قضايا لغوية
LINGUISTIC ISSUES

Volume : 07 Number : 01 June 2026 Pages : 152 - 170

الاستراتيجيات التداولية في الدبلوماسية الإنسانية: تحليل لغوي لخطاب التفاوض والوساطة

Pragmatic Strategies in Humanitarian Diplomacy: A Linguistic Analysis of Negotiation and Mediation Discourse

Ahmed Kaid Thabet Alshokhada*
Thamar University, Yemen

Dr. Marwah Hatem Khaleel
Al-Iraqia University

Received date: 04/03/2026	Acceptance date: 10/05/2026	Publication date: 15/12/2026

ملخص

تناولت هذه الدراسة الدور المحوري للاستراتيجيات التداولية في الدبلوماسية الإنسانية، حيث تُعدّ الفعالية في التواصل أمرًا بالغ الأهمية لنجاح المفاوضات ووساطات الحلول. قامت الدراسة بفحص الاستراتيجيات التداولية التي يستخدمها الدبلوماسيون في البيئات المتأثرة بالنزاعات والسياسات الحساسة، بهدف فهم كيفية تأثير جودة اللغة وفعاليتها على قدرتهم في الوصول، والتفاوض، والوساطة. باستخدام منهجية وصفية-تحليلية نوعية، أجرت الدراسة تحليلًا للخطاب التداولي للبيانات المختارة بعناية، بما في ذلك البيانات الرسمية، وموجزات المفاوضات، وخطاب الوساطة. كشفت التحليلات أن الدبلوماسيين يستخدمون بشكل مستمر استراتيجيات الأدب، والالتباس الاستراتيجي، واللطف غير المباشر، والتخفيف لإدارة الديناميكيات الشخصية، وتخفيف التوتر، وتحقيق الأهداف الإنسانية. تُظهر النتائج أن فهم التداولية يلعب دورًا استراتيجيًا في الدبلوماسية الإنسانية، مع تسليط الضوء على ضرورة امتلاك الممارسين للكفاءة التداولية. تسهم هذه الدراسة في تعزيز الدراسات اللغوية في السياقات الإنسانية، مؤكدة على أهمية التواصل الفعال لتحقيق الأهداف الإنسانية.

الكلمات المفاتيح: التداولية؛ الدبلوماسية الإنسانية؛ التفاوض؛ الوساطة؛ تحليل الخطاب.

Abstract

This study investigated the pivotal role of pragmatic strategies in humanitarian diplomacy, where effective communication is crucial for successful negotiations and mediations. The study examined the pragmatic strategies employed by humanitarian diplomats in conflict-affected and politically sensitive environments, aiming to understand how language quality and effectiveness impact their ability to access, negotiate, and mediate. Employing a qualitative descriptive-analytical methodology, the study conducted a pragmatic discourse analysis of purposively selected data, including official statements, negotiation briefings, and

* **Corresponding author:** Ahmed Kaid Thabet Alshokhada **E-mail:** adkdtt@tu.edu.ye

CC BY NC
E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

mediation discourse. The analysis revealed that humanitarian diplomats consistently utilize politeness strategies, indirectness, mitigation, and strategic ambiguity to manage interpersonal dynamics, alleviate tension, and achieve humanitarian objectives. The findings demonstrate that understanding pragmatics plays a strategic role in humanitarian diplomacy, highlighting the need for humanitarian practitioners to possess pragmatic competence. This study contributes to the advancement of linguistic studies in humanitarian contexts, emphasizing the importance of effective communication in achieving humanitarian goals.

Keywords: Pragmatics; Humanitarian Diplomacy; Negotiation; Mediation; Discourse Analysis.

1. Introduction

With the increase in conflicts and crises around the world today, humanitarian diplomacy is more important than ever before. Humanitarian diplomacy allows agencies involved with providing humanitarian assistance to stabilize the delivery of the aid provided during times of armed conflict and political instability. Utilizing the core principles of neutrality, independence, and impartiality, humanitarian diplomatic activities can take place within an environment in which there are multiple state and non-state actors involved. As Xi and Wang (2024) note, that “negotiation is a communication activity between two or more parties and arises only when the needs of the parties involved are likely to be met through the actions of the other” (p. 43). In this context, communication is used as a strategic resource rather than as a technical means of transmission, as each party involved needs to be able to establish a relationship of trust and cooperation. Humanitarian negotiations and mediation processes, therefore, are particularly sensitive due to the fact that they take place in an environment characterized by asymmetrical power dynamics, competing political interests, and increased emotion and moral stakes. According to Lum (2012, xiv), negotiation "signifies any discussion in order to reach an agreement which embraces almost any situation where people are trying to persuade and influence each other." This broad definition highlights the complexity of negotiation processes. In contrast, Kolmackova (2011, p. 14) suggests that "distributive negotiation, also referred to as slicing the pie or win-lose bargaining, is grounded on a competing style." In addition to being sensitive in terms of the afore mentioned factors, negotiation and mediation processes can also be negatively affected by using a confrontational or rigid approach to language.

 E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

For humanitarian diplomatic personnel, this requires using pragmatic strategies to communicate indirect aims, diminish the face-threatening nature of negotiation, and create ongoing collaborative relationships with a variety of actors. As AlIott (2010, p. 38) states, "the context of an utterance represents a source of information that assists the hearer in finding out what the speaker intended to express." This highlights the significance of context in effective communication. Additionally, understanding the context can help individuals navigate complex social situations. Jenkins and Leung (2019) found that “practicing different kinds of conversations, from casual chats to formal discussions, helps learners adjust their language to fit the situation.” (p. 86). This adaptability is crucial in various professional settings, including negotiation. Furthermore, Nieuwmeijer (1988, p. 1) states that "negotiation refers to an exchange of information through communication." In order to facilitate dialogue and decrease tensions within the humanitarian negotiation process, various pragmatic strategies, including politeness, hedging, implicature, and context-sensitive framing, exist from a linguistic perspective. Thompson (2001, p. 43) suggests that "negotiators can increase the probability of obtaining a favourable slice of the pie if they apply ten basic strategies." This implies that negotiation is a skill that can be developed with the right approaches. Negotiation may be described as "an interaction between people to meet their requirements. In other words, every negotiation is a sort of trade where people obtain something at the expense of something else" (Schatzki & Coffey, 1991, p. 180; Al-Youbi, 2025; Babiker, 2024, Wasel, 2020). This trade-off is a fundamental aspect of negotiation, which is a pervasive social activity that manifests across various levels of human interaction. Reflecting this breadth, Mulholland (1991, p. xi) assumes that "negotiation is a social activity which ranges from instances such as discussion of the daily distribution of work within an office to organizing a huge sales campaign intended for an overseas market." Indeed, negotiation is a versatile process that applies to various contexts, including politics. According to Saffah (2022, p. 220), "negotiation is prevailing in the political field where politicians frequently apply it in order to resolve conflicts and achieve the best outcomes." This highlights the importance of negotiation in achieving mutually beneficial results, particularly in high-stakes environments. In practice, effective negotiation requires balancing firmness and flexibility, as seen in pragmatic strategies that

CC BY NC
E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

help humanitarian actors navigate complex situations. These strategies enable them to firmly state their commitment to humanitarian principles while not appearing to coerce and adapt their communication to the rapidly changing context surrounding their organisation's activities. Although these pragmatic strategies are important from a practical standpoint within humanitarian diplomacy, linguistic aspects of this activity have not been examined as thoroughly as they should have been by future researchers, and little has been written about practical examples of how to implement these strategies into negotiation and mediation discourse.

This study will examine the use of several pragmatic strategies within the context of humanitarian diplomatic communication, with particular attention to their manifestation at the linguistic level within negotiation and mediation discourse. Through analysis of discourse from a pragmatic standpoint, this study will enhance understanding of how language serves as a major tool in the practice of humanitarian diplomacy, and how the use of strategic communication contributes to achieving the goals of humanitarian workers in the complex and constantly changing environments in which they work.

1.1. Study Problem

The importance of humanitarian diplomacy is on the rise. However, most studies of this phenomenon have looked primarily at the political and institutional aspects of humanitarian diplomacy, and not enough focus has been paid to the linguistic and pragmatic dimensions of negotiation and mediation in humanitarian diplomacy. Yet since humanitarian workers must continually explore and utilize strategic linguistic tactics to facilitate their sensitive engagement with third parties for humanitarian access in volatile and complex environments, the absence of any comprehensive systematic analysis of these pragmatic tactics within humanitarian diplomatic discourse indicates a major gap in our understanding of how effective negotiating and mediating practices are conducted by humanitarian workers.

1.2. Study Objectives

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1- Identify the core pragmatic strategies used in humanitarian diplomatic discourse.

2- Analyze how these strategies are linguistically expressed in negotiation and mediation contexts.

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

3- Examine the communicative roles of pragmatic strategies in supporting humanitarian goals.

1.3. Study Questions

The study addresses the following questions:

1- What pragmatic strategies are used in humanitarian diplomatic discourse?

2- How are these strategies linguistically realized in negotiation and mediation contexts?

3- What communicative functions do these strategies serve in achieving humanitarian objectives?

1.4. Study Significance

The study studied the importance of pragmatic strategies in humanitarian diplomacy by demonstrating how language is used strategically within conflicts when negotiating and mediating. Furthermore, this research provides an example of how many of the pragmatic strategies, politeness, indirect language, mitigation of language and strategic ambiguity, etc., within Humanitarian Diplomacy can be effectively utilised to promote humanitarian access, mitigate sensitive interactions and increase the level of trust between relevant stakeholders. This study extends the current Academic literature by applying pragmatic discourse analysis methods or principles to the less studied area of humanitarian diplomacy, creating greater potential for collaboration between linguistics and humanitarian studies. Additionally, the practical outcome of this study is in the form of providing valuable tools to enhance humanitarian practitioners training and increase their communication capability, ultimately providing greater opportunities for creating and implementing effective, principled and contextually appropriate humanitarian Interventions based on neutrality, independence and impartiality.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study adopts an empirical theoretical approach that corresponds closely with its qualitative descriptive analytical methodology and its focus on pragmatic discourse analysis within the broader scope of pragmatic theory. The purpose of this theoretical framework is to explain how meaning is constructed in humanitarian diplomatic communication, while simultaneously functioning as an analytical tool that guides the systematic processes of coding, categorizing, and interpreting the research data. As Sifakis (2019) notes, that "the communicative approach's tone lies in its ability to evaluate various features of language

CC BY NC
E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

proficiency outside grammar, such as critical thinking, creativity and problem-solving, contributing to a well-rounded evaluation of language competence". (p. 288). Accordingly, pragmatic theory is employed both as a conceptual lens and as an operational framework that directly informs the analytical procedures described in the data analysis section of this study.

Pragmatics is particularly appropriate for the analysis of humanitarian diplomacy as it emphasizes the interrelationship between language use, communicative function, and contextual influence. Humanitarian negotiations and mediation processes take place within highly complex institutional, political, and ethical environments where meanings are rarely expressed in a fully explicit manner. In such settings, language must be carefully managed to balance authority with neutrality, cooperation, and sensitivity. According to Clark (2018), adopting a flexible mindset is key, "the pragmatic Approach, which emphasizes language's pragmatic and contextual usage in everyday contexts, marks a substantial shift from conventional evaluation techniques in language testing" (p. 170). By focusing on the functional role of utterances in context rather than solely on their propositional content, pragmatics allows for the systematic identification of communicative strategies used by humanitarian actors to pursue access, compliance, and cooperation. The theoretical basis for understanding language as a form of social action and for examining how utterances perform functions such as requesting, expressing obligation, and signalling intent is provided by Speech Act Theory, as developed by Austin (1962) and further refined by Searle (1969). Searle (1969) suggested that "the concept of perlocutionary actions or speech's actual effects on the recipient or listener" (p. 10) is vital to understanding the impact of language. This focus on the "actual effects" aligns with how Speech Act Theory constitutes a central component of the analytical framework for identifying and coding pragmatic moves in humanitarian diplomatic discourse, which serve as the unit of analysis in this study. By examining these outcomes, the study adopts the view of Jenkins & Leung (2019), who note that "the fundamental building blocks of communication, or speech actions, are a central idea in pragmatics" (p. 87).

In humanitarian negotiations, directive and commissive speech acts frequently occur, particularly in contexts involving access provision, solution proposals, and expressions of commitment. However, due to the presence of

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

power asymmetries and contextual sensitivities, these speech acts are most often realized through mitigated or indirect forms in order to reduce imposition and preserve cooperative relationships. As Hussain (2024, p. 384) notes, "the speech act theory's illocutionary, perlocutionary, and locutionary actions are explained in depth, emphasizing that language usage is dynamic and how its context affects interpretation". Through the application of Speech Act Theory, this study demonstrates how humanitarian practitioners perform institutional roles and professional responsibilities while maintaining neutrality and cooperation. According to Alemi & Haeri (2020, p. 83), understanding "the functional and contextual components of language use requires understanding the pragmatic approach and speech act theory". Particularly, politeness theory, as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 160), outline five superstrategies for politeness, spanning from direct to indirect approaches. These include: "bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record, and withhold the FTA." This framework structures their understanding of social interaction. Politeness Theory offers additional insight into how humanitarian actors manage interpersonal interaction and address face concerns during negotiation and mediation. The concept of face is especially relevant in humanitarian communication, as such interactions typically involve multiple actors with varying degrees of power and potentially competing interests.

Consequently, humanitarian communicative exchanges often carry a high risk of face-threatening acts. The effective management of face is therefore essential for sustaining dialogue and facilitating cooperation. In this study, both positive politeness strategies, such as expressions of solidarity and shared interests, and negative politeness strategies, such as hedging, indirectness, and deference, are operationally identified as recurring pragmatic strategies. Politeness Theory thus provides a systematic basis for identifying and interpreting linguistic devices that mitigate face threats, reduce tension, and support ongoing cooperation in humanitarian negotiations.

Importantly, Grice (1989, p. 26–28) identifies four key maxims governing conversational cooperation. The guiding principles for effective communication are: "quality, quantity, relevance, and manner." Intentional deviation from these maxims can lead to "a conversational implicature can be generated" (Grice, 1989), implying more than what's explicitly stated. Grice's framework also applies to

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

humanitarian diplomacy, where indirect communication and implied meaning play a crucial role, incorporating the cooperative principle and its maxims to unpack subtle exchanges. Humanitarian diplomats frequently rely on implicature to convey sensitive information in a manner that avoids confrontation or escalation. This may involve the deliberate non-observance of certain conversational maxims through indirect statements, or the careful observance of these maxims to maintain an appearance of cooperation while conveying implicit expectations or concerns. As De Bartolo (2014, p. 453) notes, "the global spread of English and the different forms and shapes that the language has taken in diverse settings has contributed, especially in recent decades, to the development of a peculiar sociolinguistic phenomenon, which has had implications in a wide range of areas, including linguistic, political, socio-cultural, ideological, and pedagogical." Gricean pragmatics is therefore particularly useful for analysing indirectness, mitigation, and strategic ambiguity, which emerged as prominent analytical categories in the data.

Together, speech act theory, politeness theory, and the cooperative principle constitute an integrated analytical framework that directly informs the data analysis procedures of this study. These theories guide the identification and coding of pragmatic moves, the categorization of pragmatic strategies, and the interpretation of their communicative functions. By linking specific linguistic forms, such as indirect requests, hedging expressions, and ambiguous formulations, to their pragmatic functions, such as reducing resistance, managing face, and sustaining dialogue, the framework enables a coherent and replicable analysis of humanitarian diplomatic discourse. Overall, this theoretical framework ensures methodological consistency across the study by aligning theory, data analysis, and findings, and it provides a structured means of examining how humanitarian diplomats strategically use language to negotiate access, mediate conflicts, and achieve humanitarian objectives within politically sensitive contexts. By operationalizing pragmatic theory within a qualitative discourse analytical methodology, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of language as a strategic resource in humanitarian diplomacy.

2.1 Literature Review

The body of literature on diplomatic and institutional discourse shows that language is a key tool for exercising power, persuading others, and managing

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

conflict. As Al-Smaihyeen et al. (2025) argue, that "language is a powerful tool in political discourse that shapes public perception and constructs ideological narratives. It extends beyond mere communication to functioning as a power, persuasion, and control mechanism" (p. 3596). Much of the empirical research on both historical and contemporary studies demonstrates the importance of using a variety of language strategies to negotiate interests, build relationships, and create a stable context for negotiation. In essence, while language serves as a medium of communication, it can also be considered as an instrument or resource for achieving desired outcomes in mediating and negotiating relationships with others. As such, many scholars have examined and analyzed pragmatic uses of language in relation to speech acts, politeness strategies, mitigation, and implicature; and in political/institutional contexts. According to Fairclough (2015), "speech acts function as a powerful tool in political discourse, conveying information while simultaneously performing actions that affect social and political realities" (p. 17). In particular, study based on Speech Act Theory shows how the use of directives and commitments (e.g., requests) and declarations, have tremendous influence over interlocutors' decisions with little overt confrontation.

The study using politeness theory indicates that face-saving strategies (e.g. indirectness and hedging) play an important role in sustaining cooperation and reducing tensions, particularly in asymmetrical power relationships between interlocutors. The collective body of these studies shows that in addition to dialogue maintenance, the choices made regarding politeness, mitigation, and indirectness in pragmatics support conflict management in political/institutional contexts. The study regarding negotiations has identified indirect and mitigated language in the context of negotiation as being particularly helpful for negotiators to reach agreements and to avoid escalating disagreements. As Maiwald (2015, p. 5) notes, that "negotiation can contain compatible and incompatible interests. In other words, it can include distributive and integrative elements." Studies looking at diplomatic negotiations have identified a tendency for negotiators to avoid making explicit requests when making offers rather, negotiators tend to use strategic proposals that include conditional statements and implicit commitments. According to Kolmackova (2011, p. 16), "the first thing to be realized is that negotiation is a process with some definite steps and phases that every successful negotiator should go through." These strategies allow negotiators to assert their

CC BY NC
E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

negotiating position, while also allowing for flexibility in their relationship with the other party; therefore these ways of communicating are especially important when dealing with protracted and high-stakes negotiations. As Nieuwmeijer (1988, p. 10) argues, "persuasion represents a vital component of negotiation. It is a communicative process that results in a shift of attitude or behaviour." Similarly, the way language is used in context can significantly impact communication, and as Levinson (1983, p. 54) notes, "the most noticeable way in which the relationship between language and context is revealed in the structures of languages themselves is through the phenomenon of deixis." Buiding on this idea, Kehal & Bephoul (2018) argue that "the continuous improvement and growth of pragmatic language testing in the digital sphere will lead to more precise, pertinent, and significant evaluations of students' communicative proficiency as technology develops"(p.13). Despite the progress made in this area of research, there is a lack of practical linguistic research regarding humanitarian diplomacy. Current study on humanitarian action places less emphasis on pragmatic language than on legal frameworks, ethical principles, organisational coordination, and policy analysis, often leaving out or treating language as a neutral or secondary aspect of the overall picture of humanitarian action. There is therefore a lack of empirical research on how actors within the field of humanitarian action strategically adapt their way of communicating to accommodate competing pressures - such as maintaining neutrality while exercising authority, or attempting to persuade parties involved in conflict situations without compromising the principles of humanitarian action. As Reisigl & Wodak (2001) state, "the interplay between presuppositions and speech acts enables politicians to formulate compelling narratives"(p. 50). While limited multidisciplinary research considers the role of communication in humanitarian situations, there is a lack of comprehensive functional analyses (pragmatic) of the real-life dialogue involved with negotiating and mediating humanitarian diplomacy. According to Yule (1996), presupposition can be understood as "something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance" (p. 25). Therefore, it is unclear how humanitarian diplomats utilize different linguistic tools to create trust among their partners or how they utilise the language to operate in an unstable political situation. As Berridge (2010, p. 1) suggests, in international politics, negotiation is "composed of disputes between officially appointed representatives intended to

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

arrive at a formal agreement on a matter that is decisive to their governments' relationship." The lack of data in this area limits the ability to develop theories in the field of pragmatics and comprehend the communication processes of humanitarian diplomacy.

The current project will build on previous studies in both pragmatics and the analysis of diplomatic speaking by using a pragmatic-based framework (theories of pragmatics) to analyse discourse concerning humanitarian negotiations and mediations. This study will identify and enlarge upon the types of communicative strategies (the properties of this language) that humanitarian negotiators and mediators utilise to support the humanitarian cause in these contexts. The findings of the study will help to inform the pragmatic interaction between humanitarian diplomacy and humanitarian assistance.

3. Methodology

This study utilized qualitative analysis to identify the pragmatic strategies used in humanitarian diplomacy, it looked at how language is utilized to accomplish negotiation and mediation objectives within various real-world scenarios.

3.1 Research Design

The researchers employed a qualitative descriptive research design in order to conduct a systematic investigation of pragmatic functions in selected texts; this approach provides a framework for identifying and interpreting linguistic strategies that are consistent with the purpose of the study.

3.2 Data Selection

Data were purposively selected to ensure relevance and richness, including official statements, negotiation briefings, and mediation discourse from international humanitarian organizations such as the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). This approach targets texts where pragmatic strategies are most evident.

3.3 Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is the pragmatic move, including speech acts, politeness strategies, indirect expressions, and mitigation devices, to link linguistic forms to communicative functions.

3.4 Sample of Data

CC BY NC
E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

The following examples illustrate the application of theoretical frameworks to real-world humanitarian communication:

Example 1	Indirect Request	"We would appreciate considering access arrangements."
Example 2	Politeness Strategy	We value your continued cooperation."
Example 3	Mitigation	It may be helpful to explore alternative options…"
Example 4	Strategic Ambiguity	Appropriate measures will be taken…"
Example 5	Commissive Act	We remain committed to supporting civilians…"

3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis procedures involved textual analysis, wherein communicative actions were identified and coded utilizing Speech Act Theory, Politeness Theory, and Grice's Cooperative Principle. Triangulation techniques were employed to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

3.6 Validity and Reliability

Credibility was ensured through theoretical grounding, consistent coding criteria, transparent data selection, and triangulation across multiple texts, guaranteeing trustworthy and replicable findings.

Methodology Summary Table

Step	Description	Unit of Analysis	Analytical Tools/Framework
1	**Data collection**	Humanitarian diplomatic texts (statements, briefings, mediation discourse)	Purposive sampling
2	**Text reading & familiarization**	Contextual interaction segments	Close reading, notes
3	**Coding**	Pragmatic moves (speech acts, politeness strategies, indirectness,	Speech Act Theory, Politeness Theory, Grice's Cooperative Principle

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

		mitigation)	
4	**Interpretation**	Function and role of each pragmatic strategy	Theoretical framework alignment
5	**Verification**	Consistency and reliability check	Triangulation, cross-text comparison

4. Results

The findings of this section are based on the qualitative pragmatic discourse analysis methodology. A qualitative pragmatic analysis of humanitarian diplomatic discourse reveals how specific pragmatic strategies systematically manage sensitive negotiation and mediation. The analysis found that both directive and commissive speech acts were widely used in humanitarian negotiations, but direct and authoritative phrasing for requests and commitments were mostly avoided. Requests and commitments were softened to avoid pressuring partners during negotiations and allow humanitarian actors to maintain neutrality while pursuing their goals. Additionally, the use of mitigation strategies, such as hedging and indirect language, was prevalent in humanitarian negotiations. This approach enabled negotiators to convey their messages effectively without jeopardizing relationships or causing offense.

4.1 Use of Speech Acts in Humanitarian Negotiation

The analyses showed that directive and commissive speech acts were frequently employed during humanitarian negotiations, often in a manner that avoided direct or authoritative phrasing. Speakers softened requests and commitments, using alternative means to seem less demanding and reduce pressure on negotiation partners. By using speech acts in this way, humanitarian organizations achieved their goals while maintaining neutrality. Notably, the strategic use of speech acts facilitated effective communication and helped build trust between parties.

4.2 Politeness Strategies and Face Management

Politeness strategies were a major component of the fiat-mediating discourse analysis. The sample contained both positive politeness (expressions of mutual concern or common interest) and negative politeness (words expressing hedging and indirect phrasing). Both forms of politeness protected negotiators' faces and

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

facilitated constructive dialogue. These politeness strategies were crucial in maintaining a positive atmosphere during negotiations.

4.3 Indirectness and Mitigation

Data indicated a reliance on indirect language and mitigation strategies in negotiations. Humanitarian diplomats used conditional or suggestive language instead of direct demands, allowing dialogue to continue in politically sensitive environments. This indirect approach enabled negotiators to navigate complex situations effectively.

4.4 Strategic Ambiguity in Mediation Discourse

One notable finding was the use of strategic ambiguity, allowing negotiators to provide vague or flexible statements with multiple interpretations. This enabled both parties to maintain their positions without obstructing the negotiation process, critical for continuing dialogue in conflict-sensitive environments. Strategic ambiguity facilitated creative problem-solving and helped parties find common ground.

Table 1: Pragmatic Strategies in Humanitarian Diplomatic Discourse

Pragmatic Strategy	Linguistic Example (Illustrative)	Communicative Function
Indirect Request	We would appreciate considering access arrangements.	Reduces imposition and resistance
Politeness Strategy	We value your continued cooperation	Maintains positive relations
Mitigation	It may be helpful to explore alternative options.	Softens proposals
Strategic Ambiguity	Appropriate measures will be taken…	Allows flexible interpretation
Commissive Act	We remain committed to supporting civilians…	Builds trust and credibility

5. Interpretation and Discussion

The data reveal that context-sensitive language use is crucial in humanitarian diplomacy. Specifically, polite communication strategies, indirect language, and strategic ambiguity work together to achieve negotiation and mediation goals.

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

These strategies demonstrate that successful diplomatic outcomes rely on maintaining rapport with the other party and respecting their role in their society and political system. But what does this mean in practice? It means that diplomats need to be aware of the cultural nuances and tailor their approach accordingly, taking into account the local customs, values, and power dynamics. For instance, in some cultures, direct communication is seen as aggressive, while in others, it's a sign of respect. The use of indirect or softened language creates a comfortable atmosphere, allowing both parties to discuss substantive issues while reducing tension. This approach also mitigates the risk of escalating hostilities. For instance, using phrases like "We appreciate your efforts" or "We understand the challenges you're facing" can go a long way in diffusing tension. Additionally, using modal verbs like "could" or "would" can help soften the tone and make the language more collaborative.

Strategic ambiguity allows both parties to interpret statements differently and remain engaged in dialogue despite opposing interests. This approach requires a deep understanding of the context and the parties involved, as well as the ability to read between the lines. By using ambiguous language, diplomats can create a sense of shared understanding without committing to a specific course of action. These three pragmatic language strategies show that humanitarian diplomacy negotiation is not just about transferring information or issuing directives. It's about carefully manipulating linguistic subtleties to balance humanitarian and political imperatives. This requires a high degree of emotional intelligence, cultural competence, and linguistic skill.

The integration of these strategies demonstrates that successful communication between diplomats results from combining politeness, indirectness, and ambiguity to foster cooperation and provide access to at-risk populations. But how can diplomats apply these strategies effectively? By being aware of their own communication style and adapting it to the context, they can build trust and credibility with their counterparts. The findings also indicate that diplomatic professionals can use these technical aspects to navigate the challenges of providing humanitarian assistance. For example, indirect language can help maintain dignity, while strategic ambiguity can help find common ground without risking public image. Moreover, these strategies can be used to build relationships, establish common goals, and create a sense of shared purpose.

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

One potential challenge is ensuring that these strategies are used authentically and not perceived as manipulative. Diplomats need to be genuine in their approach and prioritize building trust with their counterparts. This requires a deep understanding of their own values and motivations, as well as a commitment to transparency and honesty. The interconnections of these techniques highlight their importance as effective instruments for addressing complex problems and achieving humanitarian outcomes. By mastering these strategies, diplomats can improve their negotiation skills and make a meaningful impact in high-pressure situations, ultimately saving lives and promoting peace.

6. Conclusion

This study elucidates the pivotal role of pragmatic strategies, including politeness, indirectness, mitigation, and strategic ambiguity, in facilitating effective humanitarian diplomacy. The findings demonstrate that humanitarian agencies' adept use of these tactics is crucial in navigating intricate negotiations, conflict resolution, and maintaining neutrality within complex political environments. The study highlights that successful humanitarian interventions hinge not only on material resources and logistical support but also on diplomatic acumen, trust-building, and relationship management with diverse stakeholders. The strategic deployment of language emerges as a critical factor in achieving these objectives. Consequently, integrating pragmatic approaches into training and professional development programs is likely to enhance humanitarian professionals' diplomatic effectiveness and ethical decision-making capabilities. Furthermore, this study underscores the importance of considering linguistic and cultural nuances in humanitarian diplomacy. The findings suggest that recognizing and adapting to these differences can significantly impact negotiation outcomes and conflict resolution processes. By combining practical training with knowledge and skill, humanitarian organizations can foster a more sustainable and effective humanitarian response culture, ultimately advancing their principles and objectives.

7.References

1. Alemi, M., & Haeri, N. S. (2020). Robot assisted instruction of L2 pragmatics: Effects on young EFL learners' speech act performance. *Language Learning & Technology, 24*(2), 82–101. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/44727

2. Allott, N. (2010). *Key terms in pragmatics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
3. Al-Smaihyeen, M. M., Rashid, R. A., Al-Ramahi, R. A., Al-Hanaqtah, M. F., Abualadas, O. A., & Al-Shamayleh, T. S. (2025). Forced displacement and rhetoric: A pragmatic analysis of presuppositions and speech acts in Trump's discourse on the Gaza Strip. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 15*(11), 3595–3605. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1511.12
4. Bai, H., Tang, J., & Wang, N. (2025). The pragmatic strategies of politeness principles and role balance of interpreters in Sino-U.S. diplomatic negotiations. *Pacific International Journal, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v8i4.842
5. Berridge, G. R. (2010). Diplomacy: Theory and practice. Palgrave.
6. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use.* Cambridge University Press.
7. Clark, E. V. (2018). Conversation and language acquisition: A pragmatic approach. *Language Learning and Development, 14(*3), 170–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2017.1340843
8. De Bartolo, A. M. (2014). Pragmatic strategies and negotiation of meaning in ELF talk. *EL.LE, 3*(3), 453-464.
9. Fairclough, N. (2015). Language and power (3rd ed.). Routledge.
10. Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words.* Harvard University Press.
11. Hussain, S. S. (2024). Testing EFL communication: Speech Act Theory and the Communicative Approach. *Arab World English Journal, 15*(1), 384–400. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no1.24
12. Jenkins, J., & Leung, C. (2019). From mythical standard to standard reality: The need for alternatives to standardized English language tests. *Language Teaching, 52*(1), 86–110. https://doi.org/10.1017/S02614448180000307
13. Kehal, M., & Beghoul, Y. (2018). Using a pragmatic approach to develop the English learners' pragmatic communicative strategies (Doctoral dissertation). Université Frères Mentouri-Constantine 1. http://depot.umc.edu.dz/handle/123456789/2622
14. Lum, G. (2012). The Negotiation Fieldbook. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

15. Mulholland, J. (1991). The language of negotiation. Routledge.
16. Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism. Routledge.
17. Saffah, M. D. (2022). The pragmatics of negotiation in peace treaties. *The Islamic College University Journal, 2*(67), 219–240. Retrieved from https://search.mandumah.com/Record/1316491
18. Schatzki, M., & Coffey, W. (1981). Negotiation: The art of getting what you want. Berkley.
19. Searle, I. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Phils.sophy of Lan8uage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
20. Sifakis, N. C. (2019). ELF awareness in English language teaching: Principles and processes. *Applied Linguistics, 40*(2), 288–306. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx034
21. Xi, H., & Wang, P. (2024). An analysis of pragmatic stance in drug negotiation discourse concerning national medical insurance catalogue in China. Athens *Journal of Health & Medical Sciences, 1*(1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.30958/ajhms.11-1-3
22. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
23. Al-Youbi, M. N. S. (2025). Pragmatics and its Role on Developing Linguistic Studies. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies, 7*(2), 9-28. https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i2.2404
24. Babiker, A. A. A.-B. M. (2024). The Speech Acts in Eid Greeting Discourse in Arab Countries from a Pragmatic Perspective. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies, 6*(3), 57-74. https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v6i3.2064
25. Maiwald, A. (2015). Power, Negotiation Type and Negotiation Tactics (Unpublished M.A. thesis). University of Twente.
26. Wasel, E. (2020). Speech Acts in the collection poems: Abgadeyat Al-Rroh "Alphabet of the Spirit", *The Pioneers of Language and Masterpieces of Literature Journal, 1*(1), 74-98.

8. Disclaimer Regarding the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

This manuscript has been prepared entirely through the authors' own efforts, without the use of any Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools in the

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894

processes of writing, editing, or preparation. All contents are exclusively the product of the authors' work, without any support or assistance from artificial intelligence technologies.

9. Declaration of Absence of Conflict of Interest

We, the authors of this article, declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to the research from which this article was derived, nor to its authorship or publication.

10. Author Contributions

Author Contributions: Dr. Ahmed Kaid Thabet Alshokhada and Dr. Marwah Hatem Khaleel contributed equally to conceptualization, methodology, data analysis, and writing the original draft. Ahmed Kaid Thabet Alshokhada was responsible for literature review and data collection. Dr. Marwah Hatem Khaleel was responsible for discourse analysis and revision. Both authors approved the final manuscript.

11. Sources of Research Funding and Support

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

12. Author Information

Dr. Ahmed Kaid Thabet Alshokhada is a Lecturer of English Literature in the Department of English Language, Faculty of Education, Thamar University, Yemen. His research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics, and literary studies. E-mail: adkdtt@tu.edu.ye ; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7170-2301

Dr. Marwah Hatem Khaleel is a faculty member in Digital Journalism, Department of Media, Al-Iraqia University. Her research focuses on media discourse, digital journalism, and communication strategies. E-mail: marwaaltahan2020@gmail.com ; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6051-1919

E-ISSN - 2773-2886 / ISSN - 2773-2894