

# A Qualitative Study on Relational Dialectics Among Teachers in The Workplace

Celso L. Tagadiad

Department of Teacher Education, UM Panabo College, Panabo City, Davao del Norte

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7823>

Received: 27 July 2023; Revised: 31 July 2023; Accepted: 07 August 2023; Published: 04 September 2023

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to determine the relational dialectics between and among teachers in the workplace. This qualitative phenomenological study was conducted at one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City, participated by ten College teachers. The data were gathered from the participants' responses based on the three research questions. Then, the core ideas were drawn from the participant's responses and were grouped into major themes. The result of the study revealed that college teachers experienced tension, which was proven during the conversation. Competing discourses between teachers speak of relational dialectics. Different language events were observed, and arguments were determined by teachers' conversations in every language event recorded. Based on the analysis of the result of the study, the three core values of the relational dialectics model, novelty vs. predictability, privacy vs. transparency, and autonomy vs. connectedness, are present among my co-teachers. With the insights elicited from the study, it is recommended that another study be conducted to assess the relational dialectics among teachers in the workplace with another model and core values.

## INTRODUCTION

Conversation as a form of communication is an unavoidable part of the teachers, for they are societal employees. Social life is a process of contradictory discourses (Baxter, 1982). Thus, conflicts and disagreements are unavoidable in conversation and communication among and between us. Social life is not a closed, univocal monologue," in which only a single voice (perspective, them, ideology, or person) can be heard: social life is an open "dialogue" characterized by the simultaneous fusion and differentiated tone of voices. It implies a dialogue rather than a monologue. To engage in Dialogue, participants must fuse perspectives to some extent while sustaining the uniqueness of their perspectives. Social life is constituted discursively in its language-in-use and its utterances.

In adopting a dialogic approach to relating, individuals become attracted to constitutive, rather than representational or transmission, views of communication (Craig, 1999). Selves and relationships are constituted in the jointly enacted communication events of the related parties (Goldsmith & Baxter, 1996). Thus, "telling with" has been largely present in this context. It describes relational dialectics as tensions, struggles, and general messiness of close ties between members in an organization.

Graffin (2009) confirms the dilemma of such opposing tensions and supports the idea that people involved in personal relationships have different ways of responding to dialectics, which can affect the outcome of the relationship.

Scholars have been excited about the promise generated by Relational Dialectics Theory, and their responses to it have been positive. The theory offers an expansive view of relationships and has generated several studies even when Baxter has been delineating the theory. Therefore, it is a heuristic theory. These

studies also point to the fact that the theory is testable. Perhaps the most positive appeal of the theory is that it explains the push and pull people experience in relationships much better than some of the other, more linear theories of relational life. Most people experience their relationships in ebb-and-flow patterns, whether the issue is intimacy, self-disclosure, or something else. Relationships do not simply become more or less of something in a linear, straight-line pattern. Instead, they often seem to be both as we live through them. Dialectics offers a compelling explanation for both this and feeling. Many researchers agree that dialectic is an exciting way to conceive communication in relational life.

In studying relationships in the workplace, Ted Zorn (1995) finds the three main dialectics, but he also finds some additional tensions specific to the workplace context. However, this is not a serious flaw in the theory, and more studies will delineate a finite number of dialectics that may vary by context.

Furthermore, taking into account for research the relationship between teachers in a formal organization is important for further understanding relational dialectics. Considering the different core values of relational dialectics according to the relational dialectics model, it is also important to answer my query whether the three relational tensions are also present among teachers' relationships as in the findings of the other related research between intimate relationships. In this qualitative exploration of relational dialectics, teachers play an important role in a more comprehensive understanding of competing discourse in an organizational setting. Relational dialectics are analyzed based on its original model constituting its three core values.

### **Theoretical lens**

Social life is a process of contradictory discourses. It is fragmented, disorderly, and messy dialogues of competing discourses. In this chaos, the order is not given but a task to be accomplished. Occasionally, the parties can create momentary consummation, completion, or wholeness in what is otherwise a fragmented life experience (Baxter, 1982).

Baxter and Montgomery's (1996) dialectical approach to personal relationships emphasizes that relationships are ever-changing processes through which contradicting relational motivations clash and are managed by relational partners. Tensions are inherent in any relationship, and dialectics and dialectics contradictions are the natural states of relationships that fluctuate over time. The playing out of the relational tensions defines the nature of relationships at any given point. Dialectical tensions are not what relational partners are supposed to resolve. Instead, the relational dialectics approach assumes no ideal end state in relational management. Contradictions between relational partners and these contradictions constantly change over time (Montgomery, 1993).

In moving to the between, it is crucial to recognize that contradictions are not in individual heads, serving as dilemmatic goals that direct an individual's communicative strategies. Instead, from a dialogic perspective, contradictions are located in the communication between related parties. However, Bahktin also emphasized the utterance in a second sense. To Bahktin, social life was constituted discursively in its language-in-use and utterances. In adopting a dialogic approach to relating, I became attracted to constitutive, rather than representational or transmission, views of communication (e.g., Craig, 1999). Selves and relationships are constituted in the jointly enacted communication events of the related parties (Goldsmith & Baxter, 1996). Thus, contradictions do not sit "out there" as objective forces that drive communicative choice between partners. Contradictions are constituted in the discursive sea of what Bahktin (1981) called "verbal-ideological" forces.

### **Relational Dialectics**

Relationships reflect tensions (conflicts, contradictions) played out in Communication interaction

(dialectical tensions). Relationships are “organized around the dynamic interplay of opposing tendencies” (L Baxter & B. Montgomery, 2004).

Dialectic is defined as the simultaneous presence of two relational forces that are interdependent and mutually negating (Baxter, 1988). The connection-autonomy dialectic is considered primary among numerous pairs of oppositional forces that relational communication researchers have identified (Montgomery, 1993). Connection and autonomy are viewed as essential for individuals to construct their own identities as well as to develop relationships. As Baxter (1988) wrote,

Sociology is one of the principal disciplines studying friendship, and relational dialectics is one of the proposed theories underlying friendship. Social life was not a closed, univocal “monologue,” in which only a single voice (perspective, theme, ideology, or person) could be heard: social life was an open “dialogue” characterized by the simultaneous fusion and differentiation of voices. To engage in dialogue, participants must fuse their perspectives to some extent while sustaining the uniqueness of their perspectives; Social life was constituted discursively in its language-in-use and utterances. In adopting a dialogic approach to relating, I became attracted to constitutive, rather than representational or transmission, views of communication (Craig, 1999).

Selves and relationships are constituted in the jointly enacted communication events of the related parties (Goldsmith & Baxter, 1996). Thus, contradictions do not sit “out there” as objective forces that drive communicative choices between partners (Bahktin, 1981). It implies a dialogue rather than a monologue. Thus, “telling with” has been largely present in this context.

In building an interactional approach to dialectics, the work of Baxter and Montgomery (1996) is relevant. They apply dialectical tensions to the context of interpersonal relationships by conceptualizing relationships in terms of tensions that continuously define and redefine relationships rather than viewing interpersonal relationships as linear entities that progress to intimacy. This synthesis they call “relational dialectics” and claim that a dialectical perspective on social life is “a belief that social life is a dynamic knot of contradictions, a ceaseless interplay between contrary or opposing tendencies.” Relational dialectics theory exposes tensions within interpersonal relationships while assuming continual maintenance and repair of these tensions. As a result, relational dialectics theory is handy for defining how tensions are managed within relationships (Meyer, 2003).

A few questions have been raised about the theory, however. One concerns the number and limit of dialectical tensions in relational life. Some question whether the dialectics of autonomy and connection, openness and protection, novelty, and predictability are the only dialectics of all relationships. For example, Rawlins (1992) needs to see the novelty/certainty of this study of friendship. Instead, he finds a different dialectic, focusing on judgment and acceptance. This dialectic emerges in the tension between judging a friend’s behaviors and simply accepting them. In studying friendships in the workplace, Ted Zorn (1995) finds the three main dialectics and some additional tensions specific to the workplace context. However, this does not seem to be a severe flaw in the theory, and more studies will probably delineate a finite number of dialectics that may vary by context.

Baxter and Montgomery (1996) observe that dialectics is not a traditional theory in that it offers no axioms or arguments. Instead, it describes a set of conceptual assumptions. Thus, it does not offer us good predictions about, for example, what coping strategies might use to deal with the significant dialectic tensions in their relationships. This problem may result from the relative youth of dialectics as a theoretical frame for relational life or from differing goals: Traditional theory seeks prediction and final statements about communication phenomena. Dialectics operates from an open-ended, ongoing viewpoint. Baxter and Montgomery end their 1996 book with a personal dialogue about the experience of writing about a theory that encourages conversation rather than providing axiomatic conclusions. They agree it is to shake the

cultural need for consistency and closure.

However, they conclude that writing about life and emerging ideas is heuristic and valuable.

Relational dialectics is a concept within communication theory. The theory, first proposed respectively by (Baxter and W. K Rawlins in 1988), defines *communication patterns* between relationship partners as the result of endemic dialectical tensions. These tensions result from the conflicting emotional needs felt by the participants of any relationship, who experience tugs and pulls, causing relationships to be in constant flux.

Leslie A. Baxter (Ph.D., University Of Oregon, 1975), a Distinguished Professor of Communication Studies at the University of Iowa, and Barbara Montgomery, a scholar from the University of New Hampshire, spearheaded the research and development of the relational dialectics approach. Consequently, their research findings led to the development of a theory. In her essay, “Relationships as Dialogues: Baxter said she and Montgomery developed a “formal articulation of a dialogism theory of relating’ and ‘have labeled it relational dialectics” (Baxter, 2004). To understand the premise and depth of this theory and how it relates to governing factors of teacher-teacher relationships, it is necessary to explore its development.

According to the original relational dialectic model, any relationship had three Core tensions (opposing values). These were:

**Privacy Vs. Transparency (Closedness vs. Openness):** By sharing information, a relationship can grow closer and more robust. However, this needs for self-disclosure conflicts with the need for privacy felt by each individual in the relationship. When these needs are at odds with one another, a relational tension is created over how much disclosure is desirable. Social penetration Altman asserts that privacy operates cyclically over time. Baxter and Montgomery Concur claim that relationships are not on a straight path to intimacy. They argue that a person has an urge to “tell all” but also vies for secrecy in a never-ending cycle that constantly changes (Hirokawa, 2005).

For example, friendship expects to be truthful . . . but sometimes being a friend means NOT telling everything. In the TLC song, CREEP, each couple member deals with the dialectic of *privacy and transparency* in different ways: the man LIES; the woman CREEIS (Hirokawa, 2005).

This is an excellent example of how transparency can be valuable in business. Privacy also has a crucial role to play. Continuing the story, we explained to the staff that there were some things we could not tell them. For example, we could not say who we negotiated with because this information was sensitive. In other words, if it were public, it would affect whether or not we could do a deal. However, we were transparent over this need for privacy and, indeed, even though we could not divulge information, we still listened to views Of where the team would like to transfer.

This is just one example of privacy. The need for privacy is ordinary and necessary in certain situations in the corporate world and even the teaching world. To finish the story, a few weeks after Lehmans in the UK collapsed, 3,500 staff transferred to Nomura.

To see trust as a question of privacy versus transparency may be misleading. Business life shows they do not have to be, and cannot be, mutually exclusive—ifs about finding the right balance depending on the circumstances. You can build great trust and deliver results when you successfully strike a balance between the two.

**Novelty vs. predictability (Certainty vs. Uncertainty):** This term refers to the need to be consistent, reliable, and steady (predictability) versus the need to be different, unique, and surprising (novelty). For example, my wife expects predictability out of me yet occasionally welcomes a little novelty and surprise. For a relationship to be maintainable, there is a need for structure and stability. At the same time, a

relationship in which nothing Out of the ordinary takes place cannot stay dynamic; the struggle to avoid monotony while maintaining order is the basis for this tension. Uncertainty reduction theory (Berger) proposes that people Want predictability in their relationships. In RD theory, Baxter and Montgomery claim that people want a certain amount of mystery and spontaneity in relationships to “spice things up.” Without variety, the relationship will become dull and predictable, therefore, “emotionally dead.”

Not surprisingly, many couples struggle to balance the tension between their need for stability and their desire for excitement. This relational tension has been referred to by researchers as the *novelty vs. predictability dialectic* (Baxter, 1988, 1990; Rawlins, 1992).

What about those relationships that are always unpredictable? Just like highly predictable relationships, fascinating relationships may also be in trouble. Having stability in your life as a couple is crucial. How would you feel without determining how your partner would react to conflict? Or, what if you never knew where your relationship was headed? Predicting your partner’s behavior and the status of your relationship is good. You want to know that your partner will be there through thick and thin.

Whatever you decide to do, working towards having a healthy balance between novelty and predictability will be to maintain your relationship.

**Autonomy vs. connectedness (Separateness vs. Connectedness):** This term refers to the need to do things with others (connection) versus the need to have one’s own space and do one’s own thing (autonomy). For example, in a relationship, there are times when we want to be WITH the other person, yet do something ALONE (e.g., read a book or the newspaper) in the presence of that other (Hirokawa, 2005).

All humans require autonomy and independence. Conversely, they wish to attach themselves to others through relationships in which decisions are made on a group level. Tension arises here when attachment to the group encroaches on the individual members’ need for self-government. The tension All humans require autonomy and independence. Conversely, they wish to attach themselves to others through relationships in which decisions are made on a group level. Tension arises here when attachment to the group encroaches on the individual members’ need for self-government. The tension between connectedness and separateness is that if one person wins, the relationship loses. No relationship can exist by definition unless the parties sacrifice some individual autonomy. However, too much connection paradoxically destroys the relationship because individuals’ identities become lost. (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996),

According to the theory, while most of us may embrace the ideals of certainty in our relationships, communication is a more complex path toward these goals. Conflicts often produce exact opposites (autonomy, novelty, and privacy).

Baxter and Montgomery (1996) suggested two secondary dialectics in development: the novelty-predictability dialectic and the openness-closedness dialectic. The novelty-predictability dialectic challenges the view held by URT that interpersonal relationships develop when relational partners can predict and explain each other’s behavior; instead, that certainty often leads to relational deadening if the role of novelty is ignored (Baxter, 1988). The third dialectic posited by Baxter is openness-closedness. According to Social Penetration Theory, self-disclosure increases intimacy between relational partners and makes partners vulnerable to each other due to the information revealed (Baxter, 1988). The intensity of experienced dialectics varies according to the stages of relationship development. In romantic relationships, the openness-closedness dialectic tends to dominate during the initial stages of relationship development, whereas, by ontrast, romantic partners are more likely to report the connection-autonomy and predictability-novelty dialectics in later maintenance phases (Baxter, 1990). Meanwhile, dialectical researchers have identified several other relational tensions, including affection-instrumentality, judgment-acceptance, and expressiveness-protectiveness (Altman et al., 1981; Baxter, 1988; Rawlins, 1992).



Within the context of relationships, Baxter and Montgomery (1996) argued that partners cope with or adapt to contradictions, consciously and subconsciously, by employing three adaptation patterns or strategies; separation and integration. Selection refers to a strategy where individuals repeatedly select actions consistent with one polarity of the contradiction. Separation refers to one of the two polarities in a given contradiction that is selected alternating over time (called “cyclic alternation” or “cyclic oscillation”) or to a scenario in which one polarity characterizes a specific domain or topic, and the other characterizes another (called “segmentation”). Integration refers to the attempt to respond simultaneously to both polarities by neutralizing responses that favor neither polarity (called “moderation”), by utilizing ambiguous or indirect communication (called “disqualification”), or by redefining the contradiction so that the two polarities no longer appear to be opposing (called “reframing”) (Montgomery, 1993). Cyclic alternation and segmentation are the two most prevalent strategies, with the former related to the connection-autonomy dialectic and the latter to the openness-closedness and the predictability-novelty dialects (Baxter, 1990).

However, these theoretical perspectives disagree about the role of bandwidth restrictions and anonymity in CMC channels and the role of individuating information in relational formation online (Yun, 2006). O’Sullivan’s (2000) Impression Management model is one of the few that has applied the dialectical approach to mediated communication, pointing out that users employ the ambiguity-clarity dialectic to achieve self-presentational goals. This dialectic is conceptually similar to the openness-closedness debate proposed by Baxter and Montgomery (1996), with the vital distinction that O’Sullivan emphasized a continuum between discrete polarities rather than the polarities themselves. The ability to strategically use mediated and non-mediated channels are considered to be as crucial in effectively managing contradictions as the ability to construct messages. In contrast, the constriction of mediated channels is perceived to be advantageous when users sense that the impression of themselves or their partners is being threatened.

*Historically*, relational Dialectics is the emotional and value-based version of the philosophical dialectic. It is rooted in the dynamism of the Yin and Yang. Like the classic Yin and Yang, the balance of emotional values in a relationship is constantly in motion, and any value pushed to its extreme contains the seed of its opposite. In the Western world, these ideas hark back to the Greek philosopher Heraclitus, who held that the world was in constant flux (like fire), with creative and destructive forces on both sides of every process. Mikhail Bakhtin applied Marxist dialectic to literary and rhetorical theory and criticism. He illustrated the tensions in the deep- structure of all human experience. For example, he identified the tension between unity and difference. Bakhtin conceived the human dialectic as two forces analogous to the physical forces, *centripetal* (emotional forces tending towards unity) and *centrifugal* (emotional forces tending towards divergence), like the Yin and Yang. Bakhtin’s forces have no ultimate resolution.

Baxter took the deep structural analysis of Bakhtin and applied it to communication theory. She found a T-Bangha of axes where this dynamic tension operated. Later authors added other axes. Four main concepts form the backdrop of relational dialectics: contradiction, totality, process, and praxis.

Contradictions are the core concept of Relational Dialectics. It is the dynamic interplay between unified oppositions. A contradiction is formed “whenever two tendencies or forces are interdependent (unity) yet mutually negate one another (negation).” For example, one can simultaneously desire intimacy and distance in a relationship.

Relational dialectic must be understood in terms of social processes. Movement, activity, and change are functional properties (Rawlins, 1989). For example, instances such as an individual fluctuating between disclosure and secretiveness, In addition, the individual may move between periods of honest and open communication (Miller, 2005).

Praxis is a philosophical term for ‘practical behavior’ or sometimes ‘the experience of practicing’; in praxis, dialectic tensions are created and re-created through active participation and interaction. In other words, the

practical experience of having a relationship exposes one to the imposition of the needs and values of another. As the relationship endures, one's own needs and values become apparent. Praxis focuses on individuals' practical choices amid opposing needs and values (dialectical tensions). In turn, the choices and actions themselves create, re-create, and change the nature of the relationship and hence the dialectical tensions between them.

Baxter and Montgomery's (1996) dialectical approach to personal relationships emphasizes that relationships are ever-changing processes through which contradicting relational motivations Clash and are managed by relational partners. Tensions are inherent in any relationship, and dialectics or contradictions are the natural states of relationships that fluctuate over time. The playing out of relational tensions defines the nature of relationships at any given point. Dialectical tensions are not what relational partners are supposed to resolve. Instead, the relational dialectics approach assumes no ideal end-state in relational management. Contradictions between opposing motivations are viewed as healthy signs rather than schizophrenic symptoms since they bring about opportunities for dialogue between relational partners, and these contradictions undergo Constant change over time (Montgomery, 1993).

Additionally, Baxter and Montgomery (1996) opposed the dominant research paradigm in the personal relationship literature as represented by such theories as Social Penetration, its parent theory Exchange, and Uncertainty Reduction Theory (URT). These theories hold a relational ideals perspective, whereby all relationships develop toward intimacy and predictability, and individuals strive to achieve ideal goals by gradually increasing the breadth and depth of self-disclosure according to stages of relational development. Information exchange and relational intimacy are in a complementary spiral, so the other increases as one increases. At the outset, URT, in particular, was applied to the study of initial relationship formation and development at the early stages of relational life, while subsequent research has applied URT to pre-existing relationships, such as romantic relationships (Parks & Adelman, 1983). According to URT, reducing uncertainty about the relational partner is the chief motivating factor for communication or communicative action. This URT-described motivation differs markedly from the motivation described in the relational dialectic perspective, where the primary purpose of communication or communicative action is to manage oppositions within a given relationship (Baxter, 1988).

Moreover, Thorburn (1987) notes that television is a particularly influential medium for narratives, arguing that narratives are "always complex mirrors of their societies, essential artifacts to which we must turn if to understand ourselves, our ancestors, and our filiations with the past" (p.168). Despite the call for attention to the complexity of the narrative, narrative readings are often regarded in scholarly endeavors as "recounting stories" already told, focusing on one-dimensional components such as characters, setting plot, and action. This reading of Dawson's Creek attempts to broaden our definition of narrative reading by centering on the relationship between Jack and Jen.

Thus, form unity in conversation but only through two differentiated voices or perspectives. Just as dialogue is simultaneously unity and difference, Bakhtin (1981) regarded all of social life as the product of "a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies": the centripetal (i.e., discourses of unity or centrality) and the centrifugal (i.e., discourses of difference, dispersion. and de-centering). This dialogic view – that social life is a process of contradictory discourses – is a centerpiece of relational dialectics, formally articulated in 1996 by Barbara Montgomery and myself in our book *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics* (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996), and subsequently the basis of multiple research studies conducted by various colleagues and myself (for reviews, see Baxter, 2004; Baxter & Braithwaite, in press). This essay is a tale of "two voices" – the contradiction-ridden dialogue Of relating. The tale lacks the Dickensian touch, with its richly painted characters and twists of plot, for which you have my apologies in advance. It is "a" tale, not "the" tale, because relational dialectics, like any theory, is not the exclusive possession of a single person but is jointly owned by all who have had a role in its development. My tale, then, is but one of many possible tales. It is the tale of how I came to think in dialogic ways about relating.

Polkinghorne (1988) noted that a narrative “transforms a chronicle or listing of events into a schematic whole by highlighting and recognizing the contribution that certain events make to the development and outcome of the story.” In telling a tale of two voices, I weave together a series of significant events or turns, which I see as crucial to developing relational dialectics.

### **Linguistic Cues**

Why is it possible to automatically recognize personality from linguistic cues? Psychologists have documented the existence of such cues by discovering correlations between a range of linguistic variables and personality traits across a wide range of linguistic levels, including acoustic parameters, lexical categories, n-grams, and speech-act type. As the correlations reported in the literature are generally weak, it is unclear whether these features will improve the accuracies of statistical models on unseen subjects. Extraversion has received the most attention from researchers of all Big Five traits. However, focusing systematically on all Big Five features is becoming more common (Walker, 2007).

According to Zhou (2004), as cited by Zhang (2012), most text-based deception detection studies use linguistic cues as attributes to inspect differences between factual statements and false statements. *Linguistic cues* aim to represent particular linguistic properties of a text using Umbers. A cue can be a linguistic cue if it can indicate a certain linguistic feature of a text, which can be words, phrases, or sentences. For example, a cue indicating whether a text-based document uses first-person singular pronouns frequently is a linguistic cue. Because texts have no pictures or voices, linguistic cues are essential resources of information and, therefore, widely used in text-based studies, including TADD studies. By offering distinct values for different texts, linguistic cues can provide information about these texts’ words, phrases, and sentences. Selecting a group of linguistic cues is significant to a TADD study; because a good group of linguistic cues may lead to a more accurate experimental result. A good group of linguistic cues should include helpful linguistic cues for TADD studies and exclude useless linguistic cues (Fuller et al. 2009). Previous TADD studies select linguistic cues using two primary methods.

### **Honorifics**

The role of linguistic categories in establishing and maintaining social relationships and, thus, maintaining and renewing patterns of culture and society is of fundamental interest to anthropologically oriented language studies. Within this broad area of concern, the last two or three decades have seen exceptionally detailed studies of the linguistic means of marking relationships of notification relationships involving social status, respect, or deference between communicative interactants. The subject matter has been approached from several different perspectives. It is generally agreed, for example, that a logical precondition on the occurrence of honorific phenomena is the existence of intersubjectively shared codes or best how they are invoked or appealed to by interactants, the extent to which they are susceptible to strategic manipulation, and their place within the more significant nexus of preconditions on discursive interaction-as an order of meaningful activity- are matters of some dispute and debate. Indeed, the literature reviewed here is characterized by a substantial variability in research goals and agendas and a range of methods used to formulate and test empirical generalizations. Honorific devices of several types include honorific pronouns and terms of address, politeness in language use, and honorific registers (Agha, 1994).

Many cross-linguistic studies have argued for a positive correlation between politeness and linguistic indirectness. While Anglo-American studies have asserted that this correlation is universal, many non-Anglo-American cross-linguistic studies have argued otherwise. Although indirectness is one of the main stereotypical characteristics attributed to Koreans, and indirectness is used strategically to indicate politeness, Korea is unique in having its language-specific means of indicating politeness (honorifics). This paper investigates the link between politeness and the indirectness of speech acts by analyzing Korean request head act forms produced in the “Discourse Completion Tasks” (DCT) of 50 Korean native speakers.



The findings of this empirical study highlight three important aspects of Korean language use directness and politeness. Firstly, it reveals how Koreans manipulate honorific elements and the directness level of their speech acts to indicate the social meaning of politeness. Secondly, the paper proposes that the manipulation of honorifics and the selection of a certain directness level are triggered by socio-cultural constraints unique to Korean society. Thirdly, the findings of the study, that the direct link between politeness and linguistic indirectness is not endorsed in the case of Korea, support the view that the relationship between indirectness and politeness has to be understood from a language- and culture-specific perspective (Byon, 2006).

## Language Choice

In the first case, “a speaker may want to avoid the language in which he or she feels insecure and speak one in which he or she has greater competence. Nevertheless, preference-related switching may also decide based on political considerations”. This pattern is also of “language negotiation” in which a speaker consistently opposes or eventually aligns with the interlocutor’s language choice. In discourse-related language choice, on the other hand, switching within a conversational episode “contributes to the organization of discourse in that particular episode.” This covers a range of well-documented functions of conversational CS, such as marking reported speech, change of topic, emphasis, disagreement, specification of the addressee, and use as a device for the internal organization of complex turns. Concerning diasporic forums, both patterns of language choice are relevant. My observations suggest that some members prefer the home language throughout their forum activities; if they dominate a particular discussion, they may establish it as the base language of interaction. This is not a matter of language competence. In a discourse environment dominated by German, bilinguals’ decision to stick to their home language may be an instance of everyday language politics, a symbol of commitment to the ethnic identity of simple language politics, a symbol of commitment to the ethnic identity a forum should represent. The “Pragmatics of CS in a Forum Discussion” case study described below illustrates this (Androutsopoulou, 2006).

The relationship between language choice and the topic was examined in a sample from the Persian forum, divided into five sections and 21 topic groups (as Of March 2005). These are listed on the screen in the following order: (1) Section General comprises discussions on [Iran, world news, sports, politics, economics and law, and history; (2) Entertainment is devoted to music and events, movies and pictures, jokes, and ethnic radio; (3) Culture offers topic groups on religion and philosophy, travel, Persian cuisine, and Farsi talk, for discussions in the Persian language; (4) Science is about computers, health, psychology, and education; and (5) Community is for greetings to community members, and there is another group on trends and fashion (Androutsopoulou, 2006).

Competing discourses are the highlight of relational dialectics research. Furthermore, tensions and conflicting ideas during communication between individuals are inevitable. In a relationship, individuals cannot avoid tensions as they communicate.

## METHOD

Discussed in this chapter is the methodology used in this study. This includes the research methods and design, the role of the researcher, informants of the study, the method of data collection, data analysis, trustworthiness and credibility, and ethical consideration.

### Research Design

With my intent to gain a deeper understanding of the perspectives Of the relationship between and among teachers in the effect of the relational dialectics, qualitative research is personally chosen because I believe that through this approach, I will be able to learn, discover, and prove theories and studies which has already been studied. Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretation of a naturalistic

approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena regarding the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research also involves using and collecting various empirical materials- case studies, personal experience, introspective, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual text that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individuals' lives (Denzel & Lincoln, 1994).

In addition to the reason for choosing qualitative research, the reason for choosing this type is because, according to Creswell (1997), qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. In this case, the researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed informants' views, and conducts the study in a natural setting.

Researchers have long debated the relative value of qualitative and quantitative inquiry (Patton, 1990). Phenomenological inquiry uses a naturalistic approach to understand phenomena in context-specific settings. Logical positivism, or quantitative research, uses experimental methods and quantitative measures to test hypothetical generalizations. Each represents a fundamentally different inquiry paradigm, and researcher actions are based on the underlying assumptions of each paradigm.

Qualitative research is "any research that produces findings not arrived at utilizing statistical procedures or other quantification" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Where quantitative researchers seek causal determination, prediction, and generalization of findings, qualitative researchers seek illumination, understanding, and extrapolation to similar situations instead. Qualitative analysis results in a different type of knowledge than quantitative inquiry.

Moreover, Strauss and Corbin (1990) claim that qualitative methods can be used to understand better any phenomenon about which little is yet known. They can also be used to gain new perspectives on things about which much is already known or to gain more in-depth information that may be difficult to convey quantitatively. Thus, qualitative methods are appropriate when first identifying the variables that might later be tested quantitatively or where the researcher has determined that quantitative measures cannot adequately describe or interpret a situation. Research problems are framed as open-ended questions that will support the discovery of new information. For example, Greene's 1994 study of women in the trades asked, "What personal characteristics do tradeswomen have in common? In what way, if any, did role models contribute to women's choices to work in the trades?"

The ability of qualitative data to fully describe a phenomenon is an important consideration not only from the researcher's perspective but also from the reader's perspective. "If you want people to understand better than they otherwise might, provide the information in the form they usually experience it" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 120). Qualitative research reports, typically rich with detail and insights into participants' experiences of the world, "maybe epistemologically in harmony with the readers' experience" (Stake, 1978) and thus more meaningful.

A phenomenological study would be best suited as the research design because this phenomenon is observed in the academic setting today. Raagas (2010) emphasized that this design would look into the multiple perspectives of the situation and make generalizations about what something is like. This design depends almost exclusively on lengthy interviews with carefully selected sample participants.

Furthermore, Moustakas (1994) pointed out the principles in phenomenological research necessary to treat experiences and behavior as integrated parts of a single whole. Silverman (2000) mentioned in his work that methods used by qualitative researchers exemplify that they can grant a deeper understanding of social phenomena. In this sense, deep understanding commences in inner experiences and language. The phenomenon of relational dialectics is an inevitable part of everyday human experience, not just only in informal settings of learning.

However, it is also considered an already inseparable part of communicative life as individuals.

Denzen and Lincoln (2000) pointed out also that the observers' focus is on how members Of the Social world apprehend and act upon the objects of their experience as if they are things separate and distinct from themselves. My desire to obtain the necessary information and better understand relational dialectics in the academic workplace has directed me to use phenomenological study. According to Creswell (1998), personal experiences are considered phenomenal. In this study, I am interested in knowing how relational dialectics affect the relationship among and between teachers at The University of Mindanao (Panabo Campus); Phenomenology is the best approach to conduct relational dialectics because it is one way of scrutinizing a particular phenomenon occurring in real life.

### **Research Participants**

Informants in this study were the ten college teachers from one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City. Most studies about relational dialectics focused on intimate relationships like those of a mother-daughter, married couples, and best friends. I chose an academic workplace because I wanted to deeply understand relationships as determined by the dialectics between and among the teachers. Furthermore, I have chosen this tertiary institution in Panabo City as the setting of observation since I have direct contact with my co-teachers and can easily connect in their conversation, allowing me to gather and interpret data quickly. Raagas (2010) further suggested that the phenomenological study will use a purposive sampling of five to twenty-five individuals. In this study, it is within the recommended range number of participants.

### **Data Collection**

In quantitative inquiry, the dominant sampling strategy is probability sampling, which depends on selecting a random and representative sample from the larger population. Probability sampling is the subsequent generalization of the research findings to the population. By contrast, purposeful sampling is the dominant strategy in qualitative research. Purposeful sampling seeks information-rich cases which can be studied in depth (Patton, 1990).

Through purposive sampling techniques, the participants were identified. A letter asking permission to conduct the study was addressed to the assistant vice-president of one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City, requesting me to conduct my research through observation and recording of conversations and interview some college teachers to gather accurate data.

The dominant forms of data collection associated with qualitative inquiry are interviews and observation. In this case, the following forms of data collection are observed:

## **RESULTS**

This chapter presents the result of the data as already transcribed, analyzed, and interpreted. These Selected relational dialectics have equivalent English translations for formality's sake, yet the true and original statements were still retained. The following findings and interpretations drawn are displayed in the following tables and thoroughly explained.

### **The Relational Dialectics among teachers in one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City**

The following are the relational dialectics I have chosen from the data I gathered. These dialectics are selected based on my knowledge of the phenomenon guarded by different related findings and literature reviews. Furthermore, translations of these dialectics are provided to understand further and clarify the conversations from different language events.

Table 1. The Relational Dialectics, the translations, and their Category (Core Values) among Teachers

Relational Dialectics	Core Values	
Woman: Hiluma uoie! Dumot man jud!	Novelty Vs. Predictability	
Tingog pud mo ba! ( <i>It's very quiet huh! Very busy...concentrating! Say something!</i> )	Autonomy Vs. Connectedness	
Man: Di mo obra'g way topic uy!!! Lisod pud way topic! ( <i>It will not work if there is no topic. It's hard without a topic.</i> )		
<b>Second relational dialectic:</b>	Privacy Vs. Transparency	
Woman: Naa pa kay manghod? ( <i>Do you have younger sibling?</i> ) Man: Naa pa'y duha..ang..gasunod sa akoa kay mo graduate ugma. ( <i>I have two...next to me will be graduating tomorrow.</i> )		
Woman2: (Away from the source and talking to another person) Hinawayon ni kuan uy! ( <i>He is too meticulous and judgemental!</i> )		
Man: Sunod kay mag third year Civil Engineering s UM. Lalaki. Isa ray babae sa amo kamagulangan. ( <i>Next to me is third Far Civil Engineering in UM. Boy. We hav e only one girl, our eldest.</i> )		
Woman: Imong mama? ( <i>And your mother?</i> )		
Man: Patay na. ( <i>She died already.</i> )		
Woman: Kanus a man namatay? ( <i>Just when?</i> )		
Man: Katong 2002 man guro to, 2001... ( <i>last 2002 or I think..2001...</i> )		
T1: Pero dapat naa jud na siya. Ang managing, o dapat, butang nato magkuha ug managing butang nato 1,500 unya ang ano 1,000, unya ang another kuan...member sa board 500, oh di at least. ( <i>But it should like that the managing, yes it should be. What if we will get the managing, then we give 1,500 then the other one is 1,000.then another is... member of the board is 500, ok at least.</i> )		Privacy Vs. Transparency
T2: Gastos naman kaayo! ( <i>That's too much expenses.</i> )		
T1: Di at least ba? ( <i>So at least, right?</i> )		
T3: Wala jud lain trabahoon. ( <i>There is no other work to done!</i> )		
T1: Ah sige, sige P300.00, basta isunod lang jud ang...( <i>Ah okey, okey 300. But you should follow the...</i> )		
T2: Mogastos na pud! Daku lagi kaayo ng P 500.00, wala jud lain trabahoon jud mao nang...kay SAIC ug board wala jud lain trabahoon jud. (Another expenses, 500 would be tm much, there is no work to done... that's why... SAIC nd board will have no work/duty.)		
T1: Butang nato...(coughing)... basta i-distribute lang jud...kanang kuan..kanng ano ba managing honorarium ba! (We will assume...(coughing) we will distribute the... the... I mean managing honorarium.)		
T3: Dili lageh pwede kay daku ra lageh kaayo nang kuan...(It couldn't be, that would be too muchfor the...)		
T1: Daku ra lageh na...angit angatan nato ang board unya kuanan lang pud nato ang SAIC...kay ang SAIC daku kaayo ug role ang SAIC dinha. Safeguarding of assets ang kuan anang SAC. (Yeah, that's tm much... we will just give more to the board then we will also give for the SAIC, because SAIC has a big role in that. Safeguarding of asset is really the role of SAIC.)		



<p>Woman: Kaulaw nuh dili kabalo moestorya. (<i>That would be shameful if you don't know what to say.</i>)</p>	<p><b>Novelty Vs. Predictability</b></p>
<p>T1: hmmp..hmmp... Imo ma'am! Kabalo naman jud ka business course man imong kuan so...mao gani. kini oh, kay manoy na man kaayo nig kuan...oh...( <i>hmmm...hmntp, you ma'am, you know that already, you are in the business course right? So... that's it. The one that is really good...good.. oh.</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Lola. (<i>Grandma.</i>)</p>	
<p>T1: Oh, kamo ra man duha. Si Amor ang ideal dapat kay hibaluan niya ang sistema. (<i>Yes, two of you, Amor is the ideal. She knows the system.</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Motuman ko unsay isulti ni Iola (LOL). (<i>I will follow what grandma will say.</i>)</p>	
<p>T1: Tama man, recommend. (<i>That's right, recommend.</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Ako pa man gane kuan anang butanga. (<i>I'm the one who is not good in terms of this thing.</i>)</p>	<p><b>Novelty Vs. Predictability</b></p>
<p>Man2: Pero, pero kinsa jud Iola ninyong duha? (<i>But, but who is really grandma among the two of you?</i>)</p>	
<p>T1: Pero..ma'am...ma'am...I suggest nga ilisan nato to atong resibo ug bag o...bag ong series. (<i>But ma'am...ma'am I suggest that you have to change our receipt with a new one... new series</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Hurot naman to siya. (<i>It was all usedup.</i>)</p>	
<p>T1: Karaan na jud kaaayo to siya, unya! (<i>It's really old.</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Karaan. (<i>Old.</i>)</p>	
<p>Man: Unya yellow pa ang papel! Hahahaha. (<i>And the paper is yellow! Ha ha ha</i>)</p>	<p><b>Novelty Vs. Predictability</b></p>
<p>Woman: Naagihan ug baha to unya nauga! Hahahaha. (<i>It was ruined by the flood then dried up! Ha ha ha</i>)</p>	
<p>T1: Mag bag-o siya ba unya ang series niya tuloy tuloy. (<i>It should be renewed and the series will continue.</i>)</p>	
<p>Woman: Basen Wala niya ginaibot Rey! Basig Wala siya kabantay!!! Na nabuing na! (<i>Maybe she didn't tear it off Rey. Maybe she didn't know! Sounds crazy.</i>)</p>	<p><b>Novelty Vs. Predictability</b></p>
<p>T1: Basta mas gwapu jud bag ong series ba, para dali na ma check ba! (<i>It is better if will have a new series so that checking is easy!</i>).</p>	
<p>T1: We have agreed that we have to alternate the field of the speakers. We have shortage with the budget. In the undergrad recognition we have little number of participants, butat least we have greater number when compared to the previous year. Thecommencement exercise, for me, I can say that we have a good graduation. in thereception, the reception area is very crucial. Our security grad were brief but the guardsin maria Clara were not brief. We were glad that Maam did not gave us additionalcharges. Though there are lapses but I will not mentioned those lapses for I am sureeveryone have given their best for the success. But next time, for those who will notcome on time to inform ahead on time. Traffic is also to be monitored also next time.Regarding the food, it's ok, everyone did eat well. Other comments?</p>	
<p>T2: We have very late flag bearer.</p>	
<p>T1: There is one proposal to have one size flag for each depart instead of having a muse. Everyone agreed. Regarding the sound system, everyone rattled about the technical problem.</p>	
<p>T5: explains his side.</p>	
<p>T2: Hopefully by this experience will come to the attention of the Admin Maria Clara.</p>	

Man 1: Unya sayu tah ana? ( <i>And do tee have to early?</i> )	<b>Autonomy Vs. Connectedness</b>
Madam: Pag ka ugma uy mag sayo tah ana alas Otso uy human ug pamahaw. Mamahaw gyud pud tah oi. Unya ala una y media pa man ang klase. ( <i>The next day we should be early at 8 am after breakfast, we should take our breakfast. Classes will be 1:30.</i> )	
Woman6: Akong Klase kay 12:30. ( <i>My class is 12:30.</i> )	
Woman7: Isa ra ma'am? ( <i>Just only one ma'am?</i> )	
Madam: Ah moabot lage tah diri ug alas onse lagi. Mohawa ta didto ug mga alas Otso. ( <i>I'm sure that we will arrive here at 11, will leave there by 8.</i> )	
Woman 1: Ang early retirement sa school, kato ra jud mo retire na dili pa kaabot ug 60. Ang uban diri kalit kalit maghimo dayun ug ceremonias decade...hahahaha...Kurat man gane tah ato. ( <i>The early retirement in school is really for who will retire More the age of 60. Somebody 'ere is just to hurry and will make ceremonias decade, and everybody was surprise.</i> )	<b>Privacy Vs. Transparency</b>
Woman2: Mao gani nuh naa pud diri. ( <i>yah, it happened here.</i> )	
Woman1: Unya mag sigeg libog suroy. ( <i>After all she will just roaming around.</i> )	
Woman2: Dili na lageh ko mabuhi sa Panabo ma'am. Kinahanglan maw-ala na jud na siya diri sa Panabo ma'am. ( <i>I can't live here anymore in Panabo ma'am, she really need to go away in Panabo ma'am.</i> )	
Woman3: Mag unsa naman na siya diri sa Panabo ma'am? ( <i>What will she doing here in Panabo ma'am?</i> )	
Woman1: Dili na lageh daw mabuhi diri sa Panabo. Pero hangtod karon nabuhi man. Dili na lageh daw siya mabuhi diri Sa Panabo. That is why moadto na jud siya Sa laing lugar. ( <i>She can't live here anymore in panabo ma'am, but until now she still living here. She can't live here anymore. That is why she has to go to other place.</i> )	<b>Privacy Vs. Transparency</b>
T2: Hoy! Tag 200 baya ang honorarium. ( <i>Hey! The honorarium is 200.</i> )	
T1: Sa? ( <i>For?</i> )	
T2: Sa board. ( <i>For the board.</i> )	
T1: O! 200. ( <i>Yes! 200.</i> )	
T2: O, per month. ( <i>Yes, per month.</i> )	
T1: Ang SAIC? ( <i>And the SAC?</i> )	
T2: Ambot wa ko kabalo. ( <i>I don't know.</i> )	
T1: Dapat equal na...P500.00. ( <i>That's should be equal... P500.</i> )	
T2: saba ja! P 500.00 ( <i>laughing</i> ). ( <i>You shot up! 500.</i> )	
T1: Time pa, pila man kabuok board? ( <i>Wait how many board do we have?</i> )	
T3: Upat...aw..lima. ( <i>Four... five rather.</i> )	
T1: O lima, Imbes 2,500 lang sa isa ka tao ihatag na sa lima ka board unya mag budget pud para sa SAIC, anyway, member man pud na at least ang SAIC maningkamot. mokayod pud na motrabaho pud, diba? ( <i>Yah, five. Instead of 2,500. For one person, you give that to the five board, then toe will give budget for the Saic, anyway they are also a member at least saic will work hard, right?</i> )	

<p>Madam: basta kinsay gusto mag overnight sa 14 sa gabii kay dili na lang manuroy ug mall kay mao ra man gihapon, kalas kalas, wa man moy paliton didto...mag gitara gitara na lang didto pagka gabii. Magswimming swimming..unya pag ka ugma mamahaw ta'g itlog og kuan dinha bulad. (<i>Who would like to have overnight on 14 so we will know if we are still going to mall 'cause it's still the same, we won't buy anything there. Let's just have fun swimming then take a breakfast with an egg and driedfish.</i>)</p>	<p><b>Autonomy Vs. Connectedness</b></p>
<p>Woman 3: Naay gas range ma'am? (<i>Is there a gas range madam?</i>)</p>	
<p>Madam: Naa, ug makuha nato ang kuan, nay gas range. <i>Yes, there is ifwe will get the...</i>)</p>	
<p>Mixed conversation: Pwede itlog ug hot dog..wala uy basta..magdala pud rice cooker...basta nagsabot sila sa. Kung nakuha nato (<i>Is it ok to have egg and hotdog..uhmmm, none...just...bring rice cooker also...uhm they agreed on it,,...if they will get that.</i>).</p>	

The above and conversations are the relational dialectics I selected from the transcribed data. Meaning. I have undergone data reduction, as Gempes (2004) suggested in her study. Based on my knowledge about this phenomenon, I just picked up the relational dialectics between and among teachers. The English translation is also provided for the readers' sake. By simply reading the dialectics above, readers can identify already that ongoing flux is present in the conversation...based on the different aspects of communication. Relational dialectics among teachers in one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City is evident. As shown above, relational dialectics show conflicting ideas between conversation elements. As explained earlier in the review of related literature, the basic way of determining relational dialectics is through the ideas of tension and opposing ideas, which will lead to the core values each dialectic exhibits. However, tension among individuals, as determined by their conversation, is only sometimes implied, and the researcher does a thorough analysis to prove that tension exists in the conversation. There are lots of signaling devices that will prove the existence of tension in certain conversations.

Table 1 displays the relational dialectics among teachers in The University of Mindanao Panabo Campus. Specifically in this part, the relational dialectics among teachers are categorized according to its three core values, to wit: Privacy Vs. Transparency, Novelty Vs. Predictability and Autonomy Vs. Connectedness in order to analyze further the interplay of these dialectics.

Considerations of the relational dialectics model are taken in categorizing the abovementioned relational dialectics.

**Autonomy vs. Connectedness (Separateness vs. Connectedness)** is a category (core values) of relational dialectics that describes the type of relationship among teachers based on the conversation. Conceptually, this refers to doing things with others (connection) versus having one's own space and doing one's own thing (autonomy). This is according to Hirokawa (2005) during his discussion.

This relational dialectics falls into autonomy vs. connectedness because the speaker used the word "we" in the conversation. This shows that there is connectedness among the teachers in doing the task. This means that the relationship between the teachers united them to do things with the help of each other. However, the individuality of the job is still observed where autonomy is exhibited. "I am sure everyone has given his best for the success." This quote proves that everyone needs to do one's responsibilities in the presence of others through the given individual task to be a part of success.

**Novelty vs. Predictability (uncertainty Vs. Certainty)** is a category (core values) of relational dialectics that describes the type of relationship among teachers based on the conversation. Conceptually, this refers to the need to be consistent, reliable, and steady (predictability) versus the need to be different, unique, and surprising (novelty) (Hirokawa, 2005).

*In this case, novelty versus predictability is evident in the above table's four (4) relational dialectics. Teachers are consistent whenever talking about specific issues. Novelty Vs. Predictability is exhibited in the relational dialectics as present among teachers. Autonomy in teachers' sense is evident because of their profession since teachers sometimes need to do it independently due to professional responsibilities.*

**Privacy vs. Transparency (Closedness vs. Openness)** is a category (core values) of relational dialectics that describes the type of relationship among teachers based on the conversation. Conceptually, this refers to sharing information that can help a relationship grow closer and more substantial. However, this needs for self-disclosure conflicts with the need for privacy felt by each individual in the relationship. When these needs are at odds with one another, a relational tension is created over how much disclosure is desirable. This definition and explanation is based on the discussion of Hirokawa (2005).

This relational dialectic speaks of privacy vs. transparency. In this case, sharing information about themselves is not evident; sharing their ideas and opinions speaks of Privacy vs. Transparency context. One speaker tries to share what is right according to what he learned. This speaks of transparency of his own ideas and own opinion. Privacy is evident because the reasons they present are limited only to a particular issue which could be interpreted as there are still reasons that one speaker does not want to share. Another one is that the teacher wants to avoid accepting the suggestion of the other, sticking only to what he thinks is right. This instance shows closedness or privacy.

Privacy vs. transparency is evident between them based on their dialogue. There is a sharing of information between them, and one of the conversation elements is trying to have self-disclosure, which is transparency in the dialectics sense. On the first question, he gives information and answers beyond questions that exhibit transparency. Furthermore, privacy is also evident because only two talked about the topic, despite other teachers still during the conversation. Evidence is the second question, and the answer posted speaks of privacy. In this case, a limited answer or sharing of information is given. Thus, in this relational dialectics, privacy versus transparency is exhibited.

### **Linguistic Cues and Signals among Teachers in one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City**

In this study, there are two types of linguistic cues identified: honorific and devices. An honorific is a word or expression with connotations conveying esteem or respect when addressing or referring to a person. Sometimes, the term is misused to refer to an honorary title. It is also often conflated with systems of honorific speech in linguistics, which are grammatical or morphological ways of encoding the relative social status of speakers. Terms of endearment are added as examples of honorific devices that prove the type of relationship between people. Terms of endearment as linguistic cues are also considered to help concretize relational dialectics among my co-teachers.

Furthermore, devices that signal relational dialectics are also considered for further analysis. These devices are words or phrases or could be sentences that were analyzed for further interpretation of the discourses. These devices help the readers identify whether tensions and competing discourses are present in the conversation.

Data was gathered by simply observing and tallying the different terms of endearment used by the teachers to address their co-teachers. Furthermore, as a qualitative researcher, the terms of endearment signaled relational dialectics in its different categories. For the devices, the data was gathered through analysis of the chosen and scrutinized thoroughly for the identification of devices.

I interpreted the different terms based on the theoretical sensitivity I posed. Also, I based on the discipline of relationships, which is one of the core concepts of my study. To give further credibility and trustworthiness to this result, I also asked the informants why they used these terms of endearment to address their co-teachers.



The terms of endearment as a signaling device played different meanings in the relationship among teachers. From my interpretation as a researcher, the choice of the teachers as to what term they will use to address their co-teachers depends on their judgment as a person.

Moreover, after identifying the differences in the conversation. I presented them to the informants and asked for their perceptions based on my analysis as a qualitative researcher. Their opinions on my interpretation and identification of the signaling devices are significant for the credibility of the data in my research.

The terms of endearment as a signaling device played different meanings in the relationship among teachers. From my interpretation as a researcher, the choice of the teachers as to what term they will use to address their co-teachers depends on their judgment as a person.

Table 2. Linguistic Cues and Signals

Linguistic Cues and Signals			
Honorific		Devices	
Term	Meaning	Term	Meaning
Sir	Shows respect by profession and by position	Hoy!	Shows ease in talking to somebody.
Madam/Ma'am	Shows respect by profession and by position	Ambot!	Shows disagreement to the idea.
Manoy	Closeness/Degree of Intimacy	Coughing	Symbolizes disagreement/desire to discontinue the ongoing discourse
Manay	Closeness/Degree of Intimacy	Laughing	Shows agreement on the idea.
Bada	Closeness/Degree of Intimacy	Kuan	A term used in referring to something which the group has known in common.
Bossing	Position/Superiority Seniority/Personality	Unya	Term used as 'then?' which suggests What happen then?
Bai	Degree of closeness and intimacy		
Calling by First Name	Degree Of Closeness and Intimacy/Convenience or Preference		

### The Language Choice of the Teachers in one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City

Sociolinguists have long been fascinated by the phenomenon of bilingualism and the complex language-switching patterns that often accompany it. Many bilingual speakers can easily switch from language to language, sometimes in mid-sentence. Attempts to define such patterns have yet to meet with much success. Research reports on the subject are cluttered with such obscure terms as 'diglossia,' 'domain,' 'code-switching,' and 'ethnolinguistic vitality,' but reduced to the level of a layman's understanding; the original conclusion would seem to that choice of language is dictated primarily by the milieu in which the speaker finds himself (Budan, 1991). The abovementioned supporting details from related literature support the existence of speakers' choice of language in conveying ideas. In this study, language choice refers to the language used by the informants during the conversation. Moreover, the language choice in this study is subject to two categories: preference and constraints. Language preference as a category of language choice refers to the languages used by the speakers where they are comfortable, particularly with the dialect they are used to speaking. These are casual and vivid.

Sometimes, they are replacements for the standard ones and are often short-lived. In this case, *Bisaya* is the dominant language used and preferred by the informants during the conversation, especially in the usual event, such as a typical conversation in the faculty room. Informants, about their casual language, are very comfortable using their dialect because they can effectively communicate ideas. In relational dialectics discourse, the language preference among the informants paves the way to understanding the core values exhibited in each conversation.

As shown in Table 3, the language choice is divided into two categories: the language preference exemplified by Bisaya or mother tongue and the constraints category to which English or a second language belongs. In addition, each language choice category presents examples of terms taken from relational dialectics to add more meanings to each category.

As presented in the table, all these terms have equivalent terms in English. The informants preferred to use these during the conversation for the following reasons: First, it is just a typical conversation, and second, informants are fluent in speaking Bisaya and are at ease in using this dialect to convey an idea. In the second language choice category, which constraints best define, the following terms taken from the dialectics are put in the example as shown in the Table 3b: third year, civil engineering, SAIC, board, 2002 and 2001, business course, overnight, flag bearer, 12:30 (twelve thirty), 60 (sixty), hot dog, rice cooker, honorarium, and series. The informant used the term ‘third year’ because the situation demanded to use it rather than preferred to say ‘ikatuulo ka tuig.’ After all, the idea will differ from what he wanted to convey. In addition, all these terms, though there are equivalents in Bisaya through translation, must be used as they alone because that is the best way to convey what they mean. No choice for the informants but to use these terms during the conversations even though in a typical setting only because these terms are unnegotiable and one could find them hard to be substituted in its Bisaya term. Thus, using these terms in a conversation exemplifies constraint language choice. In addition, language events also affect the language choice of the informants. Let us consider that during the faculty meeting wherein faculty members spoke in English, nobody attempted to speak in Bisaya even though all were Bisaya people. This language category falls into constraints because teachers have no choice but to speak in English since they are in a formal setting. That profession or educational attainment, knowing that informants are all teachers, affects the language choice of the speakers.

Table 3. Language Choice of the Teachers

Language Choice			
Preference		Constraints	
Bisaya (Mother Tongue)	Lola	English (Second Language)	Third year
	Kuan		Civil Engineering
	Ambot		SAIC
	Unya		Board
	Dumot		2002/2001
	Tingog		Business course
	Manghod		Overnight
	Lain		Flag bearer
	Estorya		12:30 (twelve thirty)
	Ilisan		60 (sixty)
	Gwapo		Hot dog
	Hangtod		Rice cooker
	Ugma		Honorarium
	Hilum		Series

## **The Language Events of the Teachers in one of the tertiary institutions in Panabo City**

To generate data regarding relational dialectics among teachers, I used the different language events in the school where these dialectics are present. To wit, four language events are the source of these data: Typical conversations in two (2) settings, loading, and meeting.

In typical conversations with the teachers in the faculty room, there are many they have talked about, and there is no need to discuss whatever topics they have talked about, personal, academic, and even showbiz. The variety of conversation topics helps me to interpret the degree of closeness of the relationship between and among them. Furthermore, they are free to talk, and their styles of conveying ideas vary according to the issue or topic.

The other one is the faculty meeting. In this language event, severe and objective topics are discussed, and the teachers' behaviors are subject to seriousness. Furthermore, teachers used a second language during this event to convey ideas.

## **Meaning Constructed by the Teacher Relationship Through the Interplay of the Discourses**

I chose my co-teachers as my informants because I wanted to study relational dialectics in a formal organization. This dramatically contrasts with most relational dialectics studies, focusing only on intimate relationships like mother-daughter, friendship, and marriage. Furthermore, I have all the opportunity to study the dialectics since every day, I am with them and have also taken into consideration the role of the researcher of being a participant.

Teachers in this institution experienced tensions, which could be proven during specific conversations. There were instances when teachers argued about conflicting ideas presented by each party. The competing discourses between teachers speak of relational dialectics. There are different language events where I, as a qualitative researcher, argument as determined by their conversation. During the meeting, some occasions, some events, and most especially, during typical settings where usual conversation among teachers is present.

With theoretical sensitivity, as qualitative research practitioners need, teachers argue and fight for ideas because they have that high intellectual capacity and are professionals with knowledge and background regarding specific topics or issues.

Relational dialectics, in a positive sense, also determines the core values of the teachers' relationship. Of course, the interpretation of this is based on the relational dialectics model. Mainly, the three core values found among teachers in the workplace depend upon the situation and the time demands. Moreover, the core values also vary between teachers as to the degree of closeness and relationship.

Based on the analysis of the result of my study, I interpreted, of course, by having the theoretical sensitivity as a qualitative researcher, I have concluded that the three core values of relational dialectics are present among my co-teachers. Furthermore, the relationship between my co-teachers can be more understood through the relational dialectics model.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

This chapter deals with the discussion and conclusion of the major themes found in the results of this study. Furthermore, a discussion of each theme is emphasized here to understand relational dialectics further. Notably, the discussion of the result is according to the research questions' findings and answers.

## **Relational Dialectics**

As defined and discussed in the previous chapter, relational dialectics refers to the competing discourses among the teachers, particularly in this qualitative inquiry; this is based on the conversation between and among teachers. In a relationship where definite rules and policies are observed, like that in a formal organization, I found out that relational dialectics has a more significant influence on the relationship and personalities of the teachers with each other.

Concretizing these findings, relational dialectics, which is more broadened and explained in an intimate and personal relationship, has existed even in a formal organization where policies control people. Moreover, in cognitive aspects, dominant teachers are highly intellectually capacitated, where everyone fights for the ideas he holds to be true.

Somehow, the nature of these relational dialectics, as present in the conversation between and among the teachers, determines the core values in the relationship.

### **The Three Core Values or Dialectical Tensions**

It has been found that the core value of autonomy vs. connectedness exists among teachers. Based on the conversation, the usual setting in the faculty is that teachers talk with each other and keep in touch with them. Having a usual conversation suggests connectedness among them. Furthermore, teachers are also interdependent with each other, not just because that is a part of the responsibility but because, human as they are, it is an instinct. Nevertheless, the teachers are sometimes busy doing their activities, which shows autonomy. Teachers must do this alone because they must be part of individual responsibility. Autonomy is evident because of their profession; teachers sometimes need to do it independently due to professional responsibilities. Furthermore, teachers have tasks based on their personality, which speaks of autonomy. I used signaling devices, linguistic cues, and interpretation of language choice as determinative factors that autonomy vs. connectedness is present.

Four (4) selected relational dialects exhibit Privacy Vs. Transparency. This core value is exhibited in the relational dialectics among teachers. The relationship between teachers is still guarded with these core values wherein even if they need to share information about themselves, they keep some things for themselves. This conclusion I derived is based on my observation during the conversation and based on the statements during the conversation. Furthermore, some teachers are open to sharing themselves (transparency) and are available to sharing opinions about specific issues. At the same time, some are very careful to share about themselves and share ideas (privacy) on particular issues.

### **The Linguistic Cues and Signals**

Linguistic Cues and signals play a very important in the analysis of this study. Each linguistic cue serves as a signaling device to what particular meaning is derived from the dialectics based on the function of these cues. Different linguistic cues are used in deriving meanings of relational dialectics. Linguistic cues like the manner of the conversation are delivered, and the different choices of expression are used to the relational dialectics on its three core values.

In this study, “terms of endearment” is given attention as linguistic cues concretize the existence of relational dialectics among my co-teachers. They added spices to flavors to the results of my thorough investigation of the core values in the relationship among my co-teachers. It has been found that terms of endearment determine the extent of how close and intimate teachers are, superiority, position, and gaps, and just as a sort of human instinct.



Furthermore, signaling devices during conversation is also very important in analyzing relational dialectics between and among teachers. Actions like coughing and laughing are determinative factors and part of conveying ideas. Words and terms used are also considered for a more concrete interpretation of relational dialectics, as discussed in Chapter 4. Thus, even in a formal organization, the relationship can also be studied in Linguistics.

### **Language Events**

Language events refer to the different settings where the conversation is present. My study was only possible with this vital part of the research inquiry. The data source will be based on the language events that I considered.

### **Implication to the Relationship among Teachers**

This study should consider different disciplines for a more credible and trustworthy result. Linguistics, Sociology, and even Psychology played a significant role in studying the relationship among teachers.

Teachers' relationship with each other varies according to intimacy, superiority, personality, and instinct. These conclusive thoughts are based on linguistic cues and signals, mainly the terms of endearment, which are very significant for better understanding the relationship between them.

Determining the relationship between and among teachers in specific organizations could be Furthermore, the three core values exist among and between teachers' relationships, and this is an inevitable part of human life even though the relationship of my informants is guarded with professionalism. It has been found here that the three relational dialectics tension can be thoroughly scrutinized even in formal organization. They do not only exist in intimate and too personal relationships.

Furthermore, this proves that even professionals experience flux and competing discourse, for they are intellectually incapacitated and professional, and their personalities vary according to their environmental exposure. Thus, leading to tensions.

However, this implies that relational dialectics existed in the academic workplace and not only in a personal and intimate relationship like most studies in relational dialectics.

### **Implications to Language Teaching**

Research has always been a part of all disciplines, and research is a must and should be part and parcel of Language Teaching. Most importantly, research in the field of communication shall be observed for language teaching not only dwell on the usage and grammar where technicalities of words are the concerns but most notably on the psychological, behavioral, emotional, and relational aspects which are an integral part of the language teaching.

This study's result helped me realize the importance of understanding the relational dimension of beings based on dialectics. How would the findings help me? Understanding this phenomenon will help me think of a better way to adjust with my students and co-workers.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Agha (199). Honorification. Retrieved from <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.001425?journalCode=anthro> on March 21, 2012.
2. Amparo, R. (2011). Approaches of Philippine Multiage Schools of dyslexic learners: A Qualitative Study. Unpublished dissertation, University of Immaculate Conception, Davao City Philippines

3. Androutsopoulos (2006). Language choice and code switching in German-based diasporic web forums. Retrieved from [https://jannisandroutsopoulos.files.wordpress.com/2009/09/her\\_15.pdf](https://jannisandroutsopoulos.files.wordpress.com/2009/09/her_15.pdf) on February 21, 2012.
4. Altman, L, Vinsel, A., & Brown, B. (1981). Dialectic conceptions in social psychology. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 106-170). New York: Academic Press.
5. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C.
6. Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problem of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. and Trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
7. Baxter, L. A. (1988). A dialectical perspective on communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck (Eds.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 257-273). New York: Wiley.
8. Baxter, L. A. (1992a). Forms and functions of intimate play in personal relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 18, 336-363.
9. Baxter, L. A. (1992b). Interpersonal communication as dialogue: A response to the "Social Approaches Forum." *Communication Theory*, 2, 330-337.
10. Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: dialogues & dialectics*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
11. Baxter, L. A. (1993). The social side of personal relationships: A dialectical perspective. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Social context and relationships* (pp. 139-165). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
12. Baxter, L. A. (2004). Distinguished scholar article: relationships as dialogues. *Personal Relationships* 11, 1-22.
13. Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*. New York: Guilford
14. Baxter, L. A. (1988). A dialectical perspective of communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck. (Ed.) *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 257-273). New York: Wiley.
15. Baxter, L. (2004). A tale of two voices: relational dialectics theory. *The Journal Of Family Communication*, 4(3&4), 181-192.
16. Baxter, L. A. (1990). Dialectical contradictions in relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 69-88.
17. Berger, P., & Kenner, H. (1964). Marriage and the construction of reality. *Diogenes*, 64, 1-24.
18. Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
19. Bogdan, R. (1991). *Introduction to qualitative research: The search for meanings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
20. Brown, B. (1996). Dialectic conceptions in social psychology: An application to social penetration and privacy regulation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 107-160). New York: Academic Press.
21. Brown, D. C. (1996). Why ask why: patterns and themes of causal attribution in the workplace. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*
22. Byon (2006). The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. Retrieved from <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jplr.2006.2.issue-2/pr.2006.013/pr.2006.013xml>.
23. Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 119-161.
24. Creswell, J. (1997). *Qualitative Inquiry and research design*: SAGE Publication, Thousand Oaks, California USA.
25. Colton, D. and Covert, R. (2007). *Designing and constructing instrument for social research and evaluation*. Jossey-Bass A Wiley Company 989 Market Street, San Francisco CA, USA
26. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
27. Duffee, L, & Aikenhead, G. (1992). Curriculum change, student evaluation, and teacher practical knowledge. *Science Education*, 76(5), 493-506.
28. Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

29. Field, P.A., & Morse, J.M. (1992). *Nursing research. the application Of qualitative approaches*. London: Chapman & Hall.
30. Gempes, G. et.al (2009). Locus of control and work commitment of babay boomers and generation X. *The Frontier*, 8,122-160
31. Glaser, B. G, & Strauss, A. L (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
32. Graziano, A. and Raulin, M. (2010). *Research methods (A process of inquiry)* Pearson Education Inc. Publishing as Allyn and Bacon, 75 Arlington Street, Boston USA
33. Graffin, E. (2009). *A first look at communication theory (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. 163-174.
34. Greene, C. K. (1994). Factors that influence women's choices to work in the trades. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(2), 524a.
35. Goldsmith, D., & Baxter, L. A. (1996). Constituting relationships in talk: A taxonomy of speech events in social and personal relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 23, 87-114.
36. Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
37. Hirokawa, R. (2005) *Introduction to theories of human communication: Dialectical Theory*. Retrieved from <http://www2,hawaii.edu/~randyh/lect19.htm> on February 4, 2012.
38. Jubahib, G. (2012) *Code Switching Of English Teachers In The Classroom: Voices Of College Freshmen*, A dissertation book.
39. Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews. An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. CA: Sage.
40. Lincoln, Y. S, & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
41. Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1984). *Analyzing social settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
42. Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research method*. Thousand Oaks CA Sage, USA
43. Meyer, M. (2003). "It's me. I'm it. Defining adolescent sexual identity through relational dialectics in Dawson's Creek. Retrieved from on November 07, 2010.
44. Merriam, S. and Associates (2002) *Qualitative research and practice*. Jossey-Bass A Wiley Company 989 Market street, San Francisco CA, USA
45. Miller, K (2005) *Communication theories: perspectives, process and contexts* McGraw Hill, Boston, ISBN 0-7674-0500-5;
46. Montgomery, B. M. (1993). Relationship maintenance versus relationship change: A dialectical dilemma. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 205-223.
47. Montgomery, B. M., & Baxter, L A. (1998). *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
48. Montgomery, Barbara M. and Baxter, Leslie A. (1998) "Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships" L. Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, ISBN 0-8058-2112-0 ;
49. O'Sullivan, P. B. (2000). What you don't know won't hurt me: Impression management functions of communication channels in relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 26 (3), 403-431.
50. Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
51. Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
52. Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Newbery Park, CA: sage.
53. Raagas, E. (2010). *Understanding research basic concepts (with computer approach to basic data analysis)* Iwag Printing Publication Cagayan de Oro, Philippines
54. Rawlins, William K. (1989). "A Dialectical analysis of the tensions, functions and strategic challenges of communication in young adult friendships, "communication Yearbook 12, ed. James A. Anderson (Newbury, CA: Sage), 157-189.
55. Rawlins, William K. (1992). *Friendship matters: communication, dialectics, and the life course*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

56. Rosier, J. (2009) Managing tensions: novelty vs. predictability. Retrieved from <http://www.jenslovelessons.com/2009/04/managing-tension-novelty-vs.html> on February 02, 2012.
57. Schatzman, L, & Strauss, A. L. (1973). Field research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice- Hall, Inc.
58. Silverman, P. (2000). Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook, Sage Publication Ltd. 6 Bonhill Street, London EC2A4PU
59. Sours, J. S. (1997). A descriptive analysis of technical education learning styles. University of Arkansas: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
60. Strauss, A, & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
61. Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 7(2), 5-8.
62. Yun, H. (2006). Crying for me, crying for us: Relational dialectics in a Korean social network site. 15. Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/v0113/issue1/kim.yun.html> on November 04, 2010.
63. Schwarzzmann, D. (2010). Behind closed doors: privacy vs, transparency. Retrieved from <http://blogs.independent.co.uk/2010/11/27/behind-closed-doors-privacy-vs-transparency/> on January 11, 2012.
64. Thorburn, D. (1987). Television as an aesthetic medium. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4, 161-173.
65. Walker M. (2007). Using linguistic cues for the automatic recognition of personality in conversation and text. Retrieved from on March 21, 2012.
66. Zhang (2012). Linguistic cues: a linguistic cues software tool for research in text-based automatic deception detection. Retrieved from <http://www.iub.edu/~cogdev/labwork/ TrainingPsychScience.pdf>