ABSTRACT

This paper will be based on an analysis of the verbal interaction between the managers and the members of staff to examine how the egalitarian and totalitarian attitudes of the managers are reflected in their discourse in terms of “directives”.

The argument of the paper depends on a research study carried out for the purpose of examining how polite verbal behaviour is reflected in the verbal interaction between superiors and subordinates at the workplace. The research has been carried out on 113 hours of recording made by the researcher as a “participant observer” in 6 private workplaces. In these official settings, three of the managers were men while three of them were women.

The main finding of the research in relation to the use of “directives” can be stated as follows: Managers reflecting an egalitarian attitude in their verbal interaction with the members of the staff at different institutional positions display their respect, interest and considerateness with the use of directives in different syntactic forms and various peripheral elements. On the other hand, managers reflect a totalitarian attitude with the lack of peripheral elements while giving directives and they do not attempt to reduce the strength of an utterance in their interaction with the subordinates.

1. Introduction

The argument of this paper is that egalitarian and totalitarian attitudes of managers towards the members of the staff at workplaces are reflected in the type of “directives” used by them. The discussion of this argument will be based on the research done to examine how polite verbal behaviour is reflected in managers’ verbal interactions with the members of staff at different institutional positions (Toksöz 2000). In the analysis of the verbal data collected for the research, polite verbal behaviour of the managers has been seen to reflect their egalitarian attitude.
Whether the manager exercises an egalitarian or totalitarian attitude also reflects the way he/she exercises power on the others. There are different views about the way power is exercised. In Foucault’s words,

"power is something which circulates .... It is never localized here or there, never in anyone’s handvs, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate its thread, they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or concentrating target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application (1980: 98)."

In this definition, the *consensual* aspect of power is emphasized. Diamond’s understanding of power seems to be close to Foucault’s view. As Diamond puts it,

"Power is political and consensual. .... It is not only a property invested in an individual or a status, but a self-image or role which is contested, .... and negotiated in discourse, and which needs ratification from others. There is thus no one person who is said to be in sole possession of power; likewise, there cannot be one person who is said to be solely powerless or weak (1996: 15)."

Diamond (1996: 12) also talks about another dimension of power, which is the "political effectiveness". That is to say, “power is not merely a quality which is assigned or earned; it is also an interactional skill and process."

The understanding of power as “consensual” is open to question and it cannot be valid for all types of interaction. In close relationships it might be possible to talk about ways of negotiating power but in an institutional or official setting where interpersonal relations and verbal interaction among the participants at different positions are determined by power relations, power may be consensual only if the manager has an egalitarian attitude.

Egalitarian attitudes of the managers are reflected in their verbal interaction with the members of the staff by the way they use their statusful and interactional power. A s Scotton (1988: 199) states, “statusful power is the extent to which someone has control over the actions and destiny of someone else”. On the other hand, the person who has interactional power has a determining role in the organization of verbal interaction in two ways: “in terms of controlling the sequential aspects of the interaction (e.g. controlling the floor) or the direction and / or outcome of the interaction (e.g. topics) and also in terms of attracting favourable attention to oneself (e.g. highlighting one’s expertise .... and experiences)”.

The way managers apply their statusful and interactional power reflects the type of discourse strategies that they use in relation to their egalitarian or totalitarian attitudes. In the analysis of the data collected in six workplaces, particular behaviours and discourse strategies of the managers that reflect their egalitarian and totalitarian attitudes have been determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflections of Egalitarian Attitude</th>
<th>Reflections of Totalitarian Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give options</td>
<td>not to give options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to reduce the strength of the imposition</td>
<td>not to reduce the strength of the imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to avoid the role of expert</td>
<td>not to avoid the role of expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to respect the others’ opinions</td>
<td>not to consider the others’ opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to show solidarity</td>
<td>to keep aloof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this paper, linguistic realizations of these discourse strategies applied by the managers who exercise their statusful and interactional power in an egalitarian or totalitarian way will be analysed in relation to the use of “directives”.

2. Directives

“Directives” are the type of speech acts whose function is to direct the addressee to perform or not to perform an act, such as ordering and requesting. They are “attempts ......... by the speaker to get the hearer to do something” (Searle 1979: 98).

The syntactic structures of directives change according to the context of situation and the participants’ social and institutional identity and status. The speaker can give an order, make a request or a suggestion or he / she can express the necessity of fulfilling a particular action to the hearer.

While in certain contexts everybody has the right to use all types of directives, in some contexts only certain people have the right to give directives to others. For example, in the context of close relationships, all participants may ask others to do something. However, in traditional Turkish families, it is not seen appropriate for the children to express their expectations for particular things in the form of an “imperative” in their interaction with their parents. In official settings, a subordinate does not have any rights to ask a superior to do something or to give orders. In these contexts only the superior has the right to give orders to others and this right of the superior is also stated in the Civil Servant Law (Başbakanlık 1982).

“Order” may be expressed directly or indirectly. Direct orders may take four syntactic forms. They may be in the form of

- bare imperative ("..... -ı yap" / “do this”)
- the present continous tense or future tense
  ("..... -ı yapıyorsun; ..... -ı yapacaksın" / “you are doing this ; you are going to do this”)
  ("..... -ı yapıyoruz; ..... -ı yapacağız" / “we are doing this ; we are going to do this”)

When the speaker says to the hearer “..... -ı yapıyorsun” (you are doing this) or “..... -ı yapacaksın” (you are going to do this), without involving himself / herself in the action, it means that there is a strong obligation for the hearer to do the work and he has not the choice of rejecting the order. When the speaker says to the hearer “..... -ı yapıyoruz” (we are doing this) or “..... -ı yapacağız” (we are going to do this) by involving himself / herself in the action, it means that the obligation is valid for both the speaker and the hearer, and they have no option about not doing whatever is needed. These directive types are stronger than the bare imperative form in terms of the obligation about carrying out the work mentioned.

Another way of giving a direct order is to express the need to do something in a short time and to give the impression to the hearer that it is something easy to do (“..... -ı yapıver” / “just do this”).

Order may also be given indirectly without telling the hearer to do something but just by mentioning about the work to be done, by making various explanations or by asking questions about the related work so that the hearer understands that he is asked to do something by making inferences about the message conveyed by the speaker.
In official settings and in the verbal interaction between the superior and the subordinates, all types of directives used by the superior function as an “order”. However, the syntactic structure of the directive changes according to the institutional status of the participants.

The speaker has three choices while giving a directive: He can make the hearer, the hearer and the speaker or the action prominent. When the hearer is made prominent, the directive can be in the form of a statement or an imperative, as in the examples of “Pencereyi aç” / “Open the window.” or “Pencereyi açın / açın mı?” “Can you open the window?” When both the speaker and the hearer are made prominent, different functions are fulfilled according to the participants’ social and institutional status. For example when a mother wants to call her child to have meal, she may express the directive in the form of an offer by saying, “Bir şeyler yiyelim mı?” / “Shall we eat something.” or “Hadi bir şeyler yiyelim.” / “Let’s eat something.” Although it is only the child to eat the meal, the mother involves herself in the action by making an offer. In an official setting, the superior may make reference both to the hearer and himself / herself while giving a directive, by saying “Önce bu raporu yazalım” / “Let’s write this report first.” Although the directive in this utterance is in the form of an offer, it functions as an “order” and it means “Önce bu raporu yaz.” / “First write this report.” The speaker’s third choice in giving a directive is to make the action prominent. In Turkish this is realized through three different syntactic forms, as illustrated below:

**(Bir liste) yapmak gerek.** / It is necessary to (make a list) (expressing necessity)
**(Bir liste) yapılması gerek.** / A list should / has to be made. (expressing necessity through passivization)
*Birisi bir liste yapmalı.* / One should / has to make a list. / (expressing necessity through impersonalization)

In an official and institutional setting, the choice of the superior in making reference to the hearer, both to the hearer and himself / herself or to the action reflects the superior’s discourse strategy determined by his / her egalitarian and totalitarian attitude. For example, the superior who wants to reduce the strength of a direct order and to avoid the role of expert may prefer to give the directive in the form of an “offer” or he / she may make the action prominent through impersonalization and passivization.

Directives are made up of two linguistic units: the core directive and the peripheral elements. The core directive is the linguistic unit which has the function of directing the addressee to do something by itself. In most cases, directives are used with various peripheral elements to mitigate or aggravate the force of the utterance conveyed by the propositional content. “These peripheral elements include address terms, various introductory utterences, explanations and justifications for the request, hedges and words like please and just.” (Sifianou 1992: 99).

Hedging devices which fulfil the function of reducing the strength of an utterance are “linguistic means by which a speaker can signal a wish not to impose” (Holmes 1995: 74-75). Linguistic items used in Turkish as hedging devices are tag questions (“değil mi?” / “isn’t it?; doesn’t he? ...”); “tamam mı?; olur mı?” / “okay? ; is that all right?”); pragmatic particles such as “gibi” (sort of), “sanırım” ( I suppose); “… diye düşünüyorum” ( I think); paralinguistic signals such as pauses and vocal hesitations like “ııııııı” (er); “şey” (well) or words like “belki” (perhaps).

1 (Sifianou 1992: 99) analyses requests as linguistic units made up of two parts: the core request and the various peripheral elements. However, it is suggested in this paper that not only the directives in the form of a “request” but all types of directives are made up of two units.
It is not only the type of directives used by the superiors but also the peripheral elements used with directives that reflect the type of discourse strategy applied by the speaker to display his/her egalitarian attitude.

In the following section, by making reference to the verbal data collected in six workplaces, directives used by the managers in their verbal interaction with the members of staff will be analysed in terms of the purpose of the conversation and the syntactic forms of the directives that change according to the institutional status of the subordinates.

In institutional settings one of the purposes of superiors in having conversations with the subordinates is “having things done”.

2.1. Having Things Done

One of the purposes of the superiors in their verbal interaction with the subordinates is to get them to do something. In the analysis of the data collected in six workplaces, it has been seen that linguistic realizations of the directives used by the managers with this aim change according to the nature of the work to be carried out. These are either the managers’ “special wants” or “something related to the work”.

2.1.1. Special Wants

In the analysis of the data, three of the managers are observed to be asking their secretaries or the office boys to bring something to drink for them by giving directives with different syntactic forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Order</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Sen bize içecek bi şey getir.”</td>
<td>“Bi çay getirir misin?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bring something to drink for us)</td>
<td>(Can you bring a (glass of) tea?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“.. Nuran Hanı’m’a söyle de bana bi elmalı çay getirsin”</td>
<td>“.. meyve çayı söyle misiniz?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tell Nuran Hanı’m to bring an apple tea for me.)</td>
<td>(.... can you also ask (the cook to bring) apple tea for me.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sevim Hanı’m, çayı söyle misiniz bize?”</td>
<td>“Sevim Hanı’m, can you order tea for us?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sevim Hanı’m, çayı söyle misiniz bize?”</td>
<td>“Mehmet’cim, ben bi sıcak çay alıyorum.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My dear Sevim, can you order tea for us?)</td>
<td>(M y dear Mehmet, let me take a (glass of) hot tea?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One manager asks his secretary to bring something to drink for him and for the researcher. At first he calls her with a request and then gives the directive in the form of a bare imperative.

“Nazlı’cım (Nazlı’cığım) bakar misin? Sen bize içecek bi şey getir.”
(M y dear Nazlı, can you look at me? Bring something to drink for us.)
In Turkish, “first name+ -ciğim (my dear)” is used among intimates and in close relationships. It displays the sympathy of the speaker for the hearer. By addressing her secretary like this, the manager shows his solidarity and wants to minimize the hierarchical level of interaction by emphasizing the interactional level. So, although he gives the directive with a bare imperative (“getir” / “bring”), with this address form, he attempts to reduce the strength of the utterance.

In another conversation the same manager wants the secretary to tell the cook to bring tea for him.

“.. Nuran Hanım’a söyle de bana bi elmalı çay getirsin”
(Tell Nuran Hanım to bring an apple tea for me.)

Another time, while the secretary is about to leave the room, the manager asks her to do something and then to tell the cook to bring tea for him by making a request.

“Tanju’yu sor bakalım. Bi de bana meyve çayı söyler misin?”
(Ask (where) Tanju (is). And can you also ask (the cook to bring) apple tea for me?)

Another manager asks the office boy to bring him tea when he comes to the room to pick up the empty glasses by making a request.

“Bi çay getirir misin?”
(Can you bring a (glass of) tea?)

One of the women managers asks the secretary to tell the working lady to bring tea for her by making a request and by addressing her with the second person plural form of “you” (siz) and by calling her “Sevim Hanım”.

“Sevim Hanım, çay söyler misiniz bize?”
(Sevim Hanım, can you order tea for us?) (i.e. for her and the researcher)

In the Turkish language, there is a “sen / siz” (tu / vous) distinction in address forms and while “sen” is used by intimates in close relationships to show their solidarity; “siz” (vous) is used by people in formal relationships to display their respect to each other and the social distance between them. In institutional and official settings, these address forms are not used reciprocally between the superior and the subordinates since the hierarchical level is emphasized in their verbal interaction. In these contexts while the superior can address the subordinate with the address form “sen”; the subordinate has to address the superior with the address form “siz”.

There is an agreement between subject and verb with respect to the address terms selected.

Sen bana - çay - getir(ir) - mi - sin?
(You: 2nd person singular) - to me - tea - bring - question word - 2nd person singular suffix

(Siz ) bana - çay - getir(ir) - mi - siniz?
(You: 2nd person plural) - to me - tea - bring - question word - 2nd person plural suffix
In Turkish the address term “first name + hanı (Miss. / Mrs.)” is used to show the respect of the speaker to the hearer and the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. It is also used by people who do not know each other well and who are not closely associated.

While making a request for tea, by saying “Sevim Hanım çay söyler misiniz bize?” , the manager displays the social distance she wants to put between them and she keeps aloof.

The same manager asks the office boy to bring tea for her, by saying “Mehmet’cin ben bi sıcak çay alıyım”. Here she addresses him with his first name and also shows her sympathy for him, by calling him “Mehmet’çığım / My dear Mehmet”. By saying “Ben bi sıcak çay alıyım” / “Let me take a (glass of) tea” she avoids giving a direct order and makes the action prominent by emphasizing her wish to drink tea.

As illustrated with examples here, when the superior asks the subordinate at a low institutional position (such as a secretary or an office boy) to bring something to drink, he / she uses the directive either in the form of a direct order or a request.

In Turkish, when you make a “request” you mean that you are aware of the burden to be placed on that person by getting him / her to do a particular work. For this reason, the superior is not expected to make requests when he / she asks the subordinates to do something which is related to the duties mentioned in their job descriptions. However, by making requests, the managers may show their considerateness and avoid imposing on the hearer with the work they ask them to do.

2.1.2. Work-Related Wants

When the superiors ask the subordinates to carry out some work, they give the “direction” in the form of a “direct” or “an indirect order”. An indirect order may be given by making explanations about what to do, by expressing the necessity of doing something or in the form of a “suggestion” or “request”. On the other hand, a direct order may be given either with a bare imperative form or with the use of the present continuous or future tenses.

2.1.2.1. Direct Order

The egalitarian and totalitarian attitudes of the superiors are reflected in the type of directives and the peripheral elements used with them.

When the superior wants a high status superordinate to do some work with the use of a direct order, he / she uses various peripheral elements to reduce the imposition to be put on the addressee. For example he / she states the reason for the directive by making explanations, gives an option about how to do the work, asks for the hearer’s confirmation with a tag question or reduces the strength of an utterance by using hedging devices like pauses or vocal hesitations.

In the following examples, the superior talks to a high status subordinate.

Situation 1

A high status subordinate is about to leave the office to attend a meeting to be held in another city. The road to that city is known with its heavy traffic and traffic accidents that happen there each year. The manager tells him to drive carefully.
The core directive + Peripheral elements
(order: in the form of a bare imperative ) (tag question)(address term) (reason for the directive)

“Dikkatli git, olur mu canı? Bolu’dan da geçiyorsun.”
“Drive carefully, will you my dear? You are also going through Bolu.”

With this positive warning, the manager shows that she is worried about him by displaying her considerate attitude.

**Situation 2**

The manager calls one of the experts to remind him of some work to be completed with another expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>peripheral elements</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>the core directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(vocal hesitation) (pause)(diminutive)</td>
<td>(diminutive)(hesitation marker) (bare imperative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lüy .......... bi Şadi’yle beraber bi şey yapın -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er .......... just together with Şadi just well do -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a pause, vocal hesitation like “ın” (er), and the use of a diminutive “bi(r)” (meaning “just”), the manager avoids giving the order directly. With these peripheral elements he also provides an opportunity for the addressee to understand what he will say; so he reduces the strength of the imposition. He also offers help by saying “Takıldığınız yerler olursa bana gelin” (If you have difficulty, you can ask for help). Then he makes an explanation about the reason why they can ask for help. With this explanation, he avoids the role of expert. He means that he can help them with the work not because he is the superior but because he talked to some people and learnt something about how to do the work.

**Situation 3**

The manager asks one of the experts to prepare something.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>peripheral elements</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>the core directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(diminutive)(hesitation marker)</td>
<td>(subjunctive) (giving permission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi şeyi de hazırlanı bi tarafından. Rakamları yuvarlayarak koyabilirsin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepare also the other thing, will you? You can write the average numbers.

The verb form used by the manager here as “yapsana” is mostly used among intimates and in informal settings. It means the addressee is expected to do something. The equivalent of this form in English may be either “do it, will you?” or “why don’t you do it?”.
The manager avoids giving the order directly by starting her utterance with a diminutive and a hesitation marker. After the directive in the subjunctive form, by giving permission to the addressee about how to write the numbers, she gives an option to the hearer about the work and signals her wish not to impose on the addressee.

In the following examples the managers tell their secretaries to do something.

“Belgeleri tam gönderiyorsun.”

With this sentence, the manager means that “the secretary has to send all the documents (somewhere)”. In Turkish the strength of the obligation is given by the present continuous tense form. With such an order, the manager emphasizes the hierarchical level of their interaction.

In the following utterances direct order is given with different syntactic forms.

“Şimdi bak. Su yazılacak. Basmadan ver de bi göreyim.”

(Now look. This will be written. Give it to me to see before printing it out.)

“Bunu Ayça Hanım’a ver. Şeye fakslasın Beşiktaş’a.”

(Give this to Ayça Hanım. Tell her to fax it to the Beşiktaş branch.

“‘Dukayev’ yazacaksın. Devran Dukayev. İkisini de yaziver. Bi faksla ona.”

(You are going to write ‘Dukayev’ Devran Dukayev. Write both. Just send a fax to him.)

In these examples the managers are observed to be using the bare imperative form of the verb (“bak” / “look”, “ver” / “give”) ; the present continuous tense (“gönderiyorsun” / “You are sending”) or the future tense (“yazacaksın” / “you are going to write”). One manager is also observed to be expressing the need to do something in a short time (“yazIVER”). While talking to a subordinate at a low institutional status, the superior is seen to be using only the diminutive “bi(bir)” to reduce the strength of an utterance.

In the following example, one of the managers tell the office boy not to do something, by criticising him about what he has done before. Seen in the way the manager makes the warning, a totalitarian attitude is reflected by the bare imperative used without any peripheral elements and the present continuous and future tense forms of the verbs.


(When I am talking on the phone if I have closed my door, don’t come to take the empty glasses. Otherwise, if my door is closed and I have a guest of course you will come and serve tea. If my door is closed and if I am talking to somebody do not take the empty glasses. Except for this, come whenever you wish.)

It is seen in the examples analysed in this section that discourse strategies which reflect the managers’ egalitarian attitude are used by the managers when they interact with high status subordinates. With subordinates at low institutional positions, the managers do not attempt to reduce the strength of the utterance.
When the managers ask the high status members of the staff to do something, they use the bare imperative form of the verb with various peripheral elements to avoid the role of expert or to reduce the strength of the utterence. On the other hand, in their interaction with the subordinates at a low institutional position, they give the direct order with the syntactic structures that are stronger than the bare imperative form in terms of the imposition to be put on the addressee (i.e. with the present continuous and future tense forms) or with a bare imperative without any peripheral elements.

2.1.2.2. Indirect Order

When the superiors ask the superordinates at different institutional positions to do something, if they avoid giving the order directly they either make a suggestion or a request or express the necessity of doing the action. They are also observed to be giving the order indirectly without mentioning the work to be done, but by implying what should be done by making explanations or asking various questions about what to do.

2.1.2.2.1. Suggestion

In the analysis of the verbal data, it has been seen that “order” is given indirectly by making suggestions in three syntactic forms:

- By involving oneself in the action with the structure “... yapalım” / (Let’s (do)).
- By giving an option to the hearer by saying “İstersen ...... yap” / (If you wish, (do) this);
- By giving permission about the way to do something “... yapabilirsin” (You can do this.)

In the following examples, the managers are seen to ask the subordinates at high institutional positions to do something by making suggestions. The superiors do not seem to be using this form of directive in their interaction with low status subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The core directive + peripheral element</th>
<th>(tag question)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Postamızı koyalım bütün formları. Tamam?”</td>
<td>(Okay?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Let’s put all the forms into our post box.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Bunları muhasebeeye fakslayalım. Ben imzalıyacağım. Tamam mı?”</td>
<td>(Okay?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Let’s fax these to the accountant. I will sign them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in the examples above, when the managers make suggestions with the structure “Let’s” (yapalım), the directive is followed by a tag question to ask the confirmation of the addressee.

The use of a tag question with a directive in the form of suggestion reflects the egalitarian attitude of the managers who respect the others’ opinions.

In the following example, a suggestion is made with an introductory remark of the manager which fulfils the function of a “hedging device”. By starting the utterence with this remark, the manager wants to tell the addressee that she is aware of what he is doing but there
is something more urgent to do. It is also important to note here that the manager gives two directives with this utterance. First she makes a suggestion by saying “... gönderelim” (let’s send ....). Then by saying “ben gördükten sonra” (after I see (them)), she indirectly says “Öncelikle, görmek için o örnekleri bana getir” / (First bring them to me to see).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>peripheral element</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>the core directive</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>peripheral element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(introductory remark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(suggestion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Halil! Böleceğim ama ... Gelen örnekleri hemen ... Bey’e gönderelim ben gördükten sonra.
(Halil! I will interrupt you but ... let’s send the samples here to Mr X immediately, after I see them.)

Managers also make suggestions by giving permission to the hearer about how to do a particular work.

“ Şu bakiyelerini toparladıktan sonra bakabilirsin (bunlara).”
(You can look at these after you add the balance.)

By involving himself / herself in the work to be done, by giving an option to the hearer or by giving permission to the hearer about how to do the work mentioned, the manager avoids the role of expert and signals his / her wish to reduce the imposition put on the hearer in his / her interaction with high status subordinates.

2.1.2.2.2. Request

Another way of giving an order indirectly in an official setting is making a request. In the analysis of the data collected, the managers were observed to be making requests when asking the secretary to make telephone connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>peripheral elements</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>the core directive</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>peripheral element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(address term)</td>
<td>(diminutive)</td>
<td>(request)</td>
<td>(direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevim Hanım</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>Alp’i bağlar misiniz</td>
<td>bana?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sevim Hanım)</td>
<td>can you</td>
<td>put me through</td>
<td>to Alp?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>Demirbank’ı</td>
<td>bulabilir misin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Can you)</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>Demirbank?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the superior makes a request to ask the subordinate to do something, the request fulfils the function of an order. The manager who prefers to express the order in a request form reflects his egalitarian attitude towards the staff by avoiding the role of expert, by giving an option to the addressee to say “no” and by minimizing the hierarchical level of interaction.

One manager has been observed making requests while asking high status subordinates to do something. As seen in the following examples, the manager shows that she is aware of the imposition to be put on the addressees and does not intend to put them to any trouble by interrupting their work or by asking them to do something difficult. For this reason she either expresses her thought about the strength of the direction with an introductory remark or offers help after asking the addressee to do something.
Situation 1

The manager goes to the subordinate's desk with a file in her hand and asks him to write something. Just after she makes the request, she recognizes that he is busy with his work. Then she wants to ask another person to do the writing. She gives him the necessary information and offers help.

```
(addr term) (pre-question) (request) (giving option)

Kema:!! Fatura defterimiz burda mı? Senden rica edebilir miyim şunları yazmanız? Yoksa Ömer Bey’e Söyliyeyim.

Kema:!! A re the invoice books here? Can I ask you to write these? Or (i.e. if you are busy) let me ask Ömer Bey.
```

```
(request) (explanation) (question about the request) (offer for help)


Well let me ask you .. This is the account number. Y es? If you need help you can ask me.
```

Situation 2

The manager calls an expert to her room and starts her utterance by saying “Senden ricam...” “(My request is) ...” and she is interrupted by the subordinate, who says “estagfurullah” (Don’t mention it). Then the manager gives the order with the use of the future tense.

```
(addr term) (diminutive) (request) (order with future tense suffix)

İmzam bi bakar misin? Senden ricam .... şunu da Şadi Bey’e göndereceksin

(Ömer Bey can you just look? My request is ....... you will send this to Şadi Bey)
```

In official settings, the manager is not expected to make a request when he / she asks the subordinates to do something. For this reason, when she starts her utterence with a request, the subordinate says “estagfurullah” meaning that there is no need for her to make a request.

Situation 3

The manager wants one of the experts to send a fax to a branch of the bank. She starts the utterence by saying “sana zahmet”(it will put you to trouble) , which is an expression used in Turkish when somebody is asked to do something which he / she is not obliged to.
2.1.2.2.3. Necessity

The managers were seen to express the necessity of doing a particular work while talking to high status members.

As seen in the following utterances, the manager either makes himself and the hearer or only the action prominent.

“Düzeltmeleri yapmamız gerek bir an önce”
(We should / have to make the corrections in a short time.)

“Bu yazının yazılması gerek.”
(This text should / has to be written.)

When the manager expresses the necessity of doing a particular work by involving himself in the activity, he / she reflects a more egalitarian attitude towards the hearer. With such an utterance the manager shows that he / she also takes the responsibility of carrying out the work mentioned.

2.1.2.2.4. Making Explanations and Asking Questions

The superiors sometimes give directives by making explanations and / or asking questions about what they want to be done. The manager who does not give a direct order to the addressee avoids the role of expert and reduces the strength of the imposition to be put on the hearer with the directive.

In the following examples the managers get the subordinates at high institutional status to understand what they want them to do just by making various explanations and asking questions.

Situation 1

The manager makes an explanation about what she wants the expert to do. He understands that the manager wants him to go somewhere and he tells her that he will not be able to go there since he will attend a meeting that afternoon. However, the manager says it will have finished by then. Then the expert says he will be able to go there.

Manager: Halil’cim tbody şey ulaştı mı Birol sana?
Halil: Ulaşmadık.

Manager: Sen – şimdi – bu ... Dörtte toplantı varmış. Pembe bina yediinci katta uun senin hazırladığın bölüm de olduğu için uun hani bi soru gelir bi şey olursa Halil Bey de kâttablabilir mi diyə aradı Birol. Duyduğun mu sen o şeyi?
Halil: Duyдум. Yalnız o öğleden sonra şey var ikide –
Manager: - O dörtte canım. O dörde kadar biter.
Halil: Tamam ben gidebileceğim.
Manager: Tamam.
(Halil odadan çıkar)

Manager: Halil my dear well has Birol called you?
Halil: No, he hasn’t.
Manager: You – now – this ... There is a meeting at four. In the pink building on the seventh floor since the part you prepared is also there you know Birol called me to ask whether Mr Birol will come in case there is a question. Have you heard about it?
Halil: Y eş, I have but there is something at two in the afternoon.
Manager: This is at four my dear. It will have finished by then.
Halil: Okay. I will be able to go.
Manager: Okay.

In this text, by asking questions and making explanations the manager gets the addressee to understand what she wants him to do.

Situation 2

The manager calls the technician to her room to get him to solve the problem with the computer. She just tells the technician about the problem without telling him what to do directly.

Manager: Haluk. Ben buna bir şey yaptım (bilgisayar gösterekt). Bi daha da büyütemiyorum. Ne yapmış olabilirim?
(Haluk bir şey söylemeden ekranın başına geçer.)
Haluk: Bunu bile bile Murat bilir. Onu bi çağırayım.
(Haluk odadan çıkar)

Manager: Haluk. I have done something to this (pointing at the computer). I can’t make it bigger. What might I have done?
(Haluk sits in front of the computer without saying anything)
Haluk: If there is someone to understand this it is Murat. Let me call him.
(Haluk goes out of the room)

When the manager gives an order to the subordinates indirectly, he / she may either makes a suggestion or a request or expresses the necessity of doing a particular work. He / she may also give an order just by implying what is needed with an explanation about the work. All types of directives expressed by the highest status person in an institutional setting function as an “order”. For this reason, the subordinates were seen to carry out the work that they were asked to do as a response to all the utterences given here as examples of order with different syntactic forms.
3. Conclusion

The scope of this paper has been limited to the linguistic analysis of the “directives” as reflections of the managers’ egalitarian and totalitarian attitude towards the members of staff at different institutional positions. The use of directives has been analysed only in the context of verbal interactions where superiors get the subordinates to do something.

The type of the directives used by the managers reveal the discourse strategy of the managers who exercise their interactional and statusful power on the subordinates in an egalitarian or totalitarian way. In the analysis of the verbal data collected in six workplaces, it has been seen that it is the institutional status of the staff that determines the type of the “directives” used in a particular context of interaction, and the egalitarian attitude of the managers is reflected in their discourse by particular linguistic realizations of directives and various peripheral elements.

In the discourse of managers who display an egalitarian attitude, the interactional level of interaction is emphasized and the hierarchical level is minimized. On the other hand, in the discourse of managers who display their totalitarian attitude, the hierarchical level of interaction is emphasized and the interactional level is minimized.
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