

Ned Danison

Structural variation and social meaning in elementary school teachers' linguistic acts of control

ETAP 850: Intercultural Pragmatics, Spring 2009

1. Introduction

Analyzed herein is a corpus of seventy verbal commands uttered by teachers keeping order in public institutions of mass education at the elementary level. The main feature of interest is that these commands are often phrased in what might be called "polite" forms (hedges, mitigated expressions, indirect speech acts) which, it is theorized, are a nod to the addressee's autonomy and/or dignity, or Goffmanian "face" (Lakoff, 1973; Brown and Levinson 1987; Goffman, 1967). While it is not controversial to say that teachers avoid threatening pupils' face, in what sense can it be said that by using such language teachers are being "polite" to pupils? There is muddiness in terminology in that *politeness* is not generally what we would call the modulation in ways teachers speak to students, yet the "politeness" employed in teacher-student dyads is marked by the same structural variation as the linguistic phenomenon termed *politeness* in academic discussion that assumes adult interlocutors. This study, therefore, reframes politeness as a presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) in which *teachers perform speech acts modulated according to cultural patterns of appropriateness underlying the institutional roles these teachers play*. To postulate an explanation for the motivation behind such politeness phenomena, it may be said that one employs politeness not only to mitigate face threats to others, but also to mitigate the appearance of being impolite, which is a threat to one's own face.

2. Theory and terminology

In terms of Searle's (1975a) typology of speech acts, a linguistic act of control fits under the category of "directives", which are essentially utterances intended to get someone to do something. This covers non-technical terms such as order, command, request, etc. The term *act of control* is chosen to zero in on the teacher in her¹ institutional role as *an authority*, defined here as a person charged with maintaining social control within institutional bounds, being presumed to have the competence to do so. Linguistic acts of control are defined by Lampert & Ervin-Tripp (1993) as "prohibitions or negative requests: utterances that require that an addressee stop or avoid a line of action" (p. 179). An example is a teacher's utterance, "Be quiet", in the context of leading a class down a corridor.

A speech act may be considered indirect in a structural sense or in a social sense. In the first sense, there is Searle's (1975b) description of the structural form of a speech act (say, an assertive) uttered to perform another type of speech act (say, a directive); as such, "the speaker's utterance meaning and the sentence meaning come apart in various ways" (p. 59). In the second sense, a speaker is considered indirect if he tries to accomplish a social goal without baldly displaying his intentions. The two senses come

¹ Teachers are referred to in the feminine and students in the masculine.

together in an indirect speech act: A teacher may utter "I shouldn't hear any talking" intending the illocutionary point, "Be quiet". Thus in linguistic terms as well as in social terms, an act of control may be done indirectly.

Brown and Levinson (1987) (hereafter B&L) state: "Indirect speech acts are certainly the most significant form of indirectness..." (p. 132), as they "... function as *hedges* on illocutionary force" (p. 134). That is, in the words of A.J. Meier, "The more obscure the intention of an utterance is, the more polite it is; the more direct or clear the intention is, the less polite" (1996, p. 349). But indirect language does not always mask intentions from a motive of politeness. In Meier's view, terminology is confused in discussions of "politeness as appropriateness and politeness as indexed by certain formal linguistic features" (p. 351). With this in mind, the present study asks the question, why would a teacher want to accomplish a social goal (an act of control) without baldly displaying her intentions linguistically? The evidence collected for this study shows that indirectness is often used in acts of control, but the question remains: Is this a species of politeness?

2.1. *Politeness theory and linguistic acts of control*

Meier (1996) observes that "although Brown and Levinson devote an entire book to politeness, the concept is never actually defined" (p. 346). Meier surveys several dozen articles inspired by B&L's theory, and concludes:

Even a brief perusal of the literature as given above [in Meier (1996)] reveals a confusion regarding politeness: is it to be equated with deference, with tact, with formality, with routine formulae, with certain lexical items or syntactic constructions, with social appropriateness, with indirectness or, are there different types of politeness and if so, which of the above, if any, do they represent? And, wherein are we then to seek universals? (p. 350).

In an attempt to tackle the "unwieldy problem of determining whether certain linguistic forms are polite or not" (p. 353), I shall bring B&L's politeness theory to bear on elementary teachers' linguistic acts of control addressed to their young pupils.

2.1.1. *Children and face*. B&L begin their argument with the assumption that "all competent *adult members* of a society" have certain rational capacities and are concerned with a public self-image (B&L, p. 61, italics added). At the outset we see that politeness theory primarily covers adult-adult dyads, and is little concerned with adult-child interactions. Whereas politeness strategies between adults are used to mark social footing (as in deference to rank, or to mark solidarity or familiarity, for instance), there is an inherently unequal footing between adults and children. An adult directing "politeness" to a child does not indicate a "mutual vulnerability of face" (p. 68) -- a sort of equilibrium brought about by attending to each other's wants. Children are vulnerable in several senses; they typically lack the knowledge, competence, strength, and experience of adults, and they depend on adults for guidance, nurturance, and protection.

B&L's *face* (roughly, public self image) is "tied up with notions of being embarrassed or humiliated" (p. 61). The vulnerable position of children, then, presents adults with considerable opportunity in having authority over them to embarrass or humiliate them, or to withhold the guidance and protection children might expect from an

adult. Thus, in American culture at least, there exists a strict-fair-lenient continuum by which an adult is judged when dealing with a child. At one extreme there is the inappropriately harsh act, and at the other extreme there is the too-lenient act (or failure to act). By this standard, school children judge teachers on how "mean" (strict or harsh) or "nice" (fair or lenient) they are. A culture or society, in any case, shares a set of notions about more or less appropriate ways in which adults may treat children. Hence, in this aspect, Meier's (1996) terminology "appropriateness" works better than "politeness"; we may say tentatively that so-called polite language is employed as a nod to the fairness or lenience side of an appropriateness continuum.

2.1.2. Face as wants. In the educational setting, the teacher is continually directing and impeding the actions of pupils. Negative face, as "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (B&L, p. 62) may apply to the educational situation insofar as a child may wish he were unimpeded -- he may want to run in the halls and play all day. A teacher's indirection, therefore, might be understood as a sort of apology for impeding the child's "natural" inclinations (cf. Rousseau's ideal of maximum play and minimum impedance [Bloch, 1995]). B&L, in one of only a few places where adult-child interaction is mentioned, allude to this possibility:

In English, for example, conventionalized indirect requests are so common that it is rare to hear a completely direct request even between equals (and in the middle classes, it is even surprisingly rare from mother to child, unless she is angry). This seems to result from the suppression of the acknowledgement of asymmetric power relations in Western dyads... This suppression makes commands extreme FTAs [face threatening acts] in Western cultures (p. 248).

We might cast doubt on this "nod to natural inclination" hypothesis on the grounds that many people, even in Western societies, take an opposite (Hobbesian) view of human nature in which each generation of children is a fresh wave of barbarians in need of strict and thorough (and unapologetic) civilizing.

As for positive face -- in one sense, the want of individuals that their wants are desirable to others (another sense is described below) -- a child may want to be recognized for his accomplishments which may be contrary to the school program. The whole notion of "wants" is complicated by the fact that the educational institution exists to inculcate wants in pupils, namely, that pupils should want to obey the institutional rules of order and the instruction of teachers. By being subjected and submitting to the institution, the pupil learns how to be a member in good standing and subsequently derives positive face from his good behavior, for example, in the form of teacher praise and compliments. Being taught to be members in good standing, pupils are essentially taught what their face wants in school *should be*. (This is to say nothing of face in peer interaction among pupils or of the face wants of teachers; the present concern is with the sense in which teachers are "polite" to pupils.)

2.1.3. Face threatening acts (FTAs). Having problematized pupils' negative face, and having given the teacher the authority to define pupils' positive face, what now constitutes a teacher's face threatening act? FTAs listed by B&L -- orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminders, etc. -- are a large part of a teacher's stock in trade and

are the means to the end of guiding and nurturing. How these means take linguistic expression, it seems, falls somewhere on the strictness-lenience continuum, and a teacher is obligated, as the situation requires, and as the culture deems appropriate, to be *judicious* in his or her application of acts of control, to keep them plausibly *fair* -- that is, not too strict and not too lenient.

A teacher's judiciousness is especially called for in acts that presumably threaten the positive-face want, in the sense of acts that indicate "the speaker does not care about the addressee's feelings", such as expressions of disapproval, criticism, reprimands, accusations, and so forth (p. 66). These acts carry a considerable potential for a pupil's embarrassment and humiliation -- which some teachers find (un-judiciously as it were) to be effective means of social control. A teacher's avoidance of a positive FTA, then, may simply be termed *kindness*, an appropriate application of indirectness given the situation.

Here we assert, therefore, that the teacher's apparent politeness indicated by the indirect, modulated, softened linguistic forms by which teachers effect social control is the judicious application of force within social and cultural parameters that define the proper deportment of an adult toward a child in terms of obligations and entitlements of both parties. Simply put, we can imagine a teacher who is directly and baldly displaying acts of control *all the time*: she would be considered authoritarian and unfeeling (in American culture, at least), ignoring her obligation to be kind and disregarding the pupil's entitlement to fair treatment. Do teachers want to be perceived this way? Why should they care?

2.2. *The teacher's presentation of self*

B&L's concept of politeness as mitigation of face threatening acts is derived from Erving Goffman's (1967) notion of face. "Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (p. 5). As such, members of a society are entitled to an expectation that they are members in good standing as they are obligated to enact the socially-approved attributes of their position or role.

A dramaturgical understanding of the term *role* is Goffman's main premise in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). In interaction in institutional roles, as in a scene on the stage, people sustain a "definition of the situation" and do the work of "impression management". A teacher, in this view, acts to sustain an institutionally appropriate educational scene and manages impressions with a variety of "props" (manner of dress, accoutrements, etc.) while speaking from a "script" (including judiciously applied linguistic acts of control). A performance, in Goffman's perspective, presents certain shared values, and draws attention to ideals commonly recognized by society. "To the degree that a performance highlights the common official values of the society in which it occurs, we may look upon it... as a ceremony..." (Goffman, 1959, p. 35). Thus we may consider a teacher's role a more or less standardized performance following a script of institutional appropriateness written in the language of a particular culture. We will return to this point in sections below.

3. Data collection and analysis

3.1. *Eavesdropping on elementary teacher's directives*

Over a period of two months, I collected samples of elementary teachers' verbal directives which I heard in the course of my daily routine as an itinerant ESL tutor in two school districts. I transcribed the utterances with attention to speaker, addressee, and setting variables (see appendix A). At first, I wrote down every directive I heard, but I eventually decided to focus on commands, which I later narrowed to acts of control, as described above. The total number of directives collected is seventy; of this number, fifty-one may be classified as acts of control (see appendix B). In my daily routine I am within earshot of no fewer than ten and no more than fifteen teachers; in recording their utterances, I tried to sample this dozen-or-so teachers evenly. My samples cannot be taken to be representative of any other demographic than the white, rural/small town, lower-middle/middle class teachers and teacher's aides who uttered them. Yet as a native speaker, I have a sense of the range of structural variation possible in acts of control in educational settings, and my samples seem to cover this range.

3.2. Structural variation adults employ in accomplishing directives

Susan Ervin-Tripp (1976) postulates that structural variation in adult directives take at least five surface forms:

1. Imperatives like 'Bring me a sweater.'
2. Embedded imperatives like 'Could you bring me a sweater?'
3. Question directives like 'Have you got a sweater here?'
4. Statements of need like 'I'm cold.'
5. Hints like 'It's a cold night.' (p. 128)

Ervin-Tripp's concern is with identifying functions of symbolic diversity, i.e., explaining why directives have structural variation, and what each variant means socially. In sum, her analysis is that language is a means to assert social relationships -- that is, to mark social distance, rank, familiarity, etc. "In general", writes Ervin-Tripp on the function of the five structures, "the higher the cost of goods or service [i.e., the demands of the speaker], the greater the option offered the listener, so that as cost goes up one moves from imperative to request question and then to statement" (p. 144). This is congruent with what was noted in the discussion of politeness theory: the more hidden the intention (indirect structures), the more polite; the more explicit the intention (direct or imperative structures), the less polite.

There is much overlap here with teacher-pupil acts of control. Structural variation in examples of teacher directives fit Ervin-Tripp's categories, and I find no example that cannot be construed as one of the five:²

1. Imperatives -- "Be quiet."
2. Embedded imperatives -- "Could I have quiet, please?"
3. Question directives like "Do you hear how noisy it is?"
4. Statements of need -- "I need it quiet in here."

² From the samples, the minimal unit which carries the illocutionary force of the utterance (the "head act"), has been stripped out.

5. Hints -- "It's noisy in here."

However, we have already observed that, since the social relationship between teacher and pupil is relatively fixed, and since teachers' indirect language is a matter of institutional appropriateness and not politeness *per se*, another line of reasoning is needed to account for variation in social meaning found in my samples of teachers' acts of control.

3.3. *Social meaning and structural variation*

From the pupil's standpoint, an entitlement to fair treatment within institutional bounds has already been posited. This accounts for the teacher's obligation as authority to apply force fairly or judiciously. Direct speech acts may generally be considered more forceful, as in these examples: "Stop talking." "Go sit down." Indirect realizations with the same illocutionary point, e.g., "It's time to focus on your work now" or "Please find a seat" are less forceful (but structure does not always predict social meaning, as we shall see). A teacher has a choice of structures at her disposal depending on what the situation calls for. I have modified Ervin-Tripp's list in order to bring out a distinction between the structurally direct, modulated, and indirect forms as follows:

1. Direct/imperative speech acts, not modulated.
 - "Go sit down."
 - "Do exactly what you were told."
2. Modulated imperatives and embedded interrogatives
 - "Please stop with the comments and talking."
 - "Maybe you should stop talking and concentrate on your work."
3. Desires of the speaker -- direct/imperative
 - "I need you to get ready."
 - "I want you to close your books."
4. Desires of the speaker -- indirect
 - "I'm not having this today, I'm not having it."
 - "Can I have quiet please?"
5. Indirect speech acts:
 - "The front of the line is doing such a great job."
 - "We are in the hall."

3.3.1. *Teacher's definition of the situation and presentation of self: a question of focus.* It is a peculiar function of verbal discourse to repeat or to draw attention to a social feature, as if to remind interlocutors of the definition of the situation at all times in a "continual assertion about social features" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 142).³ The teacher's choice of literal content or elaboration in acts of control is meaningful. For a rational actor, a particular choice of focus precludes an alternative focus and indicates a specific intention. Unless a teacher's choice of words is random and erratic, the indicated focus must offer a

³ For example, in situations where it is appropriate to call someone *doctor*, it is not sufficient to use the term once to establish social footing and then arbitrarily switch to alternative terms (say, *miss*); the choice of terms is meaningful.

clue to what is desirable and important in a particular situation. Following, therefore, is a further modification of the above structural variation list with labels indicating topic in focus⁴ (see Appendix C for samples sorted in these categories):

1. "You" topic direct/imperative speech acts, not modulated.
2. Modulated imperatives and embedded interrogatives.
3. "I" topic: desires of the speaker: direct/imperative.
4. "I" topic: desires of the speaker: indirect.
5. Indirect speech acts -- varied focus.

The following sections consider what social meaning each of these five structural types may carry in terms of a teacher's definition of a situation and presentation of self indicated in the focus.

(1) Imperatives simply reflect the teacher's authority to command; this is directly connected to a felicity condition of acts of control requiring the speaker to have authority to execute directives. The teacher draws attention to the fact that the pupil ("you") is obligated to obey.

(2) Modulated directives ("*Please* sit down") contain a conventional polite form, but this doesn't necessarily mitigate forcefulness. The modulation redounds to the teacher's appearance of civility as she presents herself as a fair arbiter of institutional order.

(3), (4) "I" topic directives ("*I need* you to sit down"; "*I want* everyone in their seats now") shift the focus from reminding pupils of the rules to telling pupils what the teacher wants. This could also be construed as coercive, as if to say "You will satisfy my need, no matter what the institutional expectations are", in which interpretation the speaker makes a big presumption on the hearer. It may even be a self-distancing from the role as an act of solidarity with the hearer, as if to say, "I step down from my official role to speak to you as (more or less) an equal". In any case, it draws attention to the teacher's status as a private individual who happens to be enacting a public role. Precisely why a person would want to make this distinction is not clear.

Another interpretation is suggested by Huls (1986), in which "I want you to..." is read as a clear statement of the felicity condition of sincerity which is constitutive of a request or order. Huls considers this a form of indirection in the social sense (see also Gordon and Lakoff (1971) in Brown and Levinson, 1987). Still, in keeping with my analysis, Huls' suggestion of a focus on or appeal to the sincerity condition may nonetheless be interpreted as a linguistic maneuver to call attention to the teacher as a person set against her role as an authority.

(5) Note that opportunity for elaborations and varied focuses expands with the use of indirect forms:

"From now on there is no talking."

"There is no excuse for talking."

⁴ Ervin-Tripp (1982) notes three points of focus reflected in the verbal form of a control act: the problem condition ("It's noisy in here"), the goal object ("Let's have it quiet"), and the addressee's projected activity ("Be quiet"). These are subsumed in my list of variants. The question remains as to the social meaning of these variants (if any).

"The voice level right now must be zero."

"We are in the hall." [so be quiet]

"Why can't you follow directions for more than 30 seconds?" [be quiet]

"The front of the line is doing such a great job." [but not the back of the line; if you want my praise, be quiet]

"We're not having such a great day today." [and that bothers me, so be quiet]

This is what Brown and Levinson (1987) call "that baroque ensemble of productive ways of constructing indirect speech acts that is so marked a feature of English usage" (p. 132). These indirect acts of control seem to draw attention to

(a) a rule or ideal, e.g., "There is no talking"; "The voice level right now must be zero"

(b) a reason for a rule, e.g., "There are classes working"; "We are in the hall"

(c) the addressee's misdeed (mainly directed at individuals), e.g., "Why are you talking?"; "You are talking"

(d) how the speaker is affected, e.g., "We're not having such a great day today"; "The front of the line is doing such a great job"

In (a), making a rule or ideal explicit, it may be that the teacher means to indicate her role as duly appointed custodian of the situation. By mentioning a reason for a rule (b), the teacher may indicate her role as pedagogue, reminding the class that there are reasons for rules other than simply to obey authorities. Or, she may consider herself a defender of group expectations (which overlaps with the next category). In (c), drawing attention to the doers of misdeeds may indicate the teacher's role as punisher of insubordinates. Drawing group attention to the misdeed is also an invitation to the powerful social control mechanisms of shame and embarrassment. By drawing attention to how the teacher is affected (d), the teacher indicates she is emotionally engaged in the situation, and to be in her good graces is a measure of a child's proper behavior.

In short, the teacher can be construed as presenting herself in the following ways, as if by making these statements (numbers correspond to structural variants noted above):

- (1) I am the appointed custodian of the situation.
- (2) I am civil.
- (3), (4) I am a private person enacting a public authority role.
- (5) I am a pedagogue.
- (5) I am the defender of the group's right to order.
- (5) I am the punisher of insubordinates.
- (5) I am emotionally involved in my position.

3.3.2. Indirectness as plausible deniability in presentation of self. A sorting of the data by addressee -- individual or whole class -- shows individuals receiving 68% of direct speech acts, and 24% of indirect speech acts. By addressing acts of control to the whole class, the teacher risks the appearance of unfairness to pupils who are not breaking rules. Indirectness gives deniability to the teacher in the face of all those students who are behaving properly; i.e., the teacher can plausibly say to any individual, "I wasn't talking specifically to you". This analysis is based on Steven Pinker's (2007) assertion that a

Gricean assumption of cooperation needs to be supplemented with the fact that people use indirection as a form of manipulation.

Furthermore, keeping institutional order is not primarily a matter of teaching rules, but is a matter of enforcing rules everyone should already know. Therefore, most directives are *reminders* of rules in effect. That said, there is a difference between *reminding* and *nagging* ("to find fault or complain in an irritating, wearisome, or relentless manner"). The teacher maintains plausible deniability that she is a nag by using a variety of expressions as various presentations of self. Each of these highlight aspects of the obvious rule. To repeatedly state the obvious is not only wearisome to the hearer, but makes the speaker appear rigid and dogmatic (in American culture, that is). A variety of approaches reflects well on the speaker.

4. For Further Study

The present study is based on a quite limited, convenience sample of language. The above analyses undoubtedly have some merit, but I may be trying to squeeze more meaning out of the structural variation than is actually there. To test my hypothesis about the teacher's linguistic acts of control as windows to a Goffmanian presentation of self, a qualitative study of teachers' reflections on what ideals are expressed in their daily enactments of authority could be devised. A quantitative study could also be devised in which relative frequency of linguistic structures are measured. This would shed light on the extent to which indirect speech acts are used as acts of control.

The literal content in the rich variety of expression described above may encode something of a teacher's cultural values. To this assertion I apply the following line of reasoning: Assuming that a teacher's role is a more or less standardized performance following a script of institutional appropriateness written in the language of a particular culture, it follows that particular acts of control should be congruent with the general values and ideals of that culture. What we find empirically is that acts of control are elaborated in diverse ways. Clues to ideals (what is desirable) and values (what is important) may be in the elaboration.

If the above analyses can be strengthened by further study, and if American teachers' expression of ideals and values line up with what is known about American cultural ideals and values from other sources, a replication study in another language and culture may well turn up areas of difference, or it might suggest a universality of particular presentations of self encoded in structural variations. This could contribute to the larger projects of discovering the extent to which values are encoded in language, intercultural contrastive analyses, and foreign language learning.

References

- Bloch, Jean. (1995). *Rousseauism and Education in Eighteenth-century France*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1976). Speech acts and social learning. In K. H. Basso & H. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology*. University of New Mexico Press, pp. 123-153.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1982). Structures of control. In Wilkinson, L. C. (Ed.), *Communicating in the classroom*. N.Y.: Academic Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual*. New York: Pantheon.
- Huls, E. (1986). Directives in Spontaneous Family Interaction. In F. Lowenthal & F. Vandamme, (Eds.) *Pragmatics and Education*. New York: Plenum. 125-142.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. In *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 292-305.
- Lampert, M. & S. M. Ervin-Tripp (1993). Structured coding for the study of language and social interaction. In Edwards, J. & Lampert, M. (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and coding methods for language research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum,. 169-206.
- Meier, A.J. (1996). Defining politeness: Universality in appropriateness. *Language Sciences*. 17 (4), 345-356.
- Pinker, S. (2007). The evolutionary social psychology of off-record indirect speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 4(4), 437-461.
- Searle, J.R. (1975a). A taxonomy of speech acts. In Gunderson, K. (Ed.) *Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science 9: language, mind and knowledge*. 344-369.
- Searle, J.R. (1975b). Indirect speech acts. In Cole, J. & Morgan, J.L. (Eds.). *Syntax & Semantics, vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1994). "Cultural scripts": A semantic approach to cultural analysis and cross-cultural communication. *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series*, 5, 1-24.

APPENDIX A

A single entry form from my directive collection log:

Date:		Time:			
Site	spkr sex	spkr age	rcvr(s)	spkr emo	spkr vol
E <input type="checkbox"/>	M <input type="checkbox"/>	20+ <input type="checkbox"/>	class <input type="checkbox"/>	LH <input type="checkbox"/>	W <input type="checkbox"/>
M <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/>	30+ <input type="checkbox"/>	M <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Q <input type="checkbox"/>
H <input type="checkbox"/>		40+ <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/>	A <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
		50+ <input type="checkbox"/>	MF pr <input type="checkbox"/>		L <input type="checkbox"/>
			MM <input type="checkbox"/> / FF <input type="checkbox"/> pr		S <input type="checkbox"/>
			MF grp <input type="checkbox"/>		
“ ”					

Site: Elementary / Middle / High School

Speaker sex: M / F

Speaker age: 20+ / 30+ / 40+ / 50+

Receiver(s): Male / Female / MF - FF - MM - pair - group / whole class

Speaker emotion: light-hearted / serious (normal) / angry

Speaker volume: whisper / quiet / normal / loud / shout

APPENDIX B

Total number of directives collected = 70. "Acts of control" (N = 51) are marked with an asterisk (*)

1. Now, you know how to get it ready?	36. Awright, why don't we wait to say the pledge.
* 2. Your word searches should be in your m - a - i - l - b - o - x (spelled).	* 37. We are in the hall.
* 3. Please stop with the comments and talking.	* 38. Here. Put your stuff away.
4. 'K! I want you to start to clean up.	* 39. There is no excuse for throwing that.
5. 'K! I need you to get ready.	40. Y'got five minutes.
6. K! look at me, you need to have this.	* 41. Get your book and read; you don't need to keep coming over here.
*7. The front of the line is doing such a great job.	* 42. Kyle, put a card in (a punishment card).
* 8. Go sit down. You don't talk to me that way.	43. Michael, you can put that right by the door
* 9. Music stuff away; this is the second time.	* 44. Why are you running?
* 10. Maybe you should stop talking and concentrate on your work.	* 45. We're not having such a great day today.
11. One more minute and then I'm gonna ask for volunteers.	46. What I would like you to do for a minute, hold up your first piece.
* 12. There is no talking at all.	47. Hey come on now, don't be a... What're you doin' there son? why'oncha go in?
* 13. Do exactly what you were told.	* 48. I'm talking. You're not. That's called listening.
14. Morning work upside down and on the corner of your desk, please.	* 49. Colby. Zip it. Get it done right now.
	50. All right everyone... Let's take a look at our

<p>15. Okay guys, right out the door; you're gonna go right down there.</p> <p>* 16. Let's go boys!</p> <p>* 17. C'mon ladies, let's go (clap, clap)!</p> <p>* 18. Shh, not a sound.</p> <p>* 19. Shh, no speaking.</p> <p>* 20. I shouldn't see that out; it should go in your take-home folder.</p> <p>* 21. Guys, walk please; walk; walk.</p> <p>* 22. Caleb, sit on your bottom.</p> <p>23. I want you to close your books.</p> <p>24. Line leaders may line up.</p> <p>* 25. Joshua, put it on my desk. Joshua, put-it-on-my-desk! I told you to stop playing with that!</p> <p>* 26. Why are you talking?</p> <p>27. Hey Jesus, put the thing away.</p> <p>* 28. Please put your pencils and crayons away. (15 seconds pass) Crayons and pencils away.</p> <p>* 29. You're away from your chair.</p> <p>* 30. Have a seat.</p> <p>* 31. Put your stuff away!</p> <p>* 32. Whose crayons are these?!</p> <p>* 33. No, you're not s'posed to bring it.</p> <p>* 34. Ladies and gentlemen...</p> <p>* 35. John. John! You need to go back, and you need to walk like the rest of us.</p>	<p>morning work</p> <p>* 51. I... want... children... sitting... in... their... seats... now.</p> <p>* 52. From now on there is no talking.</p> <p>* 53. The voice level right now must be zero.</p> <p>54. C'mon honey, c'mon, we have to go.</p> <p>* 55. Nice and quite in the halls.</p> <p>* 56. I need you to be on your best behavior (in the hallway).</p> <p>* 57. Get your feet off that wall, or you're cleaning it after school</p> <p>* 58. I'm not having this today, I'm not having it.</p> <p>59. Good job everybody. I like how well you're working. (Being quite + working at their desks)</p> <p>* 60. Can I have quiet please?</p> <p>* 61. Why can't you follow directions for more than 30 seconds?</p> <p>* 62. You do not walk in our door and start blurting out stuff.</p> <p>* 63. Um, there are classes working.</p> <p>64. Go right in and sit quietly please.</p> <p>* 65. C'mon Jesus, speed it up.</p> <p>* 66. Who's the boss -- you or me? ("You") Then follow directions.</p> <p>* 67. I am looking for a table that is ready</p> <p>* 68. I don't want to see you writing.</p> <p>* 69. You know what? I'm gonna ask you to stop right there.</p> <p>* 70. I shouldn't hear any talking.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX C

\$ = Directed to an individual addressee.

"You" topic direct/imperative speech acts, not modulated.

- \$8. [You] Go **sit** down. **You don't talk** to me that way.
9. [Put your] music stuff away; this is the second time
- \$13. **Do** exactly what **you** were **told**
18. [You do] not [make] a sound [conventionalized]
19. No speaking [conventionalized]
- \$22. Caleb, [you] **sit** on your bottom.
- \$27. [You] **Put** the thing away
31. [You] **Put** your stuff away!
- \$33. No, **you're** not s'posed to bring it
- \$35. John. JOHN. **You** need to **go back** and **you** need to **walk** like the rest of us
- \$41. [You] **Get** your book and **read**, you don't need to keep coming over here.
- \$49. Colby. [You] **Zip** it. [You] **Get it done** right now
- \$57. [You] **Get** your feet off that wall, or you're cleaning it after school
- \$62. **You do not walk** in our door and start blurting out stuff (followed by a long lecture)
- \$65. C'mon Jesus, [You] **speed it up**
- \$66. Who's the boss -- you or me? ("You") Then [You] **follow** directions.

Modulated imperatives and embedded interrogatives

3. **Please** stop with the comments and talking
 \$10. **Maybe you should** stop talking and concentrate on your work
 28. **Please** put your pencils and crayons away.
 34. Ladies and gentlemen... [conventionalized]
 60. Ssh. **Can I have** quiet **please**?

Focus on "I": desires of the speaker: direct/imperative

5. **I need you to get** ready
 6. **Look at me**, you need to have this
 23. **I want you to close** your books
 \$25. **I told you to stop** playing with that!
 51. **I want children sitting** in their seats now
 56. **I need you to be** on your best behavior (in the hallway)
 \$69. **I'm gonna ask you to stop** right there.

Focus on "I": desires of the speaker: indirect

20. **I shouldn't see** that out; it should go in your take home folder [so put it there]
 \$58. **I'm not having this** today, I'm not having it [so behave properly]
 60. **Can I have quiet** please? [for me to have it, you must stop talking]
 67. **I am looking** for a table that's ready [and children who are ready will earn my favor, so get ready]
 68. **I don't want to see** you writing [so stop writing]
 70. **I shouldn't hear** any talking [but I hear it, so stop it]

Indirect speech acts.

attention to a rule

2. Your word searches should be in your m.a.i.l.b.o.x [so put them there] {assertive -- statement of rule}
 12. There is no talking at all [except for those who shouldn't be talking, so stop] {assertive -- statement of rule}
 52. From now on there is no talking. [This is the rule, and you must obey it] {assertive or declarative -- statement of rule }
 53. The voice level right now must be zero. [This is the rule, and you must obey it] {assertive or declarative -- statement of rule }

attention to a reason for the rule

37. We are in the hall. [the halls should be quiet, so stop talking] {assertive -- statement of rule}
 63. There are classes working [talking disturbs them, so be quiet in the hall] {Assertive -- appeal to reason, teacher advocates for others who suffer from hearer's misdeed, or applies reason to situation, as if to say there are reasons to behave other than simply because I said so}
 39. There is no excuse for throwing that. [there's no reason to do it, so stop it] {assertive --- a display of teacher power?}

attention to hearer's misdeed

- \$44. Why are you running? [you shouldn't be, so don't] {interrogative ... focus on breach drawing attention to hearer -- a display of teacher power?}
 61. Why can't you follow directions for more than 30 seconds? [There is no reason, so follow directions properly] {interrogative ... focus on breach drawing attention to hearer's shortcoming -- a display of teacher power?}
 \$26. Why are you talking? [you shouldn't be, so don't] {interrogative ... focus on breach drawing attention to hearer -- a display of teacher power?}
 \$29. You're away from your chair. [and you should be in it, so sit] {assertive -- focus on breach drawing attention to hearer -- a display of teacher power?}

32. Whose crayons are these?! [that person must put them away] {interrogative ... focus on breach drawing attention to hearer -- a display of teacher power?}

\$48. I'm talking. You're not. That's called listening. [So listen and stop talking] {assertive -- statement of rule, focus on roles, display of power}

attention to how the speaker is affected

45. We're not having such a great day today [your behavior disappoints me, so behave properly]

{expressive -- reflects the teacher's feelings -- you are hurting me, emotional manipulation}

7. The front of the line is doing such a great job [but not the back of the line, so behave properly] {assertive -- an example of proper deportment; here is an illustration of how it should be, in case you're not sure -- Or maybe it's a kind of manipulation, trying to win the teacher's favor}