

**A Study of Leech's Politeness Maxims in Arabic Supervisor –
Student Interaction**

Ashraf A. Dhannoon

Assistant Lecture

Kamal H. Hussein

professor

University of Mosul – College

of Education for Humanities

أشرف عبد الواحد ذنون

مدرس مساعد

د. كمال حازم حسين

أستاذ

جامعة الموصل- كلية التربية للعلوم

الانسانية

ashrafdhannoon1971@uomosul.edu.iq

kamalhaizm67@uomosul.edu.iq

تاريخ القبول

2022/4/25

تاريخ الاستلام

2022/4/10

الكلمات المفتاحية: مبادئ التهذيب- الإشراف- أنماط الحوار

Keywords: politeness maxims- Supervision- Modes of interactions

المخلص

نسبيًا، لا يُعرف الكثير عن مبادئ التهذيب التي يستخدمها المشرفون للتواصل مع طلابهم الباحثين. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ومن غير المعروف ما إذا كان بإمكان مبادئ التهذيب لجيفري ليتش (١٩٨٣) المساعدة في تحديد نمط تفاعل المشرفين مع طلابهم عبر مراحل العملية الإشرافية بالإضافة لتحديد النمط السائد خلال العملية الإشرافية بأكملها. تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى دراسة استخدام المشرفين لمبادئ التهذيب أثناء تقديم ملاحظاتهم الشفوية أثناء الجلسات الإشرافية وكذلك تسعى الدراسة الى تتبع استخدام المشرفين لمبادئ التهذيب خلال مراحل كتابة الرسالة ومعرفة إمكانية استخدامها لمعرفة النمط التفاعلي الذي يستخدمه المشرفون في الحوار مع الطلبة خلال مراحل العملية الإشرافية والنمط السائد. تستخدم الدراسة الحالية نموذج تجميعي مكون من جزأين. يعتمد الجزء الأول بشكل أساسي على مبادئ التهذيب اللغوي لجيفري ليتش (١٩٨٣) ويشتمل الجزء الثاني على النموذج التفاعلي لهيرون (١٩٧٦) ذو الست فئات. تم تناول البيانات بشكل وصفي؛ بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، تم استخدام بعض الأدوات من الطريقة الكمية ، مثل النسب المئوية والأرقام وبعض الإحصائيات الرياضية لاستكشاف الارتباط بين مبادئ التهذيب لجيفري ليتش وطريقة التفاعل الإشرافية. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة ان مبادئ التهذيب ممكن ان تستخدم لتحديد النمط الاشرافي للمشرفين عبر المراحل المختلفة للعملية الاشرافية بالإضافة لتحديد نوع النمط الاشرافي الغالب خلال العملية الاشرافية ككل. كما بينت الدراسة ان النمط التسلطي هو النمط السائد الذي يعتمده المشرفون اثناء الجلسات الاشرافية بمراحلها المختلفة.

Abstract

Relatively, little is known about Leech's politeness maxims the supervisors employ throughout their communication with their research students. In addition, it is unknown whether Leech's (1983) politeness maxims can help determine the supervisors' mode of interaction across the stages of the supervisory process and also the dominant mode throughout the entire process. The present study seeks to investigate the supervisors' use of politeness maxims while presenting their oral feedback. The study traces the supervisors' use of politeness maxims throughout the stages of writing the thesis. Also, it aims at finding if they can be used to identify the mode of interaction at each stage and the dominant one employed by the supervisors throughout the entire process. The study adopts an eclectic model that combines two parts. The first part is based mainly on Leech's (1983) politeness maxims. The second part comprises Heron's (1976) six-category intervention analysis. The data has been approached qualitatively; in addition, some instruments from the quantitative method are used, such as percentages, figures, and some mathematical statistics, to explore the correlation between Leech's politeness maxims understudy and the supervisory mode of interaction. The data analysis concludes that politeness maxims can be used to determine the supervisors' mode of interaction throughout the various stages of the supervisory process and identify the dominant mode of interaction across the entire supervisory process. Besides, the findings show that the authoritative mode is the dominant mode of interaction employed by the supervisors throughout the various stages of the supervisory process.

1. The problem

The choice of this topic was explicitly motivated by the following: first, relatively little is known about the Leech's (1983) politeness maxims supervisors employ to communicate with research students, and the types and frequency of these maxims throughout the various stages of the supervisory process. Second, the literature on postgraduate supervision in Arabic context is very poor. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, no previous study has investigated the supervisors' use of politeness maxims, as supervision is still a blurry area that takes place behind closed doors. In addition, it is unknown whether Leech's (1983) politeness maxims can help determine the supervisors' mode of interaction across the stages of the supervisory process and the dominant mode throughout the whole process.

2. Aims of the Study

The present study aims at:

1. Identifying and describing Leech's politeness maxims related to the topic in the study sample.
2. Tracing the changes in the supervisors' use of Leech's politeness maxims throughout the three stages of the supervisory process, i.e. beginning, middle and final.
3. Finding out whether the adopted politeness maxims, through each of the three stages of the supervisory process, can determine the dominance for each supervisory mode of interaction.

3. Data Collection and Analytical Procedure

The study sample comprises twelve supervisory groups: each group consists of a supervisor and a research student. The groups are chosen from three departments at the College of Education for Humanities/University of Mosul for the academic year 2020-2021. The data were collected by audio recording three meetings for each supervisory group (at the beginning, middle and final stages). After transcribing all the recordings, Mayring's (2000) analytical procedures for deductive qualitative content analysis are followed to figure out the

unit of analysis. The units of analysis are selected based on the existence of Leech's politeness maxims.

4. Value of the Study

The study can hopefully provide a pragmatic model for analysing supervisors' utterance and detecting the supervisory mode of interaction employed by the supervisors throughout the various stages of supervision as such model is completely neglected in language study.

5. Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle

According to Leech (1983, p. 104), politeness is an attitude that creates and maintains feelings of courtesy among a group of people, i.e., participants' ability to converse in a relaxed setting. Leech's (1983) model of politeness principle is composed of six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. Each maxim is split up into two sub-maxims. The first exemplifies negative politeness (reduce impolite language), whereas the second exemplifies positive politeness (promote the use of polite language) (Leech, 1983, pp. 80-136). For example:

- A: Kia and Hyundai are unique Korean automobile manufacturers. Aren't they?
- B: Well, Kia motors exceeded my expectations.

The impolite belief in the preceding example is that 'Hyundai automobile manufacturer is not as good as Kia motors.'

1. The Tact Maxim

The tact maxim (henceforth TM) is centred on the "other". By adhering to this maxim, the speaker reduces the cost and simultaneously increases the benefit to the hearer. The following are the pairs of tact maxims: a. *"Minimise cost to other"* b. *"Maximise benefit to other"*. This maxim applies to both directives, (henceforth DIRs), such as instructing, advising, requesting, etc. and commissives,

(henceforth COMs), such as promising or committing, etc. (Leech, 1983, p. 132).

2. The Generosity Maxim

Adhering to generosity maxim (henceforth GM), the speaker mitigates self-benefit and increases self-cost. Thus, unlike the tact maxim, this maxim is self-centred. The pairs of generosity maxims are as follows: a. *Minimise benefit to self* b. *Maximise cost to self*. The maxim of generosity is only applicable to the DIRs such as instructing, requesting, advising, etc., and COMs such as promising, offering, etc.

3. The Approbation

The approbation maxim (henceforth AM), entails reducing others' criticism and increasing their praise; thus, it is considered an 'other-centred maxim.' When delivering an utterance, the speaker is deemed to be polite because he/she is constantly attempting to praise others good behaviours. The following are the approbation maxima's pairs: a. *Minimise dispraise* b. *Maximise praise of other*. This maxim applies to both expressives, (henceforth EXPs) such as blaming and praising, as well as assertives, (henceforth ASs) such as stating and complaining.

4. The Modesty Maxim

The modesty maxim (henceforth MM), resembles the generosity maxim, in being self-centred' maxim. To adhere to this maxim, the speaker speaks humbly by reducing the praise of himself. The following are the pairs of the modesty maxim: a. *Minimise praise of self* b. *Maximise dispraise of self*. This maxim is only applicable on EXPs such as praising, thanking, blaming, etc. and ASs such as stating, explaining, etc.

5. The Agreement Maxim

The maxim of agreement (henceforth AGM), describes situations in which the speaker and listener can boost mutual

understanding throughout a conversation. Kesuma (2017, p. 22) claims that interlocutors generally exaggerate agreement with others and mitigate disagreement in various ways (i.e., showing regret, admitting partial agreement, etc.). The following are the pairs of the agreement maxim: a. *"Minimise disagreement between self and other"* b. *"Maximise agreement between self and other"*. This maxim applies only to ASs such as asserting, stating, and explaining.

6. The Sympathy Maxim

The sympathy maxim (henceforth AGM), emphasises the significance of the psychological feelings between self and others. By adhering to this maxim, the speaker is expected to maximise sympathy between himself and others. The following are the pairs of the sympathy maxim: a. *"Minimise antipathy between self and other"* b. *"Maximise sympathy between self and other"*. This maxim is only applicable in ASs, e.g. stating, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting.

6. Pragmatic Scales

Leech completes his model by identifying a set of inter-related pragmatic scales used to measure the degree of politeness in a particular maxim, e.g. tact or generosity, etc. The scales suggested in Leech (1983, p. 123) include:

1. The cost-benefit scale: this scale enables the speaker to evaluate the action as costly or beneficial to himself or the hearer concerning the degree of politeness displayed. The greater the cost and lower the benefit to the hearer, the less courteous the utterance. On the contrary, the lower the cost and more significant the benefit is to the hearer, the more polite the utterance.
2. The optionality scale: this scale indicates the extent to which the speaker allows the hearer to choose. For instance, a 'command' in

directives obligates the hearer to take action, whereas a 'request' does not. Correspondingly, in contrast to 'offering,' 'promising' in COMs commits the speaker to perform an act.

3. The indirectness: this scale indicates the amount of inference the hearer incorporates in interpreting the speaker's utterance. Indirect illocutionary acts are typically more polite than direct illocutionary acts because they add a degree of optionality and reduce the directive force of the utterance.

4. The authority scale: this scale determines how much authority/power the speaker has over the listener. This scale represents the participants' social status relationship. How the speaker communicates reflects his or her relationship with the hearer.

5. The social distance scale: this scale measures the degree of familiarity between the speaker and the hearer. It concerns the rank of social relationship between the speaker and hearer; the closer the participants in an interaction, the less polite the speech, and vice versa.

Leech (1983) suggests that when it comes to politeness, the scales of indirectness and optionality frequently work in tandem. Consider the following utterance that incorporates the maxim of generosity: 'Have a sandwich!', keeping the cost-benefit scale in mind; one can argue that though it is imperative, it is likely to be perceived as beneficial to the hearer (unless the hearer is on a diet). In comparison, 'could I have a sandwich?' is likely to be perceived as costly to the hearer, as it obligates the hearer to give a sandwich. According to Leech (1983) at this point, the optionality and indirectness scales work side by side. 'Could I have a sandwich?' is an indirect plan to give the hearer a choice about whether or not to comply, whereas the imperative, 'Have a sandwich!' leaves the hearer with no choice. Leech (1983) suggests that when it comes to politeness, the scales of indirectness and optionality frequently interact in this way.

7. Supervisory Mode of Interaction

To communicate effectively, the interlocutors are expected to adhere to one or more modes of interaction. As with any communication, the supervisors in postgraduate studies need to employ a specific mode or modes of interaction throughout the supervisory process to guide the research students in completing the thesis. Simultaneously, the research student needs to engage adequately in any mode of interaction employed by the supervisor during the meeting. Supervisors' participation in supervisory meetings typically entails stating, explaining, instructing, clarifying, and expressing, among other things. To express any illocutionary acts listed above, the supervisor employs a particular mode of interaction that may differ from that used by other supervisors. The variation in modes of interaction among different supervisors or concerning the same supervisor throughout the various stages of the supervisory process could be attributed to the implicit perceptions that individual supervisors have of the supervisory process. Moreover, the level of postgraduate studies, whether diploma, Master or doctoral studies, also may influence the supervisory mode of interaction. To identify the supervisory mode of interaction, Heron's (1976) six categories of intervention model is adopted. These categories involve two major groups: authoritative and facilitative interventions.

Authoritative interventions include three sub-categories, the first is prescriptive interventions, where the supervisor tries to control, guide the supervisee's actions, and provide advice and suggestions. For example, in a postgraduate supervision environment, the supervisor attempts to direct the behaviour of the research student to use a specific method of analysis. The second is the informative mode, where the supervisor intends to provide knowledge. It is authoritative in the sense that the supervisor serves as the source of information. For instance, the supervisor shares his or her beliefs or perspectives with the research

student to explain the rationale behind employing a specific model of analysis to assist the research student in comprehending the model. The third sub-category is confronting, in which the supervisor draws the supervisee's attention to some limiting attitude or behaviour that he or she is unaware of by challenging them with comments without personal attack. It should be a fruitful and productive interaction rather than an aggressive one. For example, the supervisor confronts the research student: *'Have you noticed how frequently I have explained this technique?'* (Cassedy, 2010, p. 109).

Facilitative interventions also involve three sub-categories. The first is cathartic, in which the supervisor assists the supervisee in relieving stress. For instance, the supervisor tells the research student, *'Do not be worried. Many other students believe they do not have enough time to complete their thesis. This is perfectly normal'*. The second mode is catalytic, in which the supervisor assists the supervisee in comprehending, analysing, and resolving problems independently. For instance, the supervisor might ask the research student, *'How would you fix this issue?'* The final sub-category is supportive, in which the supervisor aims to build trust and demonstrate the supervisee's worth. For instance, the supervisor could tell the research student, *'well done, I'm so pleased of you.'* (Yaghchi, Ghafoori, & Nabifar, 2016, p. 182).

8. Data Analysis

The first step is to analyse supervisors' utterances extracted from the transcribed materials based on the presence Searle's (1979) speech acts, i.e. ASs, DIRs, COMs and EXPs. The second step entails determining whether politeness maxims can lead to identifying the supervisory mode of interaction throughout the three supervisory stages and recognising the dominant mode of interaction across the study sample.

9. Politeness Maxims

The first step involves examining the supervisors' observance or non-observance of the politeness maxims in each type of Searle's speech acts at the three stages in all the study sample. The data related to the first step are presented in Tables 1-4. Table 1 summarises the analysis linked to the observance and non-observance of AM, AGM, MM, and SM in assertives. The analysis regarding the observance and non-observance of TM and GM in directives and commissives are summarised in Tables 2-3. Finally, the data related to the supervisors' observance and non-observance of AM and MM in EXPs is presented in Table 4.

Table (1)
Frequency of Observed and Non-observed Politeness principles in Assertives

Dept.	Stages of supervision	Politeness Principles							
		AM		AGM		MM		SM	
		Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob
		No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)
English	Beginning	16(41%)	6(23%)	15(38%)	20(77%)	1(3%)	0(0%)	7(18%)	0(0%)
	Middle	26(63%)	3(19%)	9(22%)	13(81%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	5(12%)	0(0%)
	Final	12(67%)	0(0%)	4(22%)	4(100%)	1(6%)	0(0%)	1(6%)	0(0%)
History	Beginning	35(70%)	0(0%)	12(24%)	13(100%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	2(4%)	0(0%)
	Middle	33(45%)	20(53%)	34(46%)	18(47%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	7(9%)	0(0%)
	Final	45(63%)	5(36%)	20(28%)	9(64%)	2(3%)	0(0%)	5(7%)	0(0%)
Arabic	Beginning	19(73%)	0(0%)	7(27%)	10(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	35(56%)	7(23%)	22(35%)	24(77%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	5(8%)	0(0%)
	Final	40(63%)	1(6%)	18(28%)	16(94%)	2(3%)	0(0%)	4(6%)	0(0%)
Total	Beginning	70(61%)	6(12%)	34(30%)	43(88%)	2(2%)	0(0%)	9(8%)	0(0%)
	Middle	94(53%)	12(17%)	65(37%)	58(83%)	2(1%)	0(0%)	17(10%)	0(0%)
	Final	67(54%)	6(17%)	42(34%)	29(83%)	5(4%)	0(0%)	10(8%)	0(0%)
Total		Ob.				N. Ob			
Beginning		115(70%)				49(30%)			
Middle		178(72%)				70(28%)			
Final		124(78%)				35(22%)			

Table (2)

Observed and Non-observed Politeness principles in Directives

Dept.	Stages of supervision	Politeness Principles			
		TM		GM	
		Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob
		No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)
English	Beginning	5(42%)	151(100%)	7(58%)	0(0%)
	Middle	3(37%)	175(100%)	5(63%)	0(0%)
	Final	30(88%)	143(100%)	4(12%)	0(0%)
History	Beginning	4(57%)	112(99%)	3(43%)	1(1%)
	Middle	0(0%)	130(100%)	10(100%)	0(0%)
	Final	1(25%)	117(100%)	3(75%)	0(0%)
Arabic	Beginning	3(43%)	98(100%)	4(57%)	0(0%)
	Middle	13(50%)	212(99%)	13(50%)	2(12%)
	Final	3(33%)	114(99%)	6(67%)	1(1%)
Total	Beginning	12(46%)	361(100%)	14(54%)	1(0%)
	Middle	16(36%)	517(100%)	28(64%)	2(0%)
	Final	34(72%)	347(100%)	13(28%)	1(0%)
Total		Ob.		N. Ob	
Beginning		26(7%)		362(93%)	
Middle		44(37%)		519(93%)	
Final		47(12%)		348(88%)	

Table (3)
The frequency of Observed and Non-observed Politeness principles
in direct Commissives

Dept.	Stages of supervision	Politeness Principles			
		TM		GM	
		Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob
		No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)
English	Beginning	0(0%)	1(100%)	3(100%)	0(0%)
	Middle	0(0%)	2(100%)	2(100%)	0(0%)
	Final	0(0%)	8(100%)	1(100%)	0(0%)
History	Beginning	1(20%)	0(0%)	4(80%)	0(0%)
	Middle	2(50%)	0(0%)	2(50%)	0(0%)
	Final	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(100%)	0(0%)
Arabic	Beginning	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	0(0%)	0(0%)	7(100%)	0(0%)
	Final	3(38%)	0(0%)	5(62%)	0(0%)
Total	Beginning	1(13%)	1(100%)	7(87%)	0(0%)
	Middle	2(15%)	2(100%)	11(85%)	0(0%)
	Final	3(25%)	8(100%)	9(75%)	0(0%)
Total		Ob.		N. Ob	
Beginning		8(89%)		1(11%)	
Middle		13(87%)		2(13%)	
Final		12(60%)		8(40%)	

Table (4)

**The Frequency of Observed and Non-observed Politeness
principles in direct Expressives**

Dept.	Stages of supervision	Politeness Principles			
		AM		MM	
		Ob.	N. Ob	Ob.	N. Ob
		No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)	No.(%)
English	Beginning	7(100%)	4(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	4(80%)	3(100%)	1(20%)	0(0%)
	Final	15(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
History	Beginning	4(100%)	1(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	5(83%)	2(100%)	1(17%)	0(0%)
	Final	4(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Arabic	Beginning	0(0%)	2(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	1(100%)	5(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Final	5(56%)	0(0%)	4(44%)	0(0%)
Total	Beginning	11(100%)	7(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	Middle	10(83%)	10(100%)	2(17%)	0(0%)
	Final	24(86%)	0(0%)	4(14%)	0(0%)
Total		Ob.		N. Ob	
Beginning		11(61%)		7(39%)	
Middle		12(55%)		10(45%)	
Final		28(100%)		0(0%)	

As for the second step, the data in the above tables is used to calculate the overall frequencies and percentages of politeness maxims' observance and non-observance at each of the three stages of the supervisory process within Searle's speech acts in general. Then, the

total frequency and percentage for each maxim across all stages are provided in Tables (5-6) after.

9.1 Observance of Politeness Maxims in Searle's Speech Acts

Following Leech's (1983) politeness theory, an utterance is regarded as polite if it positively affects the research student. Therefore, observing the politeness maxims will foster positive relationships and create a cooperative environment among the supervisory participants.

Table (5)

Observance of Politeness Maxims in Searle's Speech Acts

Stages of supervision	AM	AGM	MM	SM	TM	GM	Total
Beginning	81(51%)	34(21%)	2(1%)	9(6%)	13(8%)	21(13%)	160 (26%)
Middle	104(42%)	65(26%)	4(2%)	17(7%)	18(7%)	39(16%)	247(40%)
Final	91(43%)	42(20%)	9(4%)	10(5%)	37(18%)	22(10%)	211(34%)
Total	276(45%)	141(23%)	15(2%)	36(6%)	68(11%)	82(13%)	618

Across all the stages, the data in Table (5) clarifies that AM is the dominant observed type among politeness maxims with a frequency of 276 and a percentage of 45%. The extensive use of this maxim compared to other maxims can be attributed to its nature and the type of speech acts it is associated with. According to Leech (1983), this maxim is linked with ASs and ESs. The supervisors have used the former with a relatively high frequency 691 in the study sample with the illocutionary forces of asserting, stating, and explaining. Meanwhile, the latter is repeated 61 times with the illocutionary forces of praising, criticising and encouraging.

Consequently, the supervisors employ a considerable number of these speech acts to convey a particular effect to the research student, either negatively or positively. The positive impact expressed by ASs and EXPs is reflected in the supervisors' use of AM maxim. The following are representative examples of the supervisors' use of AM;

since we cannot consider examples from all stages due to time limitations. The examples for each of Leech's (1983) maxims will be chosen randomly from the three stages.

١. عملك ممتازانت الان تعتبر خبير في موضوعك وتقدم وجهه نظرك لا تحتاج الى مصدر في هذا الامر بدليل انك طورت نموذج للتحليل خاص بك.

Trnsl. *You did an outstanding job. You are considered an expert in your field. You present your point of view on the subject without consulting a reference. since you developed an analytical model for your data.*

In (1), the supervisor employs AM to minimise criticism to the research student and maximise praise. The AM is expressed through the ES speech act. The supervisor praises the research student and explains that the research student is considered an expert in the subject and does not need to quote from others regarding the study model. The supervisor's utterance is deemed polite on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority and social distance. The utterance under study is considered courteous on the cost-benefit scale since the supervisor minimises the cost to the research student and maximises the benefit by stating that the research student does not need to quote from other rescues. On an authoritative scale, the current utterance is also thought to be polite, as the supervisor has authority and power but chooses to interact with the research student politely. As a result, a mutual understanding develops between the supervisory participants. Thus, the social distance scale is used. Nevertheless, the indirectness and optionality are irrelevant to this utterance.

The data analysis indicates that the AGM is the next most observed maxim, occurring 14 times (23%). The relatively high frequency of observing this maxim implies the supervisors' tendency to exaggerate agreement with research students and mitigate disagreement. This maxim is observed through directly agreeing with the research student, using mitigating devices or partial agreement to

convey indirect disagreement. The use of mitigating devices such as 'please and could you and the partial agreement' are also considered courteous. The supervisors attempt to avoid direct conflict with the research student, as this might obstruct communication among the supervisory participants and jeopardise the completion of the thesis. Additionally, maximising conflict with research students can undermine their confidence in accomplishing the thesis. This maxim is found in ASs with several illocutionary forces. In the current study, it is implemented in illocutionary forces of asserting, stating, and explaining. The following is a representative example of the supervisors' use of AGM in ASs.

٢. انا احضرت الحاسبة لاجلك قلت احتمال أيضا لم تجلب نسخة ورقية من شغلك.

Trnsl. *I managed to bring a laptop from the department for you, in case you did not bring a paper copy of your work.*

In (2), the supervisor maximises agreement and minimises disagreement between himself and the research student. The AGM is conveyed via the AS speech act. The supervisor's utterance is deemed courteous on the following scales: cost-benefit, indirectness, authority, and social distance. On the cost-benefit scale, the supervisor maximises the cost and minimises the advantage to himself by bringing the laptop and minimises the cost and maximises the advantage to the research student by bringing the laptop. This utterance is also considered polite on the indirectness scale. The supervisor does not inform the research student directly that submitting the work on paper is preferred. It is more polite to express disagreement indirectly via partial agreement.

Moreover, the supervisor has authority and power over the research student and can converse without observing the politeness maxims, yet he does not demonstrate his authority or power but instead reveals solidarity. Consequently, the utterance is considered polite on

the social distance scale as well since this scale describes the degree of solidarity between interlocuters. However, the scale of optionality is irrelevant to the utterance under study.

Meanwhile, the supervisors observe the GM with a frequency of 82 and a percentage of 13%. The relatively low frequency of observing this maxim compared to AM and AGM can be ascribed to the research students' role in postgraduate studies since he/she is responsible for accomplishing the thesis. However, the supervisors sometimes employ the GM to help, encourage or support their research students. According to Leech (1983), GM is linked with DIRs and COMs. In DIRs, the supervisors have observed this maxim 55 times in the study sample for its direct and indirect forms, while in COMs, it has been observed 27 times (See Tables 2-3). The following are examples of the supervisors' observance of the GM in DIRs and COMs.

٣. لا تقلقي سأقتصر رسالتك على كتاب الغنية للقاضي عياض وسأنظم اجتماعًا للجنة العلمية لمراجعة عنوان موضوعك وتقديم سيمينار حول التغييرات.

Transl. *Do not worry. I will confine your thesis to Al-Ghuniya book by judge Ayyad and organise a meeting for the scientific committee to revise the title of your subject and provide a seminar on the changes.*

٤. حسنا ذكرني اجلب لك نسخة من كتاب تحليل الخطاب الروائي.

Transl. *well, remind me to bring you a copy of the Narrative Discourse Analysis book.*

In (3), the supervisor's adherence to GM is evident since he aims to minimise the cost to the research student and maximise benefit. The GM is employed in this utterance through a COM speech act with the illocutionary force of a pledge. The supervisor demonstrates his commitment to limit the thesis to Al-Ghuniya and arrange a meeting for the scientific committee to present a seminar on the changes. The utterance under study is deemed courteous on the cost-benefit and

social distance scales. In this utterance, the cost to the supervisor is higher than the benefit. Besides, the supervisor demonstrates his solidarity with the research student. Thus, the utterance is considered polite regarding the social distance scale, while the rest of the scales are irrelevant to this utterance.

In (4), the GS is expressed through the supervisor's use of the DIR speech act. The supervisor, in this utterance, asks the research student to remind him to bring a copy of the *Narrative Discourse Analysis* book; thus, he "minimises benefit to self and maximises cost to self". The supervisor's utterance is regarded as polite on the cost-benefit and social distance scales. In this utterance, the cost to the supervisor is greater than the benefit since he will bring the book to the research student. Additionally, the supervisor expresses his support by stating that he will bring the book to his research student. Consequently, the utterance is deemed polite on the authority and social distance scales. Meanwhile, the indirectness scale is considered irrelevant to the utterance under study.

As for the TM, Table (5) shows that it has been observed 68 times (11%) by the supervisors in the present study. The relatively low frequency of observing this maxim compared to AM, AGM, and GM can be ascribed to the nature of the supervisory process. Postgraduate supervision is regarded as the highest form of teaching in university. Throughout the supervisory process, the supervisors perform numerous DIRs such as instructing, requesting, advising, and recommending to guide research students. According to Table (5), supervisors do not use many courteous terms to mitigate the powerful effect of DIRs; this can be attributed to the supervisors' desire to avoid being misunderstood by their research students or their desire to sound authoritative. This maxim is implemented by employing DIRs and COMs. In the present study data, the DIRs are utilised with the illocutionary force of

instructing, requesting, advising, and suggesting. On the other hand, COMs are associated with offering, committing and promising.

In DIRs, the supervisors have observed this maxim 62 times in the study sample, while in COMs, it has been observed 6 times (Table 3). The following are examples of the supervisors' observance of the TM in DIRs and COMs:

٥. ممكن تضيفين مبحث عن الادراك في الفصل الثالث.

Transl. *You may add a section concerning cognition in chapter three.*

٦. أي موضوع خاص ببحثك اعطيني أقرأه.

Transl. *Give me any subject related to your study to read it.*

In (5), the supervisor is very tactful in giving instructions. He employs TM through the DIR speech act. Although the supervisor maximises the cost to the research student by advising him to add another section to chapter three, he mitigates the effect of his utterance by beginning with a polite expression that raises the possibility for the research student to agree or not. The utterance under study is considered polite on indirectness, optionality, and authority scales. AS for the other maxims, they are considered irrelevant to measuring the politeness of this utterance.

In (6), the supervisor utilises TM to show politeness by using the COM speech act. He instructs the research student to give him any subject related to the study to read it. Thus, the supervisor minimises the cost to the research student and maximises the benefit. This example is deemed polite on the cost-benefit, authority, optionality and solidarity scales. At the same time, the indirectness and optionality scales are irrelevant to the present utterance.

The SM has been observed 36 times (6%) by the supervisors in the current study. The low frequency of SM compared to other maxims is ascribed to the fact that this maxim is associated with a narrow range of speech acts that are rarely used in supervision, such as congratulation, condolence, and conveying regrets. The SM is

employed through supervisors' use of ASs. The following is a representative example of SM in the supervisory process.

٧. لاحظت انك كلما تحدثت حول المناقشة تبدأين تقلقين.

Trnsl. *I noticed that whenever we discuss the viva, you start to worry.*

By observing SM in (7), the supervisor reduces antipathy between himself and the research student and promotes compassion. This maxim is applied in this utterance via AS speech act with the illocutionary force of stating. This utterance is judged courteous on the indirectness, authority, optionality and solidarity scales. However, the cost-benefit scale is irrelevant to assessing the politeness of the utterance under study.

Finally, the MM is observed 15 times (2%) by the supervisors. The low frequency with which supervisors observed this maxim in the study sample is linked to its nature. This maxim expresses apology and humility, which are rarely utilised in supervision. Supervisors use the MM through the employment of ASs and EXPs. The MM maxim is illustrated through the following examples.

٨. أنا ابعثكم على مختصين بالاختبار لأنهم يوجهوكم أفضل مني.

Trnsl. *I send you to specialists in test because they can guide you better than me.*

٩. البحث العلمي ليس بالأمر السهل انت بالبحث تتعبين وما تتامين بالليل وتفكرين، انا

دكتور مرات أمور أقرأها يومين حتى أفهمها. انت تريدين تحليلين حديث هكذا بسهولة.

Trnsl. *Scientific research is not an easy task. You become exhausted and unable to sleep at night when conducting research, and you are always thinking; I am a doctor, yet there are many things that I read for two days until I grasp them. And you want to analyse such discourse as simple as this!*

In (8), the supervisor demonstrates MM; he minimises praise of self and maximises dispraise of self for the advantage of the research student. The supervisor acknowledges that forming a test is not of his specialisation; thus, he sends the s research tudents to those who have experience in conducting the test. The MM is employed in this example through the AS speech act. On the cost-benefit scale, the supervisors minimises the cost to the research students and maximises the benefit by advising him to consult specialists about how to construct the test rather than attempting to design it himself numerous times and wasting his time. In terms of authority, the supervisor gives up his authority and admits that forming the test is outside the area of his expertise. The supervisor does not show his authority or power; instead, he expresses his modesty. As a result, the utterance is also regarded courteous on a social distance scale. Nevertheless, the rest of the scales are irrelevant to this utterance.

In (9), the supervisor utilises MM by employing the ES speech act with the illocutionary force of blaming. The supervisor uses the MM to persuade the research student that conducting scientific research is not an easy task. This utterance is deemed polite in terms of authority and social distance scales. On the other hand, the other three scales are regarded as irrelevant.

Consequently, the total frequency and percentage of observing politeness maxims show that it is used at the beginning stage with a frequency of 160 (26%), 247 (40%) in the middle stage and 211 (34%) in the final stage (See Table 5). The high frequency of this strategy at the middle stage is ascribed to the relatively difficult nature of this stage as it represents the culmination of the work. Thus, the majority of the supervisors tend to praise their research students' achievements at this stage to encourage them to complete the work. The final stage of the research also shows a considerable use of observing politeness maxims in general. The supervisors employ these maxims at the final stage to praise their research students for their hard work in completing

the thesis and encourage them to be prepared for the viva. Observing politeness maxims at the beginning stage is employed with a relatively low frequency. This reflects that in the beginning stage of the supervisory process, the relationship between the two participants is relatively formal compared to other stages wherein the relationship develops gradually, a matter which demands more use of politeness maxims.

9.2 Non-observance of Politeness Maxims in Searle's Speech Acts

Non-observing of the maxims impedes the relationship between the interlocutors, and the communication objective of interaction, i.e. completing the thesis, cannot be met. Nevertheless, there are cases where non-observing a particular maxim can benefit the addressee in the future.

To count the total frequencies and percentages of the supervisors' non-observance of politeness maxims in Searle's speech acts, in general, the total frequencies of non-observing the maxims in each speech act (Tables 1-4) are summarised in Table (6). This table shows the frequency and percentage of each maxim in the beginning, middle and final stages of the supervision within Searle's speech acts in general. Then the total frequency and percentage for each maxim throughout all stages will be supplied.

Table (6)

Non-Observance of Politeness Maxims in Searle's Speech Acts

Stages of Supervision	AM	AGM	MM	SM	TM	GM	Total
Beginning	13(3%)	43(10%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	362(87%)	1(0%)	419 (30%)
Middle	22(4%)	58(10%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	519(86%)	2(0%)	601(42%)
Final	6(2%)	29(7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	355(91%)	1(0%)	391(28%)
Total	41(3%)	130(9%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1236(88%)	4(0%)	1411

The data in Table (6) shows that TM is the most non-observed maxim across all the stages, with a frequency of 1236 and a percentage

of (88%). The high frequency of non-observing this maxim is ascribed to the supervisors' extensive use of DIRs to instruct the research student without employing any mitigating devices. The majority of the supervisors in the study sample prefer to submit their instruction directly rather than presenting it indirectly to avoid being misunderstood by the research students. In addition, this maxim has two sides; the first minimises the cost to the research student, and the second maximises the benefit to the research student. Although the supervisors try their best to achieve the latter side of TM, when they instruct the research students to do something, they maximise the cost to the research students. Consequently, they do not observe the first side of TM that involves minimising the cost to the research student. As for the speech acts implemented, they are the same as those used in observed TM. In DIRs, supervisors failed to observe this maxim 1225 times in the study sample, while COMs is not observed 11 times (See Table 2-3). The following are illustrative examples of supervisors' non-observance of TM in DIRs and COMs. The examples of politeness maxims are chosen randomly from the three stages for each maxim.

١٠. اطروحتي لازم تطلعين عليها أنا كاتب على الحقل الدلالي فصل كامل.

Trnsl. *You should read my dissertation; I dedicated a whole chapter to the semantic field.*

١١. اجلب لي نسخة ورقية حتى أقرأها وأقول لك هذا يضاف هذا يحذف هذا يقدم هذا يؤخر.

Trnsl. *Bring me a paper copy so I can read it and notify you if any information has to be added, deleted, initiated, or delayed.*

In (10), the supervisor employs the DIR speech act to instruct the research student to read his thesis, which comprises a whole chapter on the semantic field relevant to the research student's subject. However, the supervisor does not observe the TM as he maximises the cost and minimises the benefit for the research student. Besides, the imperative structure is applied without using a mitigating device.

Though the supervisor does not strictly adhere to the TM, he does not intend to reduce the benefit for the research student by overburdening him with too many tasks; instead, he seeks to assist the research student in acquiring the necessary knowledge for completing the thesis. Furthermore, though the research student advantage during the period of providing the directions is not equivalent to the amount of effort expended, over time, the benefit increases for the research student as he becomes closer to achieving his final goal, which is the completion of the thesis. The supervisor's utterance is viewed as a violation of courtesy on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority, social distance, indirectness, and optionality. In terms of the cost-benefit scale, the supervisor does not adhere to politeness maxims because his utterance increases the cost to the research student while decreasing the benefit by instructing the research student to read his dissertation.

Similarly, the utterance is believed to violate politeness on the authority scale since the supervisor utilises his authority to direct the research student without employing any mitigating device to reduce the impact of his utterance on the research student. As a result, an uncomfortable atmosphere between the supervisory participants can emerge, impeding the completion of the thesis. According to the social distance scale, the supervisor does not observe politeness maxims since he clearly expresses the inequality between two individuals by not employing any mitigating devices. As for indirectness, the supervisor presents his viewpoint directly to the research student without using any mitigating device; consequently, his utterance is regarded as a violation of politeness according to indirectness. Finally, according to the optionality scale, the supervisor does not present any options to the research student.

In (11), the supervisor employs DIR and COM speech acts to instruct the research student to bring a paper copy of the work to read it. Nevertheless, the supervisor does not observe the TM since he

maximises the cost and minimises the benefit to the research student. Moreover, the supervisor employs the imperative form without soothing its effect by using a mitigating device. On the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, indirectness, authority, optionality and social distance, the supervisor's utterance is considered a violation of politeness since he implements his utterance contrary to what these scales suggest.

The data analysis illuminates that the supervisors do not observe AGM 130 times (9%). The relatively low frequency of not observing this maxim compared to TM indicates that most supervisors want to show agreement and mitigate disagreement with their research students'. However, the data analysis shows that some supervisors maximise disagreement and minimise agreement with their research students in certain situations. The supervisors, for instance, refuse to agree with some of their research students' attitudes or opinions, especially those that are highly unacceptable and can affect the progress of the work—considering that the majority of research students do not have previous experience in research writing. The supervisors do not observe this maxim through expressing their disagreement directly without employing mitigating devices or partial disagreement. This maxim is not observed in ASs with the illocutionary forces of stating and explaining. The following illustrates how supervisors do not observe the AGM in ASs.

١٢. لا المقدمة التي كتبته كثيرة انا قلت لك المقدمة هي مجرد تقديم بسيط للرسالة ربما

تذكر فيها بالخير هدفك من الرسالة.

Trnsl. *No, your introduction is lengthy. I told you the introduction is a brief introductory to the thesis, in which you might mention your goal in the thesis at its end.*

In (12), the supervisor utilises the AS speech act to inform the research student that he needs to revise the introduction since he wrote a lengthy one containing unnecessary information. The supervisor does

not observe the AGM because he maximises disagreement with the research student and minimises agreement. The supervisor makes it apparent that he rejects the introduction by using the word 'no'. The supervisor's utterance is regarded as a violation of courtesy on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, indirectness, authority, optionality, and social distance since he performs his utterance opposite to what these scales recommend.

Across all the stages, the AM is not observed by the supervisors 41 times (3%) (See Table 6). The relatively low frequency of not observing this maxim compared to TM and AGM can be attributed to its crucial role in the supervisory process. Not observing AM by the supervisors affects the communication between the supervisory participants and hinders the completion of the thesis since it aims to "minimise dispraise of other and maximise praise of other". This maxim is associated with ASs and EXPs. The supervisors have not observed the AM 24 times in ASs and 17 times in EXPs. The following are examples of not observing AM in ASs by the supervisors in the study sample.

١٣. انت مامركز بعملك عندك تكرر في فقرة كاملة في الفصل الثالث هاي الفقرة قريتها قبل شوية.

Trnsl. *You are not concentrating on your work. In chapter three, an entire paragraph is repeated. I have just read this paragraph.*

١٤. شوف المقدمة والخاتمة بالرسالة مهمين جدا، يعني الخاتمة مالك انا بدون ماأقرأها أقول لك لاتصلح.

Trnsl. *Listen to me the introduction and conclusion are essential components of the thesis; without reading your conclusion, I can say it is inappropriate.*

In (13), the supervisor employs an EXP speech act; he blames the research student for being not punctual in his writing because the research student has repeated an entire paragraph in chapter three. The supervisor does not observe the AM as he maximises dispraise of the research student and minimises praise. Regarding the cost-benefit scale, the supervisor's utterance violates courtesy since it increases the cost to the research student while decreasing the benefit by stating that the research student should rewrite the repeated paragraph. Meanwhile, (13) is viewed as a violation of politeness on the authority scale since the supervisor uses authority to criticise the research student without employing any mitigating device to reduce the effect of his utterance on the research student. The utterance breaches politeness concerning the social distance scale because it indicates inequality between two individuals. As for indirectness, the supervisor communicated his point of view directly to the research student and did not use any mitigating device; consequently, it violates politeness regarding this scale. Finally, the supervisor does not provide the research student with any options, thus non-observing politeness regarding the optionality scale.

In (14), the supervisor employs an AS speech act to inform the research student about the introduction and conclusion's important roles in writing the thesis. However, he considers that the conclusion written by the research student is not suitable for the thesis even before reading it. The supervisor does not observe the AM in this utterance as he maximises dispraise of the research student and minimises praise. He deemed the conclusion unsuitable for the work even before reading it without stating why or using any mitigating device to soften his utterance. The supervisor's utterance is judged a violation of politeness on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority, social distance, indirectness, and optionality since he performs his utterance contrary to what these scales imply.

As for GM, the data analysis shows that the maxim has not been observed 4 times (0%) by the supervisors in the study sample. Not observing this maxim involves maximising the benefit and minimising the cost to self. The low frequency of not observing this maxim compared to TM, AGM and AM is ascribed to the supervisors' intentions, which may vary from one person to another. However, peoples' intention in observing a maxim or not is out of the scope of the present study. According to the present study, not observing GM by supervisors can be attributed to the fact that, within the context of supervision, the majority of supervisors do not aim to maximise benefit and minimise cost for themselves. Though the supervisors are not obliged to provide something they are not responsible for, it is essential for them to perform their duties effectively during the supervisory process so the research student can complete his thesis. This maxim is associated with DIRs and COMs. The supervisors have not observed the GM 4 times in DIRs and zero time in COMs. The following is an illustration of not observing GM in DIRs.

١٥. انت لازم تكتبين البحث المسئل من الرسالة، مسؤولية المشرف تقتصر على توجيه الطالب باختيار الجزء المناسب من الرسالة ومن ثم التنبيه على الأخطاء العلمية، اللغوية والفنية.

Trnsl. *You should write the abridged paper. The supervisor's responsibility is limited to directing the research student to choose the appropriate part of the thesis and then notifying him of any scientific, linguistic, or technical mistakes.*

In (15), the supervisor utilises the DIR speech act to instruct the research student to write the abridged paper. He informs the research student it is his responsibility to write the paper and not the supervisor's. The supervisor does not observe the GM as he maximises the benefit to self and minimises cost. The supervisor's utterance is believed to be non-courteous on the following scales: cost-benefit,

indirectness, authority, and social distance, because he acts opposite to what these scales state. Besides, the supervisor does not use any mitigating devices in his utterance to smooth its effect on the research student.

Finally, Table (6) demonstrates that the supervisors have not observed the MM and SM at all (0%). The zero frequency of non-observing MM is related to the nature of this maxim, since observing it entails "minimise praise of self and maximise dispraise of self". The supervisors' objective in the supervisory process is to guide the research student to complete his thesis successfully. Thus, in reality, supervisors do not seek to "maximise praise of self and minimise dispraise of self". Meanwhile, the zero frequency for non-observing the SM is attributed to supervisors' desire in the study sample to help the research students accomplish their thesis rather than maximising antipathy and minimising empathy with their research students.

As for the total frequency and percentage of non-observing politeness maxims, Table (6) shows that politeness maxims are not observed 419 times (30%), 601 times (42%) and 391 times (28%) at the beginning, middle and final stages, respectively. The high frequency of non-observing politeness maxims at the middle stage is attributed to the nature of TM that is extensively not observed at the middle stage with a frequency of 519 times and a percentage of (86%). This maxim involves minimising the cost to the research student and maximising the benefit to the research student. The majority of the supervisors do not observe this maxim since they prefer to submit their instruction directly rather than presenting it indirectly to avoid being misunderstood by the research student. Thus, they tend to maximise the cost to the research student and minimise the benefit to the research student in this stage that involves the practical part of the research writing process. However, while the benefit to research students is minimal at the time of utterance production, it gradually increases as the research student approaches the completion of the thesis.

Meanwhile, the relatively high frequency of not observing politeness maxims at the beginning stage is attributed to the supervisors' desire not to waste the research students' time looking for and investigating minor details. Thus, supervisors in the study sample give their instructions directly to avoid any possible misunderstanding on the side of their research students. However, at the final stage, the supervisors' non-observance of politeness maxims is the least among the three stages. This indicates that the research student at this stage has gained sufficient knowledge on his subject that enables him/her to work independently to some extent. Moreover, the decrease in the supervisors' non-observance of politeness maxims at the final stage shows a development in the relationship between the two supervisory participants wherein less direct instructions are employed on the supervisors' part.

10. Politeness Maxims and Heron's (1976) Mode of Interaction

To investigate whether the pragmatic strategy of politeness can lead to identifying the supervisory mode of interaction or not, the researcher investigates the correlation between politeness maxims and Heron's (1976) interactional model subcategories. The correlation between politeness maxims and Heron's (1976) interactional model is achieved by counting the number of the supervisors' total observance or non-observance of politeness maxims. However, to arrive at the total frequency and percentage of the supervisors' observance and non-observance of the maxims regardless of their types within Searle's speech acts in general, the researcher designed Table (7).

The data in Table (7) demonstrates that politeness maxims have been observed in Searle's speech acts in general 160 times (28%) at the beginning, 247 times (29%) at the middle stage and 211 times (35%) at the final stage. As for the supervisors' non-observance of Leech's maxims in Searle's speech acts in general, it shows that politeness maxims have not been observed 419 times (72%) at the beginning, 601

times (71%) at the middle stage and 391 times (65%) at the final stage.⁽¹⁾

Table (7): The Supervisory Mode of Interaction in Leech's Maxims

Mode of Interaction		Ob.	Non-Ob.
Stages of supervision		(Facilitative)	(Authoritative)
Total	Beginning	160(28%)	419(72%)
	Middle	247(29%)	601(71%)
	Final	211(35%)	391(65%)
Total		618(30%)	1411(70%)

The total frequency of politeness maxims observance and non-observance in Seale's speech acts, in general, paves the way to determining the supervisory mode of interaction. Observing the politeness maxims by the supervisors is not only an indication of the supervisor being polite to the research students but also an indication of the supervisors' adhering to the facilitative mode of interaction. By contrast, non-observing the politeness maxims does not only imply that the supervisor violates the maxims, but rather it is an indication of the supervisors' adoption of the authoritative mode of interaction to direct the research student.

According to Heron's (1976) model, the facilitative mode of interaction involves the following sub-categories catalytic, cathartic and supportive interventions. The following are examples of supervisors' utterances that are regarded facilitative in relation to Leech's (1983) politeness maxims.

⁽¹⁾ In some utterances, the supervisors observe or do not observe one or more than one maxim; this is why the number of observed and non-observed maxims exceeds the total frequencies of direct and indirect speech acts.

A. Catalytic

١٦. طريقة التحليل باطروحتي تفيدك جدا ، اجيبيها للقاء القادم.

Trnsl. *The method of analysis in my thesis is quite valuable for your work; I will bring it to our next meeting.*

B. Cathartic

١٧. لا داعي للقلق الامر جدا طبيعي سبب قلقك من الاختبار لأنها المرة الأولى التي تعملين

بها اختبار .

Trnsl. *Do not worry; it is quite normal to be concerned about the test since this is the first time you have administered one.*

C. Supportive

١٨. جيد استمري على هذا المستوى وان شاء الله تخلصين عالوقت وماتحاجين تمديد.

Trnsl. *Good; go on, God willing, you will complete your thesis on time and without extending the deadline.*

In (16), the supervisor employs the GM through using COMs. The supervisor minimises the benefit to self and maximises cost by informing the research student that the method of analysis in his thesis is valuable to the research student's work; and pledges to bring it to the next meeting. This utterance is rated courteous on the cost-benefit, authority and social distance scales. The other scales are irrelevant to this utterance. The facilitative mode of interaction is reflected through the *catalytic* intervention since the supervisor seeks to assist the research student in understanding, interpreting, and resolving problems autonomously.

In (17), the supervisor employs SM through the deployment of the AS speech act. He reduces enmity between self and other and boosts sympathy between self and other by assuring the research student that there is no need to worry. It is understandable that research student is anxious about the test, as this is the first time the research student has administered one. The utterance is courteous on the

authority, social distance. The remaining maxims are irrelevant to this utterance. The facilitative mode of interaction is reflected through the *cathartic* intervention in which the supervisor assists the research student in releasing tension in order to continue working.

In (18), the AM is deployed through the supervisor's employment of the ES speech act. He reduces dispraise of others and maximises praise by encouraging the research student to keep working with the same productivity. The utterance is polite on the authority, social distance. The other maxims are irrelevant to this utterance. The facilitative mode of interaction is evident throughout the supervisor's employment of the *supportive* intervention, which recognises the other person's merits and characteristics, behaviours, and deeds.

As for the authoritative mode of interaction, it involves the following sub-categories prescriptive, informing and confronting. The following are examples of supervisors' utterances recognised as authoritative according to Leech's (1983) politeness maxims.

A. Prescriptive

١٩. لكتابة الخاتمة بصورة صحيحة اطلعي على بعض الكتب التي تتعلق بكتابة الرسالة.

Trnsl. *To properly write the conclusion, consult some books on thesis writing.*

B. Informative

٢٠. من راح اخذ شغلك اليوم راح اتعب، يعني شوفي كم فقرة كاتبه نفس المصدر.

Trnsl. *When I read your work today, I am sure I will get tired; notice how many paragraphs you cited from the same source.*

C. Confronting

٢١. انا نبهتك اكثر من مرة ان تتأكد من كتاباتك ومصادر.

Trnsl. *I told you numerous times to check your writings and references.*

In (19), to write an appropriate conclusion, the supervisor employs the DIR speech act to instruct the research student to read books relevant to thesis writing. The supervisor in this utterance does

not observe the TM as he increases the cost and reduces the benefit for the research student. Moreover, the imperative form is implemented without using a mitigating device. Additionally, while the advantage to the research student throughout the time of offering direction is not relevant to the amount of effort done, it gradually increases over time as the research student approaches his eventual goal, which is the accomplishment of the thesis. The supervisor's utterance is viewed as a violation of courtesy on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority, social distance, indirectness, and optionality. The supervisor's use of *prescriptive* intervention to direct the research student exemplifies the authoritative mode of interaction.

In (20), the supervisor employs AS speech act to inform the research student that quoting many paragraphs from the same source is unacceptable in thesis writing. The supervisor does not observe the AM in this utterance as he maximises dispraise of the research student and minimises praise. Besides, the supervisor does not use a mitigating device to soften the impact of his utterance on the research student. The supervisor's utterance is judged as a violation of courtesy on the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority, social distance, indirectness, and optionality since he performs his utterance contrary to what these scales imply. The supervisor's use of *informative* intervention to inform the research student demonstrates authoritative interaction.

In (21), the supervisor employs the EXP speech act to blame the research student for not being precise in writing the thesis's references. The supervisor does not observe AM because he emphasises criticism and reduces appreciation for the research student. Additionally, the supervisor does not attempt to mitigate the impact of his utterance on the research student by employing mitigating devices. On the pragmatics scales of cost-benefit, authority, social distance, indirectness, and optionality, the supervisor's utterance is regarded as a

violation of polite behaviour because he conducts his utterance contrary to what these scales entail. The supervisor uses *confronting* intervention to bring the research student's attention to some restrictive attitude he is unaware of by challenging him with direct yet non-offensive words, which exemplifies the authoritative mode of interaction.

Depending on the previous account, it has been found that the authoritative mode is used with a frequency of 1411 (70%), while the facilitative mode occupies 618 (30%) of the total percentage. This reveals that in regard to the link between politeness strategy and Heron's model, the authoritative mode is the dominant one across the stages in all the study sample.

11. Conclusions

The study comes up with the following points:

1. In Supervisory interactions, politeness maxims are sometimes observed; other times, they are not. The AM is the most observed maxim across all the stages. Supervisors utilised AM to appreciate their research students' achievements and motivate them to complete the work. The TM is the most non-observed one. The high frequency of non-observing this maxim is ascribed to the supervisors' extensive use of DIRs to instruct the research student without employing any mitigating devices. On the contrary, zero frequency of non-observing MM and SM is found since the MM does not seek to "maximise praise of self and minimise dispraise of self". By contrast, supervisors do not seek to increase antipathy and decrease empathy with their research students in the SM.
2. The non-observance of politeness maxims exceeds their observance. However, non-observance of politeness maxims in the middle stage is more than in the other stages due to the nature of this stage, which requires more intervention from the supervisors. Non-observing a maxim implicates being impolite; nevertheless, this is not applicable here because the supervisors' ultimate goal is to increase the advantage to the research students. They do not want to waste the research students' time looking for and investigating minor details; thus, they give instructions directly to avoid any possible misunderstanding on the part of their research students. However, by giving instruction directly, the range of not-observing the maxims increase.
3. Observing the politeness maxims by the supervisors is not only an indication of the supervisor being polite to the research students but also an indication of the supervisor's adhering to the facilitative mode of interaction. By contrast, non-observing the politeness maxims does not imply that the supervisor violates the maxims but rather indicates

the supervisor's adoption of the authoritative mode of interaction to direct the research student.

4. In the facilitative mode of interaction, the supervisors seek to assist the research student in understanding, interpreting and resolving problems autonomously as well as easing tension in order to continue working. In the authoritative mode of interaction, supervisors inform research students and draw their attention to some restrictive attitudes they are unaware of. Thus, the data analysis shows that in the relation between politeness maxims and mode of interaction, the authoritative mode is the dominant one across the stages.
5. politeness maxims are good tools for identifying the supervisory mode of interaction. The dominant mode of interaction is the authoritative mode.

References

- ❖ Cassidy, P. (2010). *First Steps In Clinical Supervision: A Guide For Healthcare Professionals: a Guide for Healthcare Professionals*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- ❖ Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 4(2), 143-155. doi:10.1080/03069887608256308
- ❖ Kesuma, A. (2017). *Politeness Principle in Mark Zuckerberg's Interview*. (M.A.), University of Sumatera Utara,
- ❖ Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- ❖ Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2), 1-10.
- ❖ Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Yaghchi, M. A., Ghafoori, N., & Nabifar, N. (2016). The Effects of Authoritative vs. Facilitative Interventions on EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate. *Journal of Instruction and Evaluation*, 9(35), 177-194.