

Specifying Power in Language with Introduction of New Signs of Power

Aliye Kord Zafaranlu Kambuziya¹, Negar Momeni²

Received: 7/12/2008

Accepted: 3/11/2009

Abstract

Power is a social phenomenon, which refers to the ability of its holders to compliance or obedience of other individuals to their will. This superiority is caused by different factors including social role, sex or even a particular style of speech. This study aims at presenting comprehensive definition of power, its role in terms of different speech styles of language and its signs. Therefore, the authors can measure power in language more carefully, recognizing new signs. In fact, power in language means avoiding linguistic uncertainty variables (filler, pause...) and using some linguistic signs (like following standard accent, etc...). "lengthening", "tag question (hear-oriented, speaker-oriented)" and "use of English word" are studied for the first time. In fact, we want to know if these three factors can be considered as linguistic uncertainty variables showing powerless speech. Sample research is 30 male managers at the age of 30-40. The results showed "lengthening" and its different kinds are one of the uncertainty linguistic variables showing powerless speech style.

Keywords: Power, Power in language, Linguistic uncertainty variables (lengthening, tag question ...)

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran

2. Ph.D Student. in Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, E-mail: n-momeni@modares.ac.ir

Introduction

Power is a well-known concept that most people think they understand its meaning intuitively, however they cannot represent a comprehensive definition. Power is a social phenomenon which has relation with language. The concept of "power in language" is defined by introducing linguistic signs and avoidance of them cause speech to be more fluent and effective, hence; its effect on the audience is increased. Therefore, power in language is defined on the basis of influence and effect of our speech on the audience. When we talk about power of language, it is necessary to refer to powerful and powerless speech styles. Actually, the linguistic signs cause speech to be effective. These signs are called linguistic certainty variables or linguistic uncertainty variables according to their role. In other words, powerful speech style/effective speech is distinct from powerless speech style by these variables. The main question is: what are these signs which bring about such a distinction?

Hypothesis: signs of powerless style including tag question, use of English word in Persian language and lengthening cause speech to be less effective (powerless style) and avoidance of these signs causes speech to be more effective (powerful style).

Principally the author aims at studying **lengthening** and **use of English word** and **tag question**, if they can fall in the group of powerless style signs.

Power

There are different definitions of power, but the researchers just refer to the most important ones, the one of which belongs to Tomas. She says: "Power is a complex and abstract concept, and has an infinitely important influence on our lives. Power is defined in *The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought* (1999, p.678) as: 'The ability of its holders to compliance or obedience of other individuals to their will'." (Thomas, Linda et. al., 2004, p.10)

Hung and Bradac in their book **Power in Language** (1993, p.3) defines power as follows:

"... a widely used concept for the analysis of human social behavior. At the simplest level, one can distinguish between two senses of the concept: power to and power over. Russell (1938) captured the "power to" meaning very well by defining power as the production of intended effects. We can differentiate these effects into the following. In the positive sense, "power to" is the realization of personal or collective goals. In the negative sense, it is the hindering of other individuals' achievement of goals for the sake of hindering. "Power over", on the other hand, is the relational facet of power. One person has power over another when the two stand in a relationship of dominance and submission; this may occur in institutional (e.g., the military) or non-institutional (e.g., a hostage situation) settings,

legitimately or illegitimately, between friends or between enemies".

Fairclough (2001, pp.36-57) says power manifests itself into two ways: "power in discourse" and "power behind discourse". "Power in discourse" is concerned with discourse as a place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted. The participants are unequal. The relationship between a doctor and a group of students is an example of this relationship. "Power behind discourse" shifts the focus to how orders of discourse, as dimensions of the social orders of social institutions or societies, are themselves shaped and constituted by relations of power. The relationship between a doctor and his patient is an example.

Power as a social phenomenon has effect on language. Various linguists and socialists talked about it and its role in language. Foucault, a French philosopher and socialist, had worked on power and discourse. He emphasized on the relation between language and social factors. This relation is so strong that Foucault says: there is a correlation between discourse, power, wisdom and reality. Jahanshahi (1388/2009) say: "On power, Foucault rejects simple hierarchy; power is not a simple notification from higher to lower status. It is, in fact, a network possessing complicated relations. Power specifies and legalizes structures of society; it derives from different layers of social

and linguistic (concept) transactions. Power is not applied on a vector from up to down, but it is shaped as a discourse. Foucault believes that power is found everywhere including relationships, linguistic transactions, social groups and etc." Salimi (1383/2004) quotes from Foucault in **The Archaeology of Knowledge**: "Discourse as a key concept is a point of power and knowledge. Discourses are forms or elements which act in correlation with power." Foucault in his work **The History of Sexuality** says: "Power and knowledge are strongly mixed with each other, no knowledge is imaginable without power; power and knowledge are interacted in bed of discourse."

After offering definitions, we deal with power and other factors with different viewpoints.

Different approaches about the relationship between power and other factors

Studies on the relationship between power and other factors began with the study on power and sex by Lakoff. Lakoff studied power on the basis of biological aspect between men and women and argues that women do not access to power in a society so this can have effect on their language. He added that the women's speech is not as effective as men's ones because the women use the signs which show uncertainty like **tag question**. Lakoff claimed this sign has the same function in all

languages!! This approach is called dominance approach.

Dominance approach

Dominance approach was proposed by Robbin Lakoff (1973). His work **Language and Women's Status** attracted others. Lakoff used Jespersen's views in his book, maintaining women's language is deviated from men's language. Lakoff's work is based on the point that the women have the submissive role and this determines their behavior in the society. Lakoff believes women's language is **other's language**; he explored different observations and found there is a common root in all these observations in that femininity equals with powerlessness. (Cameron, 1998, p.216)

Lakoff continued that men and women use language with special aims as long as sexual differences play role in accessing power in society, it is natural to say these differences breed the lingual differences between men and women.

Cultural approach

The most famous researcher of this approach is Debora Tannen. In an article entitled "relativity of language", she says when disagreement occurs in conversation between women and men, definitely there is not the problem of hierarchical status and lack of equality. She compares the difference in women and men's language with cultural

differences. She also believes that it is wrong and unfair to say men are always superior to women in speech; however she does not deny the sexual inequality.

For the first time *international sociolinguistics* was introduced by Camperz. Tannen (1993, p.11) says: "Camperz believes social relation such as dominance and subordination are made in communication. In this approach, the criteria are as following:

- a. In communication, role is not given but made.
- b. Situation is not given but made by speech and performance.
- c. Anything that occurs in communication is not only related to one conversation, but it is a shared product and result of a communication in which different people participate.
- d. Linguistic factors like interruption, volume of talk, indirectness can not bear a special meaning".

According to Tannen, difference between dominance approach and cultural approach is that in the latter, one participant can be superior to another while communicating but it does not mean participant wants to be superior in any situation of communication.

Action approach

This is one of the newest approaches which attracted a lot of attention. Actually, in this approach, there is no constant entity for sexism.

Women always play their feminine role and follow the feminine prescription.

Coats (1996), the pioneer of this approach, believes femininity is not a constant concept. MehdiPur (1378/2000) quotes from Coats that “in this developed world, femininity has numerous prescriptions for us. Different discourses bring different types of femininity for us and women play different roles of femininity on the basis of situations and discourses. The concept of femininity has changed during the course of time. The meaning of femininity depends on the context in which this concept is used.”

Tabbo approach

Jespersion (1992) gathered linguistic differences in his book entitled **Language, its Entity, its Change and its Root**. He explores linguistic variation. MehdiPur (1378/2000) says: “Jespersion quotes from Lyons (1724) who lived in Caribs that the women were not allowed to call their husbands' name, or use some words or phonemes, so they used different elements. Therefore, linguistic variations between men and women were made. Actually, "tabbo words" is a source of linguistic difference between men and women”.

O'Barr (1982) focused on more general aspects of social power. In an experiment, O'Barr showed the people, whether men or women, who access to social power and have high-social power jobs like engineer,

lawyer...use some special signs and avoid some others which show certainty in their speech. (We explain more in part of "powerful and powerless speech styles").

Power of Language to Impress and Influence

In order to influence and impress others, the people use different means; their facial expression, actions and personalities. Perhaps the only shared thing that every one can enjoy to leave an impression on others is use of language. Aristotle and other classic scholars recognized a long time ago that facts and logic alone are often insufficient for persuasion. Facts and logic - the prescribed bases of persuasion-must be adapted to the situation, and it is language and its style that will bear the burden of this mission. Various linguists such as Hung and Bradac, 1993; Beattie, 1982; Bull and Mayer, 1988; Burke, 1941; Duncan, 1962 state that some people like John F. Kennedy, Margaret Thatcher etc. can influence and persuade others. These linguists believe these leaders' persuasion is not just resulted from their social role. A significant feature of this power – inducing communication, is the speech or language style such people employ. It is their language which leaves an impression on others and persuades them. Linda Thomas et.al (2004, P.45) describe this persuasive language -the power of rhetoric- as follows:

"Rhetoric is the skill of elegant and persuasive speaking, perfected by the ancient Greeks. **The Oxford English Dictionary** defines it more precisely as 'the art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order that he may express himself with eloquence'."

How the language should be used to impress others is an important question which will be explained about.

Hung and Bradac (1993, p.5) say: "The use of language in everyday life contributes to the realization of goals - this is "power to." Specifically, we should examine first how language can be used to impress and influence people. What a person says and how he or she says it leaves an impression on hearers".

The particular interest lies in the power dimension of impression formation: How to measure the power dimension of processes underlies the formation of a powerful or powerless impression, and how these processes are related to speech features.

Powerful and Powerless Speech styles

Now the question arises as: "what features of language, either spoken or written, affect persuasive outcomes?" Perhaps a useful starting point is recognizing the variables of powerful versus powerless style, because research on the

variables purports to be exclusively focused on language and power.

The powerful versus powerless style variables emerged from the empirical work of anthropologist O'Barr and associates (Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1978; O'Barr 1982), although a case could be made that an earlier point of origin was an essay by linguist Lakoff (1973). It is worth reiterating that Lakoff was primarily interested about the connections between gender and language, whereas O'Barr focused on more general aspects of social power.

Many signs showing uncertainty are used in measuring power in language. These signs like "tag question and question intonation, rising, for declarative sentences" are stated by Lakoff (1973, p.53). He also continues these two factors are found in women's speech. What Lakoff named *women speech* is what we talked about in *dominance approach*. He also continues that the reason of uncertainty in *women speech* is that they do not access to power in society¹.

Hung and Bradac (1993, p.19) in their book **Power in Language** say: "O'Barr initially recorded and later transcribed verbal communication transpiring over many hours in an American courtroom in North Carolina.

1. Janet Holms (1999, pp.86-96) states that these signs and fillers (e.g. you know,...), uncertainty verbs (e.g. I think,...) as well do not show uncertainty but admit politeness in language.

Examination of the transcripts revealed a cluster of linguistic features that certain speakers used frequently and that others did not. The speakers drawing from this cluster tended to be uneducated witnesses, i.e., inexpert testifiers, defendants, and so on, people viewed by O'Barr and associates to have one thing in common: low social power. The speakers who avoided using linguistic forms from this cluster tended to be lawyers, judges, expert witnesses, and so forth - individuals with relatively high social power. The low-power forms were these:

1-Hedges: "I *sort of* liked it" 2-Intensifiers: "I *really* liked it" 3-Tag questions or declaratives with rising Intonation: "*I liked it?*" 4-Hesitations: "I... *uh...* liked it." 5-Deictic phrases: "That man *over there* liked it." 6-Polite forms: " *Yes sir*, I liked it." "

The nonuse of these forms by ostensibly high-power speakers resulted in speech that was comparatively direct, fluent, and terse.

Signs of Power I

After definition of power, it is important to say what signs of power in language are. Signs of power are classified into two parts, those which are countable and power of language is measured by them and those which are not as countable as the first ones. **The first group is composed of linguistic uncertainty variables and called signs of power I and the second one is called signs of power II.**

As we saw in the previous section, low power forms are composed of some linguistic variables (hedge, filler...) showing uncertainty. *Since they are used in measuring power in language, they are called signs of power.* The less they are used, the more power in language is proved. But there are more signs (low-power forms/uncertainty variable) showing uncertainty. Here the authors try to numerate the most important ones. (We name these signs in part of linguistic uncertainty variables)

Signs of power II

In the preceding section, it was shown that virtually all of the research on power of style have focused on the powerless, or low-power, style. That is, research on the powerful or high power, style has been framed not on its own terms but, rather, always with reference to powerlessness. If the people avoid the low-power style (linguistic uncertainty variables), they have more power in language. However, signs of power II focus on positive aspect of power in language, in a way that *use* of these factors show powerful style. As signs of power II have qualitative properties more, they are not used to measure power in language. Actually they are not as countable as the first ones. Since the signs of power I are focused in this research, the researchers of this article just touch the second group i.e. signs of power II. These are as follows:

Nonstandardness and Status Rating: Hung & Bradac (1993, pp.40-41) conclude: Standardness or nonstandardness of speech, or more generally regionalism, may be a factor in persuasion. So accent and pronunciation are considered as language variables to show persuasion.

Lexical Diversity: Hung and Bradac (1993, p.42) contend that a high-diversity message produced more positive attitudes toward a proposed tuition increase than did its low-diversity counterpart. A low level of diversity may violate valued norm of linguistic expression in the same way that use of a broad nonstandard accent does.

Speech Rate: Hung and Bradac (1993, p.43-45) point to another language variable, speech rate. They continue that an increased rate of speech facilitates persuasive effectiveness, probably because it functions as a credibility cue.

Language Intensity: Bowers (1963, p.345) defined intensity as "the quality of language which indicates the degree to which the speaker's attitude toward a concept deviates from neutrality". Hung and Bradac (1993, p.45) admit "a speaker can be weakly positive toward a concept, approaching neutrality, or extremely positive; the same logic holds for negative views that a speaker might have. They add sex can be still one of the ways to have more power to influence on others and males have this chance more because of their roles in society.

Effects of Powerful and Powerless Styles

Now this question arises about what O'Barr and associates did in a courtroom and led to classification of powerless and powerful style: Does low-power style reduce the effectiveness of persons testifying in a courtroom setting?

Hung and Bradac (1993, p.25) put: "To explore this question Erickson, et al. (1978) conducted an experiment to examine the consequences of power of style for both a male and a female when testimony was both heard (via a tape recording) and read (via a transcript) by male and female respondents. The major finding was this: Both male and female testifiers were judged as more credible and more attractive by both male and female respondents when they used the high -power style".

Linguistic Uncertainty Variables

In order to analyze power in language, at first we should know which variables confirm uncertainty. As mentioned before, Bradac introduced six uncertainty variables as low-power style including; hedges, intensifiers, tag question, hesitation, deictic phrase and polite forms. It means power in language is measured by the signs which show low-power style in a way that, the less these signs are used, the more power in language is proved. Here according to the hypothesis, the mentioned linguistic factors will be introduced. These linguistic factors are

the uncertainty variables which are introduced below. The more these factors are used, the less rhetorical and fluent the speech will be, therefore, the persuasion of the speech will be lowered. Since the power in language (in the previous section) is defined as influence and persuasion on the hearer, these factors are playing an important role in measuring power in language. The examples which are given before each linguistic factor are the products of the interviews which have been taken.

Filler

Fillers are the words or phrases which are devoid of their real meaning and fill the empty positions (Mehdipur, 1378/2000, p.75). In English, the fillers are as: you know, I mean, you see, etc.

In Persian language, fillers cover a wide range, though some of them are commonly used:

به اصطلاح، مثلا، به قول معروف، بعد، عرض به
حضورتون، حالا، خُب...

به قول معروف حتی اگه خیلی هم مشکل داشته باشن می‌یان
سرکارشون می‌یان مگه که مثلا دیگه موارد خاصی باشه نیان.

- As people say, if they have many problems, they'll go to their work. If, for example a special problem occurs, they won't go.

Uncertainty adverb

"These words are usually adverbs showing doubt, uncertainty and probability. They lower the effectiveness of other words. (MC Fadyen,

1992, p. 355)". Maybe, probably, perhaps... fall in this group in English language. In Persian language uncertainty adverbs have the same role; in fact they lower the certainty of a sentence. These words are as follows;

شاید، احتمالا، ممکنه، گویا، پنداری، به نظر من...

- شاید مثلا کسی که بالا دست من باشه در سطح من نباشه.

- Perhaps, for example my superior one is not at my (scientific) level.

Pause

Mehdipur (p.75) says: "Pause can be divided into two groups; filled pause and unfilled pause. "Filled pauses (Hung & Bradac, 1993, p.19 call it hesitation) are the linguistic factors devoid of meaning and are produced in order to fill the pause in the speech. Erickson (1978), Watkins (1980), MC Fadyen (1996) consider filled pause as one of the linguistic factors showing uncertainty". Occurrence of frequency of filled pause is too high in Persian language. In other words, the speech of speakers usually have short pause filled by meaningless sounds. In the public, filled pause is considered as stumbling. Any way, it is believed that filled pause show uncertainty of the speaker.

ا... مجبور شدم که خروجیها را در قالب ا... مصادیق قابل

شمارشی تعریف کنم.

- mhum, I was forced to define the out put data mhum in terms of countable sense.

Unfilled pause is total silence without producing any sounds. "Unfilled pause like filled pause in English language is considered as one of the linguistic factors showing uncertainty. These two factors (filled and unfilled pause) not only can show uncertainty of the speaker but also they provide the speakers the chance of choosing the best answer, word or idea." (Mc Fadeyn, 1996, p.355). Any role they have, they lower the fluency and the persuasion of the speech and consequently power in language.

- برای ترقی حالا... (سه ثانیه) اول این که آدم باید... (دو ثانیه) شانس داشته باشد.

- To promote, now... (3 seconds) first, one should have... (2 seconds) a chance.

The authors of this article consider those silences which last minimally one second as unfilled pause. Brown and Yule (198, pp.162-163) classify pause into three groups; "Extended pauses are long pauses which extend from 3.2 to 16 seconds (which occur at points where the speaker has provided sufficient information for the hearer to draw or write what has been described). They show such pauses by ++. Long pauses range from 1 to 1.9 seconds. They show such pauses by +. Short pauses range from 0.1 - 0.6 seconds. They show such pauses by _".

Repetition

MC Fadeyn (1996) refers to repetition as one of the linguistic factor showing uncertainty. Repetition can be composed of repeating of one syllable or more of a word, one complete word or even a chain of words. In Persian language, three mentioned factors, filled pause, unfilled pause and repetition show uncertainty, though they have different roles like providing the chance to think and concentrate. Any way, they lower the effectiveness of speech, in other words, the less they are used in some one's speech, the more the speech seems to be effective and powerful. Besides, the central message can be conveyed to the addressee without these interfering factors, therefore, the speech can have better and faster effect. It is worth pointing that, the context is very important to account repetition and pause as linguistic uncertainty factors. In the classroom, a teacher might repeat something to convey what he wants to teach or leaves pause between sentences in order to let the students think about what ever said. What has been considered in this research is not the this kind of context but those kind of contexts in which one person is forced to speak like the interview, especially when the interviewee is not aware of the questions previously. In this kind of context repetition and unfilled pause represent low-power style.

- تو جامعه ما با توجه به پیشرفتی که تو این ده سال اخیر

خانوما تو جامعه ما داشتن...

- In our society, considering the progress, the women had in last ten years in our society...

Tag question

Some linguists especially Lakoff (1975, p.57) emphasizes on this point that tag question is one of the linguistic factors showing uncertainty, though, it is a controversial issue. Mehdiipur (p.76) quotes from Coates & Cameron (1988) and Holms (1984): "Some linguists believe that there are different kinds of tag questions but just some of them show uncertainty. In Persian language, there is no exact equivalent for these features. There are some structures which can have the same role meaningfully and pragmatically. Some words or phrases as a question following a declarative sentence can have the same function such as":

"نه؟" "نیست؟" "مگه نه؟" "اینطور نیست؟" "اینطوره؟"

Mehdiipur (p.76) went on to say: "It is worth pointing that tag questions do not always show uncertainty and being admitted. According to Holmes (1984) the tag question can be divided into two major groups: speaker-oriented and hearer-oriented. The first one shows uncertainty because the speaker wants to be admitted by the addressee. The second one has a communication function and shows power in language".

The mentioned Persian phrases fall in the first group and confirm uncertainty.

Among all the interviews, the authors did not find any tag question such as:

مگه نه؟ "نه؟" "اینطوره؟"

But the authors found the words like چرا, دیگه and درست with falling intonation. The authors guess they can be considered as the second kind of tag question and confirm power in language. The authors think "that's it" is a suitable equivalent for چرا, دیگه and "that is right" for درست.

- والا قاعدتا نباید اینجوری باشه ولی تو مملکت ما خوب

این باور غلط هست دیگه.

- By God, it should not be so, but there is this wrong belief in our country, that's it.

- مثلا یه پروژههایی هستش درست.

- For example there is a project, that is right.

- تبعیض جنسی که داره، صد در صد تبعیض جنسی داره

توی جامعه ما چرا.

- There is sexual discrimination, definitely there is in our society, that's it.

Incomplete sentence

The authors found incomplete sentences as the linguistic factor showing uncertainty. "Incomplete sentences are the sentences which are not finished because of the speaker's doubt about their truth or when there is not a precise

thought behind the sentences to continue and the speaker has not previously thought about the message he wants to convey, he is not able to find appropriate words to complete his message". (Mehdipur p.76)

- ولی چون می‌دونم که اون داره روی صداقت این حرفه می‌زنه...



- But, as I know he is speaking honesty... →

Ill-formed sentence

Ill-formed sentences are those which can convey the message to the addressee but are not grammatically correct. Mehdipur (p.77) also refers to this linguistic factor and says: Ill-formed sentences manifest themselves in disagreement between subject and verb, subject and object or object and verb in the form of number, being animate or inanimate, inflectional ending etc. , these kinds of sentences are usually produced when the speaker changes his thought and decision. This change is the result of doubt about content of the sentence. An unexpected change from active to passive construction or a change in subject fall in this classification and are easily distinguished."

- من برای این که بتونم ضریب عملکرد ماهیانه به

پرسنلم بدم که بتونم I پاداش بگیرن.]...

- For giving monthly performance coefficient to my personnel whom I can be awarded...

Uncertainty verb

Uncertainty verbs seem to be one of the linguistic factors showing the speaker's doubt about content of a sentence. Mehdipur (p.77) also claims these verbs show the speakers' doubt and add their effect on the sentences are as the same as uncertainty adverbs. These verbs are as follows:

فکر می‌کنم، گمان می‌کنم، به نظرم می‌آید...

- از بخش دومش فکر کنم شروع کنیم بهتره.

- I think it is better to start from the second part.

These verbs show that the speaker has doubt about what he wants to say. The best situation to account this linguistic factor as an uncertainty variable is the classroom; when the student is asked and he continuously repeats the verb of "I think, I guess..."

Intensifier

Hung and Bradac (1993, p.19) say that O'Barr claimed intensifiers are one of the low-power forms.

"Intensifier is a class of words, generally adverbs, which are used to modify gradable adjectives, adverbs, verbs, or -ed-PARTICIPLES as in:

It is very good..." (Longman, 1992, p. 184)

Persian intensifiers are

خیلی، کاملاً، واقعا، بسیار...

-توانایی داشتن اون سابقه کاری یا دانش کاری خیلی مهمه.

- To have an experience or know-how is very important.

Self-correction

One of the factors showing uncertainty in language is self-correction. It was apparently stated in Mc Fadeyn's work for the first time. He believes the situations in which a person stops speaking and corrects himself show uncertainty. Self-correction stalls the conversation and consequently lowers the influence and persuasion on the hearer, therefore, power in language is decreased. Self-correction can be one word or more.

Example: He thought that was a good, well fairly good idea.

This is somehow complicated in Persian language. Since it is common to use a number of synonyms in Persian language, it is so hard to consider self-correction as one of the linguistic factors showing uncertainty. However, the authors consider this factor in the research. In this research the synonyms are not accounted as self-correction.

- If we rage page through the history of Iran

- الان ما تاریخ ایران رُقم ورق بزیم

Use of English words

During the interviews, some English words were recorded too. In order to understand if this item can be considered as a linguistic factor showing uncertainty the data should be analyzed in the next chapter.

- بالاخره اون محیط شرکت خودش safe هستش دیگه.

- The environment of the firm, itself, is safe, that is it.

Lengthening

One of the factors the author encounters is lengthening. It manifests itself into three forms. One is unfilled pause between two syllables inside one word. The second one, when one word is articulated longer than usual with the help of vowel inside that word and the third one is filled pause between two words of a phrase in a way there is no silence before filled pause actually filled pause is a link between the last letter of a first and the first letter, consonant, of a second word. The examples represented here show three mentioned conditions above respectively. The dots in the first example show unfilled pause between syllables and the dots in the third example show filled pause between two words of one phrase.

- مُدی.ریت باید تصمیم بگیره.

- The ma.nage.ment should make decision.

- درسته که باید انجام بشه، ولی باید ارزش گذاری بشه.

- Definitely they should be done, but (first) they should be evaluated.

- مدیریت... بخش مربوط نظر می ده

- The related... management offers the idea.

Moods of verbs

One of the ways used to show certainty or power in language is mood of the verb. Sharifi (1383/2004, pp.54-55) says: "One of the linguistic factors showing modality is the mood of a verb".

Declarative mood

Declarative mood is used when the speaker is sure about the falsehood or truth of the proposition.

Example: Ali went home.

علی به خانه رفت. -

Since it took different minutes for the interviewees to speak and one sentence might be declarative according to meaning or pragmatics not grammatical, declarative mood is not considered among linguistic variables in this research.

Subjunctive mood

This mood is used when there is uncertainty about the occurrence of the verb. This mood shows the speaker's interpretation and is accompanied with verb.

Example: Perhaps Amir went home

شاید امیر به خانه رفته باشد.

Conditional mood

In order to say conditional proposition, this mood is used.

Example: If Amir has gone to home,...

اگر امیر به خانه رفته باشد...

Imperative mood

It is used when a speaker orders an addressee to do something.

Example: Amir! Go back home.

امیر! برگرد برو خانه. -

Among the above-mentioned moods, the imperative and declarative show more certainty

and cognition but above subjunctive and conditional show less certainty and cognition.

Research Method

The method used in the present research is descriptive and correlative. In order to test the hypothesis, the author used interviews. As, there are interfering variables such as sex, education ..., 30 male managers¹ (mostly with B.A. degree) working in factories manufacturing car parts were selected. To design an appropriate interview in order to assess *power in language*, the authors took suggestions from professors and experts. The reliability of measuring power in language in this research is .71 percent.

Data Analysis

The hypothesis was tested using SPSS. In here the managers' power in language were measured².

Table 1 shows the appropriate information about linguistic uncertainty variables-low-power style. (It is worth reiterating that we measure power in language with low-power style)

1. The managers who were interviewed are working in "LoLo Group Company" manufacturing car parts.
2. Previously, in a separate article bearing the title "the correlation between low-power style and emotional intelligence among managers", by Negar Momeni, power in language was measured. This article was published in proceedings of "3rd international conference on human resource management, HRM 1385/2006". This article showed the more emotional intelligence; the less low-power style is proved. It means that the more emotional intelligence exists, the more power in language is proved.

Table 1 Linguistic uncertainty variables

Linguistic uncertainty variables	Frequency occurrence	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1-Lengthening	223	2.0	20.0	6.900	4.8519
2-Illformed sentences	99	.00	11.00	3.2000	2.10746
3-Incomplete sentences	166	1.00	24.00	5.8333	4.37141
4-Filler	578	.00	51.00	19.2667	15.42486
5-Filled pause	496	2.00	72.00	16.5333	14.52639
6-Unfilled pause	1707	15.00	89.00	52.6667	22.72980
7-Uncertainty adverb (به نظرم ...)	76	.00	13.00	2.5333	2.82517
8-Other uncertainty adverb (شاید..)	101	.00	20.00	3.3667	3.83705
9-Repetition	155	.00	15.00	5.1667	5.03151
10-Self correction	138	.00	11.00	4.4000	3.23345
11-Use of English word	36	.00	5.00	1.2000	1.27035
12-Intensifier	158	.00	61.00	5.5667	11.37051
13-Uncertainty verb	73	.00	10.00	2.4333	3.07025
14-Tag question	.00	.00	.00	.0000	.00000
15-Subjunctivemood	101	.00	20.00	3.3667	3.82806
16-Conditionalmood	104	.00	16.00	3.4333	3.30812
Total	4211	60.00	367.00	135.7000	62.38377
Valid N (leastwise)					

This table belongs to low-power style. As the table shows, the most frequency belongs to unfilled pause and the least frequency belongs to tag question. As it was stated in the last part, tag question does not show uncertainty in Persian language; where as, Lakoff and Bradac say it is one of the uncertainty linguistic variables. Two mentioned variables by the author, lengthening and use of English words, are analyzed. People who have more power in language with consideration of other fourteen variables use lengthening less than others. It

means that use of lengthening can be one of the uncertainty linguistic variables, and use of English word is not related to power in language. Therefore, use of English word does not show necessarily uncertainty. It is clearer in Tables 2 & 3. Table 2 shows when other variables go up, lengthening does too. It means that there is a positive correlation between low-power style and lengthening ($p < 0.01$). It means the more lengthening is used, the less power in language is proved. The analysis shows those who have more power in language, use

lengthening less than others. Therefore lengthening can be one of the signs of low-power style and consequently is among the linguistic uncertainty variables.

Table 2 Correlation between low-power style and lengthening

	Low-power style	Lengthening
Low-power style	1	.520 **
Pearson Correlation		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.005
N	30	30
Lengthening	.520 **	1
Pearson Correlation		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.
N	30	30

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Here use of English word is analyzed in order to find out if it can be among other linguistic uncertainty variables. Table 3 shows that there is no correlation between low-power style and use of English word (p=0.85).

Therefore use of English word can not be one of the signs of low-power style and consequently is not among the linguistic uncertainty variables.

Table 3 Correlation between low-power style and use of English word

	Low power style	Use of English word
Low power style	1	-.036
Pearson Correlation		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.856
N	30	30
Use of English word	-.036	1
Pearson Correlation		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.856	.
N	30	30

Result: As Tables 2 & 3 show, we can claim lengthening is one of the linguistic uncertainty variables and use of English word can not be considered among the linguistic uncertainty variables. Therefore, lengthening was inserted

in the group of linguistic uncertainty variables. Besides, tag question can not be considered as an uncertainty linguistic variable in Persian language.

Results

Since the method by which the power in language is measured focus on low-power style; in a way that the less low-power style exists, the more power in language is proved, we can say if low-power style goes up, power in language lowers. Therefore, we can say if lengthening as one sign of low-power style goes up, power in language comes down supporting our hypothesis. That kind of tag question which is included in one of the signs of low-power style, speaker-oriented, is not applicable among managers in Persian language. But another kind of tag question, hear-oriented, is somehow used in Persian language among the managers¹. Therefore, we can not strongly claim that tag question is one of the linguistic uncertainty variables in Persian language. The analyzed data show at least 67 percent of the managers, use English words in their speech. Therefore, it might be possible to say English word is one of the signs of jargon² among managers.

1. The authors think it is natural for the managers not to use that kind of tag question which is a sign of low power style, because their social rank cause them to speak in a way that represent their status. Modarresi (1365/1987, p.160) contends: Generally there is certain relationship between linguistic factors and social class as non-linguistic factor; therefore, a number of linguistic variations in one society are justified by social class.

2. Speech or writing used by a group of people who belong to a particular trade, profession, or any other group bound together by mutual interest, e.g. the jargon of law, medical jargon. (Longman dictionary, 1992, p.193)

References

- [1] Beeman, W.D, (1986) language, Status and Power in Iran, Bloomington, Indiana University press,.
- [2] Bowers, J.W., (1963), "*Language intensity, social introversion and attitude change*", Speech Monographs, vol.30, pp. 345-352.
- [3] Brown, Gillian; Yule, George, (1989) Discourse analysis, New York, Cambridge University Press,.
- [4] Cameron, D. (ed) (1998), *The Feminist Critique of Language*, London, Rutledge Publishers,.
- [5] Fairclough, Norman, (2001) *Language and Power*, Second Edition Edinburgh, Pearson Education Limited,.
- [6] Holms, Janet, (1999) *Women, Men and Politeness*, London, SAGE publications,.
- [7] Jahanshihi, Omid, (2009) "*Foucault, Power and Mission*", Hamshahri,.
- [8] Lakoff, Robins, (1975) "*Language and Women's Place*", *Language in Society*, , vol. 2, pp. 45-80.
- [9] Mc Fadyen, R.G, (1996), "*Gender, States and Powerless Speech: Interaction of Students and Lecturers*", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, vol.35, pp.353-367.
- [10] MehdiPur, Marjan, (2000) *Studying power in Language among Persian Women and Men speakers*, M.A. thesis in General Linguistics, Tehran, Allameh Taba Tabaei University,.

- [11] Momeni, Negar, (2006) A Study of Relation between Power in Language and Emotional Intelligence, M.A. thesis in General Linguistics, Tehran, Tarbiat Modares University (T.M.U.),.
- [12] Richards, Jack C and et al, Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Britain, Longman group UK limited, 1992.
- [13] Salimi Nave, Asqar, (2004), "*Discourse in Foucault' Thought*", Keyhan Fahangi, No.219, pp50-55
- [14] Sharifi, Maryam, (2005) Modality and Polarity in Discourse of Iranian and Western Political Heads, M.A. thesis in General Linguistics, Tehran, Islamic Azad University: Central Branch,.
- [15] Sik Hung NG; Bradac J.James, Power in Language, London, SAGE publications, 1993.
- [16] Tannen, Debora, (1993), "*The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking power and Solidarity in Gender & Dominance*", Gender and Conversational Interaction, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.165-188.
- [17] Thomas, Linda; Wareing, Shan; Singh, Ishtla, Stilwell; Peccei, Jean; Thorn borrow, Joanna & Jones, Jason, (2004) Language, Society and Power an Introduction, London, Rutledge,.

شناسایی قدرت در گفتار با معرفی نشانه‌های جدید قدرت

عالیه کرد زعفرانلو کامبوزیا^۱، نگار مؤمنی^۲

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۸۷/۹/۱۷

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۸۸/۹/۹

قدرت به عنوان یک مقوله اجتماعی مطرح می‌شود و به توانایی اطلاق می‌شود که صاحب آن می‌تواند برای نیل به هدف مورد نظر طرف مقابل را مجاب به اطاعت کند. این برتری به واسطه عوامل گوناگون مانند نقش اجتماعی، جنسیت و حتی سبک خاصی از گفتار ایجاد می‌شود. هدف از این مقاله ارائه تعریفی قابل قبول از قدرت و نقش آن در قالب سبک‌هایی از قدرت موجود در گفتار است. بنابراین با شناسایی نشانه‌های زبانی می‌توانیم قدرت در گفتار را دقیقتر اندازه بگیریم. در واقع، قدرت در گفتار به معنای اجتناب از متغیرهای زبانی عدم قطعیت (پر کننده، مکث...) و استفاده از برخی نشانه‌های زبانی مانند (داشتن لهجه استاندارد...) است. نشانه‌هایی مانند کشش، سوال ضمیمه‌ای (شنونده محور، گوینده محور) و استفاده از واژه انگلیسی برای اولین بار در این تحقیق بررسی می‌شوند. در واقع می‌خواهیم بدانیم آیا می‌توان این نشانه‌ها را جزو متغیرهای زبانی عدم قطعیت لحاظ کرد. جامعه آماری در این تحقیق سی مدیر مذکر بین سی تا چهل سال هستند. نتیجه تحقیق نشان داد که کشش و انواع آن را می‌توان جزو نشانه‌های زبانی عدم قطعیت بیان کرد که بیانگر سبک ضعیف گفتار هستند. سؤال ضمیمه‌ای (گوینده محور مانند مگه نه؟) نشان‌دهنده عدم قطعیت یا سبک ضعیف گفتار است اما این نشانه در گفتار جامعه آماری ما یافت نشد. اما سوال ضمیمه‌ای (شنونده محور مانند درسته) بیانگر قطعیت یا سبک گفتاری قوی است و این نوع سؤال ضمیمه‌ای در گفتار مدیران یافت شد. واژگان انگلیسی در این مصاحبه‌ها ثبت شد اما این نشانه را نمی‌توان جزو نشانه‌هایی دانست که بیانگر عدم قطعیت یا سبک ضعیف گفتار هستند. بنا به نظر نگارندگان واژگان انگلیسی ضبط شده می‌توانند جزو واژگان صنفی مدیران باشند.

واژگان کلیدی: قدرت، قدرت در گفتار، متغیرهای زبانی عدم قطعیت (کشش، سؤال ضمیمه‌ای...)

۱. استادیار دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، گروه زبان‌شناسی

۲. دانشجوی دکتری تخصصی زبان‌شناسی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، E-mail: n-momeni@modares.ac.ir