Gender and Power in Shaw's *Arms and the Man & Man and Superman:* A Pragma-Cognitive Approach

A research submitted by
Shahenda Moustafa Abuzeid
An M.A student
Helwan University
Faculty of Arts
Department of English Language and Literature
Linguistics and Translation Section
A part-time teaching assistant at various institutions

(Summary)

This research tends to prove that approaches which suggest the relevance of gender as being the only important variable in analyzing the linguistic differences in cross-sexual interactions should be urgently reconsidered. On the other hand, there are other variables that should be taken into account as they affect the participants' linguistic choices. These variables are: power, age, solidarity and most importantly, one's cognition. The research tends to investigate how relevant gender, power and the use of bold-on-record directives and expressives are relevant to each other. It also explores the relation between power and cognition. This is done through analyzing the frequency and phraseology of the directives and expressives used by the main male and female characters in *Arms and the man* along with *Man and Superman*, in addition to analyzing the characters' mental processes.

The qualitative analysis is used in the analysis of this study to analyze the way the directives and expressives are phrased by both the male and female characters in addition to analyzing the mental processes stimulated by the characters.

It has been shown that the assumption that politeness is highly relevant to gender is not always applicable. The argument that females are more polite has been refuted. Additionally, it has been proven that power and gender are not always related to the participants' politeness. This can be pertained to the fact that characters, whether males or females, use more on-record strategies than off-record ones where power is irrelevantly applicable. On the contrary, the less powerful characters almost use the same amount or even more on-record utterances, whereas the more powerful characters show a tendency towards using off-record strategies. Other variables prove themselves to be equally important as they play a considerable role in influencing the characters' linguistic choices in terms of their adherence or overlooking of adopting politeness strategies, amongst of which is one's cognition. Also, solidarity, social distance and age are influential variables that should be taken into account.

النوع والقوة في مسرحيتي شو الرجل والسلاح والرجل و الرجل الخلرق: تحليل تداولي معرفي

(ملخص)

تعني هذه الدراسه بالتحليل اللغوي لصياغة كل من الاوامر و الجمل التعبيرية من قبل الشخصيات المحورية رجال ونساء في مسرحيتي الرجل و السلاح و الرجل و الرجل الخارق لبرنارد شو و ذلك من خلال منظور مشترك بين كل من البرجماتية و المعرفية . تهدف الدراسة الي بيان أن الاعتماد الكلي علي النوع ككونه المتغير الأوحد الذي يؤثر علي صياغة الجمل للأفراد سواء الذكور او الاناث يؤدي حتما الي الي نتائج غير دقيقة. فهناك العديد من العوامل التي يجب ان تؤخذ في عين الاعتبار. توضح الدراسة أن علي رأس هذه المقاييس يأتي إدراك الفرد و فهمه لطبيعة الموقف الكائن حيث انه يؤثر بشكل واضح في اختيار المتحدث لصياغة بعينها دون الأخري. كما تهدف الرسالة الي اثبات أن النوع و القوة لابد ان يعتبرا متغيرين منفصلين ليس بالضرورة أن يتأثر أحدهما بالآخر. أيضا توضح الرسالة ان استخدام الأوامر أو صياغتها بطريقة مباشرة ليس شرطا أن يعكس قوة المتحدث والعكس صحيح . وقد تناولت الدراسة التحليل اللغوي للشخصيات التي تلعب دورا رئيسيا عن طريق تحليل المواقف المتعددة التي تشمل الرجال و النساء معا. و الدراسة مبنية علي التحليل الكيفي. و قد بينت النتائج أن الالتزام بمعايير التأدب في الحيث ليس بالضرورة أن يكون مرتبطا بالنوع فقد لوحظ أن هناك اختلاف واضح في صياغة كل نوع للأوامر و تتأرجح صياغة الأوامر بين استخدام الطريقة المباشرة و الغير مباشرة. كما أوضحت النتائج أن ليس بالضرورة أن تكون القوة مرتبطة بالنوع فقوة المتحدث لا تستمد من النوع بل هناك عوامل أخري كالسن و المستوي الاجتماعي .و يعد أهم ما توصلت إليه هذه الرسالة هو بيان أهمية عنصر الإدراك ككونه متغيرا هاما يؤثر في تشكيل الأساليب اللغوية للمتحدث.

Gender and Power in Shaw's *Arms and the Man & Man and Superman:* A Pragma-Cognitive Approach

A research submitted by
Shahenda Moustafa Abuzeid
An M.A student
Helwan University
Faculty of Arts
Department of English Language and Literature
Linguistics and Translation Section
A part-time teaching assistant at various institutions

1. Introduction
1.1 Context of the study

Do men and women speak differently? Such a question has always been and is still the concern of many sociolinguists who dedicated many of their publications to answer this question. However, it requires further development and requires special attention than it has actually received. This is because of the fact that, in some of these previous works, the answer is not satisfactory with respect to women's depiction which is approached primarily from a stereotypical perspective. Not all the attempts which tackle men's and women's use of language succeeded in portraying objectively how both sexes, precisely women, use language. In some studies, women are regarded as less powerful than men, which can be evidently seen in the language they use. This implies that gender and power are considered the most important, if not the only, variables in analyzing the difference between men's and women's speech in cross-sex interaction; hence, ignoring the role played by one's cognition to perceive the situation in which s/he is involved. This study aims at investigating how far women's portrayal as users of "powerless language" opposing to men's portrayal as users of "powerful language" is true in addition to investigating how cognition may contribute to the linguistic differences between both sexes.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study aims at:

1- Finding out the relation between power and the use of bold-on-record directives and expressives.

2-Exploring how far gender, politeness and power are relevant to each other.

3-Exploring the relation between power and cognition.

4-Investigting how relevant cognition is to using expressives and directives.

5-Investigating how far the context of situation as well as status and age difference influence power relations in male and female interactions..

1.3 Research Questions

The study attempts to answer the following questions with respect to Shaw's play *Arms and the Man* and *Man and Superman*,

1-How are on-record as well as off-record Directives and Expressives relevant to the manipulation of power in male-female interactions?

2- To what extent do the context of situation as well as status and age difference determine power relations between male and female characters?

3- In what way is the manipulation of power together with the manipulation of on/off record strategies a reflection of the male/female's cognitive processes?

1.4 Rationale of the study

Nowadays, the co-existence of men and women in professional contexts is not only seen the norm but it has also become, in some cases, an inevitable necessity. There is an infinite set of social contexts in which men and women are involved together. Despite their frequent co-existence, misinterpretation might occur. A common example of this misinterpretation is attributing any form of dominance to the attempt of one sex to exercise power over the opposite sex. In other words, dominance is interpreted in terms of gender and hence, overlooking any other variables such as the context of situation in which the participants are involved. However, such a context of situation mainly depends on how the participants perceive it, or namely their cognition. Moreover, making certain linguistic choices, specifically directives, is regarded as a sign of exercising power .Therefore, this research tends to reconsider the relation between gender and power on the one hand and how both can be related to cognition.

1.5 Significance of the study

Examining the linguistic differences between men's and women's speech has been the concern of many sociolinguists who interpret such differences in terms of gender. Only few studies started to take into account the possibility of the irrelevance of gender in analyzing the differences in the linguistic behavior of men and women. Accordingly, what this study tends to demonstrate is reconsidering the relation between gender and power in the sense that power can be dealt with independently from gender in the context of situations where both males and females are involved. Instead, other variables such as how the participants perceive

the situation in which they are engaged should be worth attention. Furthermore, previous studies focus on analyzing the differences between males' and females 'speech in natural conversation, with little or no attention paid to written discourse. However, this study focuses on dramatical discourse showing that this discourse can be a rich area where a variety of variables along with gender can contribute to providing reliable interpretations of such linguistic differences.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the study

The theoretical and empirical framework of the present study focuses mainly on the relation between politeness, power and gender on the one hand, and how they can be relevant to one's cognition on the other hand. This is done through analyzing the males' and females' utterances of the main characters of the plays under study. Accordingly, the analysis is confined to literary discourse, which are *Arms and the Man* and *Man and Superman***.** Therefore, the question whether the differences in conversational behavior of males and females can be explained in terms of one's cognition, gender or power in addition to how far such variables are relevant to the notion of politeness are answered in this study.

2 Methodology

2.1Data

The data under study are two plays: *Arms and the Man* and *Man and Superman* by Bernard Shaw. *Both plays belong to the twentieth century. According to* Zsuzsanna (2012), the twentieth-century theatre describes a period of a great change within the theatrical culture of the 20th century. The theatre in the twentieth-century witnessed a dramatic change with respect to the theatrical culture. This resulted in the development of many new forms of theatre including modernism, realism, expressionism, impressionism and political theatre. In an attempt to confront the audience's perceptions and assumptions in order to raise questions about their society, new direction i.e. political and satirical is adopted. The common themes in the new early 20th century drama were political, philosophical, and revolutionary.

Among the most influential playwrights of this era is Bernard Shaw. .Through his plays, he intended to change what he perceived as social maladies. His plays always display a sharp critique of the society. As stated by Tayari (2014), " he is an active member of Fabian society, destroys all of these convictions and insists on the equality of people's income and right especially equality of man and woman in society."

As far as *Arms and the Man* is concerned, the light is shed on two main characters: Raina, as being representative of the female character, and Bluntshli who represents the male character. As far as *Man and*

Superman is concerned, the focus is directed to John Tanner, the male hero, and Ann whitefield, the representative of the main female character.

Arms and the Man has been chosen due to the relevance of its themes to the topic of the study. The play tackles several themes, amongst of which are the themes of war. The theme of war corresponds to the theme of power. Example of exercising power is when Bluntschli threatens Riana, a defenseless woman, with his gun and orders her to hide him behind the curtain. This interaction has been selected to be part of the data of analysis of the study at hand.

Additionally*, Man and Superman* is selected to be one of the plays used in the analysis of the study because it focuses in its themes primarily on gender and power. As far as the gender theme is concerned, the play presents the relation between men and women in the modern time through the relation between Mr. Tanner and Miss Whitefield. *Man and Superman* provides an example of what love is in modern life, which is depicted in steadfastly realistic way that corresponds to what happens in everyday life. Shaw believes that great literature and works of art so often treat the relation between man and woman in an unrealistic way. As far as the theme of power is concerned, Shaw thinks that life has become a battle where the individual, whether a male or a female, has to exercise his/her power in order to survive. This can be obviously shown in the interaction between Ann and Tanner.

2.2 Approach

The present study follows a pragma-cognitive approach to answer the research questions.

2.2.1 Pragmatic Approach

The linguistic tools that lie under the pragmatic approach are speech act theory and politeness. The pragmatic approach is used to analyze the phraseology of the expressives and directives used by the male and female characters. In addition, it is used to explore how far using such two categories is relevant to politeness and the manipulation of power.

2.2.1.1 Speech Act Theory

It was introduced by Austin (1962). Its main premise is that the speakers, while uttering sentences, are not only saying words, but they are also performing actions. In other words, this theory tries to explain how speakers use language to achieve intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning from what is said. Despite being introduced by Austin,

it is Searle (1975) who should be given the credit of classifying the speech acts into five categories.

Searle presents his own classification of speech acts which can be regarded as a modification of Austin's. Searle (1975) bases his modified taxonomy on three dimensions: (i) illocutionary point, (ii) direction of fit in addition to (iii) expressed psychological state. Searle's taxonomy (Sadock, 2006; Searle, 1969; 1975) includes five main categories. This study particularly focuses in its analysis on two categories:

Directives are those types of speech acts which refer to the speaker's attempts to get the addressee to do something. Advice, commands, questions and requests can be included within this category. While using a directive, the speaker's intention to elicit some future course on the addressee's behalf becomes very clear. Therefore, one can say that the speaker makes the world match the words via the addressee.

Expressives are given to those kinds of speech acts which express the speaker's psychological state or attitude for instance, joy, sorrow, likes/dislikes. Paradigmatic cases include thanking, praising, congratulating and blaming. This type of speech act has no direction of fit.

2.2.1.2 Brown and Levinson Model

During interaction, the participants' faces are threatened by the performance of certain acts. This paves the way for introducing the face-threatening acts. According to Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987), a face threatening act is carried out when an act of verbal or non-verbal communication" run{s} contrary to the face want of the addressee and or the speaker" (p. 70). As an illustration, examples of speech acts that can threaten the hearer's positive face would be contradiction or expression of disagreement which means the speaker thinks that there is something wrong with an opinion held by the hearer. However, requests can be considered speech acts that threaten the hearer's negative face. This may be attributed to the fact that the speaker can be considered impeding on the hearer by asking the hearer not to do what he wants but rather to do what speaker wants.(Fasold, 1990). Not only can the hearer's positive or negative face be threatened, but the speaker's as well. To clarify, the speaker's positive face can be threatened in case of confessions, apologies when he/she is obliged to admit something that is not expected of her/him. As for the speaker's negative face, it could be damaged in case of offer if he/she carries out an offer by which he/she is meeting the hearer's interest, not necessarily his/her own.

The concept of face has two aspects: positive and negative face. Similarly, politeness has two aspects: positive and negative politeness.

Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) require the use of politeness strategies to maintain harmony and undamaged face. Brown and Levinson offer five 'super-strategies '(1987, p.92) that the speaker may employ to mitigate an FTA. The five super-strategies are as follows: bold on record without redressive action, on record with redressive action orientated toward positive or negative face, off record or not to perform a FTA.

Doing the act boldly on record means that the expression is done "in the most direct, clear unambiguous concise possible way."(Brown &Levinson, 1978, p.74) They mention that doing an act with redressive actions means "giving face to the addressee."(p.74) This means doing the act using positive politeness "orientated towards the positive image of H, the image which the hearer claims for himself" or using negative politeness "orientated towards partially satisfying (redressing) the H's negative face "his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self determination"(p.75). On the other hand, the term off record refers to the case when an expression can have "more than one unambiguously attributable intention"(pp.73-4).

Tracy (1990) states that only negative politeness is "similar to what people in every life mean by being polite" while positive politeness is "a communicative way of building solidarity, showing that the other is liked and desirable"(pp.211-12).

Watts (2003, p.90) points out that in order to calculate the weightiness of an FTA, the value of power, social distance and rate of imposition must be already known. However, the three variables cannot be considered on a par. It would be impossible to ascertain which variable most contributed to the weightiness. Substantial difference in power relations between the participants in conversation may call for a different choice of FTA redress than an emotional distance

2.2.2 Cognitive Approach

The cognitive approach is used to analyze the mental processes stimulated by the characters to find out the relation between gender, power and politeness. The linguistic tool that is used in this study and lies under the branch of cognitive linguistics is the possible world theory. Such a theory is based on the concept that the actual world is only one of a number of other alternative possibilities/worlds.

Possible Worlds have been identified by researchers such as Pavel (1986), Ryan (1980; 1984; 1991a; 1991b) and   Stockwell (2002) as follows:

W-worlds (Wish Worlds): world corresponding to the characters wishes and desires.

K-World (Knowledge Worlds/epistemic world): world corresponding to what characters know or believe.

P-Worlds (Prediction- worlds): worlds corresponding to future states predicted by characters that take place in the text's actual domain.

H-Worlds (Hypothesis-worlds): worlds corresponding to hypothesizing about alternative ways in which things might have happened .

I-Worlds (Intention Worlds): worlds corresponding to characters' goals and plans.

O-Worlds (Obligation Worlds): Worlds corresponding to social commitments and prohibitions, and moral principles.

F-Worlds (Fantasy Worlds): worlds corresponding to characters' dreams/visions and imaginations that they compose.

P-Pretended Worlds: worlds corresponding to those forged by some characters to deceive others.

3. Literature review

3.1 Speech Act Theory

Pragmatics dates back to the work done by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969; 1975). They are philosophers who are interested in how natural human language conveys meaning, as a way of understanding thought, logic and communication. They came up with the so-called theory of "speech Act".

Speech Act theory is considered one of the important theories in linguistics as it marks a shift in the way people see language use. The major premise of which is that language is or should be viewed as a means of performing actions. Despite the fact that speech act theory is one of the topics that is related to pragmatics, its origin can be traced to the philosophy of language. Since the early years of the twentieth century, Oxford-based philosophers started to direct their attention to the relation between language and philosophy. They adopt the view that everyday language is deficient. According to them, it is full of illogicalities and contradictions; therefore, it needs to be refined. Accordingly, they consider their main task is to refine ordinary sentences into a better (i.e. more logical) wording. Hence, they came up with a philosophical trend namely "Logical Positivism". Logical Positivism is a branch that lies under the umbrella of "Truth conditional semantics". Such a trend is

based on the assumption that any sentence should be judged as being true or false; otherwise, it will be considered meaningless or rather absurd. Accordingly, Austin came up with his theory of speech act. Austin's hypothesis can be considered as an opposing reaction against the logical positivist philosophers. Austin, who belongs to the ordinary language philosophers, supports the idea that people are able not only to communicate with each other, but they also understand one another unproblematically. So, instead of modifying everyday language by excluding its contradiction, we should understand how language works.

Unlike the logical positivists, Austin goes for describing the total speech act in the total speech situation. Austin (1962) states:

It has come to be seen that many specially perplexing words embedded in apparently descriptive statements do not serve to indicate some specially odd additional feature in the reality reported, but to indicate (not to report) the circumstances in which the statement is made or reservations to which it is subject or the way in which it is to be taken and the like. To overlook these possibilities in the way once common is called the descriptive fallacy (p.3).

Although Austin (1962) is the one who introduces speech act theory, this study is primarily concerned in its analysis with Searle's classification. Searle (1969; 1979) systemizes the ideas which Austin has previously proposed. Searle's contribution is remarkable, the most important of which is his own classification of the speech acts.

3.2 Gender

The issue of gender has been one of the most prominent issues tackled not only in sociolinguistics but in other branches of linguistics. There have been attempts to provide elaborate justifications for gender differences in speech. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003) state that "[g]ender doesn't just exist, but is continually produced, reproduced, and indeed changed through people's performance of gendered acts, as they project their own claimed gendered identities, ratify or challenge others 'identities" (cited in Holmes& Marra,2010,p.9). Holmes and Marra (2010) also point out that language plays an important role in constructing gender ideologies as they mention that

language plays an important part in constructing the gender order. Feminist linguists have the knowledge and skills not only to identify, describe discourses of femininity and masculinity, but also to highlight

discursive behaviors which penalize women in many social contexts, and to document active discursive resistance to sexist behaviors (p.10).

It is quite evident that the area of the gender differences in speech has been tackled frequently by researchers whose points of view are characterized by a noticeable variation. Among those studies, there are four prominent approaches which are: the deficit approach, the dominance approach, the difference approach and the social constructivist approach.

A-Deficit Approach

Lakoff (1975) proposes the argument that the way women talk reflects their uncertainty and their subordinate status, thus founding the deficit approach. The deficit framework refers to all the previous works which adopt the view that women's speech is full of deficiencies in comparison to men's speech; hence, any linguistic difference between men and women is interpreted as an evidence of women's powerlessness and subordination. The deficit framework suggests that women's ways of speaking or writing are by nurture or nature, deficient in comparison to men's. Lakoff highlights some linguistic features that characterize women's speech. They are as follows:

"(a)Lexical hedges or fillers, e.g. you know ,sort of, well you see.
(b) Tag Questions, e.g. She is very nice, isn't she?
(c) Rising intonation on declaratives, e.g. it's really good.
(d) Empty adjectives, e.g. divine, charming, cute.
(e) Precise colour terms, e.g. magenta, aquamarine.
(f) Intensifiers such as just and so, e.g. I like him so much.
(g) 'Hypercorrect' grammar, e.g. consistent use of standard verb forms.
(h) 'Superpolite' forms, e.g. indirect requests, euphemisms.
(i) Avoidance of strong swear words, e.g. fudge, my goodness.
(j) Emphatic stress, e.g. it was a BRILLIANT performance
(Holmes,1993, 314).

B- Dominance Approach

The dominance framework is later developed by Spender, in her book *Man Made Language* (1980). From this perspective, women are quite literally dominated by men in their talk, in terms of both the amount they talk, and their control over the topic. Weatherall (2002) states that dominance approach "explains women's language as a consequence of the relatively powerless position of women compared to men"(p.55). Spender (1980) thinks that language is sexist since it is dominated by men. This can be attributed to the fact that grammarians, politicians, orators, philosophers and linguists who are males have the absolute power to label

the world from their own perspective, and create a language that suits their own ends. She means that men have coined all the words and invented the grammar. So it can be said that they defined linguistic terms from their point of view, excluding women.

C- Difference Approach

The 'difference' framework is most commonly associated with the work of Tannen (1990). This theory emerges as an opposing reaction to both the deficit and dominance theories. This approach is based on the idea that men and women have 'different but "equally valid styles" (Tannen, 1990, p.15). In other words, it can be said that the cultural difference approach interprets the linguistic differences that exist between men and women as not emerging from hierarchy as the previous approaches. However, such differences, as stated by Weatherall (2002, p.69) emerge from the fact that men and women develop "within different sociolinguistic subcultures." Despite the fact that both styles are valid on their own terms, misunderstandings and tensions as a result of these linguistic differences occur. In addition, discrimination will inevitably occur if the way of dealing with such differences does not change in terms of regarding women's language as inferior to men's.

D-Social Constructionist Approach

According to Leaper and Smith (2004), the social constructionist theory adopts the view that gender should be defined in terms of the social contexts in which the interaction between men and women take place. Men and women are not confined to one specific language style. However, their exchange of language styles depends on the social contexts in which they are involved. On the other hand, the theory approves the view that roles of gender are contextually situated and both sexes choose their gendered identities.

3.3. Politeness

When people are involved in a conversation, they individually adopt certain strategies, whether consciously or subconsciously, to maintain harmony between one and another which help the conversation going on. According to Lakoff (1975), the purpose of politeness is "to reduce friction in personal interaction"(p.64). In everyday life, expressions such as 'lose face/save face' are commonly used by people upon encountering embarrassing situations. The notion of face could be traced back to the fourth century and originates in the Chinese culture. In

the 1959, the concept of face was introduced by Goffman and defined it as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact"(p.213). Based on the concept of face, Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) proposed a universal theory of politeness. Brown and Levinson define face as " the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself"(p.61). According to them, it has two aspects namely: positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to "the want of every member that his wants to be desirable to at least some others."As for the negative face, it refers to "the wants of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others" (1987, p. 62).

3.4-Possible World Theory (PWT)

Possible world theory lies under the branch of cognitive linguistics, particularly the cognitive pragmatic approach. Pragmatics from a cognitive scientific perspective, can be defined as "a capacity of the mind, a kind of information-processing, a system for interpreting a particular phenomenon in the world, namely human communicative behavior"(Cartson, 2002, p.128). This paves the way to the emergence of the theory of Cognitive Pragmatics. Cognitive Pragmatics is concerned with the characteristics of the mind/brain that allow individuals belonging to the human (and possibly to other) species to intentionally communicate with each other"(Tirassa, 1999, p.419). In other words, the objective of cognitive pragmatics is "describing, on a chosen level of analysis, what goes on in the mind of an agent who engages in a communicative interaction with another"(Tirassa, 1999, p.419).

The concept of possible worlds (PWs), originally introduced in philosophical logic, proves to be a productive tool borrowed by literary theory to explain the notion of fictional world. In an attempt to evaluate the truth _value of a sentence, the notion of possible worlds has been developed by philosophers and logicians (Leibniz, 1969; Bradley and Swartz, 1979). Those philosophers came up with such a theory to deal with logical problems such as the truth values of modal propositions. However, PWT has made its way from the logical_ philosophical domain to the literary domain. In 1970s, a group of literary scholars who are familiar with structuralist methods found out that PWT can be adopted in linguistics to provide a plausible interpretation for literary texts. PWT is based on the premise that the actual world is only one of other multiple possible worlds or other alternative possibilities.

The concept of PW gradually emancipates itself from its origins in logic and analytic philosophy and comes to designate more broadly the

imaginary, the virtual, the mental, and the potential possible worlds theory in literary studies which use concepts from possible-world logic and applies them to worlds that are created by fictional texts.

4. Analysis

4.1 First Interaction

The first interaction is extracted from Act 1 of *Arms and the Man*. This interaction involves only two characters: Raina and Bluntchli. Raina stands for the female character, whereas Bluntschli stands for the male character. Bluntschli takes refuge in Raina's room in order to hide from the soldiers who want to kill him. At the beginning, power as well as social distance are the variables that evidently characterize this interaction. This is attributed to the fact that each one tries to exercise his/her power over the other. As for the social distance, they do not know each other before since Bluntschli is considered a stranger for Raina. However, as the conversation flows, their relation develops and is replaced by solidarity that becomes obvious in the way they deal with each other. Therefore, the variables that are relevant in this interaction are power, social distance and solidarity.

4.1.1 Pragmatic Analysis

The first part of the analysis is the pragmatic analysis. Analyzing the phraseology of the directives and expressives used by both characters shows that there is a significant fluctuation towards applying or condoning the politeness strategies. The inconsistent phrasing of the utterances used by both characters suggests dividing the context of situation in which Raina and Bluntschli are involved into three phases. In other words, both Bluntschli and Raina undergo several phases in which their mental perception of the situation they are involved changes. Each phase is characterized by certain linguistic features in terms of using expressives and directives

As for Bluntchli, he passes through three stages. The first stage starts when he runs into Raina's room, directing his pistol towards her and threatening her that her life will come to an end upon uttering a word loudly or refusing to accept him as a refugee. Secondly, when he realizes Riana's social position, character in addition to how far she is not frightened. The third stage is acknowledging his gratitude to Riana as she saves his life after agreeing to hide him from the soldiers.

The same goes for Raina who undergoes several phases concerning her attitude towards Bluntschli. The first stage starts when Bluntschli rushes into her room, raising his pistol, threatening her and of course exerting his power over her, she refuses to be submissive. Instead, she challenges his power. The second stage is when Bluntschli draws her attention to the fact that she cannot receive the soldiers in her night gown in addition to the fact that he might take advantage of such a situation. The third stage is when Bluntschli gives her the gown in order not to receive the soldiers in her nightgown. This moment marks a shift in Raina's attitude towards Bluntschlli .

To start with, examples can vividly show Bluntschli's fluctuating attitude. Turn 1 can be a vivid example that illustrates Bluntschli's attitude in the first stage and offers a clear representation of how he exercises his power over Raina linguistically.

Turn1 MAN (in the darkness, subduedly, but threateningly). Sh—sh! Don't call out or you'll be shot. Be good; and no harm will happen to you. (She is heard leaving her bed, and making for the door.) Take care, there's no use in trying to run away. Remember, if you raise your voice my pistol will go off. (Commandingly.) Strike a light and let me see you. Do you hear?

In the first stage, Bluntschli's power is obviously demonstrated. Everything is within his control since he can kill Raina with the pistol he carries whenever he wants or rather let her alive. His power is reflected in his linguistic choices. No off-record strategies are employed and using address titles is totally ignored. On the other hand, he uses direct commands which may reach to the level of threats as in "Don't call out or you'll be shot.

As for Raina's attitude in the first stage, she does not feel that she is powerless despite being threatened by a pistol. Turn 4 can show the fact that Raina is not afraid.

(disdainfully). I suppose not. (She draw herself up superbly, and looks him straight in the face, saying with emphasis) Some soldiers, I know, are afraid of death.

The stage direction 'disdainfully' emphasizes the idea that Raina responds in a dignified manner. The word 'disdainfully' is very insightful. In turn 10, she adds**:**

(revolted). It is not the weapon of a gentleman!

This utterance can be considered a face threatening act as it poses a threat on Bluntchli' positive face. In addition, the stage direction depicts Raina's negative feelings towards Bluntchli as the word 'revolted' shows how dissatisfied she is.

The second phase that Bluntchli goes through is when "he reckons up what he can guess about Raina, her age, her social position, her character, the extent to which she is frightened." After noticing Raina's character and her social position, he realizes that he is not as powerful as he thinks himself to be. His phraseology changes as he says:

"Excuse my disturbing you: but you recognize my uniform-Servian. If I'm caught I shall be killed. (Determinedly) Do you understand that?"

In turn 5 , he adds:

(with grim good humor). All of them, dear lady, all of them, believe me

It is obvious that in the second stage, Bluntschli's attitude witnesses a noticeable change. Bluntschli starts to employ some sort of indirectness by using polite requests rather than direct commands. He starts to show care towards saving Raina's negative face. This is very evident when he apologizes that he disturbs her. He also uses softeners such as "Excuse my disturbing you …" and the term of endearment 'dear' to mitigate the force of his utterance.

As opposed to her dignified manner in the first stage, Raina, in the second stage, becomes obliged to obey Bluntschli's orders after being threatened by being forced to receive the soldiers in her night gown. Accordingly, she realizes that Bluntshcli has power over her. This exchange can illustrate this point.

Turn 7 MAN Stop! (She stops.) Where are you going?
Turn 8 RAINA (with dignified patience). Only to get my cloak.

The final stage that both characters pass through starts when each of them realizes that the other does him/her a favor for which he/she should be thankful. As for Bluntschli, his gratitude is because of the fact that Raina saves his life by hiding him from the soldiers and not reporting to anyone that he is hiding in her room. In this stage, the relation between Raina and Bluntschli becomes based on solidarity rather than power as opposed to the previous two phases. There are various examples used by Bluntschli in the last phase that reflect solidarity. There are several examples of expressives that reflect Bluntschli's changeable manner. Bluntschli's attempt to maintain Raina's positive face becomes very evident. As an illustration, his utterance in turn 18 shows how grateful he is towards Raina as he says: "Dear young lady, your servant until death. I

wish for your sake I had joined the Bulgarian army instead of the Servian."

In turn 34, he says:

"You are an angel!"

As for the directives used by Bluntschli in the third stage, their linguistic pattern reflects solidarity rather than power since they are softened by using terms of endearment. For example, in turn 20, he says:

"Don't hate me, dear young lady"

In turn 34, he says:

"Don't do things so suddenly, gracious lady."

Furthermore, there are some directives that are in Raina's interest as in turn 110. Bluntschli says:

"Better not touch my hand, dear young lady. I must have a wash first.

Raina's third stage starts when Bluntschli gives her the cloak and does not take advantage of the situation. His gentle manner obliges her to feel grateful to him which is linguistically reflected in her utterances. Therefore, the expressives used by Raina in this stage reflect solidarity. As a clarification, Raina's utterance in turn 12 "(catching the cloak eagerly). Oh, thank you. " Moreover, in turn 27, she says:

"I am sorry I frightened you. (She takes up the pistol and hands it to him.) Pray take it to protect yourself against me."

In this utterance, Rania's positive face is damaged by the apologetic expression.

As for the directives used in this stage, they reflect Raina's concern as they are in Bluntschli's interest. In turn 16, Raina says:

"I will help you. Hide yourself; hide yourself quickly, behind the curtain."

In turn 79, she says: "Stop! (She catches him by the shoulder, and turns him quiet round), they will kill you."

It is quite vivid that the context of situation in which Raina and Bluntschli are involved is characterized by a dramatic change in the speech of both characters. The way both characters address each other seems to be characterized by an evident fluctuation between using straightforward commands on the one hand and using polite requests and sometimes expressives on the other. This suggests that neither Bluntschli's nor Raina's power is constant even within the same stage.

4.1.2 Cognitive Analysis

There is an urgent necessity for a deeper analysis that can illustrate the paradigm shift which each character undergoes concerning his/her

perception of his/her powerful position, which affects their manner towards one another. An analysis of the mental processes which passed through Bluntschli's and Raina's minds can justify their inconsistent use of directives and expressives. Multiple types of possible worlds can be used in the analysis of each stage that the characters pass through, including the knowledge world, prediction, obligation ..etc

To start with, blending the knowledge and prediction worlds, in particular, justifies Bluntchli's attitude in the first stage. Bluntschli starts his conversations with Raina in such a harsh manner. At first, Bluntschli thinks that he is more powerful according to what he knows or believes to be true about the nature of human beings, particularly females, that whenever they are attacked by a pistol, they will be afraid. This cognition can be inferred from Raina's question in turn 6 "How do you know that I am afraid to die?"The verb 'know' shows the fact that Bluntschli's attitude towards Raina is based on this knowledge.

Moreover, the use of the future tense in his threats shows how he predicts Raina's reaction towards his threats in turn 1such as "Don't call out or you'll be shot.", ' Be good: and no harm will happen to you." In other words, he predicts that his threats will be effective. Therefore, his knowledge in addition to his prediction make him feel that he has the power over her. Accordingly, his utterances come in a straightforward manner or what is commonly known as direct directives.

Employing the knowledge world and the prediction world can provide an interpretation of the paradigm shift which Bluntschli undergoes concerning his perception of his powerful position. Bluntschli's second stage is when his knowledge in addition to what he predicts turn to be totally wrong. When he "reckons up what he can guess about Riana, her age, her social position, her character, the extent to which she is frightened", he "continues more politely." The use of the verb' reckon up' signals this paradigm shift and shows the knowledge which Bluntschli gains in such a situation. Also the use of the verb 'guess' in "what he can guess about her social position, character and the extent she was frightened" shows that Bluntschli starts to predict what might happen to him upon dealing with a person like Raina . He starts to take into consideration her age, social position, her character in addition to the fact that he notices that she is not frightened by his threats especially when Raina asks him "How do you know that I am afraid to die?" So he realizes the fact that his threats do not give the effect he thinks they will give. So instantaneously, he resorts to use softeners and proceeds saying "Excuse my disturbing you: but you recognize my uniform- Servian. If

I'm caught I shall be killed." And he also uses terms of endearment as it is clear in his response "All of them, dear lady. All of them. Believe me."

Bluntschli's soft manner and Raina's defying attitude lasts till the end. The following exchange illustrates Bluntchli's and Raina's shift of attitude.

Turn 7 MAN (cunningly). Ah; but suppose I don't shoot you, what will happen then? Why, a lot of your cavalry—the greatest blackguards in your army—will burst into this pretty room of yours and slaughter me here like a pig; for I'll fight like a demon: they shan't get me into the street to amuse themselves with: I know what they are. Are you prepared to receive that sort of company in your present undress? (Raina, suddenly conscious of her nightgown, instinctively shrinks and gathers it more closely about her. He watches her, and adds, pitilessly) It's rather scanty, eh? (She turns to the ottoman. He raises his pistol instantly, and cries) Stop! (She stops.) Where are you going?

Turn 8 RAINA (with dignified patience). Only to get my cloak.

Turn 9 MAN (darting to the ottoman and snatching the cloak). A good idea. No: I'll keep the cloak: and you will take care that nobody comes in and sees you without it. This is a better weapon than the pistol.(He throws the pistol down on the ottoman.)

The fact that Raina stops acting in a dignified way and becomes more obedient should be cognitively justified. Blending both the obligation and the knowledge worlds respectively can interpret the paradigm shift that Riana undergoes resulting in such an attitude. In other words, Raina becomes aware of Bluntschli's power. Raina knows that receiving the soldiers in her night gown is against the morals which an aristocratic lady should abide by. The stage direction shows that Raina becomes "suddenly conscious of her nightgown, instinctively shrinks and gathers it more closely about her." Accordingly, she becomes obliged to obey his orders because it also reflects his concern that she shouldn't be seen undressed by strangers. This is as far as applying the obligation world is concerned.

Similarly, the fact that Bluntschli uses the authoritative manner reflects that he becomes aware of the fact that he regains power. As a justification, Bluntschli knows well the fact that Raina, as a representative of an upper class young lady, should behave as a well bred lady who cannot receive company of soldiers in this dress. The obligation world is embedded in what Bluntchli says "It's rather scanty." This utterance reflects his perception of the whole situation. As a clarification, using the word 'scanty' bears the meaning of obligation. Social commitment

prohibits a well bred young lady to act in this seductive manner: a fact that gives Bluntshli the chance not only to be entirely sure that she cannot let the soldiers in but also to be sure that his commands will be obeyed.

This makes Raina as well as Bluntschli reconsider their stances: Raina's powerlessness as opposed to Bluntchli's power.

However, when the soldiers come closer towards Raina's room, Bluntschli does not apply what he has planned to do. Turn 11 shows Bluntschli's paradigm shift. Although Bluntschli decides to take the advantage of keeping the cloak with him as an attempt to force Raina to prevent the soldiers from stepping inside and he spells out his intention explicitly, he acts as if he totally "(dropped the manner which he has been assuming to intimidate her, flings the cloak to her, exclaiming sincerely and kindly) No use: I'm done for. Quick! wrap yourself up: they're coming!"

No sooner does he feel that the soldiers are approaching than he gives Raina her cloak: an immediate reaction that takes him no time to reach such a resolution. Employing the obligation world theory can provide a logical justification of what has happened and reveal how Bluntschli's mind perceives this situation. As an illustration, Bluntschli's utterance "It's rather scanty" shows his full awareness of the social commitments that prohibit receiving the soldiers in the nightgown. In addition to the obligation world, the Knowledge world can also be applied. To clarify, Raina's utterance upon commenting on Bluntschli's intention of keeping the nightgown with him "This is not the weapon of a gentleman." shows that there is preconceived knowledge or shared belief between Bluntschli and Raina that what Bluntschli intends to do is against chivalry. Accordingly, Bluntschli's awareness of the moral principles of what manhood is and how gentle men should act makes it inevitably impossible for him to play the role of a villain.

After giving her the cloak, Raina could see how gentle Bluntschli is, and this is the third phase that she undergoes in terms of her mental perception of the situation. In this stage, Raina's attitude witnesses a dramatic linguistic change as she uses expressives. Utilizing the prediction world can interpret why Raina feels grateful towards Bluntschli. Her prediction of how critical the situation might be if she encounters the soldiers in her nightgown makes her feel indebted to Bluntschli. Her gratitude is represented linguistically in her use of expressives.

Bluntschli's shift towards use of expressives, which marks the beginning of the third stage that he undergoes through his interaction with

Raina, can be interpreted by employing the prediction worlds. Bluntschli, at the beginning of the interaction, says:

"If I'm caught, I shall be killed"

The prediction is implied in using the if conditional form. In this utterance, Bluntschli tries to convince Raina to hide him. He justifies the urgency of the situation by predicting that he might be killed if the soldiers catch him. Accordingly, Raina agrees. This prediction is a mere proof that supports the fact that Bluntschli knows quite well that his life is in a complete danger before being saved by Raina. This prediction makes Bluntschli believes that Raina plays the major role in saving his life as if it had not been for her help, he would not have survived. Therefore, he starts to use expressives in order to acknowledge his debt towards Raina.

4.2 Ann/ Tanner interaction

This interaction takes place between Ann and Jack Tanner in the presence of Mr. Ramsden and Ann's mother upon discussing Ann's father's will. The conversation between Ann and Tanner revolves around convincing Tanner to be her guardian. However, he tries to resist. Tanner tries to exercise his power over Ann, more precisely, the legitimate power. Being her guardian gives Tanner the right to have authority over Ann. On Ann's part, solidarity plays a major role in their interaction together because they know each other since they were children and she has feelings for him. Hence, power as well as solidarity are the variables that influence the characters' way of phrasing their utterances.

4.2.1 pragmatic analysis

The directives used by Ann have different forms. Some of them are off-record, whereas others are on-record. Firstly, she insults Tanner directly as in turn 6 as she says:

"Don't be foolish, Jack."

Later, in turn 36, Ann changes her attitude with Tanner. She indirectly begs him to be kind with her saying:

"Come, Jack! Be kind to me in my sorrow. You don't refuse to accept me as your ward, do you**?"**

Finally, she puts her directive in the form of polite request in turn 47. She says**:**

"Oh, is there any harm in it? I didn't know. Then I certainly won't call you that. May I call you Jack until I can think of something else?"

The pragmatic analysis of the previous examples show that there is an inconsistency in the way Ann phrases her directives. Turn 6 can be categorized as bald- on record – impoliteness as she says:

"Don't be foolish, Jack."

The word' foolish' can be categorized as bald- on record – impoliteness as the FTA is done unambiguously. Accordingly, Tanner's positive face is entirely ruined. Later, in turn 36, Ann's attitude with Tanner becomes different as the utterance she uses, regardless of its linguistic form, can be considered an indirect request. She says:

"Come, Jack! Be kind to me in my sorrow. You don't refuse to accept me as your ward, do you**?"**

It is clear that the previous utterance, despite taking the form of a command, it reflects solidarity rather than power**.** Furthermore, using question tags is one of the strategies that reflect intimacy between the participants of the conversation. In such an utterance, Ann claims the same ground between her and Tanner by using the question tag.

Finally, the rate of imposition is minimized by using the polite request in turn 47 as Ann says**:**

"Oh, is there any harm in it? I didn't know. Then I certainly won't call you that. May I call you Jack until I can think of something else?"

Similarly, there is a fluctuation in the directives used by Tanner in terms of their phraseology. The following examples can clarify this fluctuation.

Tanner starts his conversation with Ann saying**:**

"Do you intend to call your guardian granny?"

Tanner in turn 22 becomes direct giving her a straightforward command as he says:

"Then read it at once and decide."

In turn 44, he says:

"I think you ought to call me Mr. Tanner."

In turn 48, he says:

"Oh, for Heaven's sake don't try to invent anything worse. I capitulate. I consent to Jack. I embrace Jack**.** Here my first and last attempt to assert my authority."

Analyzing these examples pragmatically, one can find that some are put in a straightforward manner, whereas others can be regarded as indirect directives. As a clarification, the first utterance that Tanner starts his conversation with Ann should be regarded as a face-threatening act. Tanner says**:**

"Do you intend to call your guardian granny?"

This utterance, despite being an indirect directive, poses a threat on Ann's face. As the context suggests, the previous utterance conveys the message that Tanner mocks her because he thinks it is totally informal to address her guardian, who should be addressed respectfully, by calling him

granny. As for 22, he addresses Ann in an authoritative manner since he says:

"Then read it at once and decide."

This is a direct order in which the rate of imposition is obvious. The phrase 'at once' emphasizes the idea that the hearer's negative face is threatened by imposing a certain action that has to be done immediately. This utterance reflects the fact that he has power over her.

Tanner continues his conversation with the same strict tone. However, this authoritative manner does not last till the end of their interaction. Tanner becomes more considerate than before. As an illustration, in turn 44, he says:

"I think you ought to call me Mr. Tanner."

Using the phrase 'I think' along with the modal verb ' ought to' minimizes the rate of imposition in this utterance, as opposed to the previous one. Consequently, Ann's negative face is not threatened by the direct directive. Furthermore, in turn 48, he says:

"Oh, for Heaven's sake don't try to invent anything worse. I capitulate. I consent to Jack. I embrace Jack. Here my first and last attempt to assert my authority."

The phrase " For heaven's sake" emphasizes the idea that Tanner is begging Ann's pardon, unlike the previous utterances. So it can be regarded as a request rather than a command. Tanner states explicitly that he stops exercising his power over her. On the other hand, he begs her not to call him something worse.

4.2.2 Cognitive Analysis

In order to reveal the mental processes that pass through each character' mind, applying the possible world theory can be of a great help. Employing the knowledge world can provide a justification for Tanner's harsh attitude with Ann at the beginning of their interaction. This exchange can be taken as an example.

Turn 21 ANN. But I haven't read your book, Jack.
Turn 22 TANNER. [diving at the waste-paper basket and fishing the book out for her] Then read it at once and decide.
Turn 23 Ramsden. If I am to be your guardian, I positively forbid you to read that book, Annie.[He smites the table with his fist and rises].
Turn 24 ANN. Of course, if you don't wish it. [She puts the book on the table].
Turn 25 Tanner .If one guardian is to forbid you to read the other guardian's book, how are we to settle it? Suppose I order you to read it! What about your duty to me?

According to Ramsden's utterance, it can be understood that the guardian is entitled to advise his ward since he plays the role of her father. Similarly, Tanner adopts the same way of thinking. He thinks that he has the right and the authority to give Ann commands because of being her guardian. The verb 'suppose' in "Suppose I order you to read it!" reflects his hypothesis since the verb 'suppose' means to think that something is likely to be true. As a clarification, Tanner's utterance while addressing Ann "What about your duty to me?" reflects his rationale concerning Ann's obligations towards him. This rationale affects his linguistic choices. This justifies his harshness which is represented in mocking her and giving her commands.

Deploying the prediction world can provide a sound explanation of Tanner's shift of manner from being tough towards being considerate. As an illustration, this exchange can provide a clear explanation.

Turn 45 ANN. [gently] No you don't, Jack. That's like the things you say on purpose to shock people: those who know you pay no attention to them. But, if you like, I'll call you after your famous ancestor Don Juan.

Turn 46 RAMSDEN. Don Juan!

Turn 47 ANN. [innocently] Oh, is there any harm in it? I didn't know. Then I certainly won't call you that. May I call you Jack until I can think of something else?

Turn 48 TANNER. Oh, for Heaven's sake don't try to invent anything worse. I capitulate. I consent to Jack. I embrace Jack. Here my first and last attempt to assert my authority.

Tanner predicts that Ann might call him something worse than Don Juan. Such a name does not appeal to Tanner since it bears negative connotations. Ann says "May I call Jack until I think of something else?" So Tanner predicts that she might call him a name which is more provoking. The prediction lies in using the verb' try' and ' invent' which bear the meaning that something will take place in the future. As a further support, the phrase "my first and last attempt to assert my authority" marks the paradigm shift that he undergoes. Tanner recognizes that he does not have the power over Ann. The verb 'capitulate' shows his admission of his powerlessness as it means to accept doing something unwillingly. He cannot control the way she talks with him. In order to save his face, he begs Ann not to call him something that might be face threatening to him. Thus, his soft manner towards Ann becomes justifiably clear.

Similarly, the knowledge world can be used to justify Ann's shift of manner towards Tanner. Such an exchange can be used to clarify this point.

Turn 31 ANN. [touchingly] Do you refuse to accept me as your ward, Granny?

Turn 32 RAMSDEN. No: I never said that. I greatly object to act with Mr. Tanner: that's all.

Turn 33 MRS. WHITEFIELD. Why? What's the matter with poor Jack?

Turn 34 TANNER. My views are too advanced for him.

Turn 35 RAMSDEN. [indignantly] They are not. I deny it.

Turn 36 ANN. Of course not. What nonsense! Nobody is more advanced than Granny. I am sure it is Jack himself who has made all the difficulty. Come, Jack! Be kind to me in my sorrow. You don't refuse to accept me as your ward, do you?

This exchange demonstrates how respectfully Ann treats Ramsden. As a result, she needs him to be her guardian. Unfortunately, Tanner and Ramsden are on good terms with each other as Ramsden says in turn 32
"I greatly object to act with Mr. Tanner: that's all." So Ann believes that Tanner is the reason for this inconvenience and he might ruin her plan of convincing Ramsden to accept her offer to be her guardian. Turn 36 sums up the whole situation. Ann says:

"Of course not. What nonsense! Nobody is more advanced than Granny. I am sure it is Jack himself who has made all the difficulty."

This utterance reflects Ann's hypothesis that Tanner is the one who causes the inconvenience. However, her cognition changes after she reconsiders the fact that she urgently needs his support as a guardian. At this moment, Ann realizes that he is more powerful than her. Therefore, the change of her attitude towards becoming considerate is logical. This explains why she begs him to understand how badly she needs him. She says**:**
"Come, Jack! Be kind to me in my sorrow. You don't refuse to accept me as your ward, do you?"

After realizing the fact that she needs his help which means she is not as powerful as she imagines, Ann maintains the friendly attitude with Tanner. Applying the knowledge world to turn 47 can be taken as a further proof. Ann says:

"Oh, is there any harm in it? I didn't know. Then I certainly won't call you that. May I call you Jack until I can think of something else?"

Ann's concern that Tanner might be offended becomes clear. This concern is reflected linguistically in using the polite request; this emphasizes Ann's attempt to save Tanner's face. Employing the knowledge world sets an emphasis on Ann's considerate attitude towards Tanner. The knowledge world is implied within the verb 'know' in "I didn't know". In such an utterance, Ann tries to justify that he does not intend to pose any threats on Tanner's face by calling him 'Dun Juan'. On the other hand, she does so attributing to her lack of knowledge that calling him such a name might provoke him.

5-Findings and Conclusion

Through analyzing the phraseology of the on-record as well as the off-record directives and expressives used by the main male and female characters in *Arms and the Man* along with *Man and Superman*, it is clear that the relation between power, gender, cognition and politeness should be reconsidered.

As far as the relation between power and gender is concerned, power should not always be associated with gender. The assumption that males represent the powerful group, whereas females represent the powerless has been proven to be totally inaccurate and not always applicable. The participants obtain their power from the social context in which they are involved in addition to their perception of the context of situation rather than gender. With regard to the relation between power and cognition, analyzing the mental processes that pass through the characters' minds reveals that their cognition is the main factor behind their awareness of how powerful or powerless they are. This suggests that the power of the participants is inconstant as it varies according to the context of situation and how s/he perceives it. Such a finding offers a sound justification of the inconstant use of politeness strategies and paves the way for investigating the relation between power and politeness. It is proved that power and politeness are related at times. Nevertheless, at other times, the assumption that both variables are inextricably linked becomes inapplicable. As an illustration, it should be taken into consideration that neither off-record directives should be generalized as an indicator of the speaker's powerlessness nor on-records should be taken as a reflection of power. This is pertained to the fact that some on-record directives have been proven to be in the hearer's interest; they are addressee-oriented not

speaker-oriented. It has been found that not all the interrogatives imply the speaker's attempt to exercise his/her power over the interlocutor by investigating; instead they communicatively serve as tools that enhance solidarity between the participants. Finally, the assumption that women are more linguistically polite than men should be reconsidered. It has been clearly shown that applying or condoning politeness strategies can be the result of other factors rather than gender.

Consequently, what can be concluded is that depending solely on gender as the only variable in analyzing the differences between males' and females 'speech is insufficient resulting in invalid interpretations. On the other hand, other variables should take the primacy over gender, the most important of which is one's cognition. How one perceives the situation in which he/ she is involved plays a fundamental role in affecting one's linguistic choices. The analysis also finds out that the context of situation plays a noticeable role in choosing either politeness or impoliteness strategies. There are multiple of variables that the context of situation imposes, which influence the participants' linguistic choices. These variables are, apart from power, solidarity, age, social status and more importantly, one's cognition of the context of the situation in which s/he is engaged.

To sum up, this research tends to show dissatisfaction with the unjustified assertions in the gender arena. In other words, any sort of generalizations should be rejected. The approaches that deal with men and women as stereotypical types should not be taken for granted. This is because human nature is complicated, alterable and perplexing which makes us obliged to think very patiently and accurately before providing any final judgments. So it is hoped that the present study can be a modest contribution towards a clear understanding of the interpersonal relation between gender, power, politeness and cognition.

Recommendations for Further Studies

This research has been concerned with analyzing the linguistic differences between men's and women's speech in mixed-sex interaction. It is highly recommended for further studies to focus on the analysis of such linguistic differences in interactions of the same sex. More so, further researches are needed to use literary text in the analysis since the attention is paid more to spoken discourse. However, focus should be directed to literary texts attributing to the substantial role they play in establishing core beliefs which construct one's ideologies including gender roles. This will emphatically assist in further changes towards the altering and developing the perception of 'gender' from essentialism to social constructionism which suggests that gender is constructed within a social and cultural discourse.

References

Austin, J.L. (1962).How to do things with words .Oxford: Oxford Press.

Bradley, R. & Swartz, N. (1979).Possible World: An introduction to logic and its philosophy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In Goody, E. (Ed.), Questions and Politeness. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cartson, R. (2002).Linguistic meaning, communicated meaning and cognitive pragmatics. Mind & Language, 17, (1, 2), 128.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). Language and gender. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fasold, R. (1990). The sociolinguistics of Language. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1959).The presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Garden City.

Holmes, J& Marra, M (2010). Femininity, Feminism and Gendered Discourse. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lakoff, R .(1975). Language and Women's place. New York: Harper and Row.

Leaper, C& Smith, T. (2004). A meta-analytic review of gender variations in children's language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech and assertive speech. Developmental Psychology, 40, 993-1027.

Leibniz, G.W. (1969).Philosophical papers and letters (L.E. Loemaker, Trans).Dodrecht: .Reidel Publishing Company.

Pavel, T.G.(1986).Fictional Worlds .Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ryan, M.L. (1980). Fiction/non-factuals, and the principle of minimal departure.Poetics,9 ,403-422.

Ryan, M.L. (1984) Fiction .as a logical, Ontological and Illocutionary Issue: Review of Fictive Discourse and the structures of Literature by Felix Martinez-Bonati. Style, 18 (2).pp.121-39.

Ryan, M.L .(1991a).Possible worlds ,Artificial intelligence and Narrative Theory. Bloomington and Indianaplois: Indiana University Press.

Ryan, M.L. (1991b).Possible worlds and accessibility relations: A semantics typology of fiction. Poetics Today, 12(3), pp. 553-76.

Sadock, J.(2006). Speech Acts. Handbook of Pragmatics (pp.53-73).   Madlen, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Searle, J.R. (1969). Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics. Vol. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press.

Spender, D. (1980).Man Made Language . Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stockwell, P. (2002). Cognitive Poetics .London: Rutledge.

Tannen, D (1990). You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. USA: Ballantine.

Tayari, F.(2014). Sexism or Gender Differentiation and Class Differentiation in George Bernard Shaw's Arms and the Man. *International Journal of Literature and Arts*. Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 6-9. doi: 10.11648/j.ijla.20140201.12

Tirassa, M. (1999). Communicative Competence and the architecture of the mind/brain. Brain& Language, 68, 419.

Tracy, K. (1990). The many of face work. In H. Giles FW.P. Robinson(Eds.), Handbook of language and social psychology. (pp.209-226) Chichester: John Wiley.

Watts, R. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weatherall, A. (2002).Gender, Language and Discourse. New York: Routledge.

Zsuzsanna, A. (2012). *Britain and Britishness in G.B.shaw's Plays*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.