دراسة تداوليه اجتماعية لاستراتيجيات التأدب في خطاب القيادة التي يستخدمها موظفو اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعات عراقية مختارة

شهد ابراهيم سليمان   ،   حذيفة يوسف تركي

جامعة الانبار/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

ed.huzaifa.youssef@uoanbar.edu.iq،   Shahad95ibrahi@gmail.com

المستخلص :

ركز هذا البحث على استراتيجيات التأدب المستخدمة في خطابات القادة. واحدة من أهم النظريات في دراسة استخدام اللغة هي نظرية التأدب. يعتبر التأدب جوهر التحليل البراغماتي. الغرض من الدراسة هو سد فجوة معرفية لأنه، على حد علم الباحث ، لم يتم فحص استراتيجيات المداراة بعد في خطاب القيادة ، وتحديدا رؤساء الأقسام وملحقيهم في الجامعات العراقية. الهدف من الدراسة هو تحديد ما إذا كان المرؤوسون ورؤساء أقسام اللغة الإنجليزية يعملون باستراتيجيات أدب متشابهة أو غير متشابهة في بيئة أكاديمية. استخدم الباحث مبادئ الأدب. تهدف الدراسة إلى فحص كيفية عمل استراتيجيات المداراة بشكل مشابه أو مختلف من قبل المرؤوسين ورؤساء قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في البيئة الأكاديمية. لتحقيق هذا الهدف ، تبنى الباحث مبادئ الأدب (2014).

لتحقيق هذا الهدف افترض الباحث انه لا يوجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في استخدام استراتيجيات التأدب بين رؤساء اقسام اللغة الإنكليزية ومرؤوسين قسم اللغة الإنكليزية ومع ذلك ، يتم تحليل البيانات التي يتم جمعها من المشاركين عبر استبيان قائم على الرابط يتم إرساله إليهم كرابط عبر الواتس اب. يتطلب عرض الترددات والنسب المئوية لمبادئ الأدب المختلفة بشكل فعال نهجا كميا. وفقا للفرضية

المعلنة ، كشفت النتائج عن اختلافات كبيرة بين رؤساء اقسام اللغة الانكليزية ومرؤوسين قسم اللغة الانكليزية لاستخدامهم لأربعه مبادئ للأدب (الكرم, اللياقة, التزام o to s، التزام s to o ، التزام s to o)

الكلمات المفتاحية: التأدب، تداولية اجتماعية، القيادة .

A Sociopragmatic Study of Politeness Strategies in Leadership Speech Employed by the Staff of English Departments at Selected Iraqi Universities

Shahad Ibrahim Sulaiman   , Assist. Prof. Dr. Hutheifa Yousif Turki (PhD)
University Of Anbar ,College of Education for Humanities,
Shahad95ibrahi@gmail.com   , ed.huzaifa.youssef@uoanbar.edu.iq

Abstract

This research focuses on the politeness strategies employed in speeches by leaders. One of the most significant theories in the study of language use is the theory of politeness. Politeness is regarded as the core of the pragmatic analysis. The purpose of the study is to fill a knowledge gap because, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, politeness strategies have not yet been examined in the speech of leadership, specifically heads of departments and their subordinates in Iraqi universities. The aim of the study is to determine whether subordinates and English department heads function with politeness strategies that are similar or dissimilar in an academic environment. The researcher used Leech's (2014) politeness maxims to accomplish this objective. The study aims to examine how politeness strategies are similarly or differently functioned by subordinates and heads of the English Department in the academic setting. To achieve this objective, the researcher adopted Leech's (2014) politeness maxims. The researcher hypothesized that there are no significant differences in the use of politeness strategies between

Subordinates of English Department and Heads of English Department. However, the data that is gathered from the participants via a link-based questionnaire sent to them via WhatsApp is analyzed quantitatively. Displaying the frequencies and percentages of different politeness maxims effectively requires a quantitative approach. According to the stated hypothesis, the findings revealed significant differences between the SDEs and HDEs' use of four maxims of politeness (Generosity, Tact, Obligation of S to O and Obligation of O to S).

Introduction

Humans need language because it helps them with essential aspects of daily living as it is employed to convey information or send messages. When leading or managing their groups, leaders, like many other people, can use various styles of language more or less deliberately. These styles can be seen as a means to sustain and create social bonds, express feelings, and programs, promote ideas, and regulations in any culture. Orders are strictly controlled to prevent passiveness in the subordinates. A vast number of studies (Bass and Stogdill, 1990; Fladerer, Haslam, Steffens, & Frey, 2021; Mayfield, & Mayfield, 2021; Tucker, 1989; Yukl, 2002) have been conducted to study leadership with business and management. They focused on the style, expressions, and behavior, used by leaders when communicating with their subordinates. The present study takes its significance from the fact that "Leadership is the ability to influence or motivate an individual or a group of individuals to work willingly toward a given goal or objective under a specific set of circumstances" (Tucker, 1989, p. 41). However, to be successful and influential leader and to lead subordinates, one must use the appropriate language and style and be cooperative that can motivate

subordinates. Thus, it becomes inevitable to investigate how language can play a vital role in leading subordinates or followers successfully.

Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics is a subfield of sociolinguistics that looked at the connections between language use and language goals (Leech, 1983). It covers the actual issues with the social functions of language, how social events affect language use and the place of language in societal life. This gives the opportunity to explain the mechanism of a social stipulation of speech activities. Sociopragmatics is the study of sociolinguistics and pragmatics. It relates the meaning of the language used to cultural and social values. According to Trosborg (2010), Sociopragmatics concerns the analysis of the major interactional patterns in specific social systems and/or specific social contexts. Speech acts, for instance, may be carried out differently in various social contexts and circumstances, as well as in various social groupings within a speech community. The foundation of socio-pragmatic research is the emphasis on the interaction element and recognition of the social context in which a speech act happens. However, not all facets of the social environment are equally general. As a result, social context can be divided into three categories: the most local context, which includes the direct text and co-text of the interaction; the medial context, which includes the social situation such as activity types, speech events, and so on.; and the overall general context, which includes cultures such as institutional cultures, organizational cultures, national cultures, regional cultures, and so on (Culpeper, 2011). Politeness as a social phenomenon is considered one of the issues that should be accounted for when studying sociopragmatics. Thus, politeness is one of the best illustrations of how sociolinguistics and pragmatics frequently overlap.

The Leadership: General Overview

A true interpretation of the word leadership has generated controversy. Many individuals try to define leadership. Some assume that a leader is one with power, leads triumphant troops, is dynamic, guides huge corporations, or affects changes in the course of nations (Yukl, 2002). Tucker (1989, p. 41) stated that "Leadership is the ability to influence or motivate an individual or a group of individuals to work willingly toward a given goal or objective under a specific set of circumstances." According to Fiedler (1967, p. 11), Leadership is, by definition, an interpersonal relationship in which power and influence are unevenly distributed so that one person is able to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others to a greater extent than they direct and control his".

The Language of Leadership

Language creates experience and the world in which we live. Language not only describes an object but also creates it. The human condition is created through language, which is also one of the most significant social influencers. We don't live in reality; rather, we live in the image of reality we have in our minds. That idea is created through common language; we are able to recognize reality over the discourse formed by language. According to **Marturano et al. (2010)**, language is the way through which leadership is socially constructed. Language can only exist if specific sorts of values and beliefs are present in social relationships in which symbols play a significant role. They contend that leadership cannot be reduced to a personal trait or a result of the relation between leader and follower since it is enacted as a language process of production. Leadership is the method of creating a dialectic relationship between the one who is being led and the person who leads, in which the process of the leader's actions gives various interpretations and reference points for meaningful actions that need to be

taken by the others. Smircich & Morgan (1982, p. 262). Leadership is a communication process in which a person, usually completing the medium of speech, influences the behavior of others to a certain end (Bass, 1990). Leadership is described by a delicate relationship between language and action, and the analysis of social influence, which characterizes the categorical core, must start with an analysis of language, as emphasized by Kelly (2008, p. 767-768) who, cited Wittgenstein, stated that leadership as a language-game is more than just a spoken language, it is also activity and a form of life. It follows that writing about leadership, talking about leadership, and using the concept, form, or shape is the product of a certain kind of action. Similar to the language of art, the language of leadership is characterized in particular by the use of pictures, symbols, and metaphors (Denhardt & Campbell, 2006). As stated by (Bass, 1990) , leadership determined the activities of the group and the actions of group members. Leadership fosters agreement and controls the social friction that results from change (Austin et al, 1997). There are many methods used by leaders to indicate their ability to manage the situation and that they deserve the position they are in. Leaders don't just use spoken and written language. They also use body language. Many of them use a number of body language suggestions that are considered important elements that indicate leadership, such as the movement of the hands or the head, even the language of the eyes.

Politeness: General Overview

The word "polite" etymologically comes from the Latin word "politus," which means "smoothly accomplished' " (Márquez - Reiter, 2000). Whether the concept of politeness belongs to pragmatics or sociolinguistics, this issue is still up for debate. (Lakoff, 1973) and Leech (1983) are two linguists who placed politeness under the umbrella of pragmatics, but (Labov, 1994) and

others viewed politeness as a sociolinguistic theory. Politeness and Gricean cooperative principles are linked and complementary (Lakoff, 1973). By establishing a set of rules for using politeness, she also applies these ideas. As a result, she is considered as the "mother of modern politeness theory (Brown, Levenson, and Eelen, 2001).

According to Leech (1983), politeness in the broadest sense is a sort of communicative behavior that can be observed in a variety of human languages and cultures; it has even been called a universal phenomenon of human society. Furthermore, according to Watts, Richard, Sachiko, and Ehlich (1992), politeness is a dynamic phenomenon that is constantly changeable and adaptable in any group, at any moment and at any age. Politeness has been characterized as both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic phenomena. In this sense, Haugh (2003, p. 12) argued that "the definitions of politeness vary accordingly from pure linguistic, pure pragmatic, to social-cultural or socio-cognitive, while other definitions can be characterized as being discursive in nature". In other words, Thomas (1995, p. 150) defined 'Politeness' as "a genuine desire to be pleasant to others, or as the underlying motivation for an individual's linguistic behavior,". This means that in order to be more or less polite than others, there is it is not obligatory to access the addresser's motivation; instead, there should be access only to what addressers really say and how their addressees react. The concept of politeness is based on the notion that interlocutors should keep their talk smooth. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are three social factors that have their effect on politeness. They are: the social distance, relative power, and absolute ranking of imposition in the particular culture. This indicates that politeness is a social phenomenon can be functioned by taking into consideration the pragmalinguistic aspects appropriate to the social norms and variables

(socipragmatic aspects) in this regard, Thomas (1981, 1983) and Leech (1983) played an important role in founding sociopragmatics. According to Leech (1983), sociopragmatics is distinguished by having "more specific" or "local" conditions on language usage." The relationship between the local, sociopragmatics, and politeness, however, is obvious: "more specific "local" conditions on language use" (p. 10) may be supposed to belong to the less abstract field of socio-pragmatics because it is clear that the Politeness Principle and Cooperative Principle work differently in different language communities or cultures, in different social situations, among different social classes.

According to Brown and Levinson, what originally inspired them to develop their politeness theory was the "Gricean observation that what is "said" is typically only part of what is "meant.". The proposition expressed by the former provides a basis for the calculation of the latter" (Brown and Levinson, 1987:49). In this view, indirection and other related kinds of mismatch between what is said and what is left unsaid is a key phenomenon that has attracted a lot of interest. According to Brown and Levinson, politeness is the motive for what Searle calls indirect speech acts.

Methods and Research Design

According to Croker (2009, p.32), methods can be defined as "ways of 'other researchers" (King et al., 1994, pp. 3-4). The current study adopted a quantitative research method and design. It was designed in a way in which quantitative data were collected and then analyzed quantitatively. In this sense, such a type of research depends on using numbers, frequencies, and percentages instead of words in the analysis of its data. The present study is considered a quantitative one as it studies politeness strategies statistically. The rationale of utilizing a quantitative method is to get in-depth

information about the aspects under study, to get a clear and sufficient analysis of the data, and to investigate the aspects in their real context.

The Sample

Concerning the current study, non-random convenience sampling was used to collect data from the heads of the departments. On the other hand, random convenience sampling was used to collect data from the subordinates who are lecturers on the departments of English. In this regard, the number of heads of English departments (henceforth HDE) is much less than subordinates of English departments (henceforth SDE). In total, 150 respondents from different colleges at different Iraqi universities participated in this study. They were divided into two groups: a) 50 HDE and b) 100 SDE. All of them are working as lecturers in English departments. The participants were aged (28–60) for the academic setting (2022–2023). The current study is selected from departments of English belonging to Iraqi public and private universities.

Instruments and Data Collection

The researcher used written discourse completion task (henceforth WDCT) questionnaire as the instrument to collect data. Two types of questionnaires were used in the present study. The first questionnaire is designed to be given to the heads of department and the second is to subordinates. Each questionnaire comprises combined situations reflecting the kind of common interaction in the academic setting. Young's (2009) WDCT was adapted in the present study because it was deemed appropriate. The adapted WDCT reflects situations appropriate to the Iraqi culture. Furthermore, for the purpose of saturation and obtaining valid data, the number of situations was modified to be 10 for each questionnaire. The questionnaire in the current study is open-ended questions. Open-ended

JOBS

مجلة العلوم الأساسية
Journal of Basic Science

Print -ISSN 2306-5249
Online-ISSN 2791-3279
العدد الخامس عشر
2023م /1444هـ

questions are chosen because the researcher does not provide the optional answer. It includes a series of items presented in written format, and each respondent is requested to answer them. These items were constructed to elicit information from participants (Sim &Wright, 2000). The rational for using WDCT is to obtain data rapidly. In this sense, Dörnyei and Taguchi (2009) stated that "one can collect a huge amount of information in less than an hour" (p. 6). As for the collection of data, data collection is the process of gathering and measuring information on variables of interest. In this studystionnaire was administered by the researcher to 130 SDE and 55 HDE.

The rational of the Study

The significance of this study stems from its focus on studying the heads of departments and their subordinates' speech in the academic context. Thus, the study hopes to add new knowledge in the area of sociopragmatics by examining SDHs and HDEs use of politeness strategies in leadership speech, on which little we know. Furthermore, this serves to show finally, the study is significant in the sense that it provides a general source to those who are interested in sociopragmatic studies, which serves to show the way with which the staff members of Iraqi Universities communicate each other saving each other's face.

GEOFFREY LEECH (2014)

Geoffrey Leech proposed a Politeness Principle as complementary to Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP). Pragmatics, according to Leech, is principle-governed that is unlike grammar which is rule-governed, assuming that while rules are constitutive in force, principles are regulative. The PP postulates that interact ants, on the whole, prefer to express or imply polite beliefs rather than impolite beliefs. Polite beliefs expressed by the speaker S are beliefs favorable to the other person O or/and unfavorable to oneself,

whereas impolite beliefs are beliefs unfavorable to O and/or favorable to S. To account for polite linguistic behavior, Leech postulated six maxims, summarized in the imperative mood as follows: In observing the PP, S will (all other things being equal):

(M1) Generosity Maxim: Give a high value to O's wants

For example, invitations, promises, and offers, which are in English, can be impositioning or direct. Directive features are underlined for example:

Come on! Sit down and have a nice cup of coffee.

(M2) Tact Maxim: Give a low value to S's wants

Requests for example are often tentative and indirect, giving a chance to refuse, mitigating, and softening, S's imposition on H. This is regarded as a familiar aspect of politeness that it needs exemplification. For example:

A: Could I help myself to a tiny sip of sherry?

B: Of course you can! Have as much as you like.

(M3) Approbation Maxim: Give a high value to O's qualities.

For example, we like to pay (and be paid) compliments if it seems appropriate to do so. In these activity types, complimentary language is a necessity, as when guests praise a hostess's meal:

'They are so delicious! Your cuisine is as good as that of a chef at any big restaurant!'

(M4) (Modesty Maxim) Self-deprecation: Give a low value to S's qualities (if sincere, even if exaggerated) is felt to be polite (Pomerantz, 1975: 93; quoted in Levinson 1983: 338):

A: ...I'm so dumb, I don't even know it. hhh! heh

B: Y-no, y- you're not du:mb

In this example, the modesty of S's utterance causes a rejection from H, in accordance with Approbation. This kind is occasionally called "fishing for compliments,"

(M5) (Obligation of S to O Maxim): Give a high value to S's obligation to O.

Apologies are examples of polite speech acts giving great prominence to S's obligation and fault to O. The following example shows the overtly apologetic forms underlined:

(19) I'm (terribly) sorry. | Please excuse me. | I'm afraid I'll have to leave early.

(M6) Obligation of O to S Maxim: Give a low value to O's obligation to S

Responses to apologies often minimize the fault for example:

 A: 'Sorry'

 B: 'It's all right'.

(M7) (Agreement Maxim): Give a high value to O's opinions

In replying to others' judgments or opinions, agreement is the preferred reply and disagreement is dis preferred:

A: It's a beautiful view, isn't it?

B: Yeah, absolutely gorgeous.

(M8) Opinion-reticence Maxim: Give a low value to S's opinions

People regularly use propositional hedges like "I think," "I guess," "I don't suppose," and "It might be that" to lessen the impact of their own opinions. In other situations, S consults H's opinion in deference to H's purportedly superior understanding, experience, or wisdom.

   In contrast, people express themselves powerfully, as though their opinions matter more than others. In Japanese society, expressing a view might be potentially offensive, especially to superiors, in that an opinion may suggest criticism. For example, in Japan, it may be considered impolite to express an opinion that differs from that of a "honored speaker," even though in Western nations it is seen as positively helpful to share opinions and ask questions during the discussion period that follows a lecture. If no

such interaction occurs, the visiting speaker may feel the presentation was a "flop."

(M9) Sympathy Maxim: Give a high value on O's feelings

It needed to clarify why we show interest in other people's feelings in some speech acts such as condolences and congratulations, for example:

 Warmest congratulations!

(M10) Feeling-reticence Maxim: Give a low value to S's feelings

According to B&L (1978: 240) say "it appears that in English one shouldn't admit that one is feeling too bad," and quote the following:

 A: Hi, how are you?

 B: Oh, fine. Actually though.... .

Results and Discussion

Politeness Strategies Implemented in the HDE and SDEs' Leadership Speech

Table (1): Frequency and Percentages of politeness strategies implied in the HDEs and SDEs' leadership speech

No	Maxims	Subordinates		Hedas of Dept.		Subordinates-Heads of Dept.
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Generosity	434	43.4%	30	7.50%	16.22*
2	Obligation of S to O	357	35.70%	12	3%	15.02*
3	Approbation	66	6.60%	23	5.75%	1.25
4	Tact	62	6.2%	174	43.50%	14.56*
5	Modesty	33	3.3%	14	3.50%	1.60
6	Sympathy	19	1.9%	33	8.25%	2.34
7	Obligation of O to S	4	0.4%	105	26.25%	12.45*

8	Feeling-reticence	25	2.5%	9	2.25%	1.33
9	Opinion of reticence	0		0		
10	Agreement	0		0		
Total		**1000**	**100%**	**400**	**100%**	

As shown in table 1, the Chi Square analysis revealed significant differences between the SDEs and HDEs' use of four maxims of politeness (Generosity, Tact, Obligation to S to O and Obligation of O to S), but no significant differences were shown in in the remaining four maxims (Approbation, Modesty, Sympathy and Feeling reticence). In this regard, the analysis demonstrated that the SDEs were higher in using 'Generosity' (43.4%) than the HDEs (7.50%). This is due to the fact that they feel that they should give high value to their heads' wants who have a higher power than them. For example, in situations1 and 9 most of the subordinates express their will to improve their work when their heads ask them to do so:

S2: "… I promise to improve my performance…"

S6: "I will do my best to improve my work"

S32: "I promise you that won't happen again. I'll try my best to make it up"

S21: "… I have certain problems and I will manage to solve them in the future."

In situations 2, 4 and 9 most of the SDEs showed their tendency to obey their heads' order of making the phone call:

S12: "I would absolutely"

S32: "I'll do it sir with pleasure"

S46: "I will do it …"
S11: "I will do my best to submit them on time"

In situations 3 and 6, Generosity is used by the SDEs in terms of promises for forbearance as they feel sorry for doing something they do not have the right to do and which gets their heads annoyed:

S1: "I am sorry. I won't do it again."
S6: "It won't happen again"
S26: "... I will not do it again"
S2: "… This is the first and last time. I promise."

In situation 5, The SDEs feel it is important to promise their heads to keep to the productivity and increasing the development of their work when they are appreciated and thanked by their heads. Therefore, the generosity maxim in this situation is represented in the form of promise.

S11: "… I promise to increase the productivity..."
S14: "We'll go on the same track."
S47: "... we will continue our efforts"

On the other hand, the HDEs' less use of 'Generosity' can be justified by their exaggerated formal style which enables them to control their departments. They use this maxim in situation 8 only when they give high value to one of their subordinates' wants when most of them give permission to the exhausted subordinate a rest and let them have some days off:

H2: "I see that you are tired... You can have a rest."
H8: "You can leave because the health is the most important…"
H15: "… Have a rest please because you need it."

Generosity is violated by some SDEs. This means that some tend not to give high value to their heads' wants. For example, in situation 4 some of them were hesitant to obey their head's order of making a large number of copies for an important document justifying that this not of their duties:

S33: "Don't have time for such extra tasks"

S41: "I would be hesitant to agree and inform them that I will check my schedule if it is possible"

As for HDEs, they also violated this maxim when they give less importance to their SDEs' benefits and wants. For example, in situation 10 the head found that the SDEs' joining the workshop is more important than the SDEs' important lecture:

H10: "You have to join the workshop, and you may postpone your lectures to another day."

Regarding the maxim of Obligation of S to O, the quantitative analysis illustrated that SDEs showed higher use of this maxim (35.70%) than the HDEs (3%). This indicates that SDEs are more likely to make apologies and thanks to their HDEs. This is maybe to save their faces or to maintain their relationships with their Heads. For example, in situations 1, 6, 7and 10, the SDEs attempt to apologies for not working well, not submitting the duty in time, or being absent and promise to improve the work and a promise for forbearance:

S1: "I am terribly sorry. I promise I will do my best."

S55: "my deepest apologies, but I had a situation that made me do so."

S21: "Sorry Dr but I cannot manage to submit it today…"

While in situation 3, they apologize for making a decision when they are not allowed to do so:

S2: "… I seek your pardon, and I promise never to let such a situation to reoccur again"
S33: "… sorry for being hasty."

In situation 4, Obligation of S to O also appeared in the form of apology when some of the SDEs apologies because they refuse their HDEs' request of "making a number of copies" since they feel it is out of their duties:
S26: "sorry Dr. … You may ask another teacher"
S35: "… if I have enough time off course i will… in case i don't have time for these papers so i will apologize …"

Obligation of S to O is presented in the form of thanking by the SDEs when the HDEs praise them for the increasing productivity of the work. Most of the SDEs find it necessary and polite to thank the HDEs for his/her encouragement and supplying positive energy to continue with their work as in situation 5:
S11: "Thank you for keeping the positive trend going …"
S19: "Thanks for your words. The group is all working as a team…"
S43: "Thank you doctor I appreciate your evaluation and support"

On the other hand, some HDEs use the maxim of Obligation of S to O less than the SDEs; furthermore, they use it only in the form of thanking when dealing with their SDEs as in situation 5 when they find it suitable and polite to thank the SDEs for their well-increasing productivity:
H3: "… Thank you all and keep on this always"
H7: "I am pleased to thank you for your positive performance …"

It might be said that according to the HDEs, the less use of this maxim when communicating with HDEs makes them more formal to the extent that they can enhance their leadership in the department. The obligation of S to O is

533

JOBS
مجلة العلوم الأساسية
Journal of Basic Science

Print -ISSN 2306-5249
Online-ISSN 2791-3279

العدد الخامس عشر
2023م /1444هـ

violated by SDEs when they refuse to do any kind of apology for their failure in work without any intention to make up the situation. For example:

S44: "I don't mind that"

S50: "It's ok".

This is in tandem with Omran's (2022) study which revealed that any person has the right not to be obliged to others. In this sense, he can refuse and accept others' speech acts.

With reference to Tact maxim, the Chi-Square analysis revealed a significant difference in the SDEs and HDEs' use of this maxim. In this regard, the HDEs were more frequent in the use of this maxim (43.50%) than the subordinates (6.2%); the tendency, which means that some HDEs try to show that they are giving low value to their own wants when requesting some issues from their subordinates. This is maybe due to some HDEs' intention to make their SDEs accept their advices or directions in the form of polite requests without getting them annoyed. In situation 1, for example, the HDEs used some expressions of indirectness and a polite request to ask their SDEs to improve their work:

H2: "You know that you have responsibilities and you should do them in the right way…"

H10: "Please, you need to work harder to meet the standards of the department…"

In situations 2, 3, and 4, they used tact maxim when they asked their SDEs politely to make a phone call, a number of copies of a paper and not to take a decision without consulting them, for example:

H7: "Would you please make a phone call to the deanery …"

H15: "Please, can you help me. Make a phone call for me..."

H16: "Please do not take a decision without sharing us"

H3: "Excuse me, please can you make some copies of this …"

Tact maxim in situation 6 takes the form of request in the sense of encouragement and praising:

H1: "Ok, we've been doing well lately, we need to keep up the good work."

H8: "You did well and I ask you to do the best"

Some HDEs also used a polite request that represents tact maxim in situation 7 to ask their SDEs to submit their final questions paper:

H12: "… please make sure you submit before deadline."

H15: "Dear colleague, I want to tell you that you should send the questions very soon because you are too late..."

Some SDEs used this maxim in this situation to make some polite requests and some indirectness when asking for another chance to deliver the question paper before the deadline as in response to situation 7:

S2: "Sorry Dr but I cannot manage to submit it today. I need one more day if you allow me."

S34: "Please doctor give me more time"

In situation 8, SDEs also used this maxim to ask for having some rest:

S48: "Sorry dr. Could you please give me your permission to go home…"

S32: "Would you please disband me form the examining committee because I can't keep my work up. I am really exhausted."

Tact maxim was violated by HEDs more than SDEs in some situations. For example, in situations 1 and 7 the HDEs informed their SDEs roughly about their faults in work with threatening them that it is possible to be fired in case they continue making such faults:

H8: "you must work hard to stay in your work"

H2: "… otherwise I have to tell you that you will be fired if you haven't done

them."

H7: "I want to draw your attention to the fact that your publications are not up to the standard, otherwise, you cannot stay as a member of this department."

H11: "You should try to make self -development throughout one month"

In situation 4, the HEDs directly asked their subordinates to make a large number of copies of a serious document without any expression of polite request:

H4: "Make sure to bring several copies of this order"

H7: "Make a large number of copies of this important university order"

In situation 7, the heads also violate tact maxim when they roughly asked their subordinates to submit the final draft of question paper on time:

H9: "I ask him or her to submit the questions as soon as possible or he will be asked from the dean and he should submit legal excuses"

H10: "You are required to submit your questions at the decided deadline. Excuses are not acceptable."

This finding is in consistent with Al-Ameri's (2020) which illustrated that people having high power are able to reflect their power in their expressions using direct speech acts.

However, Chi-square analysis showed no significant difference in the use of other maxims, like: Approbation, modesty, sympathy, and feeling reticence. This means that both groups (HDEs & SDEs) were approximate in the use of these maxims. Concerning 'approbation', it is used by SDEs in the form of praising their HDEs in situation 10:

S4: "… it is really great chance to join the conference with you …"

JOBS

مجلة العلوم الأساسية
Journal of Basic Science

Print -ISSN 2306-5249
Online-ISSN 2791-3279

العدد الخامس عشر
2023م /1444هـ

S13: "…I would be so happy and excited to join the workshop with you …"

The HDEs also used this maxim in terms of praising their SDEs in order to encourage them to keep their increasing productivity as in situation 5:

H13: "Your performance is great. We need to keep it up to be competitive."

H8: "You did well and I ask you to do the best"

In regard to the maxim of 'modesty', it was used by the SDEs in the form of admitting their failure when their HDEs asked them to improve their work. This means that they dispraise themselves and give low value to their qualities, as in situation 1:

S17: "I apologize and I will try to correct the faults in my work"

S53: "It's my fault. I'll improve it as soon as possible"

In situation 3, modesty was represented by self-criticism by the SDEs when they are unauthorized to take a decision and get their HEDs annoyed:

S33: "Ok and sorry for being hasty."

S3: "Sorry, I will consult you first next time sir"

On the other hand, HDEs used this maxim when they admit their need for the help of their SDEs as in situation 4:

H3: "Excuse me, please can you make some copies of this order since I „m very busy and need your help"

H14: "please help me, it is important to make a large number of copies in time."

In situation 10, some HDEs used modesty when they confessed that they were less experienced in a topic to be discussed in a workshop. In other

words, they gave low value to their own qualities when they communicated with their SDEs. For example:

H15: "I'd like you to participate with me in the workshop as you have good experience in the topic of the workshop."

This is in tandem with Sumarla's (2017) finding which indicated that the respondents who participated in the study used modesty in low percentages, which means that they admitted their mistakes without shame.

Concerning the maxim of Sympathy, it is used by the HDEs when they gave high value to their subordinates' feelings as they felt they need some rest as in situation 6, they congratulated the productivity of the teamwork and when they welcome the returning absent subordinate. For example:

H6: "Congratulation for your progress"

H1: "Welcome back dear, it is been hard without you."

H14: "hope you get some rest and we need to invest your eagerness to work"

H2: "I see that you are tired. You have done great efforts today. You can have a rest."

This result is similar to that of Sari (2008) which revealed less use of 'sympathy' by respondent under investigation. They used this type of strategy perhaps because of the power they possess.

As for the maxim of Feeling--reticence, some SDEs and HDEs used this maxim when giving low value to their own feeling or real feeling in communicating with each other. For example:

H10: "It's ok not to work anymore in the examining committee..."

H15: "Dear colleague, I want to tell you that you should send the questions very soon because you are too late and no time is left to prepare for the examinations."

H14: "…never mind we will complete the work"

This study shows the same results as Omran's (2022) in that they showed low use of the maxim of Feeling--reticence, which means they gave low value to their feelings in order to hide their true feelings in order to continue working.

Conclusion

The findings revealed that the SDEs used the 'Generosity maxim' and Obligation of S to O more than the HDEs because they feel that they should give high value to their heads' wants, who have a higher power than theirs. Thus, it can be inferred that the SDEs were aware of their heads' power and position that govern them to choose the appropriate strategies of politeness. Besides, they were more sociopragmatically competent in their commitment to their HDEs to the extent that they are obliged to do their duties.

As for the HDEs, they were more frequent in the use of 'tact and obligation of O to S'. This is because some heads tend to give priority to their own benefit over their subordinates', in the sense that they want to show their power and authority even when requesting some personal issues. Thus, it can be concluded that some HDEs think that their position as leaders enables them to control their SDEs to the extent that they belittle their efforts and take away their rights. In addition, they oblige them to work for the sake of staying in their positions. On the other hand, in certain situation, some heads behaved as one team with their subordinates in order to encourage them to keep to their good progress. This leads to the conclusion

that these HDEs were sociopragmatically aware of the way and expressions of politeness appropriately used when addressing SDEs in any act of communication. This implies that they believe in the fact that working hand in hand leads to success for all.

References

1.Al-Ameri.Th.A. (2021). *A Pragmatic Study of Speech Acts and Politeness in American Presidential Victory Speeches* (Unpublished thesis).

2.Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

3.Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

4.Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St.

5.Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence* (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.

6.Denhardt, J. V., & Campbell, K. B. (2006). The role of democratic values in transformational leadership. *Administration & society, 38*(5), 556-572.

7.Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge.

8.Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

9.Fladerer, M.P., Haslam, S.A., Steffens, N. K., & Frey, D. (2021). The Value of Speaking for "Us": the Relationship Between CEOs' Use of I- and We-Referencing Language and Subsequent Organizational Performance. *J Bus Psychol* **36**, 299–313 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09677-0

10. Haugh, M. B. (2003). *Politeness implicature in Japanese: A metalinguistic approach*. Published Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Queensland, Australia.

11. Heigham, J., & Croker, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction.* Springer.

12. Kelly, S. (2008). Leadership: A categorical mistake? *Human Relations, 61*(6). 763-782.

13. King, G., Keohane, R., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

14. Labov, W. (1994) *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 1: Internal factors.* Oxford: Blackwell.

15. Lakoff, R. (1973, April). The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 292-305). Chicago Linguistic Society.

16. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

17. Leech, G. N. (2014). The pragmatics of politeness. *Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18. Márquez Reiter, R. (2000). Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay. *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay*, 1-243.

19. Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2021). Sound and safe: The role of leader motivating language and follower self-leadership in feelings of psychological *safety*. *Administrative Sciences, 11*(2), 51.

20. Omran. S. W. (2022). *A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Employed in Apology Used by Iraqi Male/Female EFL Learners* (unpublished thesis).

21. Sari, D. M. (2014). *A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Performed by Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in the Democratic Debate Held on February 26, 2008* (Doctoral dissertation, Thesis).

22. Sim, J., & Wright, C. (2000). Research in health care: concepts, designs and methods. Nelson Thornes: Cheltenham.

23. Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *The Journal of applied behavioral science, 18*(3), 257-273.

24. Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics, 4*(2), 91-112.

25. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman, London.

26. Thomas, J. A. (1981). *Pragmatic Failure* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Lancaster, Lancaster.

27. Trosborg, A. (Ed.). (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (Vol. 7). De Gruyter Mouton.

28. Tucker, A. (1989). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

29. Tucker, A. (1993). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. Greenwood.

30. Watts, Richard J., Sachiko Ide, and Konrad Ehlich (1992). *Introduction In Politeness in Language*. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice, Richard J.

31. Watts , Richard J. , Sachiko Ide , and Konrad Ehlich . 1992. Introduction . In Richard J. Watts , Sachiko Ide , and Konrad Ehlich (eds.). *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory and Practice* . Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-17.

32. Young, C. (2009). Linguistic Strategy and Leadership: A study of how politeness in management affects subordinates' motivation. (Dissertation). Retrieved from http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:miun

33. Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.