24
"PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE OF COMPLAINT IN MANAGERIAL COMMUNICATION: A STUDY"

Ravindra Anant Porlekar, *Research Student*
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 'complaint' 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, complaint strategies, Speech Act, Politeness and Cooperative Strategies.*

Introduction

   It is said that complaints are one of the face threatening but necessary speech acts of everyday living. We all experience complaints either when we are angry with someone or about any issues which upset us, or when someone is angry with us. We all face many actions, behaviors and matters which do not make us happy and therefore lead to complaints. In other words, a complaint can be an expression of being angry, unhappy or dissatisfied about something and requires particular linguistic strategies for its expression. Consequently, when making complaint the speaker reacts with anger to things which go wrong.

   Every business is essentially an economic and a social system. 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. Complaint is one of them that can endanger social relationship. Complaint is also a Face-threatening Speech Act in which the speaker complains about a case of injustice directly to the 'offender'. Such cases of complaint are very subjective in that individuals differ in their assessment of what they perceive to be injustice or wrong-doing. This assessment is again based upon, to a certain extent, the social and cultural expectations. The realization of this Speech Act varies across different dimensions like social status, familiarity, Power and Solidarity, etc.

   For the present study, 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, the instance of complaining in 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 Complaints in Managerial Communication

   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 studiers 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 complaint.

The speech act of complaint has attracted good attention of pragmaticians, for it is a face-threatening act. It has also been the subject of many cross-cultural studies. For example, Trosborg (1995) examined complaints produced by native speakers of English and Danish learners of English. Searle (1969) classifies complaint as an expressive speech act in which complainers express their feelings and attitudes regarding a dispute, challenge, or sometimes directly deny the social competence of the hearers. Thus, through speech act of complaint speakers make the statements which are face threatening and can breakdown the relationships; however, using appropriate semantic and politeness strategies they can repair these statements and remedy the problem.

Speech Acts

Speech act is one of the most significant component of pragmatics. Speech acts are realized by means of various strategies to constitute and maintain the starting, developing and ending points of the concerned illocution. 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.

Complaint Strategies

Complaints are very subjective in that the individuals differ in their assessment of what they perceive to be injustice or wrong-doing. This assessment is again based upon, to a certain extent, the social and cultural expectations. The realization of this Speech Act varies across different dimensions like social status, familiarity, Power and Solidarity, etc. That is to say, in the realization of this speech act, the addresser follows the cultural norms. The realization of this speech act may be Direct or Indirect depending upon the variables pointed out above. The addresser again needs to use some Politeness Strategies so that the relation between the complainer and the addressee should not get damaged. That is to say, s/he should be tactful while complaining. The following could be seen as some of the factors involved:

1. The speaker should perceive that the addressee has committed an action which is socially unacceptable.
2. It involves the realization of the speaker that the socially unacceptable action has unfavourable consequences for him/her or for the general public.
3. The speaker uses an expression of complaint which can be either Direct or Indirect depending upon the Power and Solidarity between the speaker and the addressee.
4. The speaker needs to use some Politeness Strategies to keep the channel open between him/her and the addressee.
5. It may also involve the explanations of the socially unacceptable action which can be used as an Indirect Complaint.
6. Generally, the Complaint is used by a person of lower or equal social status/age/class/caste etc. to address a person at upper hierarchical level. The superior person, in such situation, would generally use Speech Act of Order rather than that of Complaint.

In order to analyze the semantic strategies used in the performance of head acts by the managers, the following model proposed by Irana Prykarpatska (2008) is used.

STRATEGY	NATURE
Not preform FTA	---
Joke	Indirect
Irony	
Hint	
Conventionally Indirect Disapproval	
Open Disapproval	
Statement that SUA took place	Direct
Request that contains forbearance	
Mitigated request for repair	
Un-mitigated request for repair	
Mitigated warning	
Un-mitigated warning	
Open attack on H / Verbal abuse	

Table 1 Model for Complaint Strategies
(Adopted from Irana Prykarpatska 2008)

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.

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.

Employee satisfaction is never perfect in any business setting. There are issues which lead to differences of opinion between the higher level and lower level managers. Therefore, there are many occasions where there is reluctance to accept a change. It requires a very good communication skill to handle complaints arising out of change implementation. The communication situation is, in fact, that of negotiating the complaints from lower level managers, and the most used speech act is that of 'complaint'. The present study deals with a complaint 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 complaint. The script of the situation runs as follows:

Situation: Issue of Ban on Use of Cell Phone in the Workshop

Galaxy Ceramics is a crockery manufacturing factory. The floor manager (Supervisor) has noticed that the workers have developed very bad habit of attending to the calls on their cell phones and very frequently checking the updates on social media. This has a very adverse effect on their performance as well as the productivity of the workshop. The supervisor has also noticed distraction of workers, breakages of products and loss of coordination as a result of use of cell phone while on duty. In the discussion with the factory management, the Supervisor has been advised to ban the use of cell phone while working. Accordingly, the supervisor has notified to all employees that it is mandatory for all the workers to deposit their cell phones with the gatekeeper before they enter the workshop. They will be allowed to take away the cell phones ONLY AT THE TIME OF LEAVING THE FACTORY.

All the workers are very upset and complain against this decision. An immediate leader Ajay/Asha comes forward with protest to meet the floor manager (Supervisor). There is a meeting between them. The supervisor defends the decision and convinces Mr. Ajay/Asha how the decision is right.

Here the parties hold higher level and lower level positions where the authority dominates the subordinates. The responsibility of the supervisor is to see that the workers smoothly accept the proposed change through his / her persuading skills, whereas the employee leader has to defend the complaint

convincingly. Finally they are expected to arrive at a kind of win-win type of negotiation than win-lose.

Speech Act Analysis

The pragmatic aspect deployed for the analysis of the responses is Speech Act. Every response is treated as a speech act and accordingly the central utterance that carries out the action of complaining is identified. The other utterances produced by the participants are treated as supportive moves that provide the necessary information and details of the act. Once the central utterance, i.e. the head act, is identified, it is studied for the Nature of Speech Act, Organization Structure and the Semantic Strategy used to realize the illocutionary force. Following is the analysis:

i. Nature of Speech Act

A speech act is said to be realized in three ways direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect. Since in the process of complaining each participant tries to put forward his/her stand, the speech act of complaint is considered as the basic speech act. Table 2 provides the details about the nature of speech acts of the responses received.

Nature	Frequency	Percentage
Direct	16	66.7%
Conventionally Indirect	8	33.3%
Total	24	100.0%

Table 2 Nature of Speech Act of Complaint

As the table shows out of the total 24 speech acts 16 are direct in nature, while the remaining eight are conventionally indirect. None of the participants has used non-conventionally indirect nature of speech act, and it shows that only 33.3% seem to contribute to politeness to their conversation.

Following are the examples of direct and conventionally indirect speech acts from the data:

Direct: "Workers are really not happy with the notice." (PM4)

It is a straightforward expression at the time of opening of the conversation.

Conventionally indirect: "How about reconsideration of the cell phone ban decision?" (WM15)

Here the manager is both implicit and conventionally indirect contributing to overall politeness to the conversation.

ii. Organization Structure of Speech Act

Table 3 shows the organization structure of all the 24 responses considered for analysis.

Organization Structure	Frequency	Percentage
HA + {SM}	4	16.7%
SMs + HA + {SM}	9	37.5%
{SM}+ HA + {SM}	11	45.8%
Total	24	100.0%

Table 3 Organization Structure of Head Speech Act (Situation E)

Note: 'SM' stands for single SM, whereas '{SM}' stands for more than one SM

The above table shows that in all the responses the participants are aware of the fact that the realization of the speech act like that of complaint requires more number of supportive moves. There are responses in which 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 where the subordinate is successful in getting the complaint accepted partially using different organization structures:

{SM} + HA + {SM}(WM1)

The speech act of complaint is realized using two Pre-HA SMs 'Pre request' and 'Additional Information' and two Post-HA SMs 'Enquiry' and 'Appeal'

Pre-HA SM1 "Sir, can I have a few minutes? I want to talk with you." (Pre Request)

Pre-HA SM2 "The employees are so disturbed." (Additional Information)

HA "Why have you suddenly banned the use of cell phones?"

Post-HA SM1 "What is the loss due to the use of cellphones?" (Enquiry)

Post-HA SM2 "Sir, this decision will cause real loss, please cancel the notice." (Appeal)

iii. Use of Complaint Strategy

The data collected for this situation are all on record responses used for the study of the speech act of complaint. In order to analyze the semantic strategies used in the performance of head acts by the managers, the model proposed by Irana Prykarpatska (2008) is used.

Complaint Strategy	Frequency	
	Total	Percentage
Conventionally Indirect Disapproval	7	29.2%
Open Disapproval	7	29.2%
Request that Contains Forbearance	2	8.3%
Mitigated Request for Repair	3	12.5%
Unmitigated Request for Repair	1	4.2%
Unmitigated Warning	2	8.3%
Open Attack on H / Verbal Abuse	2	8.3%
Total	24	100.0%

Table 4 Use of Complaint Strategy

The above table shows that a good majority of managers (58.4%) has preferred to express disapproval of the decision of ban on use for mobile phones either in a conventionally indirect way or openly stating it. 29.2% of them are indirect and implicit in their complaining For example,

"Isn't there any other option instead of depositing phones with the gatekeeper?" (PM3)

29.9% of the participants openly express their complaints, as in

"I don't like this decision." (WM13)

12.5% use the strategy of Mitigated Request for Repair, but 8.3% of them use Unmitigated Warning and Open Attack strategies. For example,

"We just cannot put away our cell phones." (WM7) (*Unmitigated Warning*)

"We want our mobiles back or we are going on strike." (PM9) (*Open Attack on H*)

iv. 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. On the basis of the organization structure of the responses, two types of SMs are identified Pre head act SM (Pre-HA SM) and Post head act SM (Post-HA SM). The Pre-HA SMs typically occur before the main action of the speech act is performed, whereas the Post-HA SMs come after the head act. 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 5 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
Defense	3	8.1%	59	33.5%	62	29.1%
Agreement	---	---	33	18.8%	33	15.5%
Enquiry	9	24.3%	14	8.0%	23	10.8%
Additional Information	12	32.4%	11	6.3%	23	10.8%
Alternative	---	---	17	9.7%	17	8.0%
Insistence	---	---	15	8.5%	15	7.0%
Pre-Request	11	29.7%	---	---	11	5.2%
Appeal	1	2.7%	7	4.0%	8	3.8%
Promise	---	---	6	3.4%	6	2.8%
Assurance	---	---	4	2.3%	4	1.9%
Reason	---	---	3	1.7%	3	1.4%
Limitation	---	---	3	1.7%	3	1.4%
Empathy	---	---	2	1.1%	2	0.9%
Caution	---	---	2	1.1%	2	0.9%
Hint	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
TOTAL	37	100.0%	176	100.0%	213	100.0%

Table 5 Types of Pre and Post-HA Supportive Moves used (Situation E)

The table shows that the total number of Pre-HA SMs used is 37 and that of Post-HA SMs is 176, thus the total number of SMs in this situation is 213. These SMs are divided according to the forces they express. It is clear from the table that 213 SMs are distributed in 15 force utterances.

With the help of total 62 SMs the managers have tried to stand with their complaint using the force of 'Defense' to carry out the speech act of complaint. Out of these 62, only three are Pre-HA SMs, while 59 are Post-HA SMs. Following is the example of the utterances of 'Defense' used in the realization of the speech act of complaint.

Pre-HA SM "We have to understand the need of the workers." (WM6) It is used before the performance of the HA "I think that's a wrong decision and we should change."

Another significant force used is that of 'Agreement'. Here the respondents try to come on terms with the alternatives proposed by the other party so as to arrive at an amiable solution to the problem by conceding. These have been used after a good discussion of the issue and hence they are used as Post-HA SMs. For example,

Post-HA SM "Yes, we can ban the mobiles, but we'll do it slowly." (PM1) It is used after the HA "It's a very harsh decision."

Next two forces 'Enquiry' and 'Additional Information' are used 23 times each and then contributed to the overall politeness of their conversations. Following are the examples:

Enquiry - Pre-HA SM "What is the serious reason that you have decided the ban on cellphones" (PM3) It is used before performing the HA "Isn't there any other option instead of depositing phones with the gatekeeper?"

Additional Information - Post-HA SM "Sir, many workers are disturbed and I have notices that they are

not so cooperative." (WM5) it is used after the HA "I want to talk about the decision of ban on cell phones."

Other significant forces, "Alternative" and "Insistence", are used 17 and 15 times respectively as in the following examples. These two have equally contributed to the realization of the FTA of complaint.

Alternative - This is used after a dispreferred response to an earlier proposal.

Post-HA SM "They should be allowed to use it in emergency by keeping them with the supervisor and not with the gatekeeper." (PM8) is used after an objection to "Cellphone ban is just not a good thing for employees."

Insistence - This is mostly used after getting a kind of preferred response to the HA as in

Post-HA SM "Sir, you should not be so harsh and allow them to use the phones when they need." (WM4) is used after encouraging response from the other party "Fine come on, what's the problem?" after the performance of the HA "I want to discuss about the ban on cell phones."

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. When the data is analyzed with this objective it is seen that all the participants have made use of hedges in their communication of complaint. This is as expected for the communication of the complaint is from the lower level to the upper level of authority. This shows that both the managers are very well aware of the effect of their speech acts of complaint and they need to bring politeness to their communication. Following is the example of performances of the HA:

"***Ok, Sir, sir…but…*** I want to know the reasons why you have banned cell phones." (PM6)

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. The data shows that as expected 21 (87.5%) out of 24 respondents have used honorifics in their responses. This is due to unequal social and power status between the communicators involved in an upward communication. However, those three (12.5%) who have not used any honorific must have compensated with some other politeness device to successfully attain the goal of their communication.

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 data reveals the fact 20 (83.3%) managers have not used understatement while complaining. This shows that they are not aware of the fact that it might lead to

impoliteness and they have to compensate for the threat by using other politeness strategies.

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 8.

Maxims →	Quantity		Quality		Manner		Relation	
Flouted	9	37.5%	6	25.0%	4	16.7%	2	8.3%
Observed	15	62.5%	18	75.0%	20	83.3%	22	91.7%
Total	48	100.0%	48	100.0%	48	100.0%	48	100.0%

Chapter 1 Page 1

Table 6 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 of goal of communication and avoid redundancy. The table above shows that around 62.5 % 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 37.5 % 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 6 above shows that six participants (25.0 %) 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 18 participants (75.0 %) are true and have contributed to increase in politeness leading to enhancement of rapport with the other partners.

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. Table 6 above shows that the majority (83.3%) of the participants are unambiguous they are direct and firm about their views, but the remaining four out of 24 participants have flouted the maxim of manner and this shows that they are hesitant to express their complaint. They have been more indirect and suggestive than being clear about their ideas. Thus, they may have needed longer time to present their complaint and bring home the desired effect.

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. The data in the table above shows that as expected, for it being an upward communication of the FTA of complaint, majority of the participants have observed the maxim of relation as they are more careful about the other party's social status and power and consequently the rapport between them. This observance of the relation maxim shows that they have relevant language with more politeness. However, though 8.3% of the remaining managers have flouted

the maxim their other partners may have understood their condition and overall there seems a good cooperation between the participants.

MAJOR FINDINGS:

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

i.   Both the 'Practising' Managers as well as 'Would-be' Managers have preferred 'Conventionally Indirect' and 'Direct' nature of complaint.

ii. The responses of the situation also show that none from both 'Practising' Managers and 'Would-be' Managers have used the 'Non-conventionally Indirect' ways of complaining.

iii. Out of the seven complaint strategies proposed by Irana Prykarpatska (2008) 'Practising' Managers use 'Conventionally Indirect Disapproval' (four responses), 'Open Disapproval' (four responses), and 'Open Attack on H' (one response). On the other hand, the 'Would-be' Managers have made use of all the seven strategies. It shows that the 'Practising' Managers pay more attention to the face of the addressee while complaining.

iv. As for the supportive moves used in the situation, the SM of 'Defense' is used 62 times, that of 'Agreement' 33 times, 'Additional Info' 23 times, 'Alternative' 17 times, 'Insistence' 15 and that of 'Enquiry' is used five times.

v.   When the data is analyzed for politeness it is found that the responses have achieved politeness with the help of such devices such as Hedges, Assertive Statements, Interrogative Forms, Negativeness and Honorifics. It is found that in all 24 responses 'Hedges', and in 21 responses 'Honorifics' are used, 18 responses make use of 'Statements', in 12 responses 'Negativeness' is used, while five responses are in 'Interrogative' forms which contribute to the overall politeness of the responses.

vi. Both the 'Would-be' Managers and 'Practising' Managers in many cases have both observed and at times flouted the different maxims of cooperation. However, around 60.0% of 'Practising' Managers observe the cooperation maxims while equal percentage of 'Would-be' Managers flout the cooperation maxims.

References:

- 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
- Andersen, Helle and Rasmussen, Eric S. (2002). The Role of Language Skills in Corporate Communication. In Nordic Workshop on Interorganisational Research.
- Arndt, H., and R. W. Janney. (1979). Interactional and linguistic models for the analysis of speech data: An integrative approach. Sociologia Internationalis 17: 12, 345.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behaviour. In S. Blum-Kulka, & G. Kapser, (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.
- Prykarpatska, Iryna. (2008). 'Why are you late?' Cross-cultural Pragmatic study of Complaints in American English and Ukrainian'. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 21: 87-102.
- 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.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- _____. (1975). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*, 1-23.
- Yule, George. (1997/2000). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.