

POWER AND SOLIDARITY IN SOCIAL INTERACTIONS: A REVIEW OF SELECTED STUDIES

Ammar Abdul-Wahab Al Abdely

Education College for Women, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq.

e-mail: lujain_ammara@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Denoting power and creating solidarity in social interactions has always been a target for researchers due to their importance in shaping relations among interlocutors within the same linguistic and cultural community or across different languages and cultures. The present work is a critical review of some of these studies. These studies are divided, according to the type of informants and the languages they investigate, into four types: native informant, non-native informant, mixed informant and cross-cultural studies. The review shows that there are many accounts of power and solidarity within the same native culture using the mother tongue, while studies that target non-native informants, mixed informants or cross-cultural studies are very few. The study recommends more cross-cultural studies to be conducted as they give helpful insights for people who use languages other than their native tongues. The same is true about studies that target non-native and mixed informants which support the fact that all humans try to be polite and friendly, but use different strategies to achieve these goals. The study also recommends that socio-pragmatic studies should rely on quantitative and/or qualitative methods that support personal claims native speakers assume about their mother tongues.

Key words: cross-cultural variations, culture, multi-lingual community, power, social interaction, solidarity

INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that speech has great influence on the social life of individuals and whole communities. Thus, a lot of research effort has been devoted to analyzing what people say in their daily interactions and the linguistic choices they make to achieve communicative goals. Formentelli (2010) claims that while engaging in conversations, speakers consciously or unconsciously demonstrate their identities, their belonging to a certain culture or social community and their desire to come close or distance themselves from their addressees. Social relations among speakers and addressees are usually reflected in the way they talk to each other; of these relations are power and solidarity. Fasold (1990) as cited in Tannen (1993), states that since Brown and Gilman's (1960) pioneering study, and the subsequent works of Friedrich (1972) and Brown and Levinson (1987), power and solidarity have been fundamental concepts to sociolinguistic theory.

To give a definition of power and solidarity is not a difficult task, but the difficulty is to identify them in the actual interactions of interlocutors. Brown and Gilman (1960) state that in any conversation between two persons one of them is thought to have the power to control the talk and the behavior of the other person. They further claim that both speakers cannot have the same level of power in the interaction. According to Tannen (1990), power is associated with nonreciprocal forms of address. A speaker, for example, addresses another by

a title or last name but is addressed by the first name. Solidarity is associated with reciprocal forms of address. Both speakers address each other by title, last-name or first name.

Power usually indicates asymmetrical relationships where one speaker is subordinate to another, while solidarity indicates symmetrical relationships characterized by social equality and similarity. Those of solidarity distinguish relatively intimate relations from distant ones (Hudson, 1996). Dominance or power in a conversation is usually affected by several variables like; sex, status, age, and kinship relations which make power a non-inherited feature. Power circulates among participants in a conversation due to many reasons (Mendez & Garcia, 2012). Therefore, identifying power in a particular talk is not an easy task. Tannen and Kakava (1992) emphasize that the linguistic markers of power and solidarity are not only ambiguous, implying either power or solidarity, but are also polysemous as they may imply both at the same time.

Sequeiros (1997), cited in Mendez & Garcia (2012), illustrates that people perceive solidarity as a sporadic value that entails closeness with others. Solidarity, Xiaopei (2011) argues, implies a similarity and a degree of closeness and intimacy between people of equal power in the social order. Hence, solidarity is a relation which mostly indicates similarity or even sameness of prominent features in two or more persons. Mazid (2008) states that “the variety in solidarity may lie in the degree of intensity, or degree of solidarity, ranging from close intimacy to distant reserve” (p.10). Most theories of solidarity conceive it as a positive concept which brings benefits to group members and generates feelings of interconnectedness. Yet, some researches like Komter (2001) talk about negative aspects and consequences of solidarity.

Studies reviewed here differ in the type of informants they observe and the medium of interaction these informants use. Most of the studies related to power and solidarity are concerned with how native speakers reflect these two social relations in their interactions using their native language. A few other studies aim at comparing the techniques people from two different languages use to express power and solidarity relations. Another type of studies target communities of mixed informants who come from different parts of the world speaking different languages but live in the same community usually due to reasons such as pursuing an education. More challenging studies are the ones that examine power and solidarity in the interactions of people using English as a foreign language. The review conducted in this study will be organized based on the type of informants they target.

NATIVE INFORMANT STUDIES

Native-informants studies of power and solidarity are the studies that observe the linguistic behavior of people who use native tongue in their social interactions. The first native informant study was conducted by Tannen and Kakava (1992). The study analyzed expressions of agreement in the natural conversations tape-recorded in Athens as provided by two Greeks, man and a woman, and an American woman to show if these expressions could denote power or create solidarity among interlocutors. The study assumes that different people have different purposes and different styles of saying ‘no’. Analysis of the three speakers’ conversations showed that they exhibited different frames; they each had different purposes in the conversation and different styles of disagreeing.

The authors tried to create a link between expressions of disagreement and remarks of power and solidarity by focusing on two markers of solidarity, namely names or figurative kinship terms often in the diminutive form and personal analogy. The authors stressed the

idea that power and solidarity are not paradoxical; they rather entail each other as they emerged in conversations. The analysis shows that although people react differently when they have different opinions regarding something, they are not really very different. This is because of the use of markers of solidarity which keep people close to each other even when they disagree. Disagreement can be seen as a marker of solidarity even though people take opposing stands. With regard to gender differences, the study concluded that the male respondent gives advice in a direct way, while the female respondent gives advice indirectly.

Tannen and Kakava's (1992) contributed a lot to the literature of power and solidarity as it was an empirical study based on the analysis of spontaneous speech. The objective set at the very beginning of the study was partly achieved. The part related to markers of disagreement and their relation to power and solidarity was totally covered, while the part related to gender differences required further elaboration. The study relied on empirical work supported by personal claims and reflections the authors, specifically Kakava, had after a long history researching in this and other related fields. The markers of disagreement and advice and their relation with, and their influence on power and solidarity among interlocutors were discussed. This hypothesis was discussed fully and a clear conclusion was attained. The second hypothesis was related to the influence of gender on the way power markers are used to disagree and give advice. This hypothesis, however, was not dealt with comprehensively. It was touched upon here and there in a way that gave the impression that it was only a marginal aim. A very pertinent question to ask is, "why was the American woman included in the study as it was about Greek?" Perhaps, the authors wanted to test a very specific point which was 'disagreeing with a foreigner'.

Salifu (2010) suggests that the linguistic forms speakers use to address each other imply various social and cultural meanings such as the relations between participants and the attitude the speaker bears to the addressee. The author identified the key linguistic components in Dagbanli, the language spoken in Savelugu in Northern Ghana such as address forms: kinship terms, names and titles. He also discussed the social and cultural values related to each. Salifu also outlines the different ways in which these elements are combined not only for the purpose of identifying the addressee or referent, but also for communicating other social meanings and attitudes like politeness, power and solidarity. The author assumes that the speaker of Dagbanli has a set of linguistic choices to address one another. These linguistic choices are influenced by three main social variables: kinship terms, age and sex. These three variables construct hierarchal relations between interlocutors. These may be represented in the rights and privileges older people have over younger ones. The mode of address, the author believes, is an example of the linguistic forms that express such hierarchal relations.

The study identified some differentiations that Dagomba people should pay attention to; social hierarchy, age, sex, and status. In terms of sex, women are considered subordinate to men, while seniority in age entails a lot of prestige, respect and positive self-image. The third variable is status which refers to a position or office usually identified by a title which a person acquires or inherits and the possession of which entitles the holder to certain degrees of privilege and prestige. In verbal interaction, respect must be shown to those older than oneself and to those of higher status. The author claims that a child should be taught the most basic speech forms for starting a successful conversation: (1) greeting and (2) addressing or referring to older people appropriately. The author states that the name of an older or higher

status person must be preceded by a kinship term whether speaker and addressee are kindred relations or not. An older person may, however, address a younger person by name only.

The author presents the theoretical framework that defines the main concepts related to the study starting with the social deixis that is concerned with those aspects of language structure that encode the social identities of participants, or the social relationships between them, or between one of them and persons and entities referred to. Then, the concept of politeness is introduced and linked with the face as the public self-image. This image is either positive or negative and are both used, consciously or unconsciously, in the conversation as the situation demands.

Names, the first form of address, are classified into two main types; traditional and Islamic. Traditional names are already found in the language of Dagomba, while Islamic names are derived from Arabic. Kinship terms are classified into superior kin which includes, among many, *yaba* (grandfather), (*yab*) *paga* (grandmother) *ma* (mother), *ba* (father), *bakpema* ('senior father', i.e. father's older brother/cousin). In Dagomba culture, any speaker who addresses any person who is older than he should use a kinship term in front of the name of the addressee such as *mapira* (junior mother/ mother's younger sister or cousin) and *pirba* (father's younger or older sister or cousin). Inferior kinship terms are used whenever the speaker is younger than the addressee. Such terms may include *bia* (son/daughter/nephew/niece), *tuzo* (younger brother/sister/cousin/).

The exceptional use of kinship and social terms to show respect has been also emphasized in other communities and cultures such as the Chinese and Japanese. You (2014) states that words expressing relationship, e.g. *father*, *aunt*, or position, e.g. *teacher*, *lecturer*, are used as address terms to show respect and/or signal the formality of the situation, for example, Mandarin Chinese: *baba qing chi*; Japanese: *sensei dozo!* The address forms of a language are arranged into a complex address system with its own rules which need to be acquired if a person wants to communicate appropriately. However, Salifu (2010) states that in the Dagomba culture kin terms can also be used to address non-related adults who are strangers to each other. Men address other adult strangers of both sexes as father's kin (*bapira*), whilst women address adult strangers as mother's kin (*mapira*).

The method adopted in Salifu (2010) is qualitative but mainly dependent on the researcher himself as he is a speaker of the Dagomba dialect. He also relies on personal interviews held with some families living in Dagbanli. Relying on personal claims and personal interviews may weaken the conclusions made in this study. However, this may be justified by the fact that such dialects do not have formal records written about them. The problem is stated at the very beginning of the study and the hypotheses are also presented in a straight forward manner. Yet, the procedures adopted in collecting and analyzing data are not very clear such as the way the researcher conducts the interviews and which claims are based on which interviews. However, the evidences provided are very effective in supporting the main argument raised in the study. These are sometimes linked with other evidences and that makes the argument more convincing.

The studies reviewed above focused on disagreement in Tannen and Kakava (1992), and forms of address in Salifu (2010). Both studies employed a qualitative approach in collecting data supported by researchers' personal perceptions. They both depended on observing and recording the linguistic behavior of informants; Salifu (2010) made use of interviews to support his personal claims while Tannen and Kakava (1992) transcribed all incidents of disagreement and accompany the transcription with word to word glosses. This

difference may be ascribed to the different audience each study targets. The procedures of choosing informants in Tannen and Kakava (1992), and executing interviews in Salifu (2010) are both obscure and should have been explained in more detail.

NON-NATIVE INFORMANT STUDIES

Socio-pragmatic studies that investigate the linguistic behavior of interlocutors using the foreign or the second language are few in number. Mendez and Garcia's study (2012) is concerned with power and solidarity relations manifested by foreign learners of English in the classroom. The study is based on a critical discourse analysis referring to school students' power and solidarity relations in English as a foreign language in an elementary school in Bogota, Colombia. The study is inspired by Fairclough's (1989) statement on the possibility of dealing with power and solidarity relations in any context where people interact with each other regardless of the medium of discourse they use, native or non-native. The study claims that there are various techniques of exercising power and solidarity in the classroom. It also assumes that reproaches can be used to exercise, resist, and challenge power. Solidarity, on the other hand, can be represented by taking sides to protect colleagues in the class.

Mendez and Garcia (2012) made use of the learner-based approach they adopted in their teaching methodology in which the learner is the focus of the educational process. Keeping the eye on students as generators of power and solidarity gave researchers the chance to recognize them as persons as well as learners. The study's focus was on (1) finding the way power and solidarity dynamics occur in the classroom when students work in groups and on (2) detecting the effect of power and solidarity in directing the class and modifying its development.

The informants targeted in the study included a class of 34 students from the fifth grade. Half of the informants belonged to low and middle-income households and the other half to high income households. After establishing procedures of data analysis, the subjects were video-recorded while working together. These procedures were later used in analyzing video-recordings in order to arrive at certain interpretations. These interpretations were validated by interviewing students and asking them for explanations for certain actions and behaviors. The study investigated two different types of relations; students-students and students-teacher relations. In each type of relation, the techniques of showing power and solidarity are different. It was observed that some of the characteristics of the students' power, among others, had to do with discipline, responsibility, fellowship, resistance, reproach, and silence. Teachers represent the dominant party in a class, yet students assume positions of power when they work together. In most events, good students exert power in the class; though in some other cases silent students assume positions of power in front of colleagues, since a student who keeps silent forces others to speak. Teachers usually express power via the reproaches they use inside the classroom, while students use reproaches to complain about others' performance and behavior. This technique can also be used by students to show solidarity with the teachers. A student, for example, might tell the teacher that his colleague had not done his/her homework, had not participated in a task, etc. Students also show their solidarity with their teammates when grouped together to perform a certain task.

Senowarsito (2013) examines strategies used by teacher and students in two 90 minute English lessons in a senior high school in Indonesia to show politeness. The data were

video-recorded from two classroom settings where English was the object and the medium of teaching. Data was analyzed in terms of Brown and Levinson's politeness Theory. As in Mendez and Garcia (2012) classroom interaction is by large dominated by the teacher to instruct, explain, appreciate, encourage, and respond to students' questions. Due to students' limited linguistic competence, their interaction was basically to respond to teachers' questions and instructions. The study showed that various positive, negative and on record strategies have been identified in the discourse used by teachers and students in classroom interaction.

Students tend to use some interpersonal function markers and linguistic expressions that include addressing, encouraging, thanking, apologizing, and leave-taking as well as some other non-verbal expressions. Social distance created by age difference and institutional setting is still prominent in classroom interactions. To be polite, teachers employ strategies such as reducing the threat of face using group identity markers and expressions of sympathy, showing respect and establishing a close relationship. Similarly to reduce power, teachers try to appreciate students' participation and use indirect speech acts and solidarity makers. Imperative expressions teachers give are often softened by the expression 'please'.

Both studies explored teachers' and students' linguistic strategies used in classroom interactions indicating that teachers usually represent the powerful side in the class, yet teachers often try to create close relations with their students. Actually, the English language becomes an object of learning, rather than a medium of communication in the English lesson. The focus is often on the linguistic and semantic features of the language instead of the pragmatic features. Teachers rarely pay attention to the pragmatic issues of language use. Consequently, students are still unaware of these issues and their pragmatic abilities still lag behind.

MIXED INFORMANT STUDIES

Mixed informant studies target communities in which people who come from various linguistic backgrounds speak the same language. Formentelli's (2010) targets mixed informants, who come from different countries and speak different languages but study together in an academic setting, namely the University of Reading, and use English as the medium of instruction. This study deals with verbal and the non-verbal patterns of address, the use of nominal and prenominal forms, the level of formality shown by students and teachers, and the influence of hierarchical relations on the frequency of certain address strategies. Hickey and Stewart (2005); Helmbrecht (2003) refer to the unusual system of address forms in English which makes it different from other European languages. Accordingly, power and solidarity are not expressed on a binary address system based on T/V pronouns.

The data collection methodology used relies basically on a nine month field research during which the corpus was collected. It includes observing the linguistic behavior of participants and semi-structured interviews conducted with 26 informants, 18 students and 8 teachers and video-recording of lessons. Observation was useful in detecting the categories of forms used in interactions and to form hypotheses about the variables and mechanisms framing the phenomenon of address.

The study found that a reciprocal usage of formal address forms indicating distance has not been identified by participants or reported in video-recordings. The mutual use of informal address forms denoting familiarity was not as frequent as was expected and

illustrated in previous models and described as marked by subjects. Although some students evaluate reciprocal informal address as a motivating factor as it helps create a suitable atmosphere for studying and collaborating with their lecturers, the majority still prefer to use formal strategies as a way to show respect. This is shown frequently in the address forms used by first year students. They feel more at ease in employing the non-reciprocal use of address forms highly employed at secondary schools. Lecturers show different opinions with regard to the use of reciprocal informal address, as some encourage the use of first name for students, while others emphasize the necessity of signaling boundaries.

The study also finds that differences in power regulate the choice and distribution of address forms in the academic setting. Formal forms of address are used to address the more powerful party, while informal strategies are used with less powerful addressees. Furthermore, the change to reciprocal informal vocatives is initiated by the powerful side and never by the less powerful. Interestingly, the findings of this study show different linguistic behavior from the ones described over the last decades for American academic settings. The British speakers are keener on keeping the asymmetrical distribution of address forms and consider reciprocal informal strategy as a marked choice.

Yet, the study does not make use of the chance of having a mixed community that encompasses students coming from different parts of the world to dig deeper for possible differences in the use of address forms during classroom interaction. It would have been so tremendous if the researcher had kept an eye on the ways natives and non-natives used address forms in classroom interactions and try to identify whether students who belong to different cultures made efforts to assimilate into the new academic setting or stick to their linguistic and social habits. No reference is made to instances of code-switching that is very popular in communities where more than one language is present though code-switching is one of the ways that denote power or create solidarity in multilingual communities (Walker, 2011).

Sliwa and Johansson (2014) examine the effects of evaluations of non-native speaking staff's spoken English in international business settings. The study proposes a sociolinguistic perspective of power and variations in linguistically miscellaneous establishments in an Anglophone environment. The study proposes a critical consideration of language and power in these establishments via concentrating on verbal language use in a diverse linguistic setting in which English is the official medium of interaction. The study employs a qualitative approach, namely an interpretive approach, where reflexive analysis of the researchers' responses to the participants' spoken English are offered. Sliwa and Johansson (2014) implicate that managers need to comprehend the relation between English language used by native and non-native speakers and power and inequalities in their organizations. Evaluations made by non-native listeners and speakers encompass several non-linguistic factors which may deepen disparities among staff and eventually lead to conflicts and rejections. Such conflicts and rejections will possibly result in negative impacts on the organization. Creating a linguistically inclusive climate inside the organization requires the development of corporate policies and processes which overtly address language attitudes and the use of language.

Following Giles and Marlow's (2011), the study employs direct interviews to construct the research design. Altogether, 54 semi-structured interviews were conducted between March-September 2012 with foreign academics working at 19 business schools in the UK. Participants were either recruited from university websites or through the

researchers' direct contact with these participants. Several criteria such as L1 background and the type of work occupied were considered in the selection of participants. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Data were analyzed in a reflexive manner starting by reading and coding respective transcripts to identify the ways participants used to account for events and emotions related to the use of English. Transcripts were later shared and discussed by researchers. A framework that can account for non-native speakers' use of English, in addition to evaluations was used. The process of data analysis and interpretation required sequential and repeated series of shifting between the empirical data, the thematized material and the theoretical notions utilized.

The study is a call for international business researchers to conduct further studies of the relationship between language use, power and inequalities in organizations. Understanding the meaning and dynamics of such categories of diversity has significant implications for managing power relations and inequalities in organizations operating in the international business environment. By contrast to a situation where the lack of linguistic solidarity between speakers leads to negative evaluations of non-native speakers and to the construction and perpetuation of organizational inequalities, where linguistic similarities are perceived, such negative evaluations do not arise. Through adopting the sociolinguistic framework of status, solidarity and dynamism, the interdisciplinarity of international business research was extended to demonstrate how concepts and ideas developed by sociolinguistic research can help understanding phenomena occurring in contemporary multicultural and multilingual organizations. The study recommends that organizations arrange regular staff training courses on the influences of language used by managers and employees in creating a more linguistically inclusive environment.

The research design was basically based on recorded interviews which could have been preceded by a questionnaire that tells something about what informants believe in and actually do in their interactions. Moreover, native speakers' evaluations were not included as a source of data; hence, discussing the judgments about non-native speakers' use of language made by standard speakers was not attempted. Speakers' and listeners' evaluations made with regard to interactions where the same speakers and listeners engaged were unfortunately not considered.

It is obvious from the two studies reviewed above that managing multilingual diversity through a focus on finding a common language does not inevitably generate an integrative outcome (Piekkari, Vaara, Tienari & Säntti, 2005). Yet, profounder understanding of the language used by people who come from different linguistic backgrounds and work or study in the same setting can be helpful in creating a more productive and friendly environment in which conflicts and prejudices can be avoided.

CROSS CULTURAL STUDIES

Misic (2004) refers to the significance of cross-cultural studies by claiming that there are rules for polite acceptance or refusal, greetings, conversation topics, forms of address, in all societies but these rules differ cross-culturally. Thus, a certain linguistic behavior is acceptable or even desirable in a certain society but is inappropriate or even taboo in another. These differences may seem totally random but are actually closely connected with different social values and attitudes of different societies. In spite of the importance of cross-cultural studies, very few researches have investigated power and solidarity relations in two different cultures looking for possible similarities between the two.

Spencer-Oatey (1997) is a cross cultural study that deals with people's conceptions of an unequal role relationship in two different types of cultures: a high power distance society and a low power one. The study employs a mixed, qualitative and quantitative, method that bases its investigation on a questionnaire and interviews. 166 British and 168 Chinese tutors and postgraduate students in three different British universities and different tertiary institutions in Beijing and Shanghai were asked to respond to a questionnaire which aims at investigating their conceptions of degrees of power differential and social solidarity in this role relationship. Results hinted to a significant nationality effect for both aspects. Chinese participants judged the relationship to be closer and having a greater power differential than the British respondents did. Written comments on the questionnaire and interviews with 9 Chinese with experience of both British and Chinese academic environments confirmed the statistical findings. The comments stated that there are major ideological differences related to the differing conceptions.

The study results are discussed in terms of Western and Asian concepts of leadership, and differing perspectives on the compatibility/incompatibility of power and solidarity. With regard to power, the study follows Pye's (1985) and Wetzels' (1993) which refer to the contrast between Asian and Western concepts of power. These two studies point out that in the West; power is usually linked negatively with authoritarianism, whereas in Asia it is often linked positively with kindness and supportiveness.

The study has a great degree of authenticity as it depends on a mixed method which makes use of statistics, comments and interviews. Practically speaking, the study adds to the body of knowledge about cross-cultural differences and their effects on social relations. The findings of the study are of great benefit to people from Britain and China in particular as it informs them of the differences between British and Chinese communities which may be problematic for interlocutors in a cross-cultural encounter. The only thing that the researcher could have done extra is to find British people to interview besides the nine Chinese interviewed and ask them to give comments.

Bargiela, Boz, Gokzadze, Hamza, Mills, and Rukhadze (2003) investigate the way ethnocentrism, and in particular anglocentrism, informs certain linguistic strategies in cross-cultural interactions between British and American speakers and speakers of English from other countries. The authors assume that for many British and American speakers, informality is considered as an indicator of ease of communication and solidarity with strangers. In British and American societies, there is a tendency to move towards first name basis as quickly as possible as it is a politeness strategy. Yet, in other language groups, such strategy may be regarded as impolite. The study also investigates strategies of politeness and distance used in English, Italian, Arabic and Georgian along with the various strategies of naming used in different countries and their effect on social relations.

The data analyzed in this study were collected from previous literature about the subject and the personal claims and assumptions each of the authors has about his native language. No recordings, interviews or questionnaire were conducted to collect data for analysis. Yet, the conclusions attained seem reasonable and well supported by a sufficient number of examples. The study concludes that British and American speakers of English should reconsider the assumption that involvement politeness strategies are perceived by people from different cultural backgrounds in opposite ways rather than the one intended. Calling others by their first name, for example, is regarded as a sign of friendliness and solidarity in communities like the British or Georgian. However, it is a sign of deference and

over-familiarity in other communities like the Arabs and Russians, especially when social variables such as age, status and gender are not regarded.

Therefore, great attention should be directed to the appropriateness of address forms in cross-cultural interactions. Social variables like age, education, status, gender, etc. should also be taken care of not only in cross-cultural interactions but also in local interactions in which the interlocutors are supposed to be equal (Salzman, 1993). The researchers also conclude, following Fraser (1990), that each society has a specific set of social traditions, including more or less explicit rules that judge a certain behavior, a state of affairs, or a way of thinking, governing polite behavior. Being polite definitely means to show respect or solidarity towards your partner and to avoid offending him. Linguistic strategies used to show politeness are formulated within different social and cultural backgrounds; thus, the ways solidarity is shown by interlocutors could be more or less different based on these social and cultural backgrounds.

The interesting thing about the two cross-cultural studies reviewed above is that they look for possible differences among various languages and cultures that should be considered in any cross-cultural encounter to avoid misunderstanding. The first study targets two different cultures, while the second is more comprehensive as it targets five different cultures. The first study, however, seems more objective than the second since it relies on qualitative and quantitative data collection. The second study relies entirely on personal claims made by the five authors who belong to the five cultures. Yet, the study findings from the second study are well supported by examples which may give the study the trait of objectiveness and reliability.

CONCLUSION

Socio-pragmatic studies are among the most interesting undertakings as they take care of the language people use to address each other in preserving social relations and respecting cultural values of the community they live in. Socio-pragmatic competence entails more than just linguistic and lexical knowledge. It entails that the speaker has the ability to vary speech in accordance with the situational or social values present (Harlow, 1990). People are always obsessed with the desire to be as friendly as possible to gain the favor of their addressees. That is why speakers are very careful with what they say to and how they address others. The studies above are all endeavors to investigate the social and cultural implications contained in different people's speech. More research efforts may be needed to investigate similar aspects of other societies in order to provide linguists with the raw material needed to understand the way people talk to each other and the communicative goals they want to achieve.

Cross-cultural studies are strongly required as they give a broader idea of the linguistic choices people from different cultures make in similar social settings. Studies that attempt to examine that behavior in mixed informant communities are also recommended, as they can show how people who belong to different cultures linguistically behave when they are in the same setting. Instances of code-switching in mixed environments can be a way of showing power and solidarity inside the classroom and that would very interesting to examine. The review presented here indicates the need for conducting more socio-pragmatic studies that investigate various social relations in interactions where people use foreign or second languages. More cross-cultural studies that look for possible similarities and differences in the way people from different cultures perceive social relations and express

them are also needed. Cross-cultural studies, in which informants from different cultures use non-native language such as English for example, are also lacking in the literature.

REFERENCES

- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp.253-276). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Bargiela, F., Boz, C., Gokzadze, L., Hamza, A., Mills, S., & Rukhadze, N., (2003). Ethnocentrism, politeness and naming strategies. *Working papers on the Web*, 3, 1478-3703.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Formentelli, M. (2010). Address strategies in British academic setting. *Pragmatics*, 19(2), 179-196.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 219 - 236.
- Friedrich, P. (1972). Social context and semantic feature: The Russian pronominal usage. In John J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp.270-300). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Giles, H., & Marlow, M. (2011). Theorizing language attitudes: Existing frameworks, an integrative model, and new directions. In C. Salmon (Ed), *Communications Year Book*. 34, 161–198. New York: Routledge.
- Harlow, L. L. (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 328-351.
- Helmbrecht, J. (2003). Politeness distinctions in second person pronouns. *Pragmatics and beyond New Series*, 185-202.
- Hickey, L., & Stewart, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Politeness in Europe* (Vol. 127). Canada: Multilingual Matters Limited.
- Hudson, R. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Komter, A. (2001). The disguised rationality of solidarity: Gift giving in informal relations. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 25(4), 385-401.
- Mazid, B. (2008). The politeness principle: From Grice to Netiquette. *Annals of the Arts and Social Sciences*, 29.
- Méndez, T., & García, A. (2012). Exploring elementary students' power and solidarity relations in an EFL classroom. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 14(1), 173-185.
- Misic, B. (2004). Language and cultural studies-wonderland through the linguistic looking glass. *Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1 – 15.
- Piekkari, R., Vaara, E., Tienari, J., & Säntti, R. (2005). Integration or disintegration? Human resource implications of a common corporate language decision in a crossborder merger. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3), 330–344.
- Pye, L. W. (1985) *Asian power and politics. The cultural dimensions of authority*. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Salifu, N. (2010). Signaling politeness, power and solidarity through terms of address in Dagbanli. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 19(4), 274–292.
- Salzmann, Z. (1993) *Language, culture, and society*. San Francisco: Westview Press.
- Senowarsito, S. (2013). Politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom context. *TEFLIN Journal-A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 24(1), 82-96.
- Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. (2014). How non-native English-speaking staff are evaluated in linguistically diverse organizations: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(9), 1133-1151.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (1997). Unequal relationships in high and low power distance societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(3), 284 – 30.

- Tannen, D. (1990). Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 16(1), 519-529.
- Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. *Gender and conversational interaction*, 16588.
- Tannen, D., & Kakava, C. (1992). Power and solidarity in Modern Greek conversation: Disagreeing to agree. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 10(1), 11-34.
- Walker, V. (2011). Codeswitching as a power and solidarity strategy in the foreign language classroom: An analysis of language alternation strategies utilized in a Portuguese-English higher education class. *Innervate*, 3, 351-363.
- Wetzel, P. J. (1993). The language of vertical relationships and linguistic analysis. *Multilingua*, 12(4): 387- 406.
- Xiaopei, Z. (2011). Cultural implications behind power and solidarity-A case study of Chinese and British English address forms. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry*, 9(2), 39.
- You, C. (2014). Analysis on the generalization of the address term "Teacher" in Chinese from the perspective of sociolinguistics. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(3), 575.