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Abstract:

Language is the medium through which we communicate, and language in the classroom is how the teacher manages the classroom and directs instruction. This qualitative case study focused on a Spanish-English bilingual preschool teacher and her fourteen bilingual and bicultural students, in particular how she used directives for classroom management and instruction. The focus of this study is the teacher directive and the student response to these directives. Along with this focus, I examined the dynamics involved in directives for classroom management and instructional objectives, as well as in maintaining interpersonal relationships.

Interaction—the comprehension and negotiation of directives—took place at the communicative locus, where the speaker’s utterance was interpreted by the listener. I used a framework based principally on Tracy’s (2003) Action-Implicative Discourse Analysis (AIDA) model, which featured four central elements: (1) the teacher’s position and (2) the sense of authority that the students granted that position; (3) the degree of directness of the directives and (4) the level of cooperation between interlocutors (Davies, 2007; Grice, 1975). Data came from two primary sources, (1) recorded observations and their transcripts and (2) interviews with both teacher and students. I
also wrote analytical memorandums and collected artifacts. I conducted 19 observations (which yielded 251 pages of transcription) (see Appendix G: Overview of Observations), six teacher interviews, and 15 student interviews. I wrote 25 analytic memos. I also developed an analytic inventory instrument that allowed me to determine the level of directness of directives.

Taking into account teacher and students, as well as immediate and ideological objectives granted insight into each interactant’s motivations. By analyzing directives for directness, via an inventory instrument, I was able to examine strengtheners and attenuators in interactive situations. I also examined debates that featured the ideologies and large-scale ideas.

I found that, in negotiation, students had to determine how to respond to teacher directives. This negotiation was part of the process of comprehension. The teacher used directives as part of her instruction to build an educational foundation for the students. Reflection and contemplation allowed the teacher to reconcile certain seemingly contradictory facets of her teaching, as well as how to use different strategies.
Dedica

Alla famiglia: a mamma e taita, ai miei fratelli e sorella, e naturalmente, a mia figlia

A tutti i bambini, che sono il futuro di questo paese

e

Alla comunità bilingue degli Stati Uniti
Aunque un sólo autor (en este caso, yo mismo) asume prácticamente toda la responsabilidad del análisis, organización, y escritura de un trabajo como el presente, me quedo indudablemente consciente que me paro encima de los hombros de, no gigantes, sino los que también se paran sobre hombros de gigantes, quienes también se paran encima de hombros de gigantes, *etc.* De esta manera, esta tesis hace referencia específica a la idea *bakhtiniana* que, como hablantes, somos representaciones (y hasta “re-presentaciones”) de nuestras experiencias y las de otras, sean académicas, lingüísticas, personales, culturales, u otras experiencias de la vida (Bakhtin, 1981).

Así entonces, con afecto y agradecimiento, extiendo palabra a mi comité, primero los directores, los catedráticos Kathy Escamilla y Dan Liston, que con sus entusiasmados “*Keep going!*” y “*Wait, have you considered…?*” me animaron y estimaron a través de los pasos de este estudio. Siempre me impresionó también el entusiasmo que mostraba la doña Susan Jurow en cuanto a las investigaciones de sus estudiantes de doctorado, y por aquello fue que le pedí servir en el comité, por el cual le agradezco. Se ha representado además mi tiempo en McKenna Languages Building con la presencia de doña Esther Brown y don Javier Rivas, previamente miembros del comité de maestría en lingüística hispánica, ahora agregando una perspectiva lingüística, y a quienes también agradezco. De hecho, considero este estudio ser uno tanto lingüístico como pedagógico.

Agradezco además el cariño y los consejos de doña Lise Menn, doña Kira Hall, don Leonard Baca, doña Karen Tracy, doña Laura Michaelis, don Edilberto Cano-Rodríguez, y doña Sandra Butvilosky, así como a todo el personal del BUENO Center de la Universidad de Colorado, Boulder. Por otro lado, un agradecimiento a mis amigos
y colegas de la Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO) y la asociación estudiantil Culture, Language, and Social Practice (CLASP) de la Universidad de Colorado, Boulder. Además, deseo reconocer y agradecer a Susana Campos y sus estudiantes del colegio Place Bridge Academy. Sin su bienvenida, apoyo, y entusiasmo por mi trabajo durante los meses de observaciones y entrevistas, nunca se habría realizado esta tesis.

Por otra parte, extiendo las gracias a otro colegio, la comunidad de la Escuela Bilingüe Pioneer en Lafayette, Colorado, es decir, la facultad y personal de apoyo, padres y, a que fuera poco, los alumnos de este colegio ejemplar, que de hecho me han otorgado una mano cariñosa con sus palabras de comprensión y de ánimo durante los últimos pasos de este proyecto.

Finalmente, quiero dar las gracias a mi familia, a quienes en parte he dedicado esta tesis—mi madre, doctora Elsie Rodríguez, mi recordado padre, el doctor Tomás Naula, mis hermanos, Tomás Andrés y Ricardo, mi hermana, María Isabel, y mi hijita, MaríaGracia Cristina.

Sea en campos académicos u otras áreas de la vida, soy la suma de todo lo que me rodea.
CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction ........................................................................................................... 1

Communicative Locus ............................................................................................................. 2

Contextual factors .................................................................................................................. 6

Teacher .................................................................................................................................. 6

Students ................................................................................................................................. 7

Background and Statement of the Problem ............................................................................ 11

Rationale for the Present Study ............................................................................................ 12

Theoretical Framework .......................................................................................................... 19

Larger goals and local strategies ............................................................................................ 21

Position and authority ............................................................................................................ 22

Directness and indirectness .................................................................................................... 25

The Cooperative Principle ....................................................................................................... 26

Research Questions ............................................................................................................... 28

Chapter 2: Review of Literature ............................................................................................ 31

Defining the directive ............................................................................................................. 32

Defining the directive in the classroom .................................................................................... 32

Strategies: Structural concerns ............................................................................................. 34

Speech Act Traditions ............................................................................................................ 36

Strategies: Taxonomies ............................................................................................................ 36

Negotiating meaning in context ............................................................................................. 39

Mechanisms for indirectness .................................................................................................. 46

Context .................................................................................................................................. 48

Listener interpretation ............................................................................................................. 50

Irrealis and Deontics ............................................................................................................... 55

Directives and Conventionalization ....................................................................................... 59

Directives in Other Professional Environments ..................................................................... 61

Children and Directives .......................................................................................................... 67

The Classroom Environment .................................................................................................. 79

Teacher Questions in the Classroom ....................................................................................... 79
“Hands Here or Here.” .............................................................................. 144
Lining Up According to ........................................................................... 148
Chapter 5: Instructional Directives ............................................................ 151
The Instructional Directive-Response .......................................................... 152
Reining in the Class .................................................................................. 154
  Morning Circle to Rein in the Class ......................................................... 155
  Discipline versus Exploration. Offset Imperatives ..................................... 157
  Discipline versus exploration. Remaining appropriate ............................. 158
  Teaching, Learning, and Risk-Taking ....................................................... 158
Instruction versus Exploration .................................................................. 160
  Exploration and the Latino Teacher ........................................................ 160
  Potential Loss of Control ......................................................................... 162
Position Undermined .................................................................................. 164
Routines and Instruction ........................................................................... 166
  Morning Circle as Part of a Routine ........................................................ 166
Response to the Instructional Directive in Morning Circle ......................... 171
Negotiation in the Instructional Directive .................................................. 173
Physical Positions for Instruction: Listening position .............................. 176
Physical Positions for Instruction: Thinking position ............................... 179
Using directives to place students in virtual places .................................... 180
Creating Spaces for Responses ................................................................. 181
Creating spaces and the Designedly Incomplete Utterance ........................ 183
Quotatives—“Say what I say” Strategy ..................................................... 184
English Instructional Directives ................................................................ 189
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions .................................................... 194
Action Implicative Discourse Analysis Framework ..................................... 196
Room for Negotiation .............................................................................. 197
Negotiation and Parameters of Acceptability .......................................... 198
A Proportional Balance ............................................................................ 202
Cooperation as Paramount ...................................................................... 204
  Ideal and Paradoxical Situations ........................................................... 206
Instructional directives ................................................................. 207
DIU’s. ............................................................................................ 211
Modeling....................................................................................... 212
Summary and Applications ............................................................. 213
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Declaratives that Reflect Deontic Mood</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Declaratives that Reflect Deontic Mood with Spanish Gloss</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods and Analysis for Research Question 1</td>
<td>98-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods and Analysis for Research Question 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Overall Token Count of Directives per Observation</td>
<td>111-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Use of the “Hands here or here” directive</td>
<td>144-145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Communicative Locus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Utterance by the Teacher and Interpretation by the Student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Large-scale Forces and Space for Negotiation</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Daily Schedule</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The Classroom Management Directive</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Morning Circle Rug</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The Instructional Directive</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Influences on Listeners and Speaker</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction

Language is the crucial medium through which meaning is expressed and interpreted between people. When people speak, they employ oral language in combination with other communicative means in order to express their intentions in ways that are contextualized to their perceptions as well as the environment and situation at hand (Yule, 1996). The challenge for the speaker lies in being able to encode meaning into the message (Yule, 1996) and taking into account social and linguistic norms of acceptability (Ebsworth, Bodman & Carpenter, 1996). The listener faces the task of interpreting the utterance and extracting meaning from speech that may be expressed in a combination of stated and unstated, or implied, messages (Bucciarelli, Colle, & Bara, 2003), in other words, deriving meaning, too, from “what is unsaid” (Yule, 1996, p. 3) (emphasis mine). Comprehension and negotiation between speaker and listener as social actors also entails maintaining relationships between, for example, friends, employer and employee, or teacher and student (Goodwin, 1990; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2014). As interlocutors (that is, speaker-listeners involved in communicative interactions), teachers and students constitute “social actors aiming to achieve social goals,” one of which is to understand each other and the other of which is to get along with each other (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 23). They, therefore, create the meanings of the messages expressed, both explicit and implicit, while they take into consideration both language and social context.
Language is likewise the key medium for the teacher and students in a classroom, and inquiry into how teachers speak and how learners comprehend may provide valuable insight into the learning process (Allwright, 1999). Walsh (2011) asserts that, “Given its complexity and centrality to teaching and learning, it is fair to say that any endeavour to improve teaching and learning should begin by looking at classroom interaction” (p. 2). For the purposes of this study, “learning” on the part of the student means demonstrating behaviors, often responses and often linguistic responses, that show that one has appropriated part or all of what the teacher aims to instruct. The importance of language in the classroom, as both medium and object of study, is not to be understated, for communication and learning can take place within linguistic interaction, and relationships between teacher and student may be strengthened or weakened (Nystrand & Gamoran, 2001). According to He (2000), the teacher who misspeaks may be missing the chance to provide quality instruction, while students who misinterpret their teacher’s message may not be learning in the way the teacher intends, to say nothing of the interpersonal relationship between teacher and students. It stands to reason that the medium of instruction must be comprehensible to the learners. Although students do express themselves in class (indeed, they should!), this qualitative methods study focuses on teacher expression of directives and student interpretations of these expressions, taking into account utterances and responses in both English and Spanish, as particular to the bilingual classroom.

**Communicative Locus**

To say that, in a classroom, the teacher teaches and the learners learn via direct transmission of knowledge and that learners are willing receptors is an oversimplification of the dynamics involved in education, and doing so likely downplays
the social and linguistic interplay at work in the classroom (Nystrand & Gamoran, 2001). Indeed, the central point of departure for the present study lies in the communicative locus between interlocutors, namely, in speaker utterances. Rather than be parties of mere transmission of knowledge, these two interlocutors—the teacher who speaks (or misspeaks) and the student who understands (or misunderstands)—form the locus of communicative language (see Figure 1.1, below), which shows how the message, at the communicative locus, is expressed by the speaker and interpreted by the listener. The boundary of the meaning of the message is porous, signifying the malleability of the message itself. There stands potential for a great deal of back-and-forth interplay; potential also arises for misinterpretation, in which the speaker may intend one message but the listener understands another. The notion of intersubjectivity addresses how language can mediate a message, especially if one party (here, the preschool student) is making attempts to understand and socialize himself or herself to a new world, namely, the world of school (Wertsch & Kazak, 2005).

It is the teacher and students, the principal social actors in the process in the classroom, who bring their own contexts into classroom interaction. Indeed, part of examining the communicative medium involves examining its interlocutors as well. Of
course, speakers encode into their utterances their intentions, while at the same time taking into consideration their interlocutors. Other indexicalizations may add to interactional dynamic: bilinguals may operate with particular influences in mind, for example, identity as bilinguals (Nilep, 2006; Rampton, 2010; Zentella, 1997; De Hower, 2009). An older speaker may identify as older when speaking with a younger interlocutor, their contrasts marking differences in forms of treatment (Bucholtz, 2009; Eckert, 2008; Labov, 2001). Ideologies, which are explanatory mindsets (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) such as the esteem of an academic linguistic style over other styles, come into play (Silverstein, 1979, 2010; Labov, 1969). In short, interlocutors communicate by expressing and interpreting an expressed intention in the kernel of communication; however, there are many considerations that shape this central message.

Communicative interaction between teacher and students includes educational resources such as books, models, posters and other realia, among a host of other classroom materials. Human participants and these contextual resources make up the communicative and educational contexts in which these interlocutors participate, and they help form the locus of educational interaction (DePalma, 2010; Walsh, 2011). Analysts who employ techniques that study the use of language pay close attention to how people formulate utterances and responses to them. For these discourse analysts, meaning is to be found within the structure of this back-and-forth interplay between interlocutors. What is more, the intentions of these interlocutors play out in their utterances and responses (DePalma, 2010; He, 2000). If the point of departure of this study lies at speaker utterance, then its analysis will focus on how interlocutors embody large-scale ideas and ideologies and communicate them with words and gestures.
Speaker intention assumes meaning once it has become contextualized, a point on which I elaborate below.

A key dimension of much classroom talk is the use of directives by the teacher. For the purposes of this study, I draw from Searle’s (1976) oft-cited definition, “attempts by the speaker to get someone to do something” (p. 3). As elaborated upon below, an operational definition of a teacher directive is an utterance—anything from a mere hint to an explicit and austere command—and includes a gesture, or combination of utterance and gesture by the teacher to try to get one or more students to do something. Directives are important to consider in classrooms because teachers employ them for instruction and for classroom management. In the bilingual classroom, the analysis stands to be more complex if, for instance, an imperative in English may come across differently (more or less harsh, better or less well understood) than the equivalent form in Spanish. Students may comprehend and interpret directives differently depending what the context is, on how the teacher utters a directive, on what their perceived relationship is, on whether the teacher expresses them in one language or another, or a host of other factors.

It is within this complex linguistic environment that the teacher and students enact and organize teaching and learning and that the teacher uses a specific range of directives. As stated above, students also utter directives; however, this study limits directives to teacher-uttered directives. Likewise, although it is understood that both teachers and students learn and teach in the classroom—Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of oubuchenie—this study limits itself to what teachers set out to do in their instruction and classroom management and how students interpret these efforts. It is in the
communicative locus, two pedagogical processes take place: teachers teach and students learn (DePalma, 2010). The lessons that the teacher endeavors to impart constitute one part of the process, and the information that the students learn constitutes another part. Certain practices can either help or hinder learning on the part of bilingual students and their learning habits as well as of their teachers and their instructional acumen. Students learn in the interactional spaces of social contexts with the added complexity of references to context and complex group dynamics (Piker & Rex, 2008). Primary interlocutors are, indeed, teachers and learners, and it is within the communicative locus that they negotiate for meaning, not always what the teacher (the speaker in this study) intends nor always completely what the learner or learners (the listeners in this study) understand.

**Contextual factors**  
**Teacher.** Part of studying pedagogical processes involves knowing what the teacher undergoes when teaching in the classroom. Castellà, Comelies, Cros and Vilà (2007) assert that a teacher must act as: (1) an expert in the subject matter, (2) a guide to learning, (3) a motivator who keeps up interest and helps students access information, and (4) an instructional and disciplinary behavior monitor, or a “sergeant-at-arms,” so to speak. Other factors come into play for teachers, as they draw from years of experience from when they were students themselves and as teachers-in-training as well as previous years of teaching. In their school buildings, they are directed by district and in-building directives by their principals and other administrators, incorporating socio-political considerations into their utterances in the classroom (Feito, 2004). Teaching and the language that teachers use must take into account students’ backgrounds and their potential levels of understanding. The difficult job for teachers in the classroom is to get
the students to learn what the teacher has in mind, in a setting of control and acceptable cooperation so that students feel included in their learning (Castellà et al., 2007). As Gersten and Baker (2000) maintain:

> [E]ffective instruction for English-language learners is more than just ‘good teaching.’ It is teaching that is tempered, tuned and otherwise adjusted, as a musical score is adjusted, to the correct ‘pitch’ at which English language learners will best ‘hear’ the content (i.e., find it most meaningful). (p. 461)

It is not enough, then, to possess the tools for successful teaching; teachers also have to know how to implement skills given the diversity, ethnic, linguistic and other, of students in bilingual classrooms. If the teacher represents one side of the meaning-making equation, then the student represents the other. As argued above, this does not mean that teachers simply transmit knowledge to their students but rather that, as in Figure 1.1, finding meaning entails back-and-forth interplay and negotiation between interlocutors.

**Students.** Students and their comprehension of their teacher’s language constitute the other side of the classroom teaching-learning dynamic. Students learn best in social contexts that take into account their perspectives and experiences (DePalma, 2010; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). For the purposes of this study, which focuses on the bilingual student, the bilingual student is a preK-12 student who has the influence of two languages and therefore has learned to communicate in the four modalities of communication—speaking, listening, reading and writing—in both languages, at least in part, because of their bilingual backgrounds (Crawford, 2004; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). For students who come from bilingual backgrounds, that is, environments in which
another language is spoken in the home, entering preschool often represents their first experience in an environment with English-dominant speakers or monolingual English speakers. I also define the student in this study as a child between the ages of 3;10 (three years, ten months) and 4;10 (four years, ten months) at the beginning of the academic year, entering their first school experience. Students in their first school experience may benefit from precise and unambiguous (sometimes direct) language, modeling and using routines, rather than language that places too much of an “inferential load” on the student who interprets teacher direction (Bucciarelli et al., 2003). In this way, students have enough information for learning to take place, while also fostering an interpersonal relationship. For, in the expression and interpretation of language, there is information communicated but also a social treatment that stands to strengthen or suffer over time.

Both parties (but primarily the teacher) must remain aware of the audience at hand, bearing in mind that (1) it takes time for a teacher to get to know what a student can interpret linguistically and (2) the teacher often has to consider an entire class, not just one student. However, with experience, the teacher can come to know the world of children in general and how to interact with them in a way that both the teacher and students feel that the students comprehend the teacher. As discussed in analytic chapters, the teacher relied more on routines over the course of time, and she made references to them. In her Spanish directives, she used slightly more direct directives earlier on than later.

In this study, for the teacher to know that the student has comprehended or at least to feel the student has done so constitutes communication. In the interactive space created by a teacher’s utterance and negotiated by the student’s interpretation, this
communication may come to fruition or it may break down. Although both teacher and student may interpret what the teacher means, the final word is most often hers. With this study, I analyzed communication, in particular, teacher’s directives and students’ responses in a bilingual preschool classroom, including oral language, prosodic and paralinguistic features beyond the spoken word (Crystal, 1966; Schuller, Steidl, Batliner, Burkhardt, Devillers, Müller, & Narayanan, 2013), and extra-linguistic markers like gesture and gaze. By examining directives, I have endeavored to identify and qualify teacher language at distinct levels of teacher expression and student comprehension, to describe how expression matched comprehension to a greater or lesser extent, and to make informed guesses as to why it may be so. I did so by framing the research and the methodology through a lens that draws from language, social treatment, and contextualization of factors that affect both the human elements of the communicative locus, teacher in her expression and students in their comprehension. In the following sections, I explain the background of my study and justify the need for further linguistic inquiry into teacher expression and student comprehension.

Figure 1.2, below, elaborates on Figure 1.1 in that it adds to the locus of communication and the principal interlocutors therein. Speakers who encode meaning into utterances, here, in the form of directives, do so with the hope and expectation that their listeners will comprehend. Additionally, as speakers, teachers often try to anticipate learners’ thoughts and actions during a lesson (Masaki, 2004). However, as outlined
above, by the time the teacher has committed to uttering the directive, many other potential influences have played upon the teacher-as-speaker and hence the language of the utterance itself. External forces, such as the school, the curriculum, and the lesson, as well as internal forces like directness and considerations of cooperation may all have a bearing on how direct or indirect an utterance comes out. This level of directness is tempered by the teacher’s facility with either language in a bilingual classroom situation (such as, so-called “teacher talk” in creating routines).

For their part, in comprehending their teacher, students must infer what their teacher’s utterances mean, and there are many mechanisms in place where, whether correct or incorrect, students discover whether their inferences are correct or not, e.g., a teacher correcting them. While students arrive at school with preconceptions, with their own external influences (perhaps their home lives) and internal influences (maybe their friendships) and intentions to comprehend what the teacher is saying, whether in Spanish or English, they often lack foundational knowledge required in schools (Delpit, 2006).
**Background and Statement of the Problem**

A great deal of researchers have pointed out the need for research that helps design and deliver instruction better for bilingual learners, instruction (i.e., teaching methods that include leading discussions, asking questions, creating a foundation of background knowledge, and making connections) that is mindful of bilinguals’ experiences, and classroom management procedures rooted in two languages, both verbal and non-verbal (Dalton-Puffer, 2005). He (2000) calls for research on how bilingual teachers construct their directives, and she asks whether teachers “ask their students or children to anticipate and/or infer their directives” (p. 137) as a part of communication in the classroom. Bilingual students represent the fastest growing group of students in the U.S. (Crawford, 2004; Goldenberg, 2008), recently reaching more than 11 million (Aud, Hussar, Planty, Snyder, Bianco, Fox, Frohlich, Kemp, & Drake, 2010). Additionally, as Bustos, Flores, Keehn, and Pérez (2002) argue, “Creating an equitable learning environment for language minority children depends on meeting the need for quality bilingual teachers” (p. 501). That is to say, if (as Gersten and Baker (2000) assert above) high quality teaching in the bilingual classroom depends upon high quality communication between these interlocutors, then many research-based interventions, lessons, and even interpersonal interactions between teacher and students must be clear to the student, since many of them are based on directives, which are a component of human communication. Educational researchers, policy makers, teacher educators, and other stakeholders are giving more and more attention to teaching quality, with many calling for improved teacher communication (e.g., Bustos Flores et al., 2002; Darder, 1997; Delpit, 2006; Gersten & Baker, 2000; Goldenberg, 2008; Walsh, 2011). Darder (1997) has said that bilingual education teachers are the key factors in the education of
language minority children, while Goldenberg (2008) has pointed to the dearth of research in classes that serve bilingual (English language learner, or ELL) students. As well, in her study on directives in the classroom, He (2000) calls for “more studies to look at how often, in what context, to whom, for what purposes” teachers make use of directives (p. 137). As a subcomponent of quality instruction in bilingual environments, the use of effective directives would be an indicator that teacher and students are communicating well. (Here, “effective” communication is what the teacher deems to be effective, although other factors comes into play; see Chapter 3 for a fuller discussion.) Communication between interlocutors is always an advantage in any interactive situation; however, it is more so when instruction and classroom management are at stake. In short, the present study addresses the calls that researchers have made for improved teaching quality by shedding light on how directives are expressed and comprehended in the bilingual classroom. Bilingual data is the source of data in this study, and bilingual students in similar circumstances stand to benefit from analysis.

Rationale for the Present Study

To date, few studies have examined how a bilingual teacher uses directives in class for instruction and/or for classroom management or, for that matter, how their learners interpret these teacher utterances. Of the research that has been conducted on directives, only select studies have taken place in the bilingual educational settings (Ellis, 1992; He, 2000; Waring & Hruska, 2012). Of studies that focus on bilingual classroom interaction in dual language (e.g., Gort, Pontier & Sembiante, 2012) and other educational settings, such as a tutoring sessions (Waring & Hruska, 2013), only He (2000) and Searles (1970) have examined teacher directives in the classroom and only the former looked at bilingual elementary school students, both for instruction and for
classroom management. All of the above have made calls for more study, as discussed below. The lacuna that the present study addresses is how teacher directives are a show of interpersonal relationships and how students respond to both instructional and classroom management directives. Such directives demonstrate larger, ideological goals of the teacher, goals that highlight the teacher’s position and authority.

As discussed above, university researchers, educators in an urban district, and my own professional experiences have all made calls for further research into this area. The communicative kernel of the speaker’s expressed message and the listener’s interpretation are negotiated in situational context, and although this study stops short of addressing learning *per se*, it does speak to a vital element therein, namely, communication between teacher and students. As Ware (2002) points out, there is potential for mismatch in communication styles between teacher and student, and this mismatch, in turn, “creates the potential for misunderstanding of actions and misinterpretation of communication between teacher and student” (p. 429). This author studied “warm demanders,” a term used to describe teachers who present themselves as “firm yet caring” (Ware, 2002, p. 443) and with a “calm demeanor” (p. 436). Herein, then, she reveals the interpersonal nature of language, as often shown in directness or indirectness in language. In similar fashion, Haager and Klingner (2005) also call on teachers to hold their students to high standards without leaving behind the interpersonal portion of teaching. In doing many things with a single directive, holding students to high standards while still expressing that they care for students, teachers demonstrate the complexity of language, as well as how they expect students to comprehend their
intentions. The notion of intersubjectivity addresses how language, along with other
tools, linguistic and other, can mediate new knowledge (Wertsch & Kazak, 2005).

Ware (2002) also defines “warm demanders” as a form of pedagogy aligned with
culturally responsive teaching, and in doing so, she assumes, at least peripherally, the
frameworks of a critical perspective and culturally relevant perspective. Culturally
responsive teaching is essential to good teaching in that it “affirms the cultures of
students, and reflects the students’ cultures in the teaching process” (Gollnick & Chin,
2006). These frameworks seek to problematize a situation which may be working “well
enough” for a majority of students or which, for bilingual and bicultural students, may
work well for those who abandon their native languages and cultures (Carspecken,
2005). Far from acceptable, situations like these, which work well for students in the
majority, still stand to leave an important minority behind. This study addresses nuances
of speaker-listener communication, which has the potential to lead to misunderstandings
between teacher and student.

Although this is a study of language use in the classroom, analysis will inevitably
warrant a discussion of the contexts and cultures involved in language. For, there is a
contextual difference between students of ethnic minority and their ethnic majority
counterparts (Valdés, 1996). In addressing issues of ethnic cultures as they sometimes
relate to language and learning, Valdés’s ethnography (1996) showed how children
learned via example and how parents never “tested” their children or otherwise
“engaged in deliberate teaching of their children” (p. 119). Even the way that children
interacted with their families stood in marked contrast to the way that many ethnic
majority children may interact within their families. Valdés’s (1996) ethnography
highlights a discussion on students who must negotiate life “between two worlds” (which is, in fact, the title of her introductory chapter), which are the world of children and their families from Mexico and those from the U.S. Students who are bilingual and bicultural may also have to confront differences between the worlds of the working class and that of the middle class, as well as differences between the adult’s world and the child’s world. As Hansen (2002) maintains, “environment can balance students’ individual interests, as well as their family-centered and community-centered outlook” (p. 7). All these differences in relevant factors may precipitate miscommunication.

Although written more than 25 years ago, Tharp and Gallimore’s (1988) call for improved schooling still has merit, rooted as it is in Vygotsky’s (1978) claim we understand the mechanisms at work in schooling when we take into account the social and cultural aspects of the student. Processes brought out in the present study—directives associated with routines, transitions, and specific lessons—likewise take into account larger forces at work and the institutions associated with them, as will be elaborated in analytic chapters of this work.

For the teacher and students, large ideological forces and local linguistic and cultural factors come into play. As defined above, an ideology is a particular mindset that symbolically but no less significantly serves to explain or justify how the world is or should be (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Likewise, a language ideology is a set of assumptions that operates from prescribed hierarchies and may tend, for example, to relegate one language or language variety as inherently better or more valued than another one. Language ideology represents the part that language plays in structuring hierarchies and other ideological structures (Silverstein, 1979). On the other hand, “local linguistic
factors” refers to “particulars of talk and text with” that a speaker (in this case, the focal teacher) may have to direct listeners (here, the students) (Tracy, 2003, p. 220). “Local cultural factors,” then, make reference to interactions that are in some way associated with cultural norms, whether these relate to ethnic culture or some other aspect or traditions, practices and values inherent in how people associate and communicate.

In the present study, I view the directive as a multifaceted way that the teacher was able to guide and effect (i.e., “cause a change in”) the behavior of students rather than as a “do-this, do-that” austere means of behavior and mind management. In a multidisciplinary program described by Tharp and Gallimore (1988), “the teacher plays off, and builds on, the children’s responses” and there is either cooperation or friction, as a show of the interpersonal cooperation (p. 122). The architectonic of a classroom linguistic structure is important here, for it can represent symmetry between teacher and students as partners, the teacher with authority and responsibility to teach and the student with the responsibility to understand (Castellà et al., 2007). Both parties, therefore, play roles in a relationship in which they have responsibilities toward successful interaction and communication. For, in directives, we may see evidence of the interpersonal as well as the linguistic, in how one chooses to speak to others and how one interprets those choices. This study, then, serves not only as an hincapié (a reminder or highlighter) of the quality of communication between teacher and students but, perhaps more importantly, as a response to the call for better communication by Castellà et al. (2007) and He (2000) inter alia and, one would hope, better teaching.

In addition to calls from researchers for improved teacher quality, with the recent passing of a referendum to award financial backing for preschool programs in the city in
which this study took place, voters demonstrated that they support preschool as a way to build a foundation for every child’s educational achievement. A cohort of third graders in this large urban district who benefited from preschool was tested and showed marked improvement in reading test scores—63.8% scored proficient or advanced, as opposed to the 58.3% of the comparative group, the group that had not had a quality preschool experience (Robles, 2014). Moreover, preschool students who were tested showed more initiative and self-control, as well as a lower incidence of behavior problems in the classroom (González-Flores, 2014). Given these studies, one could argue that attention to a high-quality preschool experience stands to benefit the classroom, schools, and neighborhoods and that improved preschool instruction will improve more if the quality and effectiveness of instruction continue to rise. These arguments point to the importance of more attention given to how the teacher expresses herself and if doing so yields comprehension from the teacher, that is, if preschoolers actually understand the meaning of their teacher’s directives.

A final apologia for this study comes in anecdotal form from a pilot study. I observed a teacher young in both age and in experience. She was in her mid-20s, and although she had passed requisite exams to teach in the district, I observed that she stammered and hesitated in Spanish. Over the course of a semester, I observed this teacher’s reading lessons in Spanish with a group of mixed native-Spanish speakers and native-English speakers, so I began to focus on this teacher’s utterances, in particular, on her directives. There was a stark disconnect between what she asked of her learning groups and how they responded, and it left me wondering how she could communicate better with her groups and facilitate learning. There were times that this teacher would
direct students who seemed either not to notice or care about what she was saying, or who were out and out defiant—it was difficult to tell. I began to notice the same disconnect between teacher and students during transitions into or out of learning activities or even in the middle of a lesson. She would often lose patience and would raise her voice and seemingly scare some of the students into submission.

By contrast, this teacher’s part-time aide, who also conducted a reading group, directed students far differently than how the teacher did and, in fact, seemed to enjoy success in having students in her group respond to her. I began to see on closer examination how students sometimes acquiesced and sometimes did not bend to any adults’ wishes. While it was not the straightforward case that the teacher had no success with the class while the aide led the children around like a pied piper, the differences in linguistic style of the teachers (the teacher and aide) and student responses under different situations made an impression, and I resolved to look more closely at teacher directives and student responses to them. Given these large-scale forces at work and the strategies employed by these two speakers (themes discussed in the following section), they depicted strong differences in how they expressed themselves. Position and authority stood to be undermined or underlined, which in turn may have had a bearing on how students understood them and how they responded to either their teacher or the classroom aide.

By analyzing directives in the classroom, this study seeks to address issues relating to communication—calls have been made by researchers, politicians, administrators, and the public, and as well, I have witnessed dire breakdowns in communication in the classroom. This study also points in the direction of addressing
the quality of communication in the classroom. As argued above, the communicative
locus is where understanding of directives between teacher and student or students can
be interpreted as either successful or not, which says a great deal about how directives
involving instruction and classroom management are expressed and interpreted.

Theoretical Framework

In this section, I present a theoretical framework that speaks to these key analytic
elements. A theoretical framework for a study such as this one must account for both
such large-scale forces and the local linguistic and cultural phenomena, so I employed as
my primary theoretical framework Action-Implicative Discourse Analysis (AIDA), a
framework which is characterized by “attention to describing the problems, interactional
strategies, and ideals-in-use within existing communicative practices” (Tracy, 2003, p.
220). AIDA draws from the following concepts of Speech Act Theory:

1. Position and Authority (Austin, 1965, 1970; Colomina Almiñana, 2011; Masaki, 2004),

2. Directness and Indirectness (Searle, 1975, 1976), and

3. the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975; Davies, 2007).

AIDA conceptualizes language as incorporating speech practices and gestures
aimed toward arriving at larger outcomes, based on reconstruction analysis involving
what “ought to be” based on ideals set into practice (Agne, 2008, n.p.) (see Chapter 3
for a more complete description). This suggests that speakers conventionalize language
forms for specific functions. Speech Act Theory often points to the notion that
interlocutors take into account the particulars of a situation, message and interlocutor or
interlocutors, prominent among these, speaking with differing degrees of directness.
Since our interlocutors are people with whom we wish to retain interpersonal
relationships, the notion of cooperation and the cooperative principle comes into play within this framework. This case study examines the ways that primary classroom interlocutors use language framed in these ways, both with larger aims in mind, as well as references to who they were, and how these messages became played out in the classroom itself. The teacher in this study worked under the authority of overarching forces, such as the school administrators and policies, and the objectives that they prescribed, and she used particular strategies to get at these objectives.

In order to rank contextual and other factors, I return to the notion of the communicative locus. The primary concern in analysis is the utterance. Secondary are linguistic gestures aside from utterances. Then, physical gestures, including facial gestures, affect analysis. Factors such as district policies and school mandates play a final though distant role in analysis. By giving forces a rank order, I relegate some factors, while preferencing others for the sake of consistent analysis.

Speakers can contextualize language in ideological contexts. Language ideology represents the part that language plays in structuring hierarchies and other systems of ideological constraints (Silverstein, 1979), that is, things that are expected or permissible in particular contexts. In educational settings, teachers and students operate within these framed contexts of implicit language ideologies, for example, the fact that a teacher is the authority figure who leads a classroom full of students (Castellà et al., 2007; Hyland, 2002) and that such leadership often leaves little room for democratic voices. For me, ideologies have a way of giving a semblance of order to language, though the reverse may be true, too. Language may give seem certain ideologies seem plausible. In this case, the teacher most often directs the class and does so using oral language with her
preschoolers, although that order may stand contrary to how we view issues of what is right and socially just.

**Larger goals and local strategies.** As the name reflects, AIDA frames communicative practices as “action-implicative,” meaning that “[i]t seeks to construct a view of the problems, strategies, and ideals of a practice” (Tracy, 2003, p. 220). As speakers, AIDA asserts, we employ routine speech practices in order to achieve larger goals. The directive constitutes such a practice by the teacher (as speaker), who has the aim of larger, ideological goals in mind. Significantly, says Tracy, “AIDA is rhetorical in thrust: it presumes that people are choosing how to act in order to achieve or avoid certain outcomes” (Tracy, 2003, p. 220). As I interpret this tenet, speakers employ utterances (i.e., linguistic structures) as well as other gestures. Speakers base many of these choices on cultural norms. As mentioned above, these outcomes have to do with forces from administration, but they may also have to do with how the teacher interprets these goals, both educationally and interpersonally. As Agne (2008), points out, “AIDA’s primary focus has been on analyzing communication practices in institutional settings” (n.p.). In the educational context of the classroom, the problems, strategies and ideals are of an educational nature, but they also reflect the day-to-day issues with four-year-old students in their first educational experiences (in this study, none had attended day-care before) such as sitting still to listen, holding a pencil, lining up, making and shunning new friends, getting sick, or having birthday parties in the classroom. These actions, teacher’s speech and gestures, and students’ responses, match up to so-called local level speech and gestures institutional language (Koshik, 2002). As such, they
likely reflect the teacher’s efforts to socialize young students into a new school setting, which is based in large part on teacher position and authority.

**Position and authority.** In addition to speaking to the dichotomy of large-scale ideals and local-level strategies, AIDA draws from Speech Act Theory in order to highlight how speakers use language to accomplish certain actions in various social and communicative situations (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Originally conceptualized on philosophical grounds, Speech Act Theory operates on the notion of that, via their position and authority, speakers do certain things with language (Austin, 1965, 1970, 1976; Levinson, 1983). Prominent among the things speakers do with language is to direct behavior—what Austin called “BEHAVATIVES” (change in font size and all capitals in original) (Austin, 1965, p. 81). In seeking to come across as more or less direct, speakers can either strengthen or attenuate directives (Colomina Almiñana, 2011). The listeners, for their part, assume the responsibility of interpreting the speaker’s intended message. Austin recognizes the importance of how authority and position shape context and, consequently, speaker meaning in the process of the use of directives. The speaker grounds meaning in convention, which is the point at which the position of the speaker (i.e., the teacher) the authority given to the position by the listener (i.e., the student or students) meet, which Colomina Almiñana (2011) echos in saying, “el hablante de un lenguaje dice lo que dice porque las palabras que emite ya contienen un cierto significado según la situación en las que son emitidas” (the speaker of a language says what he says because the words he emits already bear a certain meaning according to the
situation in which they are emitted\(^1\)) (translation mine) (p. 47). This meaning-bearing is what Austin (1965) calls _consensus ad idem_ (p. 36), and as Austin (1965) sums up, “There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, the procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances” (italics in the original) (p. 26). Uncovering these procedures, words, and circumstances is part of analysis of position and authority in this preschool class.

There are two important points to make regarding this consensus within this framework, as they relate to the present study. The first is that the speaker may have a different picture than the listener as to what the intended meaning is, and despite negotiation and back-and-forth interplay at the point of the communicative locus, the teacher, as leader of the class, oftentimes has the final say in deciding whether directives have been comprehended to her (the teacher’s) satisfaction. The second point follows from the first, in that students are just learning the meanings of their teacher’s directives, in all their nuances of position of the teacher, level of directness, and effort of cooperation. In the present study, how teachers use their position as leaders of the class conditions their language in such a way that their directives reflect their position as teachers and large educational ideals and objectives. For their part, students who comprehend and follow through on the teacher’s directives grant them authority. A teacher who calls for the class to sing a song does so in her position as teacher and

---

\(^1\) Since most of the interactions in the dataset were in Spanish and since many of my notes were also taken in Spanish, what I provide here are translations, which, according to APA standards, constitute a paraphrase and therefore are not to be placed in quotation marks. Translations of Blum-Kulka et al. (1988), Colomina Almiñana (2011), and Castellà et al. (2007) are mine. Likewise, all translations from the corpus are mine.
teaching a song that, one hopes, will have educational value for the class. Students who follow along and begin to learn to sing the song are deemed by the teacher to have understood.

In order to arrive at a conventionalized meaning, one must ask, *Why do so many adults already know this?* or, perhaps more poignantly for the present study, *How do children learn this?* Masaki (2004) teases apart speaker intention and listener effect, asserting that the use of a performative “must involve someone who interprets the utterance. Since humans are ever-interpreting beings, they never cease attaching their own meaning to such incoming stimuli” (p. 35). For Masaki (2004), what the speaker means may not be what the listener interprets, and in critiquing Austin, she analyzes Austin’s concept of convention, of how interlocutors convene upon a common, often negotiated, meaning. Arriving at convention, or agreement, between speaker and listener is a matter of negotiation that sometimes takes place over years in one’s childhood, with children misunderstanding pragmatic meaning. As Colomina Almiñana (2011) concludes, “*el significado no es cuestión de intención sino de convención*” (meaning is not a matter of intention but of convention) (p. 62). For the present study, examining what the teacher meant in a particular exchange and what the student thought the teacher meant underscored both the negotiation (the process or mechanism) as well as the arrived-upon meaning (the convention, as referred to above).

As shown in *Figure 1.1*, speakers and listeners negotiate the message between what the speaker intends and what the listener or listeners interpret. It is in this negotiation for meaning that many factors came into play, factors I attended to in my analysis. When making meaning as interlocutors, both teachers and students relied on
previous experiences both in and out of the classroom, as well as lesson objectives and mandates from their supervisors (Feito, 2004). For their part, students also drew from previous experiences, and they started school already as active participants in the rudiments of their home languages and cultures, rather than arriving at school on the first day as empty vessels ready to be filled wholly by the school system (Freire, 1973).

**Directness and indirectness.** Speech can be direct, or it can be indirect, and teachers can certainly communicate directly, and use imperatives when they want to effect the behavior of a class (e.g., “Sit down” or “Pay attention”); however, given the fact that teachers must, while instructing and managing a classroom, foster interpersonal relationships (Castellà et al., 2007) and given the fact that, in adult interactions, teachers are not always direct, they will often employ so-called “indirect directives,” with the expectation that their students will infer certain meanings and comply. Teachers can express themselves with “indirect directives,” with the expectation that their students will comprehend (Hess, Dickson, Price, & Leong, 1979; Yule 1996). However, this is not always the case. Hence, the intention of the speaker and its concomitant effect, by the listener, is important. Directness can denote closeness in a relationship and can range from informal language (e.g., in Spanish, the informal tú versus the more formal usted) (Grainger & Mills, 2016) to use of swear words or pejorative terms (Bucholtz, 2009; Grainger & Mills, 2016). In analyzing directives for both instruction and discipline, I took into account factors that made the teacher’s language either more or less direct. I expound on this analytic process in the Methods chapter (Chapter 3). As teachers and students, these interlocutors are still social actors, who confront social rules and conform to social norms and mores.
The Cooperative Principle. Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle addresses this idea of social actors-as-interlocutors in a way that highlights communication and potential miscommunication. This principle states that what one utters must be understood in the given context. It places the onus on speakers to express what they feel their listeners must know in order to attain full meaning, although listeners are also involved in negotiation for meaning. However, as Levinson (1983) contends, listeners in social situations often allow breakdowns in communication to go undiscovered, with both parties perhaps assuming that listener understanding and compliance will follow suit down the road, which is to say that interlocutors often comprehend speakers’ utterances afterwards but not immediately afterwards, after discourse may have moved in another direction.

Figure 1.3, below, draws from the concepts named above, at the same time that it expands upon Figure 1.1 (the Communicative Locus) and Figure 1.2. (contextual forces—external forces, like the school, curriculum, and lesson, and internal forces, like the level of directness and cooperation that contextualize this communicative locus) with respect to AIDA.
Figure 1.3 conceptualizes how the directive, located at the communicative locus, is uttered by the speaker and interpreted by the listener, with space given for negotiation for meaning. As speaker and listener, respectively, teacher and student or students are subject to large-scale forces (ideals-in-use and institutional forces such as position and authority) in both expressing and interpreting directives. Both interlocutors also use directness and cooperation, both for expression and comprehension.

The framework for the present case study proposes that, although there are many ways to examine how intentions are expressed and interpreted in the classroom, there are key factors to highlight the dynamics involved with respect to teacher-student interchange. As stated above, under AIDA, teachers, as speakers, employ prescribed strategies toward particular objectives, and she used particular strategies as communicative practices aimed toward larger outcomes, often of pedagogical nature. Speech Act Theory proposes that, via performatives, this teacher would be able to do things with language, given her authority and position, convention, intention and meaning, which students would be expected to comprehend. The teacher may speak with
a greater or smaller degree of directness and indirectness, depending upon situation, message and interlocutor. As human interactants, these teacher and student interlocutors may endeavor to maintain relationships; thus, inviting the notion of cooperation. This case study examines the ways that primary classroom interlocutors use language framed in these ways, both with larger aims in mind, as well as references to who they were, and how these messages become played out in the classroom itself. By focusing on the primary locus of language (Figure 1.1) and factors that might influence them (Figure 1.2), I aim to delve into possible intention or intentions of the teacher as well as the response of the students.

The purpose of this study is to analyze directives in the classroom, especially how teachers express meaning and how their learners interpret it. Assumptions offered by AIDA (Agne, 2008; Tracy, 2003), by Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1965, 1970; Colomina Almiñana, 2011; Masaki, 2004), directness (Searle, 1975, 1976), and by the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975; Davies, 2007) created the frame for analysis of both utterance and response of directives in the preschool class in this case study. Other theoretical contributions that concern context and culture will lend analytic support and help “flesh out” analysis. For, to revisit a main idea from the first passages of this chapter, speakers entool language as a cultural and contextualized tool used for communicative means (Haspelmath, 2004, p. 565) (cf. Bybee, 2001). The theoretical points foregrounded here help focus this study in that they frame the queries as laid out in following section.

**Research Questions**

With the aim of analyzing the interactive nature of teacher directives and learner response, I examined what factors played a part in both uttering and understanding
directives. As well as external and internal influences, I took into account linguistic, paralinguistic features (such as tone, speech rate, and expressions such as sighs or gasps), and extra-linguistic features (such as facial expressions, hand gestures, or gaze).

By examining the classroom interactions surrounding directives and by looking into the teacher’s and students’ contextual matters, I have sought to determine how and why particular bilingual students responded distinctly to their teacher’s directives more than other bilingual students, better than in other situations (i.e., more successful in the eyes of key players involved), and better than other teacher directives. As such, I address the following questions:

1. How did the preschool teacher in this study use directives to communicate with her learners in order (a) to manage her classroom and (b) to instruct? What sorts of contextual features (such as displays of position as teacher, choice of language, convention, politeness, or indirectness) add to speaker utterances that stood to be interpreted differently or misinterpreted by the listeners, this teacher’s students?

2. How did her students respond to her directives? What sorts of contextual features (such as those named above, in addition to granting authority to the teacher) were they themselves displaying, and what elements might these listeners have been interpreting differently or misinterpreting?

Summary

By focusing on directives in the bilingual preschool classroom and the principal interlocutors therein, on how these directives are expressed and interpreted, as well as how they are couched socially and linguistically, I endeavor to shed light upon the matter of how our bilingual students understand and interpret their teacher’s directives.
The nature of the working relationship between teacher and student evidenced itself in directives, especially in terms of types of discourse, level of indirectness, cooperation between the teacher and students.

Theory plays a large part in analysis of directives, since uttering and interpreting directives is not a simple matter of expressing the meaning of a message (for the teacher) and knowing what is meant in the message (for the student or students). Analysis must take into account contextual and cultural influences, smaller-scale strategies, matters of authority, position, and convention upon meaning, interpersonal cooperation between interlocutors, to say nothing of mechanisms involved—both pedagogical and linguistic. This complex issue requires that any approach to analyzing it account for multiple factors, and AIDA is well suited to address these factors.

The present study contributes to the body of knowledge in pedagogical linguistics in that it (1) examines directives in Spanish and English (the He (2000) study looked at Chinese Heritage speakers in the U.S.), and (2) takes into account student response as an interactive factor. In the following chapter, I review relevant literature on the themes covered in the theoretical framework and how their relationship to directives, primary among them directness, position, authority, and cooperation, have a bearing on directives in the classroom.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This chapter will review the literature regarding the contributions to the major empirical elements regarding the use of directives as they relate to the present study. Where, at first, directives were defined on philosophical and philological grounds, more recent studies have collected linguistic corpora in the field. “Doing things with language,” or “in so uttering to be doing,” as Austin phrased it (1965, p. 6), led to the establishment of taxonomies regarding directives and other speech acts. These taxonomies could be applied to various institutional settings, opening the door for analysis at the level of situational context and listener interpretation. Whether in purely adult environments, such as the workplace, or with children, be it at home or at school, the study of directives to date has had to do with language in its social environment and with interlocutors as social beings.

In this chapter, I first define the directive as it has been used historically, leading to how I use it in this study. The primary theoretical framework for this study, AIDA, relies on key elements of Speech Act Theory. By examining first the philosophical foundation and not linguistic or anthropological traditions, I show how previous authors have conceptualized the directive with respect to position and authority. Afterwards, I look at taxonomies of directives, including directness and indirectness, that is, the range of options afforded to speakers to utter directives. Since choice has largely to do with context, especially with respect to interpersonal relationships and cooperation, I next examine contextual features in the literature that may apply to my study. These contextual features include both institutional and cultural elements noted in Chapter 1. Context affects the way that speakers formulate utterances as well as the way that
listeners interpret them, and the section that follows includes a review of relevant literature on listener interpretation of directives. An outsider may not interpret context in the same way that the participants will, so understanding subtleties in language, as in the study on requestive hints, will prove important. It is via trial-and-error negotiation that many children respond to directives in the expectations, resulting in convention. I then take up how children develop an understanding of directives, and afterwards, more to the point of my own study, classroom contexts. I conclude this chapter by examining the lacuna in the literature that the present study endeavors to address.

**Defining the directive**

Directives can be defined as “control acts” (Ervin-Tripp, O’Connor, & Rosenberg, 1984) or commands, such as invitations, recommendations, or even reminders, in short, attempts to direct behavior toward one’s own desires, whether for one’s own gain, for the good of the listener, or for the good of multiple persons involved. They can fulfill the role of questioning, inviting, suggesting, requesting, or advising.

Hyland (2002) defines the directive as an utterance “expressing obligation on the reader either to do or not to do something…proposing an action intended to be carried out by the hearer (Searle, 1976)” (p. 216). Hyland and various others (e.g., Waring & Hruska, 2012; Ryckebusch & Marcos, 2004; Vine, 2009) draw from Searle (1976) in defining directives as “attempts by the speaker to get someone to do something” (p.3), a definition that implies authority on the part of one interlocutor, namely, the one giving the directive, and subjugation to authority by the other interlocutor or interlocutors, namely, the hearer.

**Defining the directive in the classroom.** Hyland (2002) further sharpens the definition of the directive for the purposes of this study, pointing out that, in educational
settings, there exists a clear disparity between interlocutors. In a classroom setting, teachers are almost exclusively in charge of learners, and teachers’ roles and responsibilities make up the position that account for the asymmetry between them and their students (Waring & Hruska, 2012). Teachers, therefore, have a distinct relationship with their students, position as authority figure among them but also the responsibility of instructing them. Moreover, because classroom situations are highly routinized settings in which actions make reference to relationships, a mere word or a seemingly unrelated combination of gestures can initiate an action or chain of actions that, to the outsider, seems not to make sense. It is for this reason that, in the parameters of this study, I assume a wide range of possibilities for a directive, as any utterance, gesture, or combination thereof aimed to effect student behavior.

He (2000) goes further in stressing the importance of directives, especially in educational contexts, as a means to socialize children, and moreover, she asserts that, as social interactants, teachers utter directives for specific aims and within specific social and institutional structures. Since speakers of any language can and do use directives, they constitute what is called a “linguistic universal” and, thus, span languages and cultures. The proposed study focuses on directives in Spanish and English; therefore, evidence in this study will draw from these languages and the differences not only inherent in the languages but, perhaps more importantly, how students acquire knowledge of the differences between them. However, there are some commonalities that span at least these two languages, and students must also come to know what these are as well.
**Strategies: Structural concerns.** Analysis would also account for linguistic structural, or morpho-syntactic, concerns, since the directive covers a wide range of possibilities. As AIDA proposes, language in all its complexity remains action-implicative and reflects larger institutional goals. Given the range of options available to the speaker, whether speaking to a group or an individual, formally or informally, speakers must also make linguistic decisions based on their authoritative positions and their intended meaning. I have devised a classification system based in part of the morpho-syntax (linguistic structure) of verbs used. Speakers employ many of these forms available, and this study seeks to find patterns regarding how the teacher used these forms and how the students reacted.

Speakers use the imperative mood to express directives. The regular imperative (what Butt and Benjamin (1988, p. 278) call the “affirmative form of the imperative”) has tenses for different persons. Second person singular has both the informal (both tú, and vos) and formal (usted, often abbreviated Ud.). In Latin America, ustedes (often-abbreviated Uds.) is used as the third person plural formal and informal, whereas in Iberian Spanish, ustedes is formal, whereas vosotros is third person familiar. Hence, there are many forms, for example, as with the verb hablar (to speak), depending on person and number, as in Table 2.1, below, shows. It shows both affirmative (e.g., speak) and negative forms (e.g., do not speak) in all persons, singular and plural. The first person may also be used in the plural, in Spanish or English, in the form of an invitation used with nosotros (we, us), e.g., Let’s speak (hablemos). Depending on the situation and interlocutors, speakers decide whether to use the singular or plural, formal or familiar, making an invitation or a direct command.
Directives can also be formed using the *que* (that or which) as in *
¡Que tengas (un)* buen fin de semana! (Have a nice weekend!) or *
¡Que se diviertan!* (Have fun!) (Iguina & Dozie, 2012). The first example would qualify as more of a hint (requestive hint) than an imperative; however, for the purposes of this study, they both count as directives, whether wishing someone a nice weekend or telling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Directives (Command Form)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first person affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first person negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person affirmative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

someone to have fun. Both cases use the subjunctive mood, which can be very similar in form (morpho-syntactic structure) to the imperative. In English this form survives in more archaic (but still used) utterances of hope or desire, e.g., “Long live the Queen!”

As speakers, we have many different ways to express a desired intention. Choices of phrases and structures reflect not only what we intend to say but, perhaps more importantly, the nature of the relationship between interlocutors in discourse. Directives,
then, may assume many different forms, and a teacher may use them, depending upon sundry situations and desired outcomes.

**Speech Act Traditions**

Research that addresses directives may be traced back to Austin’s (1965) series of lectures on speech acts. Even though the lectures were delivered at Harvard University, Austin had been visiting from Oxford University, hence the term *revolución oxfordeniense* (Colomina Almiñana, 2011), or Oxfordian Revolution. Also known as the “speech act revolution,” Austin’s lectures opened the door for analysis on distinct levels of interpretation (Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014). What a speaker says may not always serve as *prima facie* evidence for what that speaker meant or for what the listener interprets. As described in Chapter 1, Austin’s main concern in his theory on performatives was how, in saying something, speakers can alternately order, advise, grant permission, or otherwise use language to carry out such actions via authority and position of the speaker. A teacher calls upon his authority and makes a performative statement when he⁡, say, calls the class to sing a song (to reiterate an example from above) or when he punishes a student. Operating from the foundation of Speech Act Theory, Searle (1975) set forth conditions that speakers take into account when uttering directives to their interlocutors.

**Strategies: Taxonomies.** Speakers have at their disposal myriad ways to express the same thing, in fact, many ways to utter a directive. According to Austin’s Speech Act Theory (1965, 1970, 1976), speakers could utter implicit performatives as well as explicit ones. Preceding declaratives with such clauses as “I name,” “I bequeath,” or “I

---

² Throughout this thesis, when I talk about a teacher in general but my definition or example is close to the focal teacher’s, I use the feminine pronoun. In cases that feature a more neutral example, such as this one, I use the masculine pronoun.
promise” renders them explicit and more formal, such as with “I promise that I shall be there” (Austin, 1965, p. 69). However, he proposed, there are also performatives that operate more via authority of the person in the power position, via compliance (what Austin called consensus ad idem), via ritualized habit or context, or more likely via a combination of these three. When a speaker does something by virtue of an utterance and authority, that speaker is drawing from available linguistic resources, some of which prove appropriate for one’s interlocutors and the linguistic and social contexts at hand (Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014). Austin (1965) drew light to the range of performatives available to speakers and that some performatives prove “most successful” to getting one’s point across to one’s interlocutors (p. 73). One of these was the directive, which he called the imperative mood and even these he divided into an order, advice, permission, consent, using various modals and other such devices as discussed in Chapter 1.

Searle’s (1975) taxonomy adds an interpersonal element to these imperatives. His listing of speech acts as directives requesting a listener to pass the salt highlighted how such statements can move from more to less direct. From Searle, Levinson (1987) created a similar, simpler taxonomy for the directive “Close the door,” in a way that makes each subsequent statement more indirect:

I want you to close the door. [the most direct]
Can you close the door?
Would you close the door?
Would you mind closing the door?
You ought to close the door.
May I ask you to close the door?
Did you forget the door? Do us a favor with the door, love.

How about a bit less breeze?

Okay, Johnny, what am I going to say next? [least direct] (pp. 264-65)

With this taxonomy, Searle proposed that certain utterances were contingent upon the recognition of certain general rules, or conditions, for an “indirect request” or “indirect directive” (1975, p. 72). Under these conditions, the speaker (1) knows that the listener can fulfill the requested act, (2) knows the “propositional content” of the directive, (3) speaks with sincerity in uttering the directive, and (4) appeals to the listeners “wants or wishes” (p. 72). Already, then, Searle and those who invoked his work had in mind the speaker and the listener, as well as what the speaker thought of the condition (comprehension, possibility, desire) of the listener to follow through on the directive, thus making a crucial connection between the directive, directness, and interpersonal cooperation.

Because indirect speech acts rely, in their subtlety and tacit understanding, on the relationship between interlocutors, they necessarily bring together language (“words”) and an interpersonal relationship (“the world”). “This is a distinction that fits nicely with Searle’s (1976) idea of two opposite ‘directions of fit’ between ‘the words’ and ‘the world’” (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 298). Whenever a relationship is foregrounded, the notions of authority and power come into play. As discussed below, authority has to do with getting one’s words and worlds to match, that is, to say the appropriate things in social situation and with one’s listener (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012). Hyland (2002) makes a similar point, asserting that, “In Searles’ [sic] taxonomy,…directives also include requests, invitations, and offers, but these seem qualitatively different forms of
social action from utterances which strongly urge the reader to act in a certain way”
(italics in the original) (p. 216). For Hyland, certain indirect directives lack the austerity
of a direct imperative. As stated above, all directives, ranging from austere directives of
obligation to those tinged with invitation, came into play in my study, as they are all
matters of communication via the directive.

On the one hand, philosophical and purely linguistic approaches about stated or
unstated utterances and their meanings made for sentences such as, “Shut [the door], do”
as an order (Austin, 1965, p. 73). Such examples were likely not grounded in empirical
data. On the other hand, anthropological and sociolinguistic approaches and schools of
thought focused on language that had been heard and audio-recorded (or at least written
down by the researcher) (Colomina Almiñana, 2011). In what Tracy (2003) cites as part
of foundational research concerning analysis of language, this “anthropologically-based
speech act tradition” (p. 221) saw the focus turn from philosophical and philological
approaches (what an ideal speaker could say--Austin’s approach), to anthropological and
sociolinguistic approaches that denoted how speakers used language in everyday speech.
In the foundational “Is Sybil There?” by Ervin-Tripp (1976), structure emerged as a
major factor creating an analytical and methodological distinction, as discussed in the
following section.

**Negotiating meaning in context.** The difference between such a speaker
situation and everyday speech, as Austin himself pointed out and both Masaki (2004)
and Colomina Almiñana (2011) corroborate, lies in communicative context. Ervin-
Tripp’s study relied on a wide linguistic distribution of directives and sought to examine
why it is that listeners know that such an utterance as, “Is Sybil there?” means what the
speaker intends, namely, that it is meant to be a directive and not an information-seeking question. Likewise, the simple question, “What?” is a request for information, most often repetition or clarification, usually steeped in context and interaction. For Ervin-Tripp, “‘requesting’ fuses linguistic form with social form,” and in becoming a social act, thus encompassed a wider range of linguistic possibilities (as cited in Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014, p. 8). The imperative, declarative, and interrogative forms made up directives that speakers were found to use in various types of situations depending upon contextual factors and situational and institutional aims. In her study, “Directives include a range from explicit and slightly qualified imperatives to questions and statements which are formally identical to utterances which are not requests” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 51). However, she was left with the conundrum that:

It is theoretically puzzling why there should not be a direct correspondence between pragmatic intent and surface form, since the formal categories are present for such a one-to-one correspondence [to which she hypothesizes:] One obvious advantage in the system of multiple expressions for the same intent, and in neutralization in these overlapping expressions, is that the discourse features of the surface expression can be taken up. (p. 49)

Given the range of words and phrases at our disposal to express many messages, there are many factors that account for choice of one word or phrase over another. Ervin-Tripp identified six types of discourse features in the directives that she documented: need statements, imperatives, embedded (though she called them “imbedded”) imperatives, permission directives, question directives, and hints. Similar to the present study, these categories represent a range of directness, “which require the listener to infer to varying
degree. As Ervin-Tripp (1976) sums up, “Members learn to interpret such utterances routinely as directives” (p. 51). The trick for the interlocutor is to acquire the routines and strategies necessary to function in one’s contextual situation.

Ervin-Tripp’s study foregrounded various strategies that, as AIDA contends, speakers use to achieve larger objectives. Speakers in her study used their utterances at different levels of directness, being either less or more direct, for example, the less direct “Oh by the way, Doctor, could you leave that chart when you're through?” versus the more direct and casual, “Hey, Doctor, shoot the chart to me, willya?” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 32). Decisions that determine how direct a speaker is with the interlocutor or interlocutors can be a matter of concatenation (“chaining,” or following one word or phrase with another) or verb choice itself. Concatenated particles, tag words (“ok?”) or tag phrases (“will you?”) and terms such as “sir” or “please,” are usually added to the end of the utterance, form part of “embroidered” imperatives when seeking some form of cooperation (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 61). Sometimes, concatenation occurs more at the beginning of a hedged directive, such as in the series: “I’m going to ask you to lower your voices when we’re in the classroom” to “I’m going have to ask you to lower your voices when we’re in the classroom” to “I’m afraid I’m going have to ask you to lower your voices when we’re in the classroom” (examples mine). Choice of the verb can have to do with the mood, via modality (modalized verbs) or tense (different times, such as past or present). If speaker and listener are to attain cooperation, the former must also take into account the inferential load placed on the listener, that is, the message that the listener must necessarily infer (Bucciarelli et al., 2003). Ervin-Tripp’s first category, need statements, would require more inference from the listener than a direct imperative,
so a statement such as, “I need a match,” is on the surface no more than a declarative that the listener would have to interpret as a directive, given the proper circumstances (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 29) and the listener’s age. Examples in her corpus (dataset) of these needs statements and similar expressions (“I want,” “I could use”) were first person accounts, as they focused on “I” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, pp. 29-30). This is true in a classroom; however, teachers often also employ “you need,” as much in English phrases (e.g., “You need to listen to me”) as in the corollary Spanish phrase (e.g., “Necesitas escucharme”). Here, then, the speaker’s intention has to match the meaning that the listener derives from the utterance—a true understanding the message. This linguistic and contextual complexity includes the range of possible interpretations that Ervin-Tripp (1976) sought.

Since they often each feature a transitive verb, object and beneficiary, structurally speaking, imperatives may be the most easily discernible of directives (Ervin-Tripp, 1976), although there are many other types of directives. For her, at the time, imperatives were, analytically speaking, a suitable starting point, since, as orders, they are simple and direct and are “routinely understood as directives under these social conditions” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 23). Delpit (2006) also has noted that, in order to emphasize power positions, speakers may bolster an utterance by employing a direct imperative and, in addition, yelling and being explicit: “Turn that radio down!” (p. 27). Heath (1983) likewise described a situation in which teachers discarded indirect statements and in place began issuing still somewhat metaphorical directives more like: “Give me your attention” (p. 283). As Delpit and Heath observed, directive use varies by economic class and by notions of race, contextual features that I will consider as well, so
there is more to even a direct directive what appears on the surface as a simple command.

I took into consideration race and class in my setting as they arose in individual, interactive situations. Where an imperative (e.g., ‘Gimme a match’) is very direct, sub-variants of this category included modals such as would and should and aforementioned tags, usually as some form of attenuator. In Ervin-Tripp’s next category, embedded imperatives, she invoked the Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1974) “Modal Directive Rule,” which states that:

an interrogative clause is to be interpreted as a command to do if…(i) it contains can, could, will, would (and sometimes going to); …(ii) the subject of the clause is also an addressee;…[and] (iii) the predicate describes an action which is physically possible at the time of utterance.(italics in the original) (as cited in Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 33).

These conditions, similar as they are to Searle’s (1975), show that the speaker takes into account the context as well as the disposition of the listener or listeners in a given situation. Another strengthener is use of the vocative (direct address), as in, for example, “Jaime, can you open the window?” Sinclair and Coulthard’s third point is that the speaker must know that the subject-addressee is capable of carrying out the command, so here again, taking the interlocutor into account becomes important, an Austinian point (1965, 1976), as well as one that Bell would expound on in 1984 (see discussion below). Weizman (1989) likewise says that, far from being an obstacle, the speaker makes requests less direct (“requestive hints”) for the listener and that this opacity has some contributory element to it. Attenuators such as saying “please,” as well as including an explanatory adjunct can lead to indirectness in a directive (what Blum-Kulka, House,
and Kasper (1989) call a “grounder”). This is especially pointed for my study, which focuses on a pedagogical environment, where teachers may use “please” and students may be taught to use it as well.

In this pedagogical environment, teachers must exercise, as Bell (1984) termed it, “audience awareness,” that is, knowing who their audience is and how to use directives with them. As discussed above, directives can come across as very direct, as commands or even demands. A problem may arise because, “If directives so flagrantly breach this cordial community contract, then they clearly represent a potentially risky strategy” (Hyland, 2002, p. 216). They are “risky” in the sense that speaking either too leniently or too harshly with one’s interlocutor may result in failure for the listener to understand and/or hurt feelings, the problems that Weizman, (1989), above, discusses with respect to opacity. For Heritage (1984), the endeavor is more one of affiliation and disaffiliation. In the classroom, teachers stand to lose a sense of authority from seeming rather than too lenient – quite the opposite—far too harsh and commandeering.

Even two-year-olds can detect that these are potential requests (Blum-Kulka, 1989). The final category discussed by Ervin-Tripp (1976) is that of hints, which are usually expressed as a declarative in which a situation or a state of condition, e.g., “The matches are all gone” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 29). She later calls them “general directives,” which could be declaratives such as “Somebody’s talking,” “There’s some chewing gum,” or interrogatives like “Where does your dish go?” and “What are those shoes doing there?” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 57). An outsider may deem that this places a great inferential load on the listener; however, statements like these often rely heavily on context and routines. At first, listeners may not have interpreted a statement like
“Somebody’s talking” as a hint to cease and desist talking, until the speaker somehow rebuked the listeners for not having complied.

A study of speech events at a choir practice revealed cross-cultural instances of directness with directives by an African national living in the UK (Grainger & Mills, 2016). As these authors say, “It is in the act of giving direction that we begin to see some differences in levels of politeness strategies,” many of which mirror the cooperation principle (p. 91). As in a classroom the de facto leader, the choir leader, felt the need to call order to an assembly of participants who were interrelating with one another in some fashion or other. However, at a given moment, the Zimbabwean choir leader called for attention in order to get the rehearsal underway. The choir leader relied on his position as leader of the group, calling for attention and for cooperation, two different but closely related aims. Cooperation is evidenced by use of “we,” in statements, and the choir leader then uttered “want” statements and “need” statements as directives, thereby keeping cooperation via indirectness and relating the wants and needs of the institution, the choir and the affiliated church.

The authors compare the Zimbabwean choir leader’s actions to those of a British choir leader, who seemed to have more success bringing the group to order, using different strategies of greetings, mock admonishment, and a misunderstood joke about the group’s singing ability (Grainger & Mills, 2016, pp. 93-94). Certainly the differences in the two leaders and their directives could have to do with their differing ethnicities, but it could also be a matter of difference in perception of their ethnicities, nationalities, ages, and levels of expertise. The interplay here between authority, nationality/ethnicity, and objective-at-hand relate closely with the present study, a large distinction being the
differences in ages stand to inform my study as well. These authors make use of the term “expert leader” when referring to the British choir leader, a term that conjures notions of epistemic authority, which is to say that a leader is often the one considered to know the most, certainly the case in a preschool classroom.

**Mechanisms for indirectness.** Similar to Searle’s (1975) system of rules and preconditions, Labov and Fanshel (1977) teased apart “what is said” from “what is done” from the perspective of the speech act “so rules that appear to be quite general are, in fact limited by those conditions that we necessarily construct unconsciously as we imagine how we would interpret the utterances in general” (p. 73). Their corpus derived from recordings of sessions with a psychotherapy patient Rhoda (a pseudonym) interacting with her therapist, her mother, and her aunt. What interested these authors were cases of direct requests vis-à-vis indirect requests. The directive “Come home” may be perceived as an order, especially if it is punctuated as an exclamation, as “Come home!” as opposed to the softer “*Well, when do you plan t’come home?*” as Rhoda expressed it (italics and bold face in the original) (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 78n).

However, as these authors reveal, direct requests or direct directives are “rarely used in actual conversational interaction” (p. 79). The listener might infer considerations of time and space, even if the speaker does not imply them. “Come home” (p. 78), like, “Get me a newspaper” (p. 80), is to be understood as “right away” or “as soon as you can” (p. 80). Likewise, with, “Get me a match,” the listener understands that the speaker needs a match at that moment or shortly thereafter and, as well, infers that the speaker believes that the listener has a match or can procure one somehow. As for Searle (1975), for Labov and Fanshel (1977), many preconditions for processes have to be in place in order
for requests to work successfully. As these authors conclude, however, “most of the information needed to interpret actions is already to be found in the structure of shared knowledge and not in the utterances themselves” (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 82). In adult interaction, the context necessary for successful interpretation of directives precedes utterances themselves. The groundwork is laid down in childhood, at home and at school.

Speakers made use of devices such as “mitigation” and “aggravation” to change the nature of indirect requests. In Labov and Fanshel (1977), when Rhoda asked her aunt to dust the room, she did so by making indirect reference to her aunt’s willingness to do so: “Wellyouknow, w’dy’mind takin’ thedustrag an’ just dustaround?” (hyposegmentation and italics in the original) (p. 83). Requests such as, “You have enough time to dust the room,” may be mitigated somewhat with a tag phrase, “don’t you,” as in, “You have enough time to dust the room, don’t you?” and even more so when it becomes an outright question, “Do you have enough time to dust the room?” (italics in the original) (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 85). In Lindström’s (2005), analysis of workplace directives, discussed below, the speakers making the requests used fewer mitigators because of different contextual reasons. Speakers can also “upgrade” indirect requests via aggravation, as in, “Will you please dust the room?” eliding the “please” to, “Will you dust the room?” to the use of the expletory, “Please dust the room!” to the direct and demanding “Dust the room!” and finally to “Dust the [g-----n] room!” (italics in the original) (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 85). These authors make note that the expletive of the last request refers not to the room but rather to the listener, which means that the expletive cannot refer to any stated person (since there is no vocative, in other
words, no form of address). Hence, the expletive seems to have been concatenated toward the end of utterance, seemingly describing the room. Significantly, as in the institutional setting of the preschool classroom, in both these studies—Labov and Fanshel (1977) and Linström (2005)—matters of sense of obligation to one’s job, age, authority, and other such contextual markers emerge as starting points to how speakers utter and listeners interpret directives.

**Context**

Aside from these categories, Ervin-Tripp (1976) discusses how speakers frame their directives contextually. As in the present study, she notes that speakers matched use of directness or indirectness with rank and age. A teacher may call the class to order, whether directly (¡Atención! or Attention!) or via routinization by, say, ringing a bell, cuing a song, and beginning to clap. Context here would highlight a different set of markers; as Ervin-Tripp (1976) pointed out, such features as “loudness, breathing rate, gaze direction, and other paralinguistic and gestural indicators may mark a change of function for listener” (p. 56). Finding consistencies among such markers may help me see patterns in the utterances of speakers as well as in responses of listeners. Aside from these physical gestures that contextualize speaker utterances, listeners may interpret differently based on context. The teacher may be speaking from the standpoint of a particular age, one or sometimes two generations away from the students, ethnicity, or socio-economic class.

At the same time that a speaker is requesting something (i.e. expressing a directive), that speaker may be saying something additional. Especially as teachers, they may be saying something about their position as teachers—perhaps the authority figure as the lead adult in the classroom, or as the one who must “earn” the students’ respect
(Delpit, 2006)—about their ability to make other people’s children comply to their wishes via their authority and by using directives in their speech. So, drawing from Speech Act Theory, we may say that there are multiple performatives, and speakers may be doing more than one thing, stating the surface-level message, while at the same time, asserting position and authority via the way that they say it.

Blum-Kulka, et al. (1989) sought to identify subtle differences in language between cultures, in both expression and intention. They directed the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), a study designed to examine speech acts, in particular requests and apologies, for different speakers (parents and children, as well as students of various ages) and nations, with 1088 participants, equally divided among males and females. The study was concerned primarily with linguistic universals across cultures and variation of languages and their speakers, especially with respect to linguistic pragmatics across countries (though the authors call them cultures, they do not distinguish between a nation and a culture, for instance, calling Israel a culture). Noting the shortcomings of observational studies, Blum-Kulka and her colleagues used the discourse-completion test (DCT), which presented the participants with 16 situations, either a request or an apology, to complete. One of the test items, “Judith, I missed class yesterday, do you think I could borrow your notes? I promise to return them by tomorrow”—included the vocative (the address to Judith), an explanatory adjunct (similar to Weizman’s example above), and the proposition (the actual request) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 17). Additionally, the example included what the authors called a downgrader (“do you think”) that attenuates the request so that it does not sound like a command or, even more strongly, like a demand, and an upgrader or supportive
utterance (e.g., “I promise to return them by tomorrow”) (p. 17). Although this study used a questionnaire, as opposed to Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) observational study, results may have mirrored what people would actually have said, as the above example illustrates. With these “internal modifications” (both downgraders and upgraders or, for Labov and Fanshel (1977), mitigators and aggravators), requests such as these contain many of the following elements: alerters (forms of direct addresses, or vocatives, titles, terms of endearment) are common with requests, as are “support moves” which signal to the listener that a request will follow (p. 17). The request itself may also be attenuated or strengthened according to levels of directness and how much the teacher may wish to exercise the cooperative principle.

As discussed in Chapter 1, speakers may employ different strategy types, such as morpho-syntactic moods, hedges, and obligation statements, and want statements, which were similar to Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) needs statements. The other four strategies—suggestions, queries (as in, “Could you clear up the kitchen, please?” or “Would you mind moving your car?”) strong, and mild hints—consisted of hints of varying degrees, either strong or subtle, that again, required the listener to draw inferences based on previous knowledge, context, or both (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 18). Cross-culturally speaking, bilingual and bi-cultural children must learn the overt meanings and the subtleties of the linguistic utterance, as in Bucciarelli et al. (2005); moreover, they must learn to interpret the contextual nuances crucial to becoming proficient members of a new culture, all the while retaining the knowledge of their home cultures.

**Listener interpretation**

Language does not take place in a vacuum, and speaker utterances often allude to the relationship between the speaker and the listener, which brings to fore the notion of
the cooperative principle. There are few studies that focus on listener interpretation in speech acts or directives; however, they may prove insightful as well because they form the other side of the speaker-listener interactive dyad from *Figures 1.1 and 1.2*. Also examining the CCSARP data, Weizman (1989) investigated the notion of indirectness in “requestive hints,” a notion that both Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Blum-Kulka (1989) investigated and that was originally conceptualized by Searle (1975). We may classify requestive hints as having hidden intentions, in which the speaker leaves a seeming gap for the listener. Nonetheless, listeners (in most studies, adult listeners) often interpret them successfully, which is to say that a requestive hint will often be followed-through on by the listener without hesitation or negotiation. As stated above, rather than present an obstacle for communicative interaction, what Weizman calls “opacity” contributes to it. In fact, Weizman argues, they are more efficient and help build community and understanding between interlocutors. Like Blum-Kulka’s (1989) division of conventional indirectness into meaning and form, illocutionary opacity differs from propositional opacity. With illocutionary opacity, once the question, “Is this an actual request?” is answered, then the request itself is salient, whereas with propositional opacity, the fact that a request has been made is obvious but the listener must determine, “What is the speaker requesting?” Weizman devised two scales to determine opacity on these two levels. The first scale was meant to divulge speaker strategies in opacity of propositional content, where on the one hand, a request would make reference to the requested (more transparency) and, on the other, the request would refer to related components (more opacity) (Weizman, 1989, p. 85). For instance, “*J’ai manqué mon bus et le prochain ne passe que dans une heure*” (I’ve missed my bus and the next one
won’t be by for another hour) shows that, on the one hand, the speaker is in a bind but, on the other hand, the utterance does not make it immediately salient that speaker is asking the listener for a favor (Weizman, 1989, p. 88). One possible interpretation is that, perhaps, instead of asking for a ride, the speaker wants to drop by the listener’s house for a while and is signaling the relief of a serendipitous newfound block of time.

The second scale tested for strategies in opacity, whereby the most transparent request would refer to listener’s commitment (i.e., “How likely is it that the listener will follow through on the request?”) and the most opaque would impose on the listener in a way that would be uncharacteristic of the relationship and/or the context (p. 87). For instance, “I haven’t got time to clean up” signals the act being requested but not any request per se (p. 88).

Some of the interplay between speaker (who makes the requestive hint) and listener (who must interpret it) was discussed by Weizman (1989). For, these types of hints bring out subtleties of language, which adults often have come to understand but that children, on the other hand, must acquire in a process that involves trial and error. In this case, the listener may not understand or may choose to feign to have misunderstood (e.g., “I know you said you missed your bus, but I didn’t know you wanted a ride!”). On the other hand, if the speaker utters a requestive hint whose proposition would register as opaque, then “the supposedly intended requested act may be acceptably denied by the speaker” (e.g., “I know I said I missed my bus, but I wasn’t really asking you for a ride!”) (p. 82). Weizmann (1989) found three listener interpretations: hints may be so opaque that the listener may miss one, the proposition or the illocution, or both. With either type of opacity, the speaker effectively “opens the door” for a request but leaves it to the
listener to uptake successfully or refuse in a way that both can save face. Likewise, a speaker’s commitment can be hedged; in the missed-bus example above, “if the [listener] suggests a ride home, the speaker may legitimately claim that he or she has never meant to ask for it” (Weizman, 1989, p. 94). Such a study brings to fore subtleties in meaning of directives, whether the directive itself is subtle or the force behind it is. For, with this study, the requests are just hints, though no less important, and the outsider may not make note of the hint-as-directive.

In expressing their wants and needs through directives, speakers employ a particular mood, or linguistic mode, by using modals or embedding sentences (subordinate clauses). Kaufmann and Poschmann (2013, p. 619) tested for listeners’ acceptability of these different modals and embedded sentences. Specifically, they wanted to know (1) if listeners would interpret imperative morphology that was embedded as reported speech as acceptable as declaratives with modals (e.g., should) and (2) how listeners would interpret wh-question imperatives depending on whether the speaker was thought to be knowledgeable or ignorant of certain facts of reported speech. In their experimental study, respondents were asked if particular utterances sounded like directives in sentences that were indirect. A sentence such as:

\[\text{Am Donnerstag beim Frühstück sagt Veronika zu Oskar: Warum fragst du jetzt plötzlich mich, wann du zu Prüfung antreten sollst? Dein Kollege hat dir doch gestern in der Mensa klar gesagt, mach sie morgen}\]

(On Thursday, Veronika is saying to Oskar at breakfast: Why are you now all of a sudden asking me when you should take the exam? Your colleague told you yesterday, take.IMP [i.e., the imperative form of take] it tomorrow) (bold in the original, denoting
the conditions for the survey question changed from one to the next) (translation in the original). (p. 626)

This was followed by the question, “When should Oskar take the exam?” with three answers possible: on Thursday, on Friday, or both interpretations are possible (p. 626).

They examined different embeddings of clauses using *soll* (“should” in colloquial German), which were reported speech (as opposed to direct quotes) and therefore did not address the interlocutor directly. By embedding or subordinating clauses or by using reported speech, a speaker can create conditions of “indirectness.” Because of these two “indirectnesss” and because of lab conditions (no outright ecology), embedded imperatives such as “He told him to go” were not as readily accepted as declaratives that used the modal such as “He told him (that) he should go.” But embedded imperatives were significantly less likely to be accepted in cases where reported and reporting context disagree on who is being addressed, while *soll*-declaratives were not affected in this way. The construction “I told him, go” (as contrasted with “I told him to go”) qualifies as a near quotative, is similar to reported speech and, therefore, highlights subtleties in embedding and the weakness of reported/near-reported speech. The point in the article is the power of *should* and how reported speech can assume a stronger or weaker quality:

In general, embedded imperatives are not accepted as readily as modalized declaratives. But embedded imperatives are significantly less likely to be accepted in cases where reported and reporting context disagree on who is being addressed, while *soll*-declaratives are not affected in this way. (p. 634)
This difference is significant, since a speaker could increase the amount of underlying force—or perceived directness—by moving from reported speech to a quotative, as in, “Te dije que te sentaras” (I told you to sit down) versus “Te dije, ‘Sentate’ (or ‘Siéntate’)” (I told you, ‘Sit down’ whether in vos or in tú, respectively). However, I would stress that these are adults in Germany. The same may not hold true for Spanish-English bilingual children in the U.S. What is more, the focus of my study is oral language, not written language in lab conditions. However, studies relating to the written word merit attention as well, since written language reflects what speakers say and what listeners understand. Although Grice (1975) treats the speaker and not the listener, listeners must engage in cooperation as well. As with speakers, listeners assess their social relationships with the speaker.

**Irrealis and Deontics**

This study has a great deal to do with how the teacher used language to express ideals or how students should behave ideally. Teachers often address their students invoking a “deontic authority [or]…how the world ‘ought to be’ (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 298). This authority is often sanctioned institutions like a school or school system and allows the teacher to express directives in ways consistent with the expectations of the institution. AIDA examines language as a part of “ideals-in-use,” which I saw evidenced in my study. The teacher had a way of denoting an idealized mindset, an idealized world, also called irrealis, central to teacher attitudes and utterances in a bilingual classroom, since forms associated with deontic mood are often used in interactive situations. As argued above, subjunctive mood resembles the imperative mood in form, and as well, the subjunctive makes reference to situations that are not real but that the speaker desires or wishes to be real. Irrealis and “how the world
ought to be” fit well into Tracy’s (2003) tack of how AIDA’s focus on how speakers in situations operate at least with ideals in mind, if not fully expecting ideal situations to come to fruition, for example, that the listener understand the speaker’s meaning fully.

One may conclude that directives that use the imperative are less attenuated—more direct—than directives that use the subjunctive. As Delpit (2006) and Heath (1983) have pointed out, speakers sometimes prefer direct language to indirect. The key, as Austin himself pointed out (although he never exemplified as such with a real-world corpus) and both Masaki (2004) and Colomina Almiñana (2011) have corroborated, lies in context. Certain statements make a proposition so clearly that a listener would be hard pressed to interpret it as anything else. On the other hand, a statement uttered in irrealis mode can refer to an event or situation that presents a contingency as necessary for a desired outcome to occur (Payne, 1997, p. 245). For example, in, “If you eat Wheaties, you’ll be like the big boys,” the introductory clause establishes the desirable condition for being growing up big and strong “like the big boys” similar to the explanatory adjunct discussed above (emphasis in the original) (Payne, 1997, p. 245). As Payne argues, “imperative clauses are likely to be irrealis, since they do not assert that X did happen, but order it to come about” (p. 245). Deontic mode uses contingencies, as in the above example, and has to do with obligations and as in the table, adapted and reproduced below (Payne, 1997, p. 245).

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declaratives that Reflect Deontic Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have to earn a million dollars this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should send out a Christmas letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There ought to be a law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They must have dinner with us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All these examples make use of modals, for example *shall*, *should*, *can*, *will*, and *would*. While it is true that the above examples are a way of insisting, they are at the same time a way of marking an idealized, irrealis world, a world in which (to refer to the above phrases) I *have earned* a million dollars; in which we *have already sent* Christmas letters (i.e., cards); in which there *is*, indeed, a law; and in which they *do*, indeed, follow through and come over for dinner. These utterances are not necessarily obligations, but they mark the *expectations* of an idealized world (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012).

Moreover, examining the both speaker directives and listener response, as will my study, underscores the interplay between expectation and obligation. “Deontic mode expresses the subject’s duty or obligation to perform the irrealis act expressed by the [predicate]...[e.g.,] I have to earn a million dollars this year” (Payne, 1997, p. 246). This duty is a learned, negotiated, and acquired response that takes time to develop, especially in children who may come from different cultures. For Payne (1997), the modal *must* represents greater strength than *should* in English, and certain utterances can express weak obligation. *Table 2.3*, below, shows how such sentences express different ranges of obligation and, additionally, their translations into Spanish.

**Table 2.3**

*Declaratives that Reflect Deontic Mood with Spanish Gloss* (translations mine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They must have left already</td>
<td>1. <em>Ya tendrían que haberse ido.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They will have left already.</td>
<td>2. <em>Ya se habrán ido.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They should have left already.</td>
<td>3. <em>Ya deben / deberían haberse ido.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They might have left already.</td>
<td>4. <em>Quizás se habrían ido ya.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Payne, 1997, p. 245)

These utterances are not seen as directives *per se*; however, if expressed in second person singular, by a person who is of authority, then sentences two and three could be
construed, in English or in Spanish, as directives, as “You should have left by already” and “You will have left by now” (as when planning one’s day with an interlocutor) and Deberías haberte ido ya and Te habrás ido ya (translations mine).

Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) examined both speaker utterances and listener responses and both negotiations and pre-negotiations between pastors and cantors in churches in Scandinavia. Their study focused on what they called “deontic authority.” As discussed above, having access to particular knowledge can grant an interlocutor epistemic authority; however, deontic authority conjures a mood associated with an idealized world, “how the world ought to be,” and presents interlocutors with irrealis situations (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 298). Hence, whether planning an event (as in Stevanovic and Peräkylä) or issuing directives, those with more authority are speaking from the perspective of an idealized world, especially so if they are speaking from the authority granted by a large institution such as a school system. Furthermore, these authors associate deontic mood with authority as well as compliance by the listener by using such modals as ought, must, should, can, may, and could—compliance is key in operating in a deontic world and in approaching this idealized world.

In investigating how participants enact deontic authority in planning events in their study, Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012) showed how, when one interlocutor made a suggestion, the other could either acquiesce or resist. Evidence of deontic authority emerged either in an “assertion,” whereby, on the one hand, a speaker states a future plan as an information without “commitment for future action” or, on the other hand, a “proposal,” in which the listener’s commitment, or compliance, is neither sought nor required (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 302). In this way, Stevanovic and Peräkylä’s
study also proves valuable in defining negotiations. These authors invoke Schegloff (2007), Lindström (1999), and Stivers (2006) in highlighting how utterances “all right” and “okay” serve as expressions of compliance. As with assertions and proposals, listeners who respond to directives with, “All right,” or, “Ok,” could mean, “Ok, I understand,” or, “Ok, I understand and will comply”(Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 304). Otherwise, a speaker may try to “fish” for compliance from the interlocutor (cf. Pomerantz, 1980) (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 305). As with pre-requests and requestive hints, “claiming deontic authority means that the speaker announces her decision without accounting for it” that the speaker opens the door, so to speak, but does not force the listener to enter (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012, p. 311). According to Stevanovic and Peräkylä, the “agreeing with the proposal” (i.e., complying) establishes a certain deontic authority for them, as well (p. 314). As discussed in the following section, negotiation here is a matter of authority and of how authority plays out for interlocutors, depending on their general authority (teacher and student or students) and authority at a given context. It is also a matter of conventionalization.

**Directives and Conventionalization**

Negotiation is necessary to achieve understanding across interlocutors. Heath (1982), for instance, examines literacy and non-literacy practices of parents and children in different communities, where even play, such as jump-robe rhymes, featured similar “productive rules for speech and practice” (p. 69). Cazden discusses participation structures in Hawaii (Aud, n.d., as cited in Cazden, 2001, p. 72) and in Australia’s Aboriginal communities (Malcolm, n.d., as cited in Cazden, 2001, p. 74-76). Likewise, as Ervin-Tripp (1976) discussed, mechanisms necessary for conventionalization to work with directives are negotiation and frequency of exposure, as well as contextualized
frames. All of this results in routinization and socialization. As she sums up: “In schools, there are many conventions marking routine events; the language simply is a signal for a familiar act: ‘It’s twelve o’clock?’ ‘Juice time!’ These rules may not be abstract at all but involve particular words” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 58). From the standpoint of the listeners, part of partaking in an institution such as school entails learning its routines and how they become routinized and conventionalized.

Another study that utilized the CCSARP data examined this notion of conventionalization. Blum-Kulka (1989) defined it in language as the practice by which speakers agree, often tacitly, upon “patterns of behavior and the meaning assigned to those patterns” (p. 38). For her, conventions assumed many processes, which would be of potential importance for teaching such conventions (again, perhaps tacitly) and the acquisition of such conventions. The first process that involved acquiring convention would be via immediate context, whereas the second would reflect the Gricean principle of cooperation. The third process would incorporate making requestive hints, and the fourth would contextualize them to suit particular cultural meanings. Six examples from the CCSARP data in Canadian French, German, Australian English, Argentine Spanish, and Hebrew showed how an utterance depends on interpretation in order to be successful. All examples were questions and thus indirect requests. Utterances from the CCSARP such as, “Would you mind making some room?” or “¿Me prestas tus apuntos [sic] de ayer?” (“Would you lend me your notes from yesterday?”) are polar (i.e., Yes / No) questions (translation in the original) (Blum-Kulka, 1989, pp. 40-41). In that case, the answer to the first could be either, “Yes, I would mind,” or “No, I wouldn’t mind,” and the answer to the second could be, “Yes, I will lend them to you,” or “No, I won’t
lend them to you.” However, the respondents in this study meant them as requests (Blum-Kulka, 1989). In similar fashion, the answer to a “Would you mind...?” question is neither “Yes” nor “No” but rather, “Sure,” or, “Ok,” accompanied by some gesture or movement that shows comprehension and compliance of the request (Yule, 1996). A response of dispreference to a, “Would you mind…?” request would often entail negotiating an excuse in some sort conventionally agreed on way. Blum-Kulka deems conventions, and the processes involved in acquiring them, as central to interpretation of requests, whether they be conventionally direct or conventionally indirect requests. Conventional indirectness may be characterized by agreement of meaning and form, pragmatic duality (i.e., both a literal and interpretive meaning), and negotiability between interlocutors.

**Directives in Other Professional Environments**

In their position as leaders of the classroom, teachers make the majority of directives to their students. Other professional environments are likewise organized with an individual leading a group, the former well versed in institutional expectations and the latter expected to comply with these expectations. As in the classroom, in workplace settings, “[t]here is an expectation of compliance” to directives given by superiors to subordinates (Vine, 2009, p. 1396). Vine (2009) explored “contextual factors” associated with workplace directives, in particular, in government offices, and she found that these contextual factors play a central role in how directives are expressed and interpreted.

The researcher worked from a corpus of recorded and observed a total of 47 interactions which spanned 422 minutes in all. She examined directives in both social context and discourse context and found that social context, or social environment, dictates speech styles (e.g., informal or formal) and lexicon (e.g., academic or
colloquial), while specific social actors (interlocutors), situations, times of day or time of the year and of course, physical environments all constitute social context. These are all formed by the “semiotic bundle” which constitutes signs (utterances and gestures) as well as their accompanying meaning and relationships (Arzarello, 2006). Discourse context refers to interactive space in the sequence of an utterance or in an interaction. For example, directives are often avoided in opening of an interactive exchange, since a speaker usually first greets or otherwise acknowledges the interlocutor or group of interlocutors, even in highly familiar contexts. As Takano (2005) revealed, a speaker will sometimes issue a pre-request before uttering an actual directive, and the pre-request is often interpreted as a directive by the interlocutor. If a directive is uttered and understood, the listener may engage in negotiation or in simple uptake with an utterance, gesture, or a combination, all of which are constituents of discourse context. Vine saw that managers of either gender used directives to “punctuate” the end of their discourse, as well as in the middle of discourse, as task-allocation.

In government offices discussed in Vine (2009) and other studies, social and linguistic contexts play a part in distribution of directives. Variation in expression of directives was accounted for by interlocutors present (speaker, listener, hearer, eavesdropper), contextual markers, status (superior, subordinate, permanent employee, temporary employee), and objectives, mostly having to do with problem-solving. Imperative-type directives, which tend to be very direct, while directives that use modals require inference on the part of the listener. In Vine’s classification of directives, the least direct are the modal interrogatives, while the most were the imperatives. Speakers used imperatives to punctuate the end of a long discussion (e.g., a problem-solving
session), in discussions in which many tasks had to be culled and jobs had to be allocated, or when a speaker asks a yes/no question or a question with limited choices. For instance, the question, “shall I leave you with …this one…?” was responded with the directive, “well leave me with [false start] leave me with Marcie’s copy and just make a note on there for” (Vine, 2009, p. 1401). Imperatives were also used with what the author called “NOW directives,” such as “hang on,” said to someone who was walking away (Vine, 2009, p. 1401). On the other hand, Vine found less direct forms in situations where directives were uttered more in isolation (i.e., lacking contextual factors), when a speaker felt a great deal of imposition and when alternatives to someone’s ideas were being proposed (Vine, 2009, p. 1403). Even with directives uttered in isolation seemingly absent of any social or linguistic context, speakers still speak and listeners still interpret them through their own so-called “constellation of ideologically related meanings” whereby directives may be uttered with expectation but, as in the case of children, interpretation is a matter of position (Eckert, 2008, p. 454). This is especially true in an institutional setting, such as a school, in which students (perhaps especially preschool students) are asked to conform to rules that, perhaps, fail to jibe with their home lives. Sitting for extended periods of time, raising a hand and waiting one’s turn to speak, and standing in line are activities that most children never have to do at home but that, by contrast, as students in their first years of school, they are told to do over and over. Over time, students learn how to be more socially competent based on strategic use of direct and indirect speech styles, positive and negative politeness, discourse markers and other ways of garnering rapport, and different forms of address, and other ways of contextualizing talk (Hymes,
Thus, there may arise a dilemma in which school expectations stand at odds with expectations to which one is accustomed from home. The AIDA framework, which seeks to connect language in use with larger ideals, here can show how this type of dilemma became enacted by interlocutors.

These signals can be subtle—a tag question, “ok?” or a simple, “Mhm”—but they can either help to create or detract from rapport between interlocutors. Blurring the line between workplace and home, Lindström (2005) examined home help providers who paid visits to senior citizens in various parts of Sweden. She used videorecordings of 34 home visits by home help providers and found three overarching types of request structures. The first was a direct imperative with use of a modal. Use of the modal “måste” (must) in “Martina du måste ge mej nånting å dricka” (“Martina you must give me something to drink”) made reference to the institutional obligations of the home help provider (translation in the original) (p. 216). The second was a question: “Gör de—Hör du eh?—hinner vattna två blommor åt mej?” (“Do you—Listen you, huh?—have time to water two flowers?”) (translation in the original) responded with “Javisst” (Of course) (translation mine) (p. 218). The speaker interrupted herself with a direct imperative, thus strengthening her question. Even with this upgrader, such a request in the form of question offers the listener the chance to come across as acquiescing in granting the request, which the listener (in this case, the home help provider) would provide with positive face. The third example highlighted how highly cooperative these situations can be so that even a declarative such as “Ja letar efter en osthyvel” (“I’m looking for a cheese slicer”) can signal to the listener that the speaker was beckoning help (translation in the original) (p. 220). Even with “indications in this sequence that the turn was not
designed to be heard as a request,” this declarative leaves open the opportunity for negative uptake (p. 221). Under the circumstances, the listener could claim not to have understood the utterance as a directive, in a show of possible opaqueness.

In this environment, these help providers were, technically speaking, in their workplace while in the homes of the senior citizens. The environment was linguistic as well as physical, and therefore, as opposed to at a doctor’s office, the senior could “claim superior knowledge” of this environment and, perhaps, enjoy a greater degree of power in certain situations (p. 211). As such, the seniors could, as set forth by Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012), hold greater epistemic and deontic authority in issuing directives or requests. The Lindström (2005) study views requests as part of a greater whole, as a “sequentially implemented social activity” embedded in interaction (p. 210). In this respect, this study followed conversational analysis (CA) methodology and analytical tradition, with focus on pre-requests that often supplant requests per se, much turn-taking, and negotiation. With the amount of turn-taking around directives, negotiation can resemble overlapping, or “braided,” language, even interrupting between interlocutors, since adequacy of the message can take precedence over its completeness (Jefferson, 1983) and since interlocutors familiar with each other often feel that they can predict what each other means (even if they do so erroneously at times). Negotiation also involved, as Lindström (2005) showed, elements of showing vulnerability or “trouble-telling” (gripping) in a gambit to beckon for more help than a provider would normally offer (p. 227). Also, in rich, heavily backgrounded context, characteristic of some institutional talk, a great deal of the utterances are actually absent, since the “institutional context creates a normative expectation for hearing the [speaker’s]
utterances as requests” (p. 213). Such interactive frames of communication can reveal both speakers’ and listeners’ intentions in analysis, knowledge to which the outsider is not always privy at first. Visual orientation played a role in these interactions as well, since gesture and other extra-linguistic features could enter into negotiation surrounding these directives-as-requests. That is to say, what a speaker shows in addition to what he or she says to the listener helps form a combination of linguistic, extra-linguistic and paralinguistic features that make meaning salient for the listener (Arzarello, 2006; Eckert, 2008). Connecting both speakers and listeners’ perspectives and intentions may prove revealing, as this would be where negotiation would occur.

Another point that Lindström made was that speakers may use declaratives to make reference to institutionally prescribed duties and social structures. Likewise Takano (2005) found speakers to use such general, or “impersonal,” directives, “Renshuu o takusan suru koto ga hitsuyoo da to omoimasu ne” (“I think it is necessary to [have students] practice a lot”) (translation in the original) (p. 643). Missing in the analysis was a discussion on difference in ages (the workers were most likely younger than the seniors) differences in ages in a classroom—a teacher, even when performing her duties in the classroom, would still likely want to come across amiable and cooperative.

Vine’s (2009) study highlighted organizational goals rather than personal ad hoc goals, as did Takano (2005), although both are valid. An employee issuing a directive wants to speak from the position of authority for the sake of the organizational goals (e.g., to produce a report or, in a school, to give students the opportunity to practice a new skill) but will still want to save face (Vine 2009). When organizational goals play a
more central role in an interaction, then directives tend to be more direct. In some social situations, the level of imposition causes a speaker, regardless of rank or position, to hedge or attenuate (downgrade or mitigate), whereas in other situations the speaker is more direct and dispenses with these elements in reference to institutional order. This was the case in the Lindström (2005) study and the directives of home health care providers in Sweden. On one occasion, a senior was more direct and even made reference to the home providers job description (i.e., what the institution had prescribed). In Vine (2009), level of imposition (giving a directive to someone whose time is in high demand) warranted use of would, perhaps taking precedence over institutional order.

Given varying sociolinguistic conditions, speakers can put into practice ad hoc strategies when giving directives, especially if directives are deemed to contravene “normative behaviors” established by a particular culture for men or women, adults or children, native speakers or non-native speakers (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Likewise, in my study, there may be times that the teacher wishes to invoke institutional order and implement direct directives, whereas at other times, she may wish to exercise more of a “human touch” and dispense with institutional authority.

**Children and Directives**

As stated above, interlocutors may comprehend utterances such as directives according to the words, the implications, or the desired outcomes. In a children’s world, a speaker who spends her days caring for and educating children will often adjust her language to suit them. If she is familiar with working with children, communication skills may be more fine-tuned and understanding may be deeper, even better still if that caretaker knows those children in particular. This seems to be the case with teachers: those who possess greater experience with children (more years’ experience) know how
to refine their language and truly “get through to” entire classrooms and even the
problem student. In many Scandinavian countries, schools comprise three grades, and
teachers “follow” a class of students from, say, first through third. By the end of third
grade, teacher and students know each other quite well. Blum-Kulka (1989) noted that
two-year-olds have shown the ability to perceive requests. Bates, Camaioni, and
Volterra (1979) researched stages of development in three pre-linguistic babies. Relying
on Piaget’s (1954) and adopting Slobin (1967) methods for a quasi-longitudinal study,
Bates et al. (1979) argued that, long before children express themselves in language,
they are developing internal linguistic structures. Invoking developmental studies from
previous decades, they conclude that, “Findings [that demonstrate the progression of
acquisition of pragmatic understanding] lead to the suggestion that performative
structures have a developmental history prior to speech itself” (Bates et al. (1979, p.
113). Results from their study showed that, even prior to actual speech, at six and twelve
months, the children begin to endeavor to make themselves understood by signaling the
listener for “intentionality…toward both social and nonsocial goals” (p. 118). They were
aware of psychological states associated with the speech of others. Between 10 and 12
months, the children in the study were also developing what the authors termed “proto-
imperative” as sequences that take into account objects, their intentions with those
objects (e.g., to give a box to someone, to pretend to talk on a toy phone), and the people
associated with them, usually the mother. All three children made gradual progress
toward referential language, beginning with “wordlike signals” such as grunts that
resembled “M-hm” (for yes) and “Uh-uh” (for no), as well as onomatopoetic sounds. At
12 to 14 months, children were advancing to more abstract utterances, one child
producing both the Italian *da* (give) and *tieni* (take). Note that both these terms are referents that are steeped in social behavior, as giving and taking involve another person, and they are also highly concrete, as both giving and taking involve objects to be handed over.

Ware and Wells (1985) explored pragmatic intents in young children. They found that children did not begin to understand *full* meaning of speaker intentions until around 60 months (five years) in age. The students in the classroom of the present study were between four and five years in age, and indeed, if we follow these authors’ gauge, these students had not yet developed ability to comprehend a directive to its fullest. Analysis in this study, however, fell short, as his coding captured directives and other interchanges at utterance level of intent, rather at an interactive level. Snow, Pan, Imbens-Bailey, and Herman (1996), who worked with young children (ages 14–32 months), added the possibility of gesture, gesticulation, and other non-verbal communicative acts in order to investigate communicative intent, all in an effort to make their findings more ecologically valid (p. 58). The parents in Snow, Pan, Imbens-Bailey, and Herman (1996), it was found, seemed to be laying a great deal of cultural (and linguistic) pragmatic groundwork for future negotiations, performatives and other communicative efforts at the pragmatic level.

This study by Snow et al. (1996) addresses questions of acquisition of speech acts by young children. Their research questions were: how many communicative attempts does a child make, as measured by Mean Length of Utterance (MLU, a mathematical calculation for measuring linguistic sophistication); in what communicative context do children makes these attempts?; is there a set type and order
of speech acts that children attempt to express, and if so, what are they?; and “which interchanges permit the greatest variety of speech acts?” (Snow et al., 1996, p. 59). One hundred children ranging in age from 14 months to 32 months were tested and videotaped in interchanges mostly with their mothers (for two subjects, with their fathers) interacting in a laboratory that had toys available. Children were recorded in semi-structured play periods. Not only frequency but also intelligibility and sophistication were of interest in children’s acquisition of speech acts as they acquired language in general. As similar to Bates et al. (1979), in Snow et al. (1996), early communicative attempts were not responses but rather imitations. The very sophisticated coding scheme revealed that children indeed use speech in combination with gesture, gaze and other features. As these authors sum up: “The data presented here confirm the relative precocity of pragmatic over grammatical development, and suggest there are regularities in the emergence of pragmatic capacities” (Bates et al., 1979, p. 78). Even though these researchers recognize the limitations of a laboratory setting over a more natural family environment, children still displayed communicative intent in a social setting with a parent, and it is this communicative intent that forms the foundation for pragmatic and therefore linguistic development in acquisition. Likewise, preschoolers do not always comprehend all teacher directives but, on the other hand, rather quickly strategize that following what others are doing will keep them out of trouble. Developing strategies, then, is not only a matter for the speaker but also for the listener in an interactive situation.

In a study of parents’ and teachers’ use of indirect directives, teachers were more often indirect in that they uttered “questions, requests and commands in indirect,
moderated forms” (Hess, Dickson, Price, & Leong, 1979, p. 310). Teachers modified their language more than did the mothers and used politeness in their directives. For instance, teachers were found to attenuate direct imperatives with politeness terms as in, “Please put this block where it belongs” (Hess et al., 1979, p. 310), the type of phrases which the teachers in Heath (1983), both in Trackton and Roadville teachers, found problematic, since students tended not to acquiesce. Teachers in Hess et al. (1979) also incorporated the subjunctive mood, as in, “I wonder how these blocks are alike? I wish you would tell me,” (italics added) or simply used the interrogative, like, “Can you tell me why you put that one there?” (p. 310). Authors of this study point out that, in the face of mothers’ more direct utterances, teachers’ indirectness and attenuation may show negotiations and attempt to give students some form of agency (Hess et al., 1979, pp. 310-11). Simple, direct requests such as, “Show me where it goes,” and, “Tell me out loud as you put it on the square,” were more characteristic of mothers than of teachers (Hess et al., 1979, p. 311). This may be because teachers generally feel more of a need to contextualize information, demonstrating and using realia and other supportive aids. Also, a teacher’s audience is generally far larger than a parent’s, and a teacher addressing a classroom full of children will have to take into account, and, as argued above, many listeners and listeners’ cultural linguistic and immediate classroom needs. In issuing directives, many times some students themselves serve as the role models for other students in the classroom. If a teacher has the class line up but only two-thirds of the class fully comprehends, then in their moment of hesitation, those who have not fully comprehended may well have been following the ones who seem to have comprehended,
making the situation appear as though everyone has had and has shown full comprehension.

Lee (2010) traces the stages of acquisition of this pragmatic development. Before the age of two, children understand simple requests and make one-word responses (Bucciarelli et al., 2003) or use gesture to respond to request and other speech acts (Ochs, 1979). From 18 months to two years, the celebrated “language explosion” accompanies the onset of learning interactional rules, including social and linguistic behavior, often by mimicking use of adults and older children, without always knowing how’s and wherefore’s of these rules. With maturity, children attach meaning to actions and interactional frames, and they learn to incorporate into their interpretive repertoires more and more contextual features, such as “non-situated knowledge” meaning that children of this age can rely on abstracted context (Ochs, 1979). At nine to thirteen years of age, children reach an even higher level of comprehension, in which they can understand mechanisms such as irony, puns, requests, humor and idioms, and respond in interactionally appropriate ways, which is to say that they can understand an indirect request as such and comply or negotiate. For instance, child directive form developed from explicitness to embeddings – telegraphic directives, limited routines, and structural modifications to hints without explicit imperatives (Ervin-Tripp, 1977). Children teased apart intended messages: in an experimental situation, one of the characters asked the teacher, “Teacher, may I go out?” to which the teacher answered, “After finishing this part” (Lee, 2010, p. 350). When a speaker asks for permission, the request may have been acquiesced or agreed to if the answer is effectively, “Yes, but...” In this case, “May I go out [or leave]?” may mean, “May I leave now?” or it may mean, “May I leave
whenever you deem appropriate?” Using think-aloud strategies, this researcher was able to glean children’s thinking processes.

Lee (2010) focused on how children of various ages develop comprehension of speech acts in a second language, such as requests (the others were “apology, refusal, compliment and complaint”) (p. 343). Participants consisted of children in Hong Kong who were native speakers of Cantonese, all learning English as a second language. Three age groups (ages seven, nine, and twelve) of second language (L2) learners fared well on measurements of having comprehended speech acts. However, all groups had trouble with more complex forms, namely indirect refusals, complaints, compliments, and processing strategies. The youngest of these groups (the seven-year-olds) paid attention to literal meaning or formulaic expressions, but on the other hand, these subjects were found to have relied the least on sequential development in expressions. The two older groups (nine- and twelve-year-olds) were more adept at using two strategies together (e.g., literal meaning and sequential development) in conjunction in order to achieve understanding, with some participants able to combine three strategies. Despite being able to use more strategies in combination, children aged seven to nine showed greater development of comprehension of speech acts than those from age nine to twelve, alluding to a plateau effect. Because they were operating with two lexicons and syntactic systems, the younger L2 (second language) learners were often using “formulaic expressions” while they took more time to separate literal from implied meaning (Lee, 2010, p. 362). Lee found that the youngest group relied most on “literal meaning, key word or part of the utterance” (p. 363). Since this study was an experimental study, it did not capture the back-and-forth negotiation typical of real
interaction in the way that natural conversation in a more natural bilingual setting would. For, part of understanding lies in negotiation, in knowing what you do not know and asking for more information from the speaker. Still, the study described here applies to the present study in that it deals with acquisition of speech acts (namely, directives, here called “requests”) by bilingual children, who operate with two different linguistic repertoires.

Although it did not involve bilinguals, an experimental study by Bucciarelli and colleagues (2003) resembled Lee (2010) in that it sought to measure both linguistic (including paralinguistic) and extra-linguistic (including gesture) communicative performance with respect to how children interpret irony and deceit. Their aims were: “To study in parallel the emergence of linguistic and extralinguistic communication, reunified under a single theoretical paradigm [and] To offer a baseline against which to confront the abnormal performance, separated with regard to linguistic and extralinguistic conditions” (Bucciarelli, et al., 2003, pp. 208-09). As in my study, the baseline for analysis would derive from regular performance of children’s acquisition of pragmatic expression and understanding. A total of 160 children participated, with 40 children evenly divided into four separate age groups: “2.6 to 3 years old, 3.6 to 4 years old, 4.6 to 5.6 years old, 6 to 7 years old” (Bucciarelli, et al., 2003, p. 220).

The authors framed their study with Cognitive Pragmatics, which draws from Grice’s cooperative principle (see Theoretical Framework section, Chapter 1), and assumes that, as speakers, we express ourselves and interpret speech based on what we believe to be shared knowledge between fellow interlocutors. “In order to reconstruct the meaning intended by an actor, Cognitive Pragmatics claims that a partner has to
recognize the behavior game of which the communicative act constitutes a move” (Bucciarelli, et al., 2003, p. 212). As children learn language, they acquire knowledge of the complexity of this shared language, incorporating direct versus indirect language and conventional versus unconventional language. Comprehending such communicative acts as irony and deceit lies at the heart of learning linguistic pragmatics, similar to my study.

In the experiment, results showed that, generally speaking, all groups had the same amount of ease or difficulty interpreting linguistic and gestural speech acts in all these categories of direct through complex indirects. The only aberration with respect to linguistic versus gestural interpretation was the 6-year-old group, which detected simple linguistic ironies significantly better than simple gestural ironies. As the authors summed up, “direct and simple indirect communicative acts are easier to comprehend than complex indirect communicative acts in both protocols,” the gestural (communicative protocol) and the speech act (linguistic) protocol (p. 229). This was true for both linguistic and extra-linguistic portions, which included gesture. Children seem to interpret irony as they approach their school-age years: “we found a considerable difference in the ability of 2.6–3 year olds and 3.6–4 year olds with regard to comprehending ironic communicative acts” (Bucciarelli, et al., 2003, p. 229). Significantly, they said, irony, is usually meant to be comprehended by the person to whom it is directed; it needs specific timing in order to succeed. Within these constraints, an ironic speech act might be more efficacious than a corresponding ironic communicative gesture; the latter requires contact conditions such as visual attention, which
could be hard to obtain instantly for actor and partner. (Bucciarelli, et al., 2003, p. 230)

I would ask if the following holds true for a comprehension of a directive from teacher to students. Over the course of my study, paralinguistic elements such as timing, visual attention (gaze on the part of all interlocutors involved), and extra-linguistics such as hand/arm gesture that characterized the teacher’s directive (as with irony, as the case above) will come into play in my study as well.

Goodwin (2006) revealed how negotiation between parents and their children at times resembles conventionalization, if not full cooperation, and even if, as social actors and interlocutors, they do not always cooperate socially, they cooperate conversationally (“interactionally”) and partake in negotiation. As in Takano (2005), speakers can preface a directive with a pre-request. In Goodwin (2006), instead of issuing a directive outright, the mother-participant said to her two daughters in anticipation of getting ready to go out, “Come on guys. You guys’ clothes are ironed” (p. 517). The situation escalated when the girls failed to comply: the mother turned off the computer and began to utter a litany of direct directives in the form of imperatives, the difference here being that, where the pre-request had been a hint, the directives that followed were imperatives, assuming a punctuative now quality described above (Vine, 2009). The girls had heard the mother, but the fact that they did not comply rendered the older daughter’s “We have to wait” an alternative rather than outright refusal (Goodwin, 2006, p. 517). Indeed, the older daughter is both authority to her sister and subjugated to her mother’s authority, a sort of power dynamic that students play out in classrooms, where they may well be a hierarchy of authority in the class based on myriad reasons, changing how speakers and listeners
address and understand each other. Authority and position, then, are not simply a matter of teacher-knows-more-and-therefore-is-the-boss; the authority figure must sometimes assert authority in given situations.

The extra-linguistics of physical positioning can also play a role in how interlocutors address each other, and they can change from one participation framework to another, e.g., that of cooperation to one of confrontation. If interlocutors are interacting in the same room or with common goals in mind, then they are operating with “mutual orientation” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 522) or “mutual alignment” (p. 526). If, by contrast, one or both interlocutors deem the negotiation fruitless, they may assume a more confrontational orientation, or “facing formation” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 515). This may be the case when the teacher wants to show she “means business” or wants to be sure the students have understood. However, “[w]hen two interlocutors are in different rooms, or even in the same room attending to different activities that fully engross them, participants may not succeed in bringing off the activity that the parent proposes” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 522). This could occur, too, in a classroom, where, when the student is concentrating on a particular activity (e.g., reading, doing computer work, or wearing headphones while listening to a book on tape), it comes time to make a transition to another activity. Again, the teacher may make students face her or may look into their eyes before uttering a direct instructional directive as a show of authority and position.

This type of environment, in which various activities make for various forms of input for a student, also creates various linguistic inputs. As argued above (Arzarello, 2006; Bucciarelli et al., 2003), speakers combine this input in combinations of utterances and gestures.
Following AIDA’s frame, these combinations could be referred to as “constellation of meanings that are ideologically linked” (Eckert, 2008, p. 464), making reference to larger ideologies. These larger ideologies and the language used to express them, “do not stand as isolated speech acts; rather, they are frequently repeated until they are agreed with” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 522). These types of speech acts feature pre-requests, hints, and negotiation in the form of bargaining. With so-called “facing formation” (i.e., when speakers are facing each other), speakers in the authority position tend to utter direct imperatives and consequences, make clear positions (rather than hints) and draw negative assessments and evaluations (Goodwin, 2006, pp. 520-21). Parents could either exploit their authority or have it undermined by their children, a dynamic that could mirror teachers in the classroom. The parents in Goodwin (2006) would say, “Ok, time for this,” or, “You have to do this now,” even though the child was clearly doing something else or at least would prefer to. Interactions such as these show how the adult (a parent or teacher) should clearly establish expectations for routines, schedules, and itineraries. At times, negotiation appeared more like either party digging in its heels, the child or children effectively expressing, “I’m not going to comply,” to which the parent would respond, “Oh, yes, you are,” and to which child or children would retort, “Oh, no, I’m not,” in a very back-and-forth confrontation style of negotiation. Goodwin (2006) reported that the parent would get in the final word (p. 535). Classroom interactions for older (intermediate or middle school grades) children can likewise assume this sort of highly tense negotiation, and although this is not typical of negotiation of preschool students. On one occasion in Goodwin (2006), one of the children ran away as an act of refusal to comply with a request.
At other times, negotiation was a matter of bargaining, whereby, as mentioned above in Hess et al. (1979), listeners can have a voice and not simply comply wholly with a speaker’s directive, “Through bargaining, children agree to partial acceptance of the directive but assert their own terms of acceptance (with regard to when they will comply, to what extent they will comply, etc.)” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 527). Even when authority figures such as parents establish rules and begin to present the possibility of sanctions for non-compliance, children still negotiate, complain, and legitimize complaints and negotiations, even if they do not protest or defy outright. It is not clear if the author has been privy to any establishment of routines. In many activities described in Goodwin (2006), the parent would effectively say, “Ok, now we’re going to change activities” but never refer to any pre-establishment of a routine or routinized activity.

The Classroom Environment

Teacher Questions in the Classroom. Socialization assumes a different tenor with teachers than with aforementioned professionals in other fields, even with parents and their children. Bilingual learners incorporate these meanings if teachers provide appropriate support. Gort, Pontier, and Sembiante (2012) put into practice a system that placed interactive teacher-learner language along a continuum in a study that examined questions in bilingual elementary classroom. They found that teachers used more-challenging and less-challenging questions in analysis as they coded for form as well as function in teacher utterances. In both these cases, the notion of “distance” (i.e., more or less direct, less or more challenging) was a crucial analytic point, since it defined, in part, the relationship between teacher-student interlocutors. When using Spanish, teachers posed recall-type questions that neither challenged students’ higher-order thinking skills nor facilitated probing conversations between teacher and students or among students.
One can surmise the fact that teacher’s questioning skills are at issue as much as the questions themselves. For, if a teacher can ask only *wh-* type questions, such as, ¿Quiénes fueron los personajes principales? (Who were the main characters?) or ¿Dónde tuvo lugar el cuento? (Where did the story take place?), a discussion cannot go far without further probing. On the other hand, if a teacher possesses and implements linguistic acumen to ask something from irrealis mood, such as, *Tomando en cuenta los deseos de personaje A, ¿qué piensan que hubiera hecho personaje B antes de haber conocido a personaje C?* (Taking into account what character A wanted, what do you think character B would have done before having met character C?). As Gort et al. (2012) sum up:

> These [more trenchant] questions prompted students to make connections with and compare what they were reading to their life experiences, interactions with text, and experiences with the world. Many of these questions had the potential to generate extended conversation due to the nature of the connections being made. (p. 272)

As these authors contend, the fact that teachers use recall-type questions predominantly with in English language dialogue and more cognitively challenging questions in Spanish language discussion suggests that either teachers in the study were not as apt or comfortable leading Spanish, or they were not willing to engage as much in Spanish. As it applies to the present study, there was disparity and tension brought about by these two discussion groups. These are the types of analytic situations on which the AIDA framework focuses.
Directives in Educational Settings. Ellis (1992) studied student requests made at school, both inside and outside the classroom. Specifically, he examined “opportunities for production” and the actual production of requests by his two participants (p. 1). In his corpus of 410 requests produced over a period of 15-21 months, he found a wide distribution of directives even though he limited his study to two participants. The study, involving two boys, who were both L2 learners of English in the UK, showed general characteristics of requests made by students.

Children can use these kinds of directives to initiate interaction, combining single words or short phrases with simple gestures in combination with props (e.g., holding up a crayon and say, “Another?” when requesting another color). In fact, results of this study showed that propositional completeness hinged on whether or not the request contained a verb or not. Directives can assume different qualities, for example, level of directness (e.g., conventionally direct, non-conventionally indirect) or sentence form (e.g., imperative, declarative, interrogative). Some directives are “mood derivable,” in which the structural mood changes (e.g., “You come here”) where others are performative (e.g., “I am asking you to come here”), modalized hedges (or indirect directives) (e.g., “I would like to ask you to come here”), or “locution derivable” (e.g., “I want it” where “it” referred to a piece of paper) (Ellis, 1992, pp. 9-10). Positive or negative mood, that is, whether the request asks the listener to do something or to stop doing something also played a part in requests. Finally, purpose (mirroring, once again, AIDA’s contention that communication is purpose-oriented) played an important part in this study, since the two participants requested different things: goods, services, attention, activity, or action. They can also be encoded from the speaker’s perspective,
from the listener’s perspective, or both (Ellis, 1992). One of the boys, who had limited
eexperience in English, made requests principally to ask for objects or to gain the
teacher’s attention. The other boy used more complex structures and made requests for
more purposes. This study was limited in that speakers used only their L2, English. I
will use both languages. Also, in Ellis’s (1992) study, requests were limited to those
made to adults, oftentimes to the researcher. Additionally, requests call for some form of
sociolinguistic knowledge on the part of the speaker, both with respect to the context
and the interlocutor, that is, following Labov and Fanshel (1977), the speaker must know
if the listener is capable, willing, obligated, etc. to carry out a request.

Indeed, speakers can issue directives in the form of a question or appeal to their
interlocutors’ sense of fairness, but these forms are just two of a large repertoire
available to speakers. Other syntactic forms or sentence types include imperatives as
interjections, such as, “Line up!” or “Get in line” (Waring & Hruska, 2012), or
statements that call on the learner infer what is desired, sometimes called hints, pre-
requests, or general directives, such as, “There’s too much noise in here” (Ervin-Tripp,
1976) as intended to mean, “Please, quiet down.” There are also morpho-syntactic
categories, different word forms that coincide with sentence forms. Speakers may
express an imperative in the form of an interjection, as exemplified above, but
declaratives that feature modals (e.g., “You may all sit down,” “Could you be quiet?” or
“You should all line up now”) are other ways of encoding a directive (He, 2000). The
range of choices available to teachers shows how, as speakers in classrooms, they must
encode meaning so that learners will successfully interpret and learn to follow them
(Ellis, 2002; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Goodwin, 2006; Gort, et al., 2012). It must be noted that
listeners acquire messages encoded in speech acts gradually and, most likely, they first acquire them through the first language (L1). Nonetheless, even indirect, understated, or implied meanings can be understood by young children (Bucciarelli et al., 2003). The key in comprehension lies in knowing what the speaker’s intended message is and responding appropriately.

The studies named in this review thus far have treated directives from the standpoint of philology, of directives in general, or in the workplace, or at home. Ellis (2002) examined student directives, while Gort et al. (2012) looked at teacher questions. The study that most reflects the current study is that by He (2000), who studied a teacher in a bilingual classroom who used directives for instruction and for discipline. This author notes that a directive is more than simple giving direction in the classroom. A directive can create a space for interaction or negotiation between the teacher and one or more students. As she points out, it is in this space that students have the chance to display knowledge or even wit, by “supplying a ‘wrong’ answer to her question, thereby creating an interactional opportunity for the teacher to issue her directive in an imperative manner (‘next, look at the blackboard’)” (He, 2000, p. 126). If part of the cooperative principle is interacting in appropriate way, then this sort of wit shows that the student knows indeed how far to go with the teacher.

As stated above, the directive offers both teacher and student the opportunity for interaction. In the case of He’s (2000) study, a student knowingly supplied an incorrect answer to the teacher’s question, which prompted the teacher to resort to a direct directive in the form of an imperative (“next, look at the blackboard”) (p. 126). In fact, here, as in pilot studies of the present study, I tend to term a direct directive, often in the
form of an imperative or even an imperative + adjectival (see discussion below) as a “punctuative” (as Vine (2006) found that managers used imperatives). He (2000) points to the variety of “form, function, and frequency” across cultures, especially with respect to how teachers employ directives in order to socialize heritage bilingual students in their L1 (He, 2000, p. 120).

Like the present study, He (2000) draws a distinction between what she terms instructional directives and disciplinary directives (p. 123), the former also deemed initiating directives since they can initiate classroom discussions and discourse, while the latter also called responsive directives since they respond to (what the author deemed to be sometimes inappropriate) student behavior and needs to be corrected. He’s (2000) focus was the socialization aspect of instructional and disciplinary directives.

Such logical inferences were present in disciplinary directives, as well, in disciplinary directives. Here, He (2000) found “rather than simply issuing directives, the teacher weaves cultural values and ideology in the prefaces so as to warrant the directives for desirable behavior” (p. 131). Another metaphor for the process, this more from the teacher’s perspective, is that the teacher is “covering all bases,” being sure to have justified classroom the use of disciplinary language from a moral standpoint, then from a more practical standpoint, as well as from a pedagogical one. The order of the discipline, I would argue, matters less than having “covered all bases,” because, really, the teacher is aware that discipline of one or a select number of students also serves as a potent warning for the rest of the class.

Although she delves into how teachers use directives for instruction and for discipline, nonetheless, He (2000) falls short on what I deem to be a crucial aspect of
pedagogical interaction, namely, to examine how students respond. Admittedly, this is not an easy task, and as she concedes: “there is little or no uptake by the students” (He, 2000, p. 125). This would not be to say that students failed to comprehend; in fact, in pilots for the present study, I often witnessed what I termed “silent acquiescence,” a situation in which the teacher issued a directive and students responded immediately and completely. Both Bucciarelli et al. (2003) and Lee (2010) have intended to ascertain what and how listeners understand, which methodologically represents conjecture and the risk of so-called “psychologizing” (Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014).

Summary

The theoretical framework for the present allows me to focus upon certain analytic elements. In my analysis, I will examine directives in the teacher-student interchange in order to see how speaker intentions are expressed in directives and how students respond to these directives. With AIDA, I place at the forefront particular speaker strategies, whether educational, linguistic, or interpersonal, that always aim at either small or large outcomes. With Speech Act Theory, in particular performatives, I will examine how the focal teacher is able to do things in the classroom via her position and authority as teacher, as well as via convention, intention and meaning. Directness and indirectness will also play a major role in analysis, since both teacher and student often, if not always, try to relate with and cooperate with each other as humans. Research has shown how in the latter part of the last century, through the beginning of the present one, theory has moved from a largely philosophical and philological tradition (Austin, 1965, 1976; Searle, 1975, 1976) to more corpus-based examinations of language in everyday situations (Labov & Fanshel, 1977). What was once considered
loosely as “empirical data,” reflecting competence and how language could be used in ideal situations, has moved largely into analysis that divulges how interlocutors put linguistic and other communicative resources to use in order to achieve certain aims in social situations, the aim of the AIDA framework. Taxonomies covered the distribution of directives (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Since then, more studies have focused on interaction between different ages (parents and their children, teachers and their students), on different environments (work, family, school), on negotiation between interlocutors, and interactions across languages. For, a phrase that expresses a directive in one language may lose or gain its strength in a second, a crucial consideration in bilingual classrooms. As discussed above, He’s (2000) study is similar to the present one in that it treats directives as a means for both instruction and classroom management. Likewise, Gort et al. (2012) classified the questions according to qualitative differences, as well as language, Spanish or English. Research on directives in this study has centered upon linguistic and contextual complexity. The following chapter focuses on the research methods used to document and interpret key points of this complexity.
Chapter 3: Methods

The primary data for this study derived from observations of teacher directives and student responses, with additional, supporting data in the form of interviews, analytics memorandums, and artifacts. The analytic focus of this study was the interchange between teacher and students, with the kernel as the directive and response between these interlocutors in the communicative locus (see Figure 1.1). Thus, in this study, I analyzed directives and their linguistic and social contexts, that is, what prompted directives, how they were communicated, and the extent to which preschoolers understood them and responded in ways that they communicated this understanding. Such analysis and understanding entailed recording language and accompanying gestures, references to previous knowledge, and use of environmental referents such as a posted alphabet chart, and educational referents, such as a district or state mandate concerning the preschool classroom or preschool instruction.

By focusing on a single classroom for a specified period of time, I sought to make this case study a way of understanding how the focal teacher, María José, directed her students and how they responded (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014). In-depth case studies of groups of learners can reveal student interpretations and their constructions of knowledge and language, including the linguistic and social mechanisms involved (Goodman, 2007), through which I developed an understanding of the use and intention of directives in a bilingual preschool. As such, I selected this class based on pilot studies in another classroom and on preliminary observations that I made of María José’s interactions with her preschool students in the prior academic year (2014-15).

3 All names in this study are pseudonyms.
This case study included descriptions of institutional forces that may have had a bearing on key persons and the language they used in the classroom. For, to the extent to which they informed my approach to data, these factors played a part in how interactants treated each other, and even though the class was quite self-contained, with no students being pulled out for special instruction, María José confided in me on more than one occasion about issues that were bothering her or that may have been bothering one or more of the students. These issues could well have had a bearing on how she addressed the students and/or how they responded. Factors that emerged from the school and district culture had a bearing on its participants, the teacher and the students.

**Setting and Participants**

**School.** As argued above, skill-based preschool programs in the district had become more and more important in the eyes of district officials and other stakeholders. As a school in a metropolitan school district of the mid-Western U.S., Bellamente Academy served both suburban and urban neighborhoods. A one-story, brick-and-concrete structure, Bellamente was set in a middle class neighborhood adjacent to a bike and running path that paralleled one of the city’s rivers. Across a bridge from the school was a city recreation center. Built in 1969 and 1970, Bellamente opened in the 1971-72 academic year as a junior high school and later became Bellamente Middle School. In 2008, as a result of a consolidation between the middle school, two area elementary schools, and a multi-intensive special needs self-contained classroom, the school became what is now known as Bellamente Academy. This consolidation resulted in a very large school, comprised of a total of 1,103 students (in 2014-15) and covering 10 grades—preschool through grade eight. This consolidation also meant that the school could offer
its students and the students’ families services and were striving to be sensitive to the needs of families new to the U.S.

The middle class neighborhood had changed in demographic from neighborhoods with almost all native-born citizens to immigrant communities (G. Schoenberg, personal communication, March 12, 2015). The school had grown to the point that some classes were taught in trailers outside the building. Another outcome of the consolidation was a clustering of large numbers of ethnic communities and their concomitant varieties of ethnic cultures, religions, and languages. Students at Bellamente represented over 60 languages. In fact, only 22% of students spoke English as a first language, with another 30% speaking Spanish as a first language, and the other 48% speaking a variety of home languages such as Nepali, Burmese, Karen, Arabic, Somali, and French (G. Schoenberg, personal communication, March 12, 2015). Many students came from refugee families, so they had had interrupted schooling, or limited formal schooling or otherwise had not been socialized into U.S. social norms including those of the school (G. Schoenberg, personal communication, March 12, 2015). By offering so-called “wrap-around” services, such as newcomer classes for students to accelerate language and social acquisition, a school-based health clinic that included dental and behavioral health services (the most utilized health clinic in the district), and a welcome center that offered various services to parents, the school had become a hub for students and their families as they adjusted to life in the United States. As large and as diverse as Bellamente was, over the course of my observations, the more I walked through the hallways of Bellamente on my way to and from María José’s classroom, the more evidence I saw of how much a tool of socialization is in schools, especially to
those families new to this nation. Diversity was cast as unity, and if bilingualism or multilingualism was presented on, say, a hallway poster, English was given preference. Furthermore, this socialization was part of institutional forces under the framework of AIDA.

Beyond traditional academics, Bellamente Academy endeavored to provide non-linguistic educational opportunities in the form of art, music, physical education, computer technology, and drama. In large urban school districts in the U.S. today (likely elsewhere, too), there is a push to do what is possible to offer these types of classes whenever possible. Insofar that programs like these reflected the socio-pedagogical philosophy and objectives of the school, they helped create an atmosphere that brought students into middle-class U.S. culture and values (G. Schoenberg, personal communication, March 12, 2015).

Philosophically and pedagogically speaking, Bellamente Academy had changed its educational stance on bilingual education. Where beforehand, the school had offered English Language Acquisition (ELA) classes and tried to transition students into English as soon as possible, it now sought to maintain Spanish instruction beginning in the early grades, that is, in preschool, kindergarten, and first grade. District offices had originally mandated that, in the 2014-15 academic year, Bellamente Academy would be a Transitional Bilingual school. The vice principal told me that the school was actually moving toward a biliteracy model so that Spanish-English bilingual instruction would no longer be transitional but rather would follow a maintenance philosophy of bilingual education, saying with respect to Spanish-English bilingual students, “We would like to have students pursue a course of study that leaves them bilingual and biliterate” (G.
Schoenberg, personal communication, March 12, 2015). The families of the students in María José’s class could benefit from the services offered by the school, while the students themselves could benefit from the lessons given by their teacher.

Classroom. I had visited María José’s preschool class the year prior, so I knew the physical space in which she taught. To hear her comment throughout the school day and to see students move about, I can say that it was not ideal. As I say above, the school had consolidated and, consequently, had grown. María José’s class was in the main building, but she taught out of two rooms, one of which was part (approximately a third) of another preschool classroom and the other which was a teacher work area. Throughout the day, she went back and forth with the students between these two spaces. One result of having two spaces was that it made for more transitions between activities. Another was the need to have two teachers, one teacher in each room. Sometimes, during a transition between activities, María José would have to explain to her aide, Ms. Domínguez, how to handle a certain follow-up practice. Hence, more transitions and delegating to the aide effectively gave students the space to misbehave or at least behave contrary to María José’s expectations. A third consequence of the two spaces was that, since the larger of the two was divided from the next class by a partition that did not even reach the ceiling, sounds such as conversations, crying, or singing would come in from the adjacent preschool classroom.

Nonetheless, each room seemed to have its advantage. The larger room had space for larger tables, a larger rug area, cabinets, a painting area, a water table and other centers whose materials took up large space, like blocks or a play kitchen. The smaller room was set back from the neighboring classrooms, so little sound reached this room.
The smaller room was also closer to the bathroom. The smaller room had a small rug and reading material, as well as some activities and small tables. Both spaces could fit the entire class, and María José taught out of both throughout the day, though she often held small group instruction in this smaller space.

**Teacher.** Ms. María José Paredes had been teaching elementary school for 16 years. The 2014-15 academic year was her first year teaching preschool, and she planned to continue teaching pre-school at Bellamente the following year, which is to say that she was not new to teaching but was new to preschool and its curriculum and pedagogical strategies, along with idiosyncrasies of four year olds. Additionally, since some of the mandates regarding curriculum and instruction sometimes came from a state offices of preschool education, as María José confided in me, she sometimes felt pulled in two different directions, what Bellamente Academy wanted and what the preschool bureaucracy required (Interview E_MJ4). María José seemed to be developing linguistic and pedagogical acumen, and over the course of the year, I saw her develop greater awareness in achieving a balance between being disciplined with the students without being too harsh. She would sometimes demand absolute stillness or silence from the students who were prone to fidgeting or whispering.

María José came to the U.S. from México to teach and, since then, had earned her master’s degree. A deeply religious woman, in both her Catholicism and her advanced degree, she saw a sense of duty and pride, as she considered teaching both a moral and intellectual endeavor, and she once became heated when, during an interview, she recalled how preschool teachers are sometimes considered nothing more than babysitters (Interview E_MJ2). In describing her vocation, she said that she put herself
in her students’ and parents’ positions, hoping that her students tell their parents every
day, “I want to go to school. I want to see my teacher. I want to see my friends” (M.J.
Paredes, personal communication, March 12, 2015).

Students. María José’s class included fourteen students, eight girls and six boys,
averging about four years old. Some had turned five early in the year, as early as
October, while one girl had just turned four in August. Although many students had
immigrated with their parents to the U.S. from Mexico, there were some students who
represented (either with one or both parents) Guatemala and Puerto Rico. I hesitate to
state outright that these students were “from” these places (countries or a protectorate)
since some students were born in the continental U.S. (i.e., not Puerto Rico) but one or
more parents or grandparents were born or grew up elsewhere. The point I want to
emphasize is that these students, as young as they were, had influences, from parents or
grandparents who were from Spanish-speaking lands but, at the same time, already had
and would continue to have a great deal of influence from mainstream U.S. culture.
María José did not know the makeup of her class initially; she found out through casual
conversation and formal meetings with parents over the course of the year and therefore
continued herself to become familiar with the contexts and backgrounds of her students.
Below I examine the dimensions of context that I will be collecting and analyzing.

Strategy of Inquiry

I chose the AIDA framework and its concomitant methodological approach as
part of my strategy of inquiry. The framework is a set of theoretical assumptions from
which analysis takes place, while the methodological approach is the steps I used during
analysis. Tracy (2003) uses grounded practical theory (not to be confused with Glaser’s
(1965) grounded theory) for AIDA framework to examine particular problems on three
levels, reconstructing both concretely (What was X saying?) and ideally (What did X mean when she said this?). Reconstruction involves asking, What was María José attempting to do at the time? The second was to reconstruct, asking, How did she go about it?

**IMPYRA.** Since a great deal of this study centered on social distance and directness, often theoretically presented as part of Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), I developed an analytic instrument, the *Inventario de Mandatos del Profesorado y Respuestas del Alumnado* (*IMPYRA*) (Inventory of Directives of the Teacher and Responses of the Students) (see Appendix A: *Inventario de Mandatos del Profesorado y Respuestas del Alumnado*). This instrument is a classification system that identifies both the perceived level of directness as well as mitigating kinesics (gestures), whether as prosodic and paralinguistic features (Crystal, 1966; Schuller et al., 2013), such as strengtheners (“upgraders”) or attenuators (“downgraders”) (Labov & Fanshell, 1977), or other factors. Although it is not a qualitative codebook *per se*, I modeled IMPYRA after a codebook created by Ninio, Snow, Pan, and Rollins (1994), which takes into account such factors. *Figures 1.1 and 1.2* (see Chapter 1) show how the kernel of conversation is at the communicative locus, as the verbal/gestural exchange, with contextual factors contribute to the intention and interpretation of a directive.

As a classification system, IMPYRA begins with the directive as an utterance. It takes into account Searle’s (1975) taxonomy, which moves from the most direct to the least direct, that is, from a direct directive, usually in the form of an imperative command, to a requestive hint, which could assume any number of morpho-syntactic structures (see Chapter 2). Over the course of the study, I realized that being direct
mattered less than being clear, for there were times that, despite being clear, students of their young age failed to comply.

I divided directives among different levels, numbering them 1 through 5. These levels began with the directive in and of itself, but I then took into account other factors, described above, that would either strengthen a directive (i.e., make it more direct) or weaken it (i.e., make it less direct or more indirect). For example, María José would sometimes repeat for them “Miren” (Look) and “Oigan” (Listen) (Observation 5, Segment 1). (Below, I use examples from the corpus to illustrate rather than to begin any kind of analysis.) Bear in mind that stronger does not always mean more effective. Repeated as they were one after the other, they were the most direct directives, and they constituted a Level 1 for directness because they had been strengthened by, say, repetition or gestures or references. A repetition, strong voice, a threat, or a direct gaze at a student would often result in that student’s compliance, as would a reference to call or text message to a parent or to other such consequence and may have garnered a more direct response from the student or students. The effectiveness of a directive was less important in overall analysis than the success or successfullness of it. Level 2 directives lacked these strengtheners. Included here are directives with polar (Yes/No) responses or directives in which the students had to repeat what she had said, as in “pregúntale a Ana [points to Ana] Qué le pasó a este árbol” (Ask Ana [points to Ana] What happened to this tree?) (Observation 9, Segment 5). Also included at this level were imperatives or declaratives, as in, “We are going to jump jump [MJ is jumping]” (Observation 7, Segment 4). They were also invitations (“Vamos a,” or “A ver,” which are both forms of
cohortative, Let’s or Let’s see), although they were often practiced invitations, or invitations that had been contextualized in routines.

Level 3 directives could include references or suggestions, (“Voces de salón,” or Inside voices, which she used to quiet the class down) as opposed to outright directives. Again, these directives could be practiced or routinized referential hints, hints that had been contextualized over the course of these first months of preschool. And again, they could be attenuated by various means, while the students themselves could fail to show understanding by not complying, whether intentionally or not. Since these were more hints than Level 1 or 2 directives, María José often used them in conjunction with gestures, routines or repetition, while students seemed to rely more on these gestures, routines or repetition than, perhaps, the directives per se. Also at this level were directives to which, although clear to me, to María José, and maybe even the majority of the students, certain students did not respond in the expected manner. When teacher and students mimed a flower being planted and then growing with the help of sunlight and water, Jenny simply watched but did not participate the way the others did (Observation 8, Segment 1), so her response had a bearing on how I judged that directive. (Potentially, any directives that were misunderstood were Level 3 directives, even if strengtheners were present.) Likewise, when María José told Michael to say, “I am silly,” he responded at the end of “am” by completing the Designed Incomplete Utterance (DIU) (Koshik, 2002) with “silly,” even after she told him outright, “Say it in a complete sentence” (Observation 9, Segment 9). Something about these directives or about the contexts failed to prompt Jenny to follow along with María José and the rest of the students and failed to prompt Michael to repeat the entire sentence. The level of
directness had to do, once again, with the clarity and appropriateness, which in turn had a bearing on the responses of the students.

Level 4 directives could be ambiguous, and although the teacher’s directive and expectation seemed salient to me and to her, I also sensed a breakdown of some kind in communication. One or more students paused, usually because they did not know what was expected of them, even though sometimes others around them were complying. On one occasion, Marí a José was miming pulling a plant out of the ground in order to examine the roots (Observation 8, Segment 4). I noted that Greta-Ann looked over at one of the older students, Marcus, rather than following suit on what the teacher was directing. In these cases, the directives may have been direct or, more to the point, clear as far as I could tell or as far as Marí a José intended. However, students’ hesitation meant that the directive and accompanying gestures failed in some fashion.

Level 5 directives were hardly directives at all but rather hints or cues that initiated action or worked on establishing routines. Also in this class of directives were cases in which Marí a José uttered a directive, and students, after hearing her, complied. For example, to start a transition when students were coloring pictures, Marí a José said, “Saben qué…Tenemos que ir con Maestra [gym teacher]” (You know what? We have to go with the [gym teacher]),” but as I noted, students kept coloring, although an acknowledgement of “MKay” could be heard (Observation 11, Segment 7). They had clearly heard their teacher and likely knew what it meant but were too absorbed in their current activity to move. Over the course of the following minutes, she made more direct and clearer utterances stating that, despite the fun they were having, the time had come for them to clean up and go to gym class. A directive, then, could never be viewed in
isolation, even when considering its contextual (prosodic, paralinguistic, extra-linguistic, or ideological) features. As was the case here, the directive may well have led to or resulted from other directives in the near or distant past or future. Still, use of the instrument gave me a point of departure for consideration and analysis.

Table 3.1, below, outlines my use of data and their relation to Research Questions 1(a) and 1(b), restated here:

1 (a). How did María José use directives to communicate with her learners in order to manage her classroom? What sorts of contextual features (such as displays of position as teacher, choice of language, convention, politeness, or indirectness) add to speaker utterances that stood to be interpreted differently or misinterpreted by the listeners, this teacher’s students?

1 (b). How did her students respond to her directives? What sorts of contextual features (such as those named above, in addition to granting authority to the teacher) were they themselves displaying, and what elements might these listeners have been interpreting differently or misinterpreting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Analytic Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• initial interview with teacher</td>
<td>• transcripts of</td>
<td>• to lay groundwork for discovering possible</td>
<td>• reconstruction problems |\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Appendix A)</td>
<td>• memos on</td>
<td>• to determine if there exist any inconsistencies</td>
<td>• graphic figures show connections or lack of \n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• emergent themes in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to glean overall philosophies, I interviewed both the teacher and the assistant principal. Because I felt I had greater rapport with María José than with the vice principal, I audiotaped (but did not videotape) interviews with María José only. I transcribed and theme-coded all interviews so that they would be easier to refer to and compare with observational data. Theme-coding also facilitated graphic figures, which contributed to any “sense making” of the observational data.

My second set of Research Questions was:

2 (a). How did María José use directives to communicate with her learners in order to instruct? What sorts of contextual features (such as displays of position as teacher, choice of language, convention, politeness, or indirectness) add to speaker utterances that stood to be interpreted differently or misinterpreted by the listeners?
2 (b). How did her students respond to her directives? What sorts of contextual features (such as those named above, in addition to granting authority to the teacher) were they themselves displaying, and what elements might these listeners have been interpreting differently or misinterpreting?

*Table 3.2*, below, outlines my use of data and their relation to my second research question.

**Table 3.2**  
Data Collection Methods and Analysis for Research Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Analytic Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• classroom observations focused on student language and gestures (all but three were recorded for audio and video) • interviews with students</td>
<td>• audio and video recordings • transcripts of audio and video • field notes • memos based on observations of recordings and field notes • transcripts of interviews • memos on interviews • placement of teacher directives onto deontic classification</td>
<td>• to create questions for interviews • to compare what the teacher says and what may actually be intended (by the teacher) to how the students respond • to show the response to the level of direction or indirectness of particular directives or a particular group of directives</td>
<td>• graphic figures show patterns or lack of patterns in teacher directives • emergent themes in memos that point to any “sense making” • devising and highlighting (preferencing) of themes and topics • IMPYRA classification of directives (see Appendix E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection

In this section, I elaborate on the specific data collection procedures that created the corpus (data set) that informed this study. I would characterize my time in María José’s classroom as a state of “flow” that Stake (1995) describes, saying that “[t]here is no particular moment when data gathering begins. It begins before there is commitment to do the study” (p. 49). I had known María José before I began this study, since the time that she was in her master’s program, and she welcomed me to her class immediately and wholeheartedly when I asked if I could observe her class. I had observed other classes, as well, so I found many similarities. What I was looking for, then, were differences—Aha! moments— in particular with respect to directives.

Observations. Transcripts of observations totaled 251 pages, of which the first three I transcribed according on what I could write down as it occurred. I experienced some technological limitations in that the camera I used would record for just over eight minutes. I felt I turned this into an advantage, as I could be more selective in what I recorded, rather than have the camera sit at the back of the classroom and record like a surveillance camera. I felt like the camera was my third eye as I followed the teacher and students around, recording longer (eight-plus minutes) or shorter (thirty seconds) of periods of interaction. Later, I did acquire a camera that let me record for longer spells, and I was able to record an 18-minute English lesson. (See Appendix G: Overview of Observations.)

Of the 251 pages, a total of 33 comprised English lessons. There were also comments, mostly from the students, that were in English. However interactions in which directives were in English were 33 pages, or 7.6%, of the total. Even though I had become familiar with María José’s classroom and her teaching from the prior year, my
first observations with this study were aimed at getting a feel for her students and a new feel for the classroom (Stake, 1995).

I allowed an initial period of about one week in order to give students time to become accustomed to me and my camera in the classroom (and because I was still waiting for research permission regarding my changes to my research protocol and therefore could not record the first three observation–neither video nor audio).

Afterwards, generally speaking, I trained the camera in the direction of interaction, keeping in profile at both the teacher and the students. My objective was to capture both speaker and listener during the entire interaction (directive-response, plus, in the moments that preceded or followed, any relevant speech or gesture by interlocutors).

The observation sheet (see Appendix E: Templete para Transcripciones (Template for Transcriptions)) that I developed for this purpose had space for: the observation number (1, 2, 3, etc.), date, time stamps (i.e., the time of day and the length of the observational segment), thick descriptions and segments. In informal conversations when I would enter the classroom or throughout the day, say, during a transition between activities, either María José or Ms. Domínguez would greet me or apprise me of the day’s or the coming days’ activities or major preoccupations. Thus, María José’s possible preoccupations on that particular day or other goings-on with the class (e.g., a class visitor or an upcoming birthday party) were what I called “overarches” in my observation transcriptions. In addition, each observation consisted of various recorded segments.

For every segment during each observation, I had space on the observation transcription form for noting: the previous and current activity, who was present (e.g.,
the whole group, small group, Maríá José and one or two students, students who later entered the setting, etc.) and what their physical orientations were (i.e., generally speaking, whom or what were they facing, such as around a table (they were facing each other or the center of the table) or they are all facing Maríá José in Morning Circle time); the major voices, usually Maríá José and other principal interactants, and finally minor voices coming in and out of the setting.

In an effort not to miss possible directives or motives for directives seconds or even minutes later, I transcribed almost everything that I recorded, many utterances and gestures. However, I was selective in my recordings, as even early on, I noted that there were times that Maríá José was questioning students more than directing instruction or behavior or that she was perhaps enjoying a more relaxed moment with them, neither instructing nor levying any outright enforcement of the rules. I was trying to remain consistent in my observations, and in looking for evidence of directives. I avoided cherry picking examples by generally recording morning circle, transitions, and small group instruction. As I transcribed, I took note of anomalies or nascent patterns in interactions and made note of them. Once I saw that interactions of teacher directives and student responses had begun to recur (e.g., Maríá José made use of the same directive to a student, who responded in the same way, which in turn prompted Maríá José to respond as she had done in a previous similar exchange), I knew that I had reached the point of saturation in data collecting (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

**Interviews. Teacher Interviews.** In order to get Maríá José’s perspective and temper what I saw and what my own impressions were, I conducted interviews with her in moments that the students were out of the classroom at, say, art, physical education,
and music (Stake, 1995). These were semi-structured interviews that were audio-taped (see Appendix C: Protocol for Interviews with Teacher). I conducted six short interviews in which I asked her to elaborate on certain directives she had made, students responses, and her relationships with particular students. In a more general interview, I asked her questions such as, “Describe in general terms your approach to teaching,” and “How is teaching a pre-school student different than teaching an older student, say, a third grader?” In other interviews, using a semi-structured format, I asked her about specific utterances in the class, using questions such as “What was going on in the classroom at this point?” and, “What were your intentions at this point?”

**Interviews. Student interviews.** In addition to recording classroom interactions and in order to triangulate student response of teacher directives, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the students (see Appendix D: Protocol for Interviews with Students). I interviewed students in groups of three to five regarding their interpretation of the teacher’s directives. Although I attempted to interview students in groups of three and always ensured that a teachers’ aide (a para-professional or para-educator) be present in order to facilitate these group interview sessions, students came in and out of these interviews, since I could not find a space in the hallway or other isolated space. At times, students seemed engrossed with technological accoutrements. They attempted to shout or sing into the microphone of my audio recorder, and one student looked for “his” letter (the first letter of his first name) on my laptop keyboard. (I later used a mobile phone, over which they were equally enthralled and distracted.) As with the teacher sessions, I audiotaped but not videotape these student group interviews, then transcribed and theme-coded them.
As with recording in-class observations, I allowed time for the students to become acquainted with me before I actually began interviewing them (Irwin & Johnson, 2005). Research with children has shown that eliciting data from them can prove difficult, especially if they are very young children (Ninio et al., 1994). Bucciarelli et al. (2003) used pictures and storytelling in their data collection protocol. Part of allowing students to become acquainted with me before real interviews entailed: (1) having María José introduce me, (2) having students become acquainted with looking at the monitor screen on the video camera, and (3) talking about goings-on in the class. Irwin and Johnson (2005) discuss sundry environments and means in which to hold interviews. Although I did not join the students on the playground in order to conduct student interviews, a technique that proved successful for these authors, I did join them on the playground sometimes as I spoke with María José and Ms. Domínguez, which proved, I feel, to get them more accustomed to me and my presence and my interactions with them.

I selected students for interviews based on how they had responded to María José in previous observations. In interviews with the groups of students, I attempted to show short segments of video featuring interaction with directives, and I then would ask them questions about what the teacher may have meant and why they responded the way that they did. Certainly, these interviews were not as straightforward, and in that respect, not as fruitful as the interviews with the teacher. At the introduction of a Student Interview, I once commented:

Las entrevistas con los estudiantes me han estado dificultando un poco, ya que los estudiantes no responden a mis preguntas así como si fuera
entrevista de pregunta-respuesta con adultos. Se volvían tímidos, pensando quizás que les estaba regañando, y no decían nada o se ponían “contrite” (digamos, medio arrepentidos). Y simplemente sus voces no eran fuertes y la grabadora no captaba lo que yo iba a poder utilizar. Es más, muchas veces quieren jugar con la grabadora o la computadora (laptop) que tengo a mano para grabar o repasar videos. (The interviews with the students have been giving me a bit of a hard time, as students don’t respond to my questions as if this were a question-response interview with adults. They became shy, thinking maybe that I’m chiding them, and they didn’t say anything or they became contrite (let’s say, rather remorseful). And their voices just aren’t strong enough and the recorder didn’t capture what I’d be able to use. Moreover, lots of times, they want to play with the recorder or the computer that I have at hand to record or go over videos). (translation mine). (Interview E_Est13).

However, they either thought that I was “trying to get them into trouble,” become contrite, and would fail to provide reflective answers, saying oftentimes that they were sorry for not listening, or they would become excited by my laptop and/or recording device (midway through the semester, I switched from a large microphone to use of my mobile phone as a recorder). All this notwithstanding, I did capture some potentially insightful responses from some of the preschoolers.

**Artifacts.** I also collected artifacts in the form of pictures of print materials (erasing any identifying characteristics) of, say, the Daily Schedule (see Figure 3.1,
below), the lesson objective that María José had posted on the wall, an alphabet chart to
which students would often refer during or outside lessons, and other materials from around the class. Although application of the AIDA framework remains fully grounded in language, similar, in fact, to this study, use of artifacts can support linguistic analysis. María José would make reference, for example, to the calendar every day, and students were seen looking at the chart as they repeated the days of the week.

With my prior experience in bilingual classrooms, I compared artifacts such as Figure 3.1 above to what principals and department chairs mandate and check for when they visit classrooms. Bear in mind that a visitor did indeed come in during one observation and checked that the teacher had attended to particular protocols for safety and care of the students (e.g., locked cabinets). These artifacts, as well as the ideas that they produced, led me to frame utterances within the ideologies connected to them. For example, with the Daily Schedule, above, administrators would have given enough importance to the preschool curriculum to want to offer to these students “Specials,” such as music, computers, and gym. Not all specials teachers feel adept at teaching four-year-olds, and not all stakeholders (administrators and others) feel that teaching these
subjects to preschoolers is time well spent. How the teacher felt about these specials might have a bearing on how she used directives associated with them. The language in this case, one might argue the institutional language in the form of repetition of another teacher and other room to go to, was supported gestures to and, therefore, reference to the Daily Schedule. Here then is an example of the communicative practices that accompany the rhetoric (Tracy, 2003).

**Memorandums.** Analytic memorandums (“memos”) likewise support of the basic analytic focus of this study. Craig and Tracy (1995) seek to create a link between theory and practice, as in this study, taking a communicative practice (language as it is expressed and interpreted) with its concomitant gestures, referents, and ideologies and linking it to theory. I composed a total of 25 analytic memos of various topics, for example, “Tacit directives,” “Beckoning for Answers,” and “Learning and Unlearning” in order to begin to glean patterns and make preliminary analyses (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). As a reflective practice, I utilized memo writing in order to ruminate on my corpus (my dataset) and the interactions I had recorded and transcribed, as well as to begin to organize them into themes. In addition to the above topics, reflections afforded me the chance to think about such topics as how my theoretical framework and my corpus were addressing my research questions, my approaches to my data, dilemmas and conflicts that arose, as with student interviews (Bogden & Bilken, 1992). With these memos, I sought to address notions relevant to my theoretical framework, for example, María José’s interactional strategies within the institutional school setting, issues of directness and indirectness, and how she used her authority and position. Memos are places to put theory to the test regarding what how I saw my data play out in the
classroom, and as I proceeded to data analysis, I saw theory building and thought as to what María José and her students were seemingly accomplishing (Maxwell, 2005).

**Coding and Data Analysis**

With these four major categories of data in hand—observations, interviews, artifacts, and memos—I proceeded to reconstruct key interactions. As a part of grounded practical theory and AIDA, reconstruction analysis represents the “sharp end” of analysis, showing the interactive dynamics between teacher and students and leading the way for the frame that included position and authority, level of directness and attempts at cooperation by interlocutors. In this way, I was able to examine and code the data. Saldaña (2009) advises that the researcher know his data in-depth. Saldaña, (2009, p. 18) draws from Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995), who advise that, during coding, one should keep in mind the following (adapted here for my study):

- What are María José and her students doing? What are their actions?
- What are they (both teacher and students) trying to accomplish (either as a group or separately)? What are their possible intentions?
- How are they using directives in what they say and do?
- What assumptions might they be making? Will I be able to verify this in a subsequent interview?
- Is my data detailed enough so as to be replicable and “put a third party in the moment” from my descriptions? (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995)

Any opportunity I could take to review data, examining it from different perspectives, was an advantage for me in my analysis. As Stake observes, analysis can assume an impressionistic quality, my first impressions to be included as part of the
overall interpretation, so transcriptions and proofreading offered me a chance to review my data (Stake, 1995). This was part of the inductive, semi-structured approach that I anticipated using at the outset of data collection. Nonetheless, I also recognize that some coding categories can be gleaned deductively from extant research. Similar to He (2000), I classified directives into purpose types (instructional, discipline) and lexicogrammatical (morpho-syntactic) forms (pp. 120-21). I decided which were which by taking note of the nature of the directive itself. Some directives seemed to do double duty; they showed students something or led them toward an educational objective, while seeming to focus as much on comportment. This did not necessarily seem antithetical to me: if a student is well behaved, that student can often also get the most out of the lesson. As an example, in the following passage, there were two aims when, during reading time, Ana clutched an oversized stuffed Clifford-the-Dog doll, but María José appealed to her:

_Sabes qué Si vamos a leer ahorita Si puedes por favor sentarte_ [Ana moves Clifford to the floor as she “kneels down” and looks at MJ for a period of before approx. 6.5 seconds, then looks under the sofa and moves Clifford there] _y vamos a ((inaudible)) y tú puedes abrazarlo a Clifford ok_ [categorizing [sic] these directives may be difficult, as MJ wants the class to sit still so that she can teach—_hay dos objetivos_]

(You know what? We’re going to read now. If you can please sit down [Ana moves Clifford to the floor as she “kneels down” and looks at MJ for a period of before approx. 6.5 seconds, then looks under the sofa and moves Clifford there] and let’s ((inaudible)) and you can hug Clifford, ok?) [categorizing [sic] these
directives may be difficult, as MJ wants the class to sit still so that she can
teach—there are two objectives) (O5.2)

I was consistent when, for example, María José used the directive of saying, “Hands
here [in your lap] or here [on the table],” before starting a lesson. This, I deemed, was an
instructional directive and addressed a larger institutional objective—socialization—as
well as a practical one—being able to proceed with the class where no one had anything
in hand.

I divided my directives into classroom management directives and instructional
directives. Table 3.3, below, shows overall count of directives. There was a total of
1,229 directives in the corpus, divided, as the table shows, into 290 classroom
management directives and 939 instructional directives. There were always fewer
classroom management directives than instructional directives, in some cases (e.g.,
Observation 10), far more. Whether I classified the directive as a classroom management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Classroom Management Directives</th>
<th>Instructional Directives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directive or an instructional directive had to do with María José’s seeming motivation at
the time of the utterance. For instance, if she said, “cuando estamos a la hora de la
lectura (.) [leans back] debemos de estar sentados [puts hands on legs] criss cross”
(when we’re in reading [leans back] we should be seated [puts hands on legs] criss
cross), I classified as an instructional directives since she was getting the group ready
for a lesson (Observation 6, Segment 3). During my token count I separated an utterance
into two if there were different motivations, different moments, audiences or markedly
different responses. For instance, during a lesson on planting seeds, María José asked the
whole group to pantomime throwing dirt on themselves but, when she noticed Jenny was
not participating, said the same thing to Jenny : “Vamos a echarnos tierra” (Let’s throw
dirt on ourselves) (Observation 8, Segment 1). However, if she went around saying the
same thing but to different speakers, each counted as a separate directive in my token
count.

Once I had divided directives in my corpus into instructional and discipline
directives, I loaded directives into the IMPYRA system. During the reconstruction
process called for by AIDA, I asked myself what María José was doing to be more or
less direct in speech or gestures and what the students were doing to show that they
needed to infer less from what María José was asking. This process also gave me the
chance to make decisions as to what constituted a direct directive, such as when María
José bent down to rebuke two male students very harshly, including their responses (one
was ashamed to the point of tears, while other one seemed to be embarrassed, his eyes
glazed over) (Observation 4, Segment 1). It was then that I began to notice patterns, for
example, when the teacher would use certain phrases or phrase types, such as the “collaborative completion” (Szczepek, 2000) or a “designedly incomplete utterance” (DIU) (Koshik, 2002) (see Chapter 4 for further explanation). I saw María José beckon for answers (Memo 4). María José also created patterns herself when she built routines with the students, which she deemed invaluable for her preschoolers. Sorting directives via IMPYRA afforded me the opportunity to see where these patterns were breaking down, for instance, when María José would not use a collaborative completion or DIU structure in her discourse or, on the other hand, when a student would not respond in the way that she deemed appropriate.

The IMPYRA tool also allowed me to code my data according to categories such as context or linguistic forms. I did not count discourse markers, such as, ¿Sabes una cosa? (You know something?) or Oye (Listen) as a directive unless it was preceded or followed by a directive, such as “enséñenme” (show me) (Observation 7, Segment 2) or “Venga a ver cómo se pinta Oye Ana” (Come see how to paint. Listen, Ana) (Observation 7, Segment 1). Other forms that did, however, count as directives were utterances like the affirmative or negative imperative forms (“Bring me your paper” vs. “Don’t just stand there”), the jussive mood (usually as a periphrastic (phrasal) form such as “Let’s all listen”), or as a declarative (“Vas a irte de esta clase” (You’re going to go from this class) (Observation 4, Segment 1) (Butt & Benjamin, 1988, p. 285) or “puede” (you can) statements that either grant permission (Ervin-Tripp, 1976) or challenge students, as in, “Can you count to twenty?” or make a threat, as in, “Anyone who misbehaves can leave the classroom!” Some questions would seem to be a request using “¿Puedes...?” (Can you…?) whether as statement giving permission or as a question per
se ¿Me puedes enseñar...? (Can you show me...?) (Observation 10, Segment 2). In all, although I found the instrument itself lacking, IMPYRA formed a valuable part of my analytic arsenal, as it prompted key questions.

Also in the present study, as I reconstructed the discourse, I took note and coded for teacher expectations, perceived relationships, and routine reminders. Expectations had to do with María José’s interactional strategies and ideals-in-use, and routine reminders had to do with establishing routines, both of which fall under action-implicative themes of AIDA. Perceived relationships had to do with how direct or indirect she was addressing students. Further, I noted when directives seemed to stem from exasperation, while also noting if the directive is delivered in a more threatening and cajoling tone or one with comedic undertones.

Also in keeping with the primary theoretical framework, AIDA, was motivation. The valuable question that helped guide analysis was, *What were María José’s motivations at the time?* As I describe above, the observation form gave space for description and contemplation around her motivations. In addition to being codes, these became analytic memos or topics to pursue in memos or interviews. There were times that she had not noticed a particular student say or do something, and there were times that she told me that, given her position as teacher, she felt she had to be more or less harsh with a particular student. In the pilot study, when the teacher was with the group that was comprised of learners from both the different learning groups, what determined which “tool,” or strategy, she used reflected her expectations and her perceived relationship with this group or certain individuals. Said strategies of interaction between María José and her students had to do, according to my framework, with how she
perceived them, how she sought to implement mandates from the school district and from the state, and in both cases, how she thought best to use one particular utterance and/or gesture over another.

In applying the AIDA framework and its concomitant methodological approach of grounded practical theory, which used reconstruction, I was able to reconstruct series of key exchanges. As an analytic technique, Conversation Analysis forefronts the question, *Why this now?* in other words, *Why would María José utter a particular directive and at the same time makes particular gestures to a particular student of group of students and given a particular situation?* Tracy (2003) has argued against giving too much analytic emphasis to small-level interaction in favor of reconstructing discourse with a larger analytic lens, but this question remains, I believe, a valuable one to ask during analysis. Before I reconstructed key interactions, I returned to the original video so that I could verify if what I had transcribed and taken notes on really happened in the way I had thought, in order to see the data with a fresh pair of eyes. To return to Saldaña (2009) and following AIDA’s methodological approach, reconstructing interactions, I asked myself what each interlocutor was trying to accomplish? What could be the possible motivators and assumptions for their utterances and for their responses? Finally, as I take a step back, would another analyst reach the same or similar conclusions from my reconstruction?

**Validity**

As I move into analytic the chapters, it seems appropriate to address the validity of this study. As Stake (1995) argues, “Qualitative study has everything wrong with it that its detractors claim” (p. 45). It is subjective in voice and often assumes a “personalistic” tone (Stake, 1995, p. 46). What is more, it often fails to yield what
should look like valid conclusions *per se*. Furthermore, “[t]he results pay off little in the advancement of social practice” (Stake, 1995, p. 45). This has steeled my resolved, however, beckoning me to ask: how will my strategies ensure or at least approach validity? In this section, I adhere to the basic frame regarding validity proposed by Maxwell (2005) and add other elements *ad hoc*. Validity calls for various strategies that help allay threats and instill confidence in the researcher’s ability to carry out a rigorous, thoughtful study (Merriam, 1998).

The first element of the frame is intensive long-term involvement (Maxwell, 2005). I had begun informal talks with the María José the spring before I conducted this study, and I was in the class making formal observations the following fall, from September 10th, 2015, until January 12th, 2016, just after Winter Break. My final time with the group was an end of year multicultural celebration, May 6th of 2016, in which the students performed a dance, “El Baile de las Chiapanecas” (The Dance of the Chiapanecas region of Mexico) for the rest of the school. So, I had gotten to know the previous class, and I observed María José with the focal group of students for almost the entire year, although observations were limited to the months of the first semester.

However, time spent in the setting does not guarantee richness of data (Merriam, 1998). Observations must consist of “detailed descriptive … videotaping and transcribing,” and all told, I transcribed 19 observations consisting of 251 pages (Maxwell, 2005, p. 110). I also relied on rich interviews, which must include “verbatim transcripts [rather than] … just notes on what you felt was significant” (p. 110). I transcribed a total of 55 pages of interviews, broken down into 15 interviews (19 pages)
with the students and six interviews (36 pages) with Marí José. I wrote 24 memos totaling 22 pages.

Additionally, data collection has consisted of re-viewing videos and reviewing notes. As with an art project such as a painting or sculpture, the work is never finished but only abandoned, the artist having left it for the time being to do other things. For myself as the researcher, I left the corpus in order to begin analysis, all the while asking myself, “were the interviews reliably and validly constructed; was the content of the documents properly analyzed; do the conclusions of the case study rest upon data?” (Merriam, 1998, p. 199). For, understanding both from the perspective of the participants is the key, “the primary rationale” to making valid claims (Merriam, 1998, p. 200). Regarding validation, in interviews, I systematically asked both Marí José and the students, in small groups, about particular interactions.

Additionally, without compromising participants’ names or other identifying information, I presented different portions of my data and analysis at academic conferences— the Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO), in 2012 and 2016, and the Conference for Culture Language and Social Practice (CLASP), 2015—in order to glean feedback from colleagues. It was at these conferences that I would ask my audience both the general question, “What do you see in the data, given the instruments I have used?” and the more specific questions, “Would the teacher have spoken differently to another student?” or “How else could this student have interpreted the teacher’s directive in order to respond the way he or she did?” each time referring to different interactions that I described. With these questions, I was searching for any alternative explanations, counter scripts, discrepant evidence, or negative cases. In
examining and re-examining my corpus, I would step back on a regular basis, usually about once every four observations write-ups, and re-examine my data, asking myself what I see and if any negative cases emerged. One observation that really shaped this study in 2012 was a question from an audience member: “How do the students respond?” Early on, my study had consisted, like others studies reviewed, of examining only the directives without regard to the response by interlocutors.

Maxwell (2005) contends that even qualitative studies have an element of a quantitative approach, a statistical bent, that may speak to validity claims. To a certain extent, the present case is generalizable—there are many other preschool bilingual classes with the same or similar makeups as María José’s. As such, I can claim that similar preschool bilingual teachers in the U.S. are probably addressing their classes in similar ways and with similar responses from their young students. This speaks to internal validity of this study and its methods. At the same time, this study retains its sense of particularity—deep enough inquiry finds places, particularities, in which her class was different. So, there were few if any comparisons to other classrooms or to similar research in the review of literature. The great comparisons to be drawn here are those between what María José expected by her directive and how students actually responded.

Since this is a case study, I collected information from only one classroom, opting for depth in a single setting over breadth across several settings with multiple teachers and multiple classrooms-full of students. With respect to triangulation, then, the key is “providing enough description so that readers will be able to determine how
closely their situations match the research situation, and hence whether findings can be transferred” (Merriam, 1998, p. 211).

**Limitations**

If involvement in the class rendered me more subjective, then perhaps this subjectivity and not seeming scientific enough come across as liabilities. These are limitations. I also explored the possibility that the lack of breadth that a case study offers may count as a limitation, as I did limit this case to a single classroom. Many case studies (Stake, 1995) do, in fact, compare their own cases to other, similar ones. With this study, however, I never ventured into another classroom for any appreciable period of time nor even on the teacher’s aide or volunteer or parents, preferring, as I say, to focus on rich and varied description on the one classroom and its primary participants. My takeaways were never necessarily generalizeable or necessarily applicable elsewhere.

It was here that I addressed both Stake’s (1995) argument that qualitative research has its limitations and thus can often fail to advance real change in social practice. This study, as consistent with AIDA, has an activist bent, so the type of intervention that Stake (1995) implicitly calls for and that Maxwell (2005) describes—open communication with key participants, often yielding interventions that can be analyzed and evaluated—aligned well with my study. This is addressed in next section, Researcher Positionality.

**Researcher Positionality**

In fact, my experiences in bilingual classrooms and have rendered me an advocate for better teaching for our bilingual and bicultural children in the classroom. Over the course of 10 years of teaching, I taught many students who were bilingual and bicultural (these days often called “linguistically and culturally diverse”) fully aware
that this sort of positioning of my own subjectivity rendered me more resolute in viewing education through the eyes and ears of students. For me, to position myself as an advocate means, as Ball (2012) asserts, remaining relevant in the classroom and aligning myself and my position to the theme encapsulated in the Latin phrase *Non satis scire* (To know is not enough) (p. 283) and which invokes Cesar Chávez who said that, “all knowledge should surely be service to others” (as cited in Ball, 2012, p. 283).

My study serves to highlight miscommunication, while at the same time calling for improved communicative acumen. For if, because of this study, a teacher can improve upon his teaching practices, so much the better for the state of preK-12 bilingual education in districts across the nation and abroad. My position is that bilingual education can and should be “done” right, with care—care of the children, care of the subject matter, and care of the language, as Valdés (1996) advocates “*con respeto*” (with respect) for the home culture and as Ware (2002) urges as a “warm demander,” firm but caring. A teaching style that “missed the mark” contrasted sharply with one that had this calm, direct demeanor that Ware describes and that I discuss below.

As mentioned above, observations in the bilingual classroom in which I conducted pilot studies revealed that students did not always listen to their teacher and that, conversely, the teacher did not always make herself out to be understood by all learners. I noted, furthermore, that certain teachers and even teachers’ aides had more facility with language than others did. Not only did they seem “smoother” in their linguistic delivery, but as I witnessed (albeit as yet, as an outsider), students responded to them. They kept their gazes on the aide for longer than on the teacher. They responded, whether physically (by turning the page, or looking or pointing when
where they were asked to) or verbally. As an outside observer, I was able to make certain assessments that teachers who were “in the process” of their teaching day may not have seen. On the other hand, when I sat down to speak with these teachers, I noted that there was a great deal about the background of the students or context of a lesson that I did not know. It is for this reason that I took up the charge to conduct this study. My role in this study was primarily that of an observer, and I interacted with the teacher and students only when the need arose.

Summary

Analysis of directives, both in their expression and in their interpretation, leads to larger analytic questions about the nature of education and the nature of social relationships in the classroom. Certainly, classrooms are settings where instruction and discipline move according to the teacher’s guidance and according to practices that are being established and inculcated. Teacher and student actions can make reference to relationships, and a mere word or a seemingly unrelated combination of gestures can initiate an action or chain of actions that, to the outsider, may seem not to make sense.

Yet, there are larger forces at work. María José taught under mandates, explicit or implied, of large institutional forces, viz., the state preschool office, the school district, or even a word from the principal or assistant principal. Aware as she was of her charge to instruct by communicating particular teaching points, she operated with authority that their position afforded to her, although she also wanted to remain cooperative and express herself so that her students would comprehend her and express that they had done so. Another large force was that of socialization, closely related to the discipline directive, which showed itself as either direct or indirect communicative forms. The
Theoretical framework of this study played out in the utterances and gestures of the key players in the class, which brought out the various themes that I discuss in this chapter.

It is for this reason that, in the parameters of this study, I assume a wide range of possibilities for a directive, as any utterance, gesture, or combination thereof aimed to effect student behavior. Analysis in the following two chapters will delve into interaction and the motivations for them. Whether for outright academic instruction or matters of comportment (individual student behavior or overall classroom management), a directive represents a learning opportunity, one that may be lost if not capitalized upon by a skilled teacher. By examining how and under what circumstances teachers issue certain directives and how students interpret them, we stand to learn something profound about the way that all humans, not just emergent bilinguals, follow direction or fail to do so, about the way that they learn or fail to learn. The intention encoded into the range of directives, whether in Spanish or English, stands to say a great deal about the nature of a relationship between a teacher and her students. Analysis of how directives are expressed and interpreted in the classroom will add to the body of literature regarding how children in educational environments and other settings endeavor to understand (and demonstrate the understanding of) teacher directives.
Chapter 4: Classroom Management Directives

As the analytical portions of this case study, the following two chapters examine directive-response interaction through the lens of the framework discussed in Chapter 1 and how, through directives, the teacher, María José, assumed different positions (different roles) while students gave her authority or not by responding to those directives in various ways. In her directives, María José showed varying degrees of directness in her utterances and gestures. As I observed María José with this preschool class, I kept in mind four elements to the theoretical framework from the introductory chapter, reiterated here:

1 and 2. Position and Authority: María José fulfilled different positions or roles, whether set forth by administrators, by her own sense of duty to teaching, or by the educational situation at hand. Her directives expressed these positions. As defined previously, authority is the amount and type of compliance that the listeners showed, in the form of acquiescence. Students complied in different ways, which María José seemed to view as either resistance or not, depending on context.

3. Level of Directness: in her utterances and in her gestures, María José’s directives were either more or less direct with her students. My examination of the corpus revealed that some directives were more direct than others, some utterances and gestures adding to or subtracting from the level of directness.

4. the Cooperative Principle: María José sometimes uttered directives that made attempts at maintaining or improving interpersonal relationships, as well as expressing directives that were age appropriate and developmentally appropriate.
This chapter deals with the directives in María José’s class whose aim it was to bring or maintain order in the classroom, as well as the response from students to these types of directives. In analyzing the classroom management directives that I observed, along with their concomitant responses, I look at the communicative locus and how each participant, the teacher and student or students, contributed given their local and ideological contexts. Following the theoretical framework and the reconstruction analysis, I examine classroom management directives with respect to position and authority, varying levels of directness and indirectness, and level of cooperation. In this chapter, I first define this class of directive for the purposes of this study. I then introduce a schema that draws from _Figure 1.1_ and _Figure 1.2_ but adds to it in that it addresses issues specific to classroom management. Drawing from a key element in the theoretical framework, I describe the use of IMPYRA, an inventory instrument designed to determine, at least in part, directness in language. I found that María José used directives in three principal ways as for classroom management, and I examine these in turn. First, she used them as tools of socialization. As revealed in observations and underpinned by interviews, María José was constantly creating a foundation of knowledge for them to use throughout their time in preschool and in later years. Sometimes the class ran smoothly, sometimes not, and she also used classroom management directives to quell students, that is, to direct them so that they are quiet and still, or at least quieter and more still than beforehand. This constituted her second use of classroom management directives. Finally, María José used this class of directives to facilitate transitions and get students ready for instruction.
Defining the Classroom Management Directive-Response

The classroom management directive is one that seeks—though perhaps does not always succeed in attaining—a sense of order in the classroom. In her study, He (2000) defines this type of directive as “disciplinary directives,” which perform multiple duties, sometimes calling attention to students’ questionable behavior, sometimes adding a moral component to this behavior, and/or sometimes using mandates aimed to rectify behavior (p. 131). Every teacher has his own sense of order, and in the case of the focal teacher for this study, María José saw classroom order and classroom management directives as maintaining order so that she could teach (Interview E_MJ5). I would extend the definition slightly to include both He’s (2000) more abstract definition and María José’s more pragmatic definition: in the classroom, María José endeavors to maintain her authority in order to keep order in the classroom so that, indeed, students may remain focused and María José may continue to teach.

With management directives, there were so many linguistic, paralinguistic/prosodic and extra-linguistic features that a neat directive-response classification was difficult to find. She oriented some directives toward one student, while, at other times, she addressed the entire group. While more responses would yield potentially more variation of responses and, therefore, more likely become a higher level (Level 4 or 5) under analysis, there were times that students all complied (“silent acquiescence”). In fact, one could say that María José’s goal was silent acquiescence in many cases. This made for myriad responses, as particular students held divergent positions, as either direct listener, member of a group of listeners, bystander, or eavesdropper (Bell, 1984). However, as I found, when María José would directly rebuke one student to listen (an instructional directive), many others would comply as well.
There were others who would not comply, which leads me to my second point: not all students followed up on these directives in the same way. Bear in mind that María José was not just issuing directives, saying things that were more or less direct; rather, in a semiotic bundle (Arzarello, 2006), she would utter a directive with different intonation and rate of speech, while gesturing, or she would concatenate directives one after the other. Discovery of such a detail as this concatenation would lead me to examine large-scale forces and María José’s position. Rather than look at what María José was doing with each directive, I let the framework guide the analysis in moving certain elements to the forefront.

In Chapter 1, I introduced the communicative locus, the theoretical point at which speaker and listener converge upon a sometimes negotiated meaning, and I schematize the idea in two figures, *Figure 1.1*, which shows only the locus itself, and *Figure 1.2*, which elaborates upon it by showing how the locus may be contextualized. Below is a further elaboration of the figure, which, for the purposes of this chapter, takes

![Diagram](image)
into account the classroom management directive. At the communicative locus, students interpret the teacher’s utterance and perhaps negotiate an understanding of it. The students negotiate from their emerging definitions of authority and classroom order, perhaps likening these to what they find in their home lives. The teacher operates from large-scale forces such as instructional ideals and educational objectives and institutional forces such as position and authority. On the teacher side, she is the one who operates from ideals in the classroom (“This is the way that students should respond,” she might have said). Not to say that the students are not aware of ideals in the classroom. Both parties employ local strategies of directness and cooperation, both for expression and comprehension, since each strives to be considered a good student or teacher.

**IMPYRA for Classroom Management Directives.** The analytic tool I used to judge the level of directness, IMPYRA, proved useful in examining María José’s use of directives and her students’ responses. It was with this class of directives that she showed how close or far she felt with a student. For example, with Ana, she said that she felt for her, as she was the youngest in the class. On another occasion, María José expressed her frustration with Ana, who used words to hurt her friends (Interview E_MJ1) (Memo 2). I explore more of this interaction in the next chapter, but with respect to classroom management directives, what I saw (María José negotiating with Ana) contrasted with how she felt she should treat Ana (more strictly). After watching the negotiation and classroom order begin to break down, I wondered how much leeway she tended to give this one student. A key factor here is cooperation: María José sought more cooperation from Ana and her classmates, and sometimes she felt she could cull
more cooperation from the students treating them with kid gloves, while at other times she felt that having an orderly class meant exercising more strictness and less leniency.

While some directives at the communicative locus can be characterized as austere and forceful, others can assume the quality of a hint or, as above, a reminder, for which Maríá José prompted behavior in a more subtle way. The level of directness, then, had to do with Maríá José’s position, as well as the cooperative principle, discussed below. For instance, Maríá José’s sharp rebuke to Michael and James prior to sending them off to their places at the beginning of Morning Circle in mid-September was exacerbated by her tone, her rapid rate of speech, her gaze (looking directly at both James and Michael), her countenance close to theirs, and pointing (Observation 4, Segment 1). At the end of her rebuke, she uttered a tag question, “*(Me) estás oyendo?”* (Are you listening to me?), and when she straightened up, both students knew where to go without being told directly or indirectly to find their spots on the rug at which Morning Circle was held every morning. Heard in isolation, the question “Are you listening?” can be a neutral question, and with the added “to me,” the proximity of Maríá José’s face to the students’ as she leaned into them, tone, and rate, the directive became that much more direct and stark.

To add to the directness of Maríá José’s directive here was the fact that both students knew that they were being disciplined harshly. They both met her gaze, and both acknowledged her when she asked, “*Me estás oyendo?”* However, each of them reacted in a different way: while James let his head hang down and nodded dejectedly, as he sulked away, Michael nodded vigorously. The camera angle did not allow me to see his facial expression during the exchange; however, Michael did not seem dejected,
and when he turned to go back to his place on the rug, he was smiling. True, his smile may have been one of tension rather than outright glee, but it certainly contrasted to James’s expression. Additionally, James’s brother Simon was smiling, perhaps out of embarrassment at the display of high emotion. All this adds to the dynamic of classroom interaction, beginning with the directive, but examining other elements as well:

IMPYRA allows one to examine the utterance and response, and then the contextualizations. In the following section, I focus on how María José used these utterances for different aims, one of which was socialization.

Classroom Management Directives Used to Socialize the Class

Physical Spaces. In María José’s classroom, socialization had a great deal to do with physical spaces and how students interacted within them. In the first observation, I noted a rug (see Figure 4.2, below) with an alphabet chart and, around the room, space given over to different Learning Centers, such as a science area with a magnifying glass, leaves, and rocks; an area for play with clay; and a water table (Observation 1, Segment 1). Indeed, one of my first observations, after noticing these artifacts was that, from an outsider’s perspective, they seemed to me to be “typical” (Observation 1, Segment 1). This comment prompted me to challenge it almost immediately saying as a form of
push-back speaking to myself, “How do you [i.e., How would I] define ‘typical’? What does this mean? Moreover, what do María José and the students do with these artifacts?” (Observation 1, Segment 1). María José often contended that she was building a foundation, as they came into preschool, to paraphrase her, knowing practically nothing (Interview E_MJ3) and having done “NADA” ([stated emphatically] NOTHING) (Interview E_MJ5). The daily calendar, the rug, as well as the songs, rhymes, chants, and stories, and the routines that they shared all formed part of this foundation. In the following chapter, I explore how this foundation and what she was trying to teach as part of it, were counter to what she felt the administration desired. With respect to classroom management directives, these artifacts served the purpose of helping socialize the students. As I say in the previous section, María José felt that classroom management and order could either come in the form of greater control over one or more students or as more lenient treatment of them. Whichever the case, it always came in the form of interpersonal relationships she had with the students. They became accustomed to
having her in position as leader of the class. As aforementioned, authority is what students granted their teacher as a form of compliance.

**Positioning Herself and Her Directives.** I saw many instances in which María José had to choose—or had already chosen—a particular position, whether to assume one of the many roles that Castellà et al. (2007) propose teachers do: in this case, whether to come across as more harsh or more caring. Were the teacher to come across as too much lenient, the student response might not show authority to the teacher and not comply. On the other hand, too harsh a demeanor and the relationship might be compromised or ruined (Ninio et al., 1994). The teacher who yells or demeans the student attains the short-term goal but likely misses out on the long term objective of nurturing a personal relationship. So it was with Britani, one of the youngest students of the group who, as María José once confided in me, would often arrive late to school because she had trouble waking up in the morning.

**Positive outcomes.** Early one morning in mid-October, María José had the rest of the class in Morning Circle, ready to start the day, with Britani and Alex having left the table running. Her speech then turned softer as she turned toward them and made a “come here” gesture with several fingers as opposed to crooking a single finger. As she led Britani back toward the table, she said, “Britani ven…ven ven” (Britani come…come come). She then took Alex by the hand and said, “Vamos a practicar…Va:mos a practicar…Nos sentamos Al↑ex” (Let’s go practice…[elongating the vowel] Le:t’s go practice…We sit Alex…[elongating the vowel]…). She pulled out a chair for Britani, who sat down, while Alex sat down on his own. She continued: “Nos sentamos bien O:k nos va:mos a sentar en el piso grande” (We sit well [elongated first vowel] O:k we’re
going to sit at the big floor). She walked back to where the class was seated in big circle
(big floor) and turned toward Britani and Alex, and made a “come here” gesture, this
time with both arms. She said, “O:k Se levanta Britani (.) Limpia la sill↑a” (elongated
first vowel) O:k Britani gets up, cleans the chair. She motioned again, this time with
one arm. “Ok ok” pointing to where Alex was, “La silla de allá Alex (...) Nos sentamos
en el pis↑o” (Alex’s chair We sit at big circle/big floor). Britani went over and stood at
the edge of the circle. María José continued, “Britani ve a sentarte en tu lugar por favor”
(Britani go sit in your place please). Britani then walked around Marcus, then skipped
beside Greta-Ann and Jesús to sit at her place. Shortly thereafter, Alex walked over and
sat and his place. María José continued with one more directive, this time to the group,
“Nos sentamos en el piso” (We sit on the floor) and then she began to sing a First
Nations (Native American) song, “Aguni-gunisha,” a song that signaled beginning the
day’s activity in Morning Circle. María José took time out for this management “lesson”
while the rest of the group was sitting in circle. Her patience, combined with directives
that were, at the same time, strengthened (via repetition) but attenuated (invitation form)
made for a calm set of interactions, in which students complied and even students not
directly involved waited patiently.

**Not-so-positive outcomes.** Despite moments like these, there were times that
María José experienced a certain tension with respect to interpersonal relationships
between her and her students. She often talked about today’s students being “praise
junkies,” students who, “vuelven aDICtos a hacer trabajo bien solamente para recibir (.)
la la el cumplido” (become ADDICTS to doing a good job if only
to receive a a a compliment / prize”) (Interview E_MJ5). I had asked her this because I
had noticed that there was a group of students who seemed to be entitled. These students would not listen to their teacher, and their behavior sometimes made her upset but whom she would still cajole.

Perhaps baiting her inadvertently, I asked her about “princesas” (princesses) in the class (though I admit I did not use that term when asking about the boys she favored) (Interview MJ_6). In one of my last observations, I did witness Ana point out the first letter of her name on an alphabet chart and then make a pre-request (Takano 2005) to María José to have the class applaud, which the teacher responded with, “A sí tenemos que darle su buen aplauso [todos aplauden]” (A yes we have to give her a good round of applause [everyone applauds]) (Observation 18, Segment 2). However, a look back at other instances of the use of calls for “aplausos” (applause) revealed that María José herself often called for applause. She had used these calls for applause to socialize them into showing gratitude, especially during Morning Circle, a time in which she routinized many activities. In time, from María José’s point of view, they came to want or even expect applause or other extrinsic rewards (Interview E_MJ5). Whether or not they had become “addicted,” or come to depend upon extrinsic rewards in the form of compliments, was subject to speculation—María José could have been exaggerating in the interview. I searched for counter-evidence, but I found that students did not seem to go readily or easily to the Morning Circle rug, to line up for computer class or to quiet down without at least some cajoling. During these instances, I saw her try different strategies to get them socialized into, as I say above, going to the rug for Morning Circle, lining up, or quelling them.
Student responses. I define socialization for these preschoolers as having students respond in a way that served to facilitate classroom management, which is to say that María José had expected reactions, for instance, when students become interested, really invested in, say, storybook reading, and she would want them to notice certain educational objectives (which I elaborate upon in the following chapter). However if the student were to become interested in the story or were to make a non sequitur comment, the teacher would have paused and tried to rectify the situation.

When reading the book *Los secretos de abuelo sapo* (*The Secrets of Grandpa Toad*), María José led the conversation toward being brave, at which point Alex suddenly commented, “*Yo cojo mi cuchillo de verdad y (?)*” (I take my real knife and ((inaudible))), at which point María José snapped and pointed at Alex, saying, “*Oye*” (Listen) (Observation 4, Segment 3). She looked up at me/the camera and continued “*eh pero >a ver a ver a ver a ver<*” (hey but let’s see let’s see let’s see), but Alex would not desist, holding his hands up and making an exploding noise, then crossing his arms, martial arts style, in a sort of pantomimed karate gesture. She had to explain that his reaction was off, first calling the class to order but then focusing again on Alex:

“*Escuchen una cosa la gente inteligente oye Alex >Alex Alex Alex<* (You all, listen to something Smart people Listen Alex >Alex Alex Alex<). He made one more martial arts motion, then pulled up his sleeve and showed his forearms to Ana, who was seated beside him. The teacher continued her train of conversation: “*Ser inteligente [points to temple with right index finger] y ser (.) [MJ makes two fists and holds them up close to her shoulders] VALIENTE es >para ayudar a los demás<” ↑Ok Al↑ex Al↑ex ¿s↑í? (To be intelligent is to be [points to temple with right index finger] y ser (.) [MJ makes two...
fists and holds them up close to her shoulders] BRAVE It’s to help others Ok? Alex? Alex? Yes?). At last, Alex pursed his lips, looked up, then cocked his head and nodded (Observation 4, Segment 3). During a lesson on bravery, Alex, María José deemed, seemed to have misconceptualized the term, and she had to struggle to bring him back to attention. Her repetitions in vocative case (“Alex”), and “Let’s see,” and her appeals to the rest of the class (“escuchen”) showed that not only was she working against a preconceived notion but that she had to concatenate many forms in order to refocus Alex and perhaps the rest of the class.

I often saw María José do just this, read a book, give an opinion or make an observation, only to have one or more students (sometimes the majority of the class) go awry in their interpretation (Memo 19). As it was, she had to re-interpret “brave” when once she had discovered that Alex had equated “brave” with “belligerent,” and this meant that she had to socialize them. This was part of her position as teacher—to get them ready for kindergarten and later years in school. An extension, then, of socialization is quelling of rowdy behavior, which I take up in the next section. A student interview with one of the shier, more well-mannered, boys, Jesús, shed some light on the sort of response that, in granting María José authority as leader of the class, also showed how they were being socialized. He said, “Es que y- yo yo J- yo yo siempre sigo a James pero ahorita no, no seguí a James ahorita” (It’s that I I I … I I always follow James but just now I didn’t I didn’t follow James just now) (Interview E_EPreliminary). A well-socialized class is also a calm and orderly class, and María José often had to call the class to order, in a word to quell them.
**Student Interviews.** I had known that student interviews would present a challenge (Interview E_E3). Students were not responding to my questions as adult or even older children might have. They would become shy, thinking that I was calling them to me in order to discipline or punish them. They would say very little, if anything at all and would, I noted, become “contrite” (Interview E_E3). This being the case, in the first three students interviews, their voices came across as very weak in recordings.

Over the course of getting to know me and becoming accustomed to my presence (and the presence of my camera and briefcase), they seemed to relax more. Or, I simply fell upon luck at the right moment, with the right students, or the right alchemy of outgoing, vociferous students in Michael, Ana, and Micaela in a series of expressive moments. In early December, they showed me how automatic it was for them to sing the first song of Morning Circle. This song, “Aguni-guni-sha,” seemed to quell students as they began activities based around Morning Circle. In the student interview, we had been talking about the song, and I asked them what they had to do when they heard it, hoping that they would tell me that they had to come to the rug and sit and sing. Not getting “real” answers, I finally asked Michael, “Michael (.) qué tienes que hacer cuando empieza a cantar la canción de ‘Aguni-guni-sha’ (..)” (Michael (.) what do you have to do when the song ‘Aguni-guni’ starts (..)) (Interview E_E14). Michael began singing the song from beginning to end. This to me was a sign of how socialized he was to hearing the prompt and singing the song. Significantly, other students present did not sing along, and while Michael continued to sing, another student came to me and tattled, telling me that Micaela was playing in the house, where even though she had not changed her name from blocks to the playhouse. This response of Michael’s was what
María José sought when issuing any kind of directive to her students. She also sought Ana’s response to my question to Michael: “qué tienen que hacer cuando empieza a cantar la canción de:” (what do you have to do when you start to hear the song of:) (Interview E_E14). I let the question trailed off but which Ana responded to anyway: “Sentarme con mis amigos” (Sit down with my friends), presumably at the Morning Circle rug (Interview E_E14).

Another interview response, one of defiance, also intrigued me. As I say above, it was Jenny who provided me with some of the most enlightening interview data. Interested as I was in her perspective regarding her response to the teacher’s prompts go sit on the small rug, I had her watch footage of her, “No,” and prefaced any question saying:

Me: Ok Ahora yo te quiero (.) volver a recordar que no- Jenny no: te estoy regañando (.) Ok (.) pero yo quiero saber por qué dijiste el No
Jenny: ‘Es que no quiero”
Me: Porque no quieres no quieres qué
Jenny: Porque (()) el- el bus
Me: Otra vez Cóm’o
Jenny: Y- y- yo fui a la bus porque está gritando todos los días e[n] la e[n] la bus
(Me: Ok Now I want to remind you again that I’m- Jenny I’m no:t scolding Ok but I want to know why you said this No)
Jenny: “It’s that I don’t want to”
Me: Because you don’t want what?
Jenny: Because ((inaudible)) the- the bus

Me: Again How’s that?

Jenny: And- and- and- I went to the bus because [?] is yelling every day o[n] o[n] the bus (Interview E_E13).

At this point, I let the question drop. However, filled with the “rage to know” (Freeland Judson, 1985), I later asked María José to help me shed light on what she may have meant. She first established that “no me gusta que mis alumnos me traten de … porque si me doy cuenta generalmente me enojo” (I don’t like that my students try to[get away with too much]…because if I see I generally get mad) (Interview E_MJ3). She admitted that she had “muchísima consideración” (a great deal of consideration) for Jenny’s home situation (Interview E_MJ3). This interpersonal feeling of consideration and understanding for her student’s home life, I believe, pushed María José to be both direct and indirect when dealing with Jenny. In the first place, she would seat Jenny close to herself, affording her the opportunity to touch her on the thigh or turn her body when she needed Jenny’s attention, (Observation 4, Segment 2). This sort of direct directive was not the type of in-your-face rebuke that I saw early in the year with James and Michael but rather reminder to sit still, keep your gaze here, or turn this way. On the other hand, María José was able to be indirect in that she did not notice or let her slide or gave her the latitude to look beyond her transgressions, such as a refusing, if only for a moment, to assume the role of Daily Helper or a bold faced, “No.”

**Classroom Management Directives Used to Quell the Class**

María José’s strategy to get students settled down (sometimes when it was plain that they were rambunctious and sometimes when it their state of order seemed less
obvious) oftentimes fell short, and I could sense her take a step back, pause, and resort
to some other strategy.

**Chiacchericcio and Chiacchere.** A case, similar in circumstance to the one
above, with Alex and his martial arts antics but different in response, occurred when
María José called the class to order during “clean up time.” It had to do with the notion
of **chiacchericcio** (generally pronounced /kya-kër-RĒ-chyo/) and **chiacchere** (generally
pronounced /kya-kër-REH/). For this study, I draw from the Italian notion and term
**chiacchericcio di sottofondo** (background chatter), or simply **chiacchericcio** (chatter)
which here characterizes a more unified, white noise of students voices and activity and,
as well, the plural form **chiacchere** (“chatters,” if you will,), in which one or two voices
rise and may dominate the din of voices and activity. On this morning in late September,
I noted the **chiacchericcie** to be mounting steadily (Memo 24) and particular voices
heard, in particular those of Ana, Greta-Ann and Greta-Teresa, whom she faced when
she said, “**Oigan (.) oigan (.) oigan** [cups her hands to her mouth] **Oigan niños a limpiar**”
(Listen (.) listen (.) listen (.) [cups her hands to her mouth] Listen children –to clean up)
(Observation 6, Segment 1). She had practiced—socialized—the class into cleaning up,
and when her directives, even strengthened as they were, failed, she sang, “**Nos
sentamos en el piso chiquito**” (We sit in the small floor). (The small floor was the floor
in the smaller of the two classrooms.) I noted that she sang this short verse a couple of
more times, but the students would have none of it. No one seemed to comply. I noted
that “**Greta-Ann** [grabbed] the hem of her skirt and [danced] a ballet-like step across the
room,” and that Jenny, in that moment, facing away from María José and the rest of the
group, looked up and said quite loudly, “NO,” with Spanish vowel articulation (i.e., no diphthongization on the vowel).

When I later asked María José about Jenny’s reaction, she said that she had not noticed Jenny’s response (Interview E_MJ4). Her reply to my interview question showed a certain tension, brought about, perhaps, by the contradiction as she became contemplative. With a lower voice and use of a rhetorical “step back,” saying, “La verdad es que” (The truth is that), María José proceeded to tell me about Jenny’s family, in particular her brothers, who are all older than she and are all special needs students at Bellamente Academy (Interview E_MJ4).

María José believed in socialization and in student accountability; however, under the circumstances, she extended to Jenny what she called “compasión” (compassion), though with select other students, she used the term “consideración” (consideration) (Interview E_MJ3). Though she claimed not to have heard Jenny’s, “No,” she understood that it could have represented her claim of identity in a family where there were so many with special needs. Jenny was the one who would not participate in a lesson on a budding seed (see Chapter 5 on instructional directives), who threw herself backwards when chosen to be the Daily Helper during Morning Circle, whom María José sat close to her during small group instruction, and whose response to my interview question as to why she had said, “No,” was a reticent “Porque sí” (Just because) (Interview E_E3). Over the course of my observations, she had a difficult time participating and seemed withdrawn, which contrasted sharply with her actions and seeming attitudes during a class party on one of the final days of school. Jenny’s parents and brothers came, and when she saw them, she squealed in delight and ran up to her
father to hug him, then during the rest of the party, stayed with them, smiling and chatting.

**Making a Note to Call a Student’s Parent.** In a slow way, calling attention to her words and the object of them, she would say for example, “Le voy a tener que dar un premio [points in Britani’s direction] a Britani” (I’m going to have to give a prize to [points in Britani’s direction] to, ah, Britani (Observation 10, Segment 1). On another occasion, when a pair of dental professionals had come in to talk about teeth and dental care, Maríá José seemed to want to have fun with the class, going through the dental professionals’ props and laughing at a select few of them (e.g, a two-foot long toothbrush), but she then began to struggle to keep the group quelled. The level of *chiacchericcie* rose and she stated, “>Nos sentamos en nuestro lug↑ar< (()) [Stands up and looks around] >Nos sentamos en nuestro lug↑ar<” (We are sitting in our place [Stands up and looks around] We are sitting in our place) (Observation 12, Segment 2). Of the whole group, only James looked up, and I noted, “other students are looking down, occasionally looking up at [Maríá José], except Ana and Alexander, who are talking” (Observation 12, Segment 2). Maríá José then upped the ante, effectively giving a directive (as a veiled promise): “Voy a tener que hablarle a la mamá de: Quién está haciendo un buen trabaj↑o [points to Jesús] A la mamá de Jesús porque e:s su niño (()) está sentado” (I’m going to have to call the mother of: Who’s doing a good job [points to Jesús] the mother of Jesús because her child ((inaudible)) he’s seated). I explore this directive more in the following section, but suffice it to say now that I noted that he remained seated and staring at Maríá José. An outsider, an observer new to the class, might have seen Jesús’s straight faced stare as lack of interest or even defiance. Quite
the opposite, as similar to Michael, Jesús had learned precisely what to do, to be still and not even celebrate being singled out for such a good reason. Indeed, this strategy of María José’s seemed to work well, as many students wanted to have their teacher send their parents a text message, voice message, or e-mail complimenting their good behavior. Jesús, then, had learned how to be quiet when María José called for it, even in the most indirect of ways. In fact, he had been socialized into sitting still and giving eye-contact to his teacher.

I include this strategy as a directive for two reasons: (1) María José used this tack almost always with the same intention, that is, as a classroom management directive (again, whether it seemed warranted to me or not); and (2) over time, student reactions for all students were just as consistent—to quell themselves and look up expectantly at María José. In my observations, I did see more use of this strategy in later than before, which is to say that she seemed to be relying on it more (Observation 16, Segment 1), rather than threatening to send unruly students elsewhere for a time out (Observation 4, Segment 1). For their part, students did not seem to perceive this as a threat (as if students were saying, “Oh, the teacher isn’t going to call my mom!”) or even a compliment per se, but rather as a signal to straighten up. By late October, students seem to have jelled and, at least during Morning Circle, they were not as fidgety as in early September.

Jesús seemed to be the best at responding to this type of directive, judging from his ability to garner praise from his teacher and even to lock his gaze on her while others would relax a little and begin to look around. By contrast, Alex would still allow himself to become caught up in a moment of emotion, say, a description in an exciting story or
the anticipation of a fun activity. She once assigned Alex the task of watching over the rest of the students while she tinkered with her laptop to take morning attendance. Alex stood up and looked around at the others. María José had to quell him: “Pero siéntate Alex Siéntate (But sit down Alex Sit down),” and I noted that, “he moved to his place but does not sit down right away” (Observation 14, Segment 1). Elements of this utterance rendered it strengthened, more direct: of course the repetition of the imperative form itself, but also the oppositional “but,” followed by the vocative “Alex.” Like Jenny’s, his response was one of resistance; however, his was more negotiated—he sat down eventually but at first he moved to his place but remained standing. He had been given a modicum of power by the teacher, power that he seemed not to want to relinquish.

I found that there was energy associated with the student responses. A seated student swings his leg, a succession of quick nods to denote agreement, understanding or at least under acknowledgement, or karate chops and exploding noises. These show that students do comply with teacher desires (as expressed through directives) but that they often include other actions, too. This may impede on the socialized, calm overall demeanor of the class and, by extension, detract from actual teaching, but even classroom management directives that lead to instruction are done so in ways that reflect position, authority, directness and cooperation.

**Classroom Management Directives for Transitions and Instruction**

I found the line between classroom management and classroom instruction a thin and porous one. A well-managed class allows the teacher to instruct well, while a well-executed lesson, with directives that are clear, makes for good classroom management as well. The following two sections demonstrate how María José used two particular
directives, which in turn facilitated her instruction. She used both strategies often and used truncated forms.

“**Hands Here or Here.**” María José often asked that her students place their hands in their laps or on their knees, saying, “*manos aquí o acá*” ([Place your hands here (in your laps) or here (on your knees)]), whether they were sitting on the floor with their legs crossed or in chairs or whether she was addressing a small group or the whole group. As *Table 4.1*, below, shows, María José often used this type of directive with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations and Segments</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Teacher Intention</th>
<th>Student Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 9.1, 12.1.2, 12.6, 17.1, 19.1</td>
<td>whole group</td>
<td>to quell the whole group, especially after moments of levity or comeback moments</td>
<td>range of different responses, usually in the form of a “negotiated compliance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1, 8.4</td>
<td>small group</td>
<td>to quell the group after a “wolf’s-howl” (“<em>orejitas de lobo...auuu</em>” (wolf’s ears…[wolf’s howl]); in one case, as a matter of course</td>
<td>- of the five, only Rosario looks up and puts her hands in her lap and only Greta-Ann lowers her hands back toward the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3, 6.3, 6.3, 10.4, 11.3</td>
<td>one student in front of the whole group Alex and Ana, Alex (in front of the whole group), as a sort of rebuke, as a way to preface a rebuke, even a gentle one, in the form of an explanation</td>
<td>to quell a student anticipated to become unruly Alex and Ana – As María José continued insisting that he put his hands in his lap or on his knees (“<em>¿Dónde van las manos?</em>” Where do your hands go?)</td>
<td>Alex looked down, perhaps timid or remorseful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1 Use of the “Hands here or here” directive*
whole group to quell the group when *chiacchericcio* began growing, I noticed, into *chiacchere*, that is, when the movement of two or three students began to become more noticeable above those of other students. Student responses ranged; however, in general, students granted these directives what I call “negotiated compliance.” Negotiated compliance, as opposed to “silent acquiescence” (described in Chapter 2) marks the beginning of compliance, but students would still remain fidgety or chatty for a while: a quick comment or a poke in the ribs to a neighbor, rocking back and forth twice more, or a glance at one’s hands before looking up again. With one exception, María José used this directive in the same way—to quell the group—whether addressing the entire group or a small group. On one occasion, she used the “hands here or here” directive as a matter of course, that is, seemingly out of habit. In that case, there was no response from the group.

There were times that she focused this directive on one student. When the entire group was present, she used “hands here or here” to quell a student, either before (in anticipation of) becoming off-task or after the fact. As above, students also responded differently. Alex assumed a remorseful expression, while with Ana, both times that this occurred, there was some added back-and-forth negotiation, far more than with the negotiated compliance. When she was addressing individual students in small groups or in one-on-one situations, she also “tagged” them, that is, touched them lightly on the back or on the arm. Interestingly, they seemed to do the opposite of a negotiated
compliance. When María José would hone in on a single student, using gestural strengtheners such as a directed gaze and a light touch, the student would comply immediately but when she would return attention to the small group, James would slouch or Jenny move her hands back to the table to play with them again.

When this “manos aquí o acá” (hands here or here) directive failed to get students into listening position, María José employed a different strategy. She would add a strengthener (she would “upgrade,” to use Labov and Fanshel’s (1977) term) in the form of a challenge. In the interaction in Observation 12, Segment 6, María José had been talking to the class about monkeys and other vociferous animals (viz. birds) that children often love to imitate, as well as their habitats. With the camera trained on Rosario, Jenny, James, Micaela, and Michael in that moment, I could see Michael rocking back and forth in his place in circle while Jenny grabbed her foot and pulled it toward herself and then played with the Velcro closure of the same shoe. This group became still for a moment, and they looked at and listened to their teacher before Rosario began to strum her wrist as if it were a guitar, James jammed his hands into the space between his legs, Micaela to play with her hair, and Rosario then to play with a sticker on her shirt. In short, the group was not rowdy, but nor was it the modicum of stillness and attentiveness. Then, Rosario began pantomiming swinging a pickaxe; Jenny began tracing a shape on the rug; James let his head drop and loll on his leg; Micaela began playing with her hair again; and Michael began shifting his weight side to side while seated. While she spoke to them about these animals and their habitats, the audio caught an occasional animal noise off camera. Additionally, there was a good bit of chiacchericcie coming from the classroom next door. (Remember that these two
classrooms were actually divided from each other by a partition that did not even reach the ceiling, so noise bled over easily.) She had students take a moment to breathe deeply, as they were showing, or so María José perceived that they were, themselves to be a little wound up or fidgety. What María José could see in her own classroom with the addition of the *chiacchericcie* from next door, I believe, precipitated this break and then her having to resort to the following upgrade.

In order to get students into listening position, she said, pointing to Micaela, “*Le voy a tener que hablar a la mamá de Micaela para decirle que su niña se sienta muy lindo (. .) y que tiene sus manitas aquí y [sic] acá*” (I’m going to have to speak with Micaela’s mom to tell her that her daughter is sitting wonderfully (. .) and that she has her little hands here and here) (Observation 12, Segment 6). It was possible that Micaela did not have her hands on her knees and on her lap at the same time, but I saw María José’s desire for consistency in retaining the phrase “*aquí o acá*” as she strengthened this indirect directive. In fact, as a directive, she was not directly or indirectly telling anyone what to do, but as I commented, the teacher is “[María José] just getting some mileage out of the phrase” (Observation 12, Segment 6). The fallout of this tack was that three voices in quick succession, those of either Alex or Jesús, perhaps Simon’s, and another voice, called out, “*Yo también*” (So am I) in quick succession (Observation 12, Segment 6). She received the response she desired, but as I went on to note, when she reverted to, “*Ojos aquí conmigo*” (Eyes here with me), “Marcus and Greta-Teresa look up but no one else does” (Observation 12, Segment 6). All this to depict how María José perceived the class and would call for order when, I thought, it was unnecessary, as the students
were not being too unruly. She could still lecture about animals and their morphologies and habitats.

**Lining Up According to…** As aforementioned the directive itself has a tendency to change via reduction; María José would tend to use *de facto* abbreviations in place of the full form, and even if she did use the full form, it may have been truncated or phonologically reduced (Bybee, 2001). Furthermore, students hearing a specific directive at the beginning of the academic year would respond differently than toward the end of this, their preschool experience. “Lining up according to colors or clothes” represents such a reduced, or indirect, directive, and can be a way for teachers to line up students in an ostensibly equitable way, while at the same time quizzing them on things like colors, kinds of clothing, or patterns.

Early in the school year, María José had been notified that a “quality checker” from the State Department of Education would be paying a surprise visit soon. The district offices in charge of preschool instruction had given her a sheaf of papers with checklists such as making sure she served students food while wearing gloves, locking cabinets—even those that were out of reach of students—and measuring the depth of the wood chips on the preschool playground, and she had her school identification showing at all times (rather than in a pocket or even turned around inadvertently as it swung on its lanyard). María José effectively had to wear a different hat to accompany her role as a teacher *per se*. She was now playing the part of a concierge, attending to details that, at best, were secondary, if not tertiary to her teaching role. Over the course of the weeks before the visit from this checker, I took note of how María José spent less time with the students in order to tend to the many details called for by this visit. This separate,
demanding role undermined her position as teacher, as María José, her T.A., her volunteer, the students, the students’ parents, and even I had been anticipating this visit, the tension and anticipation mounting daily. One morning in late September, María José had students line up at the door by calling on those with black shoes to line up, and then she said, “Se forman por favor lo niños o niñas que traigan BOTAS” (Line up please those boys or girls who are wearing BOOTS) (Observation 5, Segment 4). Instead of lining up right away, Greta-Ann told the teacher that she had on purple shoes, while Ana showed María José her black shoes on her way to line up. These routine-building directives I placed at Level 3. They contained the imperative form (i.e., “line up”), but additionally, they relied on routines created previously. These sorts of directives represent an oft-used technique to get students to line up. María José used this technique often, but the problem was that many students (as did Greta-Anna and Ana here) show her what counts first instead of just proceeding to the line.

On another occasion that I observed, María José had the students make a transition by lining up according to the colors and clothes of their shoes, beginning with khaki pants, then black shoes, and finally something pink, such as a shirt or shoelaces (Observation 6, Segment 2). In later grades, students are taught/learn how to do this more quickly and efficiently, but María José’s students had not yet acquired this notion, and as I wrote in my notes, as similar to the previous example: “they tend to show you the color they’re wearing and even, as Micaela does, say the color and wait for you (as teacher) to acknowledge that you’ve seen it” (Observation 6, Segment 2). Her directive “se forman por favor…” was steeped in routine and inculcated practice, which called on
the students to perform multiple tasks, even doing things beyond what María José may have anticipated.

Summary

Using IMPYRA, I was able to begin to examine the directness of certain utterances, beginning with this type of classroom management directives. Building a foundation for later years, María José used these directives to socialize the group. She contended that they knew very little and that it was her job to create the groundwork of routines, rhymes, chants, and songs that would aid them in kindergarten and beyond. Especially at this age, in light of the fact that preschool is the one of the first (if not the first) experiences for students outside the home, socialization presents inherent difficulties for the teacher. Constant reminding and care not to be overly harsh were factors that affected María José’s directives. Socialization is similar to a kind of quelling, and students did well to show that they had been socialized into following these management directives that sought to quell through their reaction of (1) being on task and (2) looking up at the teacher when recognized instead of celebrating.

The final type of these directives was that which more specifically sought classroom management to facilitate instruction. Sitting still, following routines, doing transitions quickly and quietly all would allow María José to teach more. The management directive and the instructional directive could be difficult to tease apart. There can be no instruction without at least a modicum of order in the classroom. Student understanding and follow-through of instructional (and management) directives relied on establishment of routines and on following previously seen models. In the following chapter, I examine these instructional directives.
Chapter 5: Instructional Directives

Where the previous chapter dealt with those directives that María José used for classroom management, as well as and students’ various responses to them, the present chapter examines those that were used for instructional aims. Once again, I look at interactions through the AIDA framework I established in Chapter 1, beginning with the directives as utterances themselves, as well as their responses. I take into account contextual features, as well as position and authority, directness and politeness. As with classroom management directive, with instructional directives, there were varying degrees of directness in María José’s utterances and gestures. Analysis revealed five large themes that I discuss in turn.

After discussing what I mean by an instructional directive-response, I focus on (1) moments in which she had to rein in the class in order to teach. I then examine (2) how María José felt pulled in two different directions that reflect the opposing side of a debate – giving direct instruction or providing space for exploration — I saw her struggle with these decisions. This struggle reflected in her directives. Sometimes, the students responded positively, sometimes not. This caused her to feel that (3) her position was being undermined, a third major theme. Without her sense of authority, her directives changed, as did student responses. I next discuss (4) how classroom routines were instrumental in instructional directives and student responses, with respect to physical position and other forms of contextualization. She used instructional directives as well to create spaces, and to give students direct language structures in a sort of Say-what-I-say directive. Finally, I look at (5) English instructional directives and how María José used them during English instruction.
The Instructional Directive-Response

The instructional directive communicates the intention of a didactic objective. In examining these directives, I asked myself, *How did María José use certain directives for instructional aims?* as well as *In responding, what do the students stand to learn?* To this end, María José uttered directives so that students would follow quickly and completely. However, as with classroom management directives, in analyzing instructional directives, I concluded that one cannot classify these directives so neatly as to say, *Every time María José said, x, the students did y.* Certainly she wanted students to be still, to listen and watch attentively, and to internalize what she demonstrated to them. Moreover, she wanted them to build a foundation for future years of schooling since, as she contended, students had very little life and school experience or even general know-how, especially those coming from the backgrounds in her class (Interview E_MJ5). As I observed María José with this preschool class, I kept in mind four elements to the theoretical framework from the introductory chapter, reiterated here:

1 and 2. Position and Authority: María José fulfilled different positions or roles, whether dictated by administrators, by her own sense of duty to teaching, or by the educational situation at hand. Her directives expressed these *positions.* As defined previously, *authority* is the amount and type of compliance that the listeners showed, in the form of acquiescence. Students complied in different ways, which María José seemed to view as either resistance or not, depending on context.

3. Level of Directness: in her utterances and in her gestures, María José’s directives were either *more or less direct* with her students.
4. the Cooperative Principle: María José sometimes uttered directives that made attempts at maintaining or improving interpersonal relationships, as well as expressing directives that were age and developmentally appropriate.

I allowed these key elements to lead the analysis, allowing them to open the door to background discussion on other themes. In Morning Circle, for instance, I looked across all observational sequences of Morning Circle and asked, with respect to directives, *What are large-scale forces at work? What is the educational objective?*

Returning to the schematic figure of the communicative locus, first discussed in Chapter 1, I draw attention to how the instructional directive at this locus brings together forces from both the teacher’s side and the student’s side. *Figure 5.1,* above, shows those forces and the negotiation for meaning that both interlocutors do when attempting to find meaning in the speakers directives, the speaker by choosing the right words for the situation (educational and interpersonal goals) and person or persons (students need a particular directive at this or that point). One of the most prevalent for María José was
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*Figure 5.1. The Instructional Directive:* at the communicative locus, the teacher’s utterance is interpreted by the student, with space given for negotiation. The teacher feels the pressure of large-scale forces such as instructional ideals and educational objectives and institutional forces such as position and authority. Likewise, both parties employ local strategies of directness and cooperation, both for expression and comprehension, since each strives to be considered a good student or teacher.
the conflict between providing direct instruction for these preschoolers and allowing them to explore openly.

**Reining in the Class**

As explored in the previous chapter, the primary justification for uttering classroom management directives was so that a particular student, small group or the whole group would be ready to learn. As such, María José assumed different roles with her class. As described in the section above, María José felt the tension between the educational objectives that the district was asking her to address and her realization that Latino students were not risk-takers when perhaps they would do well to be (Interview E_MJ5). Here, the teacher was moving them from a social activity to a learning setting. She was trying to include the whole group or at least as many preschoolers as she could as she settled them down for instruction. I found María José’s tack here similar to that of participants in similar research by Heath (1983) and Cazden (2001) in that there was a great deal of back-and-forth interaction and she seemed always to be learning new details about the students and revising her strategies for communicating with them. Regardless of whether socialization practices cross cultural boundaries in the same country—perhaps, across socio-economic boundaries, as in Heath (1983)—or cross countries and continents—as in Cazden (2001)—practices of establishing a foundation of socialization can resemble each other. Regardless of background, “children are born with a self-regulating strategy for getting knowledge by human negotiation and co-operative action” (Trevarthen, 1988, p. 39). What differs, of course, and what was crucial for María José or may well be for any other preschool teacher, is that the application be appropriate for both the age and backgrounds, including cultural and linguistic backgrounds, of these students.
Morning Circle to Rein in the Class. In her directives during Morning Circle, María José would rein in the students in order to get the instructional day started. This process had a great deal to do with routines, which in turn had a great deal to do with songs, chants, and rhymes. Effectively directives, these songs, chants, and rhymes eventually cued in students to follow along, to sing, recite or chant themselves, while mimicking the gestures that María José was leading. The first observations of Morning Circle, however, divulged the teacher more as a model, since students had not yet learned these songs, chants, or rhymes. For instance, the phrase that dismissed the Daily Helper, “hiciste un buen trabajo Jenny” (you did a good job Jenny) became effectively a chant, as María José delivered it in a “high voice, very rhythmically” (Observation 5, Segment 1). Furthermore, I noted, right afterwards, she called for “Un aplauso por favor” (Applause please), as which point María José “applauds and many, though not all, students applaud, too” (Observation 5, Segment 1). Not all students followed along, as opposed to in later observations of Morning Circle, in October and November.

As students learned more, she would beckon them to participate more “Vamos a cantarla un poquito más fuerte” (We’re going to / Let’s sing it [that song] again a little bit more strongly/loudly) (Observation 11, Segment 2). This cohortative (jussive) form, coupled with the attenuated diminutive (little bit more strongly, as opposed to simply, a little more strongly) prompted many students to respond. Indeed, María José used these chants, songs and rhymes, when combined with other highly routinized activities, to which many students responded. One could argue that this is the best time for a preschool teacher to direct the class in instruction (or even in management)—when students are responding en masse. However, here I would submit a caveat: when, in
Observation 11 (conducted in mid-October), María José said, “Vamos a cantarlo un poquito más fuerte” (We’re going to / Let’s sing it a little more strongly), class participation came and went:

James and Rosario raise their arms quickly to the rhythm of the music, while Micaela and Jenny are slow to raise her arms; by the time of the running arm movements, everyone in the camera’s view (Rosario, Jenny, James, Micaela, and Michael) are singing and making the gestures, and by the final portion of “Hola cómo está:s” [Hello how are you?], James is not doing the arm movements.

(Observation 11, Segment 2)

It is for this reason that quantitative counts of student response would fail to depict the classroom dynamic. Does one count this description as participation? Have students responded to María José’s position as teacher and as leader of the class? Is her authority reflected in James and Rosario’s quick response, in Micaela and Jenny’s slow response, or in James abandonment of arm movements late in the song? I would conclude that these students, even when not responding to María José’s directives as adults or even older children would, are indeed demonstrating learning by attempting to participate.

Furthermore, she was employing a very indirect directive by inviting instead of commanding and by using attenuators (“poquito,” little, in its diminutivized form). Part of her strategy, then, was to soften these preschoolers’ experiences, allowing them to participate when they could or felt they would be able to, as reflected in an interview in which she expressed that she always wanted for her students to want to come to school, to come see their teacher, to come see their friends (Interview E_MJ1). Over the course of weeks of observation, I began to note a change in student response even when María
José was less direct and either used attenuators or simply truncated forms of directives. She began using more prompts than outright directives, such as “Manos y boca” (Hands and mouth) when students were given sanitized wipes after eating and when just arriving at Morning Circle (Observation 10, Segment 1). However, shortly beforehand, she had said, “Ahorita estamos limpiándonos las manos y la boca” (Right now, we’re cleaning our hands and our mouths) and thus the short prompt (Hands and mouth) above might have been a sort of syntactically reduced (shortened) form of the longer version.

**Discipline versus Exploration. Concatenated Imperatives.** In her position as instructor of the class, María José would sometimes no longer allow them to play like children, in other words, no longer to indulge them but rather, as I argue above, to continue with the lesson. Her strategy to regain the class’s attention via instruction would include short, concatenated imperatives, “Miren [holds Jenny’s hand] Miren el vestido de- Oigan Miren el patrón Oyen” (Look [holds Jenny’s hand] Look at the dress of- Listen Look at the pattern You’re listening) the last directive no longer an imperative (Observation 5, Segment 1). At this point, I noted, students closest to her did look up at her and a short while later two more did, as well. However, the chiacchere forced her hand, and María José resorted to reining in the class by continuing the lesson and invoking rhythm: “Jenny [points to Jenny’s dress] tiene un patrón (very rhythmically as she points to the different colors on Jenny’s horizontally striped dress) ne:gro bla:nco ne:gro bla:nco ne:gro bla:nco” (Jenny…has a pattern…bla:ck whi:te bla:ck whi:te bla:ck whi:te) (Observation 5, Segment 1). It seems that, the short imperative exhausted, in the moment, she chose to show them something to which they might respond and which would lead to a lesson, rather than to more talk.
Discipline versus exploration. Remaining appropriate. Reining in the group had a great deal to do with, as I say above, remaining aware of what is appropriate for age and level of development. In fact, I noticed, María José constantly chose her battles, sometimes insisting that students sit still and keep their eyes on her, while other times allowing students to move around. At one point, she brought Micaela to the front to stand beside Alex, the Daily Helper, since they were both wearing similar shirts and pants, and she showed enthusiasm to find this coincidence. This, however, prompted Ana to mirror the enthusiasm to the point that she proceeded to get up and stand beside them to show off her clothes with a frilly skirt. María José commented “Nos vamos a nuestro lugar” (We go to our place) before looking at “even though Ana has been jumping up and down, apparently with nervous energy” (Observation 11, Segment 2). I asked her later about how she treated Ana. She contended at first that she did at times deal with Ana with a heavy hand and that she disapproves of her puerile behavior and dominio con sus compañeras (dominance over her (female) friends), but when I pointed out her use of such indirect directives and other treatment that showed favoritism (Interview E_MJ1), María José said that she does tend to give her leeway, since Ana is one of the youngest in the class.

Teaching, Learning, and Risk-Taking. There were other times in which, in her efforts to stay appropriate, she was a reminder or a taskmaster, keeping activities moving along. Sometimes it seemed that students may have been too hesitant to explore their world, her turn as taskmaster having succeeded too well. She sat down once, with another small group, laid out a synthetic animal pelt in front of them, and said, “Fíjense lo que tengo” (Look at what I have), which drew some, “Ooh’s” and “Aah’s” from these
five students (Observation 11, Segment 5). At first, I noted, no one from the group reached for the pelt; in fact, no one moved, even when she said, “Tóquenla” (Touch it) a first time. She then put five synthetic orange-colored feathers in front of them and said almost in a whisper, “((inaudible)) ‘lo que tengo aquí’” (What I have here?). At the same time, she said, “Lo pueden tocar (.) Tóquenla” (You can touch it. Touch it). My comment, “as if they were released coils, they all reach for the pelt without being rough about it,” showed that perhaps they were waiting and did not want to be rough about touching the pelt (Observation 11, Segment 5). She then said, “alcanza una pluma” (reach for a feather). Only Marcus, who was sitting farthest from the where María José has tossed the pelt, stood up slightly but this was just to reach for the pelt to touch it for a second, after which he sat back down. María José again encouraged them to be more engaged, saying, “Tóquenla tóquenla siéntanla… ¡Miren tóquenla!” (Touch it touch it feel it…[whispering] Look, touch it). Finally, María José pushed the pelt to Marcus and said, “¡Marcus… toca esto!” ([whispering] Marcus…touch this). The students’ response, this dire show of reticence, could be explained as natural shyness typical at their age, but one could also argue that students this age are naturally curious and want to grab, touch, and feel without prompting from their teacher. There were certainly moments that these and other students of María José’s were rambunctious and unruly, even during instructional time. She was doing a job to socialize them into school, to create expectations that, perhaps, would cost them their sense of curiosity. As I say above, part of creating successful response to instruction was establishing and practicing routines. A second major theme, as explored in the following section, was that she wanted to get them socialized, one would hope, not at a cost to their curiosity.
Instruction versus Exploration

María José grounded these ideological aims—direct instruction and exploration—in the form of strategies in the bilingual and bicultural classroom. Despite María José’s contention that the nature of preschool is, ideologically speaking, to explore one’s new worlds rather than simply to learn what the teacher instructs, I often found the opposite to be true. Students were often told what to think rather than being allowed to explore books, songs, situations, or the environment around them. María José stated in an interview that she valued independence and wanted students to know that life is not “suffer free” or “challenge free” (she used these terms interchangeably) (Interview E_MJ2) and, on more than one occasion, that she wanted to see her students take risks, that is, to explore their worlds (Interview E_MJ3, Interview E_MJ5). This notwithstanding, she acknowledged that in “nuestra cultura” (our culture), as she put it, children are taught to wait for direction from an adult, and it is an adult who often cautions them instead of allowing them to explore (Interview E_MJ6). This may be have been because Latinos, especially those who are first-generation immigrants, show more caution in their new environments, and they may pass this on to their children and students. Of course, in an ideal world, the bilingual teacher—Latino or not—allows students to take calculated risks and to explore their worlds in ways that lead to instructional points. However, as Buchsbaum, Gopnik, Griffiths, and Shafto (2011) suggest, doing so requires a great deal of planning, ad-hoc creativity, and experience.

Exploration and the Latino Teacher. At the time, she was making reference to Latino children of various ages, pointing out that children who come from families that have assimilated more tend to take more chances. I saw here a clash of ideals, that on the one hand, María José wanted her students to express themselves and exercise some
modicum of independence while, on the other hand, she inculcate them to wait for direction. I also saw a potential slight, since it may seem like María José viewed her students negatively, and as a teacher during an interview, she took note of her students and their disposition. At least during instruction time, María José wanted them to follow instructions rather than explore, a notion that, regarding students of this age, both researchers (Buchsbaum et al., 2011) and I (Memo 3) have found troublesome. The counterfactual, so to speak, is that, if students are allowed to explore anything and everything *a volonté* (to their heart’s desire), students may choose not to explore anything. During the day, there was time allotted for free play, while at other times, María José instructed them. Call this a compromise or getting the best of both worlds.

As María José intimated in an interview and as Gopnik (2011) and Buchsbaum, et al. (2011) have asserted, teachers can affect learning; they can teach to the points on the curriculum, or they can teach students how to learn, that is, how to be curious learners. According to María José, Latino or Latina teachers ruin their curiosity (Interviews E_MJ5 and E_MJ6). Although she was brushing broad strokes in making this generalization, María José reiterated this point from this interview twice again in informal talks. When she said this, she was drawing from her own first- and second-hand experience in pointing to how she felt students failed to take chances (though there were certainly times that they did take chances) and how teachers and parents failed to foster risk-taking in their students. She felt pulled in two directions—allowing students the leeway to explore their world versus feeling the need to teach them via direct instruction.
Vygotsky (1978) touches on this theme when he differentiates between teaching and learning with his term *oubuchenie* (roughly translated, training, or general instruction) which actually makes reference to two separate processes. By separating the processes of teaching and learning, he highlights how not everything that the teacher teaches is what the students learn and, conversely, not all lessons that students learn come in the form of lessons taught by their teachers. Vygotsky showed how students (children, in his case, whether in or out of school) learned a great many things on their own, as a part of a natural and social process. I kept this in mind with respect to María José’s preschoolers, who were sometimes reticent and shy (not curious) and sometimes rambunctious and needed more discipline and more socialization into the ideologies of school order.

**Potential Loss of Control.** On one occasion, when María José chose Jenny to be the new Daily Helper, the directive, in the form of a prompt of showing Jenny’s name card, which had been chosen at random, meant that that she was to come forward. This prompted other students to show “very excited giggling…and Jenny looks away with a huge smile on her face, and she angles her head so that she does a sideways dive and then turns so that she is flat on her back” (Observation 5, Segment 1). The giggling turned to laughter and then guffaws, and some students began throwing themselves backwards too, ending up lying face-up on the floor, all the while the *chiacchere* of the group grew. In fact, students were laughing not at anything that María José had said or done, but rather because of what she had not said or done, namely, to step in and give a word, akin to, “All right, let’s have order.” Students were not granting María José’s position any authority, but they were laughing at Jenny’s antics, condoning it by
following suit. It can be a very powerful thing for a teacher to laugh alongside one’s class or at least to allow *chiacchericcio* to grow into giggles and then outright laughter; it can build great rapport. The pitfall, however, can come in the form of complete loss of control of the classroom order (Hyland, 2002). The fact that she allowed the situation to proceed as far as she did demonstrated how she felt about an overarching situation that undermined her position, described below, and although she did indeed use certain strategies to restore order, she opened herself up to some critique. It also demonstrated to me that she felt the pull of the forces of the many hats a teacher wears in the classroom (Castellà et al., 2007), in this case of the instruction-versus-exploration debate (Buchsbaum et al., 2011; Gopnik, 2011).

The job of Daily Helper was a highly prized one during Morning Circle as part of a grand routine (elaborated upon below). When one of the students, Marcus, had been called forward as Daily Helper on a Friday morning, María José said, “*Ok fíjense*” (Ok look / pay attention), and then explained how there was no class the following day, as it would be Saturday, then proceeding with to say that the following day would be “*Do=***” (the first part of “*Domingo***” (Sunday). Students chimed in with the rest of the word for Sunday, “=*mingo***” (Observation 10, Segment 1). By keeping students on task, with a quick imperative and with a DIU, she was instructing rather than allowing them to explore the calendar, perhaps formulate questions and build vocabulary around it. Perhaps she was allowing them to take note of how –*day* comes at the end of the names of all the days of the week in English, while in Spanish, names of the weekdays always end in –*es* and names the weekend days do not.
Ideologically speaking, she was saying, “This is important and you need to learn it this way rather than explore and form your own thoughts regarding the calendar.” She had spoken before about all the foundation-building she felt she was doing (Interview E_MJ1). In my observations, I saw that she often structured her class, and the directives she used during instruction, as instruction rather than as opportunity for exploration. These competing views and larger ideological aims granted me insight into this key contradiction of this preschool class. However, as the school district wanted, there was more direct instruction for these very young students, thinking that getting students learning skills earlier would benefit them later in their schooling. This situation created the potential for María José’s position to be undermined, a third major theme of this chapter.

**Position Undermined**

On the morning that the anticipated “quality checker” came in in late September, I noted that María José did things that I had not seen her do previously: she gave a lesson in English, using musical instruments no less and recorded music from a CD player. Somewhat out of sorts, under the circumstances, María José seemed to lose her composure, and students, who were unused to seeing her instruct in English, may have picked up on her unease. For instance, at one point, I saw María José laugh nervously and let the *chiacchericcio* grow until she commented jocosely but good-naturedly to them that they looked like “*bobitos*” (little dummies) at which point she pantomimed being a marionette lolling its head and raising and lower its hands around while she made nonsense noises (Observation 5, Segment 1). This served to render the *chiacchericcio* into outright laughter, as in the example above, students dismissed the lesson, if only momentarily in order to laugh perhaps at her, not with her. Later, María
José used direct directives in order to redirect attention to Jenny’s dress: “miren miren el vestido de—Oigan miren el patrón miren” (Look at the dress of—Listen look at the pattern look) and direct gestures, such as pointing to a board or to Jenny’s dress in an attempt to rein the group in (Observation 5, Segment 1). One might say that this was María José at her most nervous and vulnerable, as the “quality checker” strode around the class with a thick binder full of checklists of her own. To the students, their teacher was the ultimate authority at school, and I had observed many instances in which parents dropped off their children at the class, saying as a form of sendoff, “Le prestas atención a la maestra” (Pay attention to your teacher). The quality checker, effectively, a new face of authoritative position, caused María José to lose this position, which in turn, caused students no longer to give her responses that reflected this position of authority.

Another way of interpreting this episode of María José’s position undermined was that she sought to show herself as very direct and potentially condescending, while at the same time repairing the relationship. As stated above, even in the weeks beforehand, I observed that there were times that she ignored the students in getting everything ready for the visit from the “quality checker.” Ironically, preparing for this visit reduced the quality of her attention to the students. So, the fact that she had at last come meant the end of anticipation, a return to teaching for María José, and most likely, the last time that the “quality checker” would come in for the rest of the year. Whether in anticipation or as a show of relief, María José sought to show cooperation between her and her students, so her “bobitos” comment seemed brash and, as I say above, potentially condescending, but it may well have been a gambit at appearing so close to her students that she could well afford joking, growing laughter, and even seeming
ridicule (Interview E_MJ3). In my interviews with Maríá José (Interview E_MJ3, Interview E_MJ4) and in informal conversations with her, I learned that she did not always know a great deal about her students but rather learned about their backgrounds as the year progressed. She also felt close to them and felt that she wanted to have a close relationship with them (Interview E_MJ1). This episode stood in stark contrast to the usual situations, when students did respond positively.

Routines and Instruction
Morning Circle as Part of a Routine. The Morning Circle routine consisted of instruction and instructional routines that Maríá José had gone to lengths to establish. Every morning, as students arrived piecemeal and their parents had signed them in, they would sit down to eat breakfast. Once almost all the students had arrived, Maríá José would begin calling in a sing song voice, “Al piso grande al piso grande” (To the big floor, to the big floor), and the class would assemble on the big rug (see Figure 4.2, above). Then, to introduce Morning Circle, Maríá José would sing a First Nations (Native American) song as they settled in. Maríá José would then have the students clean their hands and mouths with sanitary wipes and sometimes lead at least one other song, often a Spanish-language version of “If You’re Happy and You Know It” (Si estás feliz y lo sabes). Afterwards, she would lead the class in saying good-bye to the previous day’s daily helper and choosing a new one. Judging by the amount of chiacchericcio and outright questions regarding the Daily Helper and by how many times students brought up this job throughout the rest of the day, this role was of very high interest to most if not all the students. Also during Morning Circle, the daily helper would assist in reciting days from a Days-of-the-Week chart and in filling out a Daily Weather chart. They would then take note of the color (and sometimes type) of clothing of the daily helper.
María José had to guide the helper in placing an X on the weather chart that tallied how many rainy, cloudy, sunny and snowy days they had had for that week. All this would take place in Spanish.

Significantly for this study, María José put to use as directives many cues that prompted responses from the students: chants, choral participation and, as mentioned above, different songs that students seemed to know, even though they had been in school for a short time. They were reading or at least enacting emergent reading skills doing so. In Morning Circle, María José would point to where the chart said “lunes” (Monday) and rhythmically proceed reciting the days of the week. I noted that only some students would chime in, even though she would invite them, as on one occasion (in a sing-song voice), “Vamos a decirle a Marcus [points to the other chart] qué dice [sing songy] aquí” (We’re going to tell Marcus [points to the other chart] what it says [sing songy] here). Only some students chimed in as she read and pointed to each word as they read the words on the chart, “‘¿Cómo está el clima?’” (How is the weather?) During Morning Circle, students practiced this form of choral participation. By Observation 16 (October 28), I noted that, with each new word that María José wanted them to repeat, she audibly slapped the Daily Weather chart when they repeated chorally, “Está lloviendo...Está nublado...Está soleado...Está nevando” (It’s raining. It’s cloudy. It’s sunny. It’s snowing) (Observation 16, Segment 1). I would deem this a Level 4 directive, that is, absent an uttered directive but making reference a highly routinized activity. The students did not seem to respond to this slap, but rather repeated neither very quietly nor very loudly. The repeated daily rhythm of activity, I would argue, was aided by any directives that María José uttered. As students participated in this chorally,
certain students could participate, while others would just listen, this represented a viable learning mechanism for the students. A great deal of learning is steeped in inculcation and routinization (DePalma, 2010; Gee, 2012). Daily active practice or exposure included songs, repeated routines, and words that were of high interest (e.g., the reading of a name when choosing the daily helper). Thus, socialization during these routines assumed many forms, María José leading her class of various levels of participation and familiarity with the activities at hand. I never failed to note how these sorts of invitations and their various levels of participation offered the appearance of classroom harmony.

This harmony contrasted sharply with a session of Morning Circle in mid-October. The students were situated at the rug, and María José sang “Si estás feliz y lo sabes” (If You’re Happy and You Know It) and, over the course of the following several minutes, Ana and Alex vied for attention to be called on to be chosen to suggest the motion for the next verse (e.g., “If you’re happy and you know it, you’ll brush your teeth,” at which point the whole class would mime brushing their teeth) (Observation 12, Segment 1.2). Although he did not utter the directive, here Alex took the same tack as those speakers in Takano (2005) who strategically offered pre-requests. Alex was beckoning María José to issue a directive for the rest of the class to follow, effectively, to be the leader of the class. The stark breakdown in communication was that he suggested the class sing, “Si estás feliz y lo sabes, te machucarás” (If you’re happy and you know it, you’ll mangle yourself). Needless to say, María José asked him to repeat and the two went back and forth about the meaning, María José calling into question every time he insisted that he had said, “machucar” (to mangle), until she asked, “¿Te
vas a machucar?” (You’re going to mangle yourself?) and he suddenly understood that (1) he should no longer insist—he changed his answer to, No, and (2) he should elaborate on his suggestions, using gesture, only part of which I could make out: “...si sabes machucar el carro” (...if you know how to mangle [sic] a car). He had meant “manejar” (to drive). I should add that, adding to the chiaccherriccio, throughout this entire exchange in front of everyone assembled at Morning Circle, Ana seemed to be waiting for an “in,” an opportunity to speak up and ask for a band-aid for her thumb.

These types of dynamics—a song translated from English, vying for a chance to suggest a word and motion for a whole-group activity, a bilingual student of this age using an incorrect word, a fellow student who wants attention for herself—form the sort of back-and-forth interplay that I found to be typical of these instructional settings. With every time that María José asked him to repeat, each time with more and more disbelief, each time she effectively added to the tension of the interchange, before he finally relented and elaborated. The way that she corrected him showed that she did not rebuke him, “Oh [annunciating clearly] Sabes m:anejar A ver diga “manejar” [singing] “manejar” [continuing with the song]” (Oh [annunciating clearly] You know how to drive Let’s see, say “to drive” [singing] “to drive” [continuing with the song]). She even used the more formal “diga” (say) instead of the familiar form of the same verb, even though she generally spoke to the students using the informal forms. At this point in the exchange, I could hear students chime in to the last syllable of “manejar.”

By late October, students chimed in to songs more readily, and they continued to become excited about being chosen as the Daily Helper. Bear in mind that choosing the new day’s Daily Helper started with saying Good-bye to the previous day’s Helper. The
teacher would lead this, “Adiós” (Good-bye) and then add the student’s name. On a particular morning, Micaela had been the previous day’s Daily Helper, and Maríá José led the class in saying Good-bye to her. She made a face and declared, “Pero ya no nos vamos” (But we’re not leaving yet/already) (Observation 16, Segment 1). The directive of Maríá José’s that followed was enveloped in explanation: “Sí pero acuérdate que ayer fuiste la ayudante Entonces te estamos diciendo Adiós porque [medio cantando] ya no vas a ser la ayudante hoy” (Yes but remember that yesterday you were the helper So today we’re saying Good-bye because [half-singing] you’re no longer going to be the helper today). I would argue that the teacher reserved this explanatory tone, here made more personable by her half-singing tone toward the end of her utterance, for certain students. However, Micaela’s response showed that she still did not understand fully the for choosing the Daily Helper: “Y mi mamá dijo [sic: dijó] que podría [sic: podría ser] el ayudante” (And my mom said [sic: said] I can could [sic: could] be the helper). (In the following section, I elaborate further on student responses.) Instruction, and the directives that drive it, then, may be found around routines and around the excitement and anticipation associated with them. In fact, on this occasion, I was surprised—delighted, in fact—that these preschool students were reading their names and each other’s names from the name cards.

As the teacher, Maríá José had the position, the role, of creating and practicing routines. The fact that she could rely on routine as she got the group ready for instruction meant that she did not have to be as direct and could therefore use either a prompt in its full form or in a more reduced form. I saw evidence of this when I called a small group of students over for a quick interview. I mentioned to them a song they sang
during Morning Circle, and all three in this group, Ana, Michael y Micaela, immediately began singing it (Interview E_E14). During actual instruction, María José relied on more direct verbal forms with strengtheners (pointing and rhythmic tapping on a chart) (Observation 10, Segment 1; Observation 16, Segment 1). In fact, as I noted, she did “a lot of (literal) hand-holding,” even taking Marcus’s hand to help him write on the board as morning helper (Observation 10, Segment 1). It was difficult to determine the level of directness, as she would move back and forth in a session, being more or less direct with the group or using more or fewer strengtheners. Even in her speech, a directive to Jesús such as, “Lo puedes marcar por favor donde están los días soleados” (Can you please make a mark where the sunny days are? with an upward intonation contour) on a daily weather chart, shows a direct question but with a politeness attenuator (downgrader) in the form of the “please” (Observation 10, Segment 2). In fact, María José herself got into the routine of issuing certain directives-as-prompts such as “Nos vamos al piso grande” (We’re going to the big floor) for Morning Circle but later in the same session telling a student who seemed lackadaisical “córrele córrele” (chop chop, or literally, run) in order to hurry her up (Observation 16, Segment 1). Instructional directives, then, came in many shapes and syntaxes, so to speak.

**Response to the Instructional Directive in Morning Circle.** With respect to student response, many directives were met with what I termed “silent acquiescence,” that is, María José would ask a student to do something, and the student would proceed to do it. This, then, depicted the successful directive, whether in English or in Spanish. It was what María José expected to happen (Memo 6). So, the successful directive for María José was one in which she expressed herself clearly (according to her own
standards) and students understood and complied immediately (Interview E_MJ1). I saw many examples of this, for instance, during English instruction time, when María José was calling individual students to come forward to pick a card for the activity at hand, she called over Greta-Teresa with the modal question in English, “Would you please come and take one?” at which point she walked to the center, knelt down and took a card (Observation 17, Segment 1). To be sure, these depictions of student understanding and follow-through of instructional (and discipline) directives relied on establishment of routines and on following previously seen models. As it was, María José had called others forward beforehand in the English lesson above, and Greta-Ann had seen others go up when called on. (See the final section of this chapter for instructional directives during English instruction.) María José’s position as the one establishing and practicing the routines, during a lesson (as here) or over the course of the entire academic year (as with daily calendar) offered her certain authority, and this sort of silent acquiescence response became a convention, especially when it was praised by the teacher afterwards.

This sort of response to the teacher directive as a students’ silent acquiescence became more conventional, and it was what María José expected. As María José said, as a teacher, she relied on student independence, and students who act independently, quickly, and completely would need to learn to do so over the period of years of routines established in the classroom, beginning in preschool (Gee, 2012). Teachers also praise student independence in lieu of explicit or even implicit directives. There are tacit directives that rely on the sort of convention established by routines. If I saw evidence of these directives, I would have classified as least direct, Level 5, on IMPYRA. For, María
José’s students were encouraged to learn an instructional directive well, in fact, as I discussed in a memo, to know what she wanted before she had to say it (Memo 1).

**Negotiation in the Instructional Directive.** This independence proved difficult for María José to monitor, since elements within interactions can seem like slight corrections, restatements, or outright rebukes, as I noted throughout my observations and subsequent interviews and a memo (Memo 2). Teaching is such an interactive, “real-time” activity that sometimes I would see María José ask a student to repeat or clarify, but then in the next second or so, what the student said seemed to become clear to me if not to María José, too. I saw evidence of this dynamic, this linguistic interplay, once when she was discussing Christmas with a small group. By the time that María José had asked Jenny for clarification, Jenny had already proceeded with an alternate answer, thinking, it seems to me, that Jenny thought herself to be wrong:

**MJ:** *En tu casa ponen un árbol...de Navidad*

**Jenny:** *Y tiene ((*))

**MJ:** *Y [turns and leans in so that her ear is close to Jenny’s mouth] tiene qué*

**Jenny:** *...Tiene “toys”*

**MJ:** *...Y tiene “presents” y “toys”...M:uy >bien<*

(MJ: In your house they put up a Christmas tree

**Jenny:** And it has ((inaudible))

**MJ:** And [turns and leans in so that her ear is close to Jenny’s mouth] it has what?

**Jenny:**...It has “toys”

**MJ:**...And it has “presents” and “toys”...Ve:ry >good<)

(Observation 7, Segment 1)
When María José asked for clarification to, “And [your tree] has what [under it]?” Jenny responded with, “It has toys.” María José thought that she had said, “presents” (which the audio did not reveal but which reading Jenny’s lips and going by what María José concluded seem to point to the fact that Jenny had said, “presents”). Jenny then corrected herself, as it were, to “toys.” She may have felt that she had to self-correct, that saying, “toys” was somehow not appropriate situationally, linguistically, or under any other circumstance. Whatever her thoughts, she changed her phrase, but María José caught them both and validated them. Jenny may not have understood this; she may have thought that “toys or presents” signaled an either-or situation (You can have one or the other), rather than “presents” as an appositive (restatement) of “toys.” In fact, in a discussion that began by talking about regular trees, María José attempted to validate Jenny’s tangent toward a Christmas tree and all the presents (at least some of which would probably be toys, all of them presents) underneath it. The use of “or” in the English language leaves this sort of interchange ambiguous; for that matter, its corollary Spanish “o” can also leave room for misinterpretation. It is important to note that, although there was some code mixing going on (switching back and forth between two languages, here, Spanish and English), this confusion could have arisen even if both parties had remained in the same language throughout the exchange. A bigger point is that, regardless of language, when a teacher asks for clarification via a question, it can seem that the teacher is correcting an error. As mentioned, María José did well to make it seem as though her question, effectively a directive, did not come across as a correction of error, but rather as part of a negotiation.
The use of Spanish directives in the first few weeks of school helped to establish socialization practices that transferred to English directives when Maria José began instruction in English. She had very few lessons in English that I observed. The day that the quality checker came in, she taught a lesson in English—the first one that I observed—but even thereafter, she taught very few lessons in English. However, as she told me in an interview, she preferred to give more time to Spanish-language instruction at the beginning of the year:

*Es que francamente lo que y↑o (.) generalmente hago es que el primer semestre (.) yo quiero ponerles “background knowledge”...Necesito llenarlos de la información que necesito que ellos manejen (.) para que después cuando nosotros cambiemos al inglés cuando yo empiece a enseñar un poco en inglés ellos ya tengan (.) un conocimiento de la rutina y un conocimiento previo de ALGO*

(It’s that, frankly, what ↑I generally do is that the first semester, I want to give them “background knowledge”…I need to fill them with information that I need them to handle so that later when we change to English, when I start to teach a little in English, they’ll already have knowledge of the routine and knowledge of [stated emphatically] SOMETHING.) (E-MJ3)

I saw in this statement María José’s educational objective of helping create a community and a classroom culture. Directives and the responses that she sought and would come to expect and even cooperation between her and her students relied upon creating this background knowledge. Although this followed the banking model for education, critiqued by Freire’s (1973), in which students are, as María José expresses it, empty
vessels to be filled with knowledge without regard to what they bring to the classroom themselves, I defend her position for two reasons. First is that these were very young students, indeed, as I argue above, in their first experiences outside the home. I tempered María José’s emphatic stance—that they have to have “knowledge of SOMETHING”—with the fact that what they bring to class must be enriched. Secondly, as María José got to know her students, she began to discover what they knew already, and again, she had the task of enriching this. One of these tasks was how to sit while the teacher is teaching, which I take up in the following section.

**Physical Positions for Instruction: Listening position.** As discussed above, one directive that María José used quite often as an instructional directive was to say, “Manos aquí o acá” (Hands here or over here), with respective gestures to her knees and her lap (if they were sitting on the floor) or with folded hands on the table and her lap (if they were seated at a table). When she would call for students to assume this listening position so that she could get a lesson underway, in the ideal situation, they would all do so. If she would see anyone fail to comply, she would focus on that particular student and ask him or her in particular to sit in the position, a potentially risky ploy for her, since this may give other students time to begin to get out of listening position. She sometimes said it automatically, as when I noted that she asked for this position at a moment when, “students aren’t particularly unruly (weren’t unruly at all, in fact), and that when [María José] says this, only James jams his hands in his lap)” (Observation 11, Segment 3). This directive represented for me a sort of “keep your hands to yourself” directive, and she would sometimes utter this directive by looking at the students and combining it, saying “Ojos aquí conmigo >manos aquí o acá<” (Eyes here with
Recall that Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) foundational study categorized directives according to use but also according to structure and word forms (see Chapter 2). In that study, the same as for Austin (1965), “can” grants permission. However, in this preschool classroom, “can” (and, significantly, its corollary Spanish puedo) may serve as a low-level challenge. This was the case when María José uttered to a learning group of five with slightly accelerated speech, “Por favor pueden enseñarme la posición de escuchar a Misis...Pared ↑ es<” (Please can you show me the position for listening to Mrs. Paredes?) (Observation 9, Segment 6). She then asked Britani, “Britani cómo nos sentamos para escuchar a Mrs. Paredes Dónde van las sillas Dónde van las sillas,” (How do we sit to listen to Mrs. Paredes? Where do the chairs go? Where do the chairs go?) (Observation 9, Segment 6). By issuing not one but several of these types of questions, María José used these questions as challenges or directives. For their part, students complied in a show of silent acquiescence. Another challenge using the same “can you” construction differed qualitatively from the previous one.

When the group of dental professionals came in one morning in mid-October, I took note of (but did not video or audio record) a tangential discussion about how many teeth children have (20) versus how many teeth adults have (32) (Observation 12, Segment 3). Although these dental professionals spoke English, during this discussion, María José asked in Spanish, “Pueden contar hasta ^20^” (Can you count to 20?) and I noted, “When they count to 20 [in Spanish], one through five is easy and everyone is engaged, i.e., I hear many voices. However, they begin to lose interest / show signs of
losing interest by seven or eight” (Observation 12, Segment 3). Although these were questions and technically not directives, I counted them as directives since they prompted student behavior and since they were highly attenuated form of saying, “Sit correctly,” “Push in your chair,” or “Count to 20.”

The first example above was part of assuming the listening position and, as such, was far more structured (María José might have said, “Students will sit correctly first; then class may begin”). Additionally, she was giving directives that pertained to practiced, routinized actions, and as for Britani, she followed through with her actions in the silent acquiescence that her teacher expected. These were reminiscent of Ware’s (2002) tough but firm “warm demanders” (see Chapter 2). Furthermore, in the first instance, the teacher concatenated one directive after another toward this one student in small group. By contrast, in challenging students to count to 20 during a moment when various students’ voices of chiacchere were heard, María José may have thought she needed to quell the group and did so with an instructional directive to the entire group. This directive, in the form of an ad hoc “can you” challenge, tested and engaged students, and as I noted, not everyone knew how to count that high. Of course, the other side of these challenges is the word of congratulations.

Whenever listening position failed to yield results, María José used another instructional strategy to get students ready to learn. She would lean back, and use the (cohortative) invitational Vamos a (Let’s) form, using the highly indirect, “Vamos a hacernos unos globitos o k” (We’re going to make little balloons, ok?). The directive was indirect because it was highly attenuated with the invitation, the diminutivized “little balloons” and the tag question at the end. At the same time that she said this, she
modeled the behavior she wanted them to follow by inflating her own lungs. While some students showed boredom or joined in later, others “over-interpreted,” and as Jesús did, made a *mueca* (an exaggerated facial gesture) while also overdoing his arm gestures. He did not fail to comply—quite the opposite, he complied too much—but he might well have garnered a reprimand from his Maríá José. Of note is that a short while after this, Alex “inflated” his balloon so much that he stood up, in a similar show of “over-interpretation.” These students’ sense of agency emerged, and the students showed themselves not as passive recipients but as active and playful interpreters.

**Physical Positions for Instruction:** *Thinking position.* In small instructional groups, Maríá José would also direct students to assume what she called “*posición de pensar*” (thinking position). As with listening position, she often called for it by inviting the students with an invitation as in, “*A ver todos vamos a pensar*” (Let’s see we’re all going to all think) (Observation 9, Segment 6), and she paired with this a gesture of an index finger to her temple and a humming sound as if thinking (Observation 4, Segment 3; Observation 9, Segment 6). It was in small group during this observation that one of the students, Ana, put her finger *in her mouth*, while another student, Michael, pinched his cheeks and pulled them out for a while, thinking perhaps that that was what his teacher was doing and he should emulate it (Observation 7, Segment 1). Perhaps as a kind of resistance (or negotiation), he was being playful as well. What is more, a moment later, Ana did the same, if only momentarily, whether prompted to or not. Students had different ways to interpret this thinking position, and following the teacher’s gestures or pose did not always mean that students would follow through. Her instructions were not heeded to the letter; however, perhaps significantly, Maríá José
might have been choosing her battles; in short, she proceeded with the lesson. Aware of the interpersonal nature of her dealings with students, I asked her about this, that is, about choosing her battles, and she said that there were times that she thought she was stricter when dealing with Ana than with Micaela because her parents let her have her way at home (Interview E_MJ1). However, I pointed out that there were times that she gave in to Ana, too, letting her hold a giant, stuffed Clifford The Dog during story time, while at the same time, not letting Simon hold a giant Very Hungry Caterpillar (Observation 5, Segment 1). She saw that sometimes she felt she had to exercise more discipline, while at others, she had to show greater leniency or that she had to be stricter with some students than with others. She felt she was taking into consideration their backgrounds and home lives (Interview E_MJ2). This was an instance of María José choosing her battles.

**Using directives to place students in virtual places.** On one occasion in this small group setting, when teaching about roots to a small group, María José discovered that they could not name the part of a tree or other plant that lies below the surface of the soil. She decided to conduct a virtual nature-walk with herself and the students seated, saying, “Sacamos [se inclina hacia Marcus] Marcus te acuerdas [as A ver...] Todos a ver vamos caminando [Mimes walking, swinging her arms, and moving her shoulders in rhythm] Vamos caminando Vamos caminando” (Let’s get out [leans in toward Marcus] Marcus, do you remember? Let’s see…Everyone, let’s see, let’s go walking) [Mimes walking, swinging her arms, and moving her shoulders in rhythm] Let’s go walking. Let’s go walking) (Observation 8, Segment 4). I noted that this prompted Simon, Greta, and Candace to make the same motions, as they seemed to be following her model. She
then pretended to see some roots, exclaiming, LOOK, after which, I commented, “Rosario’s eyes shoot to where María José motions toward the ground” (Observation 8, Segment 4). Could María José have shown these virtual roots without placing these students in this virtual place? Perhaps. However, Rosario’s powerful responses showed that, by taking them along this walk, by inviting them along and motioning, she ensured that they all had the experience, even if second hand, what roots were. When María José realized these students did not know about roots, where they lie or what they look like, she effectively scaffolded them “down” the scaffold (Castellà et al., 2007). As she said on more than one occasion, in order to get students ready for kindergarten, she needed to build so much foundational work that she felt she was constantly playing catch-up (Interview E_MJ3; Interview E_MJ5).

**Creating Spaces for Responses.** In a classroom, the teacher has been placed in charge of the students (Castellà et al., 2007; Hyland, 2002), and especially in the preschool classroom, she must lead the classroom full of students who are far younger than she and whom she has only begun to get to know. It would be possible to say that, with any given class, María José would have a hard time finding rapport with a portion or all of her students. Nonetheless, I did see instances of linguistic pairings of a collaborative nature. Interlocutors who work together often tend to get along, and this becomes evident in the language they use (Szczepeck, 2000). As María José would likely agree, by prompting or beckoning students to complete her words or sentences, she was creating spaces in which students could respond, effectively asking her interlocutors to “help out” in order to garner participation and build vocabulary (Memo 4).
These completions formed part of a strategy that the teacher put to use in small as well as large groups. While leading the students on an activity similar to the above virtual nature walk, described above, Michael, perhaps still excited at having pronounced the word “agujas” (needles) better or louder, was engaged with María José as she tried to have them complete her sentence (Observation 8, Segment 6). Although he said, “agarrar” (to grab / to pull), when the term the teacher was looking for was “arrancar” (to rip or to pull) (slightly different both phonologically and semantically), he already showed this desire to complete her sentences in this small group setting. In fact, sometimes, she would beckon someone to finish a word, as when talking about the change of seasons. María José asked, “¿Qué se le cayeron al árbol?” (What fell off the trees?), before proceeding to answer, saying, “Se la cayeron las hojas” (What fell off the trees were the leaves). At this point, I noted, Michael either made a striking down motion with his hand or just put his hand on the table after having scratched his back, but he completed María José’s word, las hojas (from “hojas,” leaves) which Ana finished by saying, “-jas,” and then Michael reiterated the word, complete with the article, “las hojas” (Observation 9, Segment 5). Close re-examination of the audio (a detail that had escaped me when transcribing) revealed that Ana uttered the correct response (the response that María José wanted to hear) in making the collaborative completion, or DIU, of finishing off the two-syllable “hojas” (leaves) with “-jas” when María José uttered the first syllable. However, perhaps because Michael’s response was louder, punctuated by his hand slapped on the surface of the table, María José gave him the credit and leaned over with her hand up, beckoning a high five. By no means was Ana shy or meek; however, Michael tended to know “how school is done,” what with its
many collaborative completions / DIU’s that build rapport and cooperation between teacher and student (Interview E_E14). María José concluded this back-and-forth rapport when she summed up with a complete sentence, “Se le cayeron las hojas” (The leaves fell off the trees), other student voices could be heard chiming in, saying, “las hojas” (the leaves).

**Creating spaces and the Designedly Incomplete Utterance.** As María José created spaces for student responses, I saw the practical value of these structures in keeping students engaged and having them pair new vocabulary with old vocabulary and structures. Also, as the above description makes evident, other students saw their classmate shine for a moment and also learned from his example. María José would use this strategy of elongating the collaborative word even more so in one-on-one exit interviews when she wanted the student to practice new vocabulary, as when she sat with Micaela and said, “está nevando y los árboles no tienen” (it’s snowing and the trees aren’t). Micaela’s response, “Fríos” (“Colds” as it were), was not the answer that the teacher sought, so she proceeded saying, “Pero si los árboles no tienen hojas” (But (if) the trees don’t have leaves) and gestured a falling motion with both hands), “están de::s” Micaela’s response “-nudos” completed the Spanish (“ desnudo” bare) (Observation 9, Segment 8). However, as with some of the teaching points, there was always a risk on the part of the student of overdoing matters (as did Michael, above) or of misinterpreting a directive (as did Micaela here).

Learning a teaching point can mean that students become so enraptured by the silliness of, say, “inflating” one’s body that they risk frustrating the teacher. A student can become so caught up in the back-and-forth rhythm of the collaborative completion
that the teacher reverts to discipline at the cost of the lesson. This, then, highlights another balancing act that the teacher must maintain. In creating these spaces for response (and for negotiation, as with Micaela’s response of “cold” instead of “bare”), she must keep students engaged, drawing out vocabulary through their responses, whether exposing new words or practicing old ones, all the while quelling to a certain degree the alacrity that these young students naturally show as a result of learning and performing well for a teacher who strives to remain amiable and whose parents know her. While Ana completed María José’s “hojas” (leaves) and Michael’s responded, almost yelling out, “LOTS OF LEAVES,” I noted that Jesús made a fish-like face while holding his fingers to his temple in the “thinking position” (Observation 9, Segment 8). Still, the devil remains in the details: creating spaces for collaboration means that one must unpack the elements of the dynamics of discourse. In this way, the collaborative completion / DIU is one possible strategy for the teacher to impart information for these students who are just learning that leaves fall off trees throughout the autumn and are bare in the winter. It also allows for the negotiation allows teachers to see what students do not know as much as what they do know and are learning.

Quotatives—“Say what I say” Strategy. María José uttered some of her most direct directives in student dyads, in which she would pair students up and have them question each other. Here she used another strategy for teaching via instructional directives—telling students what to say to each other, to give them the exact words to question their partners in these dyads “Joshua (.) tú pregúntale a Greta-Ann [high tone] >Qué está pasando aquí<” (Joshua…ask Greta-Ann [high tone] >What’s happening here<?) (Observation 4, Segment 5). This, she told me, got students involved
so that they were not simply listening to her but rather were participating more actively (Interview E_MJ5). She gave them the words and phrases, she said, so that they could ask their partners about, as in the example above, the change in seasons from autumn to winter.

I had seen this strategy used with first graders but never with kindergartners or preschoolers. This was a strategy that had been presented to her in her preschool training, the thinking being that if it worked well for first graders, then preschoolers would do well to start practicing, too, or at least to be exposed to this structure of interaction. Whether in small learning groups of four to five or with the entire group, María José paired up students and had them hold quick discussions. For example, in the middle of reading a book to the group, María José once interrupted the reading and, I noted, “[went] around to the rest of the group…pairing up students who are adjacent to each other by pointing to two students and asking one of them,” when reviewing a longer sequence (Observation 9, Segment 1). She continued:

María José: >Greta-Ann< pregúntale a Marcus… “Por qué se cayó el señor”

Greta-Ann: [turning to Marcus and saying almost staccato and very quietly] “Po’ qué de cayó e’ deñó [as in, Por qué se cayó el señor]”

Marcus: [his response is also quiet, in fact, mostly inaudible…energetically motions to Greta-Ann to say the same thing to him.] [She is in the middle of responding to him, when María José begins counting in order to get the whole group’s attention.]

(María José: >Greta-Ann< ask Marcus Why did the man fall down?)
Greta-Ann: [turning to Marcus and saying almost staccato and very quietly] Why ‘nid’ the ‘mah’ ‘fah’ down?” [as in, “Why did the man fall down?”]

Marcus: [his response is also quiet, in fact, mostly inaudible…energetically motions to Greta-Ann to say the same thing to him]. [She is in the middle of responding to him, when María José begins counting in order to get the whole group’s attention.] (Observation 9, Segment 1)

As evidenced by Marcus’s beckoning to Greta-Ann to ask him the question, at least some students were beginning to learn the structure, even if, judging by Great-Ann’s lack of articulation, they had not yet learned the language. María José had not provided them with any answers or any other type of follow up. These directives were often sophisticated sentences, calling to mind Kaufmann and Poschmann’s (2013) study with adolescents and adults and under experimental conditions. In this preschool classroom, María José was asking them to respond by repeating phrases that they perhaps did not fully understand, to say nothing of failing to provide them with possible answers. One could view this as a teacher’s attempt at providing them with room to explore, or alternately, she was setting them up to fail, or to explore and then fail, by not telling them what to say as a response to, Why did the man fall down? However, the issue, as in many issues of students this age becoming socialized into what is expected of them in partner questioning or any other of a dozen types of activities is exposure to asking more sophisticated questions and to initiating a conversation. Although Greta-Ann (one of the youngest in the class) did not seem to know what to do, Marcus (one of the oldest) did. One may view Greta-Ann’s lack of response in this situation in two different ways—(1) that Greta-Ann fell short in this activity, and, to the extent that María José was her
teacher, she also failed in her instruction, or (2) Greta-Ann is on her way, and María José gave her the tools (the quotative embedded in a directive) at least to initiate this type of paired conversation. In a subsequent interview, María José told me that she likes to get students to take chances, and this may have been a prime example. However, she had also said that many students are not yet ready for more advanced material (Interview E_MJ3). These “say what I say” directives were in the form of the (“say this” “say that”) imperative, as she was directing behavior that would begin a conversation and get them to use their own voices.

The final example in this section on routines and directives is the direct directive of a different sort. Telling a student where to look or what to listen to would not be an instructional directive per se, but it can lead to mini-routines and teachable moments. For instance, María José prefaced a small group lesson on snakes by taking a discursive step backwards, so to speak. She said, “Pero ahora les voy a decir una cosa” (But now I’m going to tell you something). She then proceeded to tell this small instructional group to touch themselves, “La víbor[a...Tóquense [pinches her lips with her fingers to demonstrate—but also this way, her words are not enunciated well] >sus sus< sus labios [students touch their lips] (.). Ahora (.). abran sus bocas” (The snake...Touch yourselves [pinches her lips with her fingers to demonstrate—but also this way, her words are not enunciated well] >your your< your lips). Students followed suit. She continued in this fashion, having students touch their own body parts, and this led to a lesson on the different body part of snakes, their scales, their lack of legs, the brille over their eyes, and their special unhinged bottom jaw that allows them to eat larger animals (Observation 12, Segment 6). It all began with an exploration of the parts of the human
body, a discussion in which María José used imperatives, “touch,” “feel,” “pinch,”
“open,” and “close,” and students followed up quickly and wholly in silent acquiescence.

Other direct directives, “¡Mira!” (Look!) or “Escuchen” (Listen!), were ways of redirecting students’ attention. As mentioned above, María José once took note of the pattern on Jenny’s dress and wanted the whole class to notice: “Oigan Miren el patrón
Oyen (.) Jenny [points to Jenny’s dress] tiene un patrón...ne:gro bla:nco ne:gro bla:nco ne:gro bla:nco” (Listen Look at the pattern You’re listening Jenny Just look! [points to Jenny’s dress] has a pattern)...bla:ck whi:te bla:ck whi:te bla:ck whi:te) (Observation 5, Segment 1). When giving individual attention, she could be more direct, as on another occasion, saying to Micaela, “A ver tú escribe” (Let’s see you write) (Observation 15, Segment 1). The situation featured several elements of cooperation as they worked in an I-do you-do exercise of practicing writing a letter in a tray full of sand. María José and Micaela were facing the same direction; her tone was soft, almost intimate (as opposed to when rebuking a student or trying to gain the class’s attention). There was use of diminutives—“A ver empieza tú solita” (Let’s see you begin your own little self) were “solita” had the diminutivized suffix “-ita”. When María José used the direct, “Ahora tú hazla aquí S” (Now make/write it right here S), Micaela seemed to have difficulty, and María José made offers of help, such as, “Te voy a ayudar” (I’m going to help you) (Observation 15, Segment 1). Perhaps not a causative relationship—when she said these direct directives tú escribe, empieza tú, and tú hazla—the utterances themselves may have been what precipitated the students’ actions, but the juxtaposition was clear: when María José said these directives, she did so in a context of great cooperation.
English Instructional Directives

Bellamente Academy’s school district mandates English Language Development (ELD) in all grades. The preschool curriculum mandates it as well for preschoolers, according to Language Enrichment Arts Program (LEAP Website). Nonetheless, the particulars are a matter for the teacher. “English instructional directives” could refer to instructional directives that María José gave in English during instruction in Spanish or, alternately, to instructional directives in during English instruction. I never observed the former case, and this section refers to the latter.

In a quick question-and-answer exchange during an observation (rather than an interview), María José once commented:

¿Sabes qué? A mí no me gusta entrar en lo del inglés porque siento como que al principio del año hay tanta actividad y los niños se están...estableciendo y haciendo...[R]utinas [y después se lo puede agregar]...cuando es una adición a las rutinas que ya tenemos puestas.

(You know what? I don’t like to get into English (instruction) because I feel that at the beginning of the year, there’s so much activity and the children are… establishing a foundation and making...[R]outines [and afterwards, it can be added in] when it’s an addition to the routines we’ve already have in place.)

(Observation 12, Segment 12)

There was a different dynamic with English instruction with respect to instructional directives. For one, María José was generally more direct with English, using direct imperatives and “say what I say” direct instruction, along with “we are going to” type invitations. When María José would repeat key words and/or repeat actions, students would repeat her words and repeat her actions.
Some students were not ready to respond. When, for example, María José asked during an ELD game if she was a monkey, and María José had instructed the students to respond with, “No, you are not,” when told, “I [meaning María José, who was doing the asking] am a monkey” (Observation 11, Segment 12). Candace said only, “No,” instead of, “No you are not,” and when María José pressed her, Candace put her finger to her mouth and mumbled something inaudible. Whether in English or in Spanish, many times, it was not enough for María José that a student answer with a nod or even an uttered, “Yes.” During another lesson in the English lesson, I saw María José direct students to speak about clothes. She chose students at random, and they each had to come up to where she had laid some picture cards, choose a card, and speak. This may have given those students with more experience and acumen in English an upper hand, while leaving the more timid students reeling (Observation 17, Segment 1).

Current English as a Second Language (ESL) pedagogy advocates that students have to show different levels of output. They may demonstrate understanding in groups (where they may not understand at all but rather are following along with what their classmates are doing, such as raising a hand if they like the color blue) through small group and individual expression as a nod or other small motion, walking from one end of the room to another (as in dividing into groups according to a favorite color), to the expression of single words and later phrases (Hausen, 2011). The point is that asking a student to speak a non-native language, in front of their preschool classmates, no less, asks them to take chances for which they may not be prepared. However, María José believes in making students take risks (Interview E_MJ3). This was what she did when she asked students to mime dancing, walking, jumping, and reading during an English
lesson. She first asked students to perform as a group, herself included, saying, for instance, “Now we are going to walk.” Student responses ranged: the more timid Greta-Ann, I noted, took smaller steps while another more vocal, never-shy Alex took the opportunity to raise his knees high and veritably march around the room, gleeful the entire time. Again, these invitations, paired with her own participation got the students moving, while she uttered the focal verbs. She then had individual students come up and demonstrate each of them, congratulating each student with a “Big round of applause” from the whole class (Observation 7, Segment 5). In their push for English, administrators should note, some students show readiness at different levels and express English in different ways.

In this English lesson, she used the phrase “We say” paired with different articles of clothing (Observation 17, Segment 1). Students may have taken the phrase as an invitation to say the name of each article of clothing in turn, as many student voices could be heard “trying the word on for size,” to wit, when María José said, “We say we say dress,” I noted that “Many student voices can be heard, “dress” with the same intonational quality that showed that they seem to be mimicking. This was good practice, I feel, for the students, and they likewise went through similar lessons where María José taught facial expressions paired with feelings, and farm animals and “Old MacDonald Had a Farm” song.

Additionally, ELD instruction may allow one to examine how students process information. Some students refuse to respond in English. They are not yet ready to delve into a second language. Other student respond shyly, while still others have to have all the information before responding in English. Then there are students like Michael and
Alex, whom I never observed as reticent; they dive into English or even a completely unknown language, personifying the Italian phrase, “parlando s’impara” (one learns by speaking). Under the circumstances, if nothing else, these students had little experience speaking English in the classroom. Their home lives may have been different (siblings or their parents may speak some or a great deal of English at home), and trips to, say, the park, the zoo, the library, the gas station, or the grocery store, among other places, may have represented opportunities to hear and listen to, if not also speak, English. These settings are difficult to account for; what can be accounted for, recorded, and qualified are classroom situations.

**Summary**

Instructional directives in María José’s class revolved, I found, around five central themes. First, there were times that María José had to rein in the class in order to teach, changing gears from more of a social setting to an instructional one. Second, I saw her struggle with whether to provide students with direct instruction or allow them space to explore. She wanted to allow these preschoolers to explore their worlds, to proffering them educational materials to explore without saying, *This is what you have to learn.* However, as with classroom management directives, instructional directives also had a bent of socialization; that is, they were, at least in part, instruments of socialization and routinization. María José did take note of what was missing (such as their lack of knowledge about roots) and tried to lead them through what she felt they would need in later years. As she was teaching, I saw that her position stood a chance to be undermined. Students, perhaps unused to the structures of schooling (routines, schedules, sharing, sitting still) responded in ways that showed they did not fully
understand directives. Response and negotiation had to do as much with various elements of context as they did with the utterances themselves. Sundry responses by students meant that María José was always changing, learning more about her students and re-evaluating her perspectives and how she treated them. Finally, her ELD instructional directives showed a greater degree of directness, which sometimes worked but sometimes failed, given the experience level and propensity for her students to take chances with their second language.

In the following chapter, I connect large-scale forces with analysis of directives. María José wanted her students to have the beginnings of a foundation that they would need for kindergarten. Patterns (black-white-black-white), songs and chants, the feel of a pelt or a feather, writing the letter S, an accurate definition for machucar, a routine that a first or second grade teacher will demand are all parts of this foundation. I also discuss applications for similar teachers and similar school situations.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter presents conclusions based on data collected and analyzed using the AIDA theoretical framework and the IMPYRA instrument in examining classroom management and instructional directives. As well, it will discuss implications for similar pedagogical settings, in turn, preschool classrooms, and finally bilingual classrooms. In preschool classrooms, I will touch upon and probe facets of debates relevant to María José and her students and to my analysis of directives in the classroom, whether as administrative mandates, as María José’s sense of duty to teaching, or by the educational situation at hand. In the bilingual classroom, I will examine how María José used different languages, Spanish and English, strategically, again, whether dictated by administrators, by her own pedagogical instincts, or by the circumstances, all of which had no small bearing on how she addressed her students and how they interpreted her utterances. At times, María José enjoyed great success; while at other times, she struggled. I believe that highlighting the vicissitudes of teaching emerging bilingual preschoolers reveals key points that may be applied to other classes.

It is no easy endeavor, this job of María José’s. Teaching bilingual preschool involves balancing native language and second language, instruction and exploration, discipline and leniency, and all the while fostering interpersonal relationships with four year-olds. When one considers that, for many of these students, the months that I observed the class represented their first linguistic, academic and social experiences, one begins to realize how dynamic her directives had to be with her charges. Over the course of this case study, I came to know some of how María José used particular language structures to particular ends. Likewise, I came to know her students in this, their first
forays into the world of school at Bellamente Academy, a setting in which they will have spent a considerable amount of time over the course of the next several years, assuming, of course, that they would continue at the school. (Most of them would.) Students bring to school what experience they have in life thus far at home, with two from previous preschools and one from daycare. Recall that María José stated emphatically that these students arrived at preschool knowing practically nothing (Interview E_MJ3) and having done NOTHING previously, while those from more affluent families had many more advantages (Interview E_MJ5). Contrary to what María José vehemently asserted on more than one occasion to me, students do come to school, I feel, with some background knowledge. *Figures 1.1 and 1.2*, which accompanied the section on the AIDA theoretical framework, as well as *Figures 4.1 and 5.1*, which contextualized, respectively, the classroom management and instructional directives, depicted how previous experiences for both student and teacher alike background the utterances and interpretations thereof.

*Figure 6.1*, below, shows how such factors as the desire to be considered a good student or teacher or the implied mandates of a quality checker from the state department of education come to influence utterances, in the form of the directive. It is
as if the teacher were saying, “This is the right way to do it,” and the students were responding with, “I’m following directions so that I can (1) do it right, and (2) the teacher won’t get upset.” As emerging bilinguals, María José’s students brought a great deal into the classroom; however, as preschoolers, they had not yet made the connections necessary to show that they knew what they knew.

**Action Implicative Discourse Analysis Framework**

AIDA, the frame that I used in my analysis, used different levels, angles, and assumptions. Moreover, it prompted me, effectively, to “back up” and re-examine my data on a regular basis. The first step was developing and implementing IMPYRA. This inventory tool forced me to compare particular directives of María José’s against others. By classifying María José’s directives first into classroom management directives and instructional directives and then into levels of directness, I was able to re-examine data, similar to “fracturing” the codes of a qualitative analysis (Strauss, 1987). Furthermore, analysis via IMPYRA allowed me a first look at what made a directive more or less direct. Of course, there were strengtheners and/or attenuators to utterances, but many were stated with a particular gesture that changed the tenor of the utterance, further strengthening or attenuating the directive. It was often the case that a directive would feature both strengtheners and attenuators, as in, “...hazte por favor para tu izquierda” (move (yourself) please to your left) (Observation 3, Segment 2).

For María José, directives often featured strengtheners, attenuators, and more neutral parts of the syntactic construction. Of course, the utterance of the directive itself, whether strengthened or attenuated, uttered in isolation or in a semiotic bundle (Arzarello, 2006), was but one part of the communicative locus. Contextualizing and finding moments of interplay was where I found the most meaning to directives in this
class. I conclude, then, that students had to determine how to respond to directives, an especially difficult task when one considers the complexity of directives with strengtheners, attenuators, different body orientations, gazes, district and school mandates, linguistic and other ideologies.

**Room for Negotiation**

In the same way in which María José had to deal with student interpretations of her directive in a way that might have been contrary to what she had intended, students were busy trying to interpret what she had meant. For, the other side of the María José’s position, or role, was how students interpreted both her and the directives she uttered. As I say above, Jenny had to follow closely her teacher’s directives when the teacher herself was close. This is not to say that Jenny did not look around letting her gaze wander or move her hands so that María José would re-place them in her lap. This sort of interplay, this interactive element, was as much determined by student response as by the teacher directive and was largely missing in other studies (Castellà et al., 2007; DePalma, 2010; Ellis, 1992; Gort et al., 2012), even in the one that most closely resembled the present study (He, 2000). Students generally complied with María José’s directives and granted her authority in the form of positive uptake or acquiescence to her directives. However, rather than a simple directive-response dyad, what I witnessed was a great deal of back-and-forth, as when Alex misinterpreted María José’s take on “brave” to mean “brave-and-belligerent.” This sort of response, which I took to be negotiation, prompted her to attempt to put a stop to Alex’s active behavior. My contribution, then, has been to apply the sort of dynamic interplay characteristic of Goodwin (2006) to school situations, which feature many interlocutors saying and doing myriad things.
**Negotiation and Parameters of Acceptability**

As I state in Chapter 4, María José moved Jenny’s place in her small group to be close to her, and she would monitor her in order to be sure Jenny remained on task. Under the circumstances, then, Jenny had practically no option but to follow María José’s directives more closely. I found that students most often responded between parameters of some fidgeting and some restlessness, that is, neither completely still nor exceedingly overactive. Indeed, how a student responded also had a bearing on how direct the directives were, as Alex showed when, in full martial arts mode, he repeatedly failed to respond to María José’s attempts to gain his attention (Observation 4, Segment 3). One could view Alex’s response as part of his negotiation, as I commented on in Observation 12, Segment 6, saying that the group was not the epitome of stillness and attentiveness. Moving just enough to allow yourself to play with your shirt (as did Rosario) but not so much that you attract the teacher’s attention, forms part of the foundation of what María José was trying to create for her students. Such actions and utterances on the side of both parties here could well be called negotiation.

Given a directive such as the one above, “Hazte por favor para tu izquierda,” or a similar one, students would often respond by following through and moving over to the left, immediately and to a sufficient degree, that is, neither, say, one inch nor two feet. Students who responded in ways other than what María José expected changed the makeup of future directives with their teacher. However (and herein, I have come to discover, lies a gist of this study), students learned sometimes by painful trial and error to operate within parameters of acceptability. It leads to comprehension. Risking chastisement or outright rebuke from María José, students came to know that when asked to place their hands “here or here,” it meant to move their hands into one of these
two positions and remain still and listen. Never, however, in all the observations, did the students stay in that position for longer than three seconds before moving something, say, their eyes, hands, or legs. This was acceptable to María José; once she perceived that they were moving again—becoming fidgety—she would call again, as I outline in Table 4.1, for them to place their hands “here or here.” Only close examination and re-examination of the corpus reveals this as a conclusion.

During the wonderful back-and-forth interplay in discovering the word “turkey” and the sound it makes, María José had to model and to be direct. According to her, and from what I saw, I would agree, that she did not rely on students’ pre-existing knowledge for successful directives. Rather, she had to tell them that the picture was that of a turkey and had to model the sound it makes. This, for the students, seemed to be entertaining enough that a moment of levity in making the turkey calls may have served as building background knowledge. According to María José, that was where their background knowledge started. Perhaps it would be fair to ask students who hail from homes in which Thanksgiving traditions are more practiced, rather than Latino or other immigrant families, which may not observe these customs.

The Other Hidden Curriculum

In pedagogical parlance, the “hidden curriculum” has to do with lessons taught via implication along with the official curriculum (Gervilla Castillo, 2006). María José likewise often taught students to sit still and listen to what she had to teach, rather to have them explore their own interests. In these respects, the hidden curriculum explicitly teaches one thing but, at least implicitly, shows another thing to be the case. Hence, at its most innocuous, it is paradoxical and, at worst, is hypocritical and confusing to the
students. María José’s take on the hidden curriculum, however, was not of this nature. They seemed to feel this tension when she beckoned them to touch feathers but they found themselves too reticent (Observation 11, Segment 5).

The term and topic “hidden curriculum” came up when she noted that students were beginning to draw better in class, and I used this observation to drive my line of questions in a subsequent semi-structured interview (Interview E_MJ5). María José’s response made mention of the “hidden curriculum.” When I asked her to elaborate, she explained, “The hidden curriculum as I understand it, is the curriculum that one TEACHES children based on their needs but that is not written on paper officially” (The hidden curriculum as I understand it, is the curriculum that one [stated emphatically] TEACHES children based on their needs but that is not written on paper officially) (Interview E_MJ5). According to María José, teachers need to know what their students lack, and teachers of young children especially need to fill in gaps. For example, students who lack fine motor skills may need more work or simply more time proffered by a teacher who knows that boys generally develop gross motor skills before fine motor skills, while girls do the opposite (Weber, 2014). Drawing, María José said, did not feature as part of the curriculum per se and may not be judged or evaluated in any official fashion. However, many a primary grade level teacher ask their students to draw and good drawings get complimented, and she felt the need to take time to teach drawing. Likewise, she said, her students needed to have in their repertoires cultural knowledge such as knowing about icons of the Thanksgiving holiday, such as who the Native Americans or the pilgrims were or what turkey is (Interview E_MJ3).
Their response, as shown in Chapter 4, was clear indication of two outcomes. The first was that they had recently been exposed to this word (*turkey*) and its semantic field (meaning) and linguistically pragmatic implementation (cultural appropriateness) (Levinson, 1983), some of them, perhaps for the first time in the group with María José early that morning in mid-January. As a result, they were “working through” the articulation of the word and its English phonemes, different from Spanish ones (e.g. the English rhotic *r*, /ɹ/ vis-à-vis the Spanish tap /ɾ/ or trill /ɾ/). The second outcome was that, with the differences in language phonology, semantics and even pragmatics aside, they would not be daunted—many of them kept trying to pronounce the word (Observation 19, Segment 2).

We often discussed the pressure she felt, ranging from the quality checker to the daily pressure that she felt to get students ready for kindergarten and beyond. Her directives were not always relaxed, and at times, they indicated that she failed to nurture the interpersonal relationship, as I saw in her sharp rebuke to Michael and James (Observation 4, Segment 1). I thought she may have damaged her relationship in her interaction with these two, as well as with the other students, those who were looking on, but they learned the lesson well—not to step out of line. James seemed to recover but only in stages. He cast his head and shoulders low at first, but when I kept my camera trained on him, in time, he began to participate. He clapped and chanted when Jenny was picked as the Daily Helper, and then, he lined up without showing outward signs of distress. When I witnessed this, I wondered what kind of model María José was serving to the class. True, she taught them such things are the change of seasons, the growth cycle of a plant, what it meant to show *valor* (courage), and the days of the week, and
she also had fun with the students. Still, there were days that I witnessed her having fun at their expense (e.g., calling them, “bobitos,” little dummies) (Observation 5, Segment 1). What to make of this in a case study? As María José understood it, her hidden curriculum were what she perceived her students to need. They were effectively those smaller details, the gaps that she felt she had to fill in in order to have students ‘kindergarten ready,” and they seemed to overwhelm her.

**A Proportional Balance**

Another element of the framework had to do with María José’s assumed different positions or roles. Context and state of mind determined how to issue a directive, as for example when she tried to reason with students who seemed to be having too much fun drawing to be coaxed into transitioning to gym class (Observation 11, Segment 7). Not wanting to sound like an ogre, she acknowledged their delight but still gently insisted. The students’ response (a gaggle of “Mkay’s” without students’ even looking up, no less) brought tears of laughter to my eyes; they effectively were saying what a teenager (also without even looking up) would express as, “Yeah, whatever.” She was searching for a proportional balance, on the one hand, of adhering to the schedule and getting these preschoolers to gym class on time and, on the other hand, of honoring and supporting their delight at drawing.

Effectively, María José had to debate with herself whether, on the one hand, to exercise kindness or, on the other hand, to levy a heavy hand (Castellà et al., 2007). Knowing when to show herself to be more lenient or stricter required flexibility and experience as a preschool teacher, and I feel that even an intermediate level (grades 3-5) teacher might have balked at achieving this delicate balance. There were times that I saw that María José seemed caught deciding between leniency and discipline. Perhaps with
only three years’ experience teaching preschool, she had yet to develop a deeper repertoire of decisions and directives that she knew would garner the responses she wanted, and at ten years, she will likely be far more effective as such.

As I perceived, the preschool student operates largely on instinct and reaction. For example, during student interviews, I saw students become excited about singing well-rehearsed songs and about the opportunity to play with a certain classmate or in a certain play area (a “learning center”), and even after I asked for order, they allowed themselves to become carried away by the moment of unbridled singing (Interview E_E14). In interviews, they would react immediately and wholly, whether beginning a song passionately or demonstrating utter shyness. They did not ruminate on topics when interacting with others. If my interactions with them during student interviews stood as any indication, they required a great deal of nurturing and validation. It was for this reason that, when she lined the students up according to color and type of clothing, many students felt compelled to show her what they were wearing on their way to line up. She neither rebuked them nor made a big show of saying, for instance, “Wow, Micaela, you are wearing pink today! How pretty!” María José here took into account the interpersonal in her effort to remain efficient in getting the class out.

The foundations that she would construct in both the interpersonal and the efficient would become part of her routinize. Beyond Morning Circle, with attention to the calendar, weather, and the daily helper, María José would have done well to make even more use of songs, rhymes or chants to introduce small group time, make transitions between activities or even help sum up a lesson. These Level 5, highly indirect directives would not only have made for a great deal of student participation and
management, but they also would have fostered the type of interpersonal relationship that María José always contended she wanted to foster.

As discussed in Chapter 4, for María José, one of her goals was to germinate and foster in her students a desire to come to school, to see her, and spend time with their friends (Interview E_MJ1). Attaining and maintaining this balance between the nurturing interpersonal relationships (so that students would want to come to school) and classroom discipline or positive management, meant enabling them and, at the same time, scooting them toward the next activity. María José had to manage the tension between remaining friendly and maintaining order, and she generally did so well. By the time students learn management routines and instructional routines and respond to her in the way that she expects, María José would already have attained a trusting relationship with the entire class. This situation would hold true for students who had very little previous experience in school or even being out of the house, which was the case for the majority of her students. This would also be the case for students who might feel out of sorts because they lacked linguistic or cultural advantages that other students might have had (Interview E_MJ5).

**Cooperation as Paramount**

The final major element of the AIDA framework was the cooperative principle. In terms of analysis, the points of departure in the framework were the utterances, the directives themselves; however, with respect to importance, cooperation could be thought of as the primary element. In interviews with both teacher and students, as well as in observations, I always felt that, at the end of the day, these were interlocutors, *people* engaged at the communicative locus in communicative acts. As such, María José took into account her students and their situations as well as the interpersonal
relationships she had with each student. While it is true that AIDA discourse was guided by actions and expectations of both teacher and students and while it is also true that a point of departure for analysis has been largely linguistic, interactions assumed an interpersonal quality. This would be true of interactions between interlocutors who began as and would likely continue to be strangers to each other, as with a retailer and his customer. This would also be true of interactions between people who dealt with each other on a regular, perhaps even daily, basis, such as co-workers. However, over the course of this study, I have come to believe that fostering interpersonal relationships means even more to interlocutors who work with each other in a classroom situation. María José came to know students, as well as parents, siblings and extended families. She told her students about her husband and her children, about her travails living in this country, and about her time taking her master’s degree at a local university. Perhaps, then, AIDA should be deemed AIIPDA (Action Implicative InterPersonal Discourse Analysis) with the added acronym “InterPersonal” inserted to underscore this point.

Classroom Management Directives

*Chiacchericcio.* To walk into María José’s classrooms (remember that the class effectively used a larger and a smaller room) was to witness activity that held a growing air of *chiacchericcio.* This phenomenon, this din characterized by student voices and movement, prompted María José toward certain ends. Some individual voices would at times become distinct over those of the others (what I deemed as being closer to the plural *chiacchere*), and as I saw, at times María José would allow herself to become fed up and quell the din once and for all. She often used classroom management directives to garner particular reactions that she herself expected.
When, as shown in Chapter 4, María José singled out Jesús by saying that she was going to have to let his mother know what a good job he was doing, the chiacchericcio instantly and wholly ceased. María José gained the response she wanted both from the class and from Jesús. I was impressed by Jesus’s stoic face as an offer of authority to María José’s compliment that he knew how to sit still. These students were building the foundations they would need later in their school careers, and their teacher knew how to use this strategy to her advantage. To say, as the teacher did, that you will have to call your student’s mother in order to pay a compliment had a great effect on almost all students, quelling the class completely, if only momentarily.

**Ideal and Paradoxical Situations.** Management directives can, I learned, reveal paradoxes. Interestingly, a teacher’s strategy may differ from one student to another in that the strategy may be not only to have students comply with her wishes but also to model appropriate behavior for them. In the same way that her students’ response to directives are subjective, the teacher makes subjective decisions based on her perspectives and perceptions of student’s or students’ predicted responses. Sometimes, she confided, she had to model how to be polite (in the conventional sense), while other times, she had to tell students to “tough things out,” or show more resilience. For instance, when Anna wanted to hold the stuffed Clifford doll during a storybook reading (as discussed in Chapter 3), I saw María José struggle in deciding whether to allow her to keep the doll and continue the lesson or to put a stop to Anna’s insistence (Observation 5, Segment 3). To exacerbate the teacher’s predicament, Simon then saw fit to reach over to take the nearby stuffed Very Hungry Caterpillar doll. María José had to backpedal and direct Simon to put this doll back but then explain to him in front of
the rest of the class why she was allowing Anna to keep hold of Clifford. In an ideal preschool situation, the teacher remains steadfast and just.

She also kept students moving along and, according to age-appropriate pedagogical practices, did not ask students to sit still for very long. The benefit of hindsight and the perspective of a detached viewer allow me to see how classroom management directives fed into instruction, letting the teacher keep teaching. As far as establishing routines and building a foundation for their future school, she was underscoring ideologically what was important. That is to say, María José was creating the sort of mindset that dictates that establishing and following routines are important for a community of learners, and in school, it is the teacher who establishes them through directives.

**Instructional directives**

For the sake of analysis, I divided directives, as did He (2000), into classroom management directives and instructional directives—though I had conceptualized this division independently of her study and before reading it. Perhaps the division between directing students for the sake of classroom order and classroom didactics is an obvious one. Nonetheless, as my study progressed—from gaining permission from myriad sources through observations, transcriptions and translation, and various phases of analysis to write-ups—I have realized how blurred is the line between these two types of directives. For, over the course of the first few months of their schooling, students generally came to know and follow through on routines, whether explicitly stated or implied very indirectly. She often used directives that one could characterize as either one or the other or as doing double duty, María José using directives as both management and instructional instruments.
Of the many interrelated themes of this study, one that recurred and became salient was the debate examined by Gopnik (2011) Buchsbaum et al. (2011). This debate had to do with whether, on the one hand, young students should sit still and learn a prescribed curriculum and routines that will, one hopes, serve them later on or, on the other hand, develop a curiosity and problem solving acumen that will serve them later on in their school careers. In other words, if teacher had to make a choice, is it more valuable for a teacher to provide a student of this age direct instruction or to lead them to a place where they can explore, say, an object, a learning center activity, or a new concept? For instance, in the lesson with plant roots, in which María José realized that her small group did not know what roots were, she had to make the decision as to which route to take. In the interest of time, could have just told them, “These are roots, and they grow underneath the Earth;” however, she had them take a virtual walk and “discover” the roots under a tree (Observation 8, Segment 4). At the same time that María José was building a foundation, (as part of the hidden curriculum) she was also implicitly saying that her students had to learn particular things and in a particular way rather than explore and form their own thoughts.

If, as mentioned previously in this chapter, one of María José’s objectives was to create a desire to come to school, then once at school, she often contended, there was a great deal of foundational work to be performed. She guided instruction on, say, the days of the week and the rest of the calendar, on scientific concepts, and on literary concepts via modeling, redirecting attention, and creating gaps of learning for them to fill in (collaborative completions or DIU’s). Factors such as her educational objectives for the lesson, affect regarding the student or groups of students or the entire class, and
immediate concerns such as conflicts between students or use of materials all
determined how she uttered directives and their concomitant gestures. The way, for
example, in which she asked Jesús to mark the current day of the week when he was
daily helper showed how gentle she could be, using attenuators and a politeness term,
and still gain the response she desired (Observation 16, Segment 1). Proximity to the
student (she was standing right next to him at the time), use of a highly routinized
activity, and the type of student had a bearing on her calm demeanor and her word
choice.

In less routinized activities, when exploring new ground with her students, I
sensed that she was less sure of herself. During these moments, with the benefit of a
third-person perspective and reflect after the lesson, I deemed I would have done things
differently. Once, when she discovered that students did not know what the roots of a
plant were, María José took a small group on a virtual walk, using cohortatives (i.e.,
“let’s” statements) to model walking along a path and seeing a tree that had shed its
leaves (Observation 8, Segment 4). She was having them discover something new on
this virtual walk, conjure an image that they had never seen, rather than simply tell them
about roots, show them photos of roots, or bring in a plant with the root structure
prominent. As I say, however, my viewpoint as researcher afforded me certain
advantages, and in her position, I may have handled the situation similarly.

I saw a stronger example of her directives for the sake of instruction when she
showed the class how a seed germinates and grows, inviting the group with
“Ahora…somos una semillita vamos a meternos en ese hoyito” (Now… we’re a small
seed and let’s get into that hole) (Observation 8, Segment 1). With the exception of
Jenny, students participated and seemed to appropriate the lesson. Bear in mind that María José’s ability to be silly or to get out of her comfort zone helped first some students, then more, and finally a majority of students participate. To re-watch the video is to see students stare at her at first and then, according to their willingness, respond by joining. Even at that, “joining in” was a negotiated endeavor: Anna followed through with the actions but, all the while, giggled and repeated intermittently, “Qué chiquito” (How little!, as if to say, Look at how little this seed is!).

This type of response differed from the “Say what I say” strategy, as discussed in Chapter 5. When she paired students up to use this strategy, the onus to respond was on them, and negotiation looked far different. When she paired up students in this way, she provided them with the tools, in the form of quotatives, which they had to use to question each other. As I have argued previously, of the students I observed and recorded, one understood how to utter the question to his partner and why, while the other student seemed to balk. María José was using their native language so that they might understand more fully what was going on. However, bear in mind that these were preschoolers and that they may have had only partial understanding of the activity. Once again, review of the video revealed that the focal students responded in a dynamic way, Greta-Anna asked what María José had asked her to but in a soft, staccato voice, after which Marcus responded and then motioned to her to ask him, then realized that he should now ask her. He knew how this routine played out. I learned then, as watching this video reinforced previous viewings of other videos, to review the video, each time looking at different interlocutors. For, interplay often overlapped, as was often the case with Designedly Incomplete Utterances (DIU’s).
**DIU’s.** The DIU was yet another strategy of María José’s. Speakers who are in a close relationship, for example, a husband-wife couple, close friends, business partners, or, as here, teacher and students often talk about the same subject matter and in each other’s company, and many times they learn each other’s speech patterns (Szczepek 2000). Certainly, a teacher in a class has at the forefront of her mind particular pedagogical goals, but with respect to communicative means, she employs tools that have at least the appearance of collaborative discourse between more or less equal partners in more conventional conversations. As Hyland (2002) and Castellà et al. (2007) point out, in school, the teacher has been given the position of as leader of the class, and she must lead the classroom full of students who are far younger than she is. Over the course of my observations, I saw instances of linguistic pairings of a collaborative nature. Szczepek (2000) calls these pairings a “duet,” and although I would not say that teacher-student interlocutors are equal partners, such as those exemplified above (e.g., husband-wife), in the back and forth of interaction, they sometimes “share the floor” of this interaction. “At certain moments in the duet their ‘togetherness’ becomes maximally apparent. That is when they collaboratively build a semantic, syntactic and prosodic production” (Szczepek, 2000, p. 12). The teacher must give or take the floor, while the students accept it (as in an oral testing situation) or concedes it quickly and wholly if it is wrested by the teacher, especially where there are epistemological concerns (knowledge sharing). There were times that I saw students take the floor when María José would rather have continued her discourse, and this negotiation, marked by DIU’s, helped create a community of learners. As Sacks sums up (1995), “There probably isn’t any better way of presenting the fact that ‘we are a group’ than by building a new
sentence together” (Szczep, 2000, p. 322). He goes on to state, as I argue in Chapter 1, that we get the kernel of what makes something that could be called ‘a conversation’” (Szczep, 2000, p. 322). When I re-watch videos or review transcripts, over and over, I see Michael, one of the oldest and perhaps one of sharpest students (he tended to respond often and accurately to teacher questions) complete DIU’s more often than the others. We might, then, that say students and their teacher build community by building utterance-response within a DIU frame.

**Modeling.** María José also instructed via modeling. Modeling language—and the directives that guide them—all falls into a catch-all category. For her part, as a model for the class, María José became routinized herself, and she would invariably call order with her “Manos aquí o acá” (Hands here or over here) before commencing a lesson. Likewise, she would oftentimes interrupt a lesson in medias res in order to refocus one or more students with an, “Ojos aquí conmigo” (Eyes here with me). In fact, on one occasion, she seemed not to take note when she directed the whole group but, as I noted, “Marcus and Greta-Teresa look up but no one else does” (Observation 12, Segment 6). All this to depict how María José perceived the class and would call for order when, I thought, it was unnecessary, since the students were not being too unruly. Perhaps for her taste and at that point in time, they were becoming distracted and needed to refocus. Here, then, is a final conclusion: as I have argued previously, what María José deemed appropriate or sufficient regarding a successfully responded-to teacher directive—one to which the student understands and demonstrates understanding—was almost entirely her call. This subjectivity, this judgment, I would argue, holds true in other bilingual classrooms. This is why the teacher needs to have patience and a great
deal of feedback and reflection on her teaching. Teaching, especially teaching bilingual preschoolers, is no mean feat. The district, the school, and parents provided María José a great deal of support. However, these entities also demanded much from her. The preschool curriculum compelled her to make decisions about instruction versus exploration. Gopnik (2011) and Buchsbaum et al. (2011) exemplify some of the language. Yet the present study suggests that more linguistic analysis could lead to better insight into how to allow students to combine the two successfully. Another contribution to the field is, as I have contended throughout this study, that one must take student response into account.

**Summary and Applications**

The final major section of this chapter seeks to make applications to other teachers and classes. While the case study, unique as it is in circumstance, players, language, and action, should not necessarily apply to other classes, there are situations that are similar and would stand to benefit from some of the conclusions of this case study (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014). Other bilingual preschool teachers in the US and abroad could see part of themselves and their students in the corpus and analysis of María José and her students. As claimed above, teachers strike a balance between being strict but not too strict, being both direct and indirect (revisit discussion on Jenny’s No and María José’s reflection before making this argument) and allowing students to explore and discover, while still covering points of the prescribed curriculum.

The first major conclusions of this study were that students had to determine how to respond to directives, an especially difficult task when one considers the complexity of a directive with both strengtheners and attenuators. An educator examining teachers
speech in this study would see how complex it is but how at the same time how precise and routinized it must be.

The second major conclusion is that negotiation of directives is often part of the process of comprehension. A teacher taking a reflective look back would note that student back talk is not always a case of defiance but of negotiation. Another major conclusion is that teachers use directives to do some linguistic, cultural, and other kinds of knowledge “from the ground up” as they build foundations for future years of schooling, and this is what María José meant by the “hidden curriculum.” I respectfully disagree with María José that her emerging bilingual students entered the class knowing nothing. I see that in the moment, she said this in order to drive home the point that she had to create a foundation of learning. I also see now that she was probably exaggerating and that she felt frustrated that she had to teach students, for example, what turkey is, who the pilgrims were, and what roots are. However, I agree with her that foundational knowledge is the key to the preschool experience. While some students are quick to make connections, most students do not just learn from exposure to something that the teacher says once; rather, they must be told over and over. This is what I meant at the outset of this chapter by saying that as emerging bilinguals, students already had background knowledge but that, as preschoolers, they were not able to show it. They had not yet made connections between their knowledge and the abstract representations often seen in classroom, even preschool classrooms. Students have to be taught both how to appropriate knowledge (i.e., how to make those connections between a tree, roots, and even the seasons) and what is more, how to demonstrate knowledge.
I was glad to see how María José was able to step back during our interviews and reflect on her teaching. Other teachers in her shoes would do well to become mindful of the language they use and of how they direct the class. For, as I say, while some students operate within parameters of acceptability and some more fidgety than others, all of them are still becoming accustomed to sitting still for relatively long stretches of time for the first time in their lives. Many principals and teachers would rather have students be still and remain still while an adult or a classmate is talking. Certainly _chiacchericcio_ can grow, and a student can become increasingly active, from being fidgety to whispering to another, then giggling, and poking, by which point students are too distracted to listen to the speaker. In the same way that experience plays a part in knowing what to say, likewise plays a part in knowing when to exercise more generosity or, alternately, more leniency.

Another major conclusion is that direct instruction or room for exploration. During instruction, the teacher should allow them to let them explore but should also know when and how to beckon particular answers. The DIU or collaborative completion was one such strategy. Modeling for students is another strategy. How well students respond is subjective, and that call is generally the teacher’s.
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Appendix A

Inventario de Mandatos del Profesorado y Respuestas del Alumnado

(Inventory of Teacher Directives and Student Responses)

The purpose of this classification system is to match morpho-syntactic categories to teacher utterances. Patterns may reveal better teacher communication with a certain student or group of students. Both the command and the expectation strongly encode for compliance into the imperative (cf. Hyland, 2002). In the third column of the table, directives in Spanish are highlighted, and English glosses are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Morpho-syntactic or other Form</th>
<th>Examples from data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Most direct</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>María José: Say My name [apunta con la mano, palmas arriba] Rosario: My name (Observation 7, Segment 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future immediate/periphrastic</td>
<td>María José: Te dije que las voces que usaras son de salón. Te vas a sentar acá (I told you that the voices you’ll use are inside voices. You’re going to sit here)… Since Jesús is sitting close to where the group is and is facing the group, I can see his reaction, which slowly unfolds over the next several minutes. At first, he is quiet, with a blank look in his eyes. Then, along with this look, he begins to swing his foreleg vigorously back and forth so much that he rocks a little in his chair (Observation 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future immediate/periphrastic + gesture</td>
<td>María José: &gt;Vas a irte de esta clase&lt; (&gt;You’re going to leave this classroom&lt;) [puts her finger in James’ face and his head is positioned a little down, though he is still looking at María José]. &gt;Vas a irte allá&lt; (&gt;You’re going to go there&lt;) [raises entire right arm and points to the right; at the same time, she touches James with her left hand to his wrist] &gt;para pensar cómo se debe de sentar [inaud]&lt; (&gt;to think about how you’re supposed to sit&lt;)… 0m08s María José: [inaudible] &gt;Estás oyendo↑&lt; (Do you hear me?) Both James and Michael have been looking at María José. At</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
María Jose’s question, Michael nods three times quickly. [here, María José may be making a gesture to Michael—though it’s not visible…During this speech, both students face María José. Michael’s arms are down by his sides. James’ hands are folded down and in front of him. When she dismisses them, they go to their assigned places on the rug. Michael’s place on the rug is closer than James’, so he sits right away. James waits for Michael to sit, then waits again for Jenny to move from where he should be sitting. Then he sits.] (Observation 4)

**repeated imperative**

María José: *Jesús siéntate* siéntate siéntate (Jesús sit down sit down sit down) [María José continues giving directions to the other students] [other students stand] …James looks down and away from the camera, scratches his neck with his right hand and then rubs his eye with his right thumb, then rubs his eye with his other fingers, and finally with his index finger as he steps into line behind Candace. He looks around at the other students. He makes an exaggerated running-in-place motion, then, as María José calls Marcus in a high voice to get into line, James steps forward to move (re-direct) Alexander so that he is facing in the direction of motion of the line. James, Alexander, and others begin to walk forward. The direction of the line changes and James, who was behind Candace, Alexander, Marcus and others is now in front of them. Alexander calls out *Oh!* Oh!, almost monkey-like, and the line moves forward. [all the fidgety-ness of lining up] (Observation 4)

**repeated imperative (or discourse marker)**

María José: *Oye* (Listen) [looks up at me/the camera] *eh pero >a ver a ver a ver a ver<* (Hey but let’s see let’s see)
Alex: [holds his hands up and makes an exploding noise, then crosses his arms, martial arts style] [What prompted this? the cuchillo remark, perhaps]
…María José: *Escuchen una cosa* la gente inteligente oye (Listen to something Intelligent people are listening (imp. listen?)) Alex >Alex Alex Alex< [makes one more martial arts motion, then pulls up his sleeve and shows his forearms to Ana, who is seated beside him] (Observation 4)

**imperative + gesture**

María José: *Por qué tenía silla de ruedas?* (Why did he have a wheelchair?)
*Mírame* (Look at me) [looks straight at Marcus, leans in and
| 2 | “tener que” (to have to) | María José: ...me tienes que decir “maestra me abrochas el zapato” (...you have to say “teacher can you tie my shoe)
Britani: [shifts by moving her hip outward, scratches her nose, drops her head] maestra me abro- (teacher can you tie)
[inaudible] (Observation 1) |
| 2 | imperative + modeling | María José: Enséñenme una cara con sueño (Show me a sleepy face) [covers her mouth as she yawns] ...
[Rosario yawns visibly, and other yawns can be heard. James and Jenny, however, do not yawn. Jenny looks down (bored?). After she yawns (actually pantomimes a yawn) along with the rest of the class, María José lets out an actual yawn, which she covers with her right hand, after which she puts this hand in her mouth ...
[4m13s Rosario yawns] (Observation 4) |
| 2 | indicative | María José: Empezamos (We are beginning/ Let’s begin)
[Leans back over to the other side and taps Jenny on the shoulder] [When she says this, the students make no visible sign that are “assuming the listening position;” however, when, at 0m39s, she picks up the book and shows it to the class, Jenny, James, Micaela, Alex, Britani, Jesús, and Marcus – everyone in the camera shot except Ana—can be seen looking up at the book] (Observation 4) |
| 2 | hortative as establishing routine | María José: [closes the book quickly and puts it on her lap, puts her right hand up to her temple] Pensemos (Let’s think)
[all students except Jenny, who is rubbing her eye, follow María José and put their hands to their temples] (Observation 4) |
<p>| 2 | imperatives repeated in a string of | María José: Párate (Stand up) [nodding her head] (. ) inténtalo ok↑ (try it, ok?) (. ) Diles (Say) (high voice) “Sal pipis” (Come out pee-pees) (. ) Así le dices “Sal pipis” y vas a ver como así |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>directives</td>
<td>te salen O:k (You say it like this “Come out pee-ppees, and you’ll see how they’ll come out O:k) [Michael walks by camera view as Greta-Ann turns to Marcus, gives a smile and a short wail] (Observation 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse marker + imperative</td>
<td>María José: Pero Candace mira (But Candace look) [Jenny can be seen with eyebrows raised and rocking her head side-to-side. Jason makes a similar, more subtle, gesture with head and eyes] (Observation 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“puede” (can)-as-threat</td>
<td>María José: El niño que no está escuchando puede ir con la maestra (The child who is not listening can go to the teacher) [motions next door de al lado (next door) Students look at her. James puts his hand, spread out, up to his face, looks at her through from between his fingers and bows his head slightly. Three students straighten their posture. (Observation 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directive associated with a threat / consequence</td>
<td>María José: Ana Ana (.) quieres ir con Mis. Jaramillo ↑o (Ana Ana, do you want to go to Ms. Jaramillo’s room?) <a href=".">James makes a sour face and lowers his head slightly</a> Ok entonces [pointing] enseñame criss-cross apple sauce ↑ (Ok then show me criss-cross apple sauce) [when I move the camera back to her, at about 8m02, she is on all fours, slowly moving back into “criss-cross apple sauce” position] (Observation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse marker + negotiating + “puedes” (you can)</td>
<td>María José: Sabes q↑ue Si vamos a leer ahorita Si puedes por favor sentarte ↑e (You know what [Discourse Marker] We’re going to read now [Discourse Marker] Can you please sit down) [Ana moves Clifford to the floor as she “kneels down” and looks at María José for a period of before approx. 6.5 seconds, then looks under the sofa and moves Clifford there] y vamos a ((inaudible)) y tú puedes abrazarlo a Clifford ↑ok (and we’re going to ((inaudible)) and you can hug Clifford, ok?) [caterogizing these directives may be difficult, as María José wants the class to sit still so that she can teach—hay dos objetivos] Ana tie:nes que abrazar &gt;tu tu tu&lt; perro tienes (Ana you have to hug your your your dog, but you have) [hugs him closer] Enseñame tu criss-cros apple sauce o↑k (Show me your criss-cross apple sauce) [Ana crosses her legs (left over right), then uncrosses them and crosses them the other way(right over left)] (Observation 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL +</td>
<td>María José: So now I am going I am go↑ing to pick up the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative (&quot;going to&quot;) + gesture</td>
<td>little ahm (.) [María José takes the bin for the güiros. Ana stands and places her güiros in the bin (Observation 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>imperative + distractor (with a hortative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | María José: *Haz así* (Do like this) [leans back, rubs her own belly, and begins to chant]  
*Sana, sana, colita de rana, si no curas hoy, curarás mañana* (Get better, get better, frog’s tail, If you don’t get better you’ll get better tomorrow) (Observation 2)  
*Chin-currín-currín-chunchún* [These are nonsense lyrics that fit the meter of the rhyme]  
[students look at one another and at least four begin to rub their bellies]  
Ana: (.) *No se me quintó* [sic] (It didn’t goes [sic] away) (Observation 2) |
| | María José: *A ver todos vamos a cantarle* (Ok let’s all sing to her)  
[She leads another round of the song with the belly-rubbing motion. This time, I see seven students—all but three who are in the room at the time –rub their bellies as well.] (Observation 2) |
| | an appeal (similar to leveling) |
| | María José: *Ayúdenme por favor los ojitos vie:ndo a la maestra* (.) *la naricita*: oyendo [(inaudible)] (.) *la boquita*: voces de salón (Help me please your eyes looking at the teacher your little nose hearing [sic] (inaudible)) (.) Your little mouth inside voices)  
0m43s [Here I focus on Rosario, who had lifted her skirt and had been biting on the hem, and, when María José when says ‘voces de salón,’ (inside voices) turns to the girl sitting beside her, Jenny, and mouths along with María José.] (Observation 4) |
<p>| | threat / consequence + leveling |
| | María José: <em>[...la persona que] necesite estar en la clase de</em> [motions with both hands to the class next door] <em>estar en la clase the Mis. Jaramillo (.) se va a la clase de Mis. Jaramillo</em> (the person who needs to be in the [motions with both hands to the class next door] be in class of Mis. Jaramillo goes to the class of Mis. Jaramillo) [lowers her head and makes a sweeping motion, again, to the class next door] <em>La persona que quiera escuchar</em> (The person who wants to listen) [takes a book and pans it so that the whole class may see*] <em>esta</em> (this)[a voice is heard off camera, though María José takes no note of it] <em>maravillosa historia</em> a se puede quedar aquí en este salón* (marvelous story can stay here in this class) | [Rosario has been lolling her tongue around as María José has |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>been talking]</td>
<td>1m24s Student off camera: (in an excited whisper) Yo (Observation 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL + indicative + noun only / noun w adjectival</td>
<td>María José: [poking at Rosario with a güiro] O:ne &gt;scoot back&lt; O:ne &gt;scoot back&lt; [no movement from Rosario except to move her knee up slightly when María José probes her] (Observation 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>establishing routines</td>
<td>María José: *es un niño o una niña que: se: lla:ma: (is a boy or girl named) [presumably here she is picking out the new daily helper, though María José is off camera right now] Student off camera: ANA James clamps his hand over his mouth. María José: Michael. Michael ((inaudible)) Michael stands and moves to the front of the class to do his job as the daily helper. [he must know that he has to do this] (Observation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeling</td>
<td>María José: <em>Ser valiente es</em> (To be brave is) [slaps her thigh and leans in to the students] NO TENER MIEDO (NOT TO BE AFRAID) [modeling] [Overall the students show no outward reaction.] (Observation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establishing routines</td>
<td>María José: <em>Tres (.) dos (.) uno</em> (Three, two, one) [Michael moves his hands up and Jenny moves quickly to her place] <em>No no no</em> * Uno (.)* (No no no. One) [many students—Michael, Candace, Britani, and James. Greta-Teresa does no, as she is flipping through a book] <em>dos (.) tres</em> (two, three) [puts her hands up to her head, as if making coyote ears] (low voice) <em>Orejitas de coyote o de lobo (.) AU: (Coyote ears o Wolf’s ears (.) Awuuhh)</em> [Here, all students follow suit with the coyote’s howl, including Greta-Teresa. María José and the students all lower their hands] (Observation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establishing routines</td>
<td>María José: (high voice, very rhythmically) [holding out hands, palms up as Jenny shrugs her shoulders and grimaces] *Y ((inaudible)) hiciste un buen trabajo Jenny Un aplauso por favor (And ((inaudible)) you did a good job Jenny A round of applause please] [applauds and many, though not all, students applaud, too] (Observation 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Protocol for Interview with Administrator

1. How is teaching a pre-school student different than teaching an older student, say, a third grader?

2. How is the preschool program here at your school different from teaching a third grader?

3. What is the philosophy here at this school?

4. Some other comment or topic?
Appendix C

Protocol for Interviews with Teacher

Initial Interview: Teacher’s Philosophy and Approach to Teaching and Discipline

1. *Describe en términos generales su aproximación a la enseñanza.*

(Describe in general terms your approach to teaching.)

2. ¿Cómo se diferencia enseñar a un niño pre-escolar que a un niño mayor, digamos, de tercer grado?

(How is teaching a pre-school student different than teaching an older student, say, a third grader?)

3. ¿Cómo se diferencia enseñar a un niño de otro país (o cuyos padres son de otro país) que a uno de acá?

(How is teaching a student from another country (or whose parents are from another country) different from teaching a student who is from here?)

4. ¿Hace algo en particular para mejorar su instrucción al momento de enseñar?

(Do you do something in particular to improve your instruction when you teach?)

5. *Describe en términos generales su aproximación a la disciplina.*

(Describe in general terms your approach to discipline.)

6. ¿Cómo se aproxima Ud. a las reglas en el salón de clase?

(How do you approach rules in the classroom?)

7. ¿Qué haría Ud. con un estudiante que no la escucha?

(What would you do with a student who does not listen to you?)

8. ¿Algún otro comentario o asunto?

(Some other comment or topic?)
Protocol for Interviews with Teacher Regarding Student Interactions

These interviews will assume a semi-structured format. Because I will be asking about teacher-student interactions around directives, I will want to follow a standard format across the board in asking about these interactions. However, I also want to grant the teacher leeway to elaborate and provide her own perspectives. The structure for interviews with the teacher will assume four steps:

1. On my digital camera, I will replay an utterance-response sequence that includes a directive. I will say, “Le quiero reproducir lo que decía Ud. en dicha fecha” (I want to replay an utterance from [such and such date]). In order to avoid swaying her opinion, I will say nothing else at this point. We will watch the utterance together.

2. I will then ask the teacher to give me some background, saying something like, “¿Cuál era el contexto en este momento?” (“What was context at the time?”) or “Contame sobre el contexto en este momento” (“Tell me about the context at the time”).

3. I will then ask teacher more specific situational with questions such as, “¿Qué ocurría en la clase en este momento?” (What was going on in the classroom at this point?) and, “¿Cuáles eran tus intenciones en este momento?” (What were your intentions at this point?).

4. At this point, I will allow the teacher to comment more freely about her interpretations.
There will be different possibilities as to how the student or students responded. I anticipate that:

1. student’s/students’ reaction(s) were in line with what the teacher expected (i.e., the student/students complied); or

2. student’s/students’ reaction(s) were different from what the teacher expected (i.e., the student/students did not comply).
Appendix D

Protocol for Interviews with Students

Protocol for interviews with the students will assume a semi-structured format. Because I will be asking about teacher-student interactions around directives, I will want to follow the same format across the board when asking about all interactions. However, I also want to grant the students leeway to elaborate and provide their own perspectives. The structure for interviews with the students will assume three steps:

1. I will remind students about what the teacher said in a select utterance-response sequence that included a directive. I will say, “¿Te acuerdas / ¿Se acuerdan cuando la profesora te / les dijo [utterance] durante [such and such time/date]?” (“Do you / you all remember when the teacher said [utterance] on [such and such time/date]?”).

2. I will then ask one or more students (whichever ones were involved) about their responses to the teacher’s directive.

3. At this point, I will allow students to comment more freely about their interpretations.

As with the teacher’s responses (see Appendix B), there will be different possibilities as to how the student or students respond during these interviews and their explanations. I anticipate that:

1. student’s/students’ reaction(s) and explanations were in line with what was expected (i.e., the student/students complied);

2. student’s/students’ reaction(s) and explanations were different from what was expected (i.e., the student/students did not comply). For example, the student(s) misunderstood, or the student(s) were defiant.
Appendix E

Template for Observation Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>El habla y gestos (gestos ling.) [gestos extraling.]</th>
<th>Apuntes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>SEGMENTO 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>(2) Previous and current activity: ; (3) Who is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present and what their orientations are: ; (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major voices: ; (5) Minor voices: (chiacchiericcie).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0m00s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>SEGMENTO 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>(2) Previous and current activity: ; (3) Who is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present and what their orientations are: ; (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major voices: ; (5) Minor voices: (chiacchiericcie).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0m00s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>SEGMENTO 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>(2) Previous and current activity: ; (3) Who is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present and what their orientations are: ; (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major voices: ; (5) Minor voices: (chiacchiericcie).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0m00s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Transcription Symbols Used in Observations Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example from the Corpus in Spanish</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| :     | prolonged vowel | e.g., E:l abuelo respiró  
(The: grandfather breathed) | Observation 4, Segment 2 |
| ALL CAPS or (high volume) | utterance (whether a directive or not) spoken at a higher volume | e.g., MIRA AQUÍ  
(LOOK HERE) | Observation 8, Segment 4 |
| > < | speech uttered at a faster rate than surrounding speech | e.g., Cómo mañana no >vamos a venir a la escuela porque< mañana…  
(Since tomorrow >we’re not coming to school because< tomorrow…) | Observation 10, Segment 1 |
| < > | speech uttered at a slower rate than surrounding speech | e.g., Many students: [chiming in at the same time] <filosos>  
Many students: [chiming in at the same time] <sharp> | Observation 12, Segment 6 |
| ↑ | rise in intonation, arrow placed just before the vowel | | |
e.g., Oigan saben cómo están ustedes Uds. están

(Listen you know how you’re being You’re being)

Observation 5, Segment 1

fall in intonation, arrow placed just before the vowel

e.g., Ann vente conmigo

([Greta-]Ann come with me)

Observation 10, Segment 5

high intonation, sustained across a word or phrase

e.g., Y entonces qué tiene tu árbol

(^And so what does your tree have^)

Observation 8, Segment 8

drawn out consonant (tap “r” only, not trill or any other consonant)

e.g., para dormir

(in order to sleep)

Observation 8, Segment 8
## Overview of Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Primary activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1    | 9:44 a.m. | 2m00s Morning circle, later interrupted to go to music   | • María José reprimanded Michael and James  
• María José picked daily helper (Michael, who had just been reprimanded)  
• The class made a transition to music                                                                                                           |
| 4.2    | 10:28 a.m.| 8m11s Whole group reading in small room                 | • María José blew Simon’s nose  
• review of rules for sitting and listening to stories  
• reading of *Los secretos de abuelo sapo* (Grandpa Toad’s Secrets by Keiko Kasza)  
• negotiation with Ana, whose stomach hurt                                                                                                       |
| 4.3    | 10:35 a.m.| 6m15s Continuation from previous segment, whole group reading in small room | • María José led discussions on being brave and being fearful  
• At one point, María José called out Alex saying, “*Ser valiente es para ayudar a los demás*” (Being brave is for helping others)                      |
| 4.4    | 10:50 a.m.| 0m16s *Alex wanted to do the train                       | • In the background, Rosario and Jenny could be seen teasing each other                                                                                                                                 |
| 4.5    | 10:56 a.m.| 3m30s Transition from bathroom, warm-up to return to story, peer | • Review of *Los secretos de abuelo sapo*  
• Collaborative learning / |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10:01 a.m.</td>
<td>Morning circle, transition into centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11:09 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition just before going outside for recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11:18 a.m.</td>
<td>*Getting ready to read while students came and went to the lavatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11:28 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition by lining students up according to what articles and color of clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11:35 a.m.</td>
<td>Practice motions and then song in English with güiros (teacher and students had 2 each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:07 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition from play time in small room to sitting in small room just before going to computers</td>
<td>2m12s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny said No following a teacher directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María José led the “Aguni-guni-sha” song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition by lining students up according to what articles and color of clothing</td>
<td>4m02s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many students showed María José their clothes before lining up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María José mentions “Abrazos y burbujas” (Hugs and bubbles) when they line up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:24 a.m.</td>
<td>Reading in small room of <em>The Little Red Hen</em>, including actions by María José and the students</td>
<td>6m08s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:37 a.m.</td>
<td>First small group instruction: introduction of lower case letters</td>
<td>2m18s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11:43 a.m.</td>
<td>2m53s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11:50 a.m.</td>
<td>1m35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11:56 a.m.</td>
<td>3m03s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12:05 p.m.</td>
<td>1m27s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12:11 p.m.</td>
<td>1m37s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9:44 a.m.</td>
<td>5m14s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instead of “chiquito y grande” (big and small), when asked, “¿Es chiquito o grande?” (Is it small or big?)

- The discussion went in the direction of Christmas trees and Christmas presents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:46 a.m.</td>
<td>Small group instruction: same group as immediately above</td>
<td>2m27s</td>
<td>Maria José drew a tree, students began to tell what color crayon they wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 a.m.</td>
<td>English lesson</td>
<td>1m38s</td>
<td>Maria José led a “Good morning” song in English, melody, lyrics, and gestures, Maria José led them in asking them to say their names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:43 a.m.</td>
<td>Continuation of English lesson from immediately above</td>
<td>2m20s</td>
<td>MJ asks Candace if she’s a girl, MJ leads the class with walking, jumping, dancing, reading, and finally sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Continuation of English lesson from immediately above</td>
<td>1m18s</td>
<td>Alex reads, walks, jumps, Greta-Ann reads, dances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:58 a.m.</td>
<td>Continuation of English lesson from immediately above</td>
<td>4m43s</td>
<td>Then long q&amp;a about family, favorite foods, etc., MJ models coughing into the crook of her arm for Jenny, who seems not to take notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:17 a.m.</td>
<td>Whole group lesson: parts of a tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition between reading group and learning centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:26 a.m.</td>
<td>Small group instruction at the small table in the smaller room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:33 a.m.</td>
<td>Discussion with the same group as immediately above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:41 a.m.</td>
<td>Exit activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:57 a.m.</td>
<td>Second small group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:04 a.m.</td>
<td>Transition: Sing-along of “Aguni-guni-sha” with whole group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12 a.m.</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18 a.m.</td>
<td>Whole group lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Exercise in digging, planting, watering & sprouting
- Coaxes Jenny to participate
- Coaxes Jenny
- Negotiation with James
- Reading of the objective
- Hangnail discussion
- Touching parts of tree-roots
- Students are reluctant at first
- Trying to get them to say “roots”
- Virtual walk
- Exit activity
- Discussion about needles on a pine tree
- Brief discussion about “puchar”/ “puchando”
- Side discussion in the Notes section (musing, ruminations) about what makes a successful directive
- Zings James for singing
- Discussion on pajamas
- Peer questioning
| (p. 86) | 9.2 | 9:25 a.m. | 1m22s | Building vocabulary | • Discussion in side-notes about responding to peer questioning  
  • “Orejitas de lobo” brings them back together |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.3 | 9:26 a.m. | 0m21s | Transition to split from whole group to activity centers and small instructional groups | • MJ tells (with gesture) Jesús to wait to go to the restroom  
  • Prompting for “furiosa” |
| 9.4 | 9:33 a.m. | 3m36s | Small group instruction | • Discussion on the change in seasons on a tree  
  • Peer questioning |
| 9.5 | 9:50 a.m. | 5m38s | Small group instruction (different group than immediately above) | • Longer, more elaborate set-up (listening position) than with previous group  
  • Dispensing statement of the objective  
  • Discussion on the change in seasons on a tree  
  • Peer questioning |
| 9.6 | 11:02 a.m. | 3m36s | Same lesson as above but now with a different group | • Listening position  
  • Discussion about the four seasons, including the heat of summer  
  • MJ brings the group back together with “Orejitas de lobo” |
<p>| 9.7 | 11:27 a.m. | 0m57s | Exit activity for lesson above with James | • Explains what he did and some key concepts around the activity |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:8</td>
<td>Exit activity for lesson above with Micaela</td>
<td>2m15s</td>
<td>Explains what she did and some key concepts around the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>English lesson</td>
<td>5m15s</td>
<td>MJ: I am fine? How are you? Use of pictures and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Morning Circle</td>
<td>8m11s</td>
<td>“If You’re Happy and you Know It” song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students pick motions for the rest of the class to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Days of the week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I’ll have to give a prize to…” for good behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Whole Group Instruction on butterflies and trees</td>
<td>5m34s</td>
<td>“Aguni-guni-sha” song with finger motions at the beginning of the session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MJ leads the class through some yoga like stretches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MJ struggles to get class’s attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer questioning to get the class back on task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>El baile de las Chiapanecas (con máscara/pañuelo)</td>
<td>1m46s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Transitions between dance lessons</td>
<td>2m01s</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>El baile de las Chiapanecas (con máscara/pañuelo)</td>
<td>0m42s</td>
<td>Begins to work on some blocking/choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10:21 a.m.</td>
<td>4m20s</td>
<td>El baile de las Chiapanecas (with music) • Continues with blocking/choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10:32 a.m.</td>
<td>7m22s</td>
<td>El baile de las Chiapanecas (with music) • Continues with blocking/choreography • Michaela seems detached • “Quién está listo” questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10:38 a.m.</td>
<td>2m33s</td>
<td>El baile de las Chiapanecas • Continues with blocking/choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10:48 a.m.</td>
<td>1m18s</td>
<td>Cutting activity in small group • MJ instructs cutting with a scissors, focusing on Alex, then Ana, then Jesús</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>10:49 a.m.</td>
<td>0m24s</td>
<td>Cutting activity in small group • MJ instructs cutting with a scissors, focusing on Micaela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11:44 a.m.</td>
<td>8m11s</td>
<td>Ms. Domínguez •</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Lost (no sé qué pasó) •</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9:20 a.m.</td>
<td>5m20s</td>
<td>Morning Circle • Sing “Hola cómo estás” song together • Pick Candace as the Daily Helper • MJ points out a color pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9:14 a.m.</td>
<td>7m11s</td>
<td>Whole group story reading about an owl • Student discipline issues with Ana, Michael • Discussion about animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9:21 a.m.</td>
<td>1m41s</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brilliant footage of students on task, then off task (bc of the teachers?), then rebuked by MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9:27 a.m.</td>
<td>3m28s</td>
<td>Small group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pelts (Don’t be afraid; touch them!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Class discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9:53 a.m.</td>
<td>7m40s</td>
<td>Transition to small group instruction (next group, different from above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pelts (passes them out to each student individually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10:04 a.m.</td>
<td>4m20s</td>
<td>Students draw while MJ goes around and facilitates, then transition for the next group of small group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MJ makes suggestions as to what goes on the birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8-11</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Lost (no sé qué pasó)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>n.t.</td>
<td>English lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• “I am a monkey” “No you are not!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>n.t.</td>
<td>Interaction with Micaela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• “Se dice carro”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1.1</td>
<td>9:01 a.m.</td>
<td>0m37s</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lots of chatter (NB: not chiacchericchio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No directives marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1.2</td>
<td>9:09 a.m.</td>
<td>6m02s</td>
<td>Morning Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rosario está demostrando que está lista…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Canción “Si estás feliz y lo sabes…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alex mistakes “machucar” for “manejar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9:11 a.m. Visit from the dental professionals</td>
<td>1m32s</td>
<td>• MJ keeps the class quelled from the paraphernalia of the dental professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9:12 a.m. Continuation of visit from the dental professionals</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>• Pueden contar hasta 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Domínguez in transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td>MJ with Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• “…un hombre sentado en un restaurante elegante…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11:10 Transition into Whole Group instruction</td>
<td>6m11s</td>
<td>• Long time getting students settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion on animales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nests (in English), [remember when someone said Yellow for the color of a student’s dress],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11:16 a.m. Continuation of this instruction</td>
<td>3m51s</td>
<td>• Discussion on snakes and other predators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11:27 a.m. Small group instruction</td>
<td>6m03s</td>
<td>• Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Characteristics of snakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11:35 a.m. Transition to next group in small group instruction</td>
<td>0m50s</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>11:36 a.m. Small group instruction with group immediately above</td>
<td>5m35s</td>
<td>• Listening position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Objective (smoother than with previous group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event details</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>11:53 a.m.</td>
<td>0m31s Transition</td>
<td>● No directives identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?? Breve intercambio entre MJ y mí</td>
<td>● Interview w MJ: su declaración de usar inglés después en el año</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?? No sé qué pasó</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12:16 p.m.</td>
<td>0m44s Handwashing and then to Ms. Domínguez</td>
<td>● Modeling of handwashing while singing a numbers song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Approx 12:25 p.m.</td>
<td>?? Lunch and transition</td>
<td>● Students snuck over to watch a video and MJ blamed me for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?? No sé qué pasó</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1:07 p.m.</td>
<td>5m48s Singing of “El árbol tiene un tronco”</td>
<td>● MJ sends Rosario and Jenny to the back of the class, and I record their elaborated responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2:39 p.m.</td>
<td>1m28 Ms. Domínguez with Micaela</td>
<td>● Can’t use bc MJ isn’t giving directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2:43 p.m.</td>
<td>2m32 Ms. Domínguez with Greta-Teresa</td>
<td>● Can’t use bc MJ isn’t giving directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2:44 p.m.</td>
<td>0m41s Ms. Domínguez with Greta-Teresa</td>
<td>● Can’t use bc MJ isn’t giving directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9:11 a.m.</td>
<td>8m11s Morning Circle</td>
<td>● Passing out Sani-wipes ● “Ya salió el sol” ● Adiós Marcus” (old helper) ● New daily helper Alex ● Days of the week ● Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>(p. 186)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>(p. 193)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9:11 a.m.</td>
<td>0m17s</td>
<td>Small group (while MJ takes roll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9:12 a.m.</td>
<td>0m18s</td>
<td>Continuation from segment immediately above: Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10:57 a.m.</td>
<td>2m52s</td>
<td>Morning snack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10:59 a.m.</td>
<td>0m45s</td>
<td>Alex collects handi-wipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11:01 a.m.</td>
<td>1m09s</td>
<td>Alphabet song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11:02 a.m.</td>
<td>0m17s</td>
<td>Continuation of alphabet song, from immediately above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11:42 a.m.</td>
<td>7m22s</td>
<td>Individual writing lesson- MJ with Micaela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9:26 a.m.</td>
<td>8m11s</td>
<td>Transition and Morning Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9:29 a.m.</td>
<td>1m59s</td>
<td>Transition into small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Small group instruction</td>
<td>1m48s</td>
<td>Peer questioning about fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Continuation of small group instruction from immediately above</td>
<td>0m45s</td>
<td>Discussion on where pineapples come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Continuation of small group instruction from immediately above</td>
<td>0m27s</td>
<td>Continuation of discussion on where pineapples come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>0m50s</td>
<td>Some students lined up as MJ gives instructions to Ms. Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>Transition and beginning of lesson with the next small group</td>
<td>3m31s</td>
<td>Peer questioning. MJ leads the discussion on where pineapples come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>Continuation of small group instruction from immediately above</td>
<td>1m21s</td>
<td>MJ leads the discussion on where pineapples come from. Mild rebuke from MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>Ms. Domínguez rebukes Johnny for what he had done to Greta-Teresa</td>
<td>0m28s</td>
<td>Can’t use bc MJ isn’t giving directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>English lesson</td>
<td>18m08s</td>
<td>Transition in Spanish. MJ rebukes Marcus. What clothes are tight and which clothes are loose. Transition in English to small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 a.m.</td>
<td>Sewing lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afterwards, transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:07 a.m.</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counting as a transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuke of Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:29 a.m.</td>
<td>Whole group lesson</td>
<td>3m39s</td>
<td>Focus on student who is talking at the moment, Discussion on where their parents work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:13 a.m.</td>
<td>English lesson</td>
<td>6m12s</td>
<td>Review farm animals, Sing-along of “Old McDonald”, Trouble saying “turkey”, Rebuke by MJ on Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Student Assent Form /

Child Participant Assent Form

(Spanish Script) Me presento:
Si tienen alguna pregunta o duda, siempre pueden preguntarle a mi o a su profesora. ¿Ok?

Introduction (English Script):
Class, good morning / good afternoon. Many of you remember me I’m Antonio-Máximo, friend of your teacher’s. Well, I’m back to see how it’s going in school, and now I’m going to be recording certain sessions when you’re all here. I would like to see you all participate because will help me see how well you all learn. But, if you would rather not, no problem.
If you have any question, feel free to come to me or to your teacher and ask. Ok?

During the first session of the Small Group Interviews, I will read the following scripts:
Script 1 (to the group): “Voy a estar observando cómo la profesora enseña y cómo Uds. aprenden. Script 2 (to each student individually): Ahora, [estudiante 1], ¿está bien si te hago preguntas y apunto y grabo tus respuestas? [esperar respuesta oral; luego, indicar asentimiento poniendo una paloma frente a su nombre en una lista].”

Script 1 (to the group): “I’ll be observing how Ms. Campos teaches and how you learn.”
Script 2 (to each student individually): “Now, [Student 1], is it ok if I ask you some questions and write down/record your answers?” [wait for verbal response; then check off name from a checklist].”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha (Date)</th>
<th>Alumno por pseudónimo (Student by pseudonym)</th>
<th>Asentimiento Oral (Verbal Assent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25Agosto ‘14</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25Agosto ‘14</td>
<td>AnneMarie</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25Agosto ’14</td>
<td>Piotr</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
Parent / Guardian Consent Form
Research Study:
“Teacher Directives and Learner Comprehension in a Bilingual Preschool Classroom”
Antonio Naula-Rodríguez, EdM, MA, Doctoral Candidate and Principal Investigator,
School of Education, University of Colorado at Boulder

Dear Parent or Guardian:

Purpose of this study: The purpose of this study is to find out more about:
1. how the teacher uses spoken directives in the class in order to: (a) instruct and (b) manage the classroom?
2. What are key differences between these types of teacher directives, especially, in (a) linguistic structure, (b) intention? How does teacher language change, for example, with different groups or individuals or at different times of the day?
3. How do students understand these directives?

Data Collection: In August, September, and October of 2015, I will be in Ms. Campos’s class to observe and take notes on classroom interactions. These sessions will be videotaped. No one else will see videos except me or my advisor. For these observations, your child will not be asked to do anything outside the regular teaching day. The teaching day will continue as normal.
I will also have individual interviews with the teacher and three short, group interviews with a paraprofessional and small groups of three to five students. These interviews will be audiotaped (not videotaped). Interviews with the students will not take longer than five minutes.
I may also be taking photos of artifacts (such as writing or drawing) in order to get a sense of the classroom environment. I will remove any identifying information from these photos

Choice of Participation: You have the right to choose to have your child participate in this study and also to leave the study at any moment without penalty. They will not suffer any negative consequences if they do not participate.

Benefits / Risks: The main benefit is to my research: how teachers and students communicate with each other via directives. Otherwise, there are no major benefits to this study, including monetary compensation. However, there are also no major foreseeable risks to participation in this study. There is no cost to the student as participant. The research project will not disrupt activities, including learning, in the classroom.

Time-line for Data Collection: I will be in charge of all data collection and storage. My plan is to finish data collection in the fall semester of 2015 (especially August, September, and October), and I will destroy all data collected on Friday, Dec. 11, 2015. Data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my office on the University of Colorado campus.

Confidentiality: I will make every effort to maintain the privacy and confidentiality of all participants in every step of the study: data collection, data analysis and reporting of study results. Real names will not be used; instead, pseudonyms will be used for all people and places.

Contact Person in Case of Questions: Parents please be aware that under the Protection of Pupil Rights Act, you have the right to review a copy of the questions asked of or materials that will be used with your students. If you would like to do so, you should contact: Antonio Naula-Rodríguez (Antonio.Rodriguez@colorado.edu) at 303-492-0508 to obtain a copy of the questions or materials. You may also contact my supervisor in this study, Kathy Escamilla (Kathy.Escamilla@colorado.edu). If you have questions about your rights as a research study participant, you can call the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is independent from the research team. You can contact the IRB if you have concerns or complaints that you do not want to talk to the study team about. The IRB phone number is (303) 735-3702.

Authorization and Consent: I, ___________________________, have read this form concerning this research I am aware of the benefits and risks. I know that my child’s participation is voluntary and that he or she is free to participate or refuse to participate at any moment. I have received, on the date accompanying my signature, a copy of this Consent Form.

(please circle Yes or No and sign below)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, I give consent …</th>
<th>for my child to participate in this study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I do not give consent…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of the Parent or Guardian: _____________________________________________  
(name of parent or guardian)

Signature of Parent or Guardian: _____________________________________________ Date: ____________  
(signature of parent or guardian)

Name of the Child: _____________________________________________  
(child’s name)
Estudio de Investigación

“Teacher Directives and Learner Comprehension in a Bilingual Preschool Classroom”
(“Mandatos de la maestra y comprensión del estudiante en una clase bilingüe prescolar”)

Antonio Rodríguez, EdM, MA, Investigador Principal
Escuela de Educación (Pedagogía)
Universidad de Colorado en Boulder

Formulario de Consentimiento del Padre

Estimado Padre o Encargado de Familia:

**Propósito del estudio de investigación:** El propósito de este estudio es el de conocer más respecto a:
1. ¿Cómo es que esta profesora (maestra) usa mandatos para: (a) enseñar? (b) manejar su clase?
2. ¿Cuáles son las diferencias claves entre los varios mandatos de la profesora, en particular, en su forma de (a) frases e (b) intención? ¿Cómo cambia la manera de hablar de la profesora?
3. ¿Cómo comprenden los alumnos?

**Procedimientos de recolectar datos:** En Agosto, Septiembre, y Octubre de 2015, yo estaré en la clase de Ms. Campos para observar y tomar apuntes sobre interacciones en la clase. Estas sesiones de clase serán grabadas por video. Nadie más verá estos videos. Para estas observaciones, su hijo o hija no tendrá que hacer nada fuera de lo requerido para la clase de Ms. Campos. Además, yo haré entrevistas con Ms. Campos y tres breves entrevistas en grupo con la asistente de Ms. Campos y tres a cinco estudiantes a la vez. Estas entrevistas serán grabadas por audio (no video). Las entrevistas con los estudiantes no durarán más de cinco minutos cada sesión. También, capaz tomé tomé fotos de artefactos (como escrituras o dibujos) para familiarizarme con el ambiente del salón de clase. Yo quitaré cualquier pista identificadora de estas fotos.

**Elección de participación:** Ud. tiene el derecho de elegir la participación de su hijo o hija en este estudio y también de dejar de participar en cualquier momento. No habrá ninguna consecuencia negativa si no participan.

**Beneficios / Riesgos:** El beneficio mayor de este estudio es un entendimiento más profundo de cómo la profesora y sus estudiantes se comunican a través de los mandatos. Por otra parte, no hay mayores beneficios con este estudio, incluyendo recompensa monetaria. Pero, como participación en este estudio, tampoco hay mayores riesgos que se puedan prever. No hay costo para participar en este estudio. Los datos serán recogidos en forma de observación y entrevistas, y no interrumpirán las actividades en la clase.

**Trayectoria de colección de datos:** Yo me encargaré de recoger y almacenar todos los datos. Mi plan es de terminar de recoger datos en el otoño del 2015, y voy a rehacerme de los mismos el viernes, 11 de diciembre, 2015. Mientras tanto, los datos serán almacenados en una gaveta con seguro en mi oficina en el campus de la Universidad de Colorado.

**Confidencialidad:** Yo haré todo lo posible para respetar la privacidad y confidencialidad de los estudiantes durante el proceso del estudio: el recolectar de datos, el análisis, y en el reportaje. Usaré nombres ficticios en los datos y reportajes.

**Contacto en caso de preguntas o dudas:** Padres deben saber que, bajo de Acto de Protección de Derechos de Alumnos (Protection of Pupil Rights Act, en inglés), tienen el derecho de revisar una copia de preguntas o materiales que se usarán con sus hijos / hijas. Si así desean, pueden comunicarse Antonio Rodríguez (Antonio.Rodriguez@colorado.edu) en 303-492-0508. También se puede comunicar con mi supervisora en este estudio, la profesora Kathy Escamilla (Kathy.Escamilla@colorado.edu). Puede comunicarse con el IRB si tiene alguna duda o queja sobre cual no prefiere hablar con el equipo de investigación. El número telefónico del IRB es (303) 735-3702.

**Autorización y Consentimiento:** Yo, _______________________________________, he leído este formulario sobre este estudio de investigación. Me he enterado de los beneficios y riesgos del mismo. Yo sé que la participación de mi hijo / hija es voluntaria y que él / ella puede elegir participar o dejar de participar en cualquier momento. He recibido en esta misma fecha una copia de este Formulario de Consentimiento.

Si doy consentimiento ___ … para que mi hijo / hija participe en este estudio.
No, no doy consentimiento _____.

Si doy consentimiento ___ … para que mi hijo / hija participe en este estudio.
No, no doy consentimiento _____.


Nombre del padre / encargado de familia: ____________________________
(nombre del padre / encargado de familia)
Firma del padre / encargado de familia: ____________________________ Fecha: __________
(firma del padre / encargado de familia)
Nombre de su hijo / hija: __________________________________________
(nombre de su hijo / hija)
Appendix J

Teacher / Paraprofessional Consent Form

Research Study:
“Teacher Directives and Learner Comprehension in a Bilingual Preschool Classroom”
Antonio Rodríguez, EdM, MA, Doctoral Candidate and Principal Investigator,
School of Education, University of Colorado at Boulder

Teacher / Para-professional Consent Form

Dear Teacher / Para-professional:
Please, read the information below. It explains this research study. I (Antonio Rodríguez) want you to be informed of this study, its purpose, and procedures, as well as any risks and benefits associated with participation.

Purpose of this study: This study is designed to explore the following research questions:
1. How does the teacher use directives with students in order to:
   (a) facilitate learning (i.e., to teach)? and (b) manage the classroom?
2. With respect to teaching and learning, what are key differences between types of teacher directives, in particular, in (a) linguistic structure, (b) intention? How does teacher language change, for example, with different groups or individuals or at different times of the day?
3. Conversely, how do students respond to these directives?

Data collection:
Classroom observations: in order to see how the teacher communicates via directives in the classroom, I will observe and take notes on classroom interactions. These sessions will be videotaped. For these observations, the teacher and students will not be asked to do anything outside of a regular day.

Group interviews: in order to verify how students interpret teacher directives, I will be speaking with small student groups of three to five students at a time, on three separate occasions. These sessions will be audiotaped (not videotaped). I will ask the para-professional to be present in order to facilitate

Collection of artifacts: in order to get a sense of the classroom environment, I may take pictures of print materials (students’ writing), students’ drawings, or other such materials from around the class. Any identifying markers (e.g., names) on these materials will be blackened out before I include them in my dataset.

Choice of participation: You have the right to participate in this study and also to leave the study at any moment without penalty. During interviews, you may decline to answer any question for whatever reason. Declining to participate in any study will not result in any penalty, fine or other sanction.

Benefits / Risks: The intended benefit to this study is an increased awareness in communication between teachers and students. Otherwise, there are no major benefits to this study, including monetary compensation. However, there are no major foreseeable risks to participation in this study. There is no cost to you, the participant. The research project will not disrupt classroom activities.

Time-line for data collection: I will be in charge of all data collection and storage. My plan is to finish data collection in the fall of 2015. Data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my office on the University of Colorado campus.

Confidentiality: I will make every effort to maintain the privacy and confidentiality of all participants in every step of the study: data collection, data analysis and reporting of study results. Real names will not be used; instead, pseudonyms will be used for all people and places.

Contact person in case of questions: If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to ask me, the Principal Investigator (PI): Antonio Rodríguez (Antonio.Rodriguez@colorado.edu). You may also contact my supervisor in this study, Professor Kathy Escamilla (Kathy.Escamilla@colorado.edu). If you have questions about your rights as a research study participant, you can call the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is independent from the research team. You may contact the IRB if you have concerns or complaints that you do not want to talk to the study team about. The IRB phone number is (303) 735-3702.

Authorization and Consent: I, ________________________________, have read this form concerning this research study. I am aware of the benefits and risks. I know that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to participate or refuse to participate at any moment. I have received, on the date accompanying my signature, a copy of this Consent Form.
(please circle Yes or No and sign below)

Yes, I give consent ___ …  
No, I do not give consent ___ …  

for participation in this study.

Name of the Participant:____________________________________________________________

(signature of participant)

Signature of Participant:____________________________  Date: _____________

(signature of participant)