Variativity of the Speaker’s Verbal and Non-verbal Behavior in the English Managerial Discourse

Варіативність вербальної та невербальної поведінки мовця у англомовному управлінському дискурсі

Lyudmila Soloshchuk
DSc. in Philology, Professor
E-mail: lsolo@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2934-7721

Yuliia Skrynnik *
Ph.D. in Philology, Assistant Professor
E-mail: juliaskrynnik@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7592-4011

Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine
4, Maidan Svobody, Kharkiv, Ukraine, 61000

Україна
майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, Україна, 61000

Original manuscript received March 17, 2021
Revised manuscript accepted October 10, 2023

* Corresponding author
ABSTRACT

Introduction. This paper focuses on the study of the verbal and non-verbal repertoire of the speaker changing his/her social roles in the managerial type of discourse in the psycholinguistic perspective. The ambition of this analysis is to regard the strategies and tactics of the social roles’ performance with the detailed psycholinguistic analysis of the verbal and non-verbal repertoire of the speakers. Taking into account a speaker’s mental representations, sociolinguistic characteristics, interpreted as a speaker’s social status and roles, and the communicative situation itself, the research purposes are to explore the influence of the managerial context of communication on the communicative repertoire of the speaker transitioning from a leadership role to a subordinate one or from a subordinate role to a leadership role; the analysis of the difference in the realization of the communicative strategies by the same speaker performing either a leadership role or a subordinate social role in the managerial discourse also presents the goal of this paper.

Methods and procedure of research. The research is carried out on the basis of the analysis of 578 dialogical fragments from film scripts in which changing of social roles by a discursive personality in the managerial discourse is presented. The discursive analysis, contextual and situational analysis, pragma-linguistic analysis, and elements of quantitative calculations are used in the article.

Results. The verbal and non-verbal repertoire of the realization of the strategies and tactics for the social roles performance in the managerial discourse are distinguished in the article. Their ratio is calculated in the research in order to display the most efficient ones for the successful role performance. The paper proves that the usage of stereotyped verbal and non-verbal models of communication in the managerial discourse contributes to the realization of the certain social role, and thus, to the achievement of the communicative goals.

Conclusions. The hierarchization of status-role relations in the managerial discourse influences the speech repertoire of the speaker. This is reflected in the verbal and non-verbal means of implementing the strategies of dominance and subordination in the managerial discourse. A promising area of the research is connected with the studying of discursive variability of verbal and non-verbal communicative components which provide the social roles’ performance in the intercultural managerial discourse with considering the psycholinguistic peculiarities of the speaker.

Key words: managerial discourse, strategy, social role, tactic, verbal component of communication, non-verbal component of communication.

Introduction

The man’s ability to perform everyday social roles is predetermined by the mechanisms by which language is processed and presented in the mind and brain of a human being; that is, it is predetermined by the psychological and neurobiological factors that enable human beings to...
acquire, use, comprehend, and produce language (Nordquist, 2019). Such interrelation between linguistic factors and psychological aspects are pointed out by psycholinguistics (Jodai, 2011; Kalmykova, 2008) as the basic ones in studying the characteristics of the performance of social roles. Psycholinguistic researches prove that human brain, which provides neuro coded generative process, adapts situationally to the language environment, thus, we find it necessary to take into consideration the psychological aspects of the strategies of social roles’ performance as they are treated as an integral part of the language environment. Social roles may be presented in various configurations (Fairclough, 1995; Heritage, 1997), which manifest themselves in the speech activity of a discursive personality (Soloshchuk, 2006, 2020). The relevance of the article is presupposed by the anthropocentric character of the modern researches of communicative processes in different communicative situations and, accordingly, at the communicators’ performance of different social roles in the managerial discourse. The psycholinguistic perspective contributes to solving the problem of interpretation of the meanings of the verbal and non-verbal communicative components of different social roles performed in the managerial discourse; and it also contributes to the determining of the psychological characteristics of the strategies and tactics which are involved into the realization of the social roles in the managerial discourse.

The subject is presented by verbal and non-verbal components of communication which are used by a personality in the managerial discourse. The mobility of social roles determines the object of the research which lies in the study of strategies and tactics employed for performing different social roles by one and the same speaker that is especially important for the managerial discourse. Thus, the research purposes are to explore the influence of the managerial context of communication on the verbal and non-verbal repertoire of the speaker transitioning from a leadership role to a subordinate one or from a subordinate role to a leadership role; the difference in the realization of the communicative strategies by the same speaker performing either a leadership role or a subordinate social role in the managerial discourse also lies within the frames of this research.

The novelty of this research lies in the investigation of the verbal and non-verbal characteristics of the strategies of the speaker performing different social roles in the managerial discourse.
Concept of Theoretical Research

Social roles performance is based on the expectations of the society (Berne, 1980; Biddle & Thomas, 1979; Pahta et al., 2010; Sapru, 2015; Skrynnik, 2019), which determine psychological behavioural norms and rules for speakers. The stereotypical performance of the social role at the verbal level of communication (Soloshchuk, 2006) takes place in accordance with the scenario, which is based on the principles of ecological communication. Ecological communication includes ethics, harmony, and efficiency of the communicative process, as well as compliance with the expectations of the society (Abram, 2014; Döring & Zunino, 2013; Haugen, 2001; Huang, 2016; Steffensen, 2007; Stibbe, 2015). The managerial discourse is based on the society’s expectations of the performance of the core psychological configuration “dominant social role – subordinate social role” (Fayol, 1949; Malik, 2016; Painter-Morland et al., 2019). That is why it has a well-structured scenario which serves as a regulator of the relationships leading to the successful accomplishment of the communicative and business aims within the managerial type of communication. Therefore, for ensuring the achievement of the communicative and business aims by the speakers it is essential to distinguish both verbal/non-verbal and psychological aspects of the speaker’s behavior.

The efficiency and job satisfaction of both the boss and the subordinate directly depend on how well balanced their psychological relationship with each other is. Business communication is a formal relationship within the framework of professional activity, but despite this, people remain people, even at work. The inclusion of a psychological element in the communication of a manager and an employee that takes into account not only cold-blooded logic, but also an emotional component, significantly increases work efficiency, eliminates obstacles in mutual understanding, stimulates the work of subordinates, helps to avoid professional deformation and even makes it possible to influence the speaker with a higher social role in the managerial discourse. Taking into consideration the fact that in the managerial discourse which is one of the types of the institutional discourse the position of a boss already provides him with a possibility to dominate in the intercourse with a subordinate both at the communicative and psychological level.
Thus, he can afford to spend less verbal/nonverbal and psychological effort in order to achieve his goals while the speaker in the subordinate position is to be more concentrated on the accurate presentation of the ideas in order to realize his intentions in the managerial discourse.

**Methods of the research**

The research methods include *the discursive analysis* (Bondarenko et al., 2017; Wodak, 2006) for determining the type of discourse, within which interlocutors realize their social roles; *the contextual-situational analysis* (Biddle & Thomas, 1979; Burke, 1993; Labov, 2006; Lakoff, 1987) for describing specific features of a discursive personality as a subject of communication in the implementation of social roles; *the pragma-linguistic analysis* (Bezugla & Romanenko, 2013; Robinson, 2003; Soloshchuk, 2020; Wierzbicka, 1991) for distinguishing the strategies and tactics of communication within the managerial discourse which determine the direction of interaction in different configurations of social roles; *the pragmatic and semantic analysis* (Goddard, 2013; Horman, 1981; Manning & Scheutze, 1999) for describing structural, semantic and pragmatic features of the strategies used for the implementation of social roles by a discursive personality; elements of *quantitative calculations* are also used for confirming the achieved results.

The fragments from the modern English film scripts of the relevant subject served as the illustrative material of this investigation of the speech repertoires of social roles. They were sorted out according to the type of the social and psychological role – dominant or subordinate; the types of the used strategies – cooperative or non-cooperative – were also analyzed, taking into consideration the tactics of their realization.

**Results**

Taking into consideration the fact that management (or managing) is the administrative activity of an organization, whether it is a company, a non-profit organization, or government body, etc. One can state that management includes the activities of setting the strategy of organization and coordination of the efforts of its employees (or volunteers) to
accomplish its objectives through the application of available resources, such as financial, natural, technological, and human resources. The term “management” also refers to those people who manage an organization (Fayol, 1949; Malik, 2016; Painter-Morland et al., 2019).

From the perspective of management, discourse is an effective tool for precise and accurate transmission of information, for making decisions, and for enlisting action (Bruce et al., 2011). In this study, the managerial discourse is treated as a type of the institutional discourse in which the administerial relations occupy the first place and “dominant social role – subordinate social role” is a core psychological role configuration of the members of the communicative process. As well as in other types of discourse in the managerial discourse “the temperaments characteristic of its subjects, their communicative abilities, feelings and motives of activity, individual features caused by the mental and emotional state of the speakers are realized”. Besides the individual in the managerial discourse is to have special knowledge and skills for effective realization of business goals.

The selection of the communicative strategies in the managerial discourse was preconditioned by the binary psychological nature of the realization of the social roles. The managerial discourse, as a type of the institutional discourse, is a combination of status-ritual and personal components with a variable degree of ritualism (Tarnaeva, 2011). This ritualism lies in the core managerial relation “dominant social role – subordinate social role”, as well as the play on the rise/fall of the social statuses. Thereafter, the basic strategies for the implementation of social roles in the managerial discourse are divided into dominant and subordinate ones, that is, the strategies operated by interlocutors with dominant social roles, and strategies operated by interlocutors with subordinate social roles. The instruments for implementing the strategy of dominance or subordination in the managerial discourse are presented by cooperative and non-cooperative tactics.

**The strategy of the dominant social role realization.** The strategies of discursive personalities with dominant social roles in the managerial discourse are realized through cooperative tactics of approving a communicative partner’s social role; converging with a communicative partner; and non-cooperative tactics of demonstrating own dominant social role; didactic influence on a partner performing the subordinate social role; humiliating a partner with a lower social role.
The strategy of realizing a dominant social role implemented through the cooperative tactic of approving a communicative partner’s social role is expressed through a compliment or praise:

(1) MR SHIRLEY [BOSS]: Look... sometimes things look good on paper... but lose their luster when you see how it affects real folks. I guess a healthy bottom line doesn’t mean much... if to get you have to hurt the ones you depend on. It’s people that make the difference. Little people, like you. So, Carl... whatever you got last year... add 20 percent (Hughes, 1989).  

The boss employs the tactic of approving his employee’s activity by expressing praise (It’s people that make the difference. Little people, like you), turning to a communicative partner by his name (Carl), giving the bonus as a means of approving the partner’s social role (whatever you got last year... add 20 percent).

The tactic of convergence is used for the implementation of the strategy of dominance in the managerial discourse in order to reduce the vertical distance between the boss and his subordinate involving the elements of humour for dispersing the atmosphere and creating favorable conditions for achieving the principal goal of communication and, thus, reducing the psychological pressure on the partner. Jokes or comic elements can embody a camouflaging function in this case (Samokhina, 2018). In case of hierarchical relations of the speakers the comic elements in the interaction are masking the vertical distance and contribute to the cooperative flow of communication:

(2) QUEEN ELIZABETH II, wearing formal robes of the Garter, is posing for an official portrait by an elderly black PORTRAIT ARTIST, (representative, one assumes, of one of the many Charities of which she is patron)...

ELIZABETH: Have you voted yet, Mr. Crawford?  
ARTIST (proudly dabbing palette): Yes, Ma’am. I was there when they opened. First in line. Seven o’clock. ...  
ELIZABETH: I rather envy you being able to vote. Not the actual ticking of the box although, I suppose, it would be nice to experience that ONCE. But the sheer joy of being partial (Morgan, 2006).

The comic effect embodied by the lowering of the Queen’s dominant role by herself infuses this interaction with positive emotions. In this case the interlocutors can feel closeness to each other, and it drives communication into the cooperative flow.
Except for cooperative tactics, non-cooperative ones are also distinguished as they are an inherent part of the process of interaction. The popular non-cooperative tactic used by the speaker with a higher status for the implementation of the strategy of dominance within the managerial discourse type is demonstrating a dominant social role:

(3) GRISWOLD: By the way, I hope my report helped out at the trade show.

MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: I’m sure it did, Grisball. Now, if you’ll excuse me, I’m in the middle of an important call. Get me somebody. Anybody. And get me somebody while I wait (Hughes, 1989).

Mr. Shirley, Griswold’s boss, eloquently demonstrates his superior social role to his subordinate. The tactic of demonstrating a dominant social role is embodied through reminding about the significance of his work and necessity to do it appropriately, which is expressed verbally (I’m in the middle of an important call). The superiority of the own social role is emphasized by cutting his employee short (I’m sure it did, Grisball. Now...) and by neglecting the success of Griswold’s report. The demonstration of the dominant social role is also highlighted by using the subordinate’s wrong surname (Grisball) and giving short orders (Get me somebody. Anybody. And get me somebody while I wait). Moreover, the dominance is emphasized through the unwillingness to wait long.

The non-cooperative tactic of didactic influence on a partner performing the subordinate social role is also frequently used for implementing the strategy of dominance in the managerial discourse. Usually, the speaker with a dominant role takes to instructing the communicative partner with a subordinate role:

(4) The QUEEN sits at breakfast. Reading the newspapers. Dogs under the table. A knock on the door, and ROBIN JANVRIN, her deputy Private Secretary, pops around.

JANVRIN: The Prime Minister is on his way, Ma’am.

ELIZABETH: To BE, Robin [correcting, terse]. Prime Minister to BE. [The QUEEN frostily flicks a page, without looking up].

ELIZABETH (cont’d): He hasn’t asked my permission yet (Morgan, 2006).

The example above demonstrates the peculiarities of the didactic nature of the speaker’s dominant administrative role through correcting the partner with the subordinate role (To BE, Robin. Prime
Minister to BE). Following with the explanation (*He hasn’t asked my permission yet*). Non-verbal communicative components interact with verbal components according to the principle of coordination (Soloshchuk, 2006: 114–123) – a correcting terse intonation, gesture and facial expression (*correcting, terse; frostily flicks a page, without looking up*) contributes to verbally expressed didactic influence. Non-verbal communication provides the speakers within the managerial discourse with a great opportunity to interpret non-verbal signs in order to adapt their communicative tactics to achieve their strategical goals. In the example above the non-verbal components contribute greatly to implementing the strategy of dominance.

The tactic of humiliating a partner with a subordinate social role is used for implementing the strategies inherent to the dominant managerial social roles to emphasize the social difference between the opponents and, thus, to psychologically oppress him. This tactic can be chosen both consciously and subconsciously. The following example demonstrates subconscious usage of this tactic:

(5) **GRISWOLD**: Mr. Shirley, merry Christmas.

**MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]**: Who’s that?

**GRISWOLD**: It’s me, Clark Griswold.

**MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]**: What do you want?

**GRISWOLD**: My wife and I came up with a little something special. It’s a gift.

**MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]**: Put it over there with the others, Greaseball (Hughes, 1989).

The boss (*Mr. Shirley*) embodies the tactic of humiliating a partner with a subordinate social role, emphasizing that his Christmas gift is not unique as he got many of them. He orders Griswold to put his gift in the common pile of gifts in the corner of his office room (*Put it over there with the others*). The boss calls Griswold “Greaseball” neglecting his real surname. The boss’s dominant role is also demonstrated by the short general question he asks the subordinate entering the room, and which is under the circumstances sounds in a very rude and impolite way (*What do you want?*).

The strategies and tactics of discursive personalities with dominant social roles in the managerial discourse are summarized in Table 1 below.
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Table 1
The Strategies and Tactics of Discursive Personalities Performing Dominant Social Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tactics (max 100%)</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demonstration and grounding of the own dominant social position</td>
<td>cooperative strategy of a dominant social role realization</td>
<td>• converging with a communicative partner (26.0%); • approving a communicative partner's social role (23.0%)</td>
<td>approving expressions; addressing to a partner by his/her first name; emphasizing a partner’s positive features; mitigation of authoritativeness / approving authoritativeness / approving sight, nod; mild tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-cooperative strategy of a dominant social role realization</td>
<td>• demonstrating own dominance (19.0%); • didactic influence on a partner performing the subordinate social role (17.0%); • humiliating a partner performing a subordinate social role (13.0%)</td>
<td>imperatives; warning expressions; threats; teasing and offending provoking an opponent’s feeling of anxiety; neglecting correct pronunciation of personal names of subordinates / angry sight; avoiding eye contact; raising of the voice; terse tone; rough gestures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratio of the tactics is calculated considering that the illustrations for each strategy of performing dominant or subordinate roles (both cooperative and non-cooperative) make up 100% (where 2.0% is the probability of inaccuracy).

The strategy of the subordinate social role realization. Under the administrative conditions, socialization of the individual, the regulation of his social behavior is carried out through the system of social regulation of behavior and activities. The strategy of the subordinate social role realization in the managerial discourse is implemented through the cooperative tactics of confirming a partner’s dominant role and flattering. As well as through non-cooperative tactics of rejecting a partner’s dominant role and neglecting a partner’s dominant social role. The tactic of confirming a partner's dominant role is realized at the verbal level through the agreement with the boss, as the expression of obedience:

(6) MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: Were you working on that non-nutritive cereal varnish?
GRISWOLD: Yes, sir.
MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: I gotta give a speech to a trade group. I'd like to mention it. Write a summary and have it to me by the end of the day.
GRISWOLD: My pleasure.
MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: Layman’s terms. None of that inside bullshit jargon nobody understands.
GRISWOLD: Yes, sir (Hughes, 1989).

Implementing the subordinate social role, the speaker agrees with his boss’s decisions (Yes, sir) making him sure that everything will be done appropriately, according to his requirements. Moreover, the subordinate demonstrates that the task will be performed by him with pleasure (My pleasure), displaying interest in his work.

In the managerial discourse the tactic of flattering is popular among speakers with a subordinate social role. It is used to win their bosses’ favour which can be a good precondition for a successful career and job opportunities according to their opinion:

(7) GRISWOLD: Oh, Mr. Shirley. We got your Christmas card the other day... And my family and I are very flattered that you remembered us.
MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: Corporate cards (Hughes, 1989).

By using flattering as a means of confirmation Mr. Shirley’s dominant social role (We got your Christmas card the other day... And my family and I are very flattered that you remembered us) the subordinate tries to direct the communication to a cooperative flow. The tactic is embodied through the emphasis of the importance of the boss’s greetings to the whole Griswolds’ family though the greeting cards are corporate, and sent not personally by the boss to the Griswolds. In this case using the interjection (oh) and the boss’s name as a direct appeal to him (Mr. Shirley) serves as a way to emphasize the boss’s superiority. The boss’s response breaks the presupposed positive effect of the flattery by emphasizing the equality of all the workers and that all of them got corporate Christmas cards.

A non-cooperative tactic of rejecting a partner’s dominant role is implemented by the speaker on condition of a subordinate’s offence by a manager:

(8) GRISWOLD [to his family at the boss’s absence]: I’d like Frank Shirley, my boss, right here, tonight. I want him brought from his happy holiday slumber on Melody Lane... with all the other rich people, and I want him right here. With a big ribbon on his head. I wanna look him
straight in the eye and tell him... what a cheap, lying, no good, rotten, low-life, ignorant, brainless... (Hughes, 1989).

The employee Griswold is upset that he hasn’t been given a bonus this year from his boss though he was useful for the company and prepared a successful report. He cannot show his utter dissatisfaction to his boss directly so he says all these obscene words (what a cheap, lying, no good, rotten, low-life, ignorant, brainless) in the absence of his boss but in the presence of his family members.

Interlocutors with lower social roles and statuses within the managerial discourse also use the tactic of neglecting the opponent’s dominant social role as a means of protection of their self-esteem and reduction of the psychological pressure towards them. At the same time, they use generalizations and avoid being on the “first name terms”, thus not destroying entirely the precepts that have developed in the society with regard to the binary nature of social roles “dominant – subordinate”.

(9) MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: I cut out bonuses this year.
GRISWOLD: Yeah. Thanks for telling us. I was expecting a check. Instead, I got enrolled in a jelly club. Seventeen years with the company. I’ve gotten a bonus every year but this one. You don’t give bonuses, fine! But when people count on them as part of their salary...
MR. SHIRLEY [BOSS]: ... well, what you did just plain...
GRISWOLD: Thank you, Russ. My cousin-in–law, whose heart is bigger than his brain ...
RUSS [GRISWOLD’S COUSIN-IN-LAW]: I appreciate that, Clark.
GRISWOLD:... is innocent. I’ll be more than happy to take the rap on this. On behalf of myself and every other employee you rear-ended this Christmas... (Hughes, 1989).

The employee Griswold is in some way destroying the existing moral and behavioural rules concerning the social role of a subordinate in a binary opposition “dominant – subordinate”. At the verbal level, he first agrees with the opinion of his boss (Yeah; fine); then he proves his dissatisfaction by giving arguments of his devotion to the company: he mentions the exact number of years he has been working for the company (Seventeen years with the company); his responsible work was well rewarded regularly (I’ve gotten a bonus every year but this one). But this year he got bonus instead, implying its needlessness (Instead I got enrolled in a jelly club). Then Clark uses generalization technique
showing the preoccupation of all the employees with the question of bonuses (But when people count on them as part of their salary...) and completes the conversation with courtesy (On behalf of myself and every other employee). Frank expression of the opinion in the managerial communication endangers the cooperative flow of communication in the social role configuration of being dominant or subordinate.

The strategies and tactics of discursive personalities with subordinate social roles are summarized in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tactics (max 100%)</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supporting an opponent’s dominant role</td>
<td>cooperative strategy of a subordinate social role realization</td>
<td>• confirming a partner’s dominant role (31.0%); • flattering (19.0%)</td>
<td>appealing to the positive self-esteem; emphasizing the common features with the opponent performing a dominant social role; demonstrating the importance of the opponent’s opinion; exaggerating the opponent’s positive qualities; using adulation and glose / agreeing signs; nods; mild tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disapproval of an opponent’s dominant role</td>
<td>non-cooperative strategy of a subordinate social role realization</td>
<td>• rejecting a partner’s dominant role (29.0%); • neglecting a partner’s dominant social role (19.0%)</td>
<td>expressions-arguments of the personal opinion; use of the implicit expressions; generalizations aiming at appealing to the addressee's feelings; obscene words / dissatisfying sights; reproaching tone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussions**

The focus of linguistic research around human beings and communicative processes led to the creation of a discursive-communicative paradigm which enables to consider social-psychological role characteristics of the interlocutors, as status, age, gender, etc., in the process of their communication (Byelova, 1997; Martynyuk, 2016; Coates, 2016; Gal, 1991; Labov, 2006; Romaine, 2001;
Schwartz et al., 2013; Van Herk Chichester, 2012; Wodak, 2015). A progressive step towards the study of the human speech was the involvement of the linguistic identity doctrines (Ashforth & Mahwah, 2001), a discursive personality theory (Soloshchuk, 2006; Petlyuchenko & Chernyakova, 2019), interpretation of the dependence of speech behaviour on the communicative situation (Ushchyna, 2015; Cromdal et al., 2012; Goffman, 1979; Goodwin, 2000), study of communicative strategies and tactics in the production of explicit and implicit meanings of the utterance (Bezugla, 2010; Prykhodko, 2013; Frolova, 2015; Maillat & Oswald, 2009; Skinner, 2014, etc.).

The strategies of lingual and psychological behavior have been investigated by the researchers in the following sub-types of the institutional discourse: in the diplomatic (Sudus, 2017), scientific (Ivanytska, 2021), state-administerial (Shklyaruk, 2016), medical (Tukova, 2018), political (Slavova, 2012; Udilova, 2013), pedagogical (Oliyar, 2016), judicial (Shvetsova, 2014) types of discourse.

By constructing his discourse, the dominant speaker in the managerial discourse is implanting a model of obedience into the subordinates’ collective psyche: they are both psychologically and emotionally forced to obey the boss’s instructions and support his social representations at almost all levels. The subordinate may achieve his goals and his strategies can bring the intended effect if planned and performed adequately at all levels (verbal/non-verbal, psychological). So, the strategies for the social roles implementation in the managerial discourse are presented by the strategy of a dominant social role realization and the strategy of a subordinant social role realization, which is predetermined by the fact that the communication in the managerial discourse highly depends on the degree of power and the hierarchy of status-role relations.

It is proved that the strategy of the dominant social role realization is implemented through cooperative tactics of converging with a communicative partner; approving a communicative partner’s social role; and non-cooperative tactics of demonstrating one’s own dominant social role; didactic influence on a partner performing the subordinate social role; humiliating a partner with a subordinate social role. The cooperative tactic of converging with a communicative partner prevails (26.0% out of 100%) over the other distinguished tactics, both cooperative and non-cooperative. This result displays that in most
typical cases managers choose democratized and cooperative ways to solve the tasks and to influence their subordinates. The verbal model of communication in this way includes approving expressions; addressing to a partner by his/her first name; emphasizing a partner’s positive features which lead to higher productivity of subordinates, better contributions from workers and increased morale in the society group. The non-verbal model is characterized by mitigation of authoritativeness be such means as an approving look, nod, mild tone which instinctively contribute to a more relaxed and trustworthy psychological atmosphere at the work place.

The strategy of subordinance is implemented through the cooperative tactics of confirming a partner’s dominant role which is distinguished in this research and flattering. As well as through non-cooperative tactics of rejecting a partner’s dominant role and neglecting a partner’s dominant social role. The cooperative tactic of confirming a partner’s dominant role prevails (31.0% out of 100%) over the other distinguished cooperative and non-cooperative tactics. The subordinates strive to solve the conflicts peacefully without resort to extreme methods, thus saving the ecological atmosphere in their micro-society. The verbal model in this way consists of appeal to the manager’s positive self-esteem; emphasis on the common features with the opponent performing a dominant social role; demonstration of the importance of the manager’s opinion. The non-verbal model demonstrates the cooperation via agreeing signs, nods, mild tone which display the subordinate’s loyalty and assistance to his / her manager.

The research proves that the both sides (dominant-subordinate) of the managerial discourse strive to cooperative communication. However, the research indicates to the fact that the next tactic by the percentage ratio among the most widespread ones used by the subordinates is the non-cooperative tactic of rejecting a partner’s dominant role (29.0% out of 100%) while among the tactics used by managers the next tactic is the cooperative tactic of approving a communicative partner’s social role (23.0% out of 100%). In this way the research exposes that the subordinates are 6.0% more likely to use non-cooperative tactics than their managers. This can be explained by the potential psychological role of a “victim” performed by the subordinates who assume their managers to be more powerful and successful. This peculiarity can be also explained by the fact that the managers are more inclined to solve
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the issues with their subordinates cooperatively as they see the things more globally comparing them to the issues of the whole company / organization, etc.

Conclusions

Any managerial communication occurs here and now, this second, every moment. And therefore, we can control our behavior causing a corresponding psycho-emotional state in a communicative partner. Experienced leaders today are interested, first of all, in soft and conflict-free management methods. The creation of a non-aggressive, non-offensive atmosphere creates a favorable psychological climate of mutual trust and cooperation. Gentle managerial methods are much efficient at stimulating labor than insults and punishments.

Non-verbal communication in managerial discourse has incorporated all the basics of non-verbal communication. This unites in one system the optical-kinematic component, which includes pantomime, facial expressions and gestures, as well as the extralinguistic component, where such parameters as the tonality of the voice, its timbre, range, tempo, intonation and quality are present. Thanks to the competent application of these techniques, it is possible to significantly increase the semantic significance of the transmitted information.

Managerial discourse has absorbed all the basics of non-verbal communication. This combines into one system the kinesic component, which includes facial expressions and gestures; prosodic component, where there are such parameters as the tonality of the voice, its timbre, range, tempo, intonation and quality; as well as the proxemic component, denoting the distance between communicants. Thanks to the competent application of these techniques, it is possible to significantly increase the semantic significance of the transmitted information.

Thus, the psycholinguistic approach to the analysis of social roles in the managerial discourse contributes to the development of the discourse analysis, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. The awareness of the strategies used in the managerial discourse and the correct use of them can contribute to the better understanding of each other and as a result to the efficient work. The research has further perspectives in the study of verbal and non-verbal components in other types of the
institutional discourse, which are based on the binary psychological opposition “dominant – subordinate”, and are characterized by horizontal role relationships. The study of these peculiarities are also of high importance for the ecolinguistic approach to the study of the language. The methods formed for the scenario construction of non-stereotypical situations of social roles realization / change are of constitutive essence for socio- and psycholinguistics. Consideration of the intercultural factor influencing the process of performing different social roles will also contribute to the modern studies of discourse.
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АНОТАЦІЯ
Вступ. Ця робота зосереджена на дослідженні вербального та невербального репертуару мовця, який змінює свої соціальні ролі в управлінському типі дискурсу в психолінгвістичному ракурсі. Метою цього аналізу є розглянути стратегії та тактики виконання соціальних ролей із детальним психолінгвістичним аналізом вербального та невербального репертуару мовців. Беручи до уваги ментальні уявлення мовця, соціолінгвістичні характеристики, що трактуються як соціальний статус і ролі мовця, а також саму комунікативну ситуацію, цілі дослідження є наступними: (1) дослідити вплив управлінського контекstu спілкування на вербальний і невербальний репертуар мовця при переході від управлінської ролі до підлеглої або від підлеглої ролі до ролі керівника; (2) проаналізувати різницю в реалізації комунікативних strategій одним і тим же мовцем, який виконує в управлінському дискурсі або роль лідера, або підлеглу соціальну роль.
Матеріали та методи. Дослідження виконано на основі 578 діалогічних фрагментів із кіносценаріїв та художньої літератури, в яких представлена зміна соціальних ролей дискурсивною особистістю в дискурсі управління. У статті використано дискурсивний аналіз, контекстний та ситуативний аналіз, прагма-лінгвістичний аналіз, елементи кількісних розрахунків.
Результати. У статті виокремлено мовленнєвий і немовленнєвий репертуар реалізації комунікативних стратегій і тактик виконання соціальних ролей в управлінському дискурсі. Їх співвідношення розраховано в дослідженні, щоб відобразити найбільш ефективні для успішного виконання ролі. У роботі пояснюється, що використання стереотипних вербальних і невербальних моделей спілкування в управлінському дискурсі сприяє усвідомленню певної соціальної ролі, а отже, досягненню ділових і психологічних цілей.
Висновки. Ієрархізація статусно-рольових відносин в управлінському дискурсі впливає на вербальний і невербальний репертуар мовця. Це знайшло відображення у вербальних і невербальних засобах реалізації стратегій домінування та підпорядкування в управлінському дискурсі. Перспективним напрямком дослідження є вивчення дискурсивної варіативності вербальних і невербальних комунікативних компонентів, які забезпечують виконання соціальних ролей у міжкультурному управлінському дискурсі з урахуванням психолінгвістичних особливостей мовця.
Ключові слова: вербальний компонент комунікації, дискурс менеджменту, невербальний компонент комунікації, соціальна роль, стратегія, тактика.