Subordinate's Imperatives in Faculty Meetings: Pragmalinguistic Affordances in Tagalog and Local Academic Conditions

Leonardo O. Munalim

School of Arts and Sciences - Philippine Women's University, and
College of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Research - Philippine
Normal University-Manila, PHILIPPINES
Email: lomunalim@pwu.edu.ph

Cecilia F. Genuino

College of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Research - Philippine
Normal University-Manila, PHILIPPINES
Email: genuino.cf@pnu.edu.ph

Abstract

Subordinate's imperatives are generally known to be a sort of a deviant speech act, especially when employed for a person in authority to do something. This paper explores two major dimensions that underpin the possible forbearance of the subordinate's imperatives. Firstly, it is shown that the Tagalog basic imperative has pragmalinguistic properties that may be followed or broken based on some socio-pragmalinguistic affordances. Secondly, a number of contextual factors such as power, distance, and ranking, including the Filipino cultural and academic orientation of *pakikisama* or smooth interpersonal relationships are described. The study employed Conversation Analysis and socio-pragmatic analytic approach. The imperatives came from five meetings from three departments in a private university in Manila, Philippines. The meetings lasted for 5 hours and 50 minutes. Results show Tagalog Basic Imperative has pragmalinguistic properties that may be followed or broken based on the following likelihood: the awkwardness, indirectness and insincerity of mitigated imperatives; and the level of urgency for the hearer to do something. The giver's socio-pragmatic conditions also hasten the production of imperatives. The results draw into the conclusion that within the sphere of a faculty meeting, subordinate's imperatives are socio-pragmalinguistically legitimate, acceptable and non-deviant within the Tagalog linguistic landscape. Although the analyses are parochially based on Tagalog, implications of these microscopic findings bear out cross-linguistic, universal and cross-cultural relevance.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Faculty Meeting, Socio-pragmalinguistics, Tagalog Imperatives

Introduction

This paper aims to account for the socio-pragmalinguistic parameters of the subordinate's imperatives for the Chair of the faculty meeting to do something. The lens includes the analysis of the linguistic affordances of the subordinate's Tagalog basic imperatives and the socio-pragmatic local academic conditions. The corpus-driven imperatives in this study were predominantly uttered in Tagalog. English imperatives occurred only twice. Hence, Tagalog imperatives are given special attention. Brown (2010) maintains that linguistic resources vary across languages that would merit sorts of structures in languages with different cultural orientations and background; the social pragmatic functions received by the hearer; and the cultural and linguistic underpinnings of the speech act.

To the knowledge of these authors, no studies have been conducted that described how Tagalog imperatives are employed by subordinates in a faculty meeting. No studies of Tagalog imperatives were conducted that describe the absence of polite markers used in professional discourses. Investigating Tagalog imperatives in the context of the faculty meeting within the Philippine cultural landscape offers more insights about how they are employed and acted upon by the speaker, and how they are received by the hearer with different local academic conditions of power, distance, and ranking including their cultural orientations in the academe. Although the data are parochially based on Tagalog language, the findings may be used for cross-linguistic comparisons (Asuka, 2018; Brown, 2010) where imperatives are employed in professional discourses such as a meeting.

(Im)Politeness Principles

In CA, Gardner (2004) explains that "one examines the data with a few assumptions and preconceptions about what is going on as possible, and with nothing being dismissed *a priori* as disorderly, accidental, or trivial" (p. 267). Notwithstanding, Gardner at the same time, believes that the rejection of *a priori* reasoning is "difficult, if not impossible, to achieve completely" (p. 267). This study was subtly guided that the features in the meetings were not predicted *a priori* given that this study looked into new, interesting, and/or deviant features. What were then predicted *a priori* are the sets of politeness principles and socio-pragmatic descriptions and analyses attached to the corpus-driven features of subordinate's imperatives.

(Im)politeness principles fall within socio-pragmatics (Culpeper, 2011). Theoretically, any speaker's attempt to take turns during a conversation must be carried out with some politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987) expound this theory of the negative and positive face—all considered a public self-image. The positive face is the desirable positive self-image or personality displayed by an interactant while the negative face is the "basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction such as freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (p. 61). Meanwhile, politeness strategies may be flouted due to prevalent cases of familiarity to one another. This idea corroborates that politeness strategies are much easier to be negotiated between and among familiar and intimate individuals (Kasper, 1997). Notably, Brown and Levinson (1987) are explicit enough to depict that the level of politeness that a speaker can use is actually precipitated by at least three crucial social variables such as power P(ower), D(istance), and R(anking). They argue that these

sociological variables can perhaps cut across all cultures. In this present study, the three-pronged social variables are limited to the following presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Social Variables in the Meeting

Local Conditions	Relationships
Power (in meetings; default)...	Chair > S
Distance (in meetings; default)...	Chair > S
Distance (default knowledge)...	Chair > S
Distance (age)..	Chair < Reg; Reg > S
Distance (accreditation knowledge)...................................	Chair < Reg
Distance (years of teaching experience)	Chair > S; Chair < Reg
Ranking (in meetings; default)...	Chair > S
Ranking (academic; accreditor)...	Chair > S; Reg > S; Reg > Chair

S – (other)subordinates; > – greater/higher/older than; < – lesser/lower/younger than

On Local Academic Conditions

Any observance, deviation or violation from the default structure and speech system of a talk can be well explicated through some local conditions that are directly consequential to the normative and regulative structure of the talk. The local contexts of the conversations are the germane domains of socio-pragmatics. Socio-pragmatics is a user-oriented science of language that centers on the context of language, and how the production and understanding of talk is shaped by context (Mey, 2001). Social context is the site of information transfer, that is, transfer depends on the social, cultural, situational and conversational context (Chen, Geluykens, & Choi, 2006).

Imperatives are not devoid of cultural and linguistic restrictions and affordances. They do not cut across cultures and linguistic resources because languages have their distinct ways of commanding, complimenting, refusing, promising, questioning, and so forth. Brown and Levinson (1987) acknowledge this idea by stating that the degree of some politeness strategies and the use of power are culturally determined, thus may vary from one culture to another. Politeness strategies in the Philippine culture may be used to shield possible incompetency (Andres, 1981; cf. Munalim, 2017) of the person in the authority. This is observed not to strain good relationships because Filipinos are toyed with the Filipino mentality of *pakikisama* or smooth interpersonal relationship (Ledesma, Ochave, Punzalan, & Magallanes, 1981).

A number of local conditions and factors may help one better understand the subordinates' imperatives. Vine (2009) claimed that many contextual factors affect the frequency and expression of directives at work such as the purpose of interaction, participant status, and social distance. To Gibson (2003), contextual factors that can affect the conversation include roles, positions, identities, and symmetrical and asymmetrical relationship, power, constraints, obligations, expectations, task-based factors, social distance, relative power, ranking, schema, and prototype. In this article, these contextual factors are lumped into a tripartite focus considered to be the immediate local conditions

within the academe such as distance, power, and ranking (Brown & Levinson, 1987, Leech, 1983). The socio-pragmatic dimensions also tap the cultural aspects that are immediate to the Filipino cultural terrains. The two-pronged objectives are indispensable in accounting for the subordinate's imperatives as a speech act for the Chair of the meeting to do something.

On (Tagalog) Imperatives

Imperatives are widely known to have been deployed only from top-down asymmetrical fashion both in ordinary or institutional types of talk. That is, the person commanding, directing or prompting someone to do something is expected to have both the ascribed and achieved power or higher status (cf. Vickers, 2014). In any event that a subordinate directs a person in a higher authority, utterances are expected to be constructed pragmalinguistically polite to maximize the positive effects on the hearer, thereby promoting social order, solidarity, and stability (Schiffrin, 2009). This section discusses briefly the structure of the Tagalog basic imperatives which dominated in the corpus. The following sentences exemplify Reg's (subordinate) imperatives from the corpus.

(1)   a. Bigyan mo ng deadline.

   '**(You) give (him/her) the deadline.'**

   b. Bigyan ninyo ng deadline.

   '**(You all) give (him/her) the deadline.'**

(2)   a. Kunin mo na Ma'am.

   '**(You) get it now Ma'am.**

   b. Kunin na ninyo.

   '**(You all) get it now.**

As illustrated in number 1 and 2, the Tagalog basic imperative explicitly indicates the second-person-pronoun actor/s, both singular and plural. In English imperatives, on the other hand, the subject "you" both singular and plural is not usually present. The presence of either singular or plural second-person-pronoun actor clearly pinpoints the actor, which may hasten the intensity of the utterance that could result in the compromise of the positive face of the hearer. The presence of an optional "you" in English may indicate rudeness which does not necessarily mean being rude in Tagalog because the absence of 'mo' ((you)) in Tagalog can make the sentence ungrammatical (Otanes & Schachter, 1972).

Tagalog basic imperative may correspond to the bald-on record strategy in English equivalent. The explicit use of 'mo' ((you)) as the actor of the event which attempts nothing to minimize threats to the hearer strengthens the notion of directness. The use of 'mo' ((you)) as a recipient indicator (Lerner, 2003) shows Reg's (the subordinate) obvious attempt to get the

Chair to do something, and at the same time presents herself with stance of authority. We may also argue that even in the absence of politeness markers in Tagalog imperatives, imperatives may serve specific pragmatic purposes in the meeting. These have to be explored in this present study with the assumption in mind that the linguistic properties of Tagalog imperatives may be used with or without politeness markers.

With all these backdrops in mind, this present study tried to describe the (1) pragmalinguistic properties of Tagalog basic imperatives uttered by the subordinate; and (2) local conditions that hastened the production of the subordinate's imperatives.

Methodology

This present study was anchored on the analytical and theoretical lens of Conversation Analysis (CA henceforth). CA was adopted because its enterprise looks into the specific sequential talk features of discourse is microscopic, case-by-case and corpus-driven in nature. It accepts the analytical fashion that as long as there are new, interesting or deviant features from the data, they are worthy of descriptions in great detail even if they only appear in limited cases (cf. Clifton, 2006; Gumperz, 1982; Kress, 2001; Psathas & Anderson, 1990; Raymond, 2003; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2010; Schegloff, 1987; Schiffrin, 2000; Ten Have, 2007; Walters, 2007; Wooffitt, 2005). The following have been crystallized:

> One of the key tasks of researchers is not to sacrifice the detailed examination of single cases on the altar of broad claims... to examine the detailed analysis of single cases as episodes with their own reality, deserving of their own rigorous analysis without respect to their bearing on the larger argument for which they are being put forward. (Schegloff, 2010, p. 42).

> ...specifying the phenomenon, showing its variants, showing that the participants are oriented to it, etc.—all return to case-by-case analysis; ... One does not go to work on a corpus of data to conduct quantitative or statistical analysis and arrive at findings; rather, one works up to the data case by case. (Schegloff, 2009, p. 389)

Thus, the data examined came from a total of 5 meetings from 3 different departments of a non-sectarian university in Manila, Philippines (School A- 3; School B-1; School C- 1 meeting, respectively). After addressing all ethical qualms, the recordings were done by the official commissioned student-videographers from the same university in June and August 2017. Two department Chairs and 1 dean chaired the meetings. The meetings were composed of an intact group of full-time and part-time university teachers. All of the subordinate's imperatives were culled from School A.

School B had the longest duration of 2 hours while the other two meetings lasted between 45 minutes to an hour, resulting in a total of 5 hours and 50 minutes. Meanwhile, the major purpose of the meetings was not uniform. Schools A and C concentrated on the accreditation while School B concentrated on the matters about the commencement of the

academic year. The primary author of this study did not sit in the meetings in School A and C, but sat in School B being a member of the faculty. He maintained the role as a ratified secretary who recorded the proceedings. This privileged him as an insider to document some exogenous factors of the participants. His presence was believed to have not affected the linguistic behaviors of the meeting members, having known and worked with his colleagues for 5 years.

Data were transcribed using the selected and limited transcription conventions by Jefferson (2004). Names in the data presentations were pseudonyms to safeguard their identities. English glosses were also indicated for Tagalog utterances. The glosses should not be, however, construed as perfect translations as they were only provided to assist non-Tagalog readers. The analysis is from an emic perspective used to identify and describe the microscopic features of Tagalog imperatives and its sequential environments (Clifton, 2006; Gardner, 2004; Tanaka, 2000; Psathas & Anderson, 1990; Raymond, 2003; Schegloff, 2009; Wooffitt, 2005). Guided with the "ethnomethods" practices and procedures of CA (Turunen, 2015), the features were described for their normative organizations, not on statistical regularity (Raymond, 2003). Overall, the data were analysed based on the pragmalingusitic properties of Tagalog imperatives and the local academic conditions of the subordinate who employed the imperatives.

Results

The Pragmalinguistic Properties of Subordinate's Imperatives

Basic imperatives in Tagalog dominated in the corpus. As previously discussed, the Tagalog basic imperative, the second-person-pronoun actor "you" (Lerner, 2003) is obligatory compared to an optional "you" in English.

Sample Subordinate's (Reg's) Imperatives

No.	Extract	
145	7	=Bigyan mo na ng deadline para=
		'(You) give (him/her) the deadline.'
148	7	Kunin mo na Ma'am para ((smiling))
		'(You) get (it) now Ma'am so that'
359	24	[So [but then hingin mo din]
		'So but then (you) ask (it) too'
1158	74	[Kunin mo na]

'(You) get (it) now.

The sample imperatives listed above are seen to be sincere especially that the themes of the imperatives are parts in the accreditation. Reg knows the level of necessity because she has been an accreditor for many years. The purpose of the meeting of School A, like any other meetings, can be considered important. Consequently, Reg becomes straightforward without any attempt to dilute the strong behests, thereby emphasizing priority, commitment, and certainty of the matter at hand. Reg's imperatives are also coupled with direct eye contact, emphasizing the strength with her paralinguistic resources (Bavelas, Coates, & Johnson, 2002) when video recordings are reviewed. This social deixis enhances status of both Reg and the Chair in their utterances.

Meanwhile, the imperatives may have abated possible negative inferences from the Chair who thinks it is unbecoming for Reg to do such strong commands without any shades of distancing of roles (Machin & Mayr, 2012. The use of politeness markers, for example, hedges may have been strategic not to appear too assertive, thus doing with some face-threatening acts. At line 152, the Chair seems to have been vexed by the series of commands.

Corpus 2, Extract 7: School A

TIMESTAMP <07:38-08:06>

142   Chair   Hindi naman naka Eden   si Dr. Dilao eh.
                      'Not really, Dilao is with Eden.'

143   Reg   'Yong 'yong mga, 'yong parang
                      halimba[wa'y
                      'The ones, the one like for example'

144   Chair   [At tsaka distributed na 'yong self-survey eh=
                      'And the self-survey has been distributed'

145   Reg   ->   =Bigyan mo na ng deadline para=
                      'Give her the deadline so that'

146   Chair   =Ma'am nagbigay na ako ng deadline
                      'Ma'am, I already gave the deadline.'

147   Matagal na 'yon Ma'am, naka out na.

'Long before has it been out already.'

148   Reg   ->   Kunin mo na Ma'am para((smiling))

'Get it Ma'am so...'

149   Kasi type kong gagawin=

'Because I feel like doing it.'

150   Chair   =Ayoko kung maging impatient.((laughing sarcastically))=

'I don't want to be impatient about it.'

151   Reg   =Huh?

152   Chair ->   I don't have to be impatient about that.

153   Reg   Kasi ikaw din ang:: maiipit.

'Because you will be having difficulty with it.'

Extract 7 from Corpus 2 shows that the two lines 145 and 148 do not contain any attempt to use some Tagalog politeness markers such as 'po' or 'ho' ((please)) which are widely known politeness markers among the Tagalog speakers. It is possible for Reg to insert some politeness markers and mitigating devices to appear commanding with careful reservation and hesitations (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Table 2 shows the possible linguistic options that could have been available in Reg's linguistic resources:

Table 2. Proposed Politeness Expressions (in transliteration)

Bigyan mo ng deadline.

'(You) give him/her the deadline.'

(1) Pakibigyan mo nalang po ng deadline.

'Please, give, you, just, please, the deadline.'

(2) Paano po kaya pag bigyan natin ng deadline?

'How about, please, if give, we, the deadline?'

(3) Bigyan nalang po natin sila ng deadline.

'Give, just, please, we, them, the deadline.'

(4) Posible kaya na mabigyan natin sila ng deadline?

'Possible if, given, we, them, the deadline?'

(5) Siguro puwede nating bigyan ng deadline.

'Perhaps, can, we, given, the deadline.'

(6) 'Di kaya mas maganda 'pag may deadline sila?

'Why not, more beautiful/better, if, there's, deadline, they?'

(7) *Awkward*: Makisuyo ako sa'yo na bigyan sila ng deadline.

'Please, I, you, to give, them, the deadline.'

(8) *Awkward*: Pakisuyo nalang. Bigyan mo na sila ng deadline.

'Please, just. Give, you, now, them, the deadline.'

When a subordinate employs some directives, he or she is expected to frame the questions pragmalinguistically with mitigation to dilute the force of the utterance. For example, in Tagalog, all imperative constructions may be changed with polite expressions by adding enclitic particles 'nga', 'siguro,' 'po,' 'ho sana,' 'nalang,' 'kaya' and special request prefixes such as 'maki' and 'paki' markers to dilute the utterance. Other expressions may include 'paano (po) kaya' ((how about)), 'possible (po) kaya' ((is it possible?)), 'siguro puwede' ((perhaps, can)), 'di (po) kaya' ((wouldn't it be)), including the use of collective pronoun 'natin' ((we/us)) resulting in a much more polite and indirect way of imposing someone in authority to do something (cf. Otanes & Schachter, 1972 for comprehensive context).

Arguably, options 7 and 8 in Table 1 may appear too awkward in this discourse. The 'maki' and 'paki' as distinct Tagalog polite markers may be only applicable in mundane conversations. Mundane and informal situations in the Philippine society include asking someone to give the jeepney fare to the driver: (1) 'Bayad po. Makisuyo lang po' ((Fare please. Please do it.)); (2) 'Bayad, makisuyo.' ((Fare, please.)); (3) 'Pakisuyo po ng bayad.' ((Please, the fare.)); or (4) 'Puwede pong makisuyo ng bayad?' ((Can please, the fare?)). (All options mean asking someone politely to hand in the fare to the jeepney driver.)

From these pragmalinguistic constructions of Tagalog imperatives, the use of Tagalog enclitic particles such as 'paki' and 'maki' which may privilege a modulated stance may not be appropriate for an institutional talk like a faculty meeting. Perhaps, the awkwardness of mitigated expressions in numbers 7 and 8 may have also conditioned Reg

to structure her utterances in a direct way. From the ears of native speakers of Tagalog, these mitigated imperatives may be considered awkward, indirect, and even insincere that could possibly vex the Chair. The linguistic options that Reg uses sit well with the courteous prolixity in TV ads "if you don't mind, could you please call as soon as possible" that can be considered quite sarcastic. Using "Call now!" is a more direct and a straight-selling approach (Pennock-Speck & Fuster-Márquez, 2014).

Equally important from Reg's imperatives, we also argue that the more serious the matter at hand gets, the less polite the person in epistemic authority can become. This claim takes up with the same line of argument by Pennock-Speck and Fuster-Márquez (2014) who posit that "addressers lack the power to impose their will, they would be expected to use more politeness markers to achieve their ends than equals would" (p. 13). Consequently, what precipitates Reg to use basic imperative and the fewer hits of politeness markers is the level of necessity and priority of her behest to the success of the accreditation. In response, the person being directed at accepts the imperatives as acceptable and appropriate especially if the person giving the imperatives holds a higher epistemic authority, power, and ranking. This may mean that even if the utterances do not have 'paddings' that may soften the impact of the bluntness (Machin & Mayr, 2012; cf. Munalim & Gonong, 2019; cf. Munalim & Lintao, 2016), the utterances are considered socio-pragmalinguistically appropriate within the sphere of an academic meeting as a professional discourse.

Local Conditions that Hastened the Production of Imperatives

Table 3. Social Conditions of Meeting Members

Local Conditions	Relationships
Power (in meetings; default)...	Chair > S
Distance (in meetings; default).......................................	Chair > S
Distance (default knowledge)...	Chair > S
Distance (age)...	Chair < Reg; Reg > S
Distance (accreditation knowledge)................................	Chair < Reg
Distance (years of teaching experience)	Chair > S; Chair < Reg
Ranking (in meetings; default)..	Chair > S
Ranking (academic; accreditor)......................................	Chair > S; Reg > S; Reg > Chair

S – (other)subordinates; > – greater/higher/older than; < – lesser/lower/younger than

Table 3 presents the social conditions between the Chair and the subordinate who employs a number of Tagalog basic imperatives. By default, the Chair is in the higher or greater hierarchical level in terms of power, distance, and ranking. The default structures

have been modified because the subordinates possess higher/greater/older local conditions as indicated local conditions.

Corpus 2, Extract 19: School A
TIMESTAMP <<14:40-15:18>>

| 304 | Reg | So ito o I have a book here. |
| | | **'So here, I have a book.'** |

| 305 | -> | This is our handbook ng accreditors katulad ko ano. |
| | | **'This is our handbook of accreditors like me.'** |

Extract 19 from Corpus 2 conveys that Reg explicitly emphasizes her identity as an accreditor, which indexes personal identities in this social situation, and reveals her orientations to the institutional character (Clayman & Maynard, 1994). Reg's behavior provides strong evidence that there is an institutional character that is taking place and has been invoked in the process. The structure of talk and the position attached to it justifies the actual display of her personal identity and self-worth. What precipitates the good reception of the Chair is that the one demanding her to do something holds an obvious difference of epistemic power and knowledge. Reg takes up her position as a more knowledgeable persona. Lines 273 and 274 strengthen the Chair's lower epistemic authority when she asks Reg about the need to present the document. At line 275, the Chair uses the third set of question as a form of setting the agenda (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). With confidence, Reg uses the word 'dapat' ((should)) to ascertain the level of certainty that encodes the value of her institutional identity. Overall, subordinate's and the Chair's utterances encode their judgment about their institutional identities.

Corpus 2, Extract 16: School A
TIMESTAMP <<13:21-13:36>>

| 273 | Chair -> | Paano kung hanapin 'yong mga nakaraan Ma'am 2012, 13? |
| | | **'How about if the 2012, 13 will be looked at?'** |

| 274 | -> | Oh pupuwede bang i-present ko lang 'yong sa akin lang? |
| | | **'Would that be fine if I just present only the documents during my term?'** |

| 275 | | Ma'am kayo Ma'am ano masasabi ninyo? |
| | | **'You Ma'am, what can you say?'** |

276   Reg   Hindi, dapat kasama ʻyon oo.
                        ʻNo, they should be part of. Yes.ʼ

Iversen (2013) shows that knowledge is tied to peopleʼs rights and responsibilities. Put simply, the use of mitigating devices, lexical choice, and politeness strategies is based on the speakerʼs epistemic authority, power, and some immediate local conditions that forbear the utterances. Biber (1995) shares that that the authority relations precipitate the production of linguistic choices, that is, the extent of shared context or background knowledge of the speaker such as the "degree of interactiveness, the production circumstances, the primary purposes, and the social relations among the participants" (p. 10). This pattern echoes the idea of Arminen (2000) pointing out the intersubjective working consensus for the realization of the task. Short and submissive responses such as "Sige po, Maʼam" with positively loaded words, including laughter manifest the air of *pakikisama* in order not to directly inform Reg that she is being too imposing. Meanwhile, the issue of *pakikisama* (Andres, 1981) may have been heightened because the Chair has a lower epistemic power and knowledge about the dynamics of the accreditation. Overall, the use of the subordinateʼs imperatives has been precipitated by these social variables such as power, distance, and ranking that are made relevant during the meetings.

Overall Discussion

The use of subordinateʼs imperatives reflects her higher and more knowledgeable status about the dynamics of the accreditation, allowing her to forge her identity as someone in authority. Consequently, the Chair has temporarily conceded to the higher authority of the subordinate. It thereby boosts the subordinateʼs epistemic authority, and the Chair accepts the imperative as non-threatening. At the top of this argument, identity is occasioned by, negotiated in, and existing only in and for specific interactional moments (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Bushnell, 2012).

The positive orientations of the chair may be attributed to the Filipino culture of respect to the elders and the concepts of *pakikisama*. The politeness principle which may be seen to have been violated by Reg has also been well accepted by chair, with the idea in mind that the person commanding her is older than she is. This encourages her to concede to the imperatives in order to look polite. Reg is conditioned to the goal in mind of passing the accreditation, at the expense of being polite to the Chair. This is made clear when Reg constructs her imperatives at a lower degree of politeness. However, it does not mean that Reg is impolite. In short, these do not jeopardize the positive face of the chair.

The paralinguistic cues demonstrated by the Chair and the subordinate are considered positive. Although Reg has emphasized superiority over the profuse use of imperatives, the tension is released through her amiable and smiling face to convey that her identity as an accreditor may not be absolute and that negotiations are still open for questions. Laughter after oneʼs utterances and the other membersʼ and chairʼs utterances are also recorded. Consequently, this laughter is seen as a strategic technique to encourage increased cooperation and solidarity between and among the faculty amid the tension created by the strong imperatives. Smiling (at line 148) at least mitigates this strong imperative for the chair.

Meanwhile, the Chair accepts the imperatives with a positive orientation as made salient in her positive linguistic and paralinguistic next-relevant turns around Reg's imperatives, for example as demonstrated in lines 1038 and 1040. The relinquishing of the Chair's power has demonstrated that, more or less, the faculty meeting as an institutional discourse is successful, collegial, collaborative, and equitable in terms of who talks, what, when, and how to talk.

Corpus 2, Extract 64, School A
TIMESTAMP <<47:03-47:15>>

1038   Chair   Oo may pag-asa=
                       'Yes, there's hope.'

1039   Reg   =So i-attach mo 'yong output na ['yon]
                       'So, you'll attach that output.'

1040   Chair   [Yes] Ma'am.
                       'Yes, Ma'am.'

Conclusion

Overall, the results show that Tagalog basic imperative has pragmalinguistic properties that may be followed or broken based on the following likelihood: (1) the awkwardness, indirectness and insincerity of mitigated imperatives when used in this institutional talk as compared to imperatives used in mundane conversations; and (2) the dire need and the level of urgency for the hearer to do something. Secondly, a number of contextual factors such as power, distance, and ranking, including the cultural and academic orientations of *pakikisama* among the speakers are consequential to the subordinates' imperatives.

From the limited data with microscopic analyses, imperatives in this study are not only exclusive to the Chair, but are also tolerable and allowable for any member with equal or higher power, ranking, and knowledge of the matters at hand. The institutional identities and local academic conditions can be suspended and taken for granted moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn in real time. We initially draw into conclusion that local conditions are occasioned by and negotiated in during turns at talk that allow the production of the subordinate's imperatives. Overall, the results show that within the sphere of a faculty meeting, subordinate's imperatives play an indispensable pragmatic role in the realization of the purpose of the interaction.

The data are considered limited although it is accepted in the methodological orientation of CA. This aspect is accepted and acknowledged that is why more longitudinal studies that track more cases of subordinate's imperatives are encouraged, not only within the Tagalog linguistic sphere, but also in other languages that provide propensity for the speakers to use (im)politeness strategies in imperative constructions. Describing more cases of imperatives will subsequently help us to generalize subordinates' imperatives beyond this specific domain of a faculty meeting, thus extending into other professional meetings,

discourses and even mundane conversations (cf. Munalim & Genuino, 2019). Doing comparative studies of subordinates' imperatives are also indispensable to help us iron out possible cross-cultural miscommunications due to cross-linguistic variations.

Nevertheless, the initial results provide invaluable inputs into the discussions on the universal, cross-linguistic, cross-cultural variabilities (Asuka, 2018) of (im)politeness principles within the professional discourses. The study highlights the importance of exposing ourselves to the different factors that are consequential to the linguistic choices we make. We can make our ESL/EFL students aware of the norms, mechanisms, and complexities of human interactions through discourses organized by professionals with identities that are procedurally relevant.

Acknowledgement

References

Andres, T.D. (1981). *Understanding Filipino values: A management approach.* Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers.

Arminen, I. (2000). On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction. *Discourse and Society,11*(4), 435-458.

Asuka, Y. (2018). The role of questions in managing affect and emotional involvement in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Universal Language, 19*(2), 1-26.

Bavelas, J.B, Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2002). Listener responses as a collaborate process: The role of gaze. *Journal of Communication,* 52, 566-580.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. (2010). Questions and their responses in Tzeltal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2627-2648.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bushnell, C. (2012). Talking the talk: The interactional construction of community and identity at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan. *Humanities Studies, 35*, 583-605.

Chen, S., Geluykens, R., & Choi, C.J. (2006). The importance of language in global teams: A linguistic perspective. *Management International Review, 46*(6), 679-695.

Clayman, S.E., & Maynard, D.W. (1994). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In ten Have, P., & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities* (pp. 1-30). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Clifton, J. (2006). Conversation analytical approach to business communication: Case of leadership. *Journal of Business Communication, 43*, 202-219.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to case offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation analysis. In Davies, A., & Elder, C. (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp.262-284). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gibson, D.R. (2003). Participation shifts: Order and differentiation in group conversation. *Social Forces, 81*(4), 1335-1381.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Iversen, C. (2013). *Making questions and answers work: Negotiating participation in interview interaction*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations from the Faculty of Social Sciences 88. 91. Uppsala.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. (pp: 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1997). Linguistic etiquette. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics,* (pp. 374-385). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kress, G. (2001). Critical sociolinguistics. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.). *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics* (pp. 542-545). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Ledesma, C.P., Ochave, J.A., Punzalan, T., & Magallanes, C. (1981). The character traits and values of selected Filipino children as described and prescribed by their teachers. In *Disciplines and the man: Development of a Filipino ideology*. Manila City, Philippines: Philippine of Education Society of the Philippines.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Lerner, G.H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society, 32*(2), 177-201.

Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. LA: Sage.

Mey, J.L. (2001). Pragmatics and sociolinguistics. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.). *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics* (pp. 50-58). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Munalim, L.O. (2017. Mental processes in teachers' reflection papers: A transitivity analysis in Systemic Functional Linguistics. *3L – Language, Linguistics, and Literature: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 23*(2), 154-166.

Munalim, L.O., & Genuino, C.F. (2019). "Through-Produced" multiple questions in Tagalog-English faculty meetings: Setting the agenda dimension of questions. *Language Art, 4*(2), 105-122.

Munalim, L.O., & Gonong, G.O. (2019). Stances in student-teachers' spoken reflection: A linguistic analysis to enhance a reflection model. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 7*(1), 119-139.

Munalim, L.O., & Lintao, R.B. (2016). Metadiscourse in book prefaces of Filipino and English authors: A contrastive rhetoric study. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching, 6*(1), 36-50.

Otanes, F.T., & Schachter, P. (1972). *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pennock-Speck, B., & Fuster-Márquez, M. (2014). Imperatives in voice-overs in British TV commercials: 'Get this, buy that, taste the other'. *Discourse & Communication*. 1-16.

Psathas, G., Anderson, T. (1990). The 'practices' of transcription in conversation analysis. *Semiotica*, 78, 75-99.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review, 68*(6), 939-967.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, E.A. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelzer (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207–234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: "Mobilizing response". *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 43*(1), 38-48.

Schegloff, E.A. (2009). One perspective on conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives. In Sidnell, J. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 357-406). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (2009). Interactional sociolinguistics. In S.L. McKay & N. H. Hornberge, *Sociolinguistics and language teaching, (pp. 307-328).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (2000). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Tanaka, H. (2000). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. Boston. Sage.

Turunen, J. (2015). *Semiotics of politics. Dialogicality of parliamentary talk*. Skrifter utgivna av Statsvetenskapliga föreningen i Uppsala 191. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. A dissertation from Uppsala University.

Vickers, M.H. (2014). Towards reducing the harm: Workplace bullying as workplace corruption—A critical review. *Employment Response Rights Journal*, 26, 95-113.

Vine, B. (2009). Directives at work: Exploring the contextual complexity of workplace directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1395-1405.

Walters, F.S. (2007). A conversation-analytic hermeneutic rating protocol to assess L2 oral pragmatic competence. *Language Testing, 24*(2), 155-183.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis & discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage Publications.