UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

"NO NEED NECESSARILY TO SHOW OFF!"

DIRECTIVES AS SITUATED ACTIVITY IN L2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Leila Kääntä

Department of Languages

2004

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Leila Kääntä
'NO NEED NECESSARILY TO SHOW OFF!'
DIRECTIVES AS SITUATED ACTIVITY IN L2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Pro gradu -työ
Englannin kieli
Huhtikuu 2004   141 sivua + 1 liite

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää, miten vieraan kielen opettajat esittävät käskyjä luokkahuonediskurssissa. Materiaali on kerätty osana laajempaa luokkahuonetutkimusta ja se koostuu kolmen englantia vieraana kielenä opettavan opettajan videoiduista lukiotason tunneista, joita nauhoitettiin yhteensä 12. Tutkimusaineisto muodostuu näiden oppituntien aikana esiintyvistä käskyjen antotilanteista. Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan seuraavia kysymyksiä: 1) millaisia kieliopillisia rakenteita opettajat hyödyntävät muotoillessaan direktiivejä sekä englanniksi että suomeksi? 2) millaisia tehtäviä direktiivit saavat esiintyessään eri luokkahuonetilanteissa? 3) millaisen roolin ei-kielellinen viestintä saa käskyjen annossa? Tutkimus on luonteeltaan laadullinen ja kuvaileva.

Tutkimuksen taustalla on keskusteluanalyyttinen näkemys, jonka mukaan käskyt voidaan tunnistaa ympäröivästä diskurssista havainnoimalla opettajan ja oppilaiden välistä vuorovaikutusta. Tutkimuksen tärkeimpänä lähtökohtana on näkemys direktiivien tuottamisesta tilanteeseen sidottuna aktiviteettina, jonka avulla niiden eri funktiot luokkahuonediskurssissa voidaan selvittää. Tämän vuoksi käskyjen roolia tarkasteltiin kolmen eri kontekstin kautta: tehtävänhallinnan, luokkahuonekontrollin ja opettamisen näkökulmista.

Tulokset osoittavat, että englannin oppitunneilla opettajat hyödyntävät käskyjen antamisessa useita kieliopillisia muotoja sekä englanniksi että suomeksi, kuten erilaisia imperatiivirakenteita, kysymys- ja väitelauseita. Lisäksi opetustilanteessa annetaan passiivimuotoisia suomenkielisiä käskyjä. Tehtävänhallinnan kontekstissa käskyjen funktiot liittyvät olennaisesti siihen, että niillä edistetään oppilaiden tarkkaavaisuutta oppitunnilla. Sen lisäksi erilaisia käskyrakenteita käytetään tehtävänannon rakenteellisen selkeyden turvaamiseksi. Luokkahuoneen järjestyksen hallinnassa direktiivejä käytetään oppilaiden asiattoman käytöksen korjaamiseen ja luokkahuonenormien asettamiseen ja ylläpitämiseen. Opettamisessa direktiivien rooli on lähinnä vieraan kielen oppimista edesauttava tekijä siten, että käskyjen anto luo oppilaille mahdollisuuden kielen harjoittamiseen itse oppimistilanteessa tai vastaavasti myöhäisempänä ajankohtana, jolloin niiden mahdollinen toteutuminen tai toteuttamatta jättäminen ei ole sidottu esitystilanteeseen. Ei-kielellisen viestinnän tehtävä on sekä direktiivien merkityksen selventäminen että tehostaminen erilaisten eleiden ja katseen avulla. Ei-kielellisen viestinnän tuloksiin on kuitenkin suhtauduttava varauksellisesti, sillä tämän tutkimuksen tulokset ovat vasta alustavia havaintoja nonverbaalin kommunikaation roolista luokkahuonediskurssissa.

Tutkimusaineiston analyysin pohjalta muodostuu vaikutelma, että käskyjä annetaan lukiotasolla huomattavasti enemmän tehtävänhallintatilanteissa kuin muissa konteksteissa, mikä saattaa johtua niiden oppitunninkulun edistämis- ja selkeyttämisfunktiosta. Järjestyksen ylläpitämiseen liittyvien käskyjen määrä on sen sijaan vähäinen, minkä vuoksi olisi kiinnostavaa tarkastella ala-asteen vastaavia tilanteita: esiintyykö niissä paljon direktiivejä, ja millaisia direktiivejä niissä esiintyy, kun ajatellaan, että ala-asteen oppilaat ovat vasta sosiaalistumassa institutionaaliseen ympäristöön ja sen asettamiin normeihin.

Asiasanat: L2 classroom interaction. institutional talk. conversation analysis. directives. embodied activity. gesticulation.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

> "Open your books from page 27!"
>
> "Write this down in your notebooks!"
>
> "Don't use swearwords in your essays!"

Everywhere in foreign language classrooms teachers issue directives such as the above to their students. Even at this moment, somewhere a teacher orders students to take out their books or to begin writing their essays and so forth. Teachers are faced with the task of giving instructions, managing classroom behavior, directing the fluent proceeding of the lessons and other similar tasks as part of their job description. For them, these activities form the basis of their daily task performed within the context of their work: the classroom.

How teachers come about realizing their task as controllers, instructors and whatnot is quite a fascinating but rather multi-dimensional question and not so easy to answer. However, the present study tries to unveil some of the aspects related to directive language use in second language teaching and classroom interaction. The primary focus of my study is the use of diverse directives in teacher's communication through verbal and nonverbal language. In particular, I am interested in what kinds of directives are actually used by the teacher and in what ways they are manifested to students through linguistic and non-linguistic means. Also, it might be interesting to see how the communication is carried out and developed: how students react to teacher's directives and how they respond to them by adjusting or changing the course of interaction. As such, the present study does not attempt to explain teachers' work exhaustively. Rather it can be

seen as a glimpse of the ways in which teachers control their students in reality.

The overall framework of the present study is based on Goffman's notion of situated activity systems that he used to refer to those interactional situations consisting of interdependent actions having only one focus (1961, in Goodwin 1995). Presently, this view is applied in the broadest possible sense to cover the entire institutional situation of the classroom and its one principal focus: teaching and learning. However, since the classroom can be considered as a social environment created jointly by the participants, already the social context suggests the multifaceted actions taking place. Some of them are directly related to the social organization of classrooms, that is, to the way that the relationship between teacher and students is perceived and developed. Other actions are connected to the fluent proceedings of the lessons as well as to the instruction of L2 itself. In all of these, directives play a crucial part as it is in part through them that the social environment is realized. The question at present is how this is achieved.

In the past few decades it has been widely acknowledged that language is action and when talking people are performing actions. More importantly, not only are people realizing actions, they are also interacting with others. It has also been suggested that the context of interaction as well as linguistic properties and the nature of the relationship between participants constitute the primary basis on which the identification of directives (or other speech acts, for that matter) is carried out. Therefore, theoretical approaches from traditional linguistics, conversation analysis and pragmatics are exploited in my study. Research conducted in the field of institutional discourse has in general taken advantage of such theoretical perspectives as sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, speech act

theory and ethnomethodology. Some of these approach institutional interaction from complementary viewpoints whereas others offer more controversial avenues. The most important insights for the purposes of the present study come from the divergent theories and findings of conversation analysis research as well as those of speech act theory from the institutional perspective. Likewise, studies from the sphere of embodied activity (i.e. nonverbal communication as one type of resource in conveying messages in interaction) provide important perspectives, as nonverbal communication is deemed to be integrally intertwined in the overall construction and accomplishment of social encounters. Thus, the first part of my thesis presents some of the most essential research findings and perspectives as well as a collection of the most important concepts and categorizations of these fields.

The research questions I am trying to find answers to fall into three categories. First of all, I investigate what kind of grammatical constructions both in Finnish and English teachers employ while issuing directives in L2 classrooms and how they are conveyed within the context of different task environments during the lesson. The three primary contexts identified for the present study are task management, instruction and classroom management. Second, I examine what kinds of discrete functions the directives have within the three task areas. And finally, I describe the role of embodied activity; that is, how directives are actually realized through language and gesticulation in classrooms.

With the help of these three questions, my aim is to demonstrate how linguistic – both grammatical and pragmatic – and nonverbal resources are utilized by language teachers in the activity of giving directives. The analysis, therefore, is founded on identifying and

describing grammatical formats, pragmatic features and patterns of interaction.

The present study has an applied focus. It tries to reveal to teachers, teacher trainees, scholars and others how teachers realize the task of giving instructions and managing classroom activity. However, it is descriptive rather than prescriptive. By trying to avoid strong evaluations, the present study is carried out in order to understand how, in reality, teachers and students communicate in classroom: what actually takes place during lessons. Hopefully, the results will give information about the roles of verbal and nonverbal messages in the context of directives in classroom discourse.

2 THE NATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL INTERACTION: THE CLASSROOM CONTEXT

2.1 Research developments in L2 classroom studies

Research on L2 learning has been plentiful and the methods as well as the theories have been varied. Before the seventies, the domain was characterized by experimental and 'laboratory'-like studies that compared differential teaching methods in the search for effective learning results (Ellis 1990). Unfortunately, these experiments did not show any proof of one method resulting in better outcomes than others and, thus, it was questioned whether research such as this was capable of explaining the teaching – learning process. That is why L2 classroom research actually saw its major growth via the rise of empirical research on classroom behavior. (Ellis 1990:10-11).

2.1.1 Classroom process research

The empirical research conducted after the seventies has provided the needed theoretical building ground for studies on classroom L2 learning. Two branches of research have resulted from it: the study of formal instruction and L2 acquisition and **classroom process research**, which includes the study of classroom interaction and L2 acquisition. (Ellis 1990, Hall and Verplaetse 2000). The former branch is represented by studies that have investigated the role of formal instruction on L2 acquisition by examining either the successfulness of teaching in the light of new knowledge gained or the process of learning itself (Ellis 1990:13). Research on formal instruction has either compared naturalistic learning to institutional or measured the effects of pedagogical instruction through experimental studies. The results have

indicated that, for example, learners who have been given formal instruction do better than the ones who have not received it (Ellis 1990:13). Studies of the learning process, on the other hand, have not shown crucial differences between the ways in which learners acquire a language in naturalistic or classroom contexts (Ellis 1990:13). Despite this, Ellis (1990:14) points out that an advantage of formal instruction research lies in its abilities to investigate the teaching – learning relationship in a more direct way as it uses measurements from both the teaching and the learning branches of research.

Classroom process research relies on ethnographic observation of classroom interaction while aiming to describe what actually takes place in classrooms (Ellis 1990:11-15). It also tries to explain in detail the various events occurring in the classroom without any predisposed theories to lean on (Ellis 1994:573). For the most part, it is sociologically oriented in that the descriptions are social rather than cognitive (Ellis 1990:11). In other words, the general view of classroom process research is that language lessons are "socially constructed events" and its main purpose is to try to understand how these events are enacted (Ellis 1994:573).

Teacher's language, learner's language and the nature of classroom interaction are some of the research areas of classroom process research (Ellis 1990:11). The study of classroom interaction and L2 acquisition has focused on examining the relationship between interaction and learning, for instance, through theory-driven studies, such as those guided by the interactional hypothesis (Ellis 1990), participation observation or ethnography (Mehan 1979). What these and other similar avenues of interaction research have in common is their mutual emphasis on the importance of studying the teaching - learning process through locally produced interaction. As for the present study,

classroom interaction is viewed as being a crucial part of the process of L2 learning, but the primary focus is on the nature of the interaction, not so much on how learning takes place or how it is affected. Thus, all the evaluative aspects in this regard are excluded.

The research examining what kind of language learners use in L2 acquisition has studied, in general, the amount and nature of learner language in teacher-centered lessons, the communicative strategies students are capable of using in the class, the comprehension signals students give with regard to teacher's utterances and so on (Ellis 1990:81-85). The results of the studies of communicative acts performed by learners indicate that students' use of language consists mostly of answering teachers' questions whether they are closed or open ones (Ellis 1990:82). Other research results indicate that, for instance, the amount of talk produced by learners depends greatly on the nature of the task (drill or role-play), their individual backgrounds, the competence level of the learner etc. (Ellis 1990:81-85).

Classroom process researchers have also studied the teachers´ language in L2 learning concentrating on aspects like error treatment (i.e. how learner errors are dealt by the teacher) and **teacher talk** (i.e. the characteristic way in which teachers talk to their students) (Ellis 1990:11-12). The latter aspect of research is also relevant background for the present study and thus, it will be discussed more thoroughly later on[1]. The former aspect is not of importance here, but nevertheless it can be stated that studies in the domain have shown that teachers consistently correct some of the students' errors while ignoring others and that in the negotiation of correctness further errors might be learned (Ellis 1990:70-74).

---

[1] See chapter 2.3.

When looking at classroom process research in general, it seems that it is merely one part of a broader field of research on institutional interaction. The study of institutional interaction has gained importance in the past few decades as an abundant source of new methods for research in the domain. These have included quite a number of divergent theoretical avenues and developments from cognate disciplines such as sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (e.g. Drew and Heritage 1992, Drew and Sorjonen 1997, Hall and Verplaetse 2000). Thus in the following section an overview follows of some of the aspects of research conducted in institutional talk and, in particular, in classroom interaction.

2.1.2 Research on classrooms and other settings as institutional contexts

In the previous section, I tried to show that L2 acquisition and teaching have been studied from many perspectives throughout the past decades. However, a discussion of one very essential and related element of such research has been postponed until now. This neglected aspect provides the foundation for all classroom process research: the institutional character of classrooms and classroom discourse.

The language used in classrooms, as well as in other institutions, is considered to be a form of talk-in-interaction through which "the participants perform and pursue their respective institutional tasks and goals" (Drew and Sorjonen 1997:92). Therefore, the context and the demands it casts over the actions of the participants define the nature of classrooms as institutional. We go to school in order to learn countless things and we do so by performing actions associated to learning

within the confines of the rules of the class. Other situations where institutional interaction can take place are court rooms, doctor's offices and television news-interviews to name but a few examples. The common denominator for them is that language is used in each setting to achieve the particular activities associated with them in interaction with other people. Moreover, it is important to comprehend that it is not always the physical setting that defines institutional talk, rather it is the social situation where people are, i.e.; at work, one can talk about work with colleagues but similarly one can discuss current events or one's health (Drew and Sorjonen 1997:92, Drew and Heritage 1992:3-4).

In general, it seems that studies of institutional dialogue emphasize the important role of the organization of turn-taking in talk-in-interaction. Studies based on conversation analysis show that, for instance, in news-interviews (Heritage and Greatbach 1991) or doctor-patient consultations (ten Have 1991) the relationship between the participants should not be considered given (i.e. through the institutional context) but rather it should be deduced from their management of interaction and construction of turns. For ten Have (1991), the supposedly asymmetrical relationship between a doctor and a patient is not a product of the context as such. The nature of the relationship is achieved through the actions of the two within the situation: how they react to each others' behavior and talk. However, observing the turn-taking organization has not been the only way of analyzing how participants position themselves within the framework of institutional talk. Drew and Sorjonen (1997) present other additional factors that reveal the interactants' attitude towards the situation through their research on institutional identities. These are the divergent verbal means the participants take advantage of while talking. Through person reference, for instance, the interactants often

refer to themselves as representatives of institutions. For example, in emergency call centers the call-takers might use the form 'we' when talking about sending help to the ones in need of it. Lexical choices can also reveal the institutionally perceived situation. In practice in some situations, this might mean issuing utterances where there are no direct accusations or hostile forms towards the recipients, but rather using words that are as neutral as possible and distanced from the speaker.

Observing the turn-taking organization has accumulated further studies within the field that have brought into consideration the structurally organized nature of institutional action. Psathas (1991), Thornborrow (2002), Sinclair and Brazil (1982) and yet other scholars suggest that institutional talk is a highly structured activity. News-interviews typically follow frequently a question – answer structure, where the interviewer asks questions and interviewee answers (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991). The same kind of organization can be found in medical consultations and emergency calls. In classrooms, by contrast, the structure is slightly different in that it includes a third component (Sinclair and Brazil 1982). This third part is considered to be a sort of feedback to the previous answer by a student[2]. All in all, it appears that the institutional roles of professionals and lay persons are deducible through the choice of turn types available for them and their actual employment in those interactional surroundings.

---

[2] For closer discussion, see 2.2.3.

2.2 L2 classroom discourse

L2 classroom discourse can be depicted from several perspectives and researchers have tried to do this in various ways. In the following, I will briefly examine some of the characteristic features of classroom talk that have been identified and discuss how these differ from the characterizations of other more informal contexts.

2.2.1 Naturalistic vs. institutional discourse

In general, studies of classroom interaction and research conducted in the sphere of institutional interaction have resorted to comparative analysis in order to distinguish ordinary conversation from institutional talk (e.g. Drew and Heritage 1992, Ellis 1990). The differentiation into these two separate forms of interaction is not considered to be clear-cut in that referring to one automatically excludes the other; rather it has been a practical framework on which divergent studies have begun to build their analysis.

First of all, differences have been found on such aspects like goal orientation, constraints on participants and inferential frameworks (Drew and Heritage 1992:21-25). In classrooms, court rooms or medical clinics, the participants are normally oriented towards achieving a particular task or an activity, and as such their dialogue is characterized by the goals they are aspiring to. In addition, the task or tasks are relatively restricted to the conventional associations of the setting and of the participants of that setting, for instance, in the present study the goal is to get students to work. In contrast to this, other researchers claim that instructional discourse is product-oriented and as such presents accurate facts (Kramsch 1985, cited in Ellis 1990:85-86).

However, according to Drew and Heritage (1992) the constraints that the institutional context manifests on its interactants further enhance its goal-oriented nature. The contributions the participants make in the interaction are influenced by the way they regard the nature of the context: some situations might promote certain conversational actions from participants whereas others hinder their performance (Drew and Heritage 1992). For example, in classrooms students do not usually initiate turns unless it is something that can be done on the basis of a particular exercise, such as open discussion[3]. Moreover, some constraints affect the ways with which the 'professionals' – the representatives of the institution as opposed to lay persons – perform their activities. These inferences involve the delicate sense of what is appropriate from one setting to another. (Drew and Heritage 1992:21-25.) News-interviewers, for example, withhold many of the normal everyday expressions that participants in casual conversation use: sympathy, surprise, shock and so forth.

Second, Ellis (1990:85-86, 1994:580-1) reports about other differences that separate classroom discourse from the mundane conversation we encounter in our daily lives. According to him, instructional discourse is organized by differential statuses of the teacher and the learner and is teacher-oriented as information is transmitted under the teacher's control through various classroom activities. Mundane conversation, on the other hand, is described as being fluent and more focused on the process of interaction of the participants; not so much on the product. What is more, the participants negotiate their roles during mundane talk and they are encouraged to participate equally in the search for meaning.

---

[3] For more detailed examples, see Mehan 1979 and Thornborrow 2002.

Finally, Edwards and Westgate (1987:44) identify additional differentiating features. They state that whereas natural conversation usually takes place between equals, it is also carried out with only a few participants. In classrooms, this is not possible. Rather the talk is characterized with unequal statuses and the number of participants is high, which further results in the fact that the teacher is obliged to control the discourse by ensuring the co-operation of students: not talking out-of-turn and listening when it is called for. This characterization is consistent with the view presented above about institutionalized talk in general: students are under certain conversational constraints which means that they are not allowed to talk freely (Drew and Heritage 1992). One more difference being emphasized is the lack of a "predetermined expert" and "authoritatively decided conclusions" (Edwards and Westgate 1987:45) in naturalistic conversation. Thornborrow (2002:109) further seconds this notion by disclosing that in classrooms teachers know the answers for the questions they are eliciting from their students. In natural conversation, this is unlikely but can occasionally occur. Classroom discourse, on the other hand, includes quite rarely the kind of free-flowing non-topic-related conversation of which everyday discourse is full (Edwards and Westgate 1987:45).

Even though the difference between naturalistic and institutional discourse is emphasized in the sphere of institutional interaction by several researchers, Ellis (1990:88) nevertheless points out that classroom discourse can be described as containing both types. But as Malamah-Thomas (1987:17) states: "the classroom exists so that students can learn, and the main focus of most classroom communication is a pedagogic one", thus indicating the considerable difference between classroom and other social contexts. How discourse

is then defined depends on its nature: whether it is used as a tool for learning the target language through metacommunication – the discourse is about the language acquired - or as an instrument of simulated authentic communication where the target language is used as a medium in the discourse whether this is written or spoken (Ellis 1990:85-86).

2.2.2 Different types of classroom discourse

There have been many attempts to define classroom discourse and the basic definition seems to be founded on the natural – pedagogical continuum (Ellis 1990:88). It appears that this distinction has been used as a starting point in the majority of studies when research has focused on how classroom discourse affects L2 acquisition (Ellis 1990:89-90). However, Ellis (1994:577-578) has reported about other ways that classroom interaction has been described and explained by different researchers. These descriptions have tried to categorize in detail the different types of interactions occurring in the classroom. They vary in their complexity: some of them contain two dimensions whereas others consist of several. How categorizations themselves have been produced have depended on the deviser's opinion of what is important when trying to understand the interaction in the classroom. These include such aspects as the amount of teacher's control over an activity and a topic, the kind of teaching that takes place during the lesson and the kinds of goals that are set and the ways in which the participants are viewed in respect of their identities in the classroom.

Van Lier (1988) approaches interaction in classrooms from a slightly different perspective. He describes classroom interaction as being either activity-oriented or topic-oriented. On the basis of these two

orientations, he suggests that there are four types of interaction in lessons. They vary from phases of less activity – less topic to more topic - more activity. That is, less activity – less topic refers to a basic normal conversation or small talk that can take place in classrooms from time to time. The other end of the continuum is the more activity – more topic pole where the class performs certain things with specific rules, for example, they do pair work or repetition drills. The other two types of interaction fall between these two extremes. (van Lier 1988: 155-156.)

The different categorizations show that classroom interaction can be approached from quite divergent perspectives: language or activity (Ellis 1994). However, it is worthwhile to point out that even though some of the categorizations seem to divide the lesson into separate identifiable sections, in the actual situation this is not so evident and should not be treated as such.

2.2.3 Characteristics of classroom discourse

By relying on conversation analysis and, particularly, on examining the turn-taking organization, scholars have been able to identify some of the primary characteristics of classroom talk. For example, the general structure of instructional discourse is usually of the following kind: Initiation – Response – Follow-up (I-R-F) and it is often referred to either as an 'exchange' (e.g. McHoul 1978, Sinclair and Brazil 1982, Sinclair and Coulthard 1992) or as a three-part instructional sequence (Mehan 1979). The exchange begins with teacher's initiation, generally a question, which is then followed by a student's response. Having heard the response, the teacher reacts to it by giving some sort of signal of acceptance by responding to it verbally or nonverbally. Mehan (1979:54-55) states that very often the sequence is extended by additional

sequences when students fail to answer correctly to the questions and the teacher is compelled to try to get proper responses from other students. Sinclair and Brazil (1982:49) point out that the exchange sequence is a highly regular and characteristic feature of teacher talk.

Other prevalent features of classroom discourse have been presented by Sinclair and Brazil (1982). They state that students are not obliged to talk in the class, however willing and eager they might be to chat with their friends or with the teacher. It is rather up to the teacher to control who gets to speak and what the topic is. That is, the teacher dominates the discussion. How much the teacher talks, depends, for instance, on the subject matter, activity type or personal characteristics of the teacher. Furthermore, it seems that learner initiatives in terms of turn-taking are discouraged so that the organized form of classroom discourse is not in any way threatened (Ellis 1990:87). This further inhibits the students from having small-talk (op. cit.) and results in a limited range of communication methods that they can perform in class. For example, pupils rarely give commands or follow-ups. Responding is the most available method for them and even this takes place within the limits set by the teacher's question as well as the evaluation of the sufficiency of the students' response (McHoul 1978). Hence, the teacher has the power to determine how the discourse develops and what kind of utterances the students are allowed to produce. (Sinclair and Brazil 1982:58[4]).

When looking at the diverse features of classroom discourse, one interesting aspect can be identified. It appears that the teacher has a relatively more powerful position than the students: the relationship between them is asymmetrical. For some scholars (e.g. Sinclair and Brazil, Ellis) this is a pervasive assumption born out of their studies

---

[4] See also McHoul 1978.

whereas for others (e.g. Thornborrow) it is still an open question. Thornborrow (2002:113), for instance, adopts another view towards the asymmetrical relationship between teacher and students. She pictures it as being in constant movement while the participants negotiate the nature of their relationship and where the power is not automatically owned by the teacher.

Thornborrow's (2002) research on the organization of classroom discussion talk seems to strengthen her views. The results show that while the teacher is nominally in control of the discussion and the allocation of turns, the students have the possibility of negotiating more powerful roles during the discussion than being mere listeners-opinion givers. They can self-select themselves as speakers, and they can be joint collaborators throughout the discussion, i.e.; they laugh at jokes, second opinions etc. In addition, students can effectively disrupt the general structure of classroom discourse rather easily by declining to co-operate according to the institutionally inscribed rules. In other words, they refuse to answer when questioned or decline to give their opinion. However, such instances are rare and teachers set about remedying them instantly after their occurrence by nominating other students to answer or give opinions. (Thornborrow 2002:108-131.)

2.2.4 Characteristic features of lesson organization

Since classroom discourse is a highly structured and regular activity, it can be assumed that the overall organization of lessons is structured as well. According to Mehan (1979), the organization of lessons is structured both hierarchically and sequentially through the joint collaboration of the interactants. The hierarchical organization is seen from the bottom to the top and it begins from the smallest interactional

unit of independent turn sequences that form the I-R-F exchange[5].
Numerous exchange sequences comprise the basic sequence during
which a topically related set, the topic of a particular part of the lesson,
is introduced. This basic sequence can have additional conditional
sequences that take the topic into new areas. The different phases of the
lessons are thus formed via the basic sequences. That is, the lesson,
which is on top of the hierarchy, encompasses several basic sequences
and within each of them a new topic is brought into discussion. (Mehan
1979.)

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) have identified a similar kind of
hierarchical organization for classroom discourse. According to them,
the basic element of classroom discourse is the lesson, which is further
divided into several sublevels. These are from the top to the bottom:
transaction, exchange, move and act. Their analysis is very detailed and
within the scope of the present study somewhat too minutes a
description for it to be exhaustively explained here. However, it is
nevertheless useful to disclose that the exchange–level of lessons
consists of the I-R-F exchange discussed above. That is, the different
components of the exchange - initiation (I), response (R) and feedback
(F) – constitute moves. Nomination of students, comments, directives,
replies and checks are some of the acts that Sinclair and Coulthard refer
to as discourse categories. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992.)

Willis (1992) has developed an analysis of the sequential
organization of foreign language classrooms. Her categorization,
however, is not about the organization of lesson as such as it is about
the type of language used within the lesson. In L2 classrooms, the
language utilized is of two kinds: it is either the medium of instruction
or it is the subject matter (Willis 1992:162). On the basis of this dual

---

[5] See 2.2.3 above.

nature of language, Willis (1992) has identified two concepts – inner and outer - which function as devices for recognizing the language type of a particular part of a lesson. The outer phases of the lessons refer to those actions that are involved with the process of socialization, organization, managing and explaining, and these can be expressed with the target language or with the students' mother tongue. The instruction, i.e.; the drilling of divergent formulations in the target language, is seen to operate in the inner phase of the lesson. The actual realization of these actions is explained with the help of the hierarchical structure that Sinclair and Coulthard have formulated, and which was discussed above. (Willis 1992.)

In comparison with their taxonomy, Willis's categorization sheds more light on how the L2 classroom discourse is organized. Having said this, however, it needs to be acknowledged that her taxonomy is also rather complex theoretically and thus is not applicable as such in the present study. The two terms – inner and outer – are somewhat too narrow in themselves, but the idea of the diverse actions of which the terms consist is important. Therefore, in the present study, the following environments are identified for analysis: task management, classroom management and instruction. All three environments include similar actions as mentioned by Willis (i.e. organization, managing, drilling etc.). The only significant difference is that her outer actions have been presently divided into task and classroom management, as it is, in my opinion, better to analyze them separately even though it is difficult to draw a clear line between them. As such, task management refers to actions connected with the fluent proceedings of the lessons. This includes the explanation of activities, giving instructions and homework and so on. Classroom management, in contrast, consists of actions aimed at controlling students' behavior and maintaining order

in the classroom. Instruction is equivalent with that of Willis's inner phase.

In Mehan's (1979:72-74) terms, the sequential organization of lessons is observed from a horizontal point of view, from the beginning of the lesson to the end. It comprises of the opening phase, the instruction and the closing phase and has been defined according to the reciprocal actions the participants perform during these phases. For example, directives and informational utterances are generated while opening and closing phases are at hand. During an opening the teacher orients herself, the needed teaching material and the students to the topic or an activity to which they are about to proceed. For this, the teacher uses both verbal and nonverbal means in order to convey to the students what they should do. The academic information is then passed forward in the instruction phase, which is closed again with directives and with summarizing of information.

Not only is the organization of lessons collaborated through interaction, the same procedure is used for the social order of lessons (Mehan 1979:81-83). By the allocation of turns, the teacher guides, and simultaneously ensures, that the lesson flows smoothly forward. The students, for their part, participate in this with their actions. The turns can be assigned either verbally or nonverbally or as a combination of both. Nominating a student individually, invitations to bid (to raise hands) or invitations to reply are only some of the means that teachers operate with in turn-allocation. On occasions where the nominations are not followed, the teacher has diverse strategies to resort to in order to redirect the lesson to its normal course. That is, if students do not answer when asked or they reply when not asked, the teacher is able to change the students' behavior by her actions. To name but a few of them, she can ignore such instances by doing nothing or she can open

the floor and let non-nominated students answer or she can plainly try to get through the situation. The strategies the teachers employ are always chosen on the basis of the context where they appear, thus making their use varied from one situation to another instead of a stable feature in similar occasions. (Mehan 1979:81-125.) What all this points to, in my opinion, bears resemblance to what Thornborrow (2002) talked about in relation to the relationship between teacher and students: it is negotiated through interaction on a moment-by-moment basis. As such, it has an effect on the social structuring of lessons.

The overall organization of lessons as described by Mehan and Sinclair and Coulthard, in my opinion, is plausible and understandable, although it is not clear how well it captures the actions that take place in L2 classrooms when compared to Willis's description. Sinclair and Coulthard's hierarchy seems too theoretical as a basis for examining L2 classroom tasks. Mehan, on the other hand, does not refer to such actions as checking exercises, going through grammar and so forth, which are essential modes of teaching in foreign language lessons, at all, and thus it is somewhat unclear where they are to be categorized: into opening or closing phases or into instruction phase. In the analysis of the present study, these and similar contexts are included within instruction phases as they can be seen to include the passing of academic information. It is only passed forward via exercises. Furthermore, the term 'topically related set' is replaced by the term topically related **task** (or task in short), which can be seen as somewhat more appropriate for the present purposes, as it is considered to entail the entire action instead of a small part of one. Likewise, the term **activity** is utilized in reference to those various actions occurring within

particular task environments[6]. For instance, teachers perform an activity when they issue directives. Other activities within lessons could be the introduction of a new topic or greeting students at the beginning of the lesson and a number of other similar kinds of acts teachers carry out.

2.3 Teacher talk

Teacher talk, in its simplest sense, refers to the characteristic ways with which teachers talk to their students (Ellis 1990:11). There have been several attempts to study the particularities of teacher talk. Some of these studies have concentrated, for instance, on the input features of teachers' speech whereas others have tried to present further aspects such as the different actions teachers perform in class.

Håkansson (1987) has conducted research on input qualities of teachers teaching Swedish as a foreign language. She has found that in general teachers use linguistically more correct forms than people participating in mundane talk. She has also proposed that teachers' vocabulary and phrasal forms become more complicated alongside with the learners' improved proficiency level. And according to her, teachers use a slower speech rate with learners than people in normal conversation. (Håkansson 1987.) However, these features are not enough to explain all the aspects of teacher talk since examining speech itself does not give insights to what teachers do with it. Research that has focused on the teacher's actions in the classroom, however, can explain it.

Sinclair and Brazil (1982), among others, have studied the activities teachers perform while teaching. According to them, language is social

---

[6] The definition of activity is based on Goodwin and Goodwin's (1992) identification of the term. See 4.2.1 for closer discussion.

activity and therefore, discourse is developed jointly in interaction with the participants. The language in classrooms is developed through the diverse activities that teachers and students are involved in. For teachers, these include acts like informing, eliciting, directing and evaluating (Sinclair and Brazil 1982, Sinclair and Coulthard 1992). Furthermore, Sinclair and Brazil (1982) insist that classroom discourse is always structured: there is a beginning and an ending and it aims at something. Thus, the activities teachers perform are aimed to fulfill this aspect.

It seems that the teacher's initiations are the most prevalent of the four activities, whether they are in the form of questions, instructions or information statements, and they constitute the main instrument of education (Sinclair and Brazil 1982:36). Another instrument that is considered to be very much used in classroom discourse is feedback. Sinclair and Brazil (1982:44) emphasize its role in the process of learning and they consider it to be "a major factor in teacher talk." All these influence the way discourse is structured in the classroom.

Sinclair and Brazil (1982) state that one of the activities teachers do in class is directing. According to them, this can be defined as getting the students to do things, ordering them and instructing how teaching is developing (1982:75). They also claim that there are two different ways for students to respond to directives. They can either reply verbally or they perform according to the content of the directive (Sinclair and Brazil 1982:75). If the latter manner is pursued, it entails the consideration of nonverbal behavior as part of interaction. In the present analysis, this is the case. But rather than examining the learners' performance per se, my study tries to identify the teachers' behavior when issuing directives.

There are several different kinds of manners of directing and it is the teacher's choice which kind he uses (Sinclair and Brazil 1982:78). Sinclair and Brazil (op. cit.) emphasize that teachers use imperative forms less nowadays, even though directives are still used continuously in teaching. Instead these are disguised syntactically under such forms as declaratives, interrogatives or embedding. Their directive nature can be identified when they fulfill certain conditions that Sinclair and Coulthard (1992:12-13) have identified. First of all, the action of the form is physically realizable within the situation. Second, the subject of the utterance is the addressee. Third, if the utterance is an interrogative, it should contain one of the modal verbs: could, would, can or will. Finally, an utterance is a directive if the action it describes is forbidden at the moment of issuing the utterance. An example of such an utterance could be 'I can hear someone talking'. Teachers like students can employ both verbal and visual means to express their directives (e.g. McHoul 1978). Whatever the form or the media is, one fact remains clear: the role of teacher is still the dominant one.

The different forms of directives teachers use in reality will be examined in detail in the analysis of the data. Before that, however, there are still further questions to be tackled through examining theory and research of institutional talk from an interactional perspective: what are directives and how they can be defined and how embodied activity is related to interaction in general.

3 DIRECTIVES IN LINGUISTICS AND CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

3.1 Difficulties in defining directives

Since the present study focuses on describing directives and their use through nonverbal and verbal language, it is important to define the term itself. Goodwin (1990:65) has offered a very basic definition by stating that directive is "an utterance designed to get someone else to do something." For the moment, this statement will be the working definition until I have introduced some of the key theories, research and problematic issues related to the field. A more sophisticated definition will be provided through the actual analysis of my data. The discussion of what kinds of grammatical forms directives acquire in interaction will also be provided alongside with the research results and thus, is not discussed here.

The reasons for adopting this kind of approach lie in the difficult question of how an utterance can be defined as being a directive or something else. It seems that linguists, analysts and philosophers have tried to categorize and define utterances through various theories ranging from Austin's speech act theory to Wittgenstein's language-games to conversation analysis. As a result, one can find an abundance of conflicting, partly overlapping, theoretical possibilities from where to choose the most appropriate foundation for analysis.

However, the current conversation analytical perspective towards examining naturally occurring behavior, such as teacher-issued directives, emphasizes the view that utterances are best identified through their **sequential placement** within the on-going interaction (Goodwin 1990:66-67). That is, the primary unit of analysis is no longer

an isolated sentence[7] but it is the sequence or the turns within sequences that are under scrutiny (Atkinson and Heritage 1984). The sequences prior to and after an utterance illuminate the nature of the speech, whether it constitutes a directive or a declarative. Such a view towards how utterances are understood also emphasizes the significance of context. It is through context that utterances are identified and made intelligible for participants as well as for analysts. (Atkinson and Heritage 1984, Goodwin 1990.)

While conversation analysts have established the importance of contextedness in talk-in-interaction over the more traditional method of studying isolated sentences, Goodwin (1990), nevertheless, argues that the two approaches can be utilized together. She considers them as complementary to each other, thus viewing both integrally relevant when analyzing utterances. In addition, Goodwin (op. cit.) criticizes research founded purely on isolated sentences. Rather similar views are expressed by, for instance, Levinson and Heritage and Atkinson (1984) as well as by other pragmatists (e.g. Drew and Heritage 1992). Levinson (1983:226-283) questions whether Austin's speech act theory can exhaustively explain all language usage or if there is need for additional approaches (e.g. CA) that take into consideration aspects like interaction, communicative intent and so forth. Heritage and Atkinson (1984:5) emphasize the importance of examining sequences as the context-dependent nature of identifying an utterance influences the way in which subsequent talk is construed.

Despite the heavy criticism, it is acknowledged that when identifying utterances, speech act theory offers important insights and

---

[7] The Speech Act Theory has concentrated on examining isolated sentences and on identifying their accomplished acts on the basis of their linguistic form to divergent categories (Searle 1969, Levinson 1983).

thus should not be completely put aside (e.g. Goodwin 1990, Atkinson and Heritage 1984). Having tackled some of the relevant literature myself, I understand the argument and will go about doing my analysis on the basis of similar foundations. That is why this chapter is used for introducing the speech act theory briefly, after which some of the most relevant theory-driven studies and research findings from the field of conversation analysis and pragmatics will be presented.

3.2 Foundations of speech act theory

The basis of speech act theory lies in the notion that when we speak a language, when we communicate, we perform different kinds of speech acts (Searle 1969:16[8]). Speech acts like stating, questioning, commanding and predicating are only a few of the acts available in our use. Not only do we perform these actions with the help of divergent linguistic forms, but the choice how we express them is based on cognitive, social, affective, interpersonal and psychological aspects (Thomas 1995:114). In principle, this means that our interaction is governed by several additional factors - aside from linguistic and nonlinguistic means - that are dependent on the situation, the participants and their relationship.

3.2.1 Austin on illocutionary acts

The beginnings of Austin's classification of illocutionary acts can be found in his original views on language. His studies of ordinary declarative sentences showed him that some of them were not mere sentences, but rather were used for doing things (Levinson 1983:228-229). An example of such a sentence could be "I hereby christen this

---

[8] See also Levinson 1983, Thomas 1995.

yacht Sweetheart" where the person saying these words is simultaneously doing the pronounced action. These sentences he named performatives, whereas other sentences that did not confine to this category, such as statements and assertions, he labeled constatives. According to him, constatives were sentences, or realized utterances, that had truth value: they were true. Performatives, on the other hand, did not have it. It also appeared that it was impossible to state their falsity, but as a part of their nature they could still go 'wrong'. In order to solve the problem, Austin further analyzed them through what he called felicity conditions. In order for a performative to be successful or 'happy', it had to meet these felicity conditions. Otherwise, it would fail. (Levinson 1983:229).

What the felicity conditions were could be presented with the help of our earlier example. To be able to christen a yacht and thus, to be able to perform the afore stated utterance, a person should be in a harbor on a certain day amongst a group of people that can claim to have gathered there for that particular purpose with the ritualistic conventions and appropriate emotions in their minds. If the performative went wrong, then one or several of these conditions would not be met, for instance, the speaker might christen the wrong yacht. In short, the time, the place, the social conventions, the proper emotions and people should all be present for the utterance to be happy, i.e.; to be a performative utterance.

The performative - constative dichotomy, however, turned out to be quite a restricted view of language as it only dealt with certain kinds of sentences or with certain types of verbs (Levinson 1983:231-232). Out of this realization, Austin created a more general theory of language that introduced the concept of **illocutionary acts**. The theory basically explains how the meaning of sentences, and utterances realized by

them, was seen to correlate with action (Levinson 1983:236). For Austin the two were connected in that by issuing an utterance one is not only meaning something but one is equally performing an action. This notion caused Austin to identify three different senses "in which saying something one is doing something" (Levinson 1983:236), which further correspond with three kinds of acts performed in synchrony.

First, **locutionary act** refers to a sentence that has a definite sense and reference. Second, **illocutionary acts** are realized through statements, orders, promises and others that we use daily and while issuing the utterance there is a conventional force associated with it. That is, an utterance like 'Come with me to the movies!' has the **illocutionary force** of urging me to go to the movies with the speaker. Illocutionary acts are thus performed through the conventional force of issuing an utterance of certain kind in accordance with conventional procedures. In simple terms, when the speaker gives an order, like the above, the addressee understands it as one through their shared knowledge of society and language. Third, **perlocutionary act** is characterized by the influence that it has on its addressees and their state of mind, values, principal and so forth. For the most part, the effect of perlocutionary acts depends on the context of the issuance of an utterance: it does not entail any conventional forces like illocutionary acts and it can have intended or unintended effects. Then **perlocutionary effect** in the example above, for instance, could be described as a plea for the addressee to go to the movies with the speaker in certain circumstances. (Levinson 1983:236-237). However, in my opinion, the concept of perlocutionary effect is equivalent with the definition of the illocutionary force and, hence, in the present study the latter is adopted for use. More importantly, pragmatists such as Levinson (1983) and Thomas (1995) acknowledge

that within Austin's theory the identification of these two terms is not simple or completely clear-cut.

3.2.2 Searle on Speech Act theory

According to Searle (1976), there are five fundamental illocutionary acts we are capable of performing: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. **Representatives** are utterances that bind the speaker to the expressed something, i.e.; to the truth of it. Asserting, for instance, is an action of this kind. **Directive utterances**, on the other hand, try to get someone to do something as, for instance, commanding utterances do. **Commissives** tie the speaker to an action taking place in the future. **Expressive utterances**, for example thanking or congratulating someone, are used for expressing a psychological state. Finally, **declarations** influence the current state of affairs by changing them and they usually rely on non-linguistic institutions. Examples of these are christening or firing someone from work.

This taxonomy is based on Austin's original classification of illocutionary acts, which Searle (1976:1) considers as lacking clarity in differentiating one type of illocutionary force from another. Searle's (1969) own counterparts for the different kinds of acts people can accomplish consist of the following: utterance acts, propositional acts and illocutionary acts. The utterance acts are the basic acts of uttering words and sentences. By contrast, propositional acts indicate the referring and predicating aspects of the issuance of utterances. The illocutionary acts are basically the same as Austin's. That is, they refer to acts like stating, questioning, demanding and so forth. The three kinds of acts are seen to be simultaneously expressed, since when a

statement is performed, at the same time, words are pronounced and some kind of referring occurs (Searle 1969:24).

Apart from criticizing Austin's classification due to its implicitness, Searle (1976) considers that Austin has also left unaccounted for certain linguistic dimensions, which give more insights into how to distinguish illocutionary acts into separate categories. However, those dimensions are somewhat far-fetched for the purposes of the present study, and thus, will not be presented here[9].

Nevertheless, it can be said that the searlian foundation of classifying illocutionary acts appears to be well-grounded as do his clearly presented categories - representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. In my opinion, these terms are efficient in that they are easily understandable and plausible already as terms by themselves. Therefore, in the present study I will make use of Searle's classification of directives as illocutionary acts, but will adopt the terminology like illocutionary act and illocutionary force from Austin's work since in the end Searle's equivalent terms do not differ from Austin's that much.

3.3 Pragmatic and conversation analytic research on directives

3.3.1 Indirect speech act research

In real speech situations when we communicate with other people, it is notable that the speech formulations we use vary enormously. The utterances we construct are not simple nor are they easy to define. Rather they are very complex and quite often expressed indirectly. The speech act theoreticians have named these **the indirect speech acts**.

---

[9] For an exhaustive explanation of the dimensions see Searle 1976.

Indirect speech acts can be defined as representing utterances "in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another" (Searle 1975:60). That is, when issuing an utterance such as 'It's cold in here' the speaker is, on one hand, stating a declarative but, on the other hand, it can be seen as a request to close a window. Even though the surface structure of the illocutionary act (statement) is not equivalent to the underlying illocutionary force (request) and thus, there are two simultaneous acts affecting the processing of the utterance, people still understand it as being a request.

Research carried out in the speech act field seems to rely on this view and there appears to be various explanations of how indirect speech acts can be explained through analyzing different illocutionary acts in the class of directives. Searle (1975) suggests that indirect forms can be analyzed on the basis of the felicity conditions that illocutionary acts entail: preparatory – sincerity – propositional – essential conditions[10]. An example of what the felicity conditions are and how they are seen to operate within speech act theory was discussed above in 3.2.1.

Other researchers have studied indirect speech acts through examining how they compare semantically to direct speech acts and what the relationship is like between the surface form and the situational conditions of an act to be performed (Davison 1975), or through divergent theoretical approaches (Sadock 1974). However, these seem somewhat inappropriate and far-fetched analyses beyond the scope of the present study, and therefore, are not discussed in detail.

---

[10] For an explanation of the felicity conditions and their use in analysing indirect forms see Searle 1969, 1975.

3.3.2 Indirectness as a means of politeness

The present study is more interested in the politeness of indirect speech acts as it can be considered a very substantial part of institutional dialogue. As it turns out, in English, indirect forms are used more often than direct ones. This is especially the case with imperative forms: indirect constructions are more readily employed in issuing directives (Levinson 1983:264). For instance, instead of giving a direct directive to close a window, a person might resort to a more implicit form such as 'Don't you think it's freezing in here.' The reasons for such behavior have often been explained by the politeness factor. Being polite is highly redeemed when interacting with others, and politeness is mainly achieved through indirectness (Searle 1975, Thomas 1995).

However, when referring to politeness, it is not just any kind of politeness. It is politeness that is described through the strategies speakers engage in when trying to, for instance, sustain harmonious relations with others (Thomas 1995:157-158) or maintain differential power relations (Ervin-Tripp 1976). In other words, politeness in this respect is not considered from the psychological and moral disposition perspective but as a communicative phenomenon (Thomas 1995:178): the linguistic expressions people employ function as referents of politeness. Ervin-Tripp (1976) in her study of English directives found out that people are highly sensitive to situational constraints and thus, they exploit divergent linguistic forms according to the rank, age, sex or other relevant features of their addressees. Equally, it is not only the linguistic form of an utterance that renders it polite but other additional aspects come into play - the context of the utterance and the relationship of the participants in the situation (Thomas 1995:157).

Within pragmatics, the most prominent theory of politeness was the one presented by Brown and Levinson (1987). The basis of their theory lies in the concept of 'face', which they consider an important feature of every human being. Face is "every individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image" which "can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others" (Thomas 1995:169). It comprises of negative and positive notions. The positive face advocates an individual's desire to be liked and appreciated by others, whereas the negative face reflects an individual's need to be oneself and act as one wants and not to be imposed upon. From the point of view of politeness theory, some illocutionary acts are already in themselves quite face-threatening and as such present problems to the interactants if realized per se. In order to minimize threat to face, speakers have a range of strategies, which they can use in order to make face-to-face communication as successful as possible. That is, the goal of interaction is fulfilled successfully when participants have not experienced any face-threatening acts from their fellow participants. The kind of strategies people exploit depend heavily upon the situation, the nature of the relationship between the interactants (asymmetrical, familiar etc.) and the amount of imposition that the participants' actions present to one another. One possible strategy for successful communication is using indirect forms such as hints. It can also be stated that the more conflicting the participants' communicative goals are, the more indirect forms are deployed as they enable the accomplishment of the interaction without 'the loss of face'. (Thomas 1995.)

When it comes to politeness, Searle (1975) argues that certain indirect expressions become conventionalized as ways of performing indirect requests. An example like 'Can you pass the salt?' represents such a form, since it is not used at all for requiring information but for getting

someone to do something. Other instances of conventionalized requests could be utterances like 'It's cold in here' and 'Could you take the garbage out?' where the former is a request to close a window or a door and the latter is an order to take out the garbage. From these examples, one can detect that speakers use various linguistic formulations to express their wants or needs and several researchers have noted the vast amount of strategies available for us (Ervin-Tripp 1976, Searle 1975). In Goodwin's (1990) terms, the choice of the grammatical form is influenced by the amount of power speakers have over their addressees: the possible formulations people can deploy range from more aggravated forms to acts of mitigation.

3.3.3 Research on some situational usage of directives

As for research conducted on directives in the conversation analytic domain, there are not enough of them to give an adequate understanding of how directives are deployed and rendered intelligible in the organization of interaction in reality. Only a few studies of talk-in-interaction have directly been related to directives, for instance, in situations like medical consultation or children's playground. In the following, some of them will be examined more closely.

When it comes to classroom discourse, Sinclair and Coulthard (1992:18-21[11]) have identified directives as one of the three principal discourse acts: elicitation, informative and directive. These are yet again divided into several sub-categories. However, in the present study the sub-categories are not discussed in detail as their identification is considered to be too complicated and unclear. Despite of this, it can be stated that their categorization is made on the basis of the acts'

---

[11] See also Sinclair and Brazil 1982.

functional properties instead of only relying on their grammatical forms. That is, the nature of the speech act is always identified with respect to the situation, the linguistic form (e.g. imperative, statement etc.) and the placement of the utterances within the on-going talk. For example, how directives are then identified depends on these three aspects in addition to the three conditions that illocutionary acts have to meet in order for them to be realized as directives[12]. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992.)

As was mentioned earlier, Ervin-Tripp (1976) has conducted a study of English directives and their use. According to her (1976:29), there are six categories in which the possible directive expressions fall, and they are presented from the more aggravated to the least imposing. The first category consists of the need-statements people use, i.e.; the utterances that have the word 'need' in them. The second comprises direct imperative constructions such as 'Give me money!'. Her third class is what she calls imbedded imperatives and these are forms that contain a direct imperative form which is embedded into a construction with other semantic properties. For instance, an utterance like 'Could you take out the garbage?' is this kind of a construction. Permission directives, the fourth category, include forms which entail actions from the speaker, e.g.; 'May I have a match?' Question directives, on the other hand, are expressions that do not identify the desired act, such as 'Gotta match?' Finally, hints fall into the last category. An utterance like 'The matches are all gone' would represent a hint. The situations on the basis of which Ervin-Tripp has built her typology have been quite varied as they range from formal military settings to hospitals, from college grounds to small shops (Goodwin 1990:71).

---

[12] The three conditions directives have to fulfill were mentioned in 2.3.

However, this categorization is somewhat oversimplified, in my opinion, as it does not cover in depth the diversity of feasible linguistic expressions, even though in reporting her findings various linguistic constructions are brought into attention. Nevertheless, it is quite a useful distinction of possible directive utterances for the present purposes. Since there are quite a few ways of expressing directives, it is also good to point out that there are equally variations to the force of a directive. What this refers to is that not all directives are, for example, commands. The illocutionary force of a directive varies greatly according to linguistic form, semantic properties, paralinguistic features as well as social context (e.g. Green 1975, Goodwin 1990, Huddleston and Pullum 2002). Semantic properties are those meanings that the speech acts get through the relationship between speaker and recipient, that is, whether it is politeness, power and so forth (Green 1975). Some directives can be seen as requests or pleas whereas others might function as warnings, orders, suggestions and the like. Therefore, the present study albeit referring continuously to only directives, exploits the general idea of the term and its alternates without having to mention separately the divergent illocutionary forces as long as the main concept of getting someone to do something is apparent.

Sorjonen (2001), on her part, has studied the different linguistic formulations doctors use when giving instructions during patient consultation. According to her, there are two different dimensions - the temporal and the level of discretion of action – on the basis of which the doctor chooses the kinds of formulations suitable to a context. The temporal dimension refers to the actions of the interactants that take place either during the consultation or after it. After the consultation, it is the patient, who is responsible for the process of getting better, which is achieved partly by following the doctor's orders and which the

patient's actions are aimed at. Sorjonen (2001:108) has also emphasized the importance of the phase of the consultation in determining the doctor's speech forms. She claims that certain forms, like direct imperatives and interrogatives, are utilized in the actual examination of the patient, whereas more indirect means, such as declaratives and forms with modal verbs, are employed when the doctor is giving instructions for treatment after the consultation. In these cases, the instructions given are considered to be beneficial for the patient, but the final decision of how helpful they will be is left for the patient through the possibility of choice for acquiescence or non-compliance.

The directive speech formats of children during play activities have also been studied. Goodwin (1990) has analyzed how boys and girls deploy directives while playing amongst their social groups proper and how these illustrate the children's orientation to social organization through talk. According to Goodwin (1990:73), "directives are best understood as actions embedded within a larger field of social activity" since the participants make their actions intelligible in the context and demonstrate their position with respect to others through the context. Her research results indicate, for instance, that boys use more direct forms while taking part in the play, thus demonstrating to others their role within the activity. Girls, in contrast to this, employ forms that promote group harmony and friendliness. Equally, she argues that the formats children use further invoke the already established relationships. Consequently, the choice of expressions illustrates well what kinds of assumptions children make about the relationship and the social organization of their group. The results Goodwin (1990) reports are, however, not as simple as this, but within the scope of the present study it is not useful to do an in-depth analysis of them.

Psathas (1991), has analyzed the activity of direction-giving and its structural nature. He observes that direction-giving is a highly structured activity, which is accomplished through the coordination and sequencing of utterances to which both the speaker and the recipient participate. It consists of identifiable steps that ensure the completion of the activity. The structural properties encompass such features as beginning or entering and closing the activity in an organized fashion. In addition, during the activity there are further avenues or routes that are taken, which are nonetheless related to the accomplishment of the direction-giving. For instance, further questions about the directions can be formulated and answered. (Psathas 1991.)

All in all, it appears that research on directives has concentrated on examining both linguistic aspects of talk as well as other factors related to the phenomenon of face-to-face communication. That is, context is deemed as an integral part of identifying speech acts alongside with the sequential placement of utterances. In addition, further aspects such as the nature of the relationship between participants and their communication goals are seen to give important insights as to how talk-in-interaction is carried out successfully. Likewise, it can be argued that there are yet other elements, which have not been mentioned before and which are partly seen to render possible the inference of directive illocutionary acts or any other speech act for that matter. That is, nonverbal communication has been considered to have a crucial role in conveying messages, and in the following chapter its functions in everyday interaction are presented more closely.

4 RESEARCH ON EMBODIED ACTIVITY IN INTERACTION

Throughout the preceding chapters, the focus has been on examining institutional discourse in relation to directives via speech act theory and divergent conversation analytical studies and their results from situated interaction perspective. In addition, the classroom as an institutional context has been defined and commented upon. So far it has helped to illuminate to some extent the research area of how institutional talk is organized and characterized. However, if one is aiming at fully describing classroom discourse, it is essential to take into consideration the nonverbal communication as it is an important part of talk-in-interaction. Moreover, since the classroom can be viewed as a social environment created through interaction, participants construct it by reverting to both language and embodied activity. Thus, in this chapter, research findings and theories of studies on **embodied activity** (i.e. nonverbal communication within a situation) are presented more closely.

4.1 Two nonverbal communication perspectives

It appears that there are two approaches within the domain of nonverbal communication research. The first one has concentrated on explaining nonverbal behavior as a psychological phenomenon whereas the other one has tried to describe it from a social interaction perspective. In the following some aspects of each of them are introduced.

It seems that the more psychologically oriented nonverbal communication researchers have tried to define the concept and every one of them has approached the task from different perspectives. For

example, for Richmond and McCroskey (2000:1) nonverbal communication is "the process of one person stimulating a meaning in the mind of another person or persons by means of nonverbal messages." They also differentiate between nonverbal communication and nonverbal behavior, which they see as "any wide variety of human behaviours that also has the potential for forming communicative messages" (Richmond and McCroskey 2000:6). This includes such features as gestures, facial expressions, space, body movement, time, gaze etc[13].

By contrast, Argyle (1988:188) has argued that gestures, for instance, are voluntary body movements that have communicative intention. What these and other psychologically oriented definitions have in common is that they all seem to divide the different kinds of nonverbal acts into identifiable sub-units. For example, gestures have been identified into several classes: emblems, illustrators, self-touching etc. (Argyle 1988, Richmond and McCroskey 2000). Emblems are those culturally conventional meanings of diverse hand-gestures such as the thumb up-sign for 'Okay' and thus, they are regarded as functioning autonomously from speech (Argyle 1988, McNeill 1986). Illustrators, on the other hand, are quite dependent on the speech as they are considered to be representations of the words being uttered. These include actions of pointing at objects or doing shapes with one's hands, for instance. Self-touching comprises of actions such as scratching oneself, playing with objects and so forth (Argyle 1988). In addition, McNeill (1986) has differentiated iconic gestures, which are related to talk in that they represent an aspect of the meaning uttered via words.

---

[13] These different kinds of nonverbal behaviors have been studied in relation to classroom communication by several researchers. The results are divergent, but the tendency seems to be that majority of the studies have identified the types of NVBs teachers employ in class, e.g.; Neill 1991.

Another aspect in common among these categorizations is their communicative nature. But the basis on which they are classified indicates quite a one-sided view towards their communicativeness. Kendon (1986) has criticized that the studies conducted in the sphere have concentrated on describing and investigating nonverbal behavior as a mental representation of the internal processes and as such, it was seen as an instrument to understand some of the ways in which the human mind operates[14]. Thus, the view emphasized is psychological and the communicative aspect is considered only in relation to that of the speaker (Kendon 1986:6). That is, the speaker is the one provided with information about the processes in the mind through verbal and nonverbal behavior whereas the addressee's role in all of this has been ignored.

Current perspectives on nonverbal communication research have begun to focus increasingly on visual modalities as an integral part of face-to-face interaction. More importantly, researchers whose interests lie in interaction have become more and more aware of people using their bodies as well as speech for conveying their messages (Kendon 1986:4). While both modes of communication are deployed, nonverbal behavior in addition to verbal is considered as an essential tool in helping to investigate how interaction is produced and made intelligible in collaboration by the interactants (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1986, Heath 1986). This in turn promotes the need to study the communicative nature of embodied activity also from the perspective of the recipient; how it is that the recipients react to nonverbal messages, if they react at all. In addition, the role of context during the process of analyzing nonverbal behavior has been given rising importance. It has been recognized that visual messages as well

[14] See also Streeck 1993 and Richmond and McCroskey 2000.

as linguistic constructions are best examined in the particular contexts of their production since their actual meanings are borne through these environments. (Streeck 1993, Kendon 1986, Goodwin and Goodwin 1986.)

In the present study, nonverbal communication is considered as an integral part of conveying a message through interaction in the particular context of the classroom. The concepts of nonverbal communication, nonverbal behavior, embodied activity and their alternates are employed as synonyms to refer to those actions produced by participants with their bodies, may it be with arms, eyes or other parts of the body. Therefore, the above mentioned taxonomies are referred to if necessary, but in principal strong categorizations are avoided as they can be too restrictive when nonverbal actions are viewed in relation to divergent situations concerning the issuance of directives in the classroom.

Kendon (1986) states that gestures are sometimes considered as being direct representations of the associated speech and at other times they are viewed as conveying a more abstract relationship with talk. Following Kendon (1986), the present study adopts the concept of 'gesticulation' which is used in association to all types of gestures that co-occur with speech and that have communicative intent. Deploying the term 'gesticulation' in this sense enables an accessible analysis of nonverbal behavior without the need to lean on presuppositions about what kind of relationship exists between speech and the accompanying behavior. In this way, some of the pre-existing and already established categories mentioned earlier lose their relevance. Furthermore, those gestures that are primarily part of self-grooming or involuntary unconscious movements are equally excluded.

4.2 Visual means as situated activity in various surroundings

From the point of view of a beginner in the sphere of research on embodied activity, the amount of studies conducted in the domain within the past twenty years seems to be abundant. Several researchers have focused on investigating the nature of interaction from divergent perspectives via visual activities. Such research has covered areas ranging from informal family discussions to gatherings of friends and from formal institutional surroundings to other work places (e.g. airports). Within the scope of the present study, it would be impossible to report even a small fraction of them and that is why only the most relevant studies and research findings for the present purposes are discussed here. Surprisingly, there appears to be a huge void of classroom research within the sphere.

   Research conducted in the domain appears to have concentrated on two separate but nevertheless complementary perspectives. First of all, gestures as part of interaction and secondly, other nonverbal means (mostly gaze) that shed light on face-to-face communication. In the following, some of the more salient studies and their results from each area are examined and commented upon.

4.2.1 Gesticulation in talk-in-interaction

As was discussed earlier, divergent gestures people employ have been identified from the psychological point of view. However, several researchers have examined their role in interaction, and as such it seems that gestures as well as gaze occupy a range of functions which are either directly or indirectly related to the production and interpretation of the verbal message. In addition, both devices are also connected to

the way the situation is organized, accomplished and maintained through the turn by turn sequencing of participants' actions.

Kendon (1985, 1986) has reported some of these functions. According to him, gestures can be used to represent those aspects of talk that speakers deem essential to the message but are not readily realizable via words. For this, they have two modes: gestures either substitute words or they are integral parts of speech. For instance, gestures are used in occasions where certain situational demands, the communication conditions, such as simultaneous disrupting noise, overlapping talk or participation within different but concurrent conversations, cast constraints on how interactants are able to position themselves in relation to the messages conveyed. Sometimes gestures replace speech if words are considered to be too indelicate or direct, for example, if a person wants a visitor who has stayed too long to leave; the wish can be gestured instead of being explicitly articulated. In addition, people tend to use gestures for conveying some aspects of speech not referred to within actual talk. In this role, gestures aid the recipient to interpret the speech correctly by lifting the possible ambiguousness of the utterance (e.g. pointing and other deictic gestures do this).

When gestures are utilized as additional information-givers integrated with speech, speakers either try to obtain particular effects from the recipients or try to achieve the most economical way to express their message (Kendon 1986). No matter what approach is taken, it is essential to understand that the full significance of the message cannot be interpreted unless gestures are considered as integrally relevant to speech and as such their role in the process of inference is taken into account. Aside from the above mentioned gestural functions, Kendon (1986) reports one more that has importance

when meaning is considered. He observes that gestures are employed to represent quite complex images that are not for the most part explicitly uttered within talk with only one comprehensive move.

Apart from conveying and substituting some aspects of talk, gestures are equally used to elicit co-participation within interaction (Heath 1992). Discreet head movements are also used for this. When recipients respond to speakers' gestures by showing co-participation in the on-going talk, they illustrate to the speaker how it is that the subsequent actions of the speaker should be structured. That is, for instance, the speaker might need to reformulate the utterance in order to render the message more easily intelligible, if it appears that the recipient has not understood it the first time. Since social interaction is viewed as being developed from jointly produced sequentially constructed actions, the co-participation of the recipient further throws light on how the situational activities are structured and accomplished, which in turn affects the outcome of the situation itself. (Heath 1992.)

Goodwin and Goodwin (1992) have investigated how participants align themselves in respect to an activity through their collaborative interaction. Activities, in this context, are defined as the discreet aims of talk or actions that are recognized by all parties (e.g. telling a story, showing agreement etc.) Goodwin and Goodwin (1992) have demonstrated that participants show mutual involvement in their efforts to achieve particular activities, for instance assessments, already during the production of an utterance. Their results indicate that when the speaker is assessing something the recipient, if she or he shares the speaker's views towards the 'something', will show agreement at the same time the speaker is formulating an utterance. For example, the speaker likes an apple pie, which she demonstrates by saying 'I love this pie, it's delicious', to which the recipient reacts by nodding his head

in agreement already when the speaker is pronouncing her words. Not only does this take place within one-party conversations but also multi-party events are construed alike. Furthermore, in multi-party conversations the participation frameworks are multiple since participants can be involved in several simultaneous activities at once: they can follow two or three different actions within the same context. For instance, one can listen to a story and be simultaneously attending to some other activity: at dinner table declining of additional serving. In such occasions, the participants display the particular participation framework they are engaged in through jointly constructed alignment to interaction. Interaction constituted in such ways resorts to various verbal means as well as to divergent nonverbal modalities such as gestures, head movements and gaze. (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992.)

Goodwin (1981) has, in particular, investigated the role of gaze when participants are trying to achieve mutual orientation to the talk at hand. He discloses that speakers use distinct strategies (e.g. restarts, pauses etc.) in their efforts to get hearers to show participation by gazing at the speaker. Moreover, in a multi-party conversation speakers are capable of using gaze alongside verbal formulations as a means to convey their addressed recipients in such a manner that other participants are not excluded from it. Insofar as interaction is construed in collaboration, speakers coordinate their speech to that of the actions of recipients so that the activity being accomplished is achieved. For this, participants possess divergent phenomena ranging from verbal modes - repetition, changing sentence structures - to nonvocal behavior such as positioning their bodies' vis-à-vis each other.

Equally, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) have examined the intricate cooperation of participants within an activity of searching for a word. Their results suggest that gestures and the accompanying talk are

intrinsically related to each other in the production of meaning, even though at the onset it does not appear to be so. Likewise, it is not only gesticulation that is utilized in the activity; gaze plays an important role as well. For instance, speakers avert their gaze from the recipient momentarily while searching for a word. Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) and Heath (1992) postulate that this kind of research endows analysts with essential insights as to how participants organize the moment-by-moment process of face-to-face interaction and how they make it meaningful through the context.

Streeck (1993), on the other hand, has examined how gestures are attended to by speakers and their addressees while taking part in conversation. He argues that speakers indicate with their gaze and body when they see the need for recipients to pay attention to the speakers' gestures and consequently to certain parts of the message. Thus, gestures marked in this way are endowed with emphasis whereas others with less significance are not subjected to similar kind of attention in face-to-face communication. In Streeck's (1993:297) terms, such behavior is important not only for the recipient but also for the speaker since the production of gesture and the accompanying gaze operate as indicators of the speaker's communicative intent for the speaker himself as well. In addition to this, Streeck (1994) has studied how an audience responds to speaker's gestures. He has reported two ways in which the audience becomes the co-author of talk in process: gaze-shifts and translations of gestures (i.e. recipients monitor speakers' gestures and try to participate in the process of making their meaning understood)[15]. For instance, the speaker, when telling a story, has momentarily forgotten a word and while he is searching for it, he gestures the meaning of it and at the same time the recipient offers the

---

[15] See also Heath 1992 above.

missing word for the speaker on the basis of what she has interpreted the speaker's gesture to be. Kendon (1985) has made a similar observation: recipients display participation by attending to and by taking part in the inference of the meaning. Similarly, if a recipient is not paying attention, the speaker will most probably try to find one who will attend to the talk at hand (Streeck 1994).

In light of the above mentioned research results, it can be asserted that gestures have multiple tasks, all of which are intrinsically intertwined to the production of talk-in-interaction. Besides talk, gestural functions are undeniably connected to the development of the social situation.

4.2.2 The importance of context in talk-in-interaction

What all the studies referred to in the previous section have in common is that in each of them it is suggested that the inference of interaction through language and the accompanying nonverbal behavior is always tied to the context. That is, the social situation is constructed and rendered intelligible within the context and its role cannot be emphasized enough as it is one of the most fundamental aspects of interaction.

Following Gumperz's notion of **contextualization**[16], researchers in the field of conversation analysis and pragmatics have been interested in how participants take advantage of the situation in their social encounters and as a result, there is an ever-growing number of studies (like the ones mentioned above) whose foundations lie in this notion. Within such research, contextualization is understood as a reciprocal

---

[16] Gumperz first introduced the term in 1976 with his wife and since then he has elaborated it on several publications (Auer 1992).

term in relation to context. Basically, this means that participants when involved in interaction draw upon verbal and nonverbal actions as well as context in order to make their messages understood, and in the process they also create the context through their actions (Auer 1992). Thus, contextualization comprises all the feasible activities that participants deem essential for developing, sustaining and revising the context.

How participants contextualize language is a matter of divergent strategies employed during face-to-face communication called contextualization cues (Auer 1992). Both linguistic and nonlinguistic cues are used to contextualize talk. The visual means utilized are usually gesture-, gaze- or posture-related whereas the verbal ones comprise of prosody, linguistic variation etc. (Auer 1992[17]).

However, it is not only those studies having focus on embodied activity that benefit and take advantage of the concept of contextualization. Rather the kind of studies of institutional discourse or discourse in general referred to earlier in chapters 2 and 3 also make use of the term alongside with the cognate conversation analysis and pragmatic approaches. In the present study, the phenomenon of contextualization is exploited as it is considered to be one of the most influential aspects of how the institutional situation of classroom is structured and accomplished through the participants' involvement in interaction.

---

[17] See also Heath 1992 and Goodwin and Goodwin 1992.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Data and participants

The present study is a qualitative study of L2 classroom interaction. As the topic deals with both verbal and nonverbal communication, the best method to gather data was to video record English language lessons. This was done within the framework of a larger research project on classrooms conducted by a group of researchers working in the English language section in the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä. The lessons were recorded in one of the upper secondary schools in Jyväskylä and the material for the present study consists of the lessons of three foreign language teachers.

The taping took place during week 5, 2003. The number of recorded lessons amounted to 12, which means that four lessons were recorded from each of the three teachers. The recordings were made with two cameras, each camera situated opposite to one another facing the class and the teacher. In addition, an extra microphone was placed near the teacher's table in each class to enhance the receiving of teacher's output as well as to improve the process of transcribing and the quality of transcripts. Thus, I have about 16h[18] of taped material from where I have identified the segments that form the data of the present study.

The three teachers were foreign language teachers and they all taught another language besides English: Swedish or German. The languages of instruction in the recorded lessons were Finnish and English. At the time of the taping, all three teachers were involved with several courses which dealt with diverse topics. Therefore, it was decided that the research material would consist of only one course

---

[18] 45 minutes x 10 lessons x two cameras = 15 hours + one double lesson that was recorded with only one camera. ~ 16 h.

from each of them. This enabled me to have clear outlines of the contents of the videos and thus the lessons, which were consecutive, were more comprehensible and observable. Moreover, the lessons chosen for taping were from a course that required varying class activities, for instance exercises, general discussion, group work, reading and so on. Courses with only writing and listening exercises or other "special" courses (i.e. little communication between participants) were ruled out, as these would probably not have offered as rich a data as the so called normal ones.

The students who took part in the courses were from levels 1-3 of the upper secondary school. The group sizes varied from 10–22 students depending on the absences. In the transcriptions students' names have been altered for the sake of anonymity. Equally, I will refer to the three teachers throughout the present study as T1, T2 and T3 respectively.

5.2 Choosing the appropriate segments

After having gathered the material, I observed the tapes carefully and at the same time I identified all the parts that seemed to include directives. In the beginning it was somewhat difficult to commence to identify directives as it was not clear where the 'boundaries' of different communicative actions lie: what counts as a directive, where it begins and ends. That is why the segments were first isolated quite roughly by plainly noting the instances where there appeared to be directives in use in one form or another. This was done on the basis of common knowledge of directives: when issued they cause reactions that are shaped either physically, verbally or with the combination of both. After preliminary analysis, the final identification was done by applying the definition of directives as utterances that are "designed to

get someone else to do something" (Goodwin 1990:65). Moreover, a working definition was developed during analysis because it soon became clear that directives in different contexts acquired distinct roles. Synchronously with this, the parts where directives were issued were isolated and transcribed in detail, i.e.; both spoken discourse and nonverbal behaviors inserted within the same transcript. These transcribed segments are the ones that form the actual data of the present study. The number of the transcribed segments amounted to 130. The size of the segments varies greatly and thus, the number of directives they manifest ranges from one up to ten directive speech acts. The data consist of segments where only Finnish or only English are deployed in issuing directives. In addition, there are also segments where both languages are utilized.

For the analysis, excerpts of segments that seemed to form quite a representative sample of what is defined as being directive in the present study were chosen for close analysis bearing in mind that sufficient enough context is available for the reader to understand the situation as a whole. Edwards and Westgate (1984:106-107) point out that sometimes researchers tend to overlook the context by presenting quite minimal excerpts that seem to be interesting but nevertheless lack the basis of the situation and thus, they run the risk of reporting proof of something that cannot be trusted. Equally, Heritage and Atkinson (1984:12) point out that the transcripts alone cannot serve as the basis for an analysis: the original recordings should always be used together with the transcripts during analysis. Therefore, in the present study the context has been described more closely where it was seen necessary in order to avoid such 'vulnerable excerpts' and to provide the reader with sufficient knowledge of the situation. However, even though the

context has been given, only the instance where a directive has been used is presented with complete transcriptions.

5.3 Method of transcription

The transcription conventions were adapted from Gail Jefferson (Atkinson and Heritage 1984). Equally, additional conventions were used following the ideas of Marja-Leena Sorjonen (2001a)[19]. Since the present study focuses on interaction as a combination of verbal, paralinguistic and nonverbal resources, all three aspects had to be incorporated into the transcripts. This posed some problems as it is not evident how these somewhat different communication channels could be transcribed into the same script without making it too complicated. My aim was to try to make the transcriptions as intelligible and easily accessible as possible. Therefore, the verbal and paralinguistic elements have been transcribed completely. The nonverbal elements, on the other hand, have been described in detail only when they were seen to affect the nature of the situation and when the focus of analysis was on embodied action. However, on both occasions, the nonverbal is partly explained in the text and partly in the transcriptions.

In the transcriptions, only the most apparent and essential features of nonverbal behavior are presented that were seen to have an effect on how the teachers' directives were interpreted. Albeit, at this point, it has to be acknowledged that the videotaped data was not in all occasions the best possible. During the transcription process, it became obvious that it was quite impossible from time to time to present the teachers' nonverbal behavior as they were not visible in the tape or the students' heads were in the way. Hence, the segments in the analysis are perhaps

---

[19] See Appendix for a detailed explanation of the transcription conventions.

not always the most representative fragments of nonverbal communication as some of them had to be left out due to their defectiveness. In the fragments that were transcribable the embodied activity is written using the text type Arial under the verbal transcripts.

In addition, in some of the situations the teachers employed Finnish as the language of instruction and those instances have been translated in the transcripts. The translations present the context and the meaning of the utterance without syntactic or other grammatical analysis. The translations are placed under the nonverbal explanations, if there are any, in Tahoma.

5.4 Evaluation of the data

The aim of the present research method was to collect as naturally occurring classroom interaction as possible. But as always is the case with classroom observation studies, no matter how many precautions are taken in order to minimize the possible effects of intervention of the researchers to the situation, nothing can change the fact that they are not normally part of the classroom and thus, their presence is already an intervention. This 'observer's paradox' was foreseeable in the present data as well. Even though all the possible precautions were made to ensure the naturalness of the data, there were still some minor adjustments made in the classroom that altered the situation for the cameras. That is, students were asked to reposition themselves so that most of them were subjected to the cameras. This made the students more aware of their presence. However, this was not done systematically throughout the recordings with different groups.

To some extent, it appeared that both the teachers and the students were aware of the cameras during the taping and also of the presence of

the two persons behind the cameras, which could have had slight effects on their actions. However, according to the teachers, the students did not behave any differently than at other times, when they were asked about it. It is regrettable that there was no time to make the observation prolonged, thus making possible to record more naturalistic behavior.

Finally, the quality of the tapes was not always as good as it could have been. It is occasionally not possible to observe how a teacher is communicating nonverbally when, for example, her hands are not visible to the camera due to students' heads or the teacher's desk. Thus, some possibly representative excerpts of directives have been left out because of this. Furthermore, the camera could have followed the teachers more around the classroom when they gave instructions to individual students or small groups during exercises. Some of those instances were available for analysis and in them directives were addressed to both individuals and the class as a whole. Unfortunately, most of them were not on the tapes, and it has to be acknowledged that they could have given a different perspective on how and what kind of directives teachers use in classrooms.

Still, I hope this research design enables results that are generalizable to some extent. At least when considering the scope my study, the chosen excerpts represent a valid sample. The data clearly illustrates the diversity of the feasible grammatical forms with which directives can be expressed and the differential functions directives get in interaction, not to mention the crucial role embodied activity has in classroom discourse. In relation to previous research, it can be observed that my data is quite representative as it demonstrates similar kinds of results others have found before this, but also provides new perspectives, for example, by showing how the nature of the moment-to-moment

interaction in the classroom can be viewed through issuing directives. However, with regard to embodied action, the pool of data could have been somewhat larger in order to validate more the various functions of nonverbal communication. At the moment, the reported embodied functions are preliminary observations, which nevertheless are in accordance with other research results when face-to-face interaction is considered.

6 THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL NATURE OF DIRECTIVES IN L2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

6.1 The foundation and the different analytical perspectives

In chapter 3 it was established that directives can be defined from several points of view, but a simple definition of a directive is that it is "an utterance designed to get someone else to do something" (Goodwin 1990:65). Unfortunately, this is rather simplified definition and does not in any respect cover the full scope of the concept. The difficulty is in its interpretation: how can an utterance be identified as a directive. When considering utterances like 'Close the door!' or 'Hurry up!' it is evident that they demand actions from their addressees – actions like closing the door and adding speed to one's steps, for instance. Thus, they are considered as directives. On the contrary, a statement like 'It's cold in here' does not seem to require any actions from its addressee in the first place, but a closer analysis reveals its directive nature. For example, a person can get another person to close a window just by stating this utterance without having to use any explicit directive form.

How can an utterance such as the one above, with its indirect implication, be considered as a directive and demanding some sort of physical reaction to it? An answer to this was supplied in 3.1 following Goodwin (1990). It was suggested that there are two complementary ways of interpreting an utterance as a directive. Firstly, one can rely on speech act theory and its constitutive regulations and secondly, the function of the utterance is inducible through its sequential placement within the on-going segment of interaction. This latter solution reflects the conversation analysis approach, which emphasizes the importance of interaction in the analysis of utterances over the traditional linguistic perspective of treating isolated sentences as the basic units of analysis

(Goodwin 1990:66). Therefore, directive utterances can be defined through their position in a stretch of discourse – according to what comes before and after.

Not only is Goodwin's view significant, it is also relevant to the present data. At many points, the best resort to identify directives was to study the interaction of the participants and especially, the students' reactions to the teacher's utterances. However, even though it is primarily founded on this perspective, my analysis relies on other additional measures such as clarifying the grammatical categories of utterances and acknowledging their illocutionary force through speech act theory as well as on several pragmatic views discussed by researchers of institutional contexts. In my opinion, this was necessary as during the analysis it became clear that without any reference to syntactic form, my conclusions would be somewhat incomplete and defect. Defect in that as a great deal of the relationship between teacher and students is negotiated through the discourse as well as the institutionalized surroundings (see 2.2.3), the way the teacher constructs her utterances grammatically partly reflects the participants' asymmetrical positions. In addition, it also reflects the way the English language is used in this setting.

One more dimension is brought into attention as it seems to be closely connected to the function of directives. That is, the divergent task environments within the L2 classroom seem to influence the way that directives can be identified and the kinds of functions they acquire in interaction. I have roughly categorized them under two different contexts: task management and instruction. Task management includes aspects such as transitions from one exercise or action to another, giving instructions on how students should do exercises or tasks, giving homework etc. Instruction encompasses the teaching of subject matter,

that is, grammar, going through a text, checking an exercise and so forth[20]. Seeing that this was not quite enough to cover all aspects of the lesson, an additional context related to the social organization of lesson has been identified, i.e.; classroom management. It basically refers to those actions teachers make to ensure an appropriate student behavior in class.

The analysis of the present data is organized by following the research questions that have been set for my study. It is presented according to the different steps taken during the analysis. It begins with an examination of the grammatical forms that were used to carry out the different kinds of directives in the data. This is followed by a closer analysis of their functions in interaction. That is to say, their functions in different task environments are identified. This is succeeded by a description of the role of nonverbal behavior in some of these functions.

6.2 Different grammatical forms of directive speech acts

In this part of the analysis, the divergent grammatical constructions the teachers issued are examined. These are presented via the discrete linguistic forms that they as directive speech acts can have. Alongside a definition of their directive nature for each grammatical category is provided.

6.2.1 Imperatives

Imperatives as grammatical forms have certain properties that differentiate them, for instance, from declaratives[21]. The basic form of an imperative is that it contains a plain verb and it does not have a

---

[20] See 2.2.4 for closer explanation.
[21] See e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002 and Downing and Locke 1992.

subject (e.g. 'Come here!'). As such, it can also be considered as a prototype of a directive illocutionary act. These so-called normal imperatives are often seen as the most typical constructions used to carry out directives. However, the present study does not validate this: while normal imperatives are used to some extent, there are others that are performed more often, e.g.; let-imperatives. Besides normal imperatives, there are two other categories in the class of imperatives. These are let-imperatives and imperatives with overt subject. In the following, examples of each category are presented one by one.

A. Normal imperatives

As already pointed out, the basic imperative form is a plain verb form with modifiers. The form can appear alone or it can have the auxiliary *do* with it. It can equally be in the affirmative or in the negative (Huddleston and Pullum 2002). In the present data, both kinds of forms were found both in Finnish and in English. Below are a few examples of both types of normal imperatives in both languages.

(1) Tell us about your skills.

(2) Don't use them in your essays.

(3) Take your books, please.

(4) Kuuntele.   'Listen.'

(5) Start reading.

In example (1), the form is that of a plain verb whereas in the second example, there is a verbal negation formed with the auxiliary *do.* In example (3), the illocutionary modifier *please* has been added to the basic structure of the imperative. The examples (4) and (5) are basic imperatives with the exception that (4) is in Finnish. All of these

formulations are used as direct illocutionary acts for getting someone to do something or, as is the case with (2), preventing some action.

B. Let–imperatives

Let–imperatives are ordinarily considered to be 1st person inclusive imperatives (i.e. they refer to both the speaker and the addressee), and they take the form 'let's' in directive discourse (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:925). The form of let-utterances suggests that their implied actions should be carried out by both the teacher and the students in the present data. The impression that was attained during the analysis was that the data displayed a large quantity of let–imperatives. Mainly, these were in English, but the equivalent grammatical form in Finnish appeared in various occasions as well. This form is most often a passive construction, as represented by example (8), which also includes the activities of both the speaker and the addressee (Sorjonen 2001:91).

> (6) Let's listen.
> (7) Let's move on to one of his sonnets.
> (8) No niin alotetaanpas.
> 'Okay, let's begin.'

All three examples refer to actions performed by both parties. In addition, they all seem to refer to the forthcoming action and not to the present action. This feature will be examined in more detail when identifying the functions let-imperatives take in interaction alongside with the reasons of why they are utilized to such large extent in the present data.

C. Imperatives with overt subject

For some imperative forms, there can be added a second person subject[22]. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002:926), these types of imperatives are normally used for contrasting effect as they tend to emphasize the speaker's authority (see below). In the present data, there were only a few instances where such forms occurred and they all had the second person subject *you* in them. However, they admittedly show the contrast in the relationship between the teacher and the students, and they also differentiate the teacher's actions from those of the students. This was not the case with let's–imperatives as the actions of both participants were included in the form of the utterance.

(9) You do lead in at home.

(10) You'll do your own cv's.

(11) You write it.

In all three examples, the directive action is meant for the addressees, the students in this case. The problem with such forms is that there is the possibility of ambiguous interpretation as they resemble undoubtedly declarative phrases (Huddleston and Pullum 2002). If there is doubt whether a form is an imperative or a declarative, the solution is then to look for the context of the utterance in the on-going interaction. Downing and Locke (1992:195) also emphasize that in spoken discourse the *you* is stressed, whereas in written language it is not, which helps in the inference of the speech act.

For instance, example (10) illustrates clearly the kind of contrasting and ambiguous effect these have as isolated elements. However, when the situation where it was uttered is analyzed more closely, it is

---

[22] See e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002 and Downing and Locke 1992.

apparent that the form is less ambiguous. Before the situation depicted in fragment 1 took place, T1 had earlier finished giving homework for the students. At the point of the extract, she is explaining what they are going to do in the following lesson. In line 2, she commences first by saying 'we'll do' (i.e. she and the students), but realizing what she is saying she repairs her utterance to such a form which indicates without doubt that it is the students who will be writing their curriculum vitae in line 3. Thus, she contrasts the students' actions to her own. She does not practice writing: it is the students who have to do it.

Fragment 1; T1, lesson 2

1   T1   cv your passport to the world of work
2   ?   and we'll do (.)
3   ?   you'll do your own (.) cv's

6.2.2 Interrogatives

Directive speech acts can also be expressed through interrogatives. When interrogatives are used for directive purposes, they are indirect in nature and are usually considered to be polite forms of issuing directives[23]. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002:939), there are several kinds of interrogative directives, for instance ability questions or desire questions. In the present data, there were only two subtypes of ability questions. Furthermore, these kinds of interrogative directives were used the least by the three teachers and hence, there were not many instances where they appeared. In spite of this, they are included in the analysis as they clearly illustrate some of the functions that directives acquire in classroom interaction.

---

[23] See e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002 and Searle 1975.

(12) Could you please read the whole sentence?

(13) Are you ready to move on?

In example (12), the interrogative is formed with a preterit *could* and an illocutionary force modifier *please* is also added. Forms with preterits are said to be more polite (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:940). The second example is an inversion question. Both of these questions basically require the addressee's ability to do certain things, like in the former case to read a whole sentence. According to Searle (1975:68), forms such as the one represented by (12) are used idiomatically for the issuing of directives. That is, they are rather conventionalized forms of directives, not idioms in the traditional sense. Likewise, he claims that since utterances with directive point have the property of taking the word *please* at the end of the sentence or before the verb, they are conventionalized directives.

Ervin-Tripp (1976:33-37), on the other hand, states that they are interpreted as directives only when the implied actions of the utterances are feasible and appropriate. That is, the function of the directive illocutionary act is inducible through the context. According to her taxonomy of English directives, these are imbedded imperatives, where modal verbs play purely a formal addition, since the basic properties of imperatives – agent and object – are explicit. If interpreted from the perspective suggested above, it soon becomes apparent that example (13) does not fulfill these requirements. First of all, it cannot take *please* anywhere so that it would sound natural. Secondly, it does not illustrate explicit properties of imperatives as identified by Ervin-Tripp. However, it can be a directive when certain conditions are in operation during its issuance, even though it does not include a modal

verb. In Sinclair and Coulthard's (1992:12) opinion, the kind of modal directives with interrogative forms can be interpreted as commands in classroom discourse on the basis of three conditions. First of all, they should include one of the modal verbs: could, would, can or will. Secondly, the addressee is the subject of the utterance and finally, the action of the utterance is physically possible at the time of its issuance. In light of these three conditions, the example sentences above can be seen to function as directives, if their feasible physical realization is taken for granted.

6.2.3 Declarative utterances

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002:941), declaratives are also used as directives. In that case, they can be direct or indirect. The direct ones consist of performative constructions as, for example, 'I demand that you clean your room.' The indirect directives involve usually the speaker's needs or wants or the addressee's future actions. Indirect directives were found in the present data in both languages whereas direct ones did not occur at all. During the analysis of the data, I got the impression that the teachers issued quite a large amount of indirect declarative directives, even though it is difficult in the end to count the exact number[24]. Thus only a small fraction of some of the most typical cases of them and their functions is presented in the analysis. The reasons why they were exploited in such a great deal will be examined in 6.3.2. Below are some of the ways in which they were expressed.

---

[24] See 5.2 for closer explanation.

(14) I'd like you to read the text.

(15) You can translate it to Finnish.

(16) Sinne voi kaikki haaveet kirjata.

'You can write down there all your dreams.'

(17) We will listen to this poem shortly.

In example (14), the teacher wants the students to read a text and as such, the want is emphasized. In (15), the students' action is the focus of the utterance as the speaker refers to a translation that is to be done in the immediate future. The form is quite indirect as the utterance includes the preterit *can* and, thus, it could be interpreted as permission instead of a directive. In Ervin-Tripp's (1976) taxonomy, these kinds of permission utterances were classified as a directive category of their own on the basis that they demand actions from their addressees. However, all of Ervin-Tripp's permission directives were interrogatives. In my opinion, declaratives could be included into the category as well. I make this claim on the basis that, similarly, they demand actions from their addressees. This is the case with all of the above examples.

Example (16) is again a reference towards the action of the students but in Finnish. As for example (17), I have categorized it presently under declaratives, albeit, in my opinion, the construction of the utterance refers to both the addressee and the speaker as it consists of the 1st person plural *we* and the modal verb *will*, which together can be seen to function in the same manner as let-imperatives. Likewise, T1 uses the expression 'we will' in similar situations where T2 and T3 use 'let's'. T1 resorts only once to the form 'let's' in her lessons. Therefore, in the later parts of the analysis 'we will' is treated as belonging to the category of let–imperatives. However, the directive nature of the above examples is not as easily deducible without the context and the analysis

of their functions that they acquire in the on-going interaction. The kinds of ambiguous illocutionary acts can be seen to function as directives if they fulfill certain expectations, which were discussed in 6.2.2 in relation with Sinclair and Coulthard.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992:12-13) have also suggested two further conditions for declaratives or interrogatives if they are to be identified as directives. The first condition is that when an action is forbidden at the moment of the utterance it is to be interpreted as a directive. The second condition refers to those actions mentioned within the utterance that should have been accomplished but have not been. An example of the latter type could be an utterance like 'Did you close the door', which is a command to a student who has forgotten to close the door to perform the expected act. However, these kinds of declaratives or interrogatives were not found in the present data.

6.2.4 Need–statements

In addition to the above categories of different grammatical forms of directives, one more can be added. According to Ervin-Tripp (1976:29), need-statements are used as baldly as normal imperatives, even though they are "distinctly different from imperatives" (1976:29). The speech form is usually the kind including the verb *need* or another verb referring to necessity or want. These directives differ from the others with respect to their illocutionary force. Need-statements indicate a slightly more powerful illocutionary force than other declarative directives. This is why I have identified them as a separate category. These speech forms were issued in both languages, but there were only few instances where they were found.

(18) Ei tartte esittää välttämättä.

'No need necessarily to show off.'

(19) You need to listen to the introduction part.

In the examples, the teachers issue directives in need-statement form, which are basically declarative sentences. The former is used to tell someone to not to show off, whereas the latter is a demand to listen attentively. It is, according to Ervin-Tripp (1976:29), a very common way of getting someone to do something between people with differential statuses. Moreover, it is used on occasions when it is obvious what is required from the addressee and normally, a closer analysis of the context is seen to suggest this. However, example (18) above, might not have such a clear connotation, as is argued in 6.3.3.

6.2.5 Summary

In classroom interaction, it appears that there is a diversity of grammatical forms with which teachers can express directives. The most explicit forms that were utilized in the present data were normal imperatives, let–imperatives and imperatives with overt subject. In contrast to these, other more implicit constructions in the form of declarative and interrogative utterances were generated. In addition, teachers resorted to need–statements. Different forms were used in different measures, but the impression is that let–imperatives and declaratives were employed the most. In order to interpret declaratives and interrogatives as directives, they need to fulfill certain requirements: they demand actions from their addressees, and they are physically feasible in the situation. It is also important to understand that while forms with second person subject *you* (i.e. overt imperatives)

differentiate the speaker's action from that of the addressee's, other constructions, for example let–imperatives, encompass the actions of both.

Even though all of the above examples of grammatical forms can be considered to act as directives in themselves, their analysis is inadequate if their context is ignored. The reported speech acts possess the imperative property, but they do not display differential functions, which they tend to acquire when they are deployed in diverse environments during interaction. This further emphasizes the importance of taking the sequential placement of an utterance in the on-going interaction into consideration, if the directive speech acts are to be analyzed and identified properly. In the following chapter, I will try to show some of these functions.

6.3 Divergent functions in different situations

During the analysis of the present data, it was found that the grammatical forms identified above take diverse functions depending on the task environment within which they were uttered. That is to say, their appearance within the context of task management, instruction or classroom management affected their role as directive speech acts and as such emphasized their directive character. It was also found that different grammatical forms can have the same functions in similar environments. In this chapter, some of these functions are introduced more closely.

6.3.1 Attention-seeking in teacher's task management actions

One of the ways with which the teachers in the present data managed the smooth flow of the lesson from the beginning to the end was that they had identifiable means to get their students' attention focused on them and the topic at hand when it was called for. In other words, they used different kinds of directive speech acts or moodless expressions (e.g. okay, well done) in order to get the students to listen to them and to follow the lesson's progress. According to Ervin-Tripp (1976:30), attention-getters are used when there is a need to hear the-what-will-come-after. In her study, it was found that words, exclamations, for example 'Excuse me' and 'hey', and names were used for drawing attention. The grammatical forms that were used for this purpose in the present study were for the most part interrogatives, let–imperatives and Finnish passive forms. Two different types of attention-seeking were identified within task management. First of all, teachers demanded students' attention at the end of an exercise or an activity before moving on to the following task (attention-seeking type 1). Willis (1992:171) has identified these kinds of actions as 'boundary exchanges' at which point the teacher is endowed with power to stop the current task and to mark the beginning of another. Secondly, teachers sought attention after having given relevant instructions right before the class moved on to a new topically related task, for example to listening to a text (attention-seeking type 2).

In 2(a) below, T3 is generating an interrogative. The students have been occupied with group work prior to the teacher's utterance. The teacher has been overseeing their work, and during the production of her utterance she is walking amidst the students along a corridor

between rows of students' desks turning her head from side to side as if to check their progress.

Fragment 2(a); T3, lesson 1

```
1    T3   ?    okay are you ready to (.) continue
2         ?    and move on to our ?text (6.9)
               {pause: walks from back of the class behind her table in front}
3    T3        now let's all listen to the (0.8) cd (1.2)
               {T3 walks behind her table, retrieves a cd
4              there we have our new text
               and returns to stand beside the transparency}
5              text (.) number seven (1.3)
6              english literature in a nutshell (2.1)
               {T3 in position beside the transparency; pause: looking at class}
```

The illocutionary function of the interrogative in lines 1-2 is quite multifaceted for it can be seen to act as a direct question for the students, but it can also be considered as an indirect directive to stop the task at hand and to begin to pay attention to what will follow. In my opinion, the latter analysis is more accurate than the former as the students do not respond verbally to the alleged question. Instead, they gradually stop their discussion and begin to listen to what the teacher is saying by following her veiled instructions in lines 3-6 (i.e. the students should take their books and find the text proper). With this latter part of the extract, it becomes clear that the teacher's interrogative utterance in lines 1-2 is a directive illocutionary act, since she continues her speech without it being followed by a response. That is, it is directive because there is no occurrence of the ordinary exchange of I-R-F.

In addition, the students' actions reveal that they treat the utterance as a command to pay attention instead of a question about their progress. When the teacher issues the utterance, the students already from the start of it begin to show the first signs of paying attention to teacher's action: they gradually stop talking. Throughout lines 4-6 most of the students get their books and find the right text in front of them.

Only two boys keep talking quietly among themselves until the class is actually listening to the text (i.e. cd is playing). However, the students' action might partly be an interactive projection of the teacher's actions. Namely, while uttering the lines 3-6, T3 goes to her table to get a cd, after which she settles beside the transparency, where she stands most often when giving instructions or explaining activities to the class. Therefore, the students know immediately that the teacher is not expecting a response to a question, since she does not act as if she was waiting for an answer: she does not stop.

The kind of coordinated action the participants perform illustrates well that the students are aware of how the utterance is understood in context and how the situation will evolve already during the action. Hence, they understand the contextualization cues of the teacher's action - the grammatical form and the directive illocutionary function of it as well as her movements in the class - and make the situation intelligible through their inferences (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992:81-82). Furthermore, according to Mehan (1979:65-66), when a teacher is preparing to move to a new topically related task (i.e. listening of the text as a new activity during this lesson), besides verbal and paralinguistic means they tend to make behavioral shifts or bring instruction materials into the picture as a sign for the students that the lesson is moving forward. In the extract, T3 retrieves the cd from the teacher's table and positions herself next to the transparency. In light of all these interpretations, the utterance can be identified as an indirect directive with a specified function: drawing someone's attention to the moment at hand from prior activity.

There were several other formulations the teachers used for seeking attention after the class was finishing an exercise or a discussion topic and was about to move on (attention-seeking type 1). For instance, T1

utilized the expression 'okay' or an equivalent Finnish form 'No niin' combined with whatever she had to say with regard to what they were going to do next, or she used those words alone. She also deployed forms such as 'we'll continue' or Finnish passive formulations such as 'alotetaanpas' (= 'let's start'). T2 and T3 resorted to similar forms with the exception that T2 employed 'hey' more often than 'okay'. Furthermore, both T2 and T3 sought attention by beginning their attention-seeking phrases by 'so' or 'now' and continuing directly with whatever they wanted to express.

The second type of attention-seeking is illustrated in fragment 2 below, which is a slightly longer version of the previously shown extract. In line 9 T3 issues a directive utterance in the form of a let–imperative. Throughout lines 3-6, the teacher has prepared the students for the upcoming activity. That is, she has reminded to the students what they were supposed to do at home and what they will do next in relation to their homework: listening to a text. Thus the illocutionary act in line 9 represents a directive for the students to move their attention to their books and to the text they will hear. Even though the teacher has already with her utterance in lines 1-2 drawn the students' attention to the listening of the text, it is obvious that she sees the need to do it again right before they begin to listen. This might be considered as a reaffirmation and a command to the students to actually listen and to not to do anything else.

Fragment 2; T3, lesson 1

```
1   T3      okay are you ready to (.) continue
2           and move on to our ?text (6.9)
            {pause: walks from back of the class behind her table in front}
3   T3      now let's all listen to the (0.8) cd (1.2)
            {T3 walks behind her table, retrieves a cd
4           there we have our new text
            and returns to stand beside the transparency
5           text (.) number seven (1.3)
            …………………………..
6           english literature in a nutshell (2.1)
            T3 in position beside the transparency; pause: looking at class
7           you were suppose to read this at home
            walks behind the table to where the cd–player is
8           I hope you have done it (.) as well (26.1)
            …………………..; pause: prepares the cd and switches it on}
9   T3  ?   so now let's listen
```

Furthermore, the grammatical form of the utterance suggests that both the students and the teacher are supposed to do the same thing: to listen. As it was suggested earlier, let–imperatives have the connotation that both the speaker and the addressee will perform the proposed action of the speech act. According to Sorjonen (2002:92), practitioners often refer to these kinds of forms when cooperation is required, and more importantly they are used in occasions of real collaboration. That is, both participants perform the required actions.

In classroom discourse, this is not as evident as very often teachers appear to do other things at the same time as the class is listening to a text. In the fragment, T3 does not seem to be listening at first since she organizes several matters: she cleans the blackboard, gets her book from a student to whom she had lent it and arranges a pile of hand-outs lying on her desk. It is not before all these procedures that she finally settles down to listen to the text her book in her hands. Therefore, it can be said that in classrooms teachers do participate in tasks requiring the actions of both participants, but on occasion they need to direct their attention to several matters simultaneously within the frames of their institutional work: they need to keep the materials and the classroom in order.

Other formulations which served to seek students' attention right before the beginning of a task were various moodless expressions as well as 'we'll' and 'let's' expressions (attention-seeking type 2). In the data, there were other instances of similar two-part attention-seeking constructions, where the teachers issued first type 1 directives, which were shortly after followed by type 2 directives. In the fragment below, it can be seen that T2 uses the type 1 attention-getter twice, and later on she issues another attention-getter of type 2. In line 1 the teacher issues a moodless expression 'hey', which is followed by detailed instructions. The teacher at this point is trying to get the students' attention from the previous task they were doing. In lines 2-5 the teacher is indicating the task to which the class is about to proceed; she tells the students to get out a handout about tools that she has given them and that they will be going through it together. However, it is not at this point that she issues the attention-seeking utterance of type 2. Instead she begins to organize some of her teaching materials and an interval of approximately one minute passes until she speaks up again. Meanwhile, the students have gotten their handouts and begun to go through them.

After the interval is over, the teacher issues a second attention-seeking utterance (type 1). This occurs in line 6 and it takes again the form of a moodless expression 'okay' followed by further statements about the completion of the handout throughout lines 6-9. The teacher continues to talk about the handout and what it deals with for a while. In line 20, she issues the directive illocutionary act in the form of a 'let's'–imperative preceded by 'so'. It is at this moment that she finally utters the attention-seeking directive of type 2, which indicates to the students that the lesson is moving forward and the students are expected to pay attention and participate in the accomplishment of the task.

Fragment 3; T2, lessons 1 & 2

```
1   T2   ?   hey all of you should have ai (.) handout
2            that looks li- like this ()
3            so could you please take that
4            and we'll check it (in a few minutes) (.)
5            or go through it together
             (There is a one minute interval in the situation.)

6   T2   ?   okay some of you have done this
7            already last lesson
8            some of you started (.) working on it
9            a few minutes ago .hhh
.
.
.
20  T2   ?   so let's go through these
21           what's the first one over here
             {here is a reference to the 1st tool on the transparency}
```

These examples show that the two types of attention-seeking devices do not always follow each other within the same turn. Rather they can be quite apart from each other and nevertheless refer to the same upcoming task that they announce. The announcing character of let's-imperatives is probably one of the explanations why it seems that they always refer to the upcoming action in classroom discourse.

Occasions where the teachers issued 'let's' or 'we will' directives take place in various parts of task management. Therefore, on the basis of these observations it can be concluded that the action requested by, for instance, 'let's listen' imperatives is not only the listening, but it is also the following and paying attention to what is going on and to what part of a lesson the class is in. Likewise, it can be argued that one of the reasons why 'let's' or 'we will' expressions are among the most used ones is their important role in task management and hence, in the process of aiding the smooth flow of the lesson organization.

6.3.2 Instruction-giving as structured activity within task management

One very essential feature in all classroom discourse is the significant number of instructions teachers give to their students. In L2 classrooms this is perhaps one of the most salient aspects as teachers seem to be formulating all sorts of instructions to students in various ways in their task management actions. In this section, instruction-giving is analyzed with regard to how structured it is and how it is achieved with the help of different utterances that can be seen to function as directives.

According to Psathas (1991), there is always an entering and a closing phase in direction-giving and within those two phases there is also the structural sequence of the participants' turn-by-turn organization of explaining the directions and acknowledging them. In similar fashion, teacher's instruction-giving can have an identifiable beginning as well as an ending. The instructions themselves constitute the structural sequence between the two phases. In the following example, the beginning phase comprises the combination of T2's evaluation of the text the class has just listened in line 1 and the word 'next' in line 2 indicating the fact that the lesson is moving onwards. Her instructions begin at this point and they follow each other in an orderly fashion: T2 issues first her declarative directives with detailed explanations, after which explicit imperative forms are formulated. The instruction-giving comes to a closing with the last imperative in line 26.

Fragment 4; T2, lessons 1 & 2

1	T2		a bit of hectic debate there >(okay)<
2		?	next I'd like you to read the text (.)
3			again (.) aloud to to yourselves
4			so °you get a better feel of it and°
5			perhaps remember it better
6			ahh and at the same time
7			if you think
8		?	you can translate it to finnish (.)
9		?	wh- what I really like you to do (.)
10		?	is to (0.8) find (.) the arguments

{pause: leaning over transparency, switches it on}

11			that they <u>give</u>
12			or what do they think of
13			these <u>four</u> main topics there
.			(she lists the topics at this point)
.			
18	T2		so go (.) first read through the text (.)
19			then translate (.)
20			>whatever needs to be translated<
21			and then (0.7) figure out the <u>arguments</u> (.)

{pause: looks at screen on her right side}

22			the reasons
23			why they think (0.8)

{pause: glances towards the screen over her right side}

24			the quality of life has improved
25			or has not improved (1.7)

{pause: looking at class}

26			so (.) start reading

Before the events depicted in fragment 4 occur, the class has been listening to a text. The extract begins by T2 commenting on the hectic dialogue of the text in line 1. This is followed by a series of instructions for different activities the students are expected to accomplish in the immediate future. In line 2, T2 commences her instruction-giving by issuing a declarative with an embedded modal expression 'I'd like you to', which is succeeded by an elaboration of what is meant by her command to read the text of lines 3-5. The instructions continue again throughout lines 6-8, at which point the teacher issues another declarative with the modal verb *can*, after which she performs another declarative in lines 9-10 with the same modal expression as before. It is

again accompanied by a more detailed explanation in lines 11-13 of what is meant by her instruction.

All three declaratives (lines 2, 8 and 9-10) can be interpreted as being directives when they are analyzed on the basis of the three conditions discussed in 6.2.2. First of all, they all have a modal verb in them. Secondly, the subject of the utterances is always the addressee and finally, the speech acts are physically realizable at the moment of their issuance. In addition to the three conditions the utterances fulfill, one further aspect provides basis for their directivity. Namely, the latter part of the teacher's extended utterance that follows from line 18 onwards demonstrates that T2's declaratives are to be taken as directives.

It is trough the context of this larger activity that the structural organization of instruction-giving is given rise to. In the first part of instruction-giving (lines 1-13), the teacher is explaining her directions, i.e.; she is producing detailed information about the tasks the students are supposed to do. The explanation of her directions is shaped with the help of declaratives. In the second part (see 4(a) below), on the other hand, the teacher repeats her previous instructions, but this time they are all in imperative form and expressed consecutively. Throughout lines 18-21, she rephrases her instructions by uttering the explicit directive illocutionary acts in a determined way[25]. Furthermore, she finishes her instruction-giving by issuing another imperative in line 26, with which she discloses that the students are expected to begin to work. The kind of directive was earlier identified as an attention-seeking device (type 2) demonstrating that from that particular moment onwards the students are supposed to work attentively.

[25] Why it is described as being determined is explained at a later point when the same situation is analyzed through embodied action in 6.4.1.

Fragment 4(a); T2, lessons 1 & 2

```
18   T2   ?   so go (.) first read through the text (.)
19        ?   then translate (.)
20            >whatever needs to be translated<
21        ?   and then  (0.7) figure out the arguments (.)
              {pause: looks at screen on her right side}
22            the reasons
23            why they think (0.8)
              {pause: glances towards the screen on her right side}
24            the quality of life has improved
25            or has not improved (1.7)
              {pause: looking at class}
26        ?   so (.) start reading
```

On the basis of the above examples, it is suggested that instruction-giving as any other situated activity can be structured and, in addition, it consists of multiple parts. However, in comparison with Psathas' (1991) findings of direction-giving, there are some differences in the structural organization of teacher's instruction-giving. The most salient difference is the lack of an active recipient as opposed to direction-giving where there are usually two or more active participants who construct the activity in collaboration turn-by-turn. In this case, the class functions as the non-participating recipient in that they merely listen to the teacher's instructions. It is only after the teacher has finished repeating her instructions in line 22 that the students begin to show signs of orienting towards the task: they turn to their books and the text. It is not however suggested here that students cannot participate in the instruction-giving. Rather in this particular situation they do not show other signs of participation other than listening. However, students have always, for example, the possibility of asking clarifying questions that further shape the teacher's instruction directives.

In other respects, the structural organization of the teacher's instructions is similar to that of direction-giving. Likewise, the extract demonstrates quite clearly that from time to time teachers structure their instructions very carefully and that they have recognizable means to do it. These include such aspects as linguistic formulations and repetition, which could partly explain the vast amount of declaratives issued in the present data. For it appeared that teachers resorted most often to such indirect forms as declaratives in their task instructions. There was yet another device to which teachers resorted in their instruction-giving and it will be discussed in 6.4.1 when the embodied activity in issuing directives is taken into consideration. Nevertheless, it needs to be pointed out that not all the instructions teachers give are as highly structured as this one. There were many instances of quite implicit instruction-giving in the present data that are not presented here and that were beyond the scope of my study.

All in all, it can be argued that in some ways everything teachers do with regard to task management is structured to some extent. In 6.3.1, it was established that teacher's have identifiable means of getting their students' attention to the topic at hand by issuing two types of attention-getting utterances or expressions. Already in that particular activity, structural characteristics play a crucial role as attention-seeking is seen to consist of having a beginning and an ending even though sometimes they are quite apart from each other.

6.3.3 Classroom management through directive speech acts

In addition to taking care of the smooth flow of the lesson, teachers are faced with difficulties of various types in the classroom. In order to solve the possible conflicts and behavioral discrepancies, they resort to

diverse directive illocutionary acts. Some of these are more indirect than others, but all of them seem to be efficient means of controlling students' behavior.

One of the practices the teachers in the present data used for controlling their students' behavior was issuing hints as directives. Albeit according to Ervin-Tripp (1976:42), hints do not confine to the normal grammatical constructions of imperatives, in my opinion, they are still quite powerful means in classroom management as well as in other contexts. Ervin-Tripp (op. cit.) states that hints are very indirectly expressed through various forms. Additionally, they seem to demand considerable knowledge of the situation from the participants if they are to be understood the right way. In mundane conversation, there are occasions of miscomprehension when the addressee has not made proper inferences from the speaker's utterance. However, for the most part participants are able to make the right inferences and to realize hints for what they are, for example demands, pleas, warnings and so forth, on the basis of the context where they are uttered.

In the present data, there were a few examples of hints that were utilized in generating directives. Surprisingly, these instances appeared only in the lessons of T1. The other two teachers did not seem to use verbal hints as a means of getting their students to do something. T1 used hints for classroom management: she resorted to indirectness as one of the ways of controlling her students' actions. Below are two examples of instances where T1 is making a hint.

Fragment 5; T1, Lessons 1 & 2

1	T1	no pojat (1.5)
		{grabbing her chair's back on her way to sit; pause: sits down}
		well boys
2		tiedättekö te ees mikä on adjektiivi
		do you even know what an adjective is
3	J	joo
		{looking at jari
		yes
4	T1	no mikä
		………..
		well what
5	J	esimerkiksi poika tai aurinko
		………………………………}
		for example boy or sun
6	St	((the whole class laughs))
7	T1	ny jari hei
		now jari hey
8	?	ei tartte esittää välttämättä
		no need necessarily to show off
9		mihin kysymykseen adjektiivi vastaa
		what is the question adjective answers to

In fragment 5, T1 is beginning to talk about adjectives and their comparison. She commences the exchange by addressing two groups of boys and by asking them if they know what adjectives are. The boys at that time are only sitting and listening to her, some of them looking at their books and others at the teacher. In line 3, Jari self-selects himself as a volunteer to give an answer to the teacher's question. In line 4, T1 acknowledges his self-nomination by looking at him and asking 'well what' in indication that she accepts him as the next speaker. However, Jari purposely replies by giving a wrong answer in line 5. The teacher reacts to this by issuing a directive in the form of a hint in line 8. Even though the grammatical form of the utterance is that of a need-statement ('no need to show off') and these have been categorized as directives in themselves, it is better to identify this as a hint. This is due to the indirect nature of the act: the teacher clearly makes a reference to Jari's behavior, and shows that she considers it unwanted in the situation. Thus she feels the need to it to be altered for a more appropriate behavior expected of students when the normal teaching exchange I-R-F is carried out.

According to Drew and Heritage (1992:45-47), professionals in institutional settings tend to maintain a certain cautiousness in their talk, i.e.; they try to avoid using strongly presented opinions with respect to the other interactants. In the present example, T1 is most probably resorting to a hint in order not to come up as too straightforward and demanding in her actions. Aside from cautiousness, professionals are endowed through their role in institutional work with the capacity to change the course of action or the topic at hand without further discussion (Drew and Heritage 1992:49). Such actions, when taken, are usually designed to prevent some other actions or topics unwanted at the time. In the present example, T1 makes use of this as she in line 9 redirects her talk immediately to the original question of what adjectives are and how they can be described, thus cutting the possibility for Jari to react to her hint and possibly to cause further arguments to her directive that he could very easily do as he demonstrates the kind of argumentative action on several other occasions[26].

In 6 below, the teacher during a conversation about nationalities asks the class to name different nationalities in English. In this example, a boy, Simo, answers 'gays' as the nationality for the Swedish in line 5, after another boy has suggested such an answer in line 2 by whispering. In response to this, the teacher issues a hint in line 7, which she repeats in line 8. After this, she further clarifies her hint with advice of what the students are not supposed to do in class through lines 9-13. At that point, she is insinuating that whatever possible personal tendencies the boys have, she does not want to hear about them. Her hint clearly

---

[26] One such example occurs in fragment 6 in line 11 at which point Jari is trying to intervene in the teacher's command with which she tells the students not to share all their personal tendencies in the class.

serves as a means of controlling the students' behavior: this type of behavior is not tolerated in the classroom and thus, should be modified.

Fragment 6; T1, lessons 3 & 4

1	T1	mikäs oli ruotsalai?set (2.4)
		whats swedes
2	?b	°gay°
3	?bs	((there's a laugh from the boys))
4	T1	nii ruotsalai?set
		yes swedes
5	S	°gays° (2.0)
6	T1	simo (.)
7	?	pientä rajaa taas
		some caution again
8	?	pientä rajaa
		some caution
9		(tää pitää tää) yksityiselämä taas (3.2)
		(the need the) the personal life again
10		hmm ei meiän tartte kaikkia täälä luetella
		hmm we don't need to list all in here
11	J	ei kaikkia (ruotsalaisia)
		not all the (swedes)
12	?bs	((there's a laugh from the boys again))
13	T1	omia taipumuksia
		personal tendencies

The teacher, even though having the possibility to use very direct forms, chooses to take advantage of such an indirect formulation despite the fact that she is trying to control her students. The choice of her formulation shows that teachers can and do resort to several ways of managing their classes including a range of forms other than direct imperatives. This further emphasizes the notion that the asymmetrical relationship between teachers and students is not given: they negotiate their roles through interaction there and then (Thornborrow 2002:113). This can also be claimed on the basis that in both extracts T1 uses Finnish as the language of directives, which could be understood as one possible method of building the relationship between them. While English is the target language to be taught and learned, resorting to Finnish in this case can be seen to operate on a more personal and

informal level, affecting how the situation is viewed by both participants.

Furthermore, this example illustrates another view expressed by Thornborrow (2002) about students and the constraints that the classroom poses upon them. She suggests that students can effectively interrupt the I-R-F exchange, for example by not responding to a question, which in turn shatters the so-called constraints. In the example, the boys who come up with the answer are breaking them by responding purposely in a rude and inappropriate manner, to which the teacher reacts by redirecting their behavior within the constraints. The indirect nature of her utterance has the desired effect and the boys alter their behavior for the moment.

Ervin-Tripp (1976:44) has observed that "hints appear to be prime examples of the kind of communicative abbreviation which appears in high solidarity, closed networks of communication." The above indirect utterances reveal rather well a similar relationship between T1 and the boys. It seems that the teacher in issuing her hints is emphasizing the relationship between them by reverting to their shared experiences and by maintaining an informal atmosphere. It could be argued that classes cannot be high in solidarity, which is quite true in the light of the institutionally inscribed rules of behavior. Nonetheless, it can be said that a more egalitarian atmosphere manifests in some classes. For example, T1 does not express her wants and demands in a direct and authoritative way. This might also be a result of her not wanting to perform possible face-threatening acts: she does not want to embarrass or offend any one student unnecessarily.

Having said this, it is still the teacher who is nominally in charge, as she is able to alter her students' behavior with her actions, thus setting the limits for admissible behavior. It is also noteworthy to mention that

T1 is not only using the hint as a behavioral modifier, but she is also establishing the boundaries of permissible action with her direct reference to what the boys should not do throughout lines 9-13. However, in comparison to other two teachers, T1 is in some way on a closer level with the students than T2 or T3. This inference is largely due to the lack of similar kinds of formulations in the lessons of T2 and T3: they do not use hints as such to control their classes[27].

I have made these observations on the basis of similar kinds of 'friendly' and humorous instances that appear elsewhere in the lessons of T1. For example, at one point further on in the teaching of adjectives, the class is moving on to talk about how comparatives are formed in English. In fragment 7, T1 is looking for a translation for a comparative sentence - 'jari is as handsome as tom cruise' – that she has given as an example in line 4. After she has issued the utterance, she continues by remarking that all the examples they are going to see will be 'jari' examples in line 5. The situation develops so that a student gives a correct answer to the example phrase and the teacher talks about it. (This has been omitted from the fragment and it has been indicated with vertical ellipsis.)

When she has finished her comments, Jari instantly begins to talk and makes a remark in reference to some other situation in the near past where they apparently have joked or talked about Jari's resemblance to Tom Cruise or something along those lines. (All of which happened before the taping took place.) Thus in line 15, Jari asks if T1 is still trying to revenge the earlier incident. She responds to this in the affirmative: she will continue her revenge throughout the course. Their exchange is a good example of what the relationship is like

---

[27] An example of T3's classroom management is given in 6.4.2 in relation to embodied activity.

between the teacher and the students all in all. Even though it has to be acknowledged that the boy, Jari, is some sort of a 'class clown' as a fellow graduate of mine so well put it. Therefore, the teacher might give him more chances to speak freely in class than to other students. That is, she tolerates more from him, but to the extent that others are equally able to express themselves if they choose to.

Fragment 7; T1, lessons 1 & 2

```
1    T1        no niin otetaas ensin ne vertailusanat
               okay let's first take the comparatives
2              miten tämmöne (1.0)
               how's this kind of
3              perusesimerkki kun
               basic example like
4         ?    jari on yhtä komea kuin tom kru:s (4.6)
               {pause: looking around in class waiting for someone to answer}
               jari is as handsome as tom cruise
5    T1        tulee jari esimerkkejä kaikki
               all will be jari examples
.
.
.
15   J         kostat sä nyt vielä sitä
               are you getting back at me the
16   T1        [kostan ] koko loppukurssin=
               yes the whole course
17   J         [(xx)    ]
18   St        =(students laugh)
```

6.3.4 Instruction directives

By contrast to task management and classroom management, there were not as many instances of directives issued within instruction environments. It seems that when directives were issued they were utilized for two purposes. Firstly, they were deployed for assigning answering turns to students when, for instance, the class was checking an exercise or having a general discussion about diverse topics dealt during the lessons. For the most part, this was achieved by calling

students' names or with embodied activity[28]. Second, some directives were formulated in order to request appropriate responses from the students within classroom instruction tasks. The activity of directing students' responses, in turn, serves the overall aim of improving their language skills, which can be said to be one of the aims of L2 teaching at secondary level. What is meant by this is explained with the help of the following fragment.

The situation depicted in fragment 8 sheds light on one of the devices teachers can revert to when aiming to improve students' language skills. That is, they seek to attain adequate enough responses from students in such ways that equip them with proper learning models, thus facilitating L2 acquisition. The example takes place when the class is beginning to check an exercise that was for homework. In line 5, T3 is requesting an answer for the second phrase of the exercise they are checking. In the following line, she allocates the answering turn to a girl student. She gives her response (line 7), which is only a small part of the phrase in question. Apparently it is not an adequate response as T3 in line 8 utters an interrogative asking the girl to read the whole sentence instead of a part of one. That is, the teacher is requesting Henna to repair her answer by reading the whole sentence. It is only after this that T3 finishes the exchange by giving feedback in line 12 that takes the form of a sigh. The example demonstrates clearly that the teacher is expecting a response with a correct English form. When this is not being provided, she demands it by way of initiating repair. By resorting to such behavior, T3 is ensuring that the girl, and other students as well, has available the correct forms of the target language.

---

[28] See 6.4.3 for closer analysis of this directive function.

Fragment 8; T3, lessons 3 & 4

```
1    T3      who would like to ?start
.
.
.
5    T3      number two (12.1)
             {pause: looking down at her book and then at class waiting for a students to
             react to her question}
6            henna
7    H       (xxx)
8    T3   ?  could you please read the whole sentence (1.9)
             {pause: searching for the place from her book}
9            starting from earlier (.)
10           specific
11   H       (xxxxx)
12   T3      ahhaa
```

The teacher's interrogative speech act can be considered to represent a directive as it demands action from its recipient instead of an ability response - 'yes' or 'no'. Likewise, the girl treats the utterance as a directive illocutionary act since she performs the required action: she reads the whole sentence. The grammatical form of T3's utterance is rather polite as it is constructed with the preterit *could* and the illocutionary modifier *please*. The kind of polite interrogative forms can be seen to include different behavioral options, for example, of compliance or non-compliance in some situations. The present example, however, does not encompass such a connotation because the demanded action can be interpreted as unproblematic and feasibly realizable. When actions, which are unproblematic and self-evident, are expected from the recipients, the speakers are known to use more explicit forms (Sorjonen 2001:92). While T3 could have used a direct directive in order to get the action accomplished, she chose to resort to a more indirect and polite construction. In spite of this, the student does not have the choice of non-compliance: she is obliged to follow the teacher's command. Apart form this, it may also be that the student does not want to be judged on her moral character: she performs the

requested action in the fear that others will think negatively of her if she were to disobey the teacher's directive. In Drew and Heritage's (1992:27) words, the participants of institutional settings who are aware of the co-participants do not often take detours from the formal turn-taking organization as they fear that their moral character might be assessed negatively by others.

However, the way T3's utterance is constructed can have an effect on the nature of the relationship between the teacher and the students. As already established, teacher's relationship with students is not to be treated given; rather it is constructed through discourse. T3's choice of the grammatical form partly shows that she is aware of this as she does not resort to a more implicit way of generating her directive. Rather she uses the conventionally polite form. By contrast, the form of the utterance can also reflect the way English is used in general: the more polite and indirect forms are preferred when directive speech acts are issued (Levinson 1983:264). This is also the tentative impression (i.e. no detailed quantitative calculations were made) that I got during the analysis of the present data: the teachers utilized different polite forms (declaratives and interrogatives) in issuing directives. Thus, T3 might generate similar forms such as the one issued in line 8 due to this.

In 6.3.3 it was stated that the relationship between T1 and her students is quite friendly and negotiated in cooperation. This became apparent through the analysis of how T1 controls her students in the classroom. For example, T1 utilizes a direct imperative form during instruction of grammar. The fragment 9 below occurs when the teacher is talking about adjectives; she is explaining to her students how the comparison of adjectives is carried out in English. A girl student is unsure of how adjectives that consist of one syllable are identified. Therefore, through lines 1-4 she asks if the adjective 'nice' has one

syllable. The teacher commences her explanation by affirming the girl's assumption and continues it by issuing a direct imperative in line 7. She tells the student to listen to the pronunciation of the word through which she can discover whether an adjective has one syllable or several.

By using an unmodified imperative, the teacher ensures that the student will understand how the comparison of adjectives functions with regard to one syllable adjectives. It can be stated that T1's action here is aimed at helping the student to learn English, thus she deploys the most suitable directive utterance: the imperative. Were the teacher's action targeted at the student's behavior, her utterance might have been considered as impolite, but in this case it can be seen as quite an appropriate and effective way of illustrating to the girl how she can learn to identify adjectives with one syllable. What is more, even though the teacher's talk is directed to the girl student, it is also targeted for all the students; they are all supposed to learn the comparison of adjectives and possible nuances of the process (i.e. to know what it means if adjective has one or more syllables).

Fragment 9; T1, lessons 1 & 2

1	?g	onks toi niinku (.)
		is that like
2		t- tai toi nice
		or like nice
3		nii onks se sitte (.)
		like is it like
4		niinku yks tavunen (1.0)
		like with one syllable
5	T1	on (.)
		yes
6		nice (.)
7	?	kuuntele (.)
		listen
8		nice (2.2)
		{pause: gazing at transparency, marker touches it}
9		ei (vaikuta) sää ääntämys (.)
		it doesn't (effect) you the pronunciation
10		sää sitä ääntämystä kuuntelet (.)
		you listen to the pronunciation
11		nice

Therefore, it can be proposed that the teachers' utterances vary a great deal when they issue directives within the instruction context[29]. In addition, the form of the directive might not play as crucial a role with regard to the nature of the relationship between the participants as long as the diverse forms are used routinely within instruction environment; especially when their action is considered to be beneficial for the students in their L2 acquisition process. The most salient feature of these directives issued in instruction phase, as well as those in task and classroom management environments, is their reference to the there and now; the actions the directives refer to are executed immediately. However, there were also other kinds of directive illocutionary acts in the data, which were generated within instruction and which were not carried out instantaneously.

6.3.5 The temporal dimension of instruction directives

All the above presented examples of directives have had one considerable aspect in common: they have all demanded immediate action and more or less acquiescence from the students at the moment of their issuance. As a final example of what kinds of directives were found in the present data, one more aspect is brought into attention before the role of embodied activity is examined.

During the analysis, it soon became clear that some of the directive illocutionary acts were not easily classified into the above mentioned categories of directives. Although they could have been included in them on the basis of their form, they differed from other cases in that they require 'remote action' from the addressees instead of immediate action in that particular context. These utterances have been defined as

---

[29] See 6.3.5 below for more examples of instruction phase directives.

being directives through their form and as such they do not differ from other feasible directive utterances. Another reason for this differentiation was that these directives can be said to be beneficial for the recipients as they endow them with useful insights to the issue at question (Sorjonen 2001). For example, when a doctor gives instructions of treatment for a patient, they are given for the patient's best interest, thus helping the process of healing, and the patient is expected to adhere to them (Sorjonen 2001:106). In the classroom, teacher's action can be seen to operate on a similar basis.

Below are three different examples, where directive utterances require remote action from the students instead of immediate compliance. Fragment 10 depicts a piece of advice for students of when to use comma in English. T3 finishes the sequence by uttering the reminder (line 5), which is in the form of a declarative. Example 11 shows how T2 during a discussion about idiomatic expressions advises her students in line 8 not to use swear words in their essays. Her utterance has the form of an imperative with a verbal negation. In extract 12, T1 is lecturing about adjectives and their functions, when she makes her remark about the *s*–genitive in line 6 having begun her utterance by reminding students of the *of*–genitive in lines 4-5. The form of her utterance is somewhat complex: she uses first a direct imperative in line 2, after which she clarifies her intent by ending it with an imperative having a verbal negation.

Fragment 10; T3, lessons 3 & 4

1	T3	and then let's take a look at
2		when we have (2.4) *comma* (5.7)
		{pauses: concentrating on writing on the transparency}
3		and this is rather important
4	?	and (.) basically this is the only rule
5	?	that you really have to remember

Fragment 11; T2, lessons 1 & 2

1	T2		that's right
2			now think about a- all the ones you know
3			and count how many letters there are in them
4			so you know (.)
5			like heck or darn (1.4)
6			or even worse ones
7			they are usually four letter words (2.4) {pause: adjusts the transparency}
8		?	don't use them in your essays

Fragment 12; T1, lessons 3 & 4[30]

1	?b		the problems of the unemployed
2	T1	?	joo ja muistakaa *yes and remember*
3			muutenki tää on jotenki unohtunu *you've kind of forgotten this*
4			tää koko of genetiivi että (1.2) *this the whole of genitive*
5			of the unemployed (3.4)
6		?	ei voi laittaa s genetiiviä *can't use s genitive*

All three example utterances have one essential feature in common: they refer to the future action of students not to the present situation as such. Therefore, it is impossible to say whether they follow the advice the teachers have given or whether they ignore it as at the moment of issuing the utterance no reaction is visible. In such instances, the students appear to have the possibility to make a choice between acquiescence and noncompliance, which is not for the most part available for them in the classroom due to the constraints (discussed in 2.2.1 and 2.2.3) that classrooms as institutional contexts possess.

Albeit the fact that there is uncertainty in compliance, these utterances are meant for the students' benefit since the teachers are trying to help them to learn a language and its functions or, as in

[30]T1 writes on the transparency during pauses in lines 4 and 5; in fact, she writes throughout the sequence of utterances and when pausing she only writes.

example 10, to try to help the students to write well-formulated and appropriate essays. Thus, all of these directives can be categorized as belonging to the instruction environment. Apart from belonging to the instruction phase, it is also noteworthy that their grammatical formulations vary in similar ways with those reported in 6.3.4 above.

In addition to the temporal dimension of action, Sorjonen (2001) emphasizes the importance of the phase of a medical consultation when utterances are analyzed. Her studies reveal that doctor's verbal constructions vary considerably according to the phase of the consultation: during the examination the utterances are in imperative or declarative form, whereas during the instruction-giving the formulations are more complex with modal verbs, non-person phrases etc. Even though the two situations – the medical consultation and the classroom – are not comparable as they are quite different events, it can still be concluded that the analysis of the present data has not so far revealed such an aspect. However, it is possible that there are more subtle differences; it is only that they have not been under systematic analysis in the present study. As was already stated above, all three examples take place while the teachers are instructing: they are teaching grammar or they are checking exercises.

6.3.6 Summary

In this part of the analysis, it has been suggested that directives acquire differential functions within the three environments assigned for classroom interaction in the present study. In the task management environment, they are utilized, for example, as attention-getters and as such their formulations vary from simple expressions like 'okay' and 'hey' to more complex constructions. Some of these consist of, for

instance, interrogatives or let's–imperatives. In those situations, the role of the directive speech acts is to help the teachers to draw their students' attention either from a prior activity or on the task at hand. As such it is also their role to operate as indicators of the particular phase of the lesson: to mark what is coming next. That is, they are utilized for directing students' behavior with regard to the lesson's progress.

It has also been proposed that teachers' instruction-giving is occasionally quite structured an activity and issuing divergent directive forms can help to shape its character. That is, teachers had recognizable means to organize their instructions by deploying different grammatical forms as well as repetition of their task requirements in order to make it structured. The grammatical forms that were deployed the most within instruction-giving were declaratives and imperatives. Aside from the instruction-giving being structured, it was argued that the actions teachers perform in task management are all quite patterned as was demonstrated by the two-phased organization of attention-seeking.

The functions directives seem to have within the classroom management context appear to be more multifaceted than their role in, for example, instruction situations. When teachers saw the need to control their students' behavior with respect to what was deemed appropriate and what was not, they were able to resort to quite implicit directives such as hints. Hints as directive speech acts can take discrete forms and in the present study need-statements as well as adverbial expressions were deployed. However, the most salient aspect of these kinds of situated directives was their important role in the process of the teacher and the students co-constructing the relationship between them. On such basis, it can be argued that the relationship is not as strictly asymmetrical as normally has been considered within

institutional surroundings. Rather it is a matter of constant negotiation and viewed as not as tightly knitted to the constraints that classroom can possess.

The instruction environment, on the other hand, was seen to endow directives with the role of them being helpful in students' L2 acquisition process by guiding them through the diverse class activities. In these situations the directives were used to allocate turns and to direct the students' responses towards appropriate forms of the target language either by requesting repair from the students or by pointing out to them the proper procedures. These types of directive forms varied in their constructions in similar ways than in the other two contexts. What was particular about these directive functions was that they required either immediate action or remote action from their addressees. That is, other directives the teachers issued were supposed to be carried out instantaneously on their issuance, whereas others were to be effectuated at an unspecified time in the future. While with the latter type of directives there is uncertainty whether there is acquiescence or not, with the former type, it is certain that they are most likely to be performed.

6.4 Role of nonverbal communication in issuing directives

In this part of the analysis some of those nonverbal actions that occur alongside with directive speech acts in the on-going interaction will be examined. The nonverbal means vary from gaze to divergent gestures and body orientations. Throughout the analysis, the aim is to show that embodied activity has particular functions in the instances of discourse where it appears. The same environments can be identified for nonverbal behavior as was done for directives as illocutionary acts in

the previous chapter (6.3). That is, embodied activity is analyzed here through task management, classroom management and instruction environments.

6.4.1 Task management through nonlinguistic means

During the lessons, all three teachers demonstrated a variety of different nonverbal actions of which they made use in task management. The nonlinguistic means seem to have accompanied divergent directive forms and at present, only three of them are discussed more closely.

As was discussed in 4.2.1, Kendon (1986) argues that gesticulation should be deemed as an integral part of interaction; it is not only words that convey meanings, gestures depict meaning as well. In the present data, it was found that some of the embodied actions the teachers performed had particular roles within interaction. For example, in example 13 below, T3 is combining speech with nonverbal behavior in order to make her message more emphatic. The situation takes place at the beginning of the third lesson. The teacher is explaining what they are going to do first (i.e. they are about to watch a short film) throughout lines 1-9. In line 11, she tells the students that they have to listen carefully while they are watching the film. Her directive is in the form of an explicit imperative modified with a turn-initial *please*. As if this is not enough, she repeats her command in line 13 in a need-statement form, in which she further clarifies her demand by stating the particular part of the film to where the students should pay close attention. When analyzing T3's talk it soon becomes clear that she is trying to emphasize the importance of listening, and hence, understanding of what the film is about as she states in line 16.

Fragment 13; T3, lessons 3 & 4

```
1    T3        [okay ehh to begin with
2    St        [students talk continuously and they continue until
3    T3        I will show you (2.5) something (.) very funny (2.4)
               {pauses: prepares  tv}
4    St        the tv is on  -----------------------------------------------
5    T3        at least I think so (2.7)
6    St        --------------------------
7    T3        this is sort of (.) a lead in to our (.)
8    St        --------------------------------------
9    T3        theme (1.3) today (5.0)
                    {2pause: prepares the video and adjusts television}
10   St        --------------------------
11   T3        and please listen carefully
               {standing towards the class in front of television, her right
12   St        ------------------------------
13   T3   ?    you need to listen to the introduction part (0.8)
               hand  raised, index finger and thumb together
14   St        -------------------------------------------------------
15   T3        so that you know (1.0) what this is all about]
               ....................................................................}
16   St        ------------------------------------------------------]
```

However, when her embodied activity is taken into account, it is
obvious that she is putting a lot of emphasis on the listening. For while
T3 is uttering the lines 11-16, i.e.; the imperative and the need-statement
that follows, she is also gesticulating with her right hand. Her hand is in
a raised position first on her right side and then in front of her with the
index finger and thumb together. In my opinion, this further gives
emphasis to her message, since it appears that she treats the two
activities: the listening and the understanding to be crucially
intertwined. She demonstrates this with her hand and especially, with
the two fingers being attached from their tips. This can also be claimed
on the basis that she is actually holding the hand raised until she has
completed her utterance in line 16.

In addition to gesticulation having a complementary role with
speech as demonstrated above, it also functions as "a device to convey
aspects of meaning that words convey only in part" (Kendon 1986:14).

For instance, in extract 14 below, the teacher is partly resorting to nonverbal behavior in conveying her utterance. Before the extract takes place, T1 has been explaining to her students about the written paper that they are supposed to do during the lesson. The topic of the lesson was compiling a curriculum vitae and the teacher wanted the students to practice writing their own curriculum vitas. In the extract, T1 has finished her explanation and is now clarifying the time frame for the task. In line 1 ('okay'), she is accepting an affirmative answer that one of the girls has given for some earlier question posed by the teacher. In line 2 she issues an explicit directive with overt subject form *you* summarizing what the students are expected to do: she has given the detailed instructions a moment earlier. At the same time, while T1 is issuing the utterance in line 2 ('and you write it'), she is also forming a rectangular shape in the air with her hands looking at her hands herself. The shape that she forms with her hands is exactly the kind that could be seen to represent a stationary. Even though her words convey in part the object to which she is referring to by 'it' in line 2, as it has been mentioned previously, it is her gesticulation that renders the utterance intelligible.

Fragment 14; T1, lessons 3 & 4

```
1    T1       okay (.)
              {looking at class
2        ?    and you write it
              hands form a square in the air looking at it
3             and an:d   we'll read   them next time
              looking at class
                          x--------------x
                          right hand makes
                           half circle, left
                            holding marker
4             and you have twenty minutes
              looking at the clock pointing with left hand marker in it
5             to do this
              looking at class}
```

The kind of gesticulation the teacher utilizes in the extract is described by McNeill (1986) as an iconic gesture. According to him, iconic gestures represent an aspect of the meaning of an utterance that is depicted simultaneously through verbal mode (McNeill 1986:107). In this case, T1's gestural behavior provides an understanding of the word 'it' which acts as a referent to the curriculum vitae. No matter how the gesticulation is defined here, the most important aspect is to consider the integral role of embodied activity in interpreting utterances through the situations where they appear, to identify the sequences of action and analyze all the contextualization cues available.

Aside from the iconic gesture, T1 is falling back on other types of gesticulation. In line 3, she is saying that they will be reading the students' papers the next time and as if to emphasize the 'next time' she performs a half a circle with her right hand. The half-circle could be seen to represent sort of a link from the current lesson to the following one, thus rendering the gesture integral part of speech. It is constructed alongside with talk to accentuate the message. However, the most interesting aspect about the gesture's production is its place of occurrence. When the teacher is uttering her words in line 3, she is shaping the half-circle already while saying the words 'we'll read'. Thus, she is already in that part of the utterance projecting with her nonverbal behavior the particular aspect of next time that is to follow the 'we'll read' part. According to Kendon (1985:229), speakers occasionally deploy gestures to represent a particular aspect of talk before that part has even been uttered. This happens especially during fluent speech and it is exactly how T1 is illustrating the particular part of 'next time' of her utterance.

In line 4, on the other hand, she is setting the time limit for the students' writing process through her words and via her nonverbal

behavior. While uttering the words, she is simultaneously looking at the clock on the wall that is on her left side and pointing at it with a marker that she has on her left hand. In my opinion, her words and embodied action set a clear limit for the students: they have twenty minutes to write their papers and that is all as after the twenty minutes the lesson will be over. It is as if she is saying to the students, and also to herself, that they all should be aware of the time passing and take advantage of the time left by working attentively.

The following example of the role of nonverbal communication is not as straightforward as the previous ones. Namely, the situation of the fragment below (fragment 4 from page 83) takes place when T2 is explaining to her students how they are supposed to go through a text. She commences her instruction-giving by explaining all the things that students should do. Her instruction forms are mostly declaratives with modal verbs (in lines 2 and 7-8) or with other modifiers (lines 9-10). The things the students need to do consist of reading the text, translating it and finding arguments for the different topics of the text. This part of T2's instructions is not as important as the next part with regard to embodied action. However, this sequence is crucial in the sense that this is the basis to which the following sequence will be founded on. It also illustrates in part how structured the organization of giving instructions can be as was discussed in 6.3.2.

Fragment 4; T2, lessons 1 & 2

1	T2		a bit of hectic debate there >(okay)<
2			next I'd like you to read the text (.)
3			again (.) aloud to to yourselves
4			so °you get a better feel of it and°
5			perhaps remember it better
6			ahh and at the same time
7			if you think
8			you can translate it to finnish (.)
9			wh- what I really like you to do (.)
			{with right hand index and thumb together raises the hand and then lowers it; }
10			is to (0.8) find (.) the arguments
			{pause: looks over her right shoulder towards the screen}
11			that they <u>give</u>
12			or what do they think of
13			these <u>four</u> main topics there
.			(she lists the topics at this point)
.			
18	T2	?	so go (.) first read through the text (.)
			{left hand circles; thumb up for counting holding it with right index
19		?	then translate (.)
			index finger up holding it with right index
20			>whatever needs to be translated<
			……………..……………………..
21		?	and then (0.7) figure out the <u>arguments</u> (.)
			middle finger up right index holding it …
22			the reasons
			……………..
23			why they think (0.8)
			pause: glances towards the screen on her right side
24			the quality of life has improved
			looking at class ……………………..
25			or has not improved (1.7)
			………….; pause: looking at class
26			so (.) start reading
			opposite back-forward movement with both hands at waist line in front of her}

The following part of T2's instructions comprises of her repeating the instructions in a shorter and more compact way. She begins the repetition in line 18 and continues throughout lines 18-21. This time around, her directives are quite explicit (direct imperatives). What is particular about her instruction-giving is that she falls back on embodied activity as a way of making it more accentuated. While she is repeating the first task the students have to do in line 18, she raises her left hand and makes circling movements simultaneously putting her thumb up holding it with the index finger of her right hand. In line 19, she puts up her left index finger and while issuing the utterance in line

21, her middle finger comes up. Both times she raises her fingers up; she holds them for a moment with the index finger of her right hand. That is, she is clearly counting with her fingers the different tasks the students have to do, thus marking how many different things there are to be done. This in return emphasizes the aspect that the gesturing functions to structure the activity of instruction-giving

The teacher's embodied action is not, however, only for the students' benefit: it can also be seen to help the teacher in her instruction-giving. Streeck (1993) claims that speakers not only deploy gesticulation in order to convey messages to the recipients, but they also occasionally utilize it for their own purposes. That is, the speaker can with the help of gestures, such as counting, follow their own line of thought, and hence, to keep a record of what they are saying themselves. In this extract, it can be interpreted so that the teacher is counting with her embodied activity in order to know if she, herself, has forgotten some aspects of the precedent phase of instructions. In addition, her counting is obviously directed to the students to ensure that they will know how many steps they need to take in order to be able to do everything required.

6.4.2 Controlling students' actions with embodied activity

In 6.3.3 it was discussed that teachers are faced with various difficulties in the classroom that momentarily hinder the smooth progress of their lessons and to which they have numerous means that help them to restore the balance. The methods teachers resort to can be expressed both verbally and visually. In the following, it will be shown that both modes of communication can be effectively integrated when aiming to change the behavior of others through participants' collaborated action.

As far as the present data is concerned, there were three apparent instances of hints being used for controlling students. In 6.3.3, two hints that T1 issued in her classroom management were examined. In contrast to those two, the third one does not take a verbal form. Rather it is carried out through nonlinguistic means. As suggested earlier, teachers and students sometimes negotiate their roles through interaction. The underlying assumption of teacher – student relations is usually the kind that teachers have the more powerful role whereas students are endowed with very little power. As was shown above, this is not always the case, as when teachers issue instructions and directions in a rather polite ways through different speech forms. Apart from speech forms, teachers can deploy nonverbal behavior for issuing directives. When this happens, the students' actions illustrate well that in the end they assign the more powerful role to the teacher. Especially interesting is the way how the teacher in co-participation with the students is able to establish a participation framework that facilitates the teacher's management activities, thus giving her the more powerful position. According to Goodwin and Goodwin (1992), interactants indicate the particular participation framework they are engaged in within multi-party situations by resorting to a combination of talk and gesticulation. What is meant by this is demonstrated with the following example.

In fragment 15 below, T3 is giving an instruction to the students to take out their books by issuing a grammatical construction of overt subject imperative with the tag *please*. At first, her utterance seems to be quite straightforward and as such directed towards the whole class. But when the teacher's nonverbal behavior is added in to the picture the tone of the utterance changes and the addressed recipients of it become apparent. When the teacher issues lines 1-2 talking to the whole class,

she is first looking down at her book, after which she raises her head (at *please*) and slightly directs it towards the left side of the classroom to the back where a group of boys (three of them) is sitting and talking. At the same time, her head is pushed forward into the same direction and her gaze directed at the boys. This position with her words reaches the boys as they begin to pay attention to the lesson by first glancing at the teacher and then at their books. According to Heath (1992:118), speakers are capable of eliciting responses from recipients with their embodied activities already before the completion of an utterance. In the extract, while T3 is verbally addressing the whole class, her visual action is directed to a subgroup of boys, which they acknowledge as they notice her intention quite soon and stop talking already before the teacher's utterance in line 1 has come to completion. Albeit at this point they are still facing each other instead of the teacher. During the teacher's talk from lines 2-3, the boys finally position themselves towards the teacher and they orient to the task at hand: finding the page.

Fragment 15, T3, Lesson 2

```
1    T3   ?    if you all please
                {talking slightly towards the left side of the room
2                turn to page one hundred and ?four (2.0)
                where boys are talking quietly her head pushed a bit forward}
3                we will listen to this poem (2.1) shortly (.)
                {pause: looks at the clock on the wall on her left at the same time glancing at
                some of the students on the left as well}
```

The teacher's alignment towards the boys and their reciprocal action can also be seen as an excellent example of how the establishment of a participation framework can have an effect on the understanding of interaction. When T3 is issuing her utterance, at the same time, she is focusing her uppermost attention towards the group of boys with her nonverbal behavior. As soon as the boys notice her actions, they look at

her, thus demonstrating their readiness to pay attention to the lesson. Even though the shift in the participation framework the teacher and the students produce in collaboration is short, it is nevertheless effective as the boys find the page proper and begin to listen to the teacher. More importantly, the kind of behavior can be considered as a nonverbal hint towards the inappropriate behavior of the boys since it is clearly a nonverbal act of managing the class. The differential statuses of the participants also become apparent as the teacher is able to control the boys' behavior with the combination of her utterance, posture and gaze. Her words alone might not have as powerful an effect. As Kendon (1986:14) suggests, speakers often deploy both gesticulation and talk together when they want to attain particular effects on the recipients, which is quite clearly demonstrated in the teacher's successful exploitation of gaze and words in such a way that her recipients alter their actions.

In comparison to T1's hints (see 6.3.3), which were indirect, T3's nonverbal hint is somewhat more direct and power-loaded. Equally, it reflects a slightly different kind of relationship between T3 and her students: it does not invoke solidarity, since T3 is capable of altering her students' actions effectively with a mere gaze. However, even though the means of managing their classrooms are different between the teachers, it is not my intention to imply that T2 and T3 would have hostile atmosphere in their classrooms. Rather the fact that the relationship between a teacher and a class whatever kind it is has an effect on the possible choices of how teacher controls students' behavior.

For example, it was not only T3 that utilized embodied activity effectively to manage her students' actions. T1 deployed the same method as efficiently as T3. In the fragment below, T1 is resorting to a

specific activity of withdrawal from the talk at hand, thus illustrating one way of controlling students' behavior. The situation takes place at the beginning part of T1's third lesson. The students are checking independently exercises that were for homework with the help of transparencies, and while they are doing this, T1 is asking some of the students whether they have done their homework or not. One of the boy students has been talking the whole beginning part of the lesson and has been ignoring the task of checking his homework. Before the teacher draws his attention to her in line 1, she makes a long out-breath, which can be seen to function as a first indication of her disapproval towards his behavior. This becomes obvious when the exchange is analyzed completely. In the extract, she inquires about Jari's homework in line 3 having first drawn his attention in line 1 by calling his name.[31] When Jari gives a negative answer in line 4, T1 demands an explanation to which he answers that he does not think he needs to practice adjectives (the exercise is about the comparison of adjectives). The teacher then continues by stating the declarative 'we'll see' and repeating it in lines 9 and 11. Jari continues after her turn by repeating the same phrase in lines 12 and 13. This is followed by the teacher's repetition of the same phrase at which point she moves on to insinuating what he has to do or does not have to do in lines 15-16, after which the situation progresses to another issue.

---

[31] This is an excellent example of an attention-seeking device (type 1) that is accomplished with calling a students' name.

Fragment 16; T1, lessons 3 & 4

```
1    T1        hhhhhh jari (1.0)
               {standing behind table looking at jari; pause: leans on transparency and
               points to the exercise tapping the place
2    J         (sorry) (1.0) what
3    T1        have you done this exer?cise
               looking at him first, then down at transparency
4    J         no (1.1) [(we-)]
5    T1             [why ] not
               looking at him leaning against the table
6    J         because I feel
               ………………...
7              that (.) I don't have to practice these (1.2)
               ……………………………………………….…..
8    T1    ?   £ hah we'll see
               looking down at transparency
9              £ we'll see=
               straightens herself
10   ?b        =rietas=
               right hand on back of the chair moving the chair
11   T1        £ =we'll see
               looking down handling some papers
12   J         yes we will see
               …………………..
13             we will see
               …………….
14   T1    ?   we'll see
               …………...
15         ?   °what you have to do
               ……………...…………..
16             or what you don't have to do°
               ……………………………….……}.
```

The situation as seen via the uttered words does not seem to differ in any way from an ordinary exchange of words. However, when the interaction is analyzed in terms of both verbal and visual actions, the picture that takes shape is quite interesting. Namely, the teacher through her nonverbal behavior influences the way the situation develops and how it is interpreted and enacted by her recipient. When the first part of the fragment (initiation and the following turns throughout lines 2-7) is also analyzed nonverbally, it can be seen that the teacher, when calling for Jari's attention in line 1 and then asking the question in line 3, is initially looking at him. It is after this that she turns her gaze to the transparency, pointing with a marker at the particular exercise in discussion. Having gotten his answer, she demands an explanation (line 6), at the same time looking at him

attentively while he gives his explanation throughout lines 6-7. She not only acknowledges his answer by uttering the phrase 'we'll see' in lines 8-9, but she is also simultaneously stating her strong opposite opinion about the issue with her words and nonverbal action of straightening herself to a standing position from a leaning position. Her utterance appears quite neutral in itself but with the embodied action it becomes more efficient in illustrating her thoughts about the whole affair.

Nonetheless, when looking at how the situation moves on from there, it seems that even though her view towards what Jari said is different from his, she does not want to continue the discussion. This becomes apparent when looking at Jari's repetitive utterance through lines 12-13. While he is repeating her words back at her, she is no longer paying attention to him: she is looking down at some papers in her hand ignoring his attempt to provoke her. Even though T1 again in line 14 repeats her own phrase and then continues her turn by her insinuation thus showing she has heard him, she is still looking down. It seems that by reacting the way she does, she tries to avoid a possible confrontation that might develop from Jari's reaction to her disapproval. T1's behavior throughout lines 12-16 has an effect on his provoking behavior in that it stops before it actually can have a chance to begin. At some point he must have noticed that he is not the focus of her attention, but unfortunately it cannot be said when, as he is not visible in the video recordings at this point: both cameras were angled towards the center of the class and he was sitting on the left side of it. However, it can still be concluded that the teachers' withdrawal from the participation framework they had established earlier functions as quite a powerful signal to him that the discussion is closed as far as the teacher is concerned, thus indicating that he should act accordingly as well.

According to Goodwin and Goodwin (1992), the kind of activity occupied withdrawal illustrated above by T1 is an effective method of signaling to recipients that the particular topic at hand is about to be closed. Quite often the manner in which it is indicated is done by means of nonverbal behavior as exemplified above by T1's withdrawal of gaze from her recipient and, in addition, by her lowered tone of voice in lines 15-16. In performing such actions, T1 is indicating the termination of the exchange between her and the student, which he interprets correctly. Thus, he withdraws from the possible forthcoming confrontation by changing the course of his action: he quiets down remarkably still discussing very quietly with the other boys sitting close to him.

6.4.3 Nonverbal communication in instruction environment

In 6.3.4 it was stated that the teachers employed directives in instruction environment for several purposes: allocation of turns, requesting correct forms from the students by way of repair, and demonstrating correct forms by drawing students' attention on them. Out of these three actions, the last two were considered to be beneficial in the students' L2 acquisition process. When instruction environments are examined from the point of view of embodied activity, it seems that the teachers deploy nonverbal behavior for the allocation of turns and for drawing students' attention to correct forms.

The following extract is an example of turn allocation process and how it is accomplished in collaboration with talk and gesticulation. In 17 below, T1 and the students are discussing about the divergent skills they have. In line 4, T1 issues a direct imperative to one of the students. Her utterance through lines 1-4 does not reveal the intended recipient. However, when her nonverbal act is analyzed it becomes obvious to

whom she is addressing her command. Already from line 1 onwards, T1 has positioned her body towards the right side of the class, where one of the boys (Jari) is sitting, her gaze directed towards him. Finally, when issuing the directive in line 4, she momentarily gestures towards Jari with her right hand, thus displaying clearly that it is him who is supposed to share his skills with the class. It is however uncertain if Jari is looking at the teacher or not at this point as the camera was angled away from him towards the center of the class. But it is likely that he is, since he reacts to the teacher's words and action by saying 'of course' in line 6, with which he simultaneously acknowledges the teacher's 'perfect pupil' remark and demonstrates shared assessment of the claim. In line 7, the teacher utters a moodless expression 'so', which evidently refers to the fact that she is waiting for his answer[32].

Fragment 17; T1, lessons 1 & 2

```
1    T1       We have (.)
              {standing her arms crossed body slightly angled to the right
2             fortunately we have  (.)
              her head lowered, gaze at jari
3             one perfect pupil here (.)
              ……………..…………………
4        ?    tell us [about your skills                  ]
              right hand points at Jari and then lowers, gaze at him}
5    St                 [(some students laugh at this point)]
6    J        of course
7    T1       So
```

The gesture the teacher performs can be seen to function to complement the speech. The imperative T1 utters conveys only part of the message (i.e. someone has to tell about their skills); while the nonverbal act of pointing with her hand completes the meaning. As Kendon (1986:14) suggests, gestures function as devices with which the speaker is able to convey those meanings that words do not reveal. This

---

[32] Jari's answer is extremely long and thus, is not presented here.

in turn indicates the complementary relationship gesticulation has with speech (Kendon 1986:13).

The nonverbal behavior that was illustrated in actual instruction was varied and at present only one of those instances is brought up for discussion. The fragment below (fragment 9) is the same that was already introduced in 6.3.4. It is the situation where T1 is teaching the comparison of adjectives to her class and one of the girls is unsure of what kind of adjectives are considered as consisting of one syllable. The teacher is explaining the concept to her, and in line 7 she issues the direct imperative 'listen' to indicate that the girl needs to listen to the pronunciation, which T1 clarifies to her in lines 9-10. While T1 is uttering lines 5-8, she is simultaneously looking at the girl, and in line 7 she is even leaning on top of her table still sitting towards the girl as if she were trying to spell out the concept for the girl with her actions.

Fragment 9; T1, lessons 1 & 2

```
1    ?g      onks toi niinku (.)
             {T1 sitting behind table and looking down
             is that like
2            t- tai toi nice
             looking at transparency
             or like nice
3            nii onks se sitte (.)
             ………………………
             like is it like
4            niinku yks tavuinen (1.0)
             ………………...…………………
             like with one syllable
5    T1      on (.)
             looks at the girl
             yes
6            nice (.)
             swings her right hand opposite to left hand
7    ?       kuuntele (.)
             leaning towards the girl still sitting behind the table
             listen
8            nice (2.2)
             pause: gazing at transparency, marker touches it
9            ei (vaikuta) sää ääntämys (.)
             looks down; at SÄÄ looks at girl, right hand palm upwards
             it doesn't (effect) you the pronunciation
10           sää sitä ääntämystä kuuntelet (.)
             slightly moving on the table….
             you listen to the pronunciation
11           nice
             …..}
```

What is particular about this situation is that by looking at and leaning towards the girl, the teacher is in a way marking the participation framework of their discussion, i.e.; she and the girl are the interactants accomplishing the discourse through their actions. According to Goodwin and Goodwin (1992), interactants display with the collaboration of talk, gesticulation and with body orientation the participant frameworks in which they are taking part during multi-party conversations. In the present example, the teacher is illustrating with all the three modalities (i.e. gaze, body position and words) the particular participation framework she is attending to with the girl student. In return, the girl is looking towards the teacher throughout the discussion. Furthermore, she has positioned herself so that she has an unobstructed view of the teacher: she is leaning slightly to her left in order to achieve this. She needs to alter her position as she is sitting in the last row of desks behind two rows of boys. Hence, everything she does can be seen to operate as an indication of her hearership and of the participation framework the two are establishing through collaboration.

It has to be acknowledged that T1 is not gazing at the girl constantly; she does look down as well. In such instances, T1 is using her right as a speaker to not to look at a recipient all the time. Goodwin (1981:75) perceives that whereas hearers should be for the most part gazing at a speaking participant, speakers are not obliged to do this. However, it is worth pointing out that when the speaker is gazing toward the recipient, the hearer should be looking at the speaker. This is exactly what happens in the example.

However, the institutional context with its multiple participants renders the framework somewhat redundant as everybody in the class can hear the exchange between the two, even though they are not

displaying active attendance to the conversation. More importantly, the instruction the teacher is giving should be targeted to the whole class as the topic of the conversation is something that can be of use to all students, not only to the girl even though she is the primary recipient having asked the question in the first place.

6.4.4 Summary

In this part of the analysis, it has been observed that embodied activity needs to be considered as an integral part of spoken discourse if it is to be understood. Likewise, it has been argued that nonverbal communication acquires multiple functions when teachers issue directives within the three task environments assigned for the present study. In task management, it was used for conveying those aspects of meaning that the teachers' utterances did not convey. That is, nonlinguistic actions functioned as one of the means of getting the speaker's words across to the recipients. Gesticulation is one of the devices, with which meaning can be conveyed and which was used successfully in the present data. In addition, gestures were seen to operate as additional information providers in that they gave more insight into how the teachers' utterances were to be taken (e.g. if the words seem to be emphasized). What is more, nonverbal behavior was deployed to reveal how the teachers organized their own thought processes as well as how they structured their instruction-giving, as in the example where it was observed that the teacher employed her fingers as counting devices in the process of organization of instructions.

It can be stated that gestures play an important role in the directives issued in instruction environment as well. They function in similar roles

as in task management, i.e.; conveying some part of the meaning that words do not reveal by themselves. In addition, teachers were able to illustrate with their body orientation the particular student, to whom they were issuing instructive directives, thus displaying the possible participant framework on their part. By contrast to task management, the nonverbal means for teachers to control their students seemed to focus on such aspects as gaze withdrawal, tone alteration, body orientation and other ways of shifting. It seems that marking the participation frameworks can be quite a powerful tool for teachers to change the course of students' actions. Teachers were also able to avoid possible confrontations or unwanted actions by displaying a withdrawal from the activity at hand by averting their gaze and lowering their voice. All in all, it appears that the teachers in the present data resorted to various nonverbal behaviors in issuing directives. It is also worth pointing out that the directives in those instances were uttered through various grammatical forms and thus, the function of the directive played a more crucial role when embodied activity was considered not the form per se.

7 DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to illustrate that the inference of a situated activity such as teacher-issued directives is always tied to the context of interaction through identifying the divergent grammatical forms of directives and their functions in different environments. In addition, the role of embodied activity was analyzed. Since L2 classroom interaction can be seen to consist of a multitude of divergent actions, the concept of context was already from the beginning divided into three separate and essential environments of classroom interaction: task management, classroom management and instruction. These three environments were seen to have an effect on the nature and the functions of the directives. Consequently, in the analysis each environment was examined individually through the functions the directives acquire in interaction as well as through the embodied activity perspective.

Aside from their functions, the directives the teachers issued were analyzed on the basis of their grammatical forms and their sequential placement within the on-going talk as these were also considered to give important insights to the directive nature of divergent illocutionary acts. The analysis shed light on the multifaceted nature of directives. However, it is acknowledged that all three aspects are integral parts of the activity of issuing directives and thus, should always be taken into consideration when analyzing feasible directive actions.

7.1 Results

The results indicate that within all three environments the teachers issued directives through various grammatical forms both in English and in Finnish. The divergent grammatical constructions utilized varied from discrete imperative forms to declaratives and interrogatives. It seems that there is no one particular form, which was deployed for one particular function, i.e.; all of the forms were uttered in all three environments in varied functions. The basic directive forms utilized were normal imperatives, let's–imperatives and imperatives with overt subject. It was argued that among these three, let's–imperatives were used the most because of their role as attention-getters in the teacher's task management actions. This was due to the significant role of attention-getters in classroom interaction as they ensure the smooth flow of the lesson's progress.

In addition to this, it was claimed that 'we will' expression was utilized with similar functions as let's–imperatives. The equivalent Finnish form for these two was the passive form, for instance, 'alotetaanpas'. What was particular about these directive forms was their indication of the actions of both participants: when they were issued it was considered that both the teacher and the students should perform the required action. However, it is admitted that within the framework of the teacher's task as an instructor, she needs to keep her instruction materials in order, thus not being always able to perform the required tasks as attentively as the students. In contrast with these, it was also suggested that imperatives with overt subject differentiate the actions of the participants in that when such forms are issued it is only the students who are the actants accomplishing the directive acts.

Other grammatical constructions that were employed in issuing directives were interrogatives and declaratives. These, however, needed to fulfill certain conditions in order for them to be considered as directives in addition to their sequential placement within the on-going interaction. These conditions included such aspects as their implied actions ought to be physically realizable within the context of their utterance, the subject of the utterance ought to be the addressee and they should entail one of the modal verbs. The results indicate that declarative and interrogative utterances were shaped in such ways that they fulfilled the three conditions as directive illocutionary acts. It is also worth pointing out the need to distinguish these types of interrogatives from normal interrogatives teachers issue. It is essential to understand the difference between the two as both acts are typical classroom actions. While directive interrogatives are aimed at getting the students to accomplish the proposed action of the act, normal interrogatives serve to invite information from the students.

In addition to all the above forms, need–statements were also seen to function as directive illocutionary acts, and as such they emphasized some sort of a necessity or want. For example, in T3's task management actions her need-statement was clearly deployed as an illustrator of the necessity to listen attentively to the video the class watched. When considering all these different grammatical formulations the teachers exploited for issuing directives, it appears that my findings reflect similar results with regard to the forms as observed by, for example Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002), and as such, the results are generalizable to some extent. What is interesting is that the non-native teachers observed in the present study utilized the same range of forms identified in studies of native speaker discourse.

The functions of the directives issued within L2 classroom interaction were various. However, it seems that in task management and classroom management their functions were more varied than in instruction environment, where they acquired only one central function. When directives were uttered in task management environment, it was shown that they served either as attention-getters or as devices that helped the teachers to structure their instruction-giving. As attention-getters, directive utterances were utilized to seek students' attention prior to a new topically related task or right before the class began to work on the new topically related task. In both cases, they were used to show to the students the phase of the lesson. In the attention-seeking role, it was claimed that interrogatives, for example, can be inferred to function as directives not only when they fulfill the three conditions discussed above, but also due to the lack of a response-move following an interrogative in the usual teaching exchange I-R-F. Therefore, it could be concluded that there are elements other than the ones reported in 6.2 on the basis of which declaratives and interrogatives can be interpreted to function as directives. In addition to this, it was observed that some of the attention-seeking directives functioned as markers for when the students were expected to work attentively no matter what kind of a task they needed to accomplish.

Aside from attention-seeking, it was argued that the teachers exploited different grammatical forms of directives in order to make their instruction-giving an organized activity. The instructions the teachers give can be highly structured with a beginning and an ending as well as with the instruction-core itself. The instruction part was seen to consist of two parts in which the teachers first shaped directives with declaratives after which they were repeated in imperative form. The beginning and ending were observed to consist of attention-seeking

actions. Not only was instruction-giving found to have structure, but it was also observed that the task management actions teachers perform in classrooms is patterned to some extent. This was claimed on the basis that the attention-getting actions were structured in two parts as well. However, it needs to be acknowledged that the instructions the teachers gave were not always as structured: on the contrary, on occasion they were quite implicit. That is why it cannot be emphasized enough that these findings are only preliminary observations and that yet a larger data sample is required to make decisive conclusions about the structural properties of instructions in L2 classroom discourse.

Within the classroom management environment it was established that the directives were utilized for controlling students' unwanted behavior and setting the limits for permissible behavior with the help of hints and nonverbal means. Even though the underlying forms of hints were need–statements or adverbial expressions, they were categorized as hints. This was done on the basis that the teachers did not only issue directives for management actions but they were also considered to function as a means to negotiate the nature of the relationship between the teacher and the students. It was observed that whereas T1 deployed hints and other indirect forms to control her students, T3, on the other hand, employed nonverbal means for the same action. Both devices were seen to be rather effective in that the teachers were able to alter their students' actions to more admissible forms. The most salient difference between the teachers was shown to be the way the relationship of the teacher and the students was co-constructed. It was suggested that T1's more indirect means to convey her directive messages showed that she did not take her more powerful role as a teacher as given. Rather she tried to adjust it to be on a more symmetrical and friendlier level with the students. This was deducible

not only from her directive actions but from other actions as well. By contrast, T3's nonverbal behavior closely integrated with her directive utterance which illustrated quite an explicit way to control her students' actions. However, it was never intentionally implied that T2's and T3's class atmosphere or attitudes towards their students were hostile: it was only observed that no matter what kind the relationship is between teacher and students affects the choices on which teachers base their directive expressions. Nevertheless, it has to be acknowledged that in the end it is the teacher who is in charge of the class as there are identifiable means, which teachers can use to alter their students' behavior. What is more, these results are in accordance with other similar findings indicating that the previously presented view of the institutionally inscribed asymmetrical relationship of teacher and students is jointly negotiated through face-to-face interaction (Thornborrow 2002).

The analysis of the directives in the instruction environment indicated that they do not acquire as many functions as in the other two environments. However, it is not claimed that the one function they have would be unimportant. On the contrary, it seems that the role of directives in instruction was to provide L2 learning opportunities to the students through establishing and drawing their attention on the correct applications of the target language as well as directing their participation in the proper usage of L2. These actions can be claimed to be beneficial for the students in their L2 learning process. What was salient among these directives was their temporal dimension. It was found that the teachers issued two kinds of directives in instruction: directives that were to be accomplished immediately with respect to their issuance and others that referred to actions at a later time in the unspecified future. The first type of directives functioned in ways that

compliance was obligatory and expected from the students. Apart from this, they functioned as devices for requesting repair when students' answers were considered inadequate or unacceptable. When considering all the other directives examined in the analysis, it can be established that all of them required more or less immediate action.

However, with the directives that required remote actions, the acquiescence was not as obvious as the students did not show any visible actions to them at the time of their performance. That is, it remained unclear whether the students actually followed these directives. The forms that the teachers deployed in issuing these were varied, i.e.; no one particular grammatical form was used for these. It should be pointed out that if the students want to learn English they should consider the kinds of directives as beneficial for their acquisition process and thus, carry them out eventually. This kind of temporal dimension of directives has only been studied in relation to doctor's orders during medical consultation and when compared to the classroom, the most important difference is that the patient after the consultation is expected to adhere to the doctor's orders. In classrooms, the situation is not as straightforward as this since there are numerous aspects influencing the students' learning process and which are beyond the scope of the present study (e.g. motivation, learning skills, comprehension of the functions of the foreign language etc.).

In 2.1.1 it was established that in the present study classroom interaction and L2 learning are deemed to be essentially related to each other, but all evaluative aspects with regard to how learning takes place are excluded. While analyzing the instruction environment through directive speech acts it became apparent that such exclusion is not as clear-cut since it can be claimed that the nature of the instructive discourse has an effect on the learning process. Ellis (1990:91) points out

that "classroom process research has done much to show us how learning opportunities are made available to the learner, but it has not been able to show how interaction results in L2 learning". In my opinion, this cannot be expected before we understand fully what actually takes place in classrooms through interaction. Only after having learned this, we are able to commence the task of relating interaction to how second language acquisition is accomplished. With such a view in mind, it can be argued that the findings of the present study represent a step towards understanding the multifarious process of L2 learning.

Although the analysis was presented here by separating verbal and nonverbal communication from each other in chapters proper, it should nevertheless be pointed out that this was done only in order to formulate a clear picture of the diverse directives and their functions. However, it is noteworthy that in reality they are quite inseparable as interaction is developed in collaboration, acted upon and interpreted through the evolving situations. In the present study, when the teachers' directives were identified, it was carried out by identifying both linguistic and embodied activities. Already during the process of identifying the functions of directives the important role of embodied activity became apparent as some of the functions addressed in the analysis were not easily categorized as directives without any reliance on nonverbal means. This was the case, for instance, with one of the attention-seeking directives T3 issued: her interrogative utterance that she uttered in order to draw students' attention from prior activity, she accomplished with the combination of her speech act and nonverbal action of walking in the class and retrieving instruction material.

In the same manner, the teachers' nonverbal actions gave more profound insights to the directive situations in the classroom. That is,

embodied activity was observed to have several functions when directives were issued. First of all, nonverbal behavior helped to disambiguate the teachers' messages as an accompaniment with the verbal form. This was exemplified by, for instance, T1 when she employed gesticulation together with her directive speech act in order to convey to the class the student to whom she was allocating the next turn. Her words alone would not have been sufficient in this, but her actions and utterance combined was an effective choice that revealed to the students her intention.

Second, embodied activity was exploited in the organization of student participation in the classroom. That is, the teachers' nonverbal actions were aimed at managing students' behavior or drawing their attention to some particular aspects of the target language. This was partly achieved by managing participation frameworks between the teacher and the students through collaborated actions. Finally, it was identified that nonverbal communication is an essential part of discourse, and it should always be treated as such. This became evident when T2's instruction-giving was analyzed. The combination of her utterance and embodied activity illustrated well the structural organization of instruction-giving.

Nonetheless, it needs to be established that the nonverbal actions identified in the analysis were quite sporadic and unique: the teachers did not repeatedly utilize the same embodied activities throughout their lessons. Thus, as far as the present data is concerned, it cannot be said that the results in this respect are generalizable. A prolonged observation, however, might help to shed more light on whether or not teachers actually deploy similar nonverbal behaviors in greater quantity and more regularly and for specific effects and functions.

All in all, it can be concluded that teachers utilize divergent means in issuing their directives in L2 classroom interaction and their choices of how to generate them seem to be effective in that the students follow their orders. The nuances teachers are able to create when issuing directives with different combinations of verbal, paralinguistic and nonverbal means are very subtle, but highly effective. More importantly, teachers assess constantly the evolving situations of the classroom, and on the basis of that evaluation they are able to adjust their instructive actions so that they are in a way on top of the situation, no matter what is happening. As such, their more powerful role in comparison with the students cannot be denied. However, the distance between teacher and students is not as clear-cut as the participants with their actions establish and maintain the kind of relationship they deem appropriate.

7.2 Implications

When I was doing my teacher training, we were given examples of different kinds of situations of the classroom in a form of a textbook of classroom English. With those situations, lists of useful phrases and expressions were provided, from where we, as teachers, could choose the ones that suited us the most[33]. The lists included numerous directive expressions as well. In some ways, they were useful as they provided alternative expressions for us as beginning teachers of how to express ourselves in certain situations. The only problem with these kinds of lists is that they remain extremely distanced from the reality of the classrooms. They do not equip teacher trainees with sufficient enough insights as to what the face-to-face interaction is like in reality, or to the

---

[33] For the full collection of the expressions see Hughes 1981.

subtle and seemingly small ways with which trainees could effectively manage and instruct their classes. As it has been demonstrated during the present study, interaction is instantiated through the evolving situations by the collaboration of both participants. Therefore, pre-learned expressions do not endow trainees with necessary flexibility so that they would be able to adjust their verbal and nonverbal communication from one situation to another. In my opinion, this is an aspect that should be treated and taken into consideration in the future in teacher training.

The data for the present study was recorded in an upper secondary school. In retrospect, when looking at the data and the findings, I have begun to wonder what the results would have been like if the data was collected from an elementary school. During the analysis, I got the impression that the teachers did not issue as many directives as they could have, especially when considering classroom management environment. This made me think how dramatically different the classroom activities, and hence the directive actions, are between the two levels of education. That is why it would be interesting to observe elementary school lessons in order to see what kinds of directives the teachers issue. More importantly, it would be interesting to see what kinds of functions directives acquire and in what ways their issuance differs from that of the upper secondary school. I make this assumption on the basis that in elementary schools, for example in 3rd grade when foreign language acquisition begins, the pupils are still learning to adjust to the institutional world of school and thus, do not necessarily know what is permissible behavior and what is not. This might cause elementary school teachers to issue behavioral directives in a significantly different ways.

One of the aims of the present study was to identify what kinds of directives teachers issue in L2 classroom interaction both in Finnish and in English. It has been observed that second language teachers generate their directives in both of the teaching languages: Finnish and English. Within the scope of the present study, only the functions of the directive acts have been identified in both languages. The purpose of the present study was not to evaluate when the different directive acts were formulated in Finnish and when in English. Therefore, the type of evaluative aspect has been excluded. However, this might yet be another interesting research area in L2 teaching in the future: in what types of situations teachers issue their directives in their mother tongue and when in the foreign language.

8 CONCLUSIONS

The present study has been carried out in order to see how, in reality; teachers realize the essential task of issuing directives in L2 classroom discourse. It has been stated that various means are deployed in this, and these include both verbal and nonverbal elements, both of which have a significant and a complementary role when directives, or any other speech acts for that matter, are being formulated. Most importantly, it has been emphasized that when talk-in-interaction is the focus of analysis, it is not enough to take only into consideration the verbal features of discourse. Rather everything that seems to create meaning needs to be included within the inference of talk and thus, how the situation as a whole is borne and accomplished with the help of divergent means is essential part of the analysis. The discrete means include aspects such as verbal and nonverbal elements as well as contextual, paralinguistic and pragmatic features. Therefore, it can be concluded that the analysis of any situated activity is a highly multifaceted process. But, on the other hand, it is very informative as to how people actually manage the complicated phenomenon of everyday interaction.

Hopefully, the present study has succeeded in revealing how second language teachers communicate in classrooms, especially when directives are at question, if only to illustrate the vast amount of choices teachers have available when they see the need to make behavioral adjustments in students' behavior or when they need to direct the lesson's progress from the beginning to its closing. Their choices seem to be effective in both environments no matter how they are combined and effectuated. Issuing directives can be seen as one of the most important tasks in teacher's work and as such, it is only to be hoped

that teachers, teacher trainees, scholars or other people in close contact with institutional surroundings understand the significance of it. Furthermore, formulating directives is something that should not be afraid to be exploited in classrooms as it seems to be such a rich phenomenon affecting how the lesson is co-constructed by both the teacher and the students. Even now, at this very moment, everywhere teachers are issuing directives to their students and instructing them in their learning process and students, for their part, help the teachers in this through their participation in the on-going interaction. Maybe one of them is you or me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyle, Michael 1988 (2nd edition). *Bodily Communication.* London: Routledge.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage (Eds.) 1984. *Structures of Social Action.* Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, Peter and Aldo di Luzio (Eds.) 1992. *The Contextualization of Language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Auer, Peter 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' Approach to Contextualization. In Auer and di Luzio (Eds.) 1992, 1-37.

Boden, Deirdre and Don H. Zimmerman (Eds.) 1991. *Talk and Social Structure.* Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson 1987. *Politeness. Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cole, Peter and Jerry L. Morgan (Eds.) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics.* Volume 3. Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.

Coulthard, Malcolm (Ed.) 1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Davison, Alice 1975. Indirect Speech Acts and What to Do with Them. In Cole and Morgan (Eds.) 1975, 143-187.

Downing, A. and P. Locke 1992. *A University Course in English Grammar.* New York: Phoenix.

Drew, Paul and John Heritage 1992. Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In Drew, Paul and John Heritage (Eds.) 1992. *Talk at Work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-65.

Drew, Paul and Marja-Leena Sorjonen 1997. Institutional Dialogue. In Teun A. Dijk. (Ed.) 1997. *Discourse as Social Interaction.* Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction Volume 2. London: Sage Publications, 92-118.

Edwards, A.D. and D.P.G Westgate 1987. *Investigating Classroom Talk.* Social Research and Educational Studies Series: 4. London: The Falmer Press.

Ellis, Rod 1990. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition. Learning in the Classroom.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, Rod 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1976. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society.* Vol. 5, No 1; 25-66.

Goodwin, Charles 1981. *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers.* New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin 1992. *Context, Activity and Participation.* In Auer and di Luzio (Eds.) 1992, 77-99.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness and Charles Goodwin 1986. Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica.* Vol. 62 – ½, 51-75.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1990. *He-said-she-said. Talk as social organization among black children.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1995. Assembling a Response: Setting and Collaboratively Constructed Work Talk. In ten Have, Paul and George Psathas. (Eds.) 1995 *Situated Order. Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities,* 173-186.

Green, Georgia M. 1975. How to Get People to Do Things with Words: the Whimperative Question. In Cole and Morgan (Eds.) 1975, 107-142.

Hall, Joan Kelly and Lorrie Stoops Verplaetse (Eds.) 2000. *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heath, Christian 1986. *Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, Christian 1992. Gesture's Discreet Tasks: Multiple Relevancies in Visual Conduct and in the Contextualization of Language. In Auer and di Luzio (Eds.) 1992, 101-127.

Heritage, John and David Greatbatch 1991. On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews. In Boden and Zimmerman (Eds.) 1991, 93-137.

Håkansson, Gisela 1987. *Teacher talk. How teachers modify their speech when addressing learners of Swedish as a second language*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Glyn S. 1981. *A Handbook of Classroom English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kendon, Adam 1985. Some uses of gesture. In Tannen, Deborah and Muriel Saville-Troike (Eds.) 1985 *Perspectives on Silence*. New Jersey: Alex Publishing Corporation, 215-234.

Kendon, Adam 1986. Some reasons for studying gesture. *Semiotica*. Vol. 62 - ½, 3-28.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malamah-Thomas, Ann 1987. *Classroom Interaction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McHoul, Alexander 1978. The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society.* Vol. 7, No 2; 183-213.

McNeill, David 1986. Iconic gestures of children and adults. *Semiotica.* Vol. 62 – ½, 107-128.

Mehan, Hugh 1979. *Learning Lessons. Social Organization in the Classroom.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Neill, Sean 1991. *Classroom Nonverbal Communication.* London: Routledge.

Psathas, George 1991. The Structure of Direction-giving in Interaction. In Boden and Zimmerman (Eds.) 1991, 195-216.

Richmond, Virginia P. and James C. McCroskey 2000. (1995) *Nonverbal Behaviour in Interpersonal Relations.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sadock, Jerrold M. 1974. *Towards a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1975. Indirect Speech Acts. In Cole and Morgan (Eds.) 1975, 59-82.

Searle, John R. 1976. A Classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society.* Vol. 5, No 1; 1-23.

Sinclair, J. McH. and D. Brazil 1982. *Teacher Talk.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, John and Malcom Coulthard 1992. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. In Coulthard (Ed.) 1992, 1-34.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. Lääkärin Ohjeet. In Eskola, Kari; Peräkylä, Anssi and Sorjonen Marja-Leena (Eds.) 2001. *Keskustelu lääkärin vastaanotolla.* Tampere: Vastapaino, 89–111.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001a. Simple Answers to Polar Questions. The case of Finnish. In Margaret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhler. (Eds.) *Studies in Interactional Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co, 405-431.

Streeck, Jürgen 1993. Gesture as Communication I: Its Coordination with Gaze and Speech. *Communication Monographs.* Vol. 60, No 4; 275-299.

Streeck, Jürgen 1994. Gesture as Communication II: The Audience as Co-Author. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 27(3), 239-267.

ten Have, Paul 1991. Talk and Institution: A Reconsideration of the "Asymmetry" of Doctor-Patient Interaction. In Boden and Zimmerman (Eds.) 1991, 138-163.

Thomas, Jenny 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Thornborrow, Joanna 2002. *Power Talk. Language and interaction in institutional discourse.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

van Lier, Leo 1988. *The classroom and the language learner. Ethnography and second-language classroom research.* London: Longman.

Willis, Jane 1992. Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom. In Coulthard (Ed.) 1992, 162-182.

Appendix

Transcription conventions partly adjusted from Gail Jefferson (ix – xvi, Atkinson and Heritage) and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (2001a)

(1.9)	silences timed in tenths of a second (approximately)
(.)	micropause which marks a clear stop in the speech too short for measuring
(( ))	double parentheses are used when vocalizations are not recognizable or spelled correctly; other additional information can be expressed by them as well
(xx)	items that are not recognized or are too difficult to hear what has been said are indicated between single parentheses
{ }	embodied activity is indicated between brackets
<u>what</u>	emphasis is underlined
what	italics mark words or sounds where voice is fading away
:	colon marks if a sound or a syllable is extended
> <	speech pace that is quicker than normally is indicated by "less than" signs
< >	speech pace that is slower than the surrounding talk is indicated by "more than" signs
° °	speech that is quieter in an utterance is marked with the degree sign in the beginning and at the end of this part of speech
WHAT	capital letters mark when part of an utterance is louder than the surrounding speech
hhh	audible aspirations where noticeable are inserted to the speech

.hh	audible inhalation
.yeah	a period in front of a word: the word is said with in breath
ye-	dash indicates a cut-off of a word
??	rising and falling intonation are marked with upward or downward pointing arrows
[	left-hand bracket indicates the beginning of overlapping utterances
]	right-hand bracket indicates where overlapping speech ends
=	no interval between adjacent utterances nor overlapping
£	smile voice throughout the whole line
@	at sign marks if a speaker is speaking with an animated voice
St	most students
?b	a boy speaking, difficult to say who
?g	a girl speaking, difficult to say who
??	someone speaking, unable to identify who
?bs	number of boys talking, how many difficult to know

Vertical ellipsis: indication of omitting intervening turns is marked with full stops

Horizontal ellipsis: indication of omitting some part of the speech though it will still be continued is marked with full stops