 2010

Today BP reiterated its pledge to clean up the oil and gas spill in the Gulf of Mexico and to pay all legitimate claims arising from the spill, even though another party already is disputing its responsibility for costs associated with the Deepwater Horizon incident and the resulting spill.

Anadarko Petroleum Corporation has announced it is refusing to accept responsibility for oil spill removal costs and damages, claiming that, under an exception to a joint operating agreement's cost and liability sharing provisions, BP Exploration & Production Inc. (BPXP) was "grossly negligent" or engaged in "willful misconduct" as operator for Mississippi Canyon, Block 252 (MC252).

BP strongly disagrees with these allegations and will not allow the allegations to diminish its commitment to the Gulf Coast region. "These allegations will neither distract the company's focus on stopping the leak nor alter our commitment to restore the Gulf coast," said BP's chief executive officer Tony Hayward. "Other parties besides BP may be responsible for costs and liabilities arising from the oil spill, and we expect those parties to live up to their obligations. But how the costs and liabilities are eventually allocated between various parties will not affect our unwavering pledge to step forward in the first instance to clean up the spill and pay all legitimate claims in an efficient and fair manner."

*Additional information*

BPXP and two other parties, including Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, co-own the leasehold interest in MC252 -- the origin of the oil and gas spill.

All the co-owners of the leasehold interest previously entered into a written operating agreement under which BPXP would act as “operator” and be responsible for conducting operations in MC252, but that the parties would share the costs of operations, including the cost to clean up any spill resulting from drilling the MC252 exploratory well, according to their respective ownership interests in MC252.

Further, all the co-owners of the leasehold interest filed documents with the U. S. federal government clearly certifying that each would be jointly and severally liable, together with any other responsible parties, for oil spill removal costs and damages in accordance with the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

## **BP7**

Release date: 08 September 2010

No single factor caused the Macondo well tragedy. Rather, a sequence of failures involving a number of different parties led to the explosion and fire which killed 11 people and caused widespread pollution in the Gulf of Mexico earlier this year.

A report released by BP today concludes that decisions made by “multiple companies and work teams” contributed to the accident which it says arose from “a complex and interlinked series of mechanical failures, human judgments, engineering design, operational implementation and team interfaces.”

The report – based on a four-month investigation led by Mark Bly, BP’s Head of Safety and Operations and conducted independently by a team of over 50 technical and other specialists drawn from inside BP and externally – found that:

The cement and shoe track barriers – and in particular the cement slurry that was used – at the bottom of the Macondo well failed to contain hydrocarbons within the reservoir, as they were designed to do, and allowed gas and liquids to flow up the production casing;

The results of the negative pressure test were incorrectly accepted by BP and Transocean, although well integrity had not been established;

Over a 40-minute period, the Transocean rig crew failed to recognise and act on the influx of hydrocarbons into the well until the hydrocarbons were in the riser and rapidly flowing to the surface;

After the well-flow reached the rig it was routed to a mud-gas separator, causing gas to be vented directly on to the rig rather than being diverted overboard;

The flow of gas into the engine rooms through the ventilation system created a potential for ignition which the rig's fire and gas system did not prevent;

Even after explosion and fire had disabled its crew-operated controls, the rig's blow-out preventer on the sea-bed should have activated automatically to seal the well. But it failed to operate, probably because critical components were not working.

Commenting on the report, which he commissioned immediately after the Macondo explosion, BP's outgoing chief executive Tony Hayward said: "The investigation report provides critical new information on the causes of this terrible accident. It is evident that a series of complex events, rather than a single mistake or failure, led to the tragedy. Multiple parties, including BP, Halliburton and Transocean, were involved.

"To put it simply, there was a bad cement job and a failure of the shoe track barrier at the bottom of the well, which let hydrocarbons from the reservoir into the production casing. The negative pressure test was accepted when it should not have been, there were failures in well control procedures and in the blow-out preventer; and the rig's fire and gas system did not prevent ignition. "Based on the report, it would appear unlikely that the well design contributed to the incident, as the investigation found that the hydrocarbons flowed up the production casing through the bottom of the well," Hayward said.

BP's incoming chief executive Bob Dudley said: "We have said from the beginning that the explosion on the Deepwater Horizon was a shared responsibility among many entities. This report makes that conclusion even clearer, presenting a detailed analysis of the facts and recommendations for improvement both for BP and the other parties involved. We have accepted all the recommendations and are examining how best to implement them across our drilling operations worldwide.

"This was a tragic accident that resulted in the loss of 11 lives and impacted the communities and the environment along the Gulf Coast region. We deeply regret this event. We have sought throughout to step up to our responsibilities. We are determined to learn the lessons for

the future and we will be undertaking a broad-scale review to further improve the safety of our operations. We will invest whatever it takes to achieve that. It will be incumbent on everyone at BP to embrace and implement the changes necessary to ensure that a tragedy like this can never happen again.”

Chairman of the Board Carl-Henric Svanberg commented: “I believe this report will be of significant value in helping the overall understanding of how this tragedy occurred. It is of the utmost importance to the Board to ensure that BP learns from this and further enhances the safety of its operations for the future.”

Based on its key findings, the investigation team has proposed a total of 25 recommendations designed to prevent a recurrence of such an accident. The recommendations are directed at strengthening assurance on blow-out preventers, well control, pressure-testing for well integrity, emergency systems, cement testing, rig audit and verification, and personnel competence.

The company said it expected a number of the investigation report’s findings to be considered relevant to the oil industry more generally and for some of the recommendations to be widely adopted.

BP said the report was based on information available to the investigating team. It noted that additional relevant information may be forthcoming, for example, when Halliburton’s samples of the cement used in the well are released for testing and when the rig’s blow-out preventer is fully examined now that it has been recovered from the sea-bed. There will also be additional information from the multiple ongoing US government investigations.

The investigation report is available online at [www.bp.com](http://www.bp.com), together with an accompanying video.

## **BP8**

Release date: 19 September 2010

HOUSTON - BP today confirmed that well kill operations on the MC252 well in the Gulf of Mexico are now complete, with both the casing and annulus of the well sealed by cement.

The MC252 well has been shut-in since July 15 and cementing operations in August, following the static kill, provided an effective cement plug in the well’s casing. The relief well drilled by the DDIII drilling rig intercepted the annulus of the MC252 well on September 15, followed by pumping of cement into the annulus on September 17. BP, the federal

government scientific team and the National Incident Commander have now concluded that these operations have also successfully sealed the annulus of the MC252 well.

“This is a significant milestone in the response to the Deepwater Horizon tragedy and is the final step in a complex and unprecedented subsea operation – finally confirming that this well no longer presents a threat to the Gulf of Mexico,” said Tony Hayward, BP group chief executive. “However, there is still more to be done. BP’s commitment to complete our work and restore the damage done to the Gulf of Mexico, the Gulf coast and the livelihoods of the people across the region remains unchanged.” BP will now proceed to complete the abandonment of the MC252 well, which includes removing portions of the casing and setting cement plugs. A similar plugging and abandonment of both relief wells will occur as well.

BP will also now begin the process of dismantling and recovering containment equipment and decontaminating vessels that were in position at the wellsite.

#### *Surface Spill Response*

Approximately 25,200 personnel, more than 2,600 vessels and dozens of aircraft remain engaged in the response effort.

No volumes of oily liquid have been recovered from the surface of the Gulf of Mexico since July 21 and the last controlled burn operation occurred on July 20. BP, as part of Unified Command, continues to conduct overflights and other reconnaissance to search for oil on the surface. At peak, approximately 3.5 million feet of containment boom was deployed in response to the oil spill. Currently 670,000 feet of containment boom remains deployed.

#### *Additional information*

On August 23 processing of claims from individuals and businesses related to the Deepwater Horizon incident transferred to the Gulf Coast Claims Facility (GCCF). To date, over 68,000 claims have been submitted to the GCCF, with over 19,000 claims totaling over \$240 million being paid, including a \$34.5 million fund for real estate brokers and agents. Prior to the transfer to the GCCF, BP had made 127,000 claims payments, totalling approximately \$399 million.

The cost of the response to September 17 amounts to approximately \$9.5 billion, including the cost of the spill response, containment, relief well drilling, static kill and cementing, grants to the Gulf states, claims paid and federal costs. On June 16, BP announced an agreed

package of measures, including the creation of a \$20 billion escrow account to satisfy certain obligations arising from the oil and gas spill.

## **BP9**

Release date: 02 September 2011

BP is aware of the claims filed against the company on 1 September 2011 by Halliburton. The company is now reviewing the contents of the claims and until this is complete cannot comment in detail. However, BP believes this lawsuit is the latest attempt by Halliburton to divert attention from its role in the Deepwater Horizon incident and its failure to meet its responsibilities, and to deflect all blame to BP. BP will vigorously contest the claims should they come to court.

BP has co-operated with the various investigation bodies, providing detailed information. Investigations published so far have concluded that multiple parties contributed to the incident, including Halliburton.

Multiple independent investigations have identified serious problems with the cementing of the well as a potential contributory factor to the Deepwater Horizon disaster – not only BP's own investigation.

BP has accepted its responsibility for responding to the spill and is accordingly paying costs and compensation. In contrast Halliburton has refused to accept any responsibility or accountability. As BP has said repeatedly, it expects other parties to accept their responsibilities and bear their share of the costs.

## **BP10**

Release date: 14 September 2011

BP agrees with the report's core conclusion consistent with every other official investigation that the Deepwater Horizon accident was the result of multiple causes, involving multiple parties, including Transocean and Halliburton.

From the outset, BP acknowledged its role in the accident and has taken concrete steps to further enhance safety and risk management throughout its global operations, including the implementation of new voluntary standards and practices in the Gulf of Mexico that exceed current regulatory requirements and strengthen the oversight of contractors.

We continue to encourage other parties to acknowledge their roles in the accident and make changes to help prevent similar accidents in the future.



## TEPCO Japanese press releases

### TEPCOJP1

#### 宮城県地震における当社設備への影響について【午後4時30分現在】

平成23年3月11  
日

東京電力株式会社

本日午後2時46分頃に宮城県で発生した地震による、当社設備への主な影響を以下の通りお知らせいたします。

#### ※下線部が新規事項

##### 【原子力発電所】

- ・福島第一原子力発電所 1～3号機 地震により停止（4～6号機は定期検査中）
- ・福島第二原子力発電所 1～4号機 地震により停止
- ・柏崎刈羽原子力発電所 1、5、6、7号機は通常運転中（2～4号機は定期検査中）

※なお、いずれの原子力発電所においても、放射線を監視している排気筒モニタの指示値は通常値と変わっておりません。すなわち、現時点において外部への放射能の影響は確認されておりません。

##### 【火力発電所】

- ・広野火力発電所 2、4号機 地震により停止
- ・常陸那珂火力発電所 1号機 地震により停止
- ・鹿島火力発電所 2、3、5、6号機 地震により停止
- ・千葉火力発電所 2号1軸 地震により停止
- ・横浜火力発電所 8号4軸 地震により停止
- ・大井火力発電所 2、3号機 地震により停止

- ・ 五井火力発電所 4号機 地震により停止

【水力発電所】

- ・ 福島県内 15 発電所、栃木県内 3 発電所、山梨県内 3 発電所、群馬県内 1 発電所が地震により停止

【流通設備等への影響】

- ・ 那珂変電所 地震により停止
- ・ 新茂木変電所 地震により停止

【当社サービスエリアにおける停電状況】

- ・ 約 405 万軒が停電中

【当社サービスエリアにおける電気の安定供給確保にむけた取り組み需給状況】

- ・ 新信濃変換所からの応援受電 60 万 kW
- ・ 佐久間変換所からの応援受電 30 万 kW
- ・ 東清水変換所からの応援受電 10 万 kW
- ・ 当社の電力設備が大きな被害を受けたことにより、今後の電気の供給力が不足する恐れがあります。お客さまにはご迷惑をおかけいたしますが、不要な照明や電気機器のご使用を控えていただくなど、節電へのご協力をお願いいたします。

【その他】

- ・ 切れた電線には絶対にさわらないでください。
- ・ 福島第二原子力発電所 1、2号機サービス建屋において一時的に火災（ボヤ）が発生していましたが、16時7分に鎮火を確認しております。

以 上

**TEPCOJP2**

契約にもとづく需要抑制と一層の節電のお願いについて

平成 23 年 3 月 12

日

東京電力株式会社

3 月 11 日に発生いたしました三陸沖を震源とする東北地方太平洋沖地震により、福島第一および第二原子力発電所をはじめ発電所および流通設備など当社設備が大きな影響を受けていることから、当社供給区域\*における電力需給が極めて厳しい状況になっております。

これまで当社は、新信濃変換所からの応援受電をはじめ他の電力会社からの応援融通受電などにより、電力の安定供給確保に全力で取り組んでおります。しかしながら、厳しい需給状況を踏まえ、あらかじめ操業の一部停止などのご契約をしている大口のお客さまの一部に対して、電気の使用を抑制していただくようお願いしてまいります。

お客さまをはじめ広く社会の皆さまには大変ご迷惑とご心配をお掛けし、誠に申し訳ございませんが、電気のご使用を極力お控えいただきますようお願い申し上げます。

\* 栃木県、群馬県、茨城県、埼玉県、千葉県、東京都、神奈川県、山梨県、静岡県  
(富士川以東)

以 上

### TEPCOJP3

需給逼迫による計画停電の実施と一層の節電のお願いについて

平成 23 年 3 月 13

日

東京電力株式会社

3 月 11 日に発生いたしました三陸沖を震源とする東北地方太平洋沖地震により、福島第一および第二原子力発電所をはじめ発電所および流通設備など当社設備が大

きな影響を受けていることから、当社供給区域における電力需給が極めて厳しい状況になっております。

これまで当社は、他の電力会社からの応援融通受電などにより、電力の安定供給確保に全力で取り組んでまいりました。また国からは、国民の皆さまや経済団体に向けて節電の要請をいただいているところです。

しかしながら、今後予想されます電気の使用量に対し、供給力が大変厳しい状況にあることを踏まえ、予見性ないまま大規模な停電に陥らないよう、明日以降は、計画的に停電をお願いさせていただきます。これまで停電回避に向け、全力で取り組んでまいりましたが、このような事態を招いてしまったことを、お客さまをはじめ広く社会の皆さまに大変ご迷惑とご心配をおかけし、誠に申し訳なく思っておりますが、当社としては、安定供給に向け早急、最大限の対策を講じることで、一日も早い復旧に取り組んでまいります。

#### ○3/14（月）につきまして

計画的な停電が予定される地域と時間帯は、以下（および別紙）の通りとなります。実際の停電時間は、各グループの時間帯のうち3時間程度になる予定です。

大変申し訳ございませんが、停電の対象となるお客さまにつきましては、お知らせしました停電予定時間に備えていただくとともに、そのほかの地域にお住まいのお客さまにつきましても、引き続き、不要な照明や電気機器のご使用を控えて頂きますよう、お願いいたします。

#### <計画停電の予定地域>

- 第1グループ 6：20～10：00 の時間帯のうち3時間程度
- 第2グループ 9：20～13：00 の時間帯のうち3時間程度
- 第3グループ 12：20～16：00 の時間帯のうち3時間程度
- 第4グループ 13：50～17：30 の時間帯のうち3時間程度
- 第5グループ 15：20～19：00 の時間帯のうち3時間程度

第1グループ 16:50～20:30 の時間帯のうち3時間程度

第2グループ 18:20～22:00 の時間帯のうち3時間程度

※グループ毎の具体的な地域については、別紙の通りとなります。

※グループ毎の時間帯は、開始・終了時間が多少前後することがあります。

※なお、当日の需給状況によっては、予めお知らせした時間以外にも停電する場合がございます。

#### 【その他】

- ・切れた電線には絶対にさわらないでください。
- ・火災防止のため、自宅を離れる際には、ドライヤーなどの電気機器のスイッチを入れたまま外出しないようお願いします。
- ・自家発をお持ちのお客さまにつきましては、燃料の確保等をお願いいたします。

#### <参考>

##### ○3月13日の需給予測

需要想定 3,700万kW (18時～19時)

供給力 3,700万kW

##### ○3月14日の需給予測

需要想定 4,100万kW (18時～19時)

供給力 3,100万kW

以上

#### TEPCOJP4

福島第一原子力発電所3号機付近での白煙発生について

平成 23 年 3 月 14

日

東京電力株式会社

本日午前 11 時 1 分頃、3 号機原子炉建屋で、大きな音が発生し、白煙が発生しました。水素爆発を起こした可能性が考えられます。

パラメータ上、原子炉格納容器の健全性は保たれていると考えておりますが、今後、プラントの状態、外部への放射能の影響などについては、現在調査中です。

プラントの作業員が負傷したことを確認しております。現在救急車を要請中です。

今後、関係機関と協調して、安全の確保に全力を尽くしてまいるとともに、引き続き周辺環境モニタリングを継続監視してまいります。

以 上

## TEPCOJP5

東北太平洋沖地震による福島第一原子力発電所および福島第二原子力発電所の事故・トラブルに対する I N E S（国際原子力・放射線事象評価尺度）の適用について

平成 23 年 3 月 18

日

東京電力株式会社

社長 清水 正孝

このたび東北太平洋沖地震による当社福島第一原子力発電所及び福島第二原子力発電所の事故・トラブルに対する I N E S（国際原子力・放射線事象評価尺度）の評価のなかで、福島第一原子力発電所 1～3 号機について「レベル 5」の適用がなされました。このことを極めて重く受け止めております。

発電所の周辺地域の皆さまをはじめ、県民の皆さま、さらに広く社会の皆さまに大変なご心配とご迷惑をおかけし、心より深くお詫び申し上げます。

私どもとしましては、これまで我が国が経験したことのない、大規模地震に伴う津波といった自然の脅威によるものとはいえ、このような事態に至ってしまったことは痛恨の極みであります。

今後とも、政府・関係各省庁、自治体のご支援とご協力を仰ぎながら、緊密に連携をはかりつつ、事態の収束に向けて全力を挙げて取り組んでまいります。

以 上

## TEPCOJP6

### 福島市への当社副社長およびJヴィレッジへの常務の駐在について

平成 23 年 3 月 18

日

東京電力株式会社

平成 23 年 3 月 11 日に発生した東北地方太平洋沖地震により、お亡くなりになられた方々のご冥福をお祈り申し上げますとともに、被害を受けられた皆さま、そのご家族に、心からお見舞いを申し上げます。

また、福島第一原子力発電所における事故、および、放射性物質の漏えいにより、発電所の周辺地域の皆さまをはじめ、県民の皆さま、さらに広く社会の皆さまに大変なご心配とご迷惑をおかけし、心より深くお詫び申し上げます。

当社は現在、国と合同で「東北地方太平洋沖地震統合対策本部」（本部長：菅直人[かん なおと] 内閣総理大臣）を設置して、事態の拡大防止および一日も早い設備の安全性の確保に向けて全力を挙げて取り組んでいるところでありますが、このたび、対応を強化することを目的として、平成 23 年 3 月 22 日より福島市に取締役副社長 鼓紀男[つづみ のりお]を、Jヴィレッジに常務取締役 小森明生[こもり あきお]を駐在させることといたしました。

鼓は、今回の福島第一原子力発電所の事故等に関して、立地地域をはじめ県民の皆さま方の声をお伺いするなどの活動を総括し、また小森は、事態の拡大防止およ

び一日も早い設備の安全性の確保に向け、福島第一、第二原子力発電所を総括いたします。

以 上

## TEPCOJP7

### 「福島原子力被災者支援対策本部」の設置について

平成 23 年 3 月 31

日

東京電力株式会社

当社は、東北地方太平洋沖地震による福島第一原子力発電所の事故等の影響により被災された地域および皆さまの支援に関する取り組みを強化するため、3月31日付けで社内組織の見直しを行いました。

#### ○「福島原子力被災者支援対策本部」の設置

社長直属の組織として「福島原子力被災者支援対策本部」を設置いたしました。

具体的には、東北地方太平洋沖地震発生後、福島第一原子力発電所の事故等の影響により避難指示の対象区域となる各自治体にお住まいの皆さまのお役に立ちたいとの思いから、避難開始直後より発電所所員等が各避難所へ常駐し、生活必需品をお届けしたり、当社全域から社員を派遣し、避難所における物資の積み降ろしをはじめとした様々なお手伝いを行うなどに努めておりますが、こうした取り組みのさらなる強化と地域復興を包括的に対応する機能を担う「福島原子力被災者支援対策本部」を新たに設置するものです。

また、同日付けで、当本部の下部組織として、現在の福島事務所の機能を強化・拡充する「福島地域支援室」を設置いたしました。

なお、3月29日に、政府原子力災害対策本部より「原子力被災者生活支援チーム」の設置が発表されましたが、当社といたしましても、「福島原子力被災者支援対策本部」を通じて、本支援チームと緊密に連携を図りながら、被災された地域および皆さまの生活支援等に誠意を持って取り組んでまいります。

以 上



## TEPCOJP8

### 東京電力に関する経営・財務調査委員会報告について

平成 23 年 10 月 3

日

東京電力株式会社

取締役社長 西澤 俊夫

このたびの当社福島第一原子力発電所の事故により、発電所周辺の皆さま、福島県民の皆さま、さらに広く社会の皆さまに大変なご迷惑とご心配をおかけしていることに対し、改めて心よりお詫び申し上げます。

本日、東京電力に関する経営・財務調査委員会の報告書が提出・公表されました。

委員の皆さま、タスクフォースの皆さまをはじめ関係者の皆さまには、当社の経営・財務状況に対する詳細な調査と精力的なご検討・ご議論を重ねていただきましたことに厚く御礼を申し上げます。

報告書には、当社にとって大変厳しい指摘事項が含まれているものと認識しておりますが、その内容を真摯に受け止め、今後、原子力損害賠償支援機構のご指導の下、共同で特別事業計画を作成し、経営の抜本的な効率化・合理化を進めるとともに、被害者の皆さまに対する公正かつ迅速な賠償の実施に努めてまいります。

以 上

## TEPCOJP9

### 原子力損害賠償請求手続の改善に向けた取り組みについて

平成 23 年 10 月 11

日

東京電力株式会社

当社福島第一原子力発電所および福島第二原子力発電所の事故（以下、「当社事故」）により、発電所周辺地域の皆さまをはじめ、広く社会の皆さまに大変なご迷惑とご心配をおかけしていることを、改めて心よりお詫び申し上げます。

当社は、現在、当社事故により被害を受けられた方々への、本賠償を鋭意進めておりますが、公正かつ遺漏なく賠償を行うためにご用意させていただいた「補償金ご請求書類（請求書用紙）」や「補償金ご請求のご案内（以下、「ご案内）」」などの書類が大部になりましたことにより、多大なご迷惑や混乱を招いたことを、あわせてお詫び申し上げます。

このたび、皆さまから頂戴いたしましたご意見・ご指摘などを踏まえ、以下のとおり、ご相談いただく上での簡易な補足資料「ご請求簡単ガイド」の配布、ならびに請求書の作成をお手伝いさせていただくサポート体制の強化など、ご請求手続きの改善を行いました。

当社は、既にご請求いただいております方々への本賠償のお支払いを10月5日より開始しておりますが、引き続き、被害を受けられた方々への賠償金のお支払いに、誠心誠意、取り組んでまいります。

### 1. ご請求簡単ガイドの配布（[別紙1](#)参照）

・「ご案内」などご請求に関する書類をお読みいただかなくても、ご請求対象となる損害項目を簡単にご確認いただく、簡易な補足資料「ご請求簡単ガイド」を、10月12日よりお送りさせていただきます。

・請求書のご記入方法がわからない方につきましては、「ご請求簡単ガイド」の確認内容をご覧ください、ご記入の上、当社にご連絡いただくことにより、ご説明、お手伝いなど、きめの細かいサポートを行ってまいります。

・なお、既にご請求いただいている方は、改めて「ご請求簡単ガイド」をご覧ください、必要はありません。

### 2. 請求書作成に向けたお手伝い・ご説明の強化（[別紙2](#)参照）

・ご要請をいただいた方への訪問によるご相談を実施いたします（当面はお出向きが難しい方を優先させていただきます）。

・説明会の開催、対面相談窓口の開設を引き続き、各地で行います。

### 3. ご請求者さまの実態に即した損害賠償の運用

・ご請求対象となる損害項目のうち、一定の項目につきましては、領収書をお持ちでない場合でも、ご事情をお聞かせいただいた上で、標準金額をお支払いいたします。なお、後日、標準金額を超える領収書をご提出いただいた場合には、精算の受付をさせていただきます。

・ご請求は、対象となる項目について一括でご請求する必要はなく、一部の項目のみでもお受けいたします。

・迅速なお支払いをさせていただくために、ご請求いただいた損害項目のうち、合意に至った項目の賠償金を先行してお支払いいたします（合意に至らない項目については、協議を継続させていただきます）。

・合意に至った項目でも、やむを得ないご事情によりご請求漏れなどがあった場合には、追加請求のご相談に応じさせていただきます。

・ご請求いただく賠償額がお支払い済みの仮払補償金の額に満たない場合には、その残額について、今回ご返金いただく必要はございません（次回以降のご請求の際に精算させていただきます）。

#### 4. 合意書の見直し（[別紙3](#)参照）

・「ご案内」に掲載した合意書見本における「一切の異議・追加の請求を申し立てることはありません」という表記は、いかなる場合でも追加のご請求ができないかのような誤解を招く表現となっておりますので、実際にご請求者さまにお送りする合意書用紙においては、当該部分を削除いたします。

なお、請求書用紙自体の見直しにつきましても検討をしてみましたがいりませんが、既に7,000件を超えるご記入済みの請求書をいただいていること、請求書用紙そのものを見直しますと、時間がかかり、迅速な賠償のお支払いに支障を来す可能性があることなどを考慮し、請求書用紙自体の見直しは行わないことといたしました。

また、当社社員がお手伝いさせていただくことによって、請求書へのご記入が進んでいる現状を踏まえ、上記の「ご請求簡単ガイド」を活用し、当社社員に

よる請求書へのご記入のお手伝いなどのサポート強化、運用面や合意書の見直しなどの改善策が、より迅速な賠償につながると考えました。

当社としては、ご請求者さまへの迅速かつ公正な賠償の実現に向け、10月下旬には全体で7,300人まで体制を強化して全力で取り組んでまいります。ご不明な点がございましたら、誠にお手数ですが、福島原子力補償相談室（コールセンター）へご連絡いただきますようお願い申し上げます。

-----  
福島原子力補償相談室（コールセンター）

電話番号：0120-926-404

受付時間：午前9時～午後9時  
-----

以 上

## TEPCOJP10

（コメント）当社福島第一原子力発電所の事故発生から1年にあたって

平成24年3月11

日

東京電力株式会社

取締役社長 西澤俊夫

東北地方太平洋沖地震の発生から1年にあたり、改めて、震災によりお亡くなりになられた方々のご冥福をお祈りするとともに、被災された皆さまに心よりお見舞い申し上げます。

当社福島第一原子力発電所の事故により、発電所周辺地域の皆さまをはじめ、福島県の皆さま、さらには広く社会の皆さまに、現在も大変なご迷惑とご心配をおかけしていることを、改めて心より深くお詫び申し上げます。

併せまして、事故発生以降この1年間、国内外を問わず、関係する数多くの皆さまに多大なるご協力とご支援をいただき、改めて心より深く感謝申し上げます。

当社は、責任の重さと果たすべき役割を常に意識し、福島第一原子力発電所の安定状態の維持、中長期にわたる廃止措置等への取り組みを、何よりも安全に十分配慮しながら確実に進めてまいります。そして、事故により被害にあわれた方々に寄り添った迅速・適切な賠償の実現に、当社グループを挙げて、真摯に取り組んでまいります。

3月11日という日を、当社グループ社員一人ひとりがしっかりと心に刻み、安全を最優先に、全身全霊をもって課題の解決に努めてまいります。

以 上

## TEPCO English press releases

### TEPCOEN1

Press Release (Mar 11,2011)

#### The Effect of Earthquake Occurred in the Northern Part of Japan(as of 4:30 pm today)

A big earthquake occurred in the Miyagi Prefecture at 2:46 today. Due to the earthquake, about 4.05 million households are in power outage in our service area.

Due to the earthquake, our power facilities have huge damages, so we are afraid that power supply tonight would run short. We strongly ask our customers to conserve electricity.

If you find any disconnected transmission lines, please do not touch them.

The effect of the earthquake to our facilities is as follows;

#### Fukushima Daiichi

-Unit 1,2,3 were operated and automatically stopped.

-Unit 4,5,6 are in regular inspection.

#### Fukushima Daini

-Unit 1,2,3,4 were operated and automatically stopped.

#### Kashiwazaki-Kariwa

-Unit 1,5,6,7 are in operation.

-Unit 2,3,4 are in regular inspection.

At all the nuclear power stations, monitoring posts, which monitor radiation through exhaust stacks have shown normal values. In other words, at the present, no radiation leaks have been confirmed.

#### (Thermal Power Stations)

-Hirono Unit 2,4 were stopped.

-Hitachinaka Unit 1 was stopped.

-Kahshima Unit 2,3,5,6 were stopped.

-Chiba Unit 2-Group 1 was stopped.

-Yokohama Unit 8-Group 4 was stopped.

-Ohi Unit 2,3 were stopped.

-Goi Unit 4 was stopped.

(Hydro Power Stations)

-15 power stations in Fukushima, 3 power stations in Tochigi, 3 power stations in Yamanashi, 1 power station in Gumma were stopped.

(Transmission and Distribution Facilities)

-Naka Distribution Facility was stopped.

-Shin-Mogi Distribution Facility was stopped.

(Others)

-At the service facility (not nuclear facilities) of the Fukushima Daini Nuclear Power Station, a small fire temporarily occurred but was extinguished at 4:07 pm.

## **TEPCOEN2**

Press Release (Mar 11,2011)

### Occurrence of a Specific Incident Stipulated in Article 10, Clause 1 of the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness (Fukushima Daiichi)

Today at approximately 2:46PM, turbines and reactors of Tokyo Electric Power Company's Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Unit 1 (Boiling Water Reactor, rated output 460 Megawatts) and Units 2 and 3 (Boiling Water Reactor, Rated Output 784 Megawatts) that had been operating at rated power automatically shutdown due to the Miyagiken-oki Earthquake.

For the above 3 units, off-site power was lost due to malfunction of one out of two off-site power system, leading to automatic startup of emergency diesel generators.

Subsequently, at 3:41PM, emergency diesel generators shutdown due to malfunction resulting in the complete loss of alternating current for all three units.

Hence, at 3:42PM, it was decided that a specific incident stipulated in Article 10, Clause 1 of the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness\*1 has occurred and a "First Level Emergency" was declared and in accordance with the aforementioned Act, the Minister of Economy, Trade, and Industry, the Governor of Fukushima Prefecture, the

Mayor of Okuma Town, and the Mayor of Futaba Town along with other involved organizations were notified of the incident.

TEPCO is taking steps to determine the exact cause behind the shutdown of the emergency diesel generators and is working towards their restoration. The exhaust pipe's monitor reading indicates that radiation levels have remained unchanged and presently there have been no confirmed radioactivity impact to external environment. Further details are in the process of being confirmed.

\*1 Specific Incident Stipulated in Article 10, Clause 1 of the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness The objective of the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness is to protect the welfare, physical wellbeing and property of Japan's citizens. To this end, when accidents and equipment breakdown have reached certain levels at nuclear power plants, the Act obligates us to notify the nation, prefectures, cities and towns in order for them to take necessary actions and to grasp information in a timely manner. Notifications are issued out under circumstances such as when the nuclear reactor cannot be shut down and/or when the water supply to the reactor is cut off.

### **TEPCOEN3**

Press Release (Mar 12,2011)

#### White smoke around the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Unit 1

On March 11, 2011, turbines and reactors of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Unit 1(Boiling Water Reactor, Rated Output 460 MW) and Unit 2 and 3 (Boiling Water Reactor, Rated Output 784 MW) that had been operating at rated power automatically shutdown due to the Tohoku-Chihou-Taiheiyou-Oki Earthquake.(already announced)

Today at approximately 3:36PM, a big quake occurred and there was a big sound around the Unit 1 and white smoke. Our two employees and two subcontract workers working for the safety of the plant were injured and transported to the hospital.

We are presently checking on the site situation of each plant and effect of discharged radioactive materials.

We will endeavor to restore the units and continue monitoring the environment of the site periphery.



## TEPCOEN4

Press Release (Mar 14,2011)

### White smoke around the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Unit 3

At approximately 11:01am, an explosive sound followed by white smoke occurred at the reactor building of the Unit 3. It was believed to be a hydrogen explosion.

According to the parameter, it is estimated that the reactor containment vessel remains intact. However, the status of the plant and the impact of radioactive materials to the outside environment are presently under investigation.

Some workers have sustained injuries. Ambulances are on their way to care for them.

TEPCO continues to take all measures to restore the safety and security of the site and are monitoring the site's immediate surroundings.

## TEPCOEN5

Press Release (Mar 18,2011)

### Assessment of INES (International Nuclear and Radiological Event Scale) on the incident at Fukushima Daiichi and Fukushima Daini Nuclear Power Station

March 18, 2011

Tokyo Electric Power Company

Masataka Shimizu, President

It has been announced that the assessment of INES (International Nuclear and Radiological Event Scale) on the incident at Unit 1, 2, and 3 of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station caused by Tohoku-Taiheiyou-Okai Earthquake resulted in "Level 5". We are taking this assessment very seriously.

We sincerely apologize to all the people living in the surrounding area of the power station and people in Fukushima Prefecture, as well as to the people of society for causing such great concern and nuisance.

We are taking this reality as an extreme regret, although it was caused by the marvels of nature such as tsunami due to large scale earthquake that we have never experienced before.

While receiving support and cooperation from the Japanese government and related department and local authority, we will continue our maximum effort to converge current situation.

## **TEPCOEN6**

Press Release (Mar 18,2011)

### Stationing Vice President at Fukushima City and Managing Director at J Village

We would like to express our great regret at the loss of people by the Tohoku-Chihou-Taiheiyo-Oki Earthquake occurred on March 11, and our deep sympathy to the people and their families suffering damage.

Besides, we would like to make our deep apologies for concern and nuisance about the incident of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station and the leakage of radioactive substances to the people living in the surrounding area of the power station, the people of Fukushima Prefecture, and the people of society.

Currently TEPCO has jointly established the Joint Headquarters for Response for the Tohoku-Chihou-Taiheiyo-Oki Earthquake (Head: Prime Minister Naoto Kan) and endeavored to prevent further damages and secure the safety of our facilities as early as possible. In order to strengthen our response, we will appoint Vice President Norio Tuzumi and Managing Director Akio Komori to station at Fukushima City and J Village respectively from March 22, 2011.

Vice President Tuzumi will direct to collect voices from the people of living in the surrounding area of the power station and the people of Fukushima Prefecture regarding the incident of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station, etc. Managing Director Komori will direct to prevent further damages and secure the safety of Fukushima Daiichi and Daini Nuclear Power Stations as early as possible.

## **TEPCOEN7**

Press Release (Mar 31,2011)

### Establishment of "Fukushima Nuclear Influence Response Division"

As of March 31, 2011, we have revised our corporate organization to enforce the support programs for the residents and areas influenced by the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station's accident due to the Tohoku-Chihou-Taiheiyo-Oki Earthquake.

Establishment of "Fukushima Nuclear Influence Response Division".

We have established a "Fukushima Nuclear Influence Response Division" under the direct control of President.

We have been dispatching our employees to the emergency evacuation sites to be able to support the evacuated residents due to the influence of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station's accident by delivering necessary goods and assisting unloading the shipments. To further enforce the support programs and assist the region's recovery, we have newly established the Fukushima Nuclear Influence Response Division.

We have further established a Fukushima Support Office under the Division to enforce and enlarge the existing Fukushima Office's functions.

As of March 29, it was announced that the Government's Nuclear Disaster Response Headquarters has established a Nuclear Evacuators Life Support Team. Together with the Team and through our Fukushima Nuclear Influence Response Division, we will faithfully support the afflicted areas and the evacuated residents.

## **TEPCOEN8**

Press Release (Oct 03,2011)

### Regarding TEPCO Management and Finance Investigation Committee Report

October 3, 2011

Tokyo Electric Power Company

President Toshio Nishizawa

We deeply apologize to the people who live around the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station, people of the Fukushima Prefecture and all the people in Japan, for the great inconvenience and anxiety that the accident of the Power Station has caused.

Today, TEPCO Management and Finance Investigation Committee Report has been submitted and published. We express our deep appreciation to all the concerned parties including the committee and the task force for their intensive discussions and detailed investigation on the management and financial situation of TEPCO.

While we recognize that the report contains quite severe arguments to us, we will consider them with sincerity. Having the instruction from the Corporation of Nuclear Disaster

Compensation, we will develop a special business plan, drastically streamline the management and promptly provide those affected with fair compensation.

## TEPCOEN9

Press Release (Oct 11,2011)

### Approach to the improvement in Nuclear Damage Indemnification Procedure

We sincerely apologize to residents residing near the power stations and the general public for the tremendous inconvenience and anxiety that has arisen on account of the accident at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station and Fukushima Daini Nuclear Power Station (the "Accident").

While we have been processing permanent indemnifications for damages caused by the Accident to concerned persons, we also apologize for the inconvenience and confusion due to the excessive volume of documentation such as various application forms and indemnification instructions (the "Instructions") originally prepared to facilitate fair and smooth treatments.

In response to the comments and suggestions from concerned persons, we will improve the indemnification procedures by distributing a simple supplemental reference form titled, "Easy Claim Instructions" and enhancing our support system to help facilitate the claims.

We have commenced with the processing of permanent indemnification payment applications submitted from October 5, 2011 and will continue to do our best to ensure that the process is as convenient as possible for all applicants.

#### 1. Distribution of Easy Claim Instructions (Reference 1)

·In order to check the applicable indemnification items without reading the Instructions, we will distribute a simple supplemental reference form titled, "Easy Claim Instructions" from October 12, 2011.

·For those having difficulty filling in the application forms, we will provide a brief explanation and support to fill in the documents based on the Easy Claim Instructions.

·If you have already filed a claim for indemnification, it is not necessary to read the Easy Claim Instructions.

#### 2. Enhancement of support to facilitate the claims and consultations (Reference 2)

·Upon request, we will pay direct visits to explain how to fill in the forms. (Priority will be given to applicants unable to leave their residences due to extenuating circumstances.)

·We will continue to hold explanation meetings and face-to-face consultation booths at various locations.

### 3. Indemnification payment procedures reflecting the applicant's situation

·In those cases where substantiating receipts and vouchers cannot be located, an investigation will be conducted. If deemed feasible, standard payment will be made.

·It is not necessary to apply for applicable damages all at once. Partial applications are acceptable when ready.

·In order to accelerate the indemnification process, we will pay the approved items of damages first. (We will continue to discuss the remaining items until consent is reached.)

·For approved categories that are not substantiated by receipts and vouchers that were lost due to extenuating circumstances, we remain open to discuss these claims.

·If the temporary indemnification payments received were larger than the claimed amount, paybacks will NOT be necessary as the difference will be accounted for at a later time.

### 4. Amendment of the Agreement Form for Indemnification (Attachment 3)

·The Sample Agreement Form inserted with the Instructions contained the following clause, "Concerning the aforementioned received amount, I will not raise any objections nor apply for additional compensation." Given the misleading nature of this statement that may be interpreted as a ruling out of all additional claims under any situation, this clause has been deleted from the amended Agreement Form which will be sent out to the applicants.

While we considered amending the application form itself, in light of time considerations, we decided against it, since we have already received over 7,000 application forms.

In view of the present situation of TEPCO employees facilitating with claim procedures, we believe that the Easy claim instructions, TEPCO employee assistance, the explanation meetings and face-to-face consultations along with the amendment of the agreement form will accelerate the indemnification procedures.

In order to realize a swift and fair indemnification process, we will strengthen our organizational structure and increase the personnel count up to 7,300 by the end of October. If

you have any inquiries, please contact the Fukushima Nuclear Compensation Consultation Room (Call Center) below.

-----  
Fukushima Nuclear Compensation Consultation Room (Call Center)

Telephone: 0120-926-404

Time in: from 9:00 am to 9:00 pm  
-----

## **TEPCOEN10**

Press Release (Mar 11,2012)

### A Message from TEPCO President Toshio Nishizawa marking the First Year since the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Accident

March 11, 2012

Tokyo Electric Power Company, Inc.

President, Toshio Nishizawa

Today, exactly one year has passed since the occurrence of the devastating Tohoku-Chihou-Taiheiyou-Oki Earthquake that struck our nation. In looking back at the events of the past year, I would like to take this opportunity to express our heartfelt sympathy to all those who passed away and their loved ones. Our thoughts and prayers are with them and also with those people who continue to be affected by the terrible events that unfolded on that tragic day.

We also extend our deepest apologies to all residents of the neighboring region of Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant and Fukushima Prefecture as well as broader society for the concern and anxiety that arose on account of the accident at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station. Moreover, I must express my sincerest appreciation to all those parties, both domestic and international, who provided much support and assistance to us during this time of tribulation.

While always keeping in mind the tremendous responsibility we have to maintain stable conditions at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plant, we will continue to safely work towards the mid-to-long term decommissioning of the reactors. In addition, all TEPCO group companies will further intensify their efforts to care for the presently afflicted and provide the compensation due them in a swift manner.

The day of March 11th is forever etched on the hearts and minds of every TEPCO employee. Hence, we will dedicate all of our strength and all of our resources to overcome the many challenges that still lie ahead of us while always remembering that no matter what tasks we are presently engaged in, safety must be our top priority.