

**“NEGOTIATION IN MANAGERIAL COMMUNICATION: A STUDY
FROM PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE”**

Ravindra Anant Porlekar

Research Student

porlekarr@gmail.com

&

Prof. Dr. A. M. Sarawade

Professor and Head

Dept. of English

Shivaji University, Kolhapur

ABSTRACT

The present study attempts to explore an important instance of managerial communication – ‘negotiation’ with the help of certain important concepts in pragmatics. The rationale for the study is that managerial communication is always goal oriented and pragmatics is the study of language from the orientation of actions carried out with the help of language. For the purpose of analysis three major concepts of pragmatics are used: Speech Act, Politeness Principle and Cooperative Principle. Each of these three concepts is further divided into smaller units for both qualitative and quantitative analysis of data collected using Role-play technique from both PMs and WMs.

Key words: managerial communication, negotiation, Speech Act, Politeness and Cooperative Principle

Introduction

According to Al-hindawi and Hasan (2018) negotiation is an interactional face-to-face pragmatically performed process that incorporates three distinct stages: defining stage, bargaining stage and resolution stage. It is a kind of communication process by which differences between people are settled. It helps them to reach a compromise or an agreement avoiding argument and dispute. Individuals facing any disagreement need to achieve the best possible outcome for their position or their organization. The principles of fairness, seeking mutual benefit and maintaining interpersonal relations are the keys to attain an effective outcome. There are many instances of managerial communication where conflicts arise and the managers have to resort to different ways in which these conflicts can be effectively managed. When the parties involved in a conflict want to work toward an amicable resolution, they must engage in a communication process to decide what kind of a deal would be acceptable to both. In other words they must negotiate to reach an agreement. Here what is

important is that all the parties concerned must want a solution. And for this they must put up or encourage proposals, not hold on to whatever grievances they have or whatever arguments they deem right. Arguments cannot be negotiated, only proposals can. This demands that emotions be kept under control. Negotiating is a delicate process and a lot of thinking must go into it, both before it actually gets underway, and while it is going on.

In a typical managerial or business scenario, negotiating is a routine and equally important activity that the managers have to carry out quite skillfully and executively. Various linguists and pragmaticians have defined the nature of negotiation. They argue that there are two basic types of negotiation – integrative and distributive. The earlier is also called ‘win-win’ negotiation and the latter is referred to as ‘win-lose’ negotiation. The integrative negotiation requires the manager to use cooperative strategies and the linguistic devices with the intention of attaining the outcome aimed at by both the parties. This type of negotiation is based on the existence of high degree of mutual trust between the participants. In the end of the process this negotiation marks reconciliation as the end of communication. On the other hand, the distributive negotiation typically requires use of various manipulative and persuasive strategies so that one out of the two parties will win over the other. Naturally, in this type of negotiation every party attempts to safeguard its benefit while ignoring the interests of the other party.

It has been hypothesized that by its very nature managerial communication is **goal oriented**. Hence, it heavily relies on the use of certain goal oriented techniques. Therefore, **managerial communication can be understood in better manner with the help of pragmatic concepts** like **Speech Act, Politeness Principle, and Cooperative Principle** which seek to explore the intended meaning of the speaker and its effect on the listener.

A Pragmatic Perspective of Negotiation

If it is believed that the mechanism of managerial communication is understood better with the help of pragmatics, Geoffrey Leech’s (1983) pragmatic approach to communication as a ‘problem solving phenomenon’ fits in the philosophy of business management. The world of business managers considers every activity as a problem and there is a constant effort to solve it. In the present state of affairs, it is often argued that the managers have not yet been able to master the mechanism of effective communication. For example, this can be done, the students believe, if the mechanism of managerial communication is understood with the help of pragmatics. Certain aspects of pragmatics like ‘Speech Acts’ ‘Politeness Principle’, ‘Cooperative Principles’ contribute to and are assumed to be the central parts in the process of initiating, developing and finalizing negotiation interactions. Thus, it is necessary here to highlight these relevant issues in order to reveal the pragmatic nature of negotiation.

Speech Acts

Speech act is one of the most significant pragmatic aspects that constitutes the pragmatic structure of negotiation. Speech acts are realized by means of various strategies to constitute and maintain the starting, developing and ending points of negotiation process. For the purpose of analysis, Seale's (1969) classification of speech acts in five types is used in addition to Yule's (1997) identification of direct and indirect nature of speech acts.

Organization Structure of Speech Act

Any speech act is hardly realized with only the head act. The case is more so when it is of a longer communication situation. In such situation the parties involved in the process generally go on interacting and exchanging various utterances and only one of them usually carries out the basic speech act. Accordingly, the other utterances produced by the parties need to be seen as supportive moves helping the successful realization of the speech act. Such responses are termed as speech act sets, and the general structure of speech act sets is:

$$SM / \{SM\} + HA + SM / \{SM\}$$

Here, SM stands for the supportive move which is the utterance that supports the basic head act of the speech act. Such an SM may either come before the head act (HA) or after it.

Semantic Strategies

It is an accepted fact that in a real life situation, a speech act cannot be realized only with a single utterance. The head act (HA) needs to be placed in an organization structure made of supportive moves (SMs) and some softeners in the form of excuses and offers. However, in the study of the realization of the speech acts, the communication of the illocutionary force via the head act is important and its success depends on the semantic strategy used for its realization.

Suggestion Strategies

In negotiation the basic force of the utterance is that of a suggestion. Suggestions are one of the sub-types of the Directive Speech Acts. In the use of the Directive Speech Act the purpose of the speaker is to make the hearer commit him/herself to some future course of action. Thus, this type of Speech Act attempts to make the world match the words. Directives contain different types of Speech Acts like Request, Commands and Suggestions. Haverkate (1984) distinguishes between Impositive and Non-Impositive Directives. The Impositive Directives include more threatening acts like Request, Order and Pleading. The Non-Impositive Directives are Suggestion and Instruction. The major difference between them is that of benefits: in the Impositive Directives, the carrying out of the action benefits the, whereas in the Non-Impositive Directives, the benefits are meant for the hearer. Nonetheless, the fact remains that Suggestion is a Face-threatening Speech Act, because in its realization,

the, in a way, intrudes into the hearer's world by performing an act about what the hearer should do. Therefore, in the performing of the Speech Act of Suggestion, many factors should be taken into consideration: the urgency of the suggestion, the degree of embarrassment in the situation and above all the social Distance and Power between the and the hearer.

The Speech Act of Suggestion, can be classified into two types: the 'Inclusive – We Suggestions', where the Suggestion benefits both the speaker and the hearer; and, the 'Non-Inclusive Suggestions', for the benefits of the hearer alone. On the basis of this discussion of the Speech Act of Suggestion, the following facts of the Speech Act can be enlisted:

- i.** Suggestion includes performing the Speech Act for the benefits of either both the speaker and the hearer, or only for that of the hearer.
- ii.** The speaker believes that a particular action of the hearer will be profitable for both of them or only for the hearer.
- iii.** It is a Face-threatening Speech Act, in which the speaker intrudes the world of the hearer, making the situation embarrassing.
- iv.** Since it involves asking the hearer to do something, it should be done with appropriate linguistic realization.
- v.** It requires the use of Politeness formulae to soften the burden that the speaker is imposing on the hearer.

In order to analyze the semantic strategies used in the performance of negotiation, the following model proposed by Martinez-Flor (2005) can be used:

TYPE	STRATEGY	EXAMPLE
DIRECT	Performative Verb	I suggest that you..... I advise you to I recommend that you.....
	Noun of Suggestion	My suggestion would be...
	Imperative	Try using.....
	Negative Imperative	Don't try to.....
	Specific formulae (Interrogative forms)	Why don't you.....? How about.....? What about.....? Have you thought about...?
CONVENTIONALIZED FORMS	Possibility/ /Probability	You can..... You could.....

		You may..... You might.....
	Should	You should.....
	Need	You need to.....
	Conditional	If I were you..... I would.....
INDIRECT	Impersonal	One thing (that you can do) would be..... Here is one possibility..... There are a number of options that you..... It would be helpful if you..... It might be better to..... A good idea would be..... It would be nice if.....
	Hints	I've heard that.....

Table 1 Most Common Suggestion Strategies
(Adopted from Martinez-Flor 2005)

Negotiation Strategies

The basic act both the parties carry out in negotiation is that of suggestion. Accordingly, the model of speech act of suggestion is used for analysis. However, negotiation has its own structure and semantic strategies. They also need to be taken into account. The following table indicates the specific strategies. Therefore, in addition to the model of speech act of suggestion, the negotiation strategies are also necessary for the study of negotiation from pragmatic perspective.

As proposed by Murtoaro *et. al.*(2005:24) the following table indicates the specific negotiation strategies:

Strategy	Description
Contending	Negotiators maintain their interests and beliefs through persuading the other negotiating side to concede. This indicates argumentative linguistic ways employed in the negotiation situation under analytic parlance.
Problem Solving	Negotiators attempt to determine the choices and selected maneuvers that satisfy both parties' interests. This refers to what is termed as creating behavior in negotiation analysis.
Yielding	Negotiators diminish their expectations and preferences. They concede and give in, in order to meet the other party's

	negotiation; in other words “negative” claiming.
Avoidance	Negotiators simply do not involve themselves in negotiations or avoid them. The strategy can be understood and explained with reference to an attractive BATNA in negotiation analysis

Table 2 Most Common Negotiation Strategies
(Adopted from Murtoaro et. al. 2005:24)

Politeness Principles

Successful performance of a speech act inevitably depends on the politeness and cooperative principle observed by the parties to communication. Use of mitigating devices such as indirectness of speech act, honorifics, hypothetical statements, supportive moves (Pre-HA and Post-HA), understatements and tactfulness contribute to politeness of speakers in the performance of an FTA.

Brown and Levinson (1978) and Leech (1983) have pointed out that the human communication process is based on the Principle of Politeness. That is to say, the absence of ‘politeness’ in the language of interaction may cause the breach in the social relationship of the participants. Thus, Politeness is the lubricant of human interaction. As such, the studier intends to study the use of Politeness Strategies employed by the respondents in their responses. One of the places where such Politeness Strategies are used is the Head Act and one of such strategies is the mitigating devices: ‘please’, ‘I’m afraid’, ‘possible’, ‘mind’, ‘will you’, etc. The use of such mitigators indicates the regret and unwillingness of the addresser to impose something on the behaviour of the addressee. Consequently, the use of such mitigators provides the required sense of Politeness to the responses.

However, it is not possible to assess the Politeness only with reference to the mitigating devices used in the Head Act. As Kachru and Smith (2008) point out, the Politeness of a response should be assessed with reference to the total response. For example, a response might not contain a mitigating device, yet it may be highly polite. Thus, besides the mitigating devices, there are other markers of Politeness, the final effect of the response should be judged from the perspective of Politeness. However, we should bear in mind that Politeness can be used as the internal factor in the Speech Act, like the use of the mitigating devices in the Head Act, or it can also be externally employed with the help of the use of Supportive Moves. Therefore, in order to investigate the Politeness of the responses, the technique evolved by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) is used. They have classified the use of Politeness Strategies into Down-graders and Up-graders. Down-graders mean the internal Politeness Strategies employed within the Head Act of the response. Such internal use weakens the Illocutionary Force of the utterance and consequently minimizes the potential threat present in it. On the contrary, the Up-graders are the Politeness Strategies employed as Supportive Moves. Such strategies do not weaken the Illocutionary Force of the Speech Act.

Cooperative Principles

Since successful participation in a conversation depends mostly on the cooperation of the participants, the analysis also includes the pragmatic features of Cooperative Principle (CP) exhibited by the participants in the role plays. Observation or flouting of the maxims of CP leads to implicature and it determines the cooperation of participants.

It is important to understand the Illocutionary Force of the Implicature present in the dialogue. Obviously, it tries to assess the competence of the speakers to identify ‘how more is communicated than is said’ in the process of communication. Conversational Implicature results when the addresser ‘flouts’ one of the Cooperative Principles (Grice, 1975). It is believed that conversation is based on the principle of cooperation between the addresser and the addressee. That is to say, both of them have to follow the principles. However, sometimes, the addresser thinks that the addressee shares the same interpersonal and situation knowledge. Such assumptions lead to the lack of explicitness in conversation. Such lack of explicitness is quite normal for those who are involved in the interaction, since they share the knowledge. However, such inexplicitness may not be comprehensible for those who do not share such knowledge. Thus, an attempt is made to assess the ability of the managers to understand the implied meaning of language. The four maxims – Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner proposed by H. P. Grice are considered for the analysis of performance of Speech Acts:

Data Collection and Methodology

Considering the empirical nature of present study, it is decided to collect first-hand data through audio-video recordings of the actual conversations of the select participants in the predefined role play situations. Certain establishments are selected after collecting the personal details of the participants and also their consent to cooperate in data collection process.

The Subjects

The best possibility of getting suitable instances of managerial communication is found in the world of ‘Practising’ Managers and equally in the world of ‘Would-be’ Managers. By ‘Practising’ Managers, the studier means those managers who are active in some kind of capacity in a business setting and ‘Would-be’ Managers are those students who are pursuing some kinds of management studies. After visiting various business establishments such as industries, banks, service industries, colleges and educational institutions, the employees were informed about the purpose and nature of the study. When convinced, the personal information regarding the suitability of participants is collected through a questionnaire prepared for the ‘Practising’ Managers. In the same way, certain

MBA, BBA institutes and the Kolhapur Branch of WIRC of The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India are visited to conduct orientations for 'Role Play' as a part and parcel of their curriculum. The willing and suitable participants are selected after studying their responses to the questionnaires.

Data Design

Role play Situations

The present study is about the communication carried out by managers in the managerial world to achieve specific managerial goals. The study is confined only to the study of Speech Acts, Principle of Politeness and Cooperative Principle. The data for the study purpose is obtained from audio-video recordings of some pairs of participants from two groups – 'Practising' Managers and 'Would-be' Managers. The pairs have played their assigned roles in the given pre-devised situations on their respective campuses. Initially, the participants were informed about the purpose of the role-plays and subsequently helped out in understanding their roles. Furthermore, the script of the situation is given to them, so that they can think of the possibility of ideas they are expected to use during the role-play to perform. The original recordings are further edited to separate them situation and group wise. The pairs of 'Practising' Managers are encoded as PM1 to PM9 and 'Would-be' Managers as WM1 to WM15. This coding is used to cite sample examples from data in the analysis. All the edited recordings are then transcribed in dialogue forms to elicit examples of various pragmatic features to be used for analysis.

The present study deals with a negotiation situation where two managers working on the same level come face to face and discuss the common problem with their respective suggestions to solve it. This situation is used for obtaining data of the performance of the speech act of suggestion. The script of the situation runs as follows:

Situation: Decision Making about Bonus Amount
--

Seven Stars Pvt. Ltd. has the practice of giving bonus to its employees, once a year at Diwali. The company has not exceeded the rate of 11% of the annual salary for last two years. The company is doing well and the sales are constant. However, the Board of Directors is reluctant to increase the rate. There is a constant pressure on the H R Department as the Employee Union is repeatedly pressing the demand of at least 20% bonus. After discussion with the top-level managers, the Board of Directors have asked the HR manager and Finance manager to meet and decide over the increase by not more than 2% and make it possible for the employees to accept 13%.

Both the managers meet and **discuss** a few critical issues about what they can do. The Finance manager agrees with the Board's decision for sound financial policy reasons, but the HR manager finds it hard to convince the Union Leader. They **suggest** the possible solutions during their discussion with arguments to come to a feasible conclusion to report to the B O D.

Data Analysis

Linguists have expressed that there are three basic stages of negotiation – initiation (Pre negotiations), problem- solving (around-the-table-negotiations), and resolution (packaging agreements). In the light of this discussion of the speech act of negotiation let us now analyze the type of negotiation in the deployed situation and the responses received for it.

i. Nature of Speech Act

Conventionally a speech act is said to be realized in three ways – direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect. Since in the process of negotiation each negotiator tries to suggest his/her stand, the speech act of suggestion is considered as the basic speech act for negotiation. Table 3 provides the details about the nature of speech acts of the responses received.

Nature	Frequency	Percentage
Direct	4	8.3%
Conventionally Indirect	38	79.2%
Non-Conventionally Indirect	6	12.5%
Total	48	100.0%

Table 3 Nature of Speech Act

As the table shows out of 48 total speech acts 38 are conventionally indirect in nature, while four are direct, and the nature of remaining six speech acts is non-conventionally indirect. It shows that the managers have preferred conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect natures of speech act to negotiate politely. Following are

the examples of direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect nature of speech acts used by the managers:

Direct speech act:

“We cannot give 20%, but we can give 13%.” (PM8 [Negotiator 1])

“I suggest increasing bonus 1% every year.” (WM11 [Negotiator 1])

Conventionally indirect speech act:

“This year rise is ok due to good financial status, but what if we have financial crisis next year?” (PM4 [Negotiator 1])

Non-conventionally indirect speech act:

“The company should think of the employee morale.” (WM14 [Negotiator 2])

ii. Organization Structure of Speech Act

The data collected for the situation is also analyzed for the organization structures of the responses received. Table 4 shows the organization structure of all the 48 responses considered for analysis.

Organization Structure	Frequency	Percentage
HA + SM	1	2.1%
{SM}+ HA	5	10.4%
SM+ HA + {SM}	4	8.3%
{SM}+ HA + SM	3	6.3%
{SM}+ HA + {SM}	35	72.9%
Total	48	100.0%

Table 4 Organization Structure of Head Speech Act

Note: ‘SM’ stands for single SM, and ‘{SM}’ for more than one SM.

The table shows that in majority of the responses (35) the Negotiators are aware of the fact that the realization of the speech act like that of negotiation requires more number of supportive moves. However, there is one response in which only one SM is used in addition to the basic HA, but in the remaining 47 responses at least two or more SMs are employed for the successful realization of the speech acts and also for providing additional politeness to the responses. Following is a representative example of responses of organization structure:

{SM} + HA + {SM} (PM2 [Negotiator 1])

Per HA SM 1 – “There has been a constant pressure from the union.” (Reason)

Pre-HA SM 2 – “I think the Board has given us the hint to have a moderate hike in a different way,” (Reminder)

HA – “We can increase 2%, 1% bonus and 1% gift.”

Post-HA SM 3 – “See, our company has a practice of giving some sweets and not a cash kind of gift.” (Alternative)

Post-HA SM 4 – “I have convinced the leaders many times before to accept the company decisions and I must be positive this time about their demands.” (Defense)

Post-HA SM 5 – “I’m sure the workers will be happy with the offer.” (Assurance)

iii. Use of Semantic Strategy

As has been mentioned earlier, in negotiation the basic force of the utterance is that of a suggestion. Accordingly, the semantic strategies used for producing the speech act of suggestion are employed for the analysis of the received responses. For this purpose the semantic strategies of the speech act of suggestion proposed by Martinez-Flor (2005) are used. They have proposed 11 semantic strategies that can be used to perform the speech act of suggestion. When the data is analyzed the table 5 below emerges.

Suggestion Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Performative	4	8.3%
Specific Formulae	3	6.3%
Possibility/Probability	20	41.7%
Should	12	25.0%
Need	1	2.1%
Conditional	3	6.3%
Impersonal	5	10.4%
Total	48	100.0%

Table 5 Suggestion Strategy

The first thing that is observed here is that out of 11 strategies proposed by Martinez-Flor (2005) the managers in the present research have made use only of seven strategies. Even out of them in 41.7% cases (20 responses) the strategy called ‘Possibility/Probability’ is used. This is the most preferred strategy evident in the following responses:

“We can give them 2% extra bonus and some gifts so as to adjust with the provisions we have made.” (WM1 [Negotiator 1])

The next preferred strategy in the collected data is the use of modal verb “Should” and assert the opinion of the participants evident in the following example:

“The BOD should be convinced to increase bonus or offer some gifts.” (WM5 [Negotiator 1])

The more polite strategies like “Conditional” and “Impersonal” are present in three and five responses respectively. They are present in the following examples:

Conditional: “If this idea works I think it is better.” (PM1 [Negotiator 2])

Impersonal: “I think we should consult the BOD in this matter.” (WM15 [Negotiator 2])

Similarly there are four responses in which the “Performative” verb like ‘suggest’ is used as a semantic strategy for the realization of the speech act. This is evident in the following example:

“I am suggesting that we will offer them 13%.” (WM7 [Negotiator 2])

iv. Negotiation Strategy

In addition to the semantic strategies of suggestion discussed above, the general orientation of the participants is seen as negotiation strategies. In all four negotiation strategies are identified as given by Fareed Hameed Al-hindawi et.al. (2018) – ‘Contending’, ‘Problem-Solving’, ‘Yielding’, and ‘Avoidance’. When the collected data is analyzed in the light of these strategies the emerging facts are given in table 6.

Negotiation Strategy	Frequency	Percent
Contending	7	14.6%
Problem-Solving	23	47.9%
Yielding	5	10.4%
Avoidance	13	27.1%
Total	48	100.0%

Table 6 Negotiation Strategy

As the table shows, out of 48 respondents in the capacity of Negotiator 1 and Negotiator 2 the orientation of 23 respondents is that of solving the problem, that is, they want to solve the problem of bonus sincerely. In 13 cases the respondents have tried to avoid the issue. Seven respondents have shown general orientation of ‘Contending’, that is, they are argumentative in their attitude, while in five responses they have yielded to the negotiation requirements of the other party. Following are the examples of these negotiation strategies:

Contending – “We can give them some other benefits instead of rise.” (PM5 [Negotiator 1])

Problem-Solving – “It would be helpful if you can do some financial help.” (PM8 [Negotiator 2])

Yielding – “OK, I’ll talk with the union leader as you say and I’ll inform you.” (PM9 [Negotiator 2])

Avoidance – “We need to talk with the BOD and decide.’ (PM7 [Negotiator 2])

v. Use of Supportive Moves

As has been stated earlier, a speech act is hardly realized only with a single head act. In order to bring home the desired effect, the respondents tend to use supportive moves with different forces either in order to support the basic illocution of the head act or to give further necessary information for carrying out the speech act. Use of such supportive moves (SMs) also contributes to the enhanced degree of politeness to the response. The SMs have different forces and they can be treated as contributing in one way or the other to the successful realization of the speech act.

Table 7 provides all the necessary details about the use of SMs employed in the responses received for this situation.

SM Type	Pre-HA SM	Percentage	Post-HA SM	Percentage	TOTAL	Percentage
Additional Information	47	25.3%	21	11.4%	68	18.3%
Defense	37	19.9%	20	10.8%	57	15.4%
Alternative	11	5.9%	31	16.8%	42	11.3%
Agreement	7	3.8%	29	15.7%	36	9.7%
Limitation	19	10.2%	14	7.6%	33	8.9%
Enquiry	22	11.8%	9	4.9%	31	8.4%
Reason	15	8.1%	8	4.3%	23	6.2%
Insistence	9	4.8%	7	3.8%	16	4.3%
Reminder	10	5.4%	5	2.7%	15	4.0%
Caution	2	1.1%	10	5.4%	12	3.2%
Promise	0	0.0%	11	5.9%	11	3.0%
Appeal	4	2.2%	6	3.2%	10	2.7%
Empathy	1	0.5%	8	4.3%	9	2.4%
Assurance	0	0.0%	6	3.2%	6	1.6%
Pre-Request	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Hint	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
TOTAL	186	100.0%	185	100.0%	371	100.0%

Table 7 Types of Pre and Post-HA Supportive Moves Used

The table shows that the total number of Pre-HA SMs used is 186 and that of Post-HA SMs is 185, thus the total number of SMs in this situation is 371. These SMs are divided according to the forces they express. It is clear from the table that 371 SMs are distributed in 16 force utterances.

With the help of total 68 SMs the managers have tried to give ‘Additional Information’ to carry out the speech act of negotiation. Out of these 68, 47 are Pre-HA SMs, while 21 are Post-HA SMs. Following is an example of the utterances giving additional information required for realizing the speech act.

Post-HA SM – “This will help us to reconsider the bonus percentage in future depending on the financial position.” It is used after performing the HA – “You can start with 13% this year, 14% next year, and 15% for the year after that.” (PM3 [Negotiator 1]).

Another noteworthy force of the SM in the data is that of ‘Defense’. Here the respondents try to defend their stand. Thus, there are 37 Pre-HA SMs and 20 Post-HA SMs. Following is the example:

Pre-HA SM – “We should not go for hike directly in bonus but think of some alternative to make adjustments.” It is presented before the head act – “We can increase 2%, 1% bonus and 1% gift.” (PM2 [Negotiator 1])

Next example of supportive force is in the form of ‘Alternative’ used by the respondents to make their proposal acceptable as the earlier is objected to. There are total 42 SMs of which 11 are Pre-HA SMs and 31 Post-HA SMs used to support the speech act of negotiation. Following is the example:

Pre-HA SM – “If we cannot give rise of 20% let’s think of some other option.” It is presented before the head act – “We can give them 2% extra bonus and some gifts.” (WM1 [Negotiator 1])

Another prominent example of supportive force is ‘Agreement’ used by the respondents to carry on the negotiation process smoothly. There are total 36 SMs of which seven are Pre-HA SMs and 29 Post-HA SMs used to support the head act of negotiation. Following is the example:

Post-HA SM – “It’s a good thing that you also think positively about the bonus hike” It is used after the HA “If we can increase two more percent it will be better.” (WM3 [Negotiator 2])

The force of ‘Limitation’ is used by the respondents to make the other party reconsider the proposal so as to come to an acceptable solution. There are total 33 SMs of

which 19 are Pre-HA SMs and 14 Post-HA SMs used to support the head act of negotiation. Following is the example:

Post-HA SM – “I don’t think the financial position of the company allows us to increase bonus.” It is used after the HA “We should continue with previous year’s rate.” (WM6 [Negotiator 1])

The force of the SM of ‘Enquiry’ helps the negotiator to figure out what exactly to propose next. There are total 31 SMs of which 22 are Pre-HA and nine are Post-HA used to support the head act of negotiation. Following are the examples:

Pre-HA SM – “How do you think this benefits the workers?” It is presented before the head act – “We can have a word with the union leader about your proposal.” (PM5 [Negotiator 2])

Analysis of Politeness

The second pragmatic parameter employed for the analysis of the data is the use of politeness by the managers in successfully bringing home the desired goal. Unlike the speech acts, where different aspects are explicitly visible on the formal level of language, in case of politeness it depends upon both formal level of language and also it has to be perceived by considering the response in totality. The appropriate amount of politeness is necessary so that, particularly in the performance of FTAs, the mutual relation between the participants should not get spoiled. The participants in the communication process, therefore, have to take utmost care with two objectives in mind – i) acquiring the desired goal of communication and ii) in the process not spoiling the relations. Here politeness is further divided into certain sub points and the totality of their discussion provides a general picture of politeness in the responses.

i. Use of Hedges

As stated earlier, politeness is both a pragma-linguistic and socio- pragmatic phenomenon, therefore, not only the formal level of language, but also the overall response and its implications in the given society has to be taken into account. Use of ‘Hedges’ is a kind of tactfulness in the use of languages where the participants without directly opposing the stand of the other communicator, indirectly seeks to achieve his/her goal.

The table shows that only one respondent does not rely on the use of hedges in his responses, but all the remaining 47 respondents are successful in increasing the amount of politeness in their responses.

Following are some of the examples of use of hedges in the responses:

“*You see, I mean* we have to consider the management’s suggestion.....” (PM4 [Negotiator 1])

“*Hmm...! OK, but well*, I have to discuss the proposal with the union leader.” (WM8 [Negotiator 2])

ii. Use of Honorific

Use of honorific acquires a great importance in the study of politeness in some countries, specifically in some cultures, for it is associated with the social respect given to the interlocutor.

Out of the 48 respondents only 10 have used honorifics in their responses; however, this less use of honorifics in the present context can be accounted for to the fact that both the parties in the present communication situation are the managers of equal status. The equal social status and power do not need the use of honorific.

Following are a couple of examples from the data:

“*Please don’t forget sir the fact...*” while performing the HA: “The financial condition does not allow the company to give any more bonuses this year.” (WM15 [Negotiator 1])

iii. Use of Understatement

Use of understatement is a strategy where the respondent minimizes the value of the self and, with this, increases the politeness of the response. This is also a preferred strategy in the western societies, and in the present case, it is used to a very less extent.

The tables show that the strategy called understatement is used only in three responses. All these three occurrences are found in the responses of Negotiator 2. Among other things, it means that the Negotiator 2 in the given cases tries to convince Negotiator 1 by using this strategy.

Analysis of Cooperative Principles

The collected role play data are analyzed in the light of the observance or flouting of the cooperative maxims. The following is maxim wise discussion of the analysis of the data presented in table 9.

Maxims →	Quantity		Quality		Manner		Relation	
Flouted	29	60.4%	27	56.3%	37	77.1%	7	14.6%
Observed	19	39.6%	21	43.7%	11	22.9%	41	85.4%
Total	48	100.0%	48	100.0%	48	100.0%	48	100.0%

Table 9 Cooperative Maxims

i. Quantity Maxim

Quantity maxim expects the participants to give all the necessary but not too much information to be irrelevant for the current communication situation. It also expects the

participants to be brief and to the point considering the goal of communication and avoid redundancy. The above table shows that around 60 % managers have flouted the maxim of quantity. It means that the amount of information they have contributed is either inadequate or irrelevant, but the remaining 40 % managers have rigorously observed the quantity maxim.

ii. Quality Maxim

The quality maxim refers to the expectation from the participants in the communication process that their contribution should be true. Moreover, it also means that they should communicate whatever they believe to be false. Such true information helps in building a good rapport between the participants and the percentage of successful communication is increased. Table 9 above shows that 27 participants (50.3 %) have flouted the quality maxim. This means that the amount of information contributed by them is something untrue about the issue of bonus to workers or the hike they are demanding. However, there are 21 participants (43.7 %) who are true and have contributed to increase politeness leading to enhancement of rapport with the other partners.

Following is an example of flouting of the maxim:

“Our workers get reasonably good salaries.” is said while the head act is “We should at least give them some gifts.” (WM12 [Negotiator 2]) is irrelevant and contradictory.

iii. Manner Maxim

With this maxim Grice wants the participants in the communication process to contribute in a plain manner, that their contribution should not be obscure and ambiguous. Whatever a participant says should be understood by the other without any difficulty. Observance of the manner maxim also helps increase the success rate of communication. As the table 9 above shows 37 of the 48 respondents have flouted the maxim of manner and this shows that they are hesitant to express their views about the hike in bonus amount. They have been more suggestive than being clear about their proposals to solve the problem. The remaining 11, on the other hand, seem to be unambiguous as they are direct and firm about their views. Thus, those managers who have flouted the manner maxim have led their discussion to take longer time.

Following is the example of flouting of the maxim:

“If we want to see our future growth we should not give any more increment than decided.” is not so clear as it is a general statement proposed by the manager as a stance and this leads to doubt and needs to be supported by more SMs. (WM4 [Negotiator 1])

iv. Relation Maxim

By relation maxim Grice expresses his view that while using language for contributing in the present communication situation the participants should take into account their relation with each other and accordingly use language. Therefore, by this maxim Grice simply states that the participants should use relevant type of language in their communication. Table 9 above shows that majority of the managers (85.4%) have observed

the maxim of relation as they are careful about the other partners' position and consequently the rapport between them. This observance of the maxim shows that they have used relevant language while negotiating. Though, however, 14.6% have flouted the maxim their other partners may have understood their conditions and overall there seems good cooperation between the participant pairs.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

Following are the findings emerging out of the analysis of the data:

- i.** As for the nature of speech act, majority of the respondents make use of 'Conventionally Indirect' nature of speech act of negotiation. However, the other two types – 'Direct' and 'Non-conventionally Indirect' are also used intermittently.
- ii.** Out of the 48 responses, 20 make use of 'Possibility/Probability' strategy as the Suggestion strategy for negotiation, 12 make use of Should statement, five make use of 'Impersonal', four make use of 'Performative', and two each make use of 'Specific Formulae', and 'Conditional' strategy for the purpose.
- iii.** Out of the 48 responses, in 23 'Problem Solving' is used as negotiation strategy, in 13 'Avoidance', in seven 'Contending', and in five 'Yielding' strategy is used for the same purpose.
- iv.** Certain specific supportive moves dominate in the responses received for the negotiation situation, they are: 'Defense' (57 responses), 'Reason' (30 responses), 'Reminder' (16 responses), 'Alternative' (42 responses), and 'Additional Information' (68 responses), and 'Agreement' (36 responses).
- v.** In all, the responses 'Hedges' are used for increasing politeness in communication. Similarly 'Statement' is used 44 times and 'Imperative' and 'Interrogative' forms are used for two responses each, which increase the politeness of the utterances.
- vi.** The analysis of observance and flouting of Cooperative Maxims indicates that both the 'Would-be' Managers and 'Practising' Managers at times observe and also flout the maxims. However, the percentage of flouting the maxims of the 'Would-be' Managers is greater as compared to that of the 'Practising' Managers.
- vii.** The data shows that all the four negotiation strategies – 'Contending', 'Problem Solving', 'Yielding', and 'Avoidance' are present. However, their percentage differs. Out of these four negotiation strategies 'Problem Solving' strategy is seen used the most up to 48% and the 'Avoidance' strategy is present in 27% responses.

Works Cited:

- Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational routines in English: Convention and creativity*. London: Longman.
- Akmajian, Adrian (2003). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Akmajian, Demers, Farmer and Harnish (Eds). 6th Edition. MIT Press.
- Al-hindawi, Fareed Hameed and Hasan, H. M. (2018).
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329990979_Negotiation_A_Pragmatic_Perspective
- Allen, Louis A. (1958). *Management and organization*. New York : McGraw-Hill
- Andersen, Helle and Rasmussen, Eric S. (2002). The Role of Language Skills in Corporate Communication. In *Nordic Workshop on Interorganisational Research*.
- Argenti, Paul A and Forman, Janis. (2002). *Power of Corporate Communication*. McGraw Hill Professional.
- Arndt, H., and R. W. Janney. (1979). Interactional and linguistic models for the analysis of speech data: An integrative approach. *Sociologia Internationalis* 17: 1–2, 3–45.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behaviour. In S. Blum-Kulka, & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp.123-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. N. (ed.) *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3): *Speech acts*. (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Kachru, Yamuna & Smith, Larry. (2008). *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1974). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. London: Penguin.
- _____. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- _____. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: OUP.
- Martinez-Flor, Alicia. (2005). A Theoretical Review of the Speech Act of Suggesting: Toward a Taxonomy for its Use in ELT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187.
- Murtoaro, J., Kujala, J. and Arto, K. (2005). *Negotiations in Project Sales and Delivery Process: An application of negotiation analysis*. Espoo, Finland: Helsinki University of Technology Press.
- Sarwade, A M. (2011) *Communicative Competence and Communicative Performance: A Case Study of Post-graduate Students of Shivaji University*. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis submitted to Shivaji University, Kolhapur.

- _____. (2019). *Face-Threatening Speech acts in English and Marathi: A Contrastive Perspective*. An Unpublished Major Research Report submitted to UGC.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- _____. (1975). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Yule, George. (1996/2000). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.