

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

Shahad Ibrahim Sulaiman*, Hutheifa Yousif Turki
Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq
* Shahad95ibrahi@gmail.com

KEYWORDS: Speech, Leadership, Iraqi Universities, Sociopragmatic, Teaching Staff.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v34i3.764.g394>

ABSTRACT:

The focus of this study is on the speech acts used in leadership speeches. Speech acts is considered one of the most important theories in the field of language use. It is viewed as the essence of pragmatic analysis since the majority of pragmatic studies are mainly based on or even have a marginal reference to this theory. The study is being conducted to fill a gap that, according to the best of the researcher's knowledge, the speech acts has not yet been investigated in the speech of leaderships, namely heads of departments and their subordinates in Iraqi universities. The study aims to investigate how speech acts are similarly or differently used by subordinates and heads of English departments in an academic setting. To achieve this objective, the researcher adopted Searle's (1969) classification of speech acts. The researcher hypothesizes that there are significant differences in the use of directive, assertive, and commissive speech acts between SDEs and HDEs. However, a quantitative analysis is conducted to analyze the data that is collected from the participants via a questionnaire sent to them in the WhatsApp as a link. A quantitative approach is efficient in displaying the frequencies and percentages of various speech act categories. The findings revealed significant differences between the heads' and subordinates' use of most speech acts (expressive, commissive, and directive).

REFERENCES:

- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. Simon and Schuster.
- 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. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36, 299-313.
- 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.
- Tucker, A. (1989). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Springer.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed). California: Wadsworth.
- Robert, K. Y. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. USA: Library of Congress.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology a step by step guide for beginners*. New Delhi: SAGE.
- Thyer, B. A. (1993). *Social work theory and practice research: The approach of logical positivism*. *Social work and social sciences Review*, 4, 5-5.
- King, G., Keohane, R., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. USA: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, C. (2007). *Research methods*. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 5(3), 65-72. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v5i3.2532>
- Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Corwin Press.

- Al-Ameri, Th.A. (2021). A Pragmatic Study of Speech Acts and Politeness in American Presidential Victory Speeches (Unpublished thesis).
- 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).
- Al-Zaidi.A.F. (2022). A Pragmatic Analysis of Persuasion and Intimidation of Receiving COVID-19 Vaccine. (Unpublished thesis).
- Leech, G. N. (2014). The pragmatics of politeness. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics.
- Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics. Requests and Apologies. Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies, 31, 1-34.

Introduction:

Language is a vital tool for human because it serves crucial purposes in their daily life. It is employed to deliver messages, convey information or even to extend influence. However, in communication, language is performed by using many utterances. These utterances are called as speech acts. Every expression that people use in daily interaction is an example of a speech act. Griffiths (2006) pointed out that speech act is the fundamental building block of language interactions, including utterances used for warning, greeting, applying, imparting information, confirming an appointment, and other purposes. Gibbs (1999), refers that Austin was the first to address the functions of utterances in interpersonal communication. Hence, it is commonly believed that the initiator of the speech act theory is J. L. Austin. Austin (1962) believes that language is employed not merely to express thoughts but additionally to perform actions. Thus, he criticized the traditional claim that "the business of a [sentence] can only be to 'describe' some state of affairs, or to 'state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely" (1962, p. 1). He asserted that many linguistic expressions seem to represent facts but they have various uses, like performing an action. Austin (1962) divided the linguistic acts into three components. The first component is the locutionary act, which refers to the act of uttering something. The second component is illocutionary act, which refers to performative utterance has like "apologizing" or "promising". The third component is the perlocutionary act, which focuses on how the hearer is affected by an illocutionary act while trying to recognize the illocutionary purpose of the speaker. In this respect, Searle (1979) listed five illocutionary purposes that Speech act can carry out: assertives, commissives, directions, declarations, and expressives. This provides a more thorough taxonomy of speech act than those proposed by Austin.

- 1- Assertives: also known as representations as defined by Searle (1975), are speech act in which the speaker commits to "the truth of a proposition," for instance by describing or making statements and facts, in order to express his opinion. For example, describing facts and assertions.
- 2- Commissives: it used to make the speaker to bind to certain action in the future, like promising, threatening, and inviting.
- 3- Directives, they are used to make the hearer do something like: commanding, suggesting, and ordering.
- 4- Declarations: they are used to change the condition of the situation such as "I pronounce you a husband and a wife".
- 5- Expressives: the purpose of expressive speech acts is to convey the speaker's feelings and emotional state; as a result, expressives are not employed to convey information but rather to express pain, likes, dislikes, admiration, pleasure or sorrow. For

example, compliments and love confessions (Crystal, 1987; Searle, 1979; Yule, 1996).

However, several theorists argued that fundamentally identical strategies are being used to achieve specific linguistic behaviors across different cultures and languages, though the proper use of any strategies could not be the same across different speech communities (Fraser, 1983). Other theorists, on the other hand, believed that speech acts differ among cultures and languages in terms of both conception and realization. They thought that the modes of speech act performance are variations in assumptions and cultural conventions (Blum Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989). Leaders as many others individuals can more or less consciously use different styles of language when leading or managing their groups. These styles can be viewed as a way to create and sustain social bonds, communicate emotions, and promote ideas, programs, and policies in any culture. This indicates that these different issues can be achieved by using speech acts. In this regard, the speech act that a given word performs frequently depends on the speaker's intention and the context in which the phrase is delivered. Accordingly, studying speech acts performed by the leaders and their subordinates in the present study requires not only focusing on the sentences of conversation but also on the situation. This is because a sentence has its meaning when it is related to the situation or the context. Hence, when people analyze speech act, they cannot separate activities, situations, and conversation. Orders must be strictly controlling to prevent passiveness in the subordinates. A vast number of studies (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Fladerer, Haslam, Steffens, & Frey, 2021; Mayfield & Mayfield, 2021; Tucker, 1989; Yukl, 2002) have been conducted to study leadership with management and business. They focused on the style, behavior, and expressions used by leaders when communicating their subordinates.

The present study imports 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, for a leader to be successful and influential and lead subordinates, he must be cooperative and use the appropriate language and style that can motivate subordinates. Thus, it becomes inevitable to investigate how language can play a vital role in leading followers or subordinates successfully. It focused on investigating how speech acts and politeness strategies are realized in the SDEs and HDEs' speech. Two types of data were collected: data collected from the SDEs and HDEs via Written Discourse Completion Task (Henceforth WDCT). In this sense, the study covers those whose origin is Iraqi Arab and whose major is English. One focal theory of speech act by Searle (1969) and a secondary framework by Leech (2014) Grand strategy of politeness were adopted in the present study.

Materials and Methods

The current study adopted a quantitative research method and design. It was designed in a way in which quantitative data were collected and then analysed 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 speech acts 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.

According to Croker (2009, p.32), methods can be defined as "ways of collecting information in and from a particular setting". Research design is an important part in doing research. Research design is the researcher's plan of how to proceed to gain an understanding of some group or some phenomenon in its context. Put differently, A research design is a procedural plan that is adopted by the researcher to answer questions validly, objectively, accurately and economically (Ary, 2010). It involves links among the research questions, the data collection, and the procedures of analysing the data (Robert, 2011; Kumar, 2011).

Thus, the main purpose of research design is to clarify how the researcher obtains answers to the research questions (Thyer, 1993). Quantitative methods are observed as the utilization of statistical methods that are "based on numerical measurements of specific aspects of phenomena...[and] are easily replicable by other researchers" (King et al., 1994, pp. 3-4). It involves "the collection of data so that information can be quantified and subjected to statistical treatment in order to support or refute alternate knowledge claims" (Williams, 2007, p. 66). Thomas (2003) believes that the quantitative method is concerned with the statistics and measurements of the features presented by the events or phenomena that are dealt with by the researcher. So, this type of data analysis provides the researcher with a precise amount of the frequencies of the speech act, and its percentages in the study. In this research.

The questionnaire in the current research is open-ended questions. 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. The participants were required to provide the appropriate linguistic forms of requests in the blank space following each situation in a way that reflects their real-life interaction. , the number of the head of departments of English (henceforth HDE) is much less than that of the subordinates (henceforth SDE). In total, 150 respondents from different collages 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. Thus, 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.

Results and Discussion

This section is devoted to examine the use of speech acts by both the subordinates and heads under investigation. Thus, Chi-square test was used to indicate whether there is a significant difference between the subordinates and their heads of English department when communicating all together in the academic setting. This can be shown in table 1:

Table (1): Frequency and Percentage of Strategies of Speech Act

No.	Speech act	Subordinates		Head of Dept.		Head of Dept Subordinates χ^2
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Expressives	327	32.56%	52	13%	15.1*
2	Commissives	327	32.56%	4	1%	15.12*
3	Assertives	231	24.96%	96	24%	1.23
4	Directives	115	9.92%	248	62%	16.5**
5	Declarations	0	0.00%	0	0%	
	Total	1000	100%	400	100%	

***p value (0.05)**

As demonstrated in table 1, the Chi-Square analysis revealed significant differences between the Subordinates' use of most speech acts (expressive, commissive, and directives) and that of the Heads, but no significant differences in one of them. In this regard, the analysis showed that the subordinates were higher in using 'expressives' (32.56%) than the heads (13%). This indicates that the former would like to be highly polite when addressing their heads by minimizing the imposition or the force of speech acts used. This is due to the fact that they feel that they should use the most appropriate expressions when communicating with their heads who have a higher power than. Here are some typical examples taken from the data of the current study, with the overtly apologetic forms:

S: I am terribly sorry.

S: I am sorry. I won't do it again.

Considering the data of the study and the context of the situation, the speakers used assertives speech act in their apologies to the hearers because they were not doing well in their work.

On the other hand, the heads showed a less use of 'expressives' when communicating with their subordinates as they think that such use of speech acts makes them more formal to the extent that they can control their departments. In addition, they might think that they have the right to address their subordinates using 'expressives' speech acts and this, in turn, according to their opinion that this is not less polite. They use this type in situation 6 when they greet a subordinate that has returned to work after some time away. This can be indicated in the following example:

H: Welcome back dear, we missed you so much.

H: Hi dear It's a long time since we met and I'm very happy to see you.

This finding is in consistent with Al-Ameri's (2020) which indicates that expressives were used less by those of higher power. This is because of the nature of the Iraqi society, which used to be vertical. Some people have a social status and some do not have a social status, so they must respect those with social status.

In terms of commissives the analysis showed a significant difference between the subordinates' use of commissives (32%) and the heads' (1%). This means that the SDEs tended to overuse commissive speech acts to indicate their respect and politeness to their HDEs. The tendency which can be attributed to the SDE's lack of power and the job requirements which commit the SDEs to be more polite with their HDEs. This, in turn, commits them to some future action as a necessity of fulfilling their jobs, in the sense that in any establishment the SDEs are always obliged to do their duties and show their predisposition and proneness to develop and improve their performance. For example, the responses in situations No.:1,3 and 6 the subordinate expresses his/her apology to his/her heads by saying:

S: I am sorry. I will improve it.

S: Sorry for doing such a mistake and definitely I'm not going to repeat it.

S: I am sorry for that, I will not do that again.

S: I am sorry. I will improve it.

Additionally, in most of the data of these situations, apology expressions are followed by a statement that expresses an offer of repair for the committed offence. He promises him/her not to repeat this fault and improve his/herself.

On the other hand, the low use or more accurately the lack in the use of commissive speech acts by the heads may be attributed to the claim that the power the heads have, always privileges them to initiate orders and do requests using direct speech acts. This is because directness allows a rapid uptake on the part of their subordinates and also it carries the highest pragmatic clarity. Besides, directives reduce the needs for meaning negotiations between both the heads and their subordinates, for example:

H: I tell him directly to improve his work according to what I am after.

This finding is in line with that of Sari (2008) which demonstrated a higher use of commissives by subordinates and a less use by Barack Obama. This reflects the complexity of the Iraqi society which is constructed on the account that leaders should indicate their power and control in their way of speaking and linguistic aspects used in any act of situation.

Concerning ‘assertives’ the table (4.1) showed a similar overall use of the assertives by the both groups. This convergence in the percentages of using these speech acts is due to the fact that both parties say what they think as true from their own perspectives. The heads use these speech acts to convey their messages directly without even being perceived by their subordinates as if they were impolite or disrespectful. In other words, the utterances commit both groups to the truth of the expressed proposition. This means that the utterances are produced on the account of the speaker’s observation of certain things then followed by stating the fact or opinion based on the observation. Thus, this enables users of ‘Assertives’ to express a wide range of thoughts without alienating and hurting others for example:

S: Yes, sure.

S: I had something very important to do.

S: I feel tired, and I need a break.

S: I feel tired lately.

S: It’s okay

S: Okay

S: Cool

S: No problem

S: I have no idea

S: I tell her to do me this favour.

All of these different situations refer to an assertive type of speech act. All of them refer to statements of fact depending on the speaker's observation. This finding goes in line with that of Alzaidi (2022) which illustrated that assertive speech acts are also widely used in various acts of communication as they tell people the truth.

Regarding the directive speech acts, the table above shows a significant difference between the HDEs and SDE in the use of these speech acts. In this regard, the HDEs tended to be frequently higher in the use of 'directives' (62%) than the subordinates (9 %). Directives illocutionary act represent the attempts of the speaker to get the hearer to do something. This discrepancy in using directives, represented by the high use of heads for these speech acts, reflects the powerful status the heads enjoy. This power authorizes them to order, command, make requests, give suggestions, and so on. In this sense, it can be said that the overuse of directness by the HDEs allows rapid uptake on the part of their subordinates, carries the highest pragmatic clarity, and diminishes the requirements of meaning negotiations on the part of the subordinates. For example, when the head orders his/her subordinates to call him when he or she is free, as in:

H: Kindly, call me when you are free.

H: Have a rest please.

H: Can you share me presenting a topic with me.

H: How about holding a joint workshop together about critical pragmatics?.

H: Let's try to make workshop together.

Directives imply the tendency to be tough to others so that it's used by interlocutors (head) who have more power than their addresses(subordinates). On the contrary, the subordinates, who lack the power the heads have, are usually obliged to renounce the directive and resort to those speech acts that enable them to cope up with the heads' needs. For example, they resort to use Expressives or Commissives as in ' By all the odds,

S: I will not do it again because I am not authorized to make'.

This is in tandem with those of Al-Ameri (2021), which revealed that persons having more power have the right to order and give commands directly to be more effective and sufficient, as they may not trust the subordinates and think that they have insufficient knowledge that enables them to do their jobs.

Finally, the table above assigned the absence of declaration speech act. This means that both the heads and subordinates tended not to use these speech acts. This is due to the fact that the nature of the academic setting in which they are indulged, requires more harmony and amity between the heads and their subordinates. In addition, the nature of the questionnaire under investigation does not require the use of these speech acts. In this sense, neither the heads nor their subordinates are in a position to declare something such war or designating someone in a certain position. This finding is in line with that of Sari (2008), which indicated no use of declaration of speech acts. Both are leaders and both of them didn't use this type because they lead a group and this is not commensurate with the nature of their work.

Speech Acts used by the Head and Subordinates in relation to social variables

This section discusses influence of the various social variables (obligation & right, vertical social distance, benefit and self and other territory) proposed by Leech (2014) on the speech acts used in HDE and HDEs' speech of leadership.

Based on Leech's (2014) scale of the social variables, obligation and right have their effect on the use of speech acts used by respondents under study. Thus, the Chi-Square was used to compare the HDEs and HDE's use of speech acts in relation to obligation and rights in the academic setting.

Table (2): Frequency and percentage of Speech acts according to Obligation and Rights

No.	Speech Acts	Subordinates		Heads of Dept.		Subordinates Heads of Dept.
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Assertives	231	41.39%	96	96%	17.55**
2	Commissives	327	58.60%	4	4%	14.05**
	Total	558	100%	100	100%	

* P value (0.05)

As seen in this table, the Chi-Square analysis revealed significant differences between the SDEs' use of speech acts such as assertives and commissive and the HDEs'. It revealed that the HDEs were highly frequent in using 'assertive speech acts' (96%) rather than the SDEs (41.39%) in relation to obligation and rights. This discrepancy, if anything, shows that the HDEs make use of their position and presented themselves as having the right and authority to lay obligations on the subordinates in doing the requested act, for example (Make a large number of copies of this important university order). On the other hand, the less use of 'assertives' by the subordinates' in relation to obligation and right can be explained in their consent on the obligations directed by the heads. In some cases, the subordinates refuse the directive and deny the obligation, for example: Sorry...I can't do that.

Regarding commissive speech acts that are used by virtue of obligations and rights, the Chi-Square analysis as shown in table 2, revealed that the SDEs were more frequent in using 'commissive speech acts' (58.60%) than the HDEs' (4%). This indicates that the SDEs always feel that they are obliged to fulfill their HDEs' needs, thus they frequently use commissive speech acts in forms of promises that commit them to some future actions, for instance, I promise you that won't happened again. I'll try my best to make it up. This example shows how a subordinate is obligated to sustain a social or work-related commitment. So, the moral obligation that the subordinates have toward their heads, to perform some future actions and fulfill their heads' needs, is what made most of the subordinates use these types of speech acts. On the contrary, the HDEs' feeling as being not obliged to their SDEs causes them to almost never use these speech acts. However, the SDEs sometimes resort to use these speech acts on a small scale for example, in form of threat to urge their subordinates to do their best You know that you have responsibilities and you should do them in the right way, otherwise I have to tell you that you will be fired if you haven't done them.

Among the social variables that also have their own influence on the speech acts used by the SDEs HDEs in the academic setting is the vertical social relation between the respondents under the study. This can be reflected differently in their status, rank, and position. Thus, Chi-Square test was used to investigate how the SDEs and HDEs are similar or different in using speech acts in relation to vertical social distance. This can be shown in table 3:

Table (3): Frequency and Percentage of Speech Acts in relation to Vertical Social Distance

No.	Speech Acts	Subordinates		Heads of Dept.		Subordinates-Heads of Dept.
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Assertives	231	41.39%	96	27.90%	1.75
2	Directives	115	26.01%	248	82.66	17.90**
3	Total	442	100%	344	100%	

The analysis of speech acts in relation to vertical social distance, as shown in table 3 revealed significant differences between the SDEs and HDEs' use of 'directives' in relation to vertical social distance, but no significant differences in their use of 'assertives'. This infers that the SDE approximated the HDE in using 'assertive'. This similarity in the use of 'assertives' reflects their awareness of the status that the heads have, so they use these speech acts to maintain the principle of politeness by giving explanations and expressing statements to their heads, for example, *It is true, because I have already finished the required number of my lectures.*

Regarding directive speech acts used in relation to the vertical social distance in the table 3 above revealed a significant difference between the HDEs (82.66%) and their SDEs (26.01%) in using 'directives'. The higher percentage used by the HDEs reflects how they exploit or take advantage of their social status and power over their SDEs in commanding, ordering, making requests, suggestions and questioning. For example, you have to make your publications presented properly and thus you can avoid the consequences. On the other hand, the SDEs are more aware of the vertical distance and the superiority of their heads over them, so they use these types of speech acts on a small scale that do not go beyond giving suggestions. For example, *Would you please find another substitute, I'm exhausted.*

Furthermore, benefit is one of the social variables that govern the use of speech acts in any act of communication between interlocutors in the academic setting. The influence of such social variable may differ according to relation that conjugate these interlocutors when interacting with other. To this end, Chi-Square test was used to examine how speech acts used by the HDEs and SDEs in relation to benefit.

Table (4): Frequency and Percentage of Speech Acts in relation to Benefit Social Variable

No.	Speech Acts	Subordinates		Heads of Dept.		Subordinates-Heads of Dept.
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Commissives	327	73.98%	4	3.33%	15.12**
2	Directive	115	26.01%	116	96.66	17.90**
	Total	442	100%	120	100%	

In terms of commissive speech acts that are used according to the 'benefit' social variable, the Chi-Square analysis in table 4 revealed a significant difference the SDEs and HDEs' in the use of commissive and directive speech acts. In this respect, the SDEs were highly frequent in using 'commissives' (73.98 %) rather than the HDEs (3.33%). The SDEs' tendency to be higher in the use of these types of speech acts is attributed to the high rate of promises and offers exploited for the benefit of their heads. The SDEs need to communicate their heads with a high amount of politeness due to their condition of inferiority. Thus, they always commit

themselves by proposing actions (promises or offers) for the benefit of their heads due to the social power they have. In other words, the SDEs try to bridge the whole of the difference in the social class between them and their heads by minimizing the expressions of beliefs which imply cost to heads and maximizing the expressions of beliefs which imply benefit of their heads. For example, I hope this mistake is not going to be repeated. Otherwise, a serious decision is going to be made regarding such an action. In this sense, due to their social status and superiority of power they have, the heads feel that they are privileged to do requests and issue orders by using direct speech act, because directness allows a rapid uptake on the part of their subordinates and also it carries the highest pragmatic clarity. In this respect, the heads are neither obliged to place themselves under the commitment to perform, for the benefit of their subordinates, any act, nor could they exceed the limits or boundaries of the teamwork ethics, for example, via issuing threats to their subordinates. Therefore, they resort to use other speech acts that correspond with their positions and duties.

Accordingly, as shown in table 4, Chi-Square test demonstrated a significant difference between the HDEs and SDEs in the use of 'directives' in relation to 'benefit' social variable. In this regard, the HDEs tended to be more frequent than the SDEs in the use of 'directives' (96.66% & 26.01%, respectively). This vast difference reflects how the heads take advantage of their social status and power over their subordinates in valuing their own benefit above that of their subordinates. The heads always feel as if they were superior over their subordinates. Thus, they maximize their benefit and minimize the benefit of their subordinates by commanding, ordering and making requests, for example, *can you call me now for important information?*

On the other hand, because of their inferiority, the subordinates resort to other speech acts other than directives that permit them to do favours at a cost to themselves and to the benefit of their heads, for example, **ok. Dr. I'll submit before the deadline.**

Finally, self and other territory plays a vital role in governing the speech acts used in the academic setting. To this end, Chi-Square test was used to indicate how these speech acts are used by the HDEs and SDEs in relation to the territory.

Table (5): Frequency and Percentage of Self and Other Territory

No.	Speech Acts	Subordinates		Heads of Dept.		Subordinates-Heads of Dept.
		Freq.	Percent.	Freq.	Percent.	
1	Expressives	327	50%	52	92%	15.1*
2	Commissives	327	50%	4	8%	15.12*
	Total	654	100%	56	100%	

P value: 0.05

Regarding speech acts that are used in relation to the self and other territory the Chi-Square analysis in table 5 revealed that Expressive speech acts are used by the heads 92% percent and 50% percent by the subordinates. The higher percentage used by the heads reflects how the heads tend to be solidary to their subordinates to build in group membership. The responsibility of the heads entails the consideration to the feelings of their subordinates, so they tend to use expressive speech acts to transmit their satisfaction which has resulted from the achievements of their cooperative. In the following example the head expresses his thank to his subordinates due to their efforts in developing the education process for example, *It was very good results that we have lately Thank you all and keep on this always.* on the other hand, the low percentage of expressive speech acts by the subordinates reflects how they are constrained by

politeness and feel as if they were an out group members. thus their use of expressive is restricted mainly on expressing apology for example, ***I am really sorry for being not engaged with your vacancy and not working with good productivity***

Conclusion

The present study sheds light on the speech acts of leadership speech in departments of English at Iraqi universities. Now that all the findings and arguments have been presented in chapter 4, the researcher sets out to address the research questions raised in chapter one, which are as follows: -

1- To what extent is the SED's use of speech acts in the academic setting different from that of the HDEs.

With regard to the first research question, the findings have shown that heads of departments used four types of speech acts: Expressives, Commissive, Assertives and Directives. Directives were the most frequent speech acts employed by HDEs than the SDEs. Thus, it can be concluded that the Iraqi HDEs would like to be directive in their communication and interaction with their subordinates in the academic setting. This is to show their power and to control the situation academically. This is due to the strength of the academic rules, laws, and university instructions. This also concludes that HDEs preferred to use directives speech acts more than other speech acts because directness allows a rapid uptake on the part of their subordinates and also it carries the highest pragmatic clarity. Furthermore, directness reduces the needs for meaning negotiations between both the heads and their subordinates.

On the other hand, since subordinates lack the power over their heads, the job requirements always commit them to be more polite with their heads and to do some future action as a necessity of fulfilling their jobs. Thus, in any establishment the subordinates are always obliged to do their duties and show their predisposition and proneness to develop and improve their performance. Consequently, they resort to be more frequent in the use of commissives and expressives. The speech acts which imply showing respect, politeness, appreciation, and saving others' face. This can be attributed to the nature of the Iraqi society and culture which involves showing respect to those who lead subordinates in all the directorates, institutions, and universities in Iraq. This supports Blum-Kulka and House (1989, p. 133) who advocate that "while the overall distribution along the scale of indirectness follows similar patterns in all languages, the specific proportions in the choices between the more direct and less direct strategies are culture-specific".

The findings also showed that neither the HDEs nor their SDEs used declaration speech acts. Thus, it is concluded that the absence of declaration speech acts is due to the facts that the nature of the academic setting in which they are indulged, requires more harmony and amity between the heads and their subordinates.

دراسة تداولية اجتماعية لأفعال الكلام في خطاب القيادة الذي يستخدمه موظفو اقسام اللغة الانكليزية في جامعات عراقية مختارة

شهد ابراهيم سليمان*، أ.م.د. حذيفة يوسف تركي

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية، جامعة الأنبار، الرمادي، العراق

* Shahad95ibrahi@gmail.com

الكلمات المفتاحية: خطاب، قيادة، الجامعات العراقية، تداولي-اجتماعي، هيئة التدريس.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v34i3.764.g394>

ملخص البحث:

تركز هذه الدراسة على افعال الخطاب المستخدمة في خطابات القيادة. تعتبر أفعال الكلام واحده من أهم النظريات في مجال استخدام اللغة. لقد اعتبرت جوهر التحليل البراغماتي لأن غالبية الدراسات البراغماتية تعتمد بشكل أساسي على هذه النظرية أو حتى لها إشارة هامشية. أجريت الدراسة لسد فجوة أنه حسب علم الباحث أفعال الكلام لم يتم التحقيق فيها بعد في خطاب القيادات أي رؤساء الأقسام ومروسيهم في الجامعات. تهدف الدراسة إلى التحقق من كيفية استخدام أفعال الكلام بشكل مشابه أو مختلف من قبل المرؤوسين ورؤساء قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في الإطار الأكاديمي. لتحقيق هذا الهدف، اعتمد الباحث تصنيف سيرل (1969) لأفعال الكلام. يفترض الباحث أن هناك اختلافات كبيرة في استخدام أفعال الكلام التوجيهية والحازمة والمتساهلة بين SDEs و HDEs. ومع ذلك، يتم إجراء تحليل كمي لتحليل البيانات التي يتم جمعها من المشاركين عبر استبيان يتم إرساله إليهم في الواتس اب كرابط. النهج الكمي فعال في عرض الترددات والنسب المئوية لفئات فعل الكلام المختلفة. وجدت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين استخدام رؤساء الاقسام والمرؤوسين لمعظم الأفعال الكلامية (التعبيرية، التوافقية، والتوجيهية).