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This dissertation investigates directive language behaviors of Korean teaching assistants (KTAs) in relation to native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs) in classrooms and lab sessions in a U.S. university setting. Directive tokens are selected from spontaneous speech of 22 KTAs and 12 NSTAs and divided into three types: (1) commanding directives, (2) requesting directives, and (3) suggesting directives. The selected tokens for each type of directive are then identified with directive construction types, perspective (i.e., hearer-oriented, speaker-oriented), and mitigation devices. Comparisons between the gender groups and the TA groups in their choice of directive construction types/perspective/mitigation strategies are conducted, followed by one-on-one retrospective interviews with nine KTAs designed to ascertain the intention behind their directive language behaviors.

Findings include differences as well as similarities between the KTA and NSTA groups. The similarities indicate that the KTAs possessed pragmatic competence of English directives (e.g., ability to strategically vary directive construction types with regard to the types of directives, ability to employ mitigation devices). The differences,
however, demonstrate that KTAs’ competence was somewhat limited in that they had a narrower range of linguistic repertoire (e.g., their reliance on the “you + can” construction, hearer-perspective, and lexical mitigation) and that they tended to employ less direct directives in situations where the NSTAs used more direct strategies. Since these differences could make the teachers look less competent, the findings of this dissertation suggest a need for ITA (international teaching assistant) education which includes both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. The other finding of this dissertation is gender difference on the directness of directive language. In both groups, male TAs tended to use the direct construction (i.e., the imperative form) more frequently than their female counterparts. This dissertation helps our understanding of teachers’ in-class directive usage in higher education and contributes to several fields of applied linguistics, such as English for Specific Purposes (e.g., ITA education), interlanguage pragmatics, and language and gender.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation is a descriptive study of directives used by Korean\(^1\) teaching assistants (KTAs) in a U.S. university. Directives are commonly found in our everyday interaction in the form of commands, requests, or suggestions, for example. In realizing these speech acts, speakers employ a variety of structural forms according to socio-contextual factors such as familiarity, social status, gender, and/or difficulty of the task (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). In the educational domain, likewise, directives are often used strategically by teachers with structural variations, such as imperatives and interrogatives (e.g., Holmes, 1983). The varied construction that directive language can have is the topic of the present study.

Due to the world-wide exchange of human, material, and cultural resources, cross-cultural communication has become commonplace. The educational domain, especially at the level of higher education, is no exception. Since U.S. universities, for example, have diversity in terms of their members’ language and cultural backgrounds as well as with regard to the type of speech event (e.g., lectures, office hours, study groups, seminars), there are plenty of opportunities for the members (e.g., students, instructors, administrators) to engage in intercultural communication with each other in a variety of situations. Among the varied types of cross-cultural encounters available in a university setting, interaction between international teaching assistants (ITAs) and undergraduate students, the majority of whom are native speakers of English, is a particular interest of the current study. This interest stems from the so-called “foreign TA

\(^{1}\) It refers to “South Korean” in the present study.
problem” (Bailey, 1984), which has been an issue in U.S. universities over the last three decades.

The ITA “Problem”

ITAs are graduate students from non-English speaking countries who assist faculty members by teaching part of a course or offering tutoring or grading. Additionally, they may teach their own classes, as is often the case at large universities. These duties, in general, involve face-to-face interaction with undergraduate students, which is the target of complaints from the students. Undergraduates have complained that they have communication problems with their instructor(s) in the classes led by ITAs. It has been reported that they have difficulties understanding ITAs’ English or that ITAs have difficulties understanding what the students say in class. Undergraduates’ complaints about ITAs’ English-speaking abilities received much attention in higher education in the U.S. in early eighties, and any issues concerning ITAs’ ineffectiveness as teachers were referred to the foreign TA or ITA problem. Campus or local newspapers have addressed students’ complaints about ITAs’ English proficiency, and the complaints that followed from the parents have had an effect on legislative changes (e.g., state laws which require ITA screening tests) in many states (see Bailey, 1984, Byrd & Constantinides, 1988, and Chiang, 2009).

On the one hand, the ITA problem results from undergraduate students’ perception of “poor” English of ITAs (e.g., Bailey, 1983, 1984; Fitch & Morgan, 2003; Gallego, 1990; Herrington & Nakhleh, 2003); their English is often regarded as accented and “broken”\(^2\). For example, undergraduates’ narratives in Fitch and Morgan’s (2003)
study demonstrate that ITAs’ “poor speaking ability” leads to a negative construction of the ITA identity. On the other hand, the ITA problem is attributed to ITAs’ communicative skills (e.g., Byrd & Constantinides, 1988; Fitch & Morgan, 2003) or competence at the discourse level (e.g., speech genre of the college classroom)\(^3\) (e.g., Ard, 1989). In other words, it has been argued that ITAs experience difficulties concerning how to lecture and interact with their students. To summarize, these concerns indicate that ITAs’ capability as instructors has been questioned in U.S. universities.

If undergraduates have difficulties understanding what ITAs are saying and if those difficulties negatively affect their attitudes toward ITAs, the communication between the ITAs and the students can be regarded as unsuccessful. This is not surprising because it is common to observe misunderstandings or certain types of negative outcomes (e.g., unfavorable impressions of the speaker) in cross-cultural communication. With regard to this communication problem in cross-cultural interaction, different subfields of applied linguistics have taken different points of view. In interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), on the one hand, infelicitous interaction is viewed “one-way” (Boxer, 2002b). That is, interlocutors are categorized as native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) of a particular language, and NNSs’ lack of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) is regarded as the source of

\(^3\) This concern is related to “sociolinguistic competence”—another component of Canale and Swain’s (1980) “communicative competence”—as it is related to appropriateness of language used in a given situation.
miscommunication. In other words, there exist target norms (i.e., NSs’ norms), and it is NNSs’ job to learn them for successful and favorable interaction to occur. In cross-cultural pragmatics (CCP), on the other hand, unsuccessful communication is treated as a “two-way” problem (Boxer, 2002b). Since people with different cultural and language backgrounds have different ways of communicating (i.e., there are no target norms), it is not only one party who is responsible for a communication problem.

The ITA problem is generally understood using an ILP framework because ITAs’ second language (i.e., English) competence, which is different from their first language competence as well as native speakers’ competence, is blamed for unsuccessful communication that affects instruction. In addition, it is believed that it is the ITAs’ responsibility to take all the potential actions which could improve the situation. This one-way approach seems understandable if we consider undergraduate students as the customers of U.S. universities. In fact, undergraduates and parents have displayed consumerist attitudes in their complaints about ITAs, as pointed out by Bailey (1984) and Byrd and Constantinides (1988). What the students and their parents expect is a quality education that is worth their money.

Some researchers, meanwhile, view the ITA problem from a CCP framework. Fitch and Morgan (2003), for example, assert that undergraduate students should take responsibility for their learning in the ITA-led classroom, since learning is a “collaborative process” (p. 307). Likewise, Rubin and Smith (1990) argue that the ITA problem should be dealt with using a two-way approach. Explaining that both ITAs (who possess less competent English skills compared to native speaker instructors) and undergraduate students (who show stereotypical attitudes toward Asian teaching
assistants) are the cause of the ITA problem, they stress that universities should put their efforts into training both parties.

It seems inappropriate to regard one framework as better than the other. ILP and CCP are two different frameworks which have different foci. ILP research focuses on the non-native speaker group of a language, while CCP research focuses on two or more speaker groups with different language backgrounds that are engaged in cross-cultural communication.

Continuous efforts have been exerted over more than three decades to ameliorate the ITA problem. For example, oral proficiency tests and language and teaching training programs have been designed for ITAs (see Bailey, 1984 and Byrd & Constantinides, 1988). At the same time, the goal of better understanding and educating ITAs has generated ongoing discussion on a range of topics, such as students’ attitudes toward ITAs (e.g., Fitch & Morgan, 2003; Golish, 1999; Plakans, 1997; Rubin, 1992; Rubin & Smith, 1990), ITAs’ actual language use (e.g., Chiang, 2009; Davies & Tyler, 2005; Gallego, 1990; Hahn, 2004; Jenkins, 2000; Pickering, 2001; Tapper, 1994; Tyler, 1992; Yates, 2005), curricula of ITA training programs (e.g., Ard, 1989; Byrd & Constantinides, 1988; Davies, Tyler, & Koran, 1989; Douglas & Myers, 1989; Gorsuch, 2006; Hoekje & Williams, 1992; Jia & Bergerson, 2008; McChesney, 1994; Rounds, 1987; Smith, 1993), and ITAs’ identity (e.g., LoCastro & Tapper, 2008; Luo, Grady, & Bellows, 2001). Notwithstanding these efforts, undergraduates’ complaints about ITAs seem relentless, as reported in a New York Times article by Finder (2005, June), for example. Therefore, we should continue our efforts to explore the problems in ITA-student interaction. The present study is one of them.
Purpose and Rationale of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to examine structural characteristics of KTAs’ in-class directive language. The ultimate aim in uncovering these characteristics is to help the parties concerned (e.g., ITA educators, English teachers in Korea) to better understand Koreans’ directive language behaviors in English so that the findings can inform ITA training in U.S. universities and English language education in Korea. In the pursuit of this purpose, KTAs’ directives in the present research are compared to those of native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs) to see whether and to what extent this particular non-native teacher group deviates from the native control group. In addition, KTAs’ directive usage patterns are interpreted on the basis of their retrospective accounts of their directive language, collected during one-on-one interviews.

The speech act of directives in class was chosen as the target of analysis in the present research for the following reasons. First, directives are one of the recurrent acts produced by teachers in classrooms (e.g., Holmes, 1983; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In classrooms, directives are not only frequent acts but they are also important acts, since they are related to students’ performance. Teachers not only give instructions and advice regarding students’ work, but also encourage participation from the students through directive language. To reiterate, as directives communicate the actions which the teachers want their students to carry out for their successful academic performance, teachers’ ability to produce directives in a correct and appropriate manner is essential. Therefore, close examination of teachers’ directive language is practical for ITA or teacher education.
Second, since directives have great potential to threaten the hearer’s negative face\(^4\) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), teachers’ directive language has an impact on the student-teacher relationship. If teachers’ directives are always bald-on record (i.e., direct) without politeness strategies, for example, students are more likely to perceive the teacher as an authoritative figure, which probably hinders rapport building. Moreover, when the teacher is a non-native speaker who has less control of the target language and different cultural norms, unintended consequences (e.g., face threats which might cause students’ negative perception of the teacher) are very likely to occur. As Beebe and Takahashi (1989) argue, face-threatening acts are worthy of investigation because not a few miscommunications in cross-cultural interaction are due to those; thus, it is important for ITAs to learn about appropriate use of directives.

The face-threatening nature of directive language which often accompanies politeness strategies served as a motive for selecting gender as a variable in the present study. According to Holmes (1995), politeness is “an expression of concern for the feelings of others” and “a behavior which is somewhat formal and distancing, where the intention is not to intrude or impose” (p. 4). Overall, women are seen as more polite than men because women frequently use certain strategies (e.g., use of politeness markers, indirect speech acts) which make their speech sound more polite (e.g., Brown, 1980; Ide, 1991). In fact, women in higher education have been described differently from their male counterparts in the literature. For instance, men tend to interrupt more frequently than women in academic talk (Gunnarsson, 1997; West, 1998b), and female teachers are more interested in enhancing classroom communication than male teachers.

\(^4\) Brown and Levinson (1987) define it as “the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others” (p. 62).
teachers (Luo et al., 2001). Moreover, undergraduates’ negative stories about ITAs often concern male ITAs (e.g., Bailey 1983; Fitch & Morgan, 2003). However, gender differences in ITAs’ academic talk are under-researched. Hence, it is worthwhile to explore how female and male TAs realize directives while teaching.

Lastly, although a rich body of literature on non-native speakers’ directive realization exists (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1982; Ellis; 1992; Kim, 1995; Koike, 1989; Rose, 2000; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989), little has been known about non-native teachers’ directive language in class, especially in the setting of higher education. Therefore, investigating KTAs’ directives issued in classrooms is expected to contribute to the relevant literature (e.g., ITA research, classroom research, ILP research) in applied linguistics.

**Research Questions**

There are three objectives that I desire to achieve in the present study. The first objective is to find general patterns of English directive language used by KTAs in a U.S. university setting. By looking at the type and the frequency of directive constructions (e.g., imperatives, interrogatives) and the mitigation strategies used by KTAs, the present research studies KTAs’ directive language behavior. The second objective is to see whether female and male KTAs are similar to or different from each other in their directive usage. The last objective is to discover the similarities and differences between KTAs and NSTAs in their directive usage. Summing up, here are the three research questions of the present study:

1. How do KTAs use directive language while teaching?
   - Which constructions are used? Are any construction types favored over others?
   - Do they use mitigation devices? Are any devices preferred?
2. How, and to what extent, does gender affect the type and the frequency of directive constructions used?

3. How, and to what extent, are KTAs similar to and/or different from NSTAs in their use of directives?

**Literature Review**

As directives are one of the categories of speech acts categorized in Speech Act Theory, I begin this section with a brief introduction to the theory of speech acts, followed by a review of speech act research focusing on directive speech acts, in particular. Then, I narrow the scope of my discussion to the directives, especially the ones used in academic talk, by addressing definitions, construction types, and previous findings on non-native teachers’ directive usage as well as on gender difference. The last part of this section discusses characteristics of and issues in international teaching assistant (ITA) discourse.

**Speech Act Theory**

Speech act theory was developed by philosophers John Austin and John Searle. The term speech act originated from Austin’s (1962) argument that saying something is not only stating of a fact, but also performing an action. Searle (1969) uses this term to refer to Austin’s “illocutionary act” (i.e., speaker’s intention expressed in an utterance such as asserting and commanding) and argues that speech acts are “the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication” (p. 16). Claiming that people perform certain acts in saying something, both scholars seek to categorize those acts.

Austin (1962) uses the term “performatives” for utterances that convey particular actions such as bets and requests, distinguishing those from “constatives” which are statements that can be verifiable as true or false. In order for an utterance to be regarded as performatives, Austin argues that uttering itself is not sufficient, but felicity
conditions should be met (i.e., appropriate language, appropriate participants and circumstances, appropriate and complete execution of procedure, and sincere intention). Otherwise, the performed action will be judged as infelicitous (i.e., misfire or abuse). To reiterate, the constative-performative distinction depends on the conditions which an utterance is to meet: truth conditions for constatives and felicity conditions for performatives. In the later part of his book, however, this distinction becomes fuzzy because Austin admits both constatives and performatives observe truth and felicity conditions. Instead, Austin argues that utterances involves “locutionary act” (production of the utterance), “illocutionary act” (illocutionary force of the utterance), and “perlocutionary act” (actual effects of producing the utterance). He further proposes five categories of illocutionary acts by listing performative verbs for each category: verdictives (e.g., assessments), exercitives (e.g., commands), commissives (e.g., promises), behabitives (e.g., apologies), and expositives (e.g., denials).

Following Austin (1962), Searle (1969) provides expanded discussions on illocutionary acts. He introduces conditions that are necessary for felicitous illocutionary acts to occur. Those are propositional (reference or predication), preparatory (background circumstance or knowledge), sincerity (speaker’s psychological state), and essential (purpose or point of an act) condition. In the case of requests, for example, the following conditions should be met, according to Searle.

- Propositional content: hearer’s future action
- Preparatory condition: speaker’s belief that the hearer is able to do that action
- Sincerity condition: speaker’s want
- Essential condition: speaker’s attempt to get the hearer to do that action

Furthermore, Searle (1976) provides different categories of speech acts from Austin (1962), criticizing his classification for not having principle. By considering a number of
dimensions such as illocutionary point, direction of fit (world-to-word or word-to world), and psychological state\(^5\), Searle classifies speech acts into five classes—representatives (e.g., insists), directives (e.g., requests), commissives (e.g., promises), expressives (e.g., apologies), and declarations (e.g., bets).

There is more to speech act theory than defining and categorizing illocutionary acts. Searle (1975) introduces the concept of indirect speech act, arguing that there exist some cases in which “the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says” (p. 50). For example, when the speaker says “can you pass the salt?”, his or her purpose is not asking a question, but requesting the hearer to pass the salt. Thus, what is expected is hearer’s action, not a yes or no answer. Then, why do people perform illocutionary acts indirectly like this? Searle claims that indirect speech acts are mainly motivated by politeness. By asking hearer’s ability, in the example of “can you pass the salt?”, the speaker is being polite because s/he gives the hearer an option of refusing, which is not the case in imperatives\(^6\).

As discussed above, speech act theory did not originate as a tool for analyzing discourse. Rather, its focus was on description and categorization of non-declarative uses of language (i.e., illocutionary acts) as well as on discussion of issues involved in using illocutionary acts. Accordingly, it does not provide methodological procedures for analyzing discourse. However, speech act theory conveys a message that people say things to perform certain actions (directly or indirectly), and the very fact suggests that

\(^5\) These are further explained in the methodology chapter.

\(^6\) Requesting someone to do certain action threatens hearer’s negative face (i.e., one’s want not to be imposed upon by others), according to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory. The example “can you pass the salt?” is a negative politeness strategy (i.e., redress directed to the hearer’s negative face), while the imperative form is a bald-on record (i.e., direct) strategy.
speech acts are the vital part of human interaction. Thus, it offers the theoretical basis for choosing speech acts as a legitimate unit of analysis for the present study. In addition, the rules and taxonomies discussed in speech act theory help to create a criterion for token identification in the present study. Due to the limitations of Austin’s (1962) classification which Searle (1976) criticizes, Searle’s categorization of speech acts is used in the present study.

**Speech Act Research**

Since speech act theory was introduced, a range of speech acts have been widely investigated with varied perspectives utilizing several methodological tools, as listed in Table 1-1. Some studies were conducted under the banner of second language acquisition (SLA) by investigating language learners’ pragmatic competence (e.g., Banerjee & Carrell, 1988; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990, 1993; Beebe, Takahashi, Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Blum-Kulka, 1982; Ellis, 1992; Kim, 1995; Koike, 1989; Rose, 2000; Schmidt, 1983; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989), while others were carried out with sociolinguistic perspective by focusing on gender differences (e.g., Goodwin, 1980; Sachs, 1987), for example. As shown in Table 1-1, a great deal of speech act realization studies which have an SLA focus, with the exceptions of some pragmatic developmental studies (e.g., Schmidt, 1983; Ellis 1992), have relied on elicited data collected from discourse completion tasks/tests (DCTs), role-plays, or other elicitation tools rather than looking into spontaneous speech\(^7\). Albeit few in number, research on

---

\(^7\) Although DCT is known to be useful for eliciting what speakers believe they would say in given situations, it is not successful in showing how people really perform a particular speech act in natural interaction. However, it does not necessarily mean that the data collected from naturally occurring speech is better than the elicited data via DCTs or role plays; that is, appropriate methodology should be employed with regard to the research goals (see Beebe & Cummings, 1996 and Golato, 2003 for details).
speech acts perception has been conducted as well (e.g., Carrell & Konneker, 1981; Hinkel, 1997; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985).

Among Searle’s (1976) five categories of speech act, only three have received a great deal of researchers’ attention: directives (e.g., requests, suggestions), commissives (e.g., refusals), and expressives (e.g., apologies, compliments). Comparative analysis of these speech acts realized by different language learner groups comprises a large body of speech act literature. Therefore, the next sub-section presents a review of previous studies on language learners’ directive usage, requests and suggestions in particular, due to its relevance to the current study.

**Non-native speakers’ directive speech acts**

Requests have been extensively researched compared to other directive speech acts such as suggestions and commands. When it comes to requests, the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), a seminal work on requests and apology, should be mentioned since it has had a great influence on speech act research up to now. This joint research started with a focus on requests and apologies in three varieties of English (American, Australian, and British) and in other five languages (Hebrew, German, Canadian French, Danish, and Russian⁸), according to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). Its goals were to investigate situational variability, cross-cultural variability, and native vs. non-native variability in different language groups’ realization of requests and apologies. In order to achieve these goals (i.e., comparison across situations, languages, and individuals), data was collected via DCTs which enabled

---

⁸ Russian was excluded in the project later (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989).
researchers to manipulate social constraints of the given situations, keep the variables constant among language groups, and collect data from a great number of participants.

The coding scheme for requests developed in CCSARP has been widely adapted in the research on requests (e.g., Ellis; 1992; Hahn, 2009; Kim, 1995; Martínez-Flor, 2005; Rose, 2000; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989). According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), a request sequence can be segmented by three parts, alerters (e.g., name, attention getter), head acts (i.e., the request), and supportive moves (or external modification) preceded or followed by head acts. They further classify head acts in two dimensions, one in perspective (i.e., speaker-oriented, hearer-oriented, and impersonal) and the other in strategy types with regard to directness. The most direct strategy is mood derivable (i.e., imperatives), followed by performatives (e.g., “I'm asking you…”), hedged performatives (e.g., “I would like to ask you…”), obligation statements (e.g., “you’ll have to…”), want statements (e.g., “I really wish you…”), suggestory formulae (e.g., “how about…?”), query preparatory (e.g., “can you…?”), strong hints, and mild hints. Speakers use modification devices, mitigation or aggravation, for the speech act of requests. When modification occurs within the head act via syntactic or lexical devices, for example, this is referred as “internal modification.” On the other hand, when modification appears beyond the head act such as grounder (i.e., giving reasons for the request) and promise of reward, it is called “external modification” or “supportive moves.”

The above coding scheme is highly relevant to the present study because requests belong to the category of directives; that is, teachers’ directive language can be analyzed following the CCSARP scheme. In order to limit the scope of analysis, however, the present study focuses only on the head acts (i.e., realization of the
directive acts, which is the core of the directive sequences), rather than examining the whole sequences. The nine request strategy types used in CCSARP are taken into account when developing a criterion for data analysis in the current study. When discussing the results of the analysis, the two dimensions–perspective and directness–are considered. In addition, internal modification devices are of interest to the present study, as it only investigates the head acts\(^9\).

As part of the CCSARP team, Blum-Kulka (1982) investigated request realization of English-speaking learners of Hebrew in comparison with native speakers (NS) of Hebrew. The participants were asked to fill out a DCT in which 17 situations\(^10\) were given. The learner group deviated from the NS group with regard to their choice of request strategy types. While the NS group had one predominantly preferred request type for each situation, the learner group did not do so. For example, in a restaurant situation where a customer is asking a waiter to bring the menu, the majority of the NS group (76%) used permission directives (e.g., “is it possible to…?”), whereas the learner group used imperatives the most (42%), followed by permission directives (36%) and others. That is, the learners showed more variation in their choice of request strategies. With regard to directness of their requests, the learner group showed more indirectness than the NS group in three situations (e.g., policeman-driver conversation).

Blum-Kulka’s (1982) study suggests that NNSs tend to use more direct request strategies than NSs, although her study has three exceptional cases. Regarding these

---

\(^{9}\) For these reasons, teaching assistants’ directive usage which will be reported in the present study are not likely to reflect the whole picture of their directive language behaviors. This limitation is further discussed in Chapter 6.

\(^{10}\) Only eight items targeted directive speech acts. Some were included to elicit speech-act markers or to test participants’ interpretation of a speech-act realization.
exceptions in which the learners employed less direct request strategies, she explains that a number of sources such as transfer of first language (L1) social norm and incomplete control over conventional request forms would contribute to. Another important point made by Blum-Kulka is that NNSs are sensitive to situational factors (e.g., in which situation and with whom they are interacting) and vary their request strategies, although their speech act realization might somehow deviate from native speakers'. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider contextual and social factors involved in situations before we compare speech act realization of any groups. Or, contextual and social factors can be controlled by focusing on a limited number of situations as in Koike (1989) and García (1989).

First, Koike (1989) studied pragmatic competence of English-speaking learners of Spanish by conducting three separate experiments which tested their (1) perception ability to identify speech acts in Spanish, (2) request patterns in Spanish, and (3) request patterns in English. As a data collection tool in the experiment two and three, she utilized DCTs which included one situation in which they were supposed to ask their friend to lend some money. In the second experiment, Koike observed that the learners of Spanish used less polite strategy types such as want statements and command forms more than the polite request types. They occasionally added *por favor* ("please") with command forms, which is the pattern observed in other studies (e.g., Ellis, 1992). In the third experiment, however, she found that the majority of learners’ requests in their L1 were realized in polite forms (e.g., interrogatives). From these findings, Koike argued that learners did possess pragmatic concepts of polite requests from their L1,
but their grammatical competence in L2 was not fully developed to sophisticate their requests in the target language.

Second, García’s (1989) study also showed language learners’ tendency to employ direct request strategies in one particular situation in which they were asked to make an urgent request for a typing service knowing that they should have given a week’s notice at least. García compared requesting behaviors of Spanish-speaking learners of English to those of the NS group. From the request tokens elicited through role-play interaction, García found group differences in their request realization. The learner group preferred personal devices (e.g., use of agent; present tense modal auxiliaries) such as “can you?”, while the NS group predominantly used impersonal devices (e.g., impersonal construction and past modality) which were regarded less direct. The NS group produced personal requests as well, but they mitigated their speech using politeness marker please, consultative device (e.g., “if there’s any way…”), or play-down marker (e.g., “I was wondering…”). Although the learner group in this study was able to realize requests in less-direct forms, instead of relying on more direct forms such as imperatives as was the case in Koike (1989), their requests were still more direct than the NS group’s.

Similar to Blum-Kulka (1892), the results of Koike’s (1989) and García’s (1989) studies suggest that NNSs are prone to produce more direct requests than NSs. However, if we compare the findings of Koike’s and García’s, we can see that the language learners in the former were more direct than the learners in the latter because the request tokens elicited in the former study were in more direct forms (e.g., imperatives) than those in the latter study (e.g., interrogatives). This difference could be
interpreted that the learners in Koike’s study were in the lower developmental stage compared to the learners in García’s\(^{11}\), according to the pattern found in the developmental studies; i.e., learners use a limited range of request types in the beginning, but become more competent by using a variety of request strategies and mitigation devices as they learn more.

Schmidt (1983) is a good example of the developmental study which investigated learners’ pragmatic development of directive speech acts. Schmidt observed informal conversations in which one Japanese adult learner of English took part in. Schmidt examined his English directive tokens collected via field notes over a 3-year period. In the beginning, his directives were realized in the progressive form (e.g., “please never thinking”) instead of imperatives. Although he occasionally employed suggestive formulas such as “shall we…?”, it was not productive. Moreover, Schmidt noted that some of his requests were very indirect, which was explained by transfer of Japanese norms\(^{12}\). By the end of his observation, however, the learner increased the number of imperatives rather than using the progressive form. In addition, his directives were accompanied by elaboration and his use of request formulas such as “let’s” and “shall we…?” became more productive. In other words, the learner’s request behavior turned out more native-like as they learned more.

\(^{11}\) It is assumed that learners’ exposure to the target language (Spanish) in Koike (1989) was minimal since they were recruited from the first-semester language classes. In contrast, learners’ exposure to the target language (English) in Garcia (1989) was reported as an average of 8.5 years.

\(^{12}\) This finding is similar to Blum-Kulka’s (1982). Takahashi and DuFon (1989) is another study which addresses transfer of L1 social norm. Takahashi and DuFon divided Japanese learners of English into three groups (beginning, intermediate, and advanced) in terms of their proficiency level and compared their requests that were collected via role-plays. They found that the advanced-level learners were the most direct group, followed by the intermediate- and the beginning-level learner group. They attributed this phenomenon to L1 pragmatic transfer. However, they assumed that other factors might play a role as well, since all learner groups were more direct than the NS control group.
Ellis’s (1992) longitudinal study conveyed a similar message with regard to language learners’ pragmatic development. By observing two boys’ requesting behaviors in classroom interactions over two years, he found that learners made developmental progress in their use of requests. Two boys’ requests were very direct in the beginning of his observation as they predominantly used verbless requests and imperatives, but they varied the types of request strategy by the end of his study. Although Ellis pointed out that their development was limited due to their preference of imperatives throughout his observation, his study supported the general developmental pattern that was found in Schmidt (1983).

Though not longitudinal nor with naturally-occurring data, Rose’s (2000) study supports the findings of Schmidt (1983) and Ellis (1992); the more advanced language learners are, the more sophisticated their requests become with an extended range of repertoire for request strategies. Rose conducted cross-sectional studies which compared three levels (primary 2, primary 4, and primary 6) of Cantonese speaking learners of English in Hong Kong by utilizing a cartoon oral production task. The results showed that the most frequently used request strategy for all three groups was preparatory (e.g., “can I…?”). However, they showed differences in the frequency of direct requests and of external modifications. The low level students (primary 2) showed higher percentage of direct requests and lower percentage of external modifications. In contrast to this, high level students (primary 6) used lower percentage of direct request strategies, but employed external modifications more than the others.

Compared to the amount of research on requests, suggestions have been less investigated (see Martínez-Flor, 2005). However, the pattern that NNSs used more
direct strategies than NSs was similar. In Banerjee and Carrell’s (1988) study, for example, Chinese and Malay speaking learners of English filled out a DCT which contained 60 situations for suggestions. Although the learner group was similar to the NS group in the proportions of direct and indirect suggestions (both groups preferred the statement type the most, followed by interrogative and imperative construction), the learner group produced more direct suggestions among the interrogative category. Moreover, Banerjee and Carrell’s qualitative analysis showed that learners’ suggestions were less polite than native speakers’ in terms of their use of politeness strategies. For example, the learners made suggestions focusing on the hearer (e.g., “your hair is messy”), while the native speakers shifted the focus from the hearer to other external causes (e.g., “the wind blew your hair”) which had a softening effect.

Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford’s (1990, 1993) studies which examined international graduate students’ suggestions support the previous finding. In advising sessions, graduate students are expected to provide suggestions for course scheduling to express their identity in the institution. However, Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990) found that the number of suggestions that NSSs made was smaller than NSs. In addition, NNSs did not mitigate their speech as much as NSs did. They explained that the differences were due to international students’ lack of knowledge about the rules of this particular gatekeeping encounter. However, their longitudinal study (1993) reported that NNSs showed pragmatic development to some extent in that the number of student-initiated suggestions was increased while they did not show much improvement on mitigation.
To sum up, language learners (or NNSs) of a certain language are different from NSs of that language in their realization of requests or suggestions. However, this does not necessarily mean that NNSs are totally different from NSs. NNSs are able to produce both direct and indirect speech acts as NSs do, although they tend to be more direct than NSs in their choice of strategy types or unskilled in minimizing imposition of directive language. The current study also focuses on the types of directives and mitigation devices in order to compare the findings of the present study to those of the previous research. Due to the differences in participants, data sources, data gathering method, and context, however, it is difficult to predict how similar or different Korean teaching assistants (KTAs) and native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs) are in their directive usage.

Koreans’ directive speech acts in English

As the main participants of the present study are Korean TAs who taught in English, it is relevant to discuss how Korean-speaking learners of English are similar to and/or different from the language learners mentioned in the previous sub-section with regard to their realization of directive speech acts.

It has been reported that preparatory is the most preferred request strategy chosen by Korean-speaking learners of English (e.g., Chang, 2009; Han, 2005; Hahn 2009; Jung & Hur, 2005; Kim 1995). For instance, Kim (1995) collected request tokens from three different groups (NS of Korean, Korean ESL learners\textsuperscript{13}, and NS of English) through an oral DCT consisting of six situations. She found similarities as well as differences between the NSs of English and the Korean ESL learner group. In most of

\textsuperscript{13} ESL learners are those who study English in a country where it is used as a main language, while EFL learners are those who study English in a country where it is not used as an official language.
the given situations, the two groups were similar in that they tended to use less direct request strategy types—the preparatory strategy in the CCASRP coding scheme. However, the learner group deviated from the NS group as they preferred more direct request strategy in some situations (e.g., Baby-sitting) and less direct request strategy in another situation (e.g., Getting off work early). Kim explained that this could be attributable to negative transfer of Korean pragmatic rules. For example, adults do not usually use polite speech to children in Korea. For this reason, the Korean ESL learners were deemed to employ more direct request types in the baby-sitting situation, since the age gap between the adults and children did not motivate them to use an indirect strategy. Another cause of deviation was from learners’ heavy reliance on certain expressions. While the Korean ESL learners predominantly used “can (could) you (I) do X?,” the NS group produced requests with other routines such as “I was wondering…” or “do you mind…?”

Korean EFL learners’ requests in Jung and Hur (2005) did not differ greatly from the Korean ESL learners in Kim (1995). Jung and Hur collected request tokens via a DCT which contained 12 situations with varied social status of the requestee (higher, lower, and equal). Most of Korean EFL learners’ requests were formed in interrogatives that belong to the preparatory strategy across the board, which was also the case for the NS group. However, the Korean EFL learners made direct requests via imperatives, for instance, more than the NS group when the hearer’s status was lower than theirs.

The results of these two studies (Kim, 1995 and Jung & Hur, 2005) summarized above are similar to the findings of Blum-Kulka (1982) in that they yielded conflicting findings on directness of requests; NNSs were more or less direct than NSs in their
realization of directive speech acts. It is no surprise that they obtained such mixed findings in that they looked into a range of situations together (e.g., interactions in workplace, academic setting, between friends, between neighbors, and so forth). As Blum-Kulka argues that NNSs are aware of social/contextual factors, it is necessary to control those factors in order to provide a better comparison between NNSs’ and NSs’ speech act behaviors. Thus, the present study limits its scope to examining the discourse of higher education which takes place in classrooms or lab sessions.

Han (2005) is a study which explored Korean ESL learners’ pragmatic development in relation to their length of residence (LOR). He divided Korean ESL learners in terms of their LOR (i.e., short-, mid-, and long-term) and collected request tokens via an oral DCT which was composed of nine situations. Native speakers’ requests were also collected for comparison. Han discovered that there were no significant differences among four groups regarding the types of request strategy and external modifications (e.g., apology, grounder) that were used. However, qualitative analysis showed that the long-term LOR Korean group approximated the NS group the most. The NS group and the long-term LOR Korean group used more of biclausal formulas (e.g., “is there any way that…?”) and external modifications than the short- and mid-term groups did. That is, in common with the NS group, the Korean ESL learners who had extended experience in the U.S. made requests with a higher degree of mitigation.

As discussed above, previous studies on Korean ESL or EFL learners’ requests demonstrated that they were similar to NSs in that they favored preparatory, the indirect request strategy, although they used more direct strategies in certain circumstances.
However, the difference between Korean learners of English and NSs lay in the details of requesting behavior such as mitigation. Therefore, it becomes more apparent that the focus of the present study should rest on the types of directives and mitigation devices.

**Directives**

The aforementioned studies focus on a single directive speech act such as requests or suggestions produced by different people in a range of situations. In contrast, the present study limits its scope to the directives spoken by teaching assistants in class or lab in a university setting. Directives are defined in the first sub-section below after addressing how researchers have defined them in their own studies. The second sub-section deals with different classifications of directive construction types in the literature. Then previous studies on non-native teachers’ directives are reviewed in the third sub-section. The last sub-section discusses the gender factor examined in the previous research on directives.

**Directives defined**

Directives belong to one of Searle’s (1976) five classes of speech acts that have the following illocutionary point:

> The illocutionary point of these consists in the fact that they are attempts...by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. They may be very modest ‘attempts’ as when I invite you to do it or suggest that you do it, or they may be very fierce attempts as when I insist that you do it. (p. 11)

This definition of directives—illocutionary acts performed by the speaker (S) to get the hearer (H) to do something—has been widely accepted in the literature (e.g., Banerjee & Carrell, 1988; Dalton-Puffer & Nikula, 2006; Hahn, 2009; Schmidt, 1983; Yates, 2005). According to Searle, directives encompass a number of speech acts such as questions, suggestions, requests and commands. Although these speech acts belong to the same
category, they differ from each other in a number of ways, as summarized in Table 1-2. In the case of questions, for example, what is attempted by S is to get H to answer. In the rest of the cases, H’s future action is intended. Suggestions differ from requests in that S wants H to do something for H’s benefit. What distinguishes commands from requests is the additional preparatory condition that S has authority over H.

Among the speech acts subsumed under the class of directives in Searle (1976), it seems that questions intended to elicit verbal response have been generally excluded in the research on directives\(^4\) (e.g., Bellinger & Gleason, 1982; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Holmes, 1983; Schmidt; 1983; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). For example, Sinclair and Coulthard’s analysis of classroom discourse excluded the questions that were used to elicit linguistic information. They stated that “directive”, “elicitation”, and “informative\(^5\)” are the three major acts found in spoken discourse. By defining directive as “an act the function of which is to request a non-linguistic response” (p. 28), Sinclair and Coulthard did not categorize information-seeking questions as directives. Rather, they treated these questions as a separate act—elicitation—which was defined as “an act the function of which is to request a linguistic response” (p. 28).

Holmes (1983) is another study which excepted questions intended to elicit verbal responses from the analysis of directives in the classroom setting. While Holmes admitted that Searle’s (1976) definition of directives, which counts questions as one of the directive speech act, could be used to study teachers’ directives, she followed

---

\(^4\) Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2006) is one exception because they consider questions as directives in their analysis of classroom directives.

\(^5\) Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) define informative as “an act whose function is to pass on ideas, facts, opinions, information and to which the appropriate response is simply an acknowledgement that one is listening” (p. 28).
Sinclair and Coulthard and limited the scope of analysis to “utterances intended to elicit a non-verbal response” (p. 97) found in elementary classrooms in New Zealand and Britain.

According to Holmes, Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) study, a seminal work on American English directives, seemed to adopt Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) definition as well. Although Ervin-Tripp did not provide any definition for directives, numerous examples included in her study suggest that she focused on the directive acts that lead to non-linguistic action.

Unlike Searle (1976), all these studies’ (i.e., Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Holmes, 1983; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) discussion on directives is based on empirical data. Notably for the present study, both Sinclair and Coulthard’s and Holmes’ work investigated classroom discourse; the former explored English used by teachers and children in classrooms in Britain and the latter examined teachers’ in-class directives in New Zealand and Britain. As these two studies suggest that questions are another big class of major speech acts which occur in classroom discourse, they offer a rationale to exclude questions from directives in the present study. What I mean by “questions” here is the utterances used to elicit information such as “what does X mean?” To reiterate, for the present study, directives are defined as utterances which have the illocutionary force of telling listeners to carry out some action, exclusive of the ones that aim for eliciting information, regardless of whether the immediate action is followed or not.

**Directive construction types**

As Searle’s (1976) and Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) work do not solely focus on directives, their focus is not to discuss the construction types in which directive language is realized. What is addressed in Searle is the deep structure—“I Verb you +
you Fut Vol Verb (NP) (ADV)– of directives such as I order you to leave. In case of Sinclair and Coulthard’s study, a little more information regarding the directive construction types is given. They state that imperatives are the frequently selected structure for directives. However, Sinclair and Coulthard also point out that directives are realized in declaratives (e.g., “I can hear someone laughing”) and interrogatives (e.g., “what are you laughing at?”) by introducing a few rules such as “any declarative or interrogative is to be interpreted as a command to stop if it refers to an action or activity which is proscribed at the time of the utterance” (p. 32).

There exist other studies which offer detailed descriptions of directive constructions; Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) study is a good example. By analyzing spontaneous data collected via her students’ projects on interaction in a variety of situations, Ervin-Tripp introduces six construction types of directives. The first one is need statements in which the speaker’s needs/wants are explicitly expressed (e.g., “I need a match”). The second type is imperatives (e.g., “give me a match”) that have several variants such as elliptical forms (e.g., “coffee, black”) and “you + imperative” (e.g., “you go straight”). The third type is imbedded imperatives used for the utterances in which “who should do what” is explicitly conveyed, not in imperative forms, but inserted in other types of sentence such as interrogatives. In an utterance like “could you give me a match?”, for example, the imperative message “you give a match” is delivered in an interrogative structure, she explains. The fourth one is permission directives (e.g., “may I have a match?”). As the name suggests, the speaker seeks the hearer’s permission, but an action is requested by the hearer. The fifth type is question directives which are realized in interrogatives, but do not overtly express what is requested by the speaker (e.g.,
“gotta match?”). The last type is hints, the statements which do not carry the requested action explicitly (e.g., “the matches are all gone”).

Janet Holmes is another researcher who makes a close investigation of the directive constructions. Holmes’s (1983) classification of directive construction type is highly relevant to the present study because it focuses on teacher’s directives. She categorizes directive structures into three categories—imperatives, interrogatives, and declaratives—and subdivides each category as follows. First, the imperative category is divided into six types, which are “base form of verb” (e.g., “speak up”), “you + imperative” (e.g., “you look here”), “present participle form of verb” (e.g., “looking at me”), “verb-ellipsis” (e.g., “hands up”), “imperative + modifier” (e.g., “looking this way please”), and “let + first person pronoun” (e.g., “let’s try”). Second, the interrogative category is split into two types, “modals” (e.g., “would you open the window”) and “non-modal interrogative directives” (e.g., “who can I see sitting quietly?”). Third, the declarative category also breaks into two types, which are “embedded agent”—a directive construction which contains the agent and the required action in the embedded clause (e.g., “I want you to draw a picture)—and “hints” which are implicit in expressing the agent and/or the requested action (e.g., “Sally you’re not saying much”).

Reinhardt’s (2010) study deserves a mention, although the topic of his investigation does not match with that of the present study completely. His classification of directive constructions is based on the corpus analysis of non-native teachers’ suggestions as well as native teachers’ in an office hour setting. Reinhardt classifies directives into three construction types, which are modal (e.g., “can”, “should”) or
periphrastic modal (e.g., “have to”, “need to”), directive vocabulary (e.g., “suggest”, “recommend”), and imperative.

As shown above, the number and the type of directive structures found in each study are different. Perhaps this is because they collected data from different setting; for example, Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) investigation of directives was based on the data collected in everyday interaction, while Holmes (1983) analyzed teachers’ in-class directives. Or, it may be because each study looked into directive construction types with different focus. Reinhardt (2010) focused on lexical items, for instance, whereas Holmes categorized directives in terms of sentence type. Even though the abovementioned studies differ in naming directive construction types, they are comparable to each other and even to the coding scheme used in CCSARP (see Table 1-3). Since the sentence type used by Holmes is the broadest category, all the construction types discussed above can be re-classified according to her classification, as in Table 1-3. Moreover, Holmes’s classification of directive structure is based on teacher’s directive usage in classrooms, which is the topic of the current study. Therefore, the present study uses Holmes’s inventory of directive types as a basis, taking others’ into consideration as well, for directive token selection and analysis.

**Research on non-native teachers’ directives**

Reinhardt (2010) is one of the few studies that explore non-native teachers’ directives in a university setting. He compared a learner group (i.e., advanced ESL students and ITAs) with an expert group (i.e., native/native-like TAs) in terms of directive language use, particularly the suggestions produced in an office hours setting. The learner group corpus consisted of the recorded role-plays in ESL and ITA preparation courses, while the expert group corpus was composed of the office hour
speech events in MICASE, the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (Simpson, Briggs, Ovens, & Swales, 2002). The corpus analysis showed that the learner group frequently used “you can,” “you had better,” and “you should” constructions as well as the directive vocabulary construction (e.g., “I suggest…”), while the expert group favored “you can” and “you want to” structures. Reinhardt claimed that non-native teachers’ use of direct suggestions such as “you should” and directive vocabulary constructions could negatively affect students’ perceptions toward them in real situations because their directives could imply authority, rather than promoting a sense of inclusion.

In addition to analyzing data quantitatively, Reinhardt (2010) triangulated it by employing several tools (e.g., post-course interviews, surveys), which enabled him to see that learner group’s directive usage was influenced by social/contextual factors such as identity as a teacher, gender, teaching experience, and so forth. Reinhardt’s findings were credible because they were on the basis of thorough analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. This mixed approach is used in the present study as well, though it does not carry out corpus analysis. Instead, the present study takes advantage of descriptive statistics for quantitative analysis and interprets the results of quantitative analysis with qualitative data collected via a stimulated retrospective interview.

On the other hand, there is at least one thing that I would like to challenge in the methodology used in Reinhardt (2010). As mentioned earlier, elicited data in role-plays consisted of the learner corpus, whereas the expert corpus was composed of natural data. To maximize comparability, it would have been better to utilize the same data
collecting tool for both groups. Although role-plays elicit naturalistic data to a certain degree, unlike the case of DCTs, in that researchers can get spoken data (Kasper & Dahl, 1991), data collected by role-plays does not exactly represent what the same speakers will actually say in real situations. As the present study uses MICASE as the NS baseline, which is the collection of recordings of naturally occurring academic talk, directive tokens produced by KTAs are collected from their spontaneous speech in the present study.

Unlike Reinhardt (2010), Tapper (1994) collected data from authentic classroom interactions. By recording one Chinese engineer's lab sessions in one university in Australia, Tapper examined how this non-native teacher issued directives in terms of the construction types. She grouped his directives into seven construction types: “you + verb,” “you + neg. + verb,” “when/then + you + verb,” “I think + you + verb,” “you + modal + verb,” “imperative,” and “neg. + imperative.” The results of her analysis showed that the Chinese engineer frequently used “you + verb” construction (43%) such as “you use this one”, followed by the imperative type (20%). The majority of his directives in this “you + verb” form (63%), however, were judged as inappropriate by five native speakers. They commented that they would have used the imperative form instead of the “you + verb” construction. Tapper presented a number of possible reasons for his overuse of “you + verb” form such as a substitute for students’ names or status-distancing marker.

Albeit on a small scale, Tapper’s (1994) study deserves attention in that it is the earliest work, to my knowledge, which explored non-native teacher directives in natural setting. Her study informs us of the construction types of directives used by a non-native
instructor in university lab sessions. By having several native speakers evaluate them, she also addresses inappropriateness of the non-native directives, which in turn suggests pedagogical implications for ITA training. However, she would have been able to provide more substantive explanation for his reliance on “you + verb” construction, if she asked him why he used that particular construction or obtained other relevant information (e.g., power issues in lab, his identity as an instructor) as Reinhardt (2010) did.

Regn (2004) expands Tapper’s (1994) study by investigating 10 Chinese TAs’ directives in Chemistry lab sessions. She transcribed video-recorded lab sessions of these ITAs and found the following results. First, the Chinese TAs used imperative forms more frequently than other construction types. Second, Ervin-Tripp (1976)’s inventory of directive types was not sufficient for categorizing directives used in a university lab setting. Third, some of the directives issued by the Chinese TAs were problematic due to inappropriate use of “just” (as a minimizer) and/or time expressions. Fourth, the male Chinese TAs showed predominant use of the “you + (modal) + verb” form(s), while the female TAs used wider range of directive constructions including embedded directives (e.g., “could you…?”).

Among the findings in Regn (2004), her detailed discussion on non-native teachers’ improper use of “just” and time expressions is worthwhile. She presented several examples of misused “just” in Chinese TAs’ directive tokens, for example, and explained why those were problematic. Moreover, she argued that those inappropriate use of “just” could lead to unfavorable outcomes in teacher-student communication. For example, when the teacher inappropriately uses “just” as minimizer for the task which is
quite difficult, it might give students an impression that the teacher is not sympathetic.

These findings were all possible because Regn took a qualitative approach to data analysis. However, unlike in Reinhardt (2010) or Tapper (1994), Regn reported the results without quantitative evidence. Her findings related to gender difference or preference of directive construction types would have been better supported, if she performed quantitative analysis. In addition, as she mentioned in her study, NS-NNS comparison and data triangulation would enable us to better understand these non-native teachers’ directive usage.

Taken altogether, the present study seeks to build on the strengths and complement the weaknesses of the previous studies addressed above, which leads to the following methodological components: use of naturally occurring data, combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis, comparison between non-native and native data, and triangulation of data. In addition, the present study expands the extant research in that it looks into other types of speech events such as discussion sections or lectures.

Research on directives and gender

It is a wonder that few speech act studies include gender as a factor in their investigation of directives, given that gender is a widely discussed variable in the field of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Women and men are “social arrangements” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 32), meaning that while we are born with sex, we are not born with gender; gender is socially constructed. In addition, we are “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987) by using what we learn (e.g., linguistic items) to show our identity as a woman or man.

By examining children’s use of directive language, several researchers (e.g., Aronsson & Thorell, 1999; Goodwin, 1980; Sachs, 1987) provide an insight into gender
socialization. Their findings indicate that boys are more likely to use direct directives than girls are. In Aronsson and Thorell’s (1999) study, for example, 48 dyads of Swedish children were requested to enact family life with dolls in given situations. The results of their study showed that the male role figures were more direct than the female figures in their use of directives. The male figures used imperatives (i.e., bald-on record), often with aggravation strategies (e.g., insulting form of address, loud or angry voice), while the female figures employed mitigation strategies (e.g., solidarity oriented types of address) when issuing directives.

Similarly, Sachs (1987) and Goodwin (1980) found that boys were more direct than girls in their use of directive language. In Sachs’s study, boys mainly used imperative directives (e.g., “be a doctor”), whereas girls used interrogative directives (e.g., “will you be the patient for a few minutes?”), which was interpreted that girls cared more about others’ needs than boys by asking what the other child would like to be in pretend play. Likewise, boys in Goodwin’s study told the other child to do some action through imperatives, while girls provided proposals or suggestions for future action in their past time activities. Moreover, girls’ directives were often mitigated by adding a lexical item such as “maybe”, which was also observed in Sachs’s study.

Summing up, aforementioned studies in this subsection suggest that girls and boys prefer different ways to ask others to do certain action. That is, boys’ directives seem more direct than girls’. Bellinger and Gleason (1982) assert that this different behavior is learned from parental modeling rather than parents’ differential treatment to

---

16 Sachs (1987) and Goodwin (1980) differ in terms of children’s age, background, and data collection method. In Sachs, children were 47.5 months old on average, Caucasian (with two exceptions), and from upper-middle-class. They were asked to be engaged in pretend play. On the other hand, children in Goodwin were eight to thirteen years old, black, and from working-class. Their directives were collected from interactions in a group project.
boys and girls. In their study, parents did not show different behavior when they directed their directives to girls or to boys. In general, fathers used imperatives more than mothers who favored conventionalized indirect forms (e.g., “can you..?”) the most.

Research on adults’ directives in professional settings has yielded similar findings. For example, West (1998a) found different directive patterns in female and male doctors’ speech in her investigation of 21 dyadic encounters between doctors and patients. While female doctors frequently mitigated their directives by phrasing them as proposals for joint action (e.g., “let’s”) or suggestions, male doctors used more of imperative forms and need/want statements.

The situation is not so different in academic setting. As male and female TAs showed different behavior in their directive usage in Regn (2004), Yates (2005) also found gender difference in her study. Yates examined directives spoken by native teachers (Australian) and non-native teachers (Chinese) in Australian universities. By analyzing naturalistic data, she found that the female teachers mitigated their directives more frequently than the male teachers in both groups (75.7 vs. 64.8% and 58.2 vs. 54.8% in the NS and NNS group, respectively).

Likewise, it has been argued that Korean women pay more attention to indirectness of directives than Korean men in Korean. Lee and Kim (1992), for example, assert that Korean men favor imperative forms whereas Korean women prefer suggestory expressions in their production of directives in Korean. Furthermore, they point out that Korean men tend to rely on hearer-oriented perspective while women are more likely to use inclusive perspective when issuing directives in Korean. Similar to Lee and Kim, Jeon’s (2006) review of a number of studies on Korean female and male
speech indicates Korean women are regarded as more polite than Korean men because they use indirect request strategies such as interrogatives.

To sum up, gender is an important variable to be taken into account in speech act research of directives. As the aforementioned research suggests, across language groups male speakers tend to favor imperative directives while females are more likely to mitigate their directives. For this reason, any result of analysis might be misleading or insufficient when we analyze data lumping women and men together. For example, it is not accurate to conclude a certain group shows a preference for particular directive construction on the basis of high average figure when there is a big gap between two gender groups. Thus, the present study takes gender into consideration in analyzing and interpreting data.

**ITA Discourse**

Considering the context (i.e., classrooms or labs in a university setting) and the participants (Korean teaching assistants) of the present study, now I would like to shift my focus to international teaching assistant (ITA) discourse. Korean graduate students, along with Indian and Chinese graduate students, comprise a large part of ITA population in U.S. universities (LoCastro & Tapper, 2008). What these ITAs speak while performing their duties falls within the realm of academic talk. Thus, this subsection begins with discussion of characteristics of academic talk as institutional talk. Then, graduate students’ identities in the academic setting are addressed, which segues into power issues in ITA-students interactions.
Academic talk as institutional talk

Academic talk belongs to so-called institutional talk, which differs from ordinary social interaction. Institutional talk is face-to-face or telephone interaction\(^{17}\) which occurs in an institutional setting such as, for example, doctor’s office, university, or courtroom (Drew & Heritage, 1992). However, physical setting is not a sole factor which determines whether a certain encounter belongs to institutional talk or not. As long as participants show their institutional identities while accomplishing a certain communicative goal which is relevant to institutional task(s), that interaction is considered “institutional.” According to Drew and Heritage, institutional speech has three characteristics, which are lacking in everyday conversation. First, institutional talk is “goal-oriented in institutionally relevant ways” (p. 23). In the case of the lecture-type class, for example, it has pedagogical goals such as teaching certain concept(s). The second characteristic is about “constraints on contributions” (p. 23), which means that there exist restrictions regarding what should be done and how the talk should go. For instance, it is the teacher who mainly initiates interaction in class through questions, and students are expected to answer them (e.g., Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence, Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Last, institutional talk features “special character of inference in institutional contexts” (p. 23), meaning that speakers’ talk is interpreted in relation to their roles, goals of the institutional setting, and other relevant contextual factors. For instance, a bald-on request might be considered as direct and face-threatening in everyday conversation, but it may not be in the case of teacher talk.

\(^{17}\) Computer-mediated interaction can be included in institutional talk as on-line communication becomes very common.
Aside from the example of lecture-type classes provided above, office hours, advising sessions, colloquia, defense meetings, discussion sections, and lab sessions are other types of speech events observed in a U.S. university setting. In these types of academic talk, faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students are the main participants. As for the topic, it may be anything related to students’ study and life at the institution. The three characteristics of institutional talk which Drew and Heritage (1992) address successfully apply to academic talk. In case of the advising session, for example, one of the goals of the interaction between faculty and graduate students is course scheduling for the coming semester (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990, 1993).

This kind of interaction generally goes through three stages which Agar (1985) found by examining courtroom and clinic discourse: diagnosis period, directive period, and report writing period. What is important in the interaction is that their talk is affected by their roles (e.g., faculty as a gatekeeper\(^\text{18}\)). In sum, academic talk has rules for participants to understand and to follow. Otherwise, they will experience difficulties achieving institutional goals successfully. Moreover, they will probably be judged negatively and not be considered as a competent member in a particular community (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990).

Since ITAs should learn the rules involved in academic talk, it is both a means of showing their identities and a goal of establishing their identities in academic settings. While engaging in a variety of speech events, they use and learn the target rules of academic talk through a series of trials and errors as well as feedback from the experts.

\(^{18}\) Gatekeeping refers to interaction with two people in which one has power to make decisions (i.e., one who represents the institution) which influence the other’s (i.e., one who seeks service from the institution) life in the future, according to Erickson and Shultz (1982). Advising sessions and office hours are examples of gatekeeping encounters in educational settings.
(e.g., faculty). They become more competent members of the target community as they learn how, when, and what to speak in a given institutional setting. This process can be explained by Schieffelin and Ochs’s (1986) framework, language socialization. When children learn their first language (L1), what is appropriate is told and modeled by adults around them (e.g., parents, teachers). Such modeled language is not only about teaching language per se, but also about teaching social values in a society. Thus, children learn what is appropriate and valued in a particular context and establish their identities while developing their L1. As a result, children are socialized by learning language and use language to show they are appropriately socialized. The role of language in this process is “both the means and a central goal of socialization” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 42). Similarly, the role of academic talk for ITAs is both the means and a goal of socialization in an academic setting.

**Identities and power issues**

Among the participants in academic talk, graduate students are expected and desire to show that they are knowledgeable about the field of their interest. At the same time, they are supposed to and want to behave appropriately in keeping with their status as a student. In other words, they possess “intellectual face” as well as “institutional face”, which are concepts addressed in Tracy and Carjuzaa (1993). By analyzing audio-taped colloquia in one U.S. university, Tracy and Carjuzaa showed that both faculty and graduate students employed conversational moves to express their intellectual identity, although the degree of the intellectual responsibility shown differed. The higher one’s rank in the institution was, the stronger intellectual competence they expressed. For example, faculty started their talk by mentioning their published work, which implied they were highly intellectual in the field. In contrast, graduate students began their
presentations by referring to their previous work, which showed they were not true
beginners in the field. However, they set their intellectual responsibility low by distanc-
ting themselves from the ideas expressed in the talk (e.g., reference to faculty’s feedback).
Faculty and graduate students also showed institutional identity through various
conversational moves (e.g., silence, type of questions, response to noncomprehension).
Since graduate students’ status was lower than faculty’s, they remained more silent
than did faculty, for instance.

Since ITAs are students as well as instructors, they have two roles to play in the
institution: the graduate student role in the program with which they are affiliated and
the instructor or gatekeeper role associated with their teaching duties. As a graduate
student, on the one hand, they participate in several types of speech events such as
lectures, advising sessions, office hours, and colloquia. As an instructor, on the other
hand, they engage in other types of academic talk while lecturing, leading discussion, or
offering office hours. Thus, they are busy with different roles they are supposed to play
and may be frustrated by unfavorable encounters they might face due to lack of
knowledge regarding the rules of academic talk or language resources.

These identities of graduate students are related to power dynamics in
interactions between teaching assistants (TAs) and students. According to Galvin
(1992), TAs, in general, struggle with power issues in the classroom because they
neither view themselves as “teacher (expert)” nor “student (novice)”; they regard
themselves somewhere between the two. In addition, most of TAs are only a few years
older than their students, as Golish (1999) points out. Therefore, TAs are not free from
feelings of insecurity and problems of establishing credibility in classrooms.
Regarding this relatively weak power perceived by TAs, Golish’s (1999) study demonstrated that students actually regarded TAs differently from faculty in terms of power. Golish administered questionnaires on perceived power and credibility of instructors (both professors and TAs) to undergraduate students in order to examine their attitudes towards to teachers. The results showed that the undergraduates reported that they had more power with TAs than with professors for all of the five types of power on power base measure (PBM) scales: coercive, referent, legitimate, expert, and reward\(^{19}\). Moreover, they differentiated professors and TAs in terms of coercive, legitimate, and expert power on PBM scales. As for the credibility, TAs were rated less credible than professors on 7-point credibility scales. However, it did not mean that TAs’ credibility was perceived low. Both TAs and professors were perceived high in credibility since the mean scores were high in both group (5.8 and 5.93 out of 7.00, respectively). Among four categories on credibility scales (sociability, composure, character, competence), TAs were rated higher in sociability and character than faculty. Golish interpreted this as undergraduates had positive attitudes toward TAs; that is students felt more comfortable with TAs and considered TAs more approachable.

ITAs are no exception to this power issue discussed above. They are aware of their intellectual and institutional status, which is lower than faculty. Thus, playing a role of instructor is challenging when they are still students. However, this is not the only challenge ITAs have regarding the issue of power in class; they struggle with power issues caused by being non-native speakers of English. Fitch and Morgan (2003), for

\(^{19}\) Coercive power is “the degree to which a person feels he/she will be punished” when non-compliance occurs. Referent power is related to “a person’s desire to comply in order to please or identify with another person.” Legitimate power is “the initial power”, whereas “expert power” is associated with person’s expertise. Reward power is “a person’s expectation that he/she will be rewarded for some desired behavior” (Golish, 1999, p. 20).
instance, showed that ITAs’ identity was formed negatively in undergraduates’ narratives. Although undergraduates expressed positive attitudes toward ITAs’ intelligence, their poor speaking ability\textsuperscript{20} was the salient characteristic of ITAs which heavily affected students’ negative perceptions of ITAs. Since ITAs often have limited command of English, it is not ITAs, but their students who have pragmatic power (Boxer, 2002a) in their interactions. Although ITAs are more knowledgeable in the subject they teach and have power to grade their students, their ability to manage class is often hindered by their perceived English proficiency. Therefore, it is more likely for undergraduate students take advantage of ITAs.

To sum up, NNS teachers’ directive usage has not been extensively studied, although a rich body of literature on NNSs’ directive realization such as requests exists. Especially, little is known about Korean teaching assistants’ directive usage in the academic setting. Accordingly, the present study which looks into naturally occurring teacher talk can contribute to better understanding of ITAs’ directive language use. Furthermore, the present study is promising in the sense that it lends some insight to teachers’ practices involved in directing their students to carry out some actions. As it addresses KTAs’ knowledge on directives in academic talk via NS-NNS data comparison and retrospective interviews, its findings thus provide pedagogical implications for both ITA training in general and English language education in Korea in particular.

\textsuperscript{20} A number of factors affecting students’ perceptions of ITAs are discussed in the literature; e.g., pronunciation (Gallego, 1990), primary stress (Hahn, 2004), tone choice (Pickering, 2001), and discourse management strategies (Tyler, 1992).
This chapter has addressed the purpose of and the rationale for the present study and provided a review of literature on the relevant topics. The rest of this dissertation is composed of the following five chapters.

Chapter 2 explains the methodology (i.e., discourse analysis with retrospective interview) used in the present research. It provides a detailed description of how the data was collected, analyzed, and triangulated. Chapter 3 demonstrates the results of data analysis on KTAs’ and NSTAs’ directive language, focusing on their use of directive constructions and mitigation strategies. It also addresses the findings on gender and group comparisons. Chapter 4 presents the interview data: i.e., KTAs’ explanations about their own language use and their views on teaching-related issues. Chapter 5 discusses the findings presented in Chapters 3 and 4 by revisiting the research questions stated in this chapter. In addition, implications of the key findings are discussed. Lastly, Chapter 6 provides a concluding summary of the dissertation and discusses pedagogical implications it has for both ITA training and English education in Korea. Moreover, it addresses future research directions after pointing out limitations of the present study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blum-Kulka (1982)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Elicited (DCT)</td>
<td>NS-NNS comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banerjee &amp; Carrell (1988)</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>Elicited (DCT)</td>
<td>NS-NNS comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takahashi &amp; DuFon (1989)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Elicited (Role-play)</td>
<td>L1 transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koike (1989)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Elicited (DCT)</td>
<td>L1 transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beebe, Takahashi, Uliss-Weltz (1990)</td>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>Elicited (DCT)</td>
<td>L1 transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim (1995)</td>
<td>Requests; responses</td>
<td>Elicited (Oral DCT)</td>
<td>L1 transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (2000)</td>
<td>Requests; apologies; compliments</td>
<td>Elicited (Cartoon oral production task)</td>
<td>L2 pragmatic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung &amp; Lee (2007)</td>
<td>Compliment responses</td>
<td>Elicited (DCT)</td>
<td>NS-NNS comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn (2009)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Elicited (Questionnaire)</td>
<td>L1 transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinhardt (2010)</td>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>Elicited (Role-play)</td>
<td>NS-NNS comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin (1980)</td>
<td>Directives; responses to directives</td>
<td>Spontaneous (Natural play activities)</td>
<td>Gender differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt (1983)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>L2 pragmatic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachs (1987)</td>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Spontaneous (Pretend play)</td>
<td>Gender differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardovi-Harlig &amp; Hartford (1990)</td>
<td>Suggestions; requests for advice</td>
<td>Spontaneous (Recording)</td>
<td>NS-NNS comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis (1992)</td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>Spontaneous (Participant observation)</td>
<td>L2 pragmatic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardovi-Harlig &amp; Hartford (1993)</td>
<td>Suggestions; rejections</td>
<td>Spontaneous (Recording)</td>
<td>L2 pragmatic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1-2. Rules for directive speech acts*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propositional content</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preparatory condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sincerity condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Essential condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Advise (Suggestion)</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any proposition</td>
<td>Future act A of H</td>
<td>Future act A of H</td>
<td>Future act A of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. S does not know</td>
<td>1. H has some reason</td>
<td>1. (S believes) H is</td>
<td>1. (S believes) H is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the answer.</td>
<td>to believe A will</td>
<td>able to do A.</td>
<td>able to do A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is not obvious to</td>
<td>benefit H.</td>
<td>2. It is not obvious to</td>
<td>2. It is not obvious to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S and H that H will</td>
<td></td>
<td>S and H that H will</td>
<td>S and H that H will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide the information at the</td>
<td></td>
<td>do A.</td>
<td>do A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time without being asked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S wants this information.</td>
<td>S believes A will</td>
<td>S wants H to do A.</td>
<td>S wants H to do A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity condition</td>
<td>benefit H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attempt to elicit information from H</td>
<td>An undertaking to the</td>
<td>An attempt to get H to</td>
<td>An attempt to get H to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effect that A is in</td>
<td>do A</td>
<td>do A in virtue of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H’s best interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>authority of S over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Searle (1969, pp. 66-67).
Table 1-3. Inventories of directive constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperatives</strong></td>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Mood derivable</td>
<td>Base form of V</td>
<td>Imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You + imperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present participle form of V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verb-ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative + modifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let + first person pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrogatives</strong></td>
<td>Query preparatory</td>
<td>Imbedded imperatives</td>
<td>Modals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestory formulae</td>
<td>Question directives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-modal interrogatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declaratives</strong></td>
<td>(Hedged) performatives</td>
<td>Need statements</td>
<td>Embedded agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Periphrastic) modal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong hints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild hints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Request strategy types developed for CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

For studying spoken discourse, such as teaching assistants’ spontaneous speech in the present study, many methodological possibilities exist. For example, Schiffrin (1994) introduces four methodological approaches to discourse analysis, which are conversation analysis (CA), ethnography of communication (EC), interactional sociolinguistics (IS), and variation analysis. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages, given the particular domain of interaction and the research questions posed (see also Boxer, 2002a, 2004 for summary of each). Some researchers adhere to one approach conducting one study (e.g., Schegloff & Sacks, 1973 [CA]; Boxer, 2002a [EC]; Davies, 2003 [IS]), while others combine elements from different approaches (e.g., García, 1989; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989; Waring & Hruska, 2012). The present study takes a mixed methodological approach as explained below.

The idea of detailed transcription in CA and IS is useful in the present study, although it is neither a CA nor IS study in the strict sense. In CA and sometimes IS research, speakers’ utterances are transcribed thoroughly along with paralinguistic and contextual information, which is often not the case in the speech act research. Rich context such as description of the situation or interlocutors’ gestures given in the transcripts contributes to more accurate token selection because a certain utterance can be a directive in one situation, but not in others. In addition, a qualitative approach to data (e.g., detailed description of the data; focus on particularities of certain language behavior) used in CA and IS is beneficial to provision of detailed descriptions of participants’ speech behaviors. Thus, the present study focuses on the details relevant to directive language in transcribing and analyzing data.
However, CA or IS which approaches data qualitatively is not fully satisfactory in achieving my research goals to examine general patterns of teaching assistants (TAs)’ directive usage and to find similarities and/or differences between the groups (i.e., female vs. male TAs and native vs. Korean TAs). Accordingly, the present study employs quantitative data analysis in addition to qualitative analysis. In order to provide a general picture of directive language usage by each TA group, the present study uses descriptive statistics, such as frequency and average percentage. As for group comparisons, the present study employs the chi-square test.

An ethnographic approach in IS and EC is relevant to the present study as well. Unlike CA, social/contextual factors and cultural knowledge are regarded important to understand speakers’ language behaviors in IS and EC. I also believe that it is necessary to relate speakers’ background information (e.g., who they are and what they believe) to their speech to investigate their language usage. As an interview is one of the effective tools to collect speakers’ beliefs and understandings of certain speech events, given situations, or behaviors (Kasper & Rose, 2002), the present study utilizes stimulated retrospective interviews to tap into speakers’ thoughts related to their language choices.

**Data Collection**

There are three sets of data investigated in the present study: directives used by native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs), directives used by Korean teaching assistants, and directives used by non-native student teaching assistants. However, it was impossible to run this statistical test for all comparisons because the tokens in certain data sets were too small for the test.

NSTAs are those who were identified as graduate student instructors whose native language is American English in the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (Simpson et al., 2002).
assistants (KTAs),\(^3\) and KTAs’ retrospective accounts collected from the interviews. Data sources and data gathering procedures of each data set are presented in following subsections.

**NSTA Data**

The source of the NSTA data, which was used as baseline data in the present study, was the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE) (Simpson et al., 2002). Development of this corpus was started in 1997 and completed in 2002 at the University of Michigan and yielded 152 transcripts of wide-ranging academic speech events. The speech events in this corpus are divided into two types, classroom events (e.g., lectures, labs, student presentations) in varied academic divisions—Humanities and Arts, Social Sciences, Biological and Health Sciences, and Physical Sciences—and non-classroom events such as tutorials, office hours, and study groups. In MICASE, one can access academic spoken English of people in different academic roles such as faculty, graduate students, researchers, undergraduates, staff, and post-doctoral fellows. In addition, information regarding speakers’ gender, native language status, and age group\(^4\) is available. The length of recording of speech events in MICASE varies, from 30 to 100 minutes approximately.

In order to maximize comparability with the KTA data, a limited number of transcripts were selected from MICASE for NSTA data. Among 152 transcripts available in total, the most comparable ones to KTAs' teaching sessions were chosen; that is, only teaching sessions directed to native speaker undergraduate students which were

---

\(^3\) KTAs are native speakers of Korean who were graduate students in the University of Florida at the time of recording.

\(^4\) Age groups, in this corpus, were divided into four: 17-23, 24-30, 31-50, 51 and older.
instructed by graduate students whose native language was identified as American English formed the NSTA data. As a result, eleven transcripts of the teaching sessions taught by 12 NSTAs\(^5\) (6 female and 6 male) were obtained from MICASE. As shown in Table 2-1, four types of speech events—student presentation, lecture, lab, and discussion section—were found in the NSTA data.

**KTA Data**

The source of the KTA data was videotaped teaching sessions stored in a database of the Academic Spoken English (ASE) program, which was developed to train international teaching assistants (ITAs), at the University of Florida (UF). In this institution, international graduate students must demonstrate whether their English oral proficiency is at the designated level deemed appropriate to teach in the U.S. classroom. Those who score 55 or higher out of 60 on the SPEAK test (which is equivalent to 28 or higher on the TOEFL-IBT speaking portion) are allowed to teach without restriction. However, international students whose test score ranges from 45 to 50 on the SPEAK (23-27 on the TOEFL-IBT) can be appointed to a teaching position with restriction: they are required to take the EAP 5836 course in ASE. According to the information provided in the ASE official webpage\(^6\), EAP 5836 is a 3-credit course designed to help ITAs to be successful in their teaching duties by providing lessons on pedagogical issues (e.g., how to organize information, how to lead a discussion) as well as on linguistic issues (e.g., pronunciation) and cultural elements (e.g., American values, cross-cultural awareness). In addition, ASE offers each ITA one-on-one conference(s) on their

\(^5\) One session was run by two graduate students (NSTA 1 and 2 in Table 2-1).

\(^6\) [http://ase.ufl.edu/syllabi2.html](http://ase.ufl.edu/syllabi2.html)
teaching performance: ASE instructors observe at least one class of each ITA, video-tape their teaching, and provide them with feedback on their language issues as well as on their teaching skills, if any. On average, three teaching videos per person\(^7\) are recorded in this 15-week course. The length of each video varies, from 15 minutes to an hour approximately. All the ITAs’ teaching videos were saved in mp4 format and stored in the ASE database.

KTAs’ teaching videos were collected from Spring 2011 to Fall 2012. With help from the ASE, I was able to access contact information of KTAs who were enrolled in the EAP5836 course between Spring 2009 and Fall 2012. In addition, I contacted representatives of the Korean Student Association at UF in order to obtain contact information of other KTAs who had taken the same course prior to Spring 2009. I contacted a total of 38 KTAs by e-mail, and 22 KTAs (8 female and 14 male) consented to my access to their teaching videos in ASE. Basic demographic information such as age and length of residence (LOR) in English speaking countries, which was presented in Table 2-2, was collected when I met them to get their signature on the consent form (see Appendix A). All of them were born in Korea, had their first English education in middle school, and obtained their bachelor’s degree in Korea with one exception of KTA 2. Their age at the time of recording ranged from 26 to 39 years old (mean age 30.81). Eight KTAs had teaching experience in Korea prior to teaching at this institution. As for the speech event, three types were found in the KTA data: lab, lecture, and discussion section.

\(^7\) According to the ASE coordinator, the number of recordings varies from one to six depending upon the number of students enrolled in a semester.
Since more than one recording was made for each KTA, a total of 56 teaching videos (1907 minutes) were transcribed. I watched each video repeatedly and transcribed the spoken data as it was in Word document using regular spelling. For each KTA, one transcript was created regardless of the number of videos located in the data. To ensure comparability between the two data sets (i.e., KTA transcripts and NSTA transcripts), MICASE transcription convention was employed; for the sake of convenience, however, a simplified version (see Appendix B) was used because not every item of the MICASE convention was necessary for studying KTAs’ directives.

In each transcript, the KTA was identified as “T.” Following the speaker identification symbol “T”, I transcribed all the utterances of KTAs. Although the unit of analysis was directive language, all of KTAs’ utterances were transcribed to provide context which might be useful for token selection and data analysis later on. In addition, non-linguistic information, such as KTAs’ gestures, movements, and activities that were related to their directive language, was transcribed for the same reason. However, other information such as suprasegmental features, gaze, overlaps, and so forth was not transcribed because of it not being the focus of the present study.

When transcribing students’ utterances, students were all indicated as “S” since speaker identification was not necessary for the purpose of the analysis. Students’ utterances were roughly transcribed because the target of the analysis was teachers’ directives, not students’ speech. The poor quality of the recording, due to students’ not wearing microphone for example, also precluded detailed transcription of their utterances. For these reasons, a great deal of their speech was written as “(xx)” in the transcripts. However, when it was related to KTAs’ production of directive language,
students’ speech and actions which were associated to KTAs’ directive language were transcribed in detail to describe relevant context.

**Interview Data with KTAs**

In order to triangulate the KTA data, I planned one-on-one interviews with the KTAs. These interviews were conducted in their first language (i.e., Korean) in order to minimize any difficulties in verbalizing their thoughts (Kasper & Rose, 2002). I contacted all of 21 KTA for this retrospective interview, but only nine KTAs agreed to participate in the interview\(^8\). On average, the interview took 58 minutes. Each interview consisted of two parts. On the one hand, a number of questions regarding the following topics were asked to everyone.

- Familiarity with speech event (prior teaching experience)
- Feelings/concerns before teaching
- Familiarity with the ITA problem
- Teaching philosophy
- Power issues in classes or lab sessions
- Evaluation from their students
- TA training session(s)

On the other hand, some of the questions were personalized with regard to the directives they used. I selected several directive tokens from the transcript and asked the KTAs to explain why they used a particular expression in a certain situation while showing them the segments and transcript of their teaching videos. The directive tokens selected for the interview were relevant to the findings of data analysis or unique to the interviewee. Each interview was audio-recorded and roughly transcribed for analysis.

---

\(^8\) Although this interview was planned from the beginning of the project, I did not inform the KTAs of this interview when I first contacted them for their consent on my access to their teaching videos. Instead, I sent a separate informed consent form (see Appendix C) later to ask whether they were willing to participate in the interview. This was because I felt that fewer KTAs would allow me to access their teaching videos if they were asked to participate in the interview on their teaching videos.
Data Analysis

This section describes the procedures of data analysis, detailing how the directive tokens produced by the NSTAs and KTAs were selected, identified, coded and analyzed. It also discusses how the interview data was handled for analysis.

NSTA and KTA Data

For analysis of directive usage patterns, the NSTA and KTA data was processed in the same manner; directive tokens were selected first, and each token was identified with the construction type and coded accordingly. Then the directive tokens were tallied and quantified in percentage with regard to the construction type in order to find general patterns and compare them between groups. Each step is described in detail below.

Token selection

Directive token selection was conducted following the definition established in the previous chapter—utterances produced to prompt students’ action, excluding the ones issued to elicit information from the students. In addition, Searle’s (1976) taxonomy served as a basis for token selection. As it was discussed in the previous chapter, three conditions should be met for an utterance to be labeled as directives, which are illocutionary point, direction of fit between words and the world, and expressed psychological state. First, illocutionary point (i.e., purpose of an utterance) of directives is the speaker’s attempt to get the hearer to do particular action. For example, when A says “get out of here” to B, illocutionary point of this utterance is A’s attempt to get B to disappear from A’s view. Second, directive language has world-to-word direction of fit, since its purpose is to get the world (i.e., action) to match the words. In the case of the “get out of here” example, world has to be changed, that is, B’s disappearing from A’s
view is expected, to comply what has been uttered\(^9\). Lastly, the speaker’s psychological state is “want.” The exemplified utterance “get out of here” can be identified as a directive only if the speaker wants the hearer to exit the place in which they are. However, the same utterance should not be selected as a directive if it conveys ironic meaning such as “no way” or “you’re kidding.” In this case, the speaker does not attempt to the hearer to get out. Moreover, speaker’s psychological state is not “want.” If any of these three conditions were violated, KTAs’ and NSTAs’ utterances were not regarded as directives in the present study.

In spite of the criteria mentioned above, it was not always straightforward to select directives from the data, as Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2006) pointed out. In the following Excerpt (1), for example, KTA10 was explaining a stage of reporting to the class of advertising research.

Excerpt (1). From KTA 10’s lecture

T: <T MOVES ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE> here’s the last stage of reporting. so here again see the big picture, see the forest, not tree. use themes and meta-themes to demonstrate your findings and just focus on meaningful findings

If his intention was only to provide explanation to his students, his utterances such as “see the big picture” and “use themes and meta-themes…” in Excerpt (1) above should not be considered as directives. However, it seemed that he wanted his students to see the big picture, use meta-themes, and focus on meaningful findings while carrying out their own research\(^10\). This kind of directive was comparatively frequent in KTAs’ speech

\(^9\) On the other hand, assertives such as statements have word-to-world direction of fit because speakers should match his or her words to represent the world, according to Searle (1976).

\(^10\) Actually, in the retrospective interview, he reported that the main purpose of the above utterances was to explain the stage, although he admitted that he had intention of directive to some extent.
in which they demonstrated how to use a certain program or solved questions on the board. Since the illocutionary point of those utterances was more explaining than directing, these kinds of utterances were excluded from token selection.

In addition, when utterances were in interrogative or declarative forms, it was more difficult to determine whether they were directives or not. For example, it was not clear whether teachers’ questions starting with “(do you) remember” were just asking if their students could remember something they had talked about or they actually wanted their students to recall it\(^1\). Since it was impossible to check every ambiguous token with each TA, ambiguous utterances were not counted as directive language. Another challenging case was found in the declaratives which were not accompanied with directive vocabulary or modal (i.e., hints). Accordingly, students’ reaction and other contextual information were crucial in token selection.

When selecting directive tokens from the NSTA data, I read the preexisting transcripts and highlighted the utterances which matched the definition and the conditions addressed above. On the other hand, directive tokens produced by KTAs were selected in the same way while transcribing their teaching videos. Since audio-visual information was useful to determine whether an utterance was directive language or not, I did not separate token selection from transcription.

In order to ensure reliability of token selection, I had another person engage in token selection, who I address as the second coder in the rest of this dissertation. The second coder was a 21-year old female American when she joined in the project. She was an undergraduate student in Linguistics at the time of working on token selection.

\(^{11}\) KTAs had different purposes issuing this particular interrogative; for example, KTA15 said she intended to get her students recall what they had talked about, but KTA14 said it was just a “yes” or “no” question.
She was provided with 11 NSTA transcripts and 22 KTA transcripts and told to examine all the transcripts closely and highlight directive language. Before she began token selection, I explained the transcription convention and the token selection criteria (i.e., the operational definition of directives for the present study and Searle’s conditions mentioned above) to her.

When she finished token selection, we met to compare each other’s work. We went over what we selected one by one and confirmed them as directives for the tokens that both of us highlighted. When we encountered discrepancies, however, we discussed why she or I did (not) select particular tokens. Most of the discrepancies were due to her not having access to KTAs’ teaching videos. Although I tried to transcribe them as detailed as possible, it sometimes turned out to be limited for her to obtain sufficient contextual information. A few discrepancies were mainly due to carelessness; she or I simply missed tokens. For the majority of the discrepancies, we easily reached mutual agreement and redid token selection together. However, we had a few tokens on which we were in disagreement. Those were mostly in unclear situations so that it was not easy to determine whether they were real directives or not. Hence, those tokens upon which we failed to reach agreement after meetings were excluded from the analysis.

Token identification and coding

Token identification was carried out along with token selection; two coders individually worked on token selection and identified the selected tokens with the construction type at the same time. We used an inventory of directive construction types (see Table 2-3) adapted from the classifications used in a number of studies (e.g.,
Holmes, 1983; Reinhardt, 2010) after a preliminary token identification procedure\(^\text{12}\). As shown in Table 2-3, it is very similar to Holmes’ categorization introduced in the previous chapter in that there are three big categories (i.e., imperatives, interrogatives, and declaratives) and that the same construction types are taken from Holmes’s work for the imperatives and interrogative categories.

However, I altered the declarative category, since what Holmes proposed in this particular category was unsatisfactory as follows. First, the construction type “embedded agent” (e.g., “I want you to draw a picture”) defined as “the agent and usually the required activity are expressed explicitly in an embedded or subordinate clause” (p. 105) failed to embrace what Ervin-Tripp (1976) categorized as “need/want statements” which are in a single clause such as “I need a match” or “I want your lab report.” Thus, I replaced embedded agent with want/need statements which can embrace the two. Second, Holmes’s inventory lacks what Reinhardt (2010) calls “directive vocabulary” (e.g., “I suggest/recommend/encourage…”) and “modal or periphrastic modal” (e.g., “you can/should…”), which were found in the pilot analysis. Therefore, these two types were included in the declarative category. To reiterate, the declarative construction category was subdivided into four types in the present study: want/need statements, hints, (periphrastic) modals, and directive vocabulary.

In anticipation of the directive tokens which could not be identified with construction types in Table 2-3, we agreed to label them as “Others.” Reliability of construction type identification was 0.96. We discussed each case of discrepancy to establish mutual agreement.

\(^{12}\) I carried out a pilot analysis with one MICASE and four KTA transcripts.
After token selection and identification, I generated a separate Excel file for individual TAs to code the selected directives. Each token was inserted in each row with a construction type and other details, if any, such as modal verb, mitigation devices, or directive vocabulary. For the purpose of analysis in the present study, directive language in a complete idea was counted as one token. If any directive token failed to convey a complete idea, it was excluded. As for repetition, when the same directive tokens were produced sequentially, it was just considered as one token. For token identification and coding, simplified labels were used for each construction type, combining abbreviation of the construction category and the number indicated in Table 2-3. For example, the first construction type “base form of verb” in the imperative category and the second construction type “non-modal question” in the interrogative category were marked as Im1 and Q2 respectively.

Analysis

Data analysis began with examining the types of directive construction located in the NSTA and KTA data. I checked whether the construction types in the inventory established for the purpose of the present study (Table 2-3) would cover all the tokens in the data. Then, I looked into purposes of directives, yielding a categorization of situations in which directive tokens were issued. This was not originally planned, but I realized the necessity of classifying the directive tokens into different purposes because illocutionary force of certain tokens was stronger than the others. For example, teachers’ directives related to the course requirements (e.g., “you have to submit the lab report today”) were stronger than the ones which were unrelated to the required tasks (e.g.,

---

13 More informative labels were used for reporting and discussing the results in the following chapters.
“please turn the light off”). For this reason, it seemed inappropriate to examine their directive construction choices without considering the purpose of each directive token. Therefore, I went over all the selected directive tokens in the NSTA and KTA data and divide them into several situations\textsuperscript{14}, which allowed me to come up with three types of directives: commanding, requesting, and suggesting directives. The second coder and I then identified the type of directives for each directive token. Reliability of directive type identification was 0.91. We discussed each token which we didn’t agree upon in order to reach an agreement.

In order to provide descriptive statistics of TAs’ directive usage, I counted the number of selected directive tokens produced by each TA. Then I calculated a percentage of each construction type used by each TA for each situation. For each TA group, a general picture of directive usage patterns was examined by calculating the average percentage of each construction type, followed by an analysis of directive usage patterns on an individual level. After that, I took a closer look at directive tokens used by each TA to look at the type of mitigation devices, modal verbs, directive vocabulary, and any other peculiar cases. As a last step of data analysis, I performed group comparisons between female and male TAs in each group and between the NSTA and KTA group in terms of their preferences for directive construction types, modal verbs choices, and mitigation strategies.

\textbf{Interview Data}

Transcribed interviews were organized by questions (e.g., “why did you use X here?” or “what do you think the role of a teacher is?”). I first gathered KTA’s responses

\textsuperscript{14} Details are discussed in the next chapter with examples.
in separate files for each question. Then I picked out similarities and/or differences in their answers to each question.

This chapter has discussed why the present study takes a mixed methodological approach (i.e., quantitative and qualitative data analysis with ethnographic/retrospective interviews to triangulate the data). It has also described the detailed procedures of data collection and data analysis. The results of data analysis are presented in the following two chapters: analysis of NSTAs’ and KTAs’ directive language in Chapter 3 and analysis of retrospective interviews in Chapter 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Speech event &amp; Course</th>
<th>Recording duration</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Student presentation: Chemistry</td>
<td>51 min</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Student presentation: Chemistry</td>
<td>51 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student presentation: Multicultural issues in Education</td>
<td>72 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lecture: Archeology of modern American life</td>
<td>73 min</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lab: Statistics</td>
<td>47 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lab: Cognitive Psychology</td>
<td>82 min</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lab: Biopsychology</td>
<td>52 min</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Discussion: Intro Astronomy</td>
<td>33 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Discussion: Intro to American politics</td>
<td>55 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Discussion: Heat and mass transfer</td>
<td>48 min</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Discussion: Intro to Anthropology</td>
<td>51 min</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Discussion: Philosophy</td>
<td>51 min</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NSTA 1 and 2 were co-teaching in one session.
Table 2-2. KTA data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speech event &amp; Course</th>
<th>No. of video</th>
<th>Recording duration</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOR*</th>
<th>Teaching Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lab: Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107 min</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1&lt;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lab: Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 min</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lab: Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69 min</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&lt;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lab: Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103 min</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&gt;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lab: Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62 min</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&gt;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lab: Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58 min</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lab: Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75 min</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lab: Anatomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lab: Anatomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57 min</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lecture: Advertising Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116 min</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lecture: Principles of Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106 min</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lecture: Problem Solving Using Computer Software</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63 min</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lecture: Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66 min</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lecture: Argument &amp; Persuasion (Writing Program)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126 min</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Speech event &amp; Course</td>
<td>No. of video</td>
<td>Recording Duration</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>LOR*</td>
<td>Teaching Exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lecture: Foundation of Language &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126 min</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>10 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Discussion: Architectural Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>159 min</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Discussion: Environmental Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77 min</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1&gt;</td>
<td>6 mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Discussion: Programming for CIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37 min</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4&lt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Discussion: Application of Discrete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89 min</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4&lt;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Discussion: Application of Discrete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66 min</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3&lt;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Discussion: Contemporary Moral Issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142 min</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Discussion: Precalculus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83 min</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1> (less than one year of residence in English speaking countries); 1< (1-2 years); 2< (2-3 years); 3< (3-4 years); 4< (more than 4 years); N/A (information not available).

1 Unlike other KTAs who had teaching experience in a university setting in Korea, KTA 11’s teaching experience was acquired in an elementary school context.
Table 2-3. Directive construction types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperatives (Im)</th>
<th>Interrogatives (Q)</th>
<th>Declaratives (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Base form of verb</td>
<td>1. Modal Qs</td>
<td>1. Want/need statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Speak louder”)</td>
<td>(“Can you read what it says for me?”)</td>
<td>(“I want (you to do)/need X”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You + imperative*</td>
<td>2. Non-modal Qs</td>
<td>2. Hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“You go on with your work”)</td>
<td>(“Who can I see sitting quietly?”)</td>
<td>(“Sally you’re not saying much”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present participle form of verb</td>
<td>3. (Periphrastic) modals</td>
<td>3. (“You can/should/have to/need to…”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Looking at me”)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Directive vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Verb-ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
<td>(“I suggest/recommend/ask…; You’re required to do X”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Hands up”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Imperative + modifier**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Turn around please”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Let’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Let’s finish there”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Examples in the parentheses were from Holmes (1983) and Reinhardt (2010).
* Revised to “subject + imperative” (see Chapter 3).
** Excluded from the imperative category, but examined separately (see Chapter 3).
CHAPTER 3
ANALYSIS OF DIRECTIVE TOKENS

The results of data analysis on directive usage by the Korean TAs (KTAs) and the native speaker TAs (NSTAs) are presented in the following order. First, it enumerates the types of directive constructions located in the KTA and NSTA data. Second, it addresses the types of directives categorized in the present study by discussing the situations in which the directive tokens were issued (i.e., the purpose of directive language). Third, it describes the patterns of directive usage found in the baseline data (i.e., the NSTA data) by looking at their choices for directive constructions and mitigation strategies and by conducting gender comparisons on them. Lastly, it reports on KTAs’ directive usage in the same manner in comparison to the patterns found in the NSTA data.

**Types of Directive Construction Found**

All of the imperative constructions listed in the inventory (Table 2-3) established in the previous chapter were found in the data. First, the base form of verb imperative form (hereafter Im-B), as in the example of “put them in the appropriate envelope”, was commonly found in the data. Negative forms such as “don’t use water” were also located\(^1\). Second, the “you + imperative” type (e.g., “you just pull it out”) was found in the data as well, but needed to be changed to “subject + imperative” (hereafter Im-Sub) since the NSTAs and KTAs not only used the second person pronoun subject “you”, but also other subjects such as “everybody”, “somebody”, and “you guys.” Third and fourth imperative construction types, “present participle form of verb” (hereafter Im-Ing) as in

\[^1\] Negative forms were not counted separately in the present study, but were treated equally with affirmative forms.
“working with your partner” and “verb-ellipsis” (hereafter Im-Ell) as in “unit please” (meaning the teacher wanted the student to write a unit in his lab report) were found in the data, but seldom. Fifth, the “imperative + modifier” type was found in the data as well (e.g., “just find these muscles in your model please”), but it was excluded from the inventory for the following reason. One of the modifiers Holmes (1983) discussed in her categorization was “please”; however, this particular modifier was not only used with imperative directives, but also with interrogatives (e.g., “will you please pass in your lab?”) and declaratives (e.g., “I wish you guys read this book carefully please”). Thus, I took this imperative + modifier type out from the inventory and analyzed NSTAs’ and KTAs’ use of modifiers separately instead. The last imperative type “let’s” (hereafter as Im-Let’s) was also located in the data (e.g., “let’s take a look at this table”).

Unlike the imperative category, no change was necessary for the interrogative and declarative categories. Regarding the former, both construction types in the inventory—“modal interrogative” (hereafter Q-M) and “non-modal interrogative” (hereafter Q-NM)—were found in the NSTA and KTA data. The NSTAs and KTAs used modal verbs such as “will”, “would”, “can”, “could”, and “may” for the Q-M construction (e.g., “can you get it to me by the end of the day today?”) and expressions like “why don’t you…?” and “how about…?” for the Q-NM type (e.g., “why don’t we take a five-minute break?”) in order to ask their students to do something.

All of the four declarative construction types listed in the inventory were located in the data as well. The typical pattern of want/need statements (hereafter D-W) was “first person subject (mostly the speaker) + Verb (e.g., “want”, “need”, “like”, “hope”, “wish”, and “expect”) + clause/noun” as in “I’d like you guys to get into groups of three or
four” and “I need your draft design by tomorrow.” The second declarative type “hints” (hereafter D-H) was also found in the data. Some examples were “these go in the discard parts right here” (meaning that the teacher wanted the students to put some objects in the designated place) and “I can’t hear you” (meaning that the teacher wanted the student to speak louder). As shown in the examples, requested action was not explicitly expressed, but needed to be inferred by the students. Third, the declarative construction using (periphrastic) modals (hereafter D-M) was found in the following pattern: subject (mostly the listener) + modals or periphrastic modals + Verb. A wide range of (periphrastic) modals were employed for D-M: “can”, “could”, “will”, “be going to (gonna)”, “want to (wanna)”, “need to”, “have to”, “should”, “must”, “gotta”, “be supposed to”, “might”, “(had) better”, and “be better off.” The last type “directive vocabulary” (hereafter D-V) was realized in the “subject (mostly the speaker) + Verb (e.g., “suggest”, “recommend”, “ask”, “encourage”) + clause/noun” structure as in D-W or with directive adjectives such as “necessary” (e.g., “it is necessary to record like this”).

However, recall that there existed some tokens which the second coder and I had to identify as “Others.” Some were incomplete or ambiguous due to ellipsis. For example, the utterances with rising intonation such as “speak up please?” were ambiguous whether they were interrogatives or imperatives. Even though we regard them as the former, it is still not clear whether they belong to Q-M or Q-NM because of the omitted element(s). On the other hand, others were complex, using if-construction, embedded declarative, and to-infinitive. The pattern of the first type was “if + you + Verb” as in “if you guys can get into groups and if you guys can hand in your rough drafts.” As for the second type, D-M or D-W was embedded to modify noun phrases (e.g., “the
thing”) as in “that’s one caveat you really need to keep in mind and one of the things I definitely want you to see is that the cortex itself.” The to-infinitive type was used to explain the noun phrase as a modifier or a subject complement as in “the key first thing to do is understand the style of a transcendental argument and your job is to find some confounds.” A few other tokens were realized in comparative/superlative construction (e.g., “it’s faster to just point to a door”) or with phrases such as “welcome to” or “free to” (e.g., “you guys are welcome to come to this to talk about the other part”).

**Types of Directive Found**

Although directives, in general, are issued when a teacher (T) wants his or her students (Ss) to do something in class, they can be sub-divided by the teacher’s intention, i.e., the purpose of directive language. In the NSTA and KTA data, directives were issued in the following eight situations. The examples in the parentheses were selected from the data.

1. T orders Ss (not) to do particular actions related to the lecture or experiment at the time of speaking (e.g., “turn to page one hundred and twelve”; “you have to choose the narrow beam”).

2. T commands Ss to remember, understand, assume, or think about something associated to the lecture or experiment (e.g., “just remember that’s the point of a confound”; “you need to memorize all these simple equivalencies”).

3. T directs Ss (not) to do something regarding upcoming course requirements or class procedures/policies (e.g., “submit the digital version by midnight of the same day”; “have a valid excuse”).

4. T requests Ss to do particular action which is not directly related to the lecture or the experiment (e.g., “keep passing around the candy please”; “can you turn it off?”).

5. T asks Ss to participate in class (e.g., “put it together for me Amy”; “could anybody come to the front and solve the problem on the board?”).
6. T suggests Ss to do something for their own benefit (e.g., “you can come talk to me individually if there’s anything”; “if you have time, just go to any website to check out APA style”).

7. T desires Ss to draw their attention to a certain topic or task (e.g., “let’s go over this exam”; “let’s look at example one”).

8. T tells Ss not to worry about something (e.g., “don’t worry about it”; “you don’t have to be that precise”).

Directives performed in Situation 1 were used as commands; that is, the TAs wanted their students to follow the orders given. As what the TAs asked their students to do was related to the task at hand (e.g., what to do, with whom, and how), compliance was generally expected. Otherwise, disadvantages such as low grade due to incomplete or unsatisfactory performance would follow. In addition, students’ actions were generally required right after the directives were uttered (or within the class or lab hour), so the instructors could tell whether the students followed the directives or not. Thus, force of TAs’ attempt to get the students do something in Situation 1 could be regarded as strong.

Directives produced in Situation 2 served as commands as well. The TAs ordered the students to keep in mind, think, or memorize something, which would help them understand the topic, complete the task given, or prepare for their course requirements. Thus, the context of Situation 2 was usually the case where the TAs provided their students with explanation regarding the target concepts of the class or experiment. The difference between Situation 1 and 2 lies in the fact that it was not obvious whether the students complied with teachers’ directives in Situation 2, because what the teacher asked such as thinking or remembering was not observable. In other words, what were requested in Situation 1 were concrete actions while what were requested in Situation 2 were mental or cognitive actions. However, the force of TAs’
attempt to direct the students to do these actions in Situation 2 was as strong as the one in Situation 1 because they were directly related to what they were learning and doing in class.

In the same vein, directives issued in Situation 3 were used as commands. The TAs instructed what the students should do for the exams, quizzes, projects, or homework. Or they gave the students directions on the course policies or schedules, such as when and how to submit their assignments. What makes Situation 3 different from Situation 1 is that no immediate action was required because the instructors were usually talking about the actions which should be done in the near future. However, similar to Situation 1 and 2, force of directive attempt in Situation 3 was strong because they were relevant to students’ obligations, and disadvantages would follow in case of noncompliance.

In contrast, force of the attempt to get the students to do something in Situation 4 was not as strong as the one found in the previous three situations. Since the directives issued in Situation 4 were not related to students’ obligations in class, these were more like requests than commands. In this situation, the TAs requested their students to do something for them (e.g., passing candy around), which was not directly related to students’ academic performance. For instance, NSTA 4 told her students to remind her to pass around a sign-up sheet for their upcoming project after break. In this particular example, the teacher requested her students’ help in order not to forget to pass it around. This directive token was not issued as an order because it was not students’ duty to remind her of it. Rather, it was used to ask for students’ cooperation. Thus, force of her attempt could be regarded not as strong as the case in Situations 1-3. In case of
noncompliance, students might not have an immediate disadvantage such as a low grade, but they are likely to be judged negatively by their teacher, which in turn might negatively affect their relationship.

As was the case with Situation 4, directives uttered in Situation 5 were used as requests—requests for participation in particular. The TAs wanted their students to participate in class by expressing their own opinions. Although it is understood that students’ participation is generally expected in class, this is not something that all the instructors automatically have in every class. Instead, they have to do something to encourage their participation—directive language is one strategy teachers employ. Students know that they would have relatively minor disadvantages for not speaking up as long as they show a teacher that they are paying attention to the lecture and carry other orders out. For these reasons, directives uttered in Situation 5 were not as strong as those found in Situations 1-3 in terms of force of the attempt.

Directives issued in Situation 6 can be classified as suggestions. In most of the cases, the TAs supposed hypothetical situations, implying that what was being asked was not required for everybody to do; i.e., what was directed to do was not a must. In other words, it was up to the students whether to follow it, and they would not receive negative evaluation from the teacher in case of noncompliance. However, it seemed that teachers used this type of directive because compliance would be believed to help students’ performance on the course requirements. As the actions were not required, force of the attempt can be regarded quite weak.

Directive language spoken in Situation 7 was frequently used in the beginning of the class or in the shift from one topic to another. It seemed that what the TAs wanted
their students to do was draw their attention to the topic introduced. However, what their students were supposed to do was not specified in the directive tokens. For example, when NSTA 5 said “let’s do a homework problem”, it was not clear whether he wanted his students to stop what they were doing, look at certain parts of the textbook, or take out what they had prepared for the question. It could be regarded as a directive if the students were supposed to bring the hard copy of their homework problem to the class, and the teacher wanted them to check whether their answer was correct whenever they did the homework problem together in class. However, this kind of information was not available to us. For this reason, we did not count the directive tokens issued in Situation 7 as true directives.

While in the imperative form on the surface, directive language uttered in Situation 8 was used as an anxiety-lowering device rather than a command. What the TAs told their students was not to worry about some tasks. The instructors’ primary intention was assumed to be lightening the workload of the task given, which would help their students feel less stressed about their study. Therefore, we excluded the tokens produced in Situation 8 from the analysis.

Taken altogether, I divided the directive tokens issued by the NSTAs and KTAs in Situations 1-6 into three categories of directive types with regard to force of the attempt: “Commanding Directive” (CD), “Requesting Directive” (RD), and “Suggesting Directive” (SD). The directives issued in Situations 1-3 fall into CD, of which force is the strongest among the three categories. In this case, what the teachers wanted their students to do was procedural, obligatory, related to the course requirements, and required for/relevant to the task at hand. As for RD, which includes the directives issued
in Situations 4-5, the requested action seemed necessary (although it was not Ss’ obligation) for the teachers to successfully manage class (e.g., students’ participation and assistance). As RD is far from students’ duty related to their academic performance or procedural activities, it is more face-threatening than CD. The directives used in Situation 6 belong to SD, the force of which is the least strong. What the teachers wanted their students to do was not required, but recommended; that is, the students were given options. Accordingly, SD is less face-threatening than CD or RD.

Based on the construction types and the directive types discussed so far, I describe the patterns of NSTAs’ and KTAs’ directive usage in the following sections.

**Directive Usage by NSTAs**

**Distribution of Directive Tokens**

A total of 266 directive tokens were located in the NSTA data. As indicated in Table 3-1, the number of the directive utterances issued in each NSTA’s class ranged from four to 56. Due to the differences in recording duration of the class they were teaching, however, it is inappropriate to determine who used directive language the most or the least by comparing the raw frequency. Thus, for each NSTA, the total number of the directive tokens that each NSTA produced was divided by the recording time, which in turn yielded an average number that each would issue directives in 10 minutes as shown in Table 3-1.

NSTA 7 used directive language the most (10 tokens per 10 minutes) followed by NSTA 5 (9 tokens per 10 minutes), and NSTA 1 and 8 (8 tokens per 10 minutes each). They were teaching different types of class: the laboratory sessions (NSTA 5 and 7), student presentation section (NSTA 1), and discussion section (NSTA 8). On the other hand, the least amount of directive tokens was found in NSTA 9 and 3 (1 token per 10
minutes each). NSTA 9 was teaching a discussion section, and NSTA 3 was in charge of a student presentation session.

Table 3-1 also shows the number and the percentage of directive construction types that each NSTA utilized. Overall, the construction category which NSTAs preferred to use for directive language was imperatives, followed by declaratives and interrogatives; the average percentages of each construction used by the NSTA group were 54%, 31% and 5%, respectively. Im-B (base form of verb imperative), D-M (modal declarative), and Q-M (modal interrogative) were the most frequently used form in each construction category. The NSTA group used deviated forms (i.e., Others) 10% of the time on average.

Among 266 directive tokens, commanding directive (CD) tokens took up the majority of NSTAs’ directive language (80% of the total directive tokens), followed by suggesting directive (SD) (13%) and requesting directive (RD) (7%). Their predominant production of CD was found on an individual level as well, as shown in Figure 3-1; all NSTAs, except for NSTA 9, predominantly produced CD tokens while performing their teaching duties. In order to offer a more accurate picture of NSTAs’ directive usage, their directive language behavior of CD, RD, and SD are explained separately in the following sub-sections.

**Commanding directives**

As summarized in Table 3-2, all NSTAs, except for NSTA 9, issued CD (i.e., directives to command their students to do something). On average, the NSTAs

---

2 NSTA 9 was teaching a discussion section (Introduction to American Politics) and used directive language mainly to encourage her students to participate in class discussion.

3 As CD tokens comprised a great majority of the NSTA data, data analysis mainly focused on this set of data. As a result, data analysis of RD and SD tokens may be limited.
employed the imperative construction category 56% of the time, which was used by all 11 NSTAs. The next frequently used construction category was declaratives (eight NSTAs utilized the declarative constructions 22% of the time on average), followed by Others (12%) and interrogatives (2%). The similar pattern was found even on an individual level; as we can see from Figure 3-2; except for NSTA 3, 6 and 8⁴ who used the other categories more than or as much as the imperative category, the NSTA group favored the imperative category over the others when issuing CD tokens.

Within the imperative category only, NSTAs' reliance on Im-B was overwhelming, since the average percentage of their Im-B use was 75%. Even on an individual level, Im-B was predominantly utilized by all NSTAs with one exception; NSTA 3 used Im-Sub (subject + imperative) only in the imperative category. Im-Sub, which held the second rank (12%) in the imperative category, was only employed by four NSTAs. They used Im-Let’s infrequently (5%) and rarely utilized Im-Ing (present participle form of verb) (less than 1% of the time).

As for the declarative constructions, the NSTAs showed a preference for D-M. The average percentage of D-M usage held the first rank (47%) within the declarative category, followed by D-H (hints) (11%), D-W (want/need statements) (8%), and D-V (directive vocabulary) (1%). On an individual level, out of eight who employed the declarative category, NSTA 3 was the only exception to this general trend here as well, who favored D-H over D-M. When using D-M, the NSTAs favored the second person subjects, such as “you” (53% of the time on average) over the first subject, such as “we” (1%), and the third person subjects, such as “everyone” (12%). With regard to their use

⁴ NSTA 3 was a male TA of a student presentation section, NSTA 6 was a male lab TA, and NSTA 8 a female TA in charge of discussion section.
of modal verbs in D-M, “need to”, “should”, “be gonna”, and “can” were frequently found in the NSTA data, as shown in Figure 3-3A. For the D-W construction, the NSTAs used three verbs “want”, “need”, “would like”, and “expect.” Only one D-V token with “be required” was located in the data.

The interrogative category was not utilized as much as other construction categories when producing CD. Only three NSTAs used it, favoring Q-M (modal interrogative) (21% of the time on average) over Q-NM (non-modal interrogative) (4%). Two modal verbs, “will” and “can”, were used for Q-M, and the “why don’t you” phrase was used for Q-NM in the NSTA data.

Other than the construction types listed in the inventory, the NSTAs utilized other forms such as if-construction (22% of the time on average), followed by embedded declarative (21%) and to-infinitive (16%).

**Requesting directives**

The NSTAs produced a small number of RD tokens; only 18 tokens were issued by nine NSTAs which accounted for 7% of the total directive tokens. These RD tokens were either in imperatives, interrogatives, or declaratives; that is, no RD tokens were identified as Others. Unlike the case in CD, the NSTAs did not show any general preference for a particular construction category. The average percentage of each category used by the NSTA group was similar: 26% for imperatives, 24% for interrogatives, and 25% for declaratives. As shown in Figure 3-4, some NSTAs preferred imperatives while others favored interrogatives or declaratives, which suggests that there existed greater speaker variability in their choice of directive constructions for RD.
Looking at the imperative category only, the construction type the NSTAs chose the most was Im-B (25% of the time on average), followed by Im-Sub and Im-Ell (4% each). This preference for Im-B in the imperative category was observed in CD as well. Neither Im-Ing nor Im-Let’s was utilized for RD tokens. Another similarity between RD and CD was found in the interrogative category; the NSTAs exhibited a strong preference for Q-M; for RD, the NSTAs used Q-M only. The modals they used for Q-M were “can”, “could”, and “would.”

However, NSTAs’ use of declarative forms for RD was in contrast to the case of CD tokens. D-W was selected the most by the NSTAS (25% of the time on average), which was used 7% of the time for CD tokens. The verbs used in this particular construction were “need” and “hope.” The next frequently used declarative construction was D-H (8%), followed by D-M (4%) and D-V (4%).

Suggesting directives

Similar to RD, the number of SD tokens produced by the NSTA group was small. Only 36 tokens (13% of the total directive tokens) were issued by nine NSTAs. Overall, for this particular type of directive, they used the declarative category the most frequently (31% of the time on average), followed by imperatives (25%) and Others (19%). However, no SD tokens were realized in interrogatives. As was the case in RD, there was speaker variability between individuals in their choice of directive constructions; some NSTAs favored the imperative category, but others used the declarative category most of the time (see Figure 3-5).

NSTAs’ preference for Im-B among the five imperative constructions was evident in their production of SD, since they did not use other imperative forms. The average percentage of Im-B usage was 50%, as only a half of the group employed this particular
construction type for SD. One interesting point to note was that all SD tokens in Im-B form were followed or preceded by an adverbial clause of condition or time (e.g., “if you have a question that you don’t really need to set up an office hour, just email to me”). Although the NSTAs used Im-B with an adverbial clause for CD and RD as well, it was rather more sporadic than consistent.

Within the declarative category only, the average percentage of NSTAs’ D-M construction use was the greatest (36%). Out of seven NSTAs who employed this construction for SD, five NSTAs predominantly used D-M. Although this preference for D-M in the declarative category was also observed in CD tokens, the types and the percentage of the modals used were different. When issuing SD tokens, as shown in Figure 3-3B, the NSTAs used “can” and “want to (wanna)” the most frequently. In the set of CD tokens, their use of “want to (wanna)” was less frequent. In addition, the modal verbs which were preferred for CD were not used much or at all for SD tokens; two modals, “be gonna” and “gotta”, were not employed at all, and “should” was used less frequently for SD. NSTAs’ use of other declarative forms (D-V, D-H, and D-W) was quite limited for SD tokens. The verbs used for D-V in this set of directives were “suggest” and “recommend.” As for D-W, the verb “want” was used.

As for Others, the NSTAs utilized if-construction (e.g., “if you wanna come up at the end of class”) and embedded declarative (e.g., “there's some handouts you wanna get”), which were also found in the set of CD tokens. In addition to these, the NSTAs used superlative/comparative construction (e.g., “best/easier to do X”) and “you are welcome to do X” phrase when issuing suggesting directives.
Mitigation and Perspective of Directives

On average, the NSTAs mitigated their directive language about 30% of the time. The NSTAs showed difference in their average percentage of mitigation with regard to the type of directives; they mitigated SD the most (43% of the time on average), followed by RD (31%) and CD tokens (25%). As a means of mitigating their directive language, the NSTAs utilized lexical and syntactic downgraders (45% and 38%, respectively) or a combination of the two (8%). Narrowing the scope to the CD tokens, they were more likely to use lexical downtoners than syntactic ones (51% vs. 39%). As a lexical mitigator, the NSTAs added a politeness marker “please”, hedges (e.g., “just”, “kind of”), or downtoners (e.g., “probably”) to their directive utterances. The most frequently employed lexical items were “just”\(^5\) (65%), followed by “please” (17%). The majority of “just” was used with Im-B (65%), while “please” was used with Im-B (55%) and Q-M (37%). For syntactic downgraders, on the other hand, they utilized past tense such as “I was hoping” instead of “I hope” or “could/might/would” instead of “can/may/will.” The constructions which belong to Others such as if-construction, embedded declarative, to-infinitive and superlative/comparative construction were other examples of syntactic downgraders, which comprised the majority of syntactic downgraders (83%).

Regarding NSTAs’ choice of perspective, they predominantly used hearer-oriented perspective (73% of the time on average). The agent of action “you” was articulated (e.g., “can you do X?” or “you should do X”) or understood (e.g., “do X”).

---

\(^5\) Lee (1987) argues that just can be used to deliver “depreciatory”, “restrictive, “specificatory”, and “emphatic” meaning. The first type is relevant to mitigation as it is used to “minimise the significance of some process” (p. 378). According to his classification, there are two sub-types in the depreciatory “just”: contrastive (e.g., “I don’t feel unwell, I just feel seedy”) and non-contrastive (e.g., “just sit down in the chair”). Only the latter was counted as a lexical mitigation device in the present study.
next frequently used perspective was impersonal, which were accompanied by neutral agents such as “they” or “it” (17%), followed by speaker-oriented directives with “I” (6%), and inclusive directives with “we” or “us” in Im-Let’s (4%). Even looking at CD tokens only, the NSTAs showed a similar behavior; they used hearer and impersonal perspective most of the time (66% and 18%, respectively).

**Gender Comparison**

Gender differences were statistically tested only for CD tokens, since the size of the RD and SD tokens was small for the statistical test. For their production of CD tokens, it appeared that there was no significant relation between gender and the choice of construction category, $\chi^2 (df 3, N = 213) = 1.41, p = .7$. Actually, both female and male NSTA groups preferred the imperative category (62% and 50%, respectively), mostly Im-B, over the other construction categories, as illustrated in Figure 3-6. Regarding NSTAs’ mitigation of CD tokens, the female and male groups were similar in their average percentage of mitigation devices used (27% vs. 24%). In addition, gender did not play a significant role in their use of perspective; both female and male NSTAs used hearer perspective the most, $\chi^2 (df 3, N = 213) = 7.32, p = .06$.

In their production of RD tokens, the female NSTAs used declarative constructions the most (44% of the time on average), followed by interrogative (31%) and imperative forms (8%), as shown in Figure 3-7. In contrast, the male NSTAs favored imperative constructions (44%) over the interrogative (17%) and declarative forms (6%). Although what Figure 3-7 illustrates seemed to suggest gender difference regard to their use of construction, caution is needed in interpreting this figure due to the small size of the tokens.
Third, as for SD tokens, the NSTAs exhibited different patterns from RD, as shown in Figure 3-8. The female NSTAs used the imperative category the most (36% of the time on average), followed by declarative category (34%) and Others (13%). In contrast, the male NSTAs utilized declarative constructions the most (30%), followed by Others (24%) and the imperative category (13%). As for mitigation, the female NSTAs mitigated SD tokens slightly more than the male group (46% vs. 40%). Regarding the perspective of directive language, no gender difference was found as all the SD tokens were hearer-oriented.

To sum up, the NSTAs showed different language behaviors depending upon the types of directives. First, when their attempt to get their students to do something was strong (i.e., CD), they, both female and male NSTAs, favored the imperative construction forms. However, different patterns were observed in their production of RD and SD; NSTAs’ preference for the imperative category decreased with more individual variability in their construction choices. Second, the amount of mitigated tokens was influenced by the types of directives; they mitigated more of SD tokens than CD tokens. Third, their use of modals for D-M also differed between the sets of CD and SD tokens; need to and should were used the most for the former while can and want to were preferred for the latter. Fourth, no striking gender difference was observed in their production of CD tokens with regard to their preference for the construction type.

Directive Usage by KTAs

Distribution of Directive Tokens

A total of 1046 directive tokens were found in the KTA data. Table 3-3 presents the total number and the percentage of the directive tokens realized in each construction type as well as the converted token number that each KTA would issue per
ten minutes in class. KTA 18 was omitted from Table 3-3 and also from the later analysis because the second coder and I did not locate any directive tokens from his speech.

Overall, the KTAs who were teaching laboratory sessions tended to produce directive language more than the other KTAs who were teaching lecture-based classes or discussion sections. As shown in Table 3-3, KTA 2, a physics lab TA, issued directive tokens the most (18 tokens per 10 minutes), followed by KTA 5 and 7 (12 and 11 per 10 minutes, respectively) who were teaching chemistry labs. On the other hand, the KTAs in the lecture-based or discussion-based classes, in general, produced fewer directive tokens than the lab TAs. For example, KTA 10, 11 and 13, who were lecturing, used the least amount of directive language (1 per 10 minutes each). However, there were exceptions to this trend; two TAs (KTA 8 and 9), out of nine lab KTAs, did not issue directives as much as did the other lab TAs (4 and 3 per 10 minutes, respectively). In addition, two KTAs, KTA 14 in charge of the lecture-based class and KTA 17 teaching the discussion section, produced directive language as much as the lab TAs did (8 and 7 per 10 minutes, respectively).

Most of the lab TAs (two out of three in the NSTA group and seven out of nine in the KTA group) issued directive tokens more than the average number of each group (5 and 6 per ten minutes, respectively), which suggests that directive language is more frequent in the lab setting than other types of speech event. However, exceptions found in the NSTA and KTA group imply that the speech event alone (e.g., whether they were teaching a lab or discussion section) cannot predict the amount of the directive language a teacher uses in class. Rather, it seems that the amount of directive
language is related to other factors, such as focus of the class and the type of activities. For example, KTAs 8 and 9 spent most of their lab sessions explaining the topic of the day rather than providing guidelines for the experiments. Thus, they did not need to produce directive language as much as did other lab TAs. In the cases of KTAs 14 and 17, they had a couple of in-class activities which required them to give directions to their students, which in turn had them use directive language more than other non-lab TAs who were mainly lecturing.

Regarding the overall distribution of the directive types, the KTA group was similar to the NSTA group. The overwhelming majority of the directive tokens (85%) were CD, followed by SD (9%) and RD (6%). All of 21 KTAs produced CD tokens more than the other two types as shown in Figure 3-9.

As for KTAs’ overall preference for directive constructions, they utilized the imperative category the most (52% of the time on average), followed by declaratives (37%) and interrogatives (7%). In addition, Im-B (base form of verb) in the imperative category, D-M (modal or periphrastic modal construction) in the declarative category, and Q-M (modal questions) in the interrogative category were the most preferred construction types. These preferences were similar to the NSTA group. However, the KTA group was different from the NSTA group in that they deviated less from the construction inventory; fewer tokens (5% of the total directive tokens), compared to the NSTA data (14%), were identified as Others in the KTA data.

Commanding directives

A total of 893 CD tokens were produced by all 21 KTAs, as indicated in Table 3-4. The KTAs preferred the imperative category when issuing CD tokens (56% of the time on average), followed by the declarative (37%), Others (4%), and interrogative (3%),
which is the pattern also observed in the NSTA data. The majority (16 out of 21 KTAs) showed this preference for the imperative category on an individual level (see Figure 3-10). The five KTAs (KTA 2, 3, 5, 7, and 10), who did not follow this pattern, had no common factors which can account for this exception.

Although the KTAs showed the same order of construction preference (i.e., imperatives > declaratives > Others > interrogatives) as the NSTAs did, they were different from the NSTA group with regard to the distribution of directive construction categories (see Figure 3-11). The KTAs' actual use of the declarative category was larger than expected on the basis of chance, whereas the NSTAs' actual use of Other category was larger than expected on the basis of chance, $\chi^2 (df 3, N = 1106) = 51.01, p < .001$. This difference seemed attributable to KTAs’ overuse of D-M, as shown as Figure 3-12.

Within the imperative category only, the KTAs utilized Im-B as frequently as the NSTA group (76% of the time on average). The only exception to this preference on an individual level was KTA 1 who favored Im-Sub\(^6\) over the other imperative forms. The next frequently employed construction was Im-Let’s (14%), followed by Im-Sub (8%). As was the case in the NSTA group, the KTAs rarely used Im-Ing (less than 1%) and Im-Ell (2%).

Looking at the declarative category, I found that the KTA group resembled the NSTA group with regard to their preference for the construction type. The KTAs selected D-M most frequently (77% of the time on average), and even on an individual level this reliance on D-M for CD tokens was observed. As for their use of subject in this

\(^6\) The number of second person subject “you” was overwhelming (58 out of 59 CD tokens realized in Im-Sub construction) in the KTA data, which was not the case in the NSTA data.
D-M form, the KTAs were also similar to the NSTAs in that they predominantly used the second person subject such as “you” and “you guys” (57% of the time on average). However, KTAs’ use of modal verbs was different from NSTAs’. As illustrated in Figure 3-13, the KTAs mainly used “have to” and “can” whereas the NSTAs used “need to”, “be gonna”, “should”, and “can” the most frequently. For the D-W construction, which held the second rank in the declarative category (11%), the KTAs mainly used the verb “want.” Other verbs utilized in D-W were “need”, “wish”, and “hope.” For the D-V construction, which the KTAs did not use much (4%), directive vocabulary such as “suggest”, “recommend”, “required”, and “necessary” was used in the KTA data.

The KTAs showed similarities to the NSTA group in their use of constructions types in the interrogative and Others categories as well. As for the former, they preferred Q-M over Q-NM (39% vs. 9%). Eight out of ten KTAs who issued interrogative directives favored modal questions. The modal verbs for the Q-M construction located in the KTA data were “can”, “could”, and “will.” For Q-NM, we found two phrases used in the KTA data—“why don’t you” and “how about.” The KTAs favored the same constructions for the latter as well in that they utilized if-construction (e.g., “if you think this unshared electron pair as another atom, it will be easier to figure out”) the most frequently over the others (30% of the time, on average).

**Requesting directives**

As was the case in the NSTA group, a relatively small number of RD tokens was produced by 16 KTAs (60 tokens which took up 6% of the total directives). The KTAs exhibited a different preference for directive construction types from the set of CD tokens. While the imperative category was favored for the CD tokens, interrogatives were predominantly used for RD tokens (55% of the time on average) in the KTA data.
This pattern was not found from the NSTAs, who showed a balanced use of the imperative, interrogative, and declarative categories (see Figure 3-14). KTAs’ reliance on the interrogative constructions for RD tokens was generally observed on an individual level (12 out of 16 KTAs), as we can see from Figure 3-15. Among the two interrogative types, the KTAs used Q-M predominantly (64% on average). The modal verbs utilized for Q-M in the KTA data were not so different from the NSTA data. The KTAs used “can” the most frequently (67% of the RD tokens realized in Q-M), followed by “could”, “would”, and “may.”

Within the imperative category, only Im-B and Im-Let’s were utilized for RD tokens in the KTA data. KTA’s use of Im-B surpassed that of Im-Let’s as they employed the former 31% of the time on average, compared to 2% for the latter. This preference for Im-B in the imperative category was observed on an individual level with only one exception and found in the NSTA data as well. As for the declarative forms, they rarely used them (2% of the time on average), which is less than the average percentage of NSTAs’ declarative usage (25%).

The directive tokens identified as Others in this set differed from the ones mentioned above. They were neither in if-construction nor embedded declarative form. They were identified as Others since the elliptical elements made identification difficult. Out of six tokens, five were uttered with rising intonation such as “volunteers?” and “please say it louder?” The other token, “if you don’t mind please”, was uttered by KTA 14, which prompted her student to turn the light off before she completed her words.

**Suggesting directives**

KTAs’ construction choice for SD tokens was different from the case of CD and RD. They employed the declarative category the most frequently (39% of the time on
average), followed by imperatives (28%), Others (9%), and interrogatives (less than 1%).

This pattern was not found from the NSTAs, who showed a balanced use of the imperative, interrogative, and declarative categories (see Figure 3-16). In addition, their preference for the declarative category was not very evident on an individual level. As we can see from Figure 3-17, 8 out of 16 KTAs employed the declarative category more than the imperative one, whereas 6 KTAs showed the opposite pattern.

Within the declarative category which the KTAs utilized the most, they used the D-M construction the most (58% of the time on average). Among these SD tokens realized in D-M, they showed a heavy reliance on “can” (33 out of 37 tokens) in terms of their modal selection, which was not the case with CD tokens. The rest of the declarative constructions were not used frequently: 6% for D-V, 2% for D-W, and 1% for D-H. They used “encourage” and “suggest” for D-V and “hope” and “wish” for D-W.

As for the imperative constructions, the KTAs used Im-B only when issuing SD tokens. Regarding the directive tokens identified as Others, they used if-construction and embedded D-M. In addition, they used comparative constructions such as “just using Sun Tools is the easier way” or other expressions like “you are welcome to and you are free to.”

**Mitigation and Perspective of Directives**

On average, the KTAs employed mitigation devices 29% of the time, which is on a par with the NSTA data. The KTA group was also similar to the NSTA group in that they mitigated SD tokens more than the CD or RD tokens (33% of the time on average compared to 28% and 25, respectively). Unlike the NSTA group, however, the KTAs predominantly used lexical devices more than syntactic downtoners (80% vs. 17%). The same was true within the set of CD tokens; the KTAs used lexical devices more than
expected on the basis of chance, whereas the NSTAs employed syntactic devices more
than expected on the basis of chance (see Figure 3-18). That is, there was a significant
relation between the TA group and the choice of mitigation strategies, \( \chi^2 (df 1, N = 301) = 43.17, p < .001 \)\(^7\). Some examples of the lexical mitigators for CD tokens located in the
KTA data were “just”, “please”, and “probably.” Similar to the NSTA group, “just” was
used the most frequently (56%), followed by “please” (26%). These two were mainly
used with the Im-B construction. Other than these two, the KTAs used “I think” or “I
guess” (10%) as a lexical mitigator to soften their directive language realized in the D-M
construction, which were not found in the NSTA data at all. As for their use of syntactic
mitigators, the KTAs used past tense, if-construction, or complex sentence structure
such as embedded declarative as the NSTAs did.

Regarding the use of perspective, the KTAs favored hearer perspective over the
others (80%), and the same was true with the CD tokens. This preference for hearer-
oriented perspective was also observed in the NSTA data. However, Figure 3-19
demonstrates that the KTAs used hearer perspective more than the NSTAs (80% vs.
66%) and utilized impersonal perspective less than the NSTAs (5% vs. 18%). The chi-
square test revealed that there was a significant relation between the TA group and the
perspective choice, \( \chi^2 (df 3, N = 1106) = 33.40, p < .001. \)

**Gender Comparison**

With regard to their preference for the construction category in the set of CD
tokens, the KTA group exhibited gender differences. While the male KTAs favored the
imperative category (62% of the time on average) as the NSTA group did, the female

\(^7\) The tokens mitigated by a combination of syntactic and lexical devices were excluded in this statistical
test due to the small number of the tokens.
KTAs showed a balanced use of imperative and declarative categories (46% vs. 45%), as illustrated in Figure 3-20. The chi-square revealed that there was a significant relation between gender and the construction choice; the male KTAs employed the imperative category more than expected on the basis of chance, whereas the female KTAs used the declarative category more than expected on the basis of chance, \( \chi^2 (df 3, N = 893) = 11.73, p < .01 \).

As was the case in the NSTA data, the female and male KTAs were similar in the average percentage of mitigation devices used (26% and 29%, respectively). In addition, there was no significant relation between gender and KTAs' use of perspective, \( \chi^2 (df 3, N = 893) = 1.13, p = .77 \).

When producing RD tokens, the KTA group did not show gender difference in their choice of construction categories or use of mitigation devices. The KTAs, female and male alike, favored the interrogative category over the others (see Figure 3-21) and mitigated a similar amount of the tokens (19%). Likewise, in their production of SD tokens, the female and male KTAs showed a preference for the same construction category (the declarative category in this case as shown in Figure 3-22) and mitigated a similar amount of their directive language (36% vs. 31%).

To summarize, KTAs' directive language behaviors differed with regard to the types of directives. They preferred different construction categories for different types of directives: imperatives for CD, interrogatives for RD, and declaratives for SD. In addition, they showed difference in mitigating their directive language; they mitigated SD tokens more than CD or RD. These overall patterns that the KTAs displayed (i.e., different
behaviors with regard to the types of directives) were similar to the ones found in the NSTA group.

However, the KTAs were different from the NSTAs in the following manner: (1) they utilized the declarative category, mainly D-M, more than the NSTAs; (2) they mostly used “can” and “have to” for the D-M construction; (3) they heavily relied on lexical mitigation; (4) they predominantly used hearer perspective and did not use impersonal perspective as much as the NSTAs did. These differences are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, after looking at KTAs’ retrospective accounts discussed in the next chapter, which promise to provide further insights into their language choices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Im-B</th>
<th>Im-Sub</th>
<th>Im-Ling</th>
<th>Im-Ell</th>
<th>Let's</th>
<th>Q-M</th>
<th>Q-NM</th>
<th>D-W</th>
<th>D-H</th>
<th>D-M</th>
<th>D-V</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(Per 10 min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSTA1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Percentage of each construction type used by each NSTA is in parenthesis.
     (2) NSTA 1-3 in charge of student presentation session; NSTA 4 in charge of lecture-based class; NSTA 5-7 in charge of lab; NSTA 8-12 in charge of discussion section.
Table 3-2. Number of CD tokens used by NSTAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Im-B</th>
<th>Im-Sub</th>
<th>Im-Ing</th>
<th>Im-Ell</th>
<th>Im-Let’s</th>
<th>Q-M</th>
<th>Q-NM</th>
<th>D-W</th>
<th>D-H</th>
<th>D-M</th>
<th>D-V</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSTA1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(80%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSKTA9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69%)</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  (1) Percentage of each construction type used by each NSTA is in parenthesis.  
(2) NSTA 1-3 in charge of student presentation session; NSTA 4 in charge of lecture-based class; NSTA 5-7 in charge of lab; NSTA 8-12 in charge of discussion section.
Table 3-3. Total number of directive tokens used by KTAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Im-B</th>
<th>Im-Sub</th>
<th>Im-Ling</th>
<th>Im-Ell Let's</th>
<th>Q-M</th>
<th>Q-NM</th>
<th>D-W</th>
<th>D-H</th>
<th>D-M</th>
<th>D-V</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(Per 10 min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTA1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(29%) (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(53%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(13%) (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(70%) (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(18%) (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(74%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(35%) (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(39%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(12%) (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(72%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>(88%) (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(88%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(71%) (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(71%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13%) (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27%) (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(47%) (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(43%) (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(63%) (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(39%) (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Im-B</th>
<th>Im-Sub</th>
<th>Im-Ing</th>
<th>Im-Ell</th>
<th>Im-Let’s</th>
<th>Q-M</th>
<th>Q-NM</th>
<th>D-W</th>
<th>D-H</th>
<th>D-M</th>
<th>D-V</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(Per 10 min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTA16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Percentage of each construction type used by each KTA is in parenthesis.
(2) KTA 1-9 in charge of lab; KTA 10-15 in charge of lecture-based class; KTA 16-22 in charge of discussion section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KTAs</th>
<th>Im-B</th>
<th>Im-Sub</th>
<th>Im-Ing</th>
<th>Im-Ell</th>
<th>Im-Let's</th>
<th>Q-M</th>
<th>Q-NM</th>
<th>D-W</th>
<th>D-H</th>
<th>D-M</th>
<th>D-V</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTA1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(71%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA</td>
<td>Im-B</td>
<td>Im-Sub</td>
<td>Im-Ing</td>
<td>Im-Ell</td>
<td>Im-Let's</td>
<td>Q-M</td>
<td>Q-NM</td>
<td>D-W</td>
<td>D-H</td>
<td>D-M</td>
<td>D-V</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(42%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Percentage of each construction type used by each KTA is in parenthesis.  
2. KTA 1-9 in charge of lab; KTA 10-15 in charge of lecture-based class; KTA 16-22 in charge of discussion section.
Figure 3-1. Distribution of three types of directives in the NSTA data

Figure 3-2. NSTAs’ choice of directive construction category for CD tokens
Figure 3-3. Modals used in D-M construction in the NSTA data. A) Modals used for commanding directives. B) Modals used for suggesting directives.

Figure 3-4. NSTAs' choice of directive construction category for RD tokens
Figure 3-5. NSTAs’ choice of directive construction category for SD tokens

Figure 3-6. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for CD tokens (NSTAs)
Figure 3-7. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for RD tokens (NSTAs)

Figure 3-8. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for SD tokens (NSTAs)
Figure 3-9. Distribution of three types of directives in the KTA data
Figure 3-10. KTAs’ choice of directive construction category for CD tokens

Figure 3-11. Group comparison of directive construction choice for CD tokens
Figure 3-12. Group comparison of directive construction choice for CD tokens

Figure 3-13. Modals used in D-M construction for CD tokens (KTAs). (Note: Modals which took up less than 1% was not labeled in the pie chart.)
Figure 3-14. KTA-NSTA comparison of directive construction choice for RD tokens

Figure 3-15. KTAs’ choice of directive construction category for RD tokens
Figure 3-16. KTA-NSTA comparison of directive construction choice for SD tokens

Figure 3-17. KTAs' choice of directive construction category for SD tokens
Figure 3-18. Group comparison of mitigation device choice for CD tokens

Figure 3-19. Group comparison of perspective use for CD tokens
Figure 3-20. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for CD tokens (KTAs)

Figure 3-21. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for RD tokens (KTAs)
Figure 3-22. Gender comparison of directive construction choice for SD tokens (KTAs)
CHAPTER 4
RETROSPECTIVE INTERVIEWS

This chapter presents the findings of the retrospective interviews conducted with the following nine Korean teaching assistants (KTAs):

- KTA 2: Physics, Lab, Male
- KTA 5: Chemistry, Lab, Female
- KTA 8: Anatomy (Applied Human Physics), Lab, Male
- KTA 10: Advertising Research, Lecture, Male
- KTA 11: Principles of Sociology Lecture, Male
- KTA 13: Housing & Urban Development, Lecture, Male
- KTA 14: Argument & Persuasion (Writing Program), Lecture, Female
- KTA 15: Foundation of Language & Culture, Lecture, Female
- KTA 16: Theory of Architecture, Discussion section, Male

First, it presents nine KTAs’ retrospective accounts regarding their language choices, such as their choice of directive construction types and/or mitigation devices. Second, it summarizes other relevant information which might have affected their directive usage, such as their attitudes towards the teacher and student relationship. All the interview excerpts included in this chapter were translated from Korean into English.

**KTAs’ Language Choices**

**Directive Constructions**

Since imperatives, Im-B (base form of verb) in particular, are commonly used for directive language in classrooms (e.g., Holmes, 1983; Liu & Hong, 2009; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) and actually were predominantly employed by the KTA data, my interview questions did not focus on KTAs' choice of the imperative forms. However, I brought Im-B up when asking about their use of other construction types at every chance. For example, I asked why they used a certain construction instead of the imperative form or requested them to put construction types in order of directness, which allowed me to collect their views on the construction they used as well as on Im-B.
Thus, I begin this section by addressing KTAs’ answers to my questions regarding their use of declarative and interrogative constructions. I then move on to their opinions on imperative directives.

**Declarative directive constructions**

As reported in the previous chapter, the (periphrastic) modal declarative (D-M) was the favored construction within the declarative category. It appeared that KTAs, in general, perceived D-M as less direct than the typical imperative directive (i.e., Im-B), but more direct than the interrogative directives in terms of illocutionary force. This is consistent with the order of directness specified in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Liu & Hong, 2009; Martínez-Flor, 2005).

Among the modal verbs used for D-M, my questions focused on can and have to, since these were the most frequently used ones by the KTAs. First, regarding their use of “you can + Verb”, KTAs’ answers to my questions which asked their intention and reason(s) to use this structure suggests that they regarded it less forceful than the imperative directives. In Excerpt (2), for instance, KTA 14 said that she used this particular form because the action of downloading the course materials was not required.

**Excerpt (2).** From the interview with KTA 14, “you can easily download it”

Interviewer: here you said you uploaded something. were you telling them to do (download) it?

→ KTA14: since I uploaded all the materials, they could download it, if necessary, but it was not a must

Interviewer: you used “you can” here, you know “can” denotes ability or possibility. “you can easily download it”, did you want them to download it or

KTA 14: um...
Interviewer: I'm asking why you used “you can” here

→ KTA: 14: it’s because I couldn’t force them to do it

KTA 14 did not articulate any word of directness for her use of this structure such as “less direct/strong/forceful.” However, her answer implies that she regarded “you can” as a non-forceful structure because she used it for a non-obligatory action with which her students did not need to comply. KTAs 2 and 5 also responded that they chose this particular construction, since what they told their students to do was encouraged but not obligatory. In short, they used this indirect construction “you can” when suggesting something to their students, which makes good sense.

However, the KTAs also employed this “you can + Verb” form for the actions which were required and thus expected to do (i.e., commanding directives). It seemed that they used this form because they wanted to direct their students to do something in a non-forceful way. In the interview with KTA 15 in Excerpt (3) below, who showed heavy reliance on this modal can (70%), for example, I asked why she employed this construction instead of other constructions like imperatives or conventional requests.

Excerpt (3). From the interview with KTA 15, “you can see example on page one twenty six”

Interviewer: here (this utterance)

→ KTA15: I was telling them to look at it (the table)

Interviewer: I see, so you were directing (them to look at it), but why- as we discussed before, we can use interrogatives or imperatives like look at the table. are there any specific reasons for you to use this construction?

KTA 15: habitually…

Interviewer: you were not suggesting, are you?

→ KTA: 15: no. I think I tend to speak indirectly out of habit
It seemed that KTA 15 felt comfortable in using this modal can because she perceived it as not direct. In the interview with KTA 14, she actually said the Korean adverb *wangokhage*, meaning indirectly in English, to answer my question that why she said “you can” for her procedural directive “you can start.” In short, the KTAs also used the “you can + Verb” for the required actions, but with intent to soften illocutionary force of the directive language.

Second, as for their use of “have to” in the D-M construction, I found that the KTAs considered “have to” as a more direct modal than “can” in terms of directive force. For example, KTA 5 in Excerpt (4) regarded “you have to + Verb” as a more effective directive construction than “you can + Verb” because the former is more direct than the latter.

Excerpt (4). From the interview with KTA 5, “you have to think with correct unit for this answer”

Interviewer: as you can see (from the recording and the transcript), you used “you have to” a lot.

KTA 5: it was because I didn’t know the expression which could replace it back then, and I thought “you can” might confuse the students. in addition, I didn’t have sufficient time to provide a lengthy explanation to each student, but had to give them a direct clue which could help them get the right answer

In addition, KTAs’ answers such as “so forceful”, “very coercive”, and “strong” to my question that how they perceive of “you have to + Verb” indicate that they regarded this construction more direct than “you can + Verb.”

The modal “have to” was regarded similar to “should” in KTAs’ perceived directness. Although the KTAs did not use “should” much compared to “have to”, it seemed that they did not differentiate the two, saying that these two modal verbs are similar with regard to directive force. As was the case with Excerpt (4), KTA 10 in
Excerpt (5) below said that he chose the “you + should + Verb” construction in order to issue directives more clearly.

Excerpt (5). From the interview with KTA 10, “you should distinguish between primary source and secondary source and data source”

Interviewer: you used “you should” when talking about the test

KTA10: It seems I say like that for the topics which the students want me to point out clearly. You know the exams are the sensitive (important or serious) matter to them, so I use that kind of expression to provide them with clear directions. I use it when taking about things related the exams or giving them some guidelines. I think I attempt to emphasize (the importance of the action addressed) by saying “you should do something.”

Although the KTAs considered “you have to + Verb” as a strong construction, they did not think it as strong as Im-B. They mentioned that the imperative form is the most forceful way to tell somebody to do something, except for KTA 8 and 161.

The KTAs gave similar responses regarding their choice of other declarative constructions. For example, KTAs 2, 10, 11, and 14 expressed that the directives using directive vocabulary “I suggest/recommend” (i.e., D-V) were less strong than the imperative construction. This is not incorrect according to the order of directness determined in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Liu & Hong, 2009; Martínez-Flor, 2005). However, the KTAs’ answers like “not so strong” indicated that they did not consider D-V as strong as the CCSARP researchers did, who regarded this kind of structure as nearly strong as the imperative directives.

Their retrospective accounts on their use of D-W (want/need statements) also indicated that they regarded this construction less direct than Im-B with regard to directive force. KTA 11 said he intended to soften his utterance when using “I want you

---

1 They regarded the Im-B less strong than D-M with “have to.” Actually, the majority of their directive language was realized in Im-B, meaning that they might have tried to avoid employing the most forceful construction form by their standards.
to do X” construction, for example. Even among the verbs that they used, KTA 14 differentiated “hope” from “want”, as shown in Excerpt (6), which suggests that she thought “I want” as more direct than “I hope.”

Excerpt (6): From the interview with KTA 14, “I hope you guys, from next time, try to be more specific on your comments”

Interviewer: okay, next, “I hope”

→ KTA14: the verb “hope?” why not using “want?”

Interviewer: “want” is possible, or you could have omitted “I hope” (meaning that she could have used imperative forms)

→ KTA 14: this is a kind of rhetorical issue, although I couldn’t force them to do it, I was suggesting

Interviewer: was that a suggestion? Didn’t you want them to do so?

→ KTA: 14: yes, I did. but using “I want” seemed um…how can I say? [Interviewer: too direct?] yes, (so using “I hope” was to) “tone down” a little

KTA14 expressed that she used “I hope” with intent not to be forceful in telling her students what to do. At the end, she used an English word “tone down” to explain why she chose “I hope” expression.

In summary, KTAs’ use of declarative constructions was related to weak force of attempt to get the students to do a certain action (e.g., they tended to use D-M for suggesting directives) or motivated by their intention to soften their directive language. In general, their perceived directness of each construction corresponded to the one discussed in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

**Interrogative directive constructions**

As the KTAs who participated in the interview rarely selected Q-NM (question directives without modal), my questions focused on their use of Q-M (question directives with modal). As discussed in Chapter 3, interrogative constructions were used more
frequently for requesting directive (RD) tokens than for commanding directive (CD) tokens. For example, KTA 14 used “could you…?” to request her student to turn the light off. To my question asking her intention, she commented that “I said so because she had to stand up and move to turn it off” and “we are not in the military unit”, meaning that KTA 14 was asking for her student’s help, not issuing her a command.

However, the KTAs used Q-M for CD tokens as well. It appeared that their choice of Q-M for CD was related to their intention to issue directives not in a forceful way. For example, KTA 15 used Q-M “can you…?” when she was asking her students to take something out. To my question asking her intention, she said “because I felt that imperatives were too strong.” KTA 2 in Excerpt (7) below explained his choice of Q-M by relating it to the politeness aspect, which suggests that he regarded Q-M as a more polite form than the imperative constructions.

Excerpt (7). From interview with KTA 2, “could you move (it) to the like a little bit off from the center, to the outside, or anywhere on the graph?”

Interviewer: here you said “could you move…?”

→ KTA: 2: right, I was telling them to do it. since I was asking them to do something, I said “could you…?” I was being very polite

Interviewer: you mean you could have said things differently like “move it”, but in order to say it politely (you used “could you”)?

KTA 2: yes, I wouldn’t do like that (I wouldn’t say the same thing) if I’m in that situation nowadays

Interviewer: then what would you say?

→ KTA: 2: just “move it…”

Similarly, KTA 16 regarded Q-M as a polite form to request his students to do particular actions. Since I had already brought up the politeness issue in the interview with him as shown in Excerpt (6) above, I asked him whether his use of Q-M was also due to his
intention to be polite. He agreed and added: “the same is true with when I’m speaking in
Korean, I rarely force people to do something, so I say things indirectly.” In short, as
was the case with KTAs’ use of declarative constructions, the main reason to use Q-M
was to be indirect or polite.

**Imperative directive constructions**

The interview data showed that KTAs’ perceived directness of imperative
directives was very strong. For instance, when I asked KTA15 to put Im-B, “can you…?”,
and “you can” in order of directness, she said “in my opinion, the imperative form is the
strongest one, “you can” is kind of neutral, and “can you…?” is the least direct.”
Likewise, KTA 11 said “there’s nothing stronger than imperative directives” to my
request for him to compare “you have to + Verb” with imperatives.

Although it is within the imperative category, however, Im-Let’s was not
perceived as a strong construction. For instance, KTA 8 said that he wanted to be
“indirect”, and KTA 10 expressed that he wanted to be “polite” to my question why they
used “let’s.” Although KTA 13 failed to articulate the reason why he used this particular
structure, he answered that “let’s” is less strong than the imperative directive form to my
request to compare Im-Let’s with Im-B.

Summing up, KTAs’ choice of directive constructions was relevant to the nature
of the action they asked the students to do; they tended to choose direct forms to
prompt students’ compliance for obligatory actions and less direct forms for non-
obligatory actions. KTAs’ retrospective accounts showed that they perceived declarative
and interrogative construction forms as less forceful than the imperative constructions.
Among the modals they used for D-M, they regarded “have to” (or “should”) as a strong
modal which denotes obligation. Accordingly, they used this modal verb for the actions
related to the course requirements (i.e., course grade) or class procedures. On the other hand, they did not consider can as a strong modal, which was mainly used for suggesting directives. However, they also used can for commanding directives with intent to mitigate them. That is, the KTAs regarded “can” as an all-purpose modal by utilizing it for all types of directive tokens, CD, RD, and SD, while “have to” was used only for CD tokens. Although they did not frequently use D-W, D-M, and Q-M, they also used these constructions based upon the idea that these are less direct than the imperative forms.

**Mitigation**

Since it turned out that the KTAs relied more on the lexical devices than the syntactic ones, more questions regarding their use of lexical downtoners were asked in the interviews. First, regarding their use of “please”, the KTAs had no difficulty answering why they added it before or after their directive language; they expressed that they used it to soften their directive language. KTA 16 referred “please” as “a magic word” which Americans use to mitigate their utterances. Other answers were “to mitigate”, “to direct politely”, and “to avoid being too forceful.”

Second, as for their use of “just”, most of the KTAs failed to provide informative answers although it was the most frequently utilized lexical downtoner in the KTA data. Most of them said that they used it with no specific reason, but that it was their habit (e.g., KTA 11, 13, and 14). Or some gave me Korean translation which means “simply” in English instead of explaining why they used this mitigator (e.g., KTA 5, 8, and 13). However, others like KTA 2 and 15 said that their use of “just” was to convey that what was being asked was not something big, but simple or easy, which is relevant to the
minimizing function that “just” has (Lee, 1987). In other words, it seemed that the KTAs indiscriminately used “just” without full understanding of its function.

Third, although “I think” and “I guess” did not occur frequently, I asked why they used them, since none of the NSTAs employed them as mitigators. This was contrast to KTA 2’s observation because he answered that he heard Americans saying it frequently, suggesting that he has picked it up from the native speakers of English. On the other hand, KTA 5 in Excerpt (8) said she was kind of suggesting what they were supposed to do by using “I think.”

Excerpt (8): From the interview with KTA 5, “I think you have to start with (xx) of unknown vinegar sample, and the air ignition”

Interviewer: you said “think” here

KTA 5: it’s because they seemed not to know what to do first among the tasks they had to do. so I was suggesting this should be done first. I was suggesting, but it was a strong command

Her answer “I was suggesting, but it was a strong directive” is conflicting because suggestions and commands differ with regard to the strength of directive attempt. What she meant seemed that she might have wanted to mitigate her command.

One of the syntactic devices to soften imposition of directives is to use past tense. Those who used this strategy were aware of mitigating effect of past tense. Excerpt (9) is one example.

Excerpt (9): From the interview with KTA 11, “could anybody um <T points at the switch> yeah the first one”

Interviewer: what was the reason that you used “could you” here?

→ KTA11: I think I was more conscious (of my speech) because it was African-American female student who was sitting back. I wanted to respect minority

Interviewer: you had not yet built relationship with this student back then?
KTA11: basically I didn’t try to build any relationship (with students). I’m a typical Asian teacher in this regard

Interviewer: would you have said something different if it was a white male student, then?

→ KTA11: If it was white male and he called me by my first name, not by my last name, then I might have said “can you?”

KTA 11 selected the indirect form Q-M and chose “could” instead of “can” to ask a female African-American student to turn off the light, which shows that he wanted to minimize the imposition by using the past form of the modal verb.

Another example of syntactic mitigators used was if-construction. However, the KTAs could not account for why they chose this particular construction. Their answers were like “well…I don’t know” or “there’s no specific reason.”

There existed a few instances of combination of syntactic and lexical mitigators. In Excerpt (10), for example, KTA 14 employed past modal verb for Q-M with a politeness marker “please.”

Excerpt (10). From the interview with KTA14, “would you please say (it) louder?”

Interviewer: here you said “would you”, but you added “please”

→ KTA14: too much?

Interviewer: no no that’s not my point, I’m asking you why you did that

→ KTA14: in my opinion, there is strong hierarchy between the teacher and the students in Korean classrooms, but, as far as I know they are more equal in status in U.S. classrooms, so I meant to respect them

KTA 14’s question “too much?” can be interpreted as “did I mitigate it too much?”, since she explained that she used “would you please…?” to show her respect to the students.

To sum up, it appeared that the KTAs have a rather limited understanding of the mitigation devices. They were confident when explaining why they used the politeness marker “please” and past modal verbs, but not about the minimizer “just”, hedges “I
think” and “I guess”, and if-construction. This is linked to the findings of the previous studies that non-native speakers experience difficulties acquiring mitigation strategies (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990), which was addressed in Chapter 1.

**KTAs’ Perspectives on TAing**

No KTAs have expressed that they had difficulties due to unfamiliarity with the setting in which they had to teach. Although most of them did not have teaching experience, they said that they were familiar with the physical setting itself. What they were not sure of was the cultural aspect of undergraduate classrooms in the U.S.

The most salient accounts collected from the interviews were KTAs’ concerns about their English across the board, as was reported in LoCastro and Tapper (2006). It did not matter whether they were aware of the issues related to international teaching assistants (ITAs) or how long they were exposed to the English speaking environment. Although they passed the minimum score of the Speak Test, they were neither confident about their English nor free from worries about the challenges that they might face due to their English. It seemed that their worries have never been eased mainly due to students’ attitudes toward their English. They said that the majority of students’ negative comments on the course evaluation were about their accented English. Some of them were very harsh like “I don’t get what you say, go to Korea.”

To my question asking whether they had experienced power challenges in class, six out of nine KTAs answered “yes.” Some were on linguistic level (e.g., students corrected teachers’ English in front of the class), while others were beyond the linguistic level (e.g., students tried to persuade the teacher to change their grades). This seems attributable to their non-native status, which is inferior to students’ who have pragmatic power over them.
As a response to my questions about their philosophy of teaching (or what they valued the most while teaching), the KTAs provided a diversity of opinions such as teaching is “learning”, “communicating”, “knowledge delivery” and “assisting.” KTAs 2 and 8 mentioned that teaching in a lab seemed different from teaching in a lecture-based class; the former is more about disseminating knowledge. KTAs 11 and 13 confessed that there was a gap between what they thought the class should look like and what they actually did in class. Although they said teaching is communication between the teacher and the students, their classes were typical teacher-fronted classes with low degree of student involvement.

It was surprising to see the most of the KTAs (seven out of nine KTAs) expressed that they did not regard the teacher-student relationship as hierarchical in the U.S. This is generally the case in their home culture, albeit it is changing. They said that they did not like the strong hierarchical relationship between the teacher and the students that they went through in Korea.

In addition to EAP 5836 (the academic spoken English course designed for the international teaching assistants) they had to take, three out of nine KTAs received training from their department which they found helpful. As for EAP 5836, all of the KTAs said that the individual conference(s) on their video-taped teaching session(s) were the most helpful because they were able to see how they did in real class and receive personalized feedback on linguistic and pedagogical issues. Other than that, their attitudes toward what they learned from the course were tepid.

This chapter has presented KTAs’ explanations regarding their choice for particular directive constructions or downtoners. In addition, it has discussed the issues
which the KTAs had (e.g., language barrier, power issues in class) and their attitudes toward teaching. A more detailed discussion on these findings follows in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Three research questions have been answered in the present study so far. First, it has described the types of directive constructions that the Korean teaching assistants (KTAs) utilized while teaching and the distribution of each construction type and found that the KTAs relied on lexical devices when mitigating their directive language. Second, the present research has informed us that gender affected KTAs’ directive construction choice when issuing commanding directive (CD) tokens. Lastly, it has shown that the KTAs were different from the native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs) with regard to their overuse of the modal declarative construction (D-M), their reliance on lexical mitigation, their underuse of impersonal perspective, and their use of a limited number of (periphrastic) modal verbs. These findings are discussed in the following sections, taking KTAs’ retrospective accounts and some of the relevant research into account.

KTA-NSTA Similarities

Both KTA and NSTA groups used directives for several purposes; they commanded, suggested, or requested their students to do something. In other words, the directives located in the KTA and NSTA data were not homogeneous in terms of the strength of their attempt to get the students to carry out a particular action. The data analysis demonstrated that they produced strong directives that were related to course requirements and tasks at hand most of the time (85%), which I addressed as commanding directive in the present research. In other words, their directives were mainly “instructional” (He, 2000) or “procedural” (Liu & Hong, 2009), which are “used in the context of implementing classroom procedures or teaching agenda” (He, 2000, p.
123). This is no surprise, considering the institutional context in which the teacher leads their students to achieve course objectives.

Regarding the construction types utilized for directive realization, the inventory established for data analysis in the present research (see Table 2-3) was only satisfactory to a certain degree; it covered 95% of the directive tokens produced by the KTAs and 86% of the directive tokens issued by the NSTAs. While the inventory was made by combining several inventories from the previous research, the context of the present research was different from that of the previous studies. This is no doubt the main reason that the inventory was not completely satisfactory.

Both groups, the KTAs and the NSTAs alike, employed a range of structures, as was the case of previous research on teachers’ directives (e.g., Holmes, 1983; Liu & Hong, 2009; Reinhardt, 2010; Tapper, 1994). In addition, both groups had the same preferred form in each construction category: Im-B (base form of verb) in the imperative category, D-M in the declarative, and Q-M (questions with modal) in the interrogative category. This suggests that this particular non-native teacher group was familiar with a range of directive constructions as well as with the few most favored NSTA constructions. In their production of CD tokens, in particular, the KTA and the NSTA group displayed the same construction preference; they favored Im-B over the other forms. Both groups were also similar in that they showed different preferences for requesting directive (RD) and suggesting directive (SD) tokens. This indicates that the KTAs were aware of the contextual differences of the three types of directives (i.e., differences in the force of attempt to get the students to do something) and able to vary their construction choices.
Other than these similarities with regard to their choice of directive constructions, the KTA group approximated the NSTA group in their use of mitigation devices and perspective to a certain degree. First, both groups mitigated a similar portion of the directives, which was about 30%. Second, the KTA group utilized the same mitigation devices that their NSTA counterparts used. For syntactic downtoners, both groups used past tense, if-construction, and other variations of complex declaratives (e.g., embedded D-M). For lexical mitigation, “just” was predominantly used, followed by “please.” Since the majority of the literature has discussed about “please” when it comes to lexical mitigators (e.g., Ellis 1992; Faerch & Kasper, 1989; Holmes, 1983; Koike, 1989), it was unexpected to find that they used the minimizer “just” more than the politeness marker “please.” Third, both KTA and NSTA groups mitigated SD more than CD or RD tokens. Lastly, KTAs’ and NSTAs’ number one choice for perspective is hearer perspective. These similarities, along with the aforementioned ones, seem to suggest that the KTAs have a good understanding of directive language.

**KTA-NSTA Differences**

Although the data analysis demonstrated that the directives in the KTA and NSTA data were realized in a variety of constructions, they did not use each form in similar proportions. Group differences in KTAs’ and NSTAs’ preferences for directive constructions were found in all three types of directives. In their production of CD tokens, the most frequently employed construction was Im-B in both groups, as previously discussed. This reliance on Im-B (43% for the KTAs and 48% for the NSTAs) is in accordance with the findings of the previous research (e.g., Liu & Hong, 2009; Holmes, 1983) and expected due to the asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and the students in the classroom setting (Holmes, 1983; Nikula, 2002). However, KTAs’
frequent use of D-M (31%) is not a common pattern reported in the literature\(^1\). The KTAs utilized this D-M construction more than the NSTAs who used it only 12% of the time on average.

KTAs’ directive realization using D-M mainly consisted of obligation statements (e.g., “you have to do X”), permissive statements (e.g., “you can do X”), and necessity statements (e.g., “you need to do X”), which are considered less strong than the imperatives (Liu & Hong, 2009). Im-B is a direct form, according to Blum-Kulka (1987), since the speaker’s intention is straightforwardly stated in an utterance. D-M is not as direct as Im-B because directive content is expressed through modality (i.e., degree of necessity, obligation, and possibility). However, D-M is direct enough for the listeners to understand the speaker’s intention, compared to the indirect strategies from which the listeners should infer the intended meaning (e.g., hints). Thus, it seemed that the KTAs utilized D-M in order to ask their students to do certain actions clearly, but not in a forceful way, which is the characteristic of D-M pointed out by Mills (1999).

The interview data actually showed that KTAs’ perceived directness of D-M was in line with the general consensus found in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Liu & Hong, 2009). Eight out of the nine KTAs who participated in the retrospective interview answered that D-M is less direct or strong than Im-B. Moreover, they commented that they did not want to force their students to do something. Thus, their retrospective accounts indicated that KTAs’ frequent use of D-M was due to their intention to be not forceful when issuing directives in class.

---

\(^1\) At least one study reported the similar pattern; Mills (1999) found that the D-M structure was frequently used in one American kindergarten classroom.
A closer look at their use of D-M showed another difference between the KTA and the NSTA group. The KTAs relied on “can” and “have to” for this particular construction type, while the NSTAs used a wide range of modal verbs, such as “should”, “need to”, “gotta”, “be going to”, and “can.” KTAs’ overuse of “have to” runs counter to their intention to be non-forceful in their production of directive language, since “have to” conveys stronger illocutionary force than “need to” and “be going to”, for example. Even though the KTAs expressed that they considered “need to” less direct than “have to”, they used the latter more than the former for CD. This is inconsistent with their desire to be non-forceful, which was frequently expressed in the retrospective interviews. In addition, “should”, which was regarded as strong as “have to”, was not as frequent as “have to” in the KTA data (11% vs. 25%). In short, KTAs’ modal selection seems not related to directness of modality, but relevant to their familiarity with modal verbs.

The NSTAs employed Others more than the KTAs (12% vs. 4%) when issuing CD tokens. That is, the NSTAs utilized the construction types identified as Others (e.g., if-construction, embedded D-M, embedded D-W) as much as D-M (12%). These constructions were regarded as syntactic mitigators in the present research based on Holmes’s (1983) interpretation of “formal additions” (p. 103)—any forms preceding or following directive content—as one kind of mitigation strategy. In short, for CD tokens, KTA group’s use of D-M was greater than NSTAs’, whereas NSTAs’ use of Others was greater than KTAs’. These constructions are less strong than the Im-B, which was used the most frequently for CD. This suggests that the two groups selected less direct construction types from time to time, but differed in their choice of construction. The
possible sources of the differences mentioned so far and their implications are discussed later in this section.

For RD tokens, KTAs’ first choice was Q-M (modal interrogative) instead of Im-B (48% vs. 12% of the time on average). This preference for Q-M confirmed the existing pattern found in non-native speakers’ requesting behavior, though the context was different (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1982; Hahn, 2009; Kim, 1995; Rintell, 1981; Rose, 2000). It appeared that the KTAs wanted to soften illocutionary force of their directives by using interrogatives. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 3, RD is more face-threatening than CD because what was being requested was not mandatory for students to do, but their compliance is still expected. Students had to do something extra, usually for the teacher’s benefit. The retrospective interviews demonstrated that the KTAs were aware of this difference between RD and CD. Thus, they saw the necessity to use politeness strategies. What they chose was Q-M because questioning willingness or feasibility of an action is a conventionalized indirect request form which minimizes the imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

However, the NSTAs did not favor Q-M when producing RD tokens. Rather, they utilized Im-B as much as Q-M (22% vs. 24%) and used D-W (want/need statements) 15% of the time. This shows that the NSTA group tended to feel free to employ construction types which have stronger illocutionary force than Q-M for face-threatening requests. For example, in the situations where the teachers need volunteers for something, the KTAs asked whether anyone would volunteer, while the NSTAs directly stated their needs. That is, NSTAs’ choice for Im-B and D-W when issuing RD tokens seems to suggest that it is appropriate for the teacher to directly request his or her students to do
certain actions in the institutional context, which the KTAs might be not aware of or comfortable with.

For SD tokens, it appeared that the KTAs did not display a strong preference for a specific construction. Their number one construction choice for SD was D-M, possibility/probability statements in particular, but they used Im-B as much as D-M (mostly with lexical mitigation). It has been reported in the literature that D-M is preferred for SD tokens in the literature. For example, Rintell (1981) found that Spanish speaking learners of English predominantly used “you can” for suggestions regardless of the level of deference. As discussed earlier, D-M carries a weaker illocutionary force than the imperatives. Moreover, possibility statements are weaker than obligation statements. Since the strength of their directive attempt was the least strong in the case of SD (because students’ compliance is not necessary), it seemed that the KTAs chose the construction which has lower level of illocutionary force. Actually, in the retrospective interviews, they confirmed that they employed D-M to convey the options the students had, rather than forcing them to perform particular actions.

The NSTAs, whose number one construction choice for SD was Im-B, also used D-M, but the two groups were different in their use of (periphrastic) modal verbs. The KTAs displayed a heavy reliance on “can”, while the NSTAs used “(might) want to” and “can” in similar proportion. As the KTAs showed a similar pattern (i.e., a heavy reliance on a particular modal verb) in the set of CD tokens, this indicates that their competence regarding the modal expressions may be somewhat limited.

Mitigation is another area in which differences between the native speaker (NS) and the non-native speaker (NNS) group have been found. For example, Banerjee and
Carrell (1988) showed that the NNS group was regarded as impolite or less polite due to the fact that their positive and/or negative politeness strategies deviated from the NS group, although both groups were similar in their preferences for the construction types. A similar pattern was observed in KTAs’ mitigation behavior in that their directive language was softened mainly through lexical downtoners, such as “just” and “please”, which were predominantly used with Im-B, whereas the NSTAs employed syntactic devices more than the KTAs.

Another difference found between the two TA groups was their use of impersonal perspective, which has been regarded an indirect and less face-threatening strategy (e.g., Martínez-Flor, 2005; Nikula, 2002). The KTAs produced impersonal directives (CD tokens) less than the NSTAs (5% vs. 18%), and this difference turned out to be statistically significant, as presented in Chapter 3. This pattern was also found in García’s (1989) study, which examined differences between Venezuelans’ and Americans’ requesting behaviors in English. As Tapper (1994) suggests, teachers’ use of second person “you” in directive language has distancing effect, KTAs’ reliance on hearer perspective might have had an unfavorable impact on students’ perception of the KTAs.

On the basis of their construction choices discussed so far, KTAs’ directive behaviors would not be regarded as more direct than NSTAs'. This is different from the general trend (i.e., non-native speakers’ being direct) found in speech act realization research (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1982; García, 1989; Koike, 1989; Martínez-Flor, 2005). It is assumed that differences in context affected KTAs’ language use. However, it should be noted that KTAs’ directive language was not as advanced as NSTAs’ in the following
aspects: (1) a limited range of modal verbs used; (2) less use of impersonal perspective; and (3) a reliance on lexical mitigators, such as “just” and “please.”

Possible Sources of Differences

Deviant patterns with regard to KTAs’ construction choices were motivated by their intention to be non-forceful in their production of directive language. And this intention can be explained through their identities in the classrooms or laboratories. As international teaching assistants (ITAs) have difficulties in defining relationships with their students due to their status as teachers and students (Galvin, 1992; Tapper, 1994), it seemed that the KTAs did not put particularly strong effort into asserting their authority in their classes. In the retrospective interviews, as addressed earlier, most of them resisted the hierarchical relationship between the teacher and the students, which they had witnessed in their home culture. Actually, their perception of the instructional roles, such as facilitators or assistors, was different from that of other ITAs reported in the literature; for example, ITAs who viewed themselves as “participant–evaluators” (Luo et al., 2001). Thus, the KTAs were likely to be more careful when performing face-threatening acts while teaching.

Moreover, KTAs’ status as non-native speakers (NNSs) of English seemed to have a great influence on their language behavior. Since they had the fear that their English, not to mention their limited knowledge of American undergraduate classrooms, might cause miscommunications, they were weak in terms of pragmatic power, regardless of their institutional status as instructors. This tendency may indeed lead the students to challenge the teacher’s power, similar to Tyler’s (1995) view that the ITA-student relationship as “vulnerable to attempts by students to negotiate or assert higher
status for themselves” (p. 131). In short, the KTAs, who were teaching assistants and non-native speakers felt insecure about their position as a powerful figure in class.

This feeling of insecurity was reflected in their directive language in many ways. As discussed earlier, for example, they favored less direct constructions (i.e., Q-M) more than the NSTAs in their production of RD tokens. Another example can be found in the amount of SD tokens issued by each group. The statistical test revealed that there was a trend that the NSTAs issued SD tokens more than the KTAs, $\chi^2 (df = 2, N = 1312) = 5.04, p = .08$. It has been argued that NNSs are not likely to provide suggestions as much as NSs due to their lack of confidence about the language (e.g., Banerjee & Carrell, 1988; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990). In addition, KTAs’ use of permission directives (e.g., “may I borrow some pen?”), which is one of the directive forms categorized by Ervin-Tripp (1976), is also relevant to their unstable status in class. According to Ervin-Tripp, permission directives were realized in the “modal + beneficiary + have/verb +?” format. She found a tendency for this type of directive to be used when the interlocutor was upward in status. However, the KTAs in the present research were higher in rank in classrooms. Despite this higher institutional status in class, KTAs’ production of permission directives suggests that they may have issues regarding their status.

Another source of KTAs’ deviation seems to be attributable to their limited knowledge about the form and function of a particular expression. For example, “wish” was used for the D-W construction only in the KTA data. Actually it was produced by one KTA, who was not sure why he selected this particular verb, as we can see from Excerpt (11).
Excerpt (11): From the interview with KTA 16, “I wish you guys read this book carefully please”

Interviewer: why did you use “I wish?”

→ KTA16: it looks like I used it with no definite reason

Interviewer: this is not the only instance of “I wish” expression. you’re going to see more later on. when do you think you usually use this expression? I mean I was wondering why you used this expression in this situation. wasn’t reading that book kind of requirement?

→ KTA 16: but I think education is regarded as service in the U.S, more than it is regarded so in Korea. well education is service, so in that respect teachers are considered as someone who provides a good quality service, especially in the U.S. couldn’t that be the underlying motivation? I don’t know why I used that expression, plus I’m not sure whether it is appropriate in that context

→ Interviewer: so were you kind of encouraging? [KTA 16: yes] since students usually do not read before they come to class, so you were encouraging them to read rather than commanding like “read it”, [KTA 16: yeah] and maybe being polite?

KTA 16: yeah I think so

KTA 16 could not account for his use of the verb “wish”, but said that teachers are expected to provide a good quality service. It seemed to me that what he meant by “a good service” was being nice and friendly to the students. This was the reason why I brought up a politeness issue and checked with him.

Other examples which reflect KTAs’ limited English abilities are their misperception of directness of D-V (e.g., “I suggest/ recommend”), which was explained in Chapter 4, and KTA 2’s use of Im-Sub (i.e., subject + imperative). KTA 2 commented that he wanted to mitigate his directive language by adding the subject “you” in front of the imperative structure. His perception was not correct. According to Holmes (1983), “you” is added to the imperatives for two reasons: (1) to emphasize the directive; and (2) to clearly designate the agent of the requested action. In addition, KTAs’ accounts for
their use of mitigation devices “I think/guess” (see Excerpt [8] in Chapter 4) and “just” indicated that KTAs’ knowledge on mitigators was limited.

Similarly, KTAs’ overuse of “have to” and “can” seems relevant to NNSs’ more limited language repertoire than NSs’. KTAs’ over-reliance on a few construction types and modal verbs has been addressed in previous research. For example, Reinhardt (2010) showed that the expert group (i.e., NS instructors) displayed variability in their use of directive constructions, while the learner group relied on only a few structures. Another possible explanation of KTAs’ overuse of “have to” and “can” may be related to transfer of training effect. Since “can” and “have to” are taught early and repeatedly in English language education in Korea, it seemed that the KTAs were more familiar with these two particular modals than the others.

KTAs’ reliance on lexical mitigators and underuse of impersonalization is also related to NNSs’ incomplete development of the second language. As Koike (1989) argues that NNS are likely to employ lexical mitigators to close the gap between the grammatical competence and pragmatic concepts, the KTAs employed rather simple devices which were acquired in their early stage of English learning. In other words, NNSs usually have fewer or no difficulties understanding pragmatic concepts due to universal aspects of pragmatics, but they are more likely to have difficulties learning the specifics (e.g., mitigation devices for NNSs in Koike’s study).

Lastly, KTAs’ attempt to be less forceful when producing directives may suggest that they were less than fully competent members of the academic discourse community (i.e., the context of higher education in the U.S). In other words, they fell short in fully knowing the rules of academic talk (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993).
Considering NSTAs’ frequent use of Im-B in other observations (e.g., Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), teacher’s use of imperative construction is not uncommon. However, the KTAs might have perceived it as too strong because they had learned that imperative directives in everyday interaction are forceful. In this respect, the KTAs did not use Im-B as much as the NSTAs for RD tokens. Even in CD tokens, the KTAs tended to mitigate Im-B more than the NSTAs (41% vs. 31% of the CD tokens realized in Im-B).

As explained in Chapter 1, institutional talk is different from everyday conversation. There exist rules to follow. That is, what, when, and how to talk are determined by the roles assigned to the participants. Since KTAs’ directives were selected from the first semester of their teaching in the U.S., their directive behaviors were mostly affected by the rules they had acquired prior to their teaching. Those rules would work for conversation in the social domain, not for interaction in the education domain. Although they were exposed to NS faculty members’ directives in the courses they took as students, what they had learned explicitly from the English language classes (e.g., a limited number of polite expressions) seemed to have stronger impact on their classroom language. In other words, the KTAs did not have an appropriate understanding of the context and the rules, which led to the different directive behaviors from the NSTAs.

**Potential Problems**

Following Blum-Kulka (1982), NNSs’ request strategies that differ from the NS baseline violate social norms, expressions that deviate from the norms are more likely to have a negative influence on the listeners’ perception of the speakers. Although the
KTAs were similar to the NSTAs in many ways, a few deviant forms might give a false impression to the students.

First, KTAs’ heavy reliance on “can” may confuse their students. Since the KTAs used “you can” for SD as well as for CD tokens, while the NSTAs rarely used it for CD, it might have been possible for some students to interpret certain tokens as possibility statements rather than commands. For example, KTA 5 said “you can share the results for each experiment” when she wanted her students to work together. She was not giving an option, but directing a specific action. However, she had to tell some of the groups again that “you’re supposed to discuss (the results)”, noticing that some were doing experiment individually. Similarly, KTA 14’s use of “might” in “you might prepare some comments for your peers” might have conveyed a different message (i.e., an option) from what she intended (i.e., a must). KTA 14 commented that she used “might” to mitigate her directive, but misunderstandings seemed likely. Tyler’s (1995) study discussed a similar case. Although one Korean TA used “may” to communicate with his student in a polite manner, it confused his student, who interpreted it as teacher’s lack of knowledge.

Second, KTAs’ use of some mitigators may give the students a negative impression of them. As addressed earlier, the KTAs did not have thorough knowledge of the minimizer “just.” When the speakers do not know about the function of a certain expression, it is more likely for them to use it inappropriately. Regn (2004), for example, discussed some of ITAs’ inappropriate use of “just”, such as “you just first check this, this, and all this.” Since “just” in this example was used with the task which required hard work, Regn argues that it could bring undesirable consequences to the teacher-
students relationship; the students would perceive the teacher as “unsympathetic.” In the present research, similar instances exist: “just make sure your topic is very challenging and very interesting” (KTA14) and “you just draw picture, draw graph, acceleration time” (KTA 1). These directives can give the students an impression that the teacher does not show concern for them because they sound like what is being requested is a simple thing. This may negatively affect their relationship.

Another problematic mitigator is “I think/guess”, which the KTAs did not seem to know well. This phrase (which is called “parentheticals”) is regarded as an indirect strategy which softens directive language (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, 2006; García, 1989; Nikula, 2002). However, it appeared that the KTAs did not use it appropriately. For example, KTA 6’s directive “I think you get a powder, not liquid (xx)” sounds weird. This mitigator usually comes along with D-M, such as “I think you should do X.” The exact same problem was found in Tapper’s (1994) study. All the directive tokens realized in the “I think + you + verb” format were judged non-target-like by NSs.

Third, KTAs’ intent to be indirect and polite might undermine the teacher’s status in class and provide opportunities for the students to challenge the teacher. As reported in Chapter 4, six out of the nine KTAs who participated in the retrospective interviews commented that they had experienced power challenges from the students. They were not happy about the experience. However, it seemed that they did not know how to deal with them. ITAs should know it is okay to be direct when necessary. In addition, they should be aware of what can be negotiated between the teacher and the students and what should not be. A good command of English alone would not suffice, but an
appropriate understanding of the classroom/lab context is required in order for ITAs to successfully perform their teaching duties.

Thomas's (1983) concept of “pragmatic failure” is relevant to the potential problems discussed above. By defining it as “the inability to understand ‘what is meant by what is said’” (p. 91), Thomas divides pragmatic failure into two types: (1) “pragmalinguistic failure” and (2) “sociopragmatic failure.” The former refers to incorrect mapping between the form and certain pragmatic force (i.e., inability to form linguistic expressions), whereas the latter is relevant to inappropriateness of a certain expression in the given context (i.e., different perceptions of what is appropriate in a particular situation). The first two types of problems mentioned above fall into pragmalinguistic failure, since any misunderstandings or unwanted outcomes stem from their lack of pragmalinguistic knowledge. On the other hand, the third problem can be considered as sociopragmatic failure because it originates from having different understandings or not knowing norms of the context.

**Gender and Language**

The female and male KTAs were similar in their preference for the Q-M construction in the set of RD tokens and with regard to the amount of the tokens mitigated in all three types of directives. However, the male KTAs seemed more direct than the female KTAs in that they favored Im-B, whereas the female group preferred D-M for CD tokens. In addition, although not tested statistically, the male KTAs used D-V (directive vocabulary construction) such as “I recommend/suggest” more than the female KTAs when issuing SD tokens. This has been regarded as much stronger than the imperative form in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Liu & Hong, 2009; Martinez-Flor, 2005). Male KTAs’ preference for direct constructions found in the
present study confirmed the findings of the extant literature (e.g., Aronsson & Thorell, 1999; Goodwin, 1980; Lee & Kim, 1992; Sachs, 1987).

While findings may differ from one researcher to the other, it has been generally agreed that women and men differ in their ways to talk, from pronunciation to conversational practice. However, this general impression is never sufficient to understand women’s and men’s speech. As mentioned in Chapter 1, moreover, gender has been considered as an important variable in sociolinguistics, but not so much in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) and ITA education. Thus, the present study contributes to the fields of ILP and ITA education, showing that the male instructors in the setting of higher education tend to employ the imperative form more than the female counterparts. Although the statistical test did not support a significant difference between the female and the male NSTA group, they showed the same pattern with the KTA group, of which difference was statistically tested. Due to the small size of the tokens, we are limited in drawing any conclusion regarding gender differences in RD and SD tokens.

**Effectiveness of Retrospective Interview**

As Gass and Mackey (2006) have asserted, “there is a danger that individuals may create plausible stories for other descriptions of mental activity (p. 6)”, it is not always possible to tap into speakers’ minds in the stimulated interviews. Especially, when there is a time lag, it seems to be more difficult for them to recall what they were thinking when their action was videotaped. However, retrospective interviews, employed as a triangulating means in the present study, yielded invaluable information regarding KTAs’ reasoning behind their use of directives. In addition, it helped me interpret the findings of the data analysis.
Without KTAs’ retrospective accounts collected from the one-on-one stimulated recall, the data would have been interpreted differently. For example, it would have not been possible to ascertain that the KTAs had limited knowledge of certain construction types (e.g., D-V, Im-Sub) and mitigators (e.g., “just”, “I think”). In addition, it would have not been successful to link their identity to their directive language behaviors (i.e., why they tried to be indirect when issuing directive tokens). Moreover, it would have not been possible to see that KTAs’ perception towards the teacher-student relationship seemed to affect their choice for directive constructions. For example, KTA 5 and 10, who did not see it as an asymmetrical one, favored the indirect construction (D-M) over the direct one (Im-B).

This chapter has discussed not only how the KTA group deviated from the NSTA group in their use of directive language, but also why they showed such differences. In addition, it has discussed the key findings on gender and directive construction choices. Lastly, it has discussed how useful the retrospective interview was as a triangulation tool. The next chapter closes the present research by providing a summary of the findings, followed by discussion of pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined the patterns of teaching assistants’ (TAs’) directives used in a Northern American university. By analyzing spoken directives of two TA groups, native speaker teaching assistants (NSTAs) and Korean teaching assistants (KTAs), the present study discovered several common characteristics of the directive language used in this particular setting. First, the TAs produced different types of directives, which were categorized as either a commanding directive (CD), a requesting directive (RD), or a suggesting directive (SD). Second, the TAs employed a dozen constructions for their directive language, but displayed preferences for particular construction types depending on the particular kind of directive (e.g., bare imperatives for CD). Third, the TAs mitigated their directive language (approximately 30% of the time) via lexical (e.g., “please”, “just”) and syntactic devices (e.g., past tense, if-construction) within the head acts. Fourth, the majority of TAs’ directives had hearer perspective. Fifth, the male TAs showed a tendency to employ the bare imperative form (Im-B) more than the female TAs.

However, a closer look at each type of directive revealed a number of differences between the KTA and the NSTA group. First, in the set of CD tokens, the KTAs used (periphrastic) modal declaratives (D-M) more than the NSTAs, though both groups’ number one choice was Im-B. Second, in the production of RD, the KTA group favored modal interrogatives (Q-M) over the other constructions, whereas the NSTA counterpart showed a relatively balanced use of Im-B, Q-M, and D-W (want/need statements). Third, in the set of SD, the KTAs displayed a preference for D-M while the NSTAs used D-M and Others in a similar proportion. These differences indicate that KTAs tended to
employ less direct construction types more than the NSTAs. The retrospective interviews revealed that this tendency was due to their desire to be non-forceful in their attempt to get their students to do something, which also suggests that they had a good understanding of which constructions are more or less direct than others.

Another difference, KTAs’ heavy reliance on lexical downtoners and hearer perspective compared to NSTAs’, could not be explained by their intention to be less direct in their production of directive language. Rather, it implies that their directive language was not as sophisticated as NSTAs’. It is assumed that they did not possess a wide range of linguistic repertoire for directives or did not have a good command of it. Similarly, KTAs’ accounts on some of the mitigation devices revealed that they had limited knowledge regarding when and how to use certain mitigators.

KTAs’ directive behaviors that are different from the native baseline and their lack of knowledge about the functions of mitigators mentioned above could be the source of miscommunications or undesirable outcomes. Therefore, instructions which take these findings into consideration would benefit KTAs and other international teaching assistants (ITAs).

**Pedagogical Implications**

The findings and discussion addressed in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 have implications for both ITA education in the U.S. and teaching English as a foreign language in Korea. For the former, this dissertation urges a need for instruction on two aspects: academic rules with regard to teaching in a U.S. university setting and patterns of teachers’ in-class directives in English. As discussed in Chapter 5, the directive language behaviors of KTAs that were different from those of NSTAs may be attributed to an insufficient or incorrect understanding of the academic discourse community, meaning that they were
novice members of the community. As shown in Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford’s (1993) study, non-native speaker novice members can make progress on their pragmatic competence over time. Yet instruction on the U.S. academic setting (e.g., what is expected of a TA in a lab session, the typical teacher-student relationship in the U.S. university setting) can quicken the socialization process, and this could be done in the ITA training programs.

For example, we can teach ITAs when and how instructors assert their authority by providing examples of NSTAs’ direct directives with context. At the same time, we can teach them when and how instructors seek to promote a sense of inclusion and establish a rapport with the students by instructing them on ways to soften their directive language. Here, it is important to let them know that the teacher has a higher status in class and that rapport building does not necessarily mean a symmetrical relationship between the teacher and the students. ITAs, especially Asian ITAs educated in a very hierarchical educational setting in their home countries, are often told that the classroom atmosphere in the U.S. is informal and friendly. This kind of information, if not addressed appropriately, leads to misperceptions of sociopragmatics (e.g., stereotypical attitudes toward the teacher-student relationship in U.S. classrooms).

KTAs’ limited linguistic resources of mitigation devices and directive construction types in the academic setting found in the present study suggest the necessity of instruction on teachers’ directive language in ITA education. On the one hand, native baseline data and the directive usage of KTAs that is congruent with that of NSTAs in a range of academic speech events can serve as a good resource for designing instructional units on directives for ITAs. The varied situations in which directives were
used, the types of directives found, the directive construction types employed, and the mitigation devices utilized are all critical aspects of in-class directives to be learned by ITAs.

On the other hand, the fact that KTAs’ directive usage deviated from NSTAs’ is informative to ITA educators as well. By studying how KTAs are different from the NSTAs, they can better understand this particular group of ITAs, predict possible communication problems in ITA-student interaction, and prepare relevant lessons for ITAs. In addition, KTAs’ directive usage can be compared with the directive usage of other groups of ITAs reported in the literature. If common patterns exist, they deserve our attention. For example, non-native teachers’ reliance on the “you can” construction found in the present study and Reinhardt (2010) suggests that ITAs should learn about the possible negative impacts of this particular construction on their relationship with their students because it communicates permission, rather than possibility, which restricts the hearers’ choices more than other construction types, such as “you could” or “you want to.”

Lastly, the present study calls for reflection on ways to bolster ITAs’ confidence in their English. Although this sounds like a difficult task, it is not impossible. While interviewing the KTAs, I realized that their expressed dissatisfaction with their English abilities was general rather than focused on specific language skills; the intensity of their frustration was seemed excessive. In order to alleviate their worries, we could, for example, ask them to point out what they do not like about their English and provide constructive feedback. If their English is intelligible and acceptable, we could tell them they are doing well and that they do not have to worry about it. If their English is, in fact,
problematic, we can provide them with tips and follow up on their performance. It seems that this kind of support would work best in the form of one-on-one conferences with a competent member of the discourse community (e.g., faculty members, ITA educators, experienced native speaker TAs). Since the KTAs commented that the personalized feedback session(s) on their teaching were the most useful element of the training course, individual training sessions are expected to maximize the possible benefits of the training.

Regarding implications for pedagogy in English education in Korea, the present study suggests that the form and function of a linguistic item should be taught together. It is relevant to Celce-Murcia’s (1991) argument that learners of language should learn an intended social message of a grammar point. When the speakers do not know about the function of a certain expression, it is more likely for them to use it inappropriately, which could have undesirable consequences. As speakers’ grammatical mistakes can be excused, but not the pragmatic ones, learning pragmatic aspects of language is necessary for one to have felicitous interaction. Thus, it is important to teach/know both form and function (i.e., pragmatic force) of a particular linguistic item in context.

For example, the retrospective interviews showed that the KTAs could not always give explanations for their directive construction or mitigator choices. They know the forms, but not the functions, which necessitates appropriate instruction (i.e., pragmatic instruction) in English classrooms in Korea. In fact, English education in Korea has set a target for building students’ communicative competence since the release of the fourth national curriculum in the 1980s. However, classroom realities did not seem to reflect this goal when the KTAs who participated in the present study were at school. English
education generally remained strongly dependent on the Grammar-Translation Method which focuses on written language (Lee, 1983), mainly due to the national university entrance exam. Although communicative approaches to language learning and teaching have been emphasized in English education in Korea, teaching pragmatics has not received sufficient attention.

This situation could be related to KTAs’ lack in repertoire of mitigation strategies and directive construction types observed in the present study. Korean learners of English do learn pragmatic concepts and forms for directive speech acts, but do not learn a wide range of strategies. They would benefit from explicit instruction on strategies and communicative practices. However, it does not seem possible to teach all the details of the pragmatic elements of every possible situation. Thus, when teaching pragmatics, it is important to provide the students with ample opportunities to analyze language use in context so that they can develop metapragmatic ability, as Thomas (1983) suggests. In this way, learners become sensitive to socio-contextual factors and learn a variety of linguistic strategies.

Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

Although this dissertation uncovered several similarities and differences between KTAs’ and NSTAs’ directive usage, there are a few noteworthy limitations of the study. First, there is lack of generalizability. Since the size of certain sub-sets of the data was small, it was impossible to test the statistical significance of every difference observed. In addition, since the present research could not use random sampling (i.e., the NSTA data was collected from one institution and the KTA data from another institution), the data investigated in the present study fails to represent the entire native speaker TA and...
Korean TA population. Thus, caution is needed in interpreting the findings, even though
generalizability was not the aim of the present research.

Second, comparability between the two data sets (i.e., the KTA and the NSTA
data) is limited. Since each data set derives from the pre-existing data, it was
impossible to control all the variables of the data, such as the number of recordings, the
types of speech event, or gender. For example, I could not find the native counterpart of
the KTA who supervised the Anatomy lab in the data source. Likewise, I could not find a
female KTA who supervised the Anatomy lab. Instead, I had to use what was available.

Third, inaccuracy may exist in the directive token selection procedure. The
second coder and I excluded all the ambiguous tokens on which we failed to reach
agreement. Thus, this might lead to under-identification of the directive tokens. On the
other hand, some tokens that we selected as directive language might reflect over-
identification because there was no guarantee that our agreement matched with
speakers’ intentions.

Fourth, findings regarding directness or politeness of directive language are
somewhat limited because I did not take every related aspect of directive speech acts
(e.g., external modification, alerters, aggravation) into account, but instead focused on a
few elements assuming other factors held constant. Since the head act is the key
segment of a directive sequence, and mitigation is generally more frequent than
aggravation, the scope of the analysis was narrowed to the head acts and mitigation
strategies within the head acts.

Lastly, there was a long time lag between the date when KTAs’ teaching was
recorded and the interview date; the interview was conducted one to nine semesters
after they were videotaped. This was unavoidable, however, because data analysis had to be finished to prepare the questions for the interview. Luckily, it seemed that the KTAs did not have difficulty in recalling the classes they taught while watching their videos.

Keeping all these limitations in mind, here are some suggestions for future research. The first one is related to expanding the scale of the study. In order to provide generalizable findings, more data is necessary. If it is possible to gather academic speech from a good number of TAs teaching in different speech events across disciplines, we could examine whether and to what extent other variables, such as speech event and discipline, affect their directive language usage. This kind of future research is expected to provide practical suggestions for ITA educators that are discipline-specific or context-specific. In addition, looking at other ITA groups, such as Chinese or Indian TAs, would enable us to better support ITA training, since these groups comprise most of the ITA population in U.S. universities.

Second, it would be fruitful to examine undergraduate students’ responses to ITAs’ directive language and their attitudes towards ITAs. For example, undergraduates’ perceptions of the directness or appropriateness of each directive construction could help ITA educators see which directive construction(s) are actually preferred by the students. In addition, the results of this future research can illuminate whether the perceived directness or appropriateness of ITAs’ directive language is related to undergraduates’ perceptions of the ITAs. This kind of information is useful in ITA education, since ITAs could use it to be better prepared in terms of their teacher talk.
Third, investigation of grammaticality and appropriateness of KTAs’ directive language is recommended. While dealing with the KTA data, I found some of the KTAs’ directive language problematic. However, these instances were not fully discussed here, since grammaticality and/or appropriateness of the directives tokens were beyond the scope of this dissertation. The results of this future research might well uncover problems in KTAs’ directive usage, awareness of which would benefit ITA education as well as English language education.

Fourth, other segments of a directive sequence are further possible topics for future research. It would be interesting to investigate whether and how ITAs increase imposition of directive language (e.g., intensifiers), since they have institutional power but lack pragmatic power in class. In addition, it would be intriguing to compare ITAs with the native baseline in terms of their use of external modification (i.e., both upgraders and downgraders outside head acts) in the academic context. It has been noted that non-native speakers tend to be verbose in external modification (i.e., longer procedures) when performing directive speech acts in everyday interaction (e.g., Faerch & Kasper, 1989). Furthermore, non-verbal strategies, such as facial expressions, gestures, and intonation, as well as alerters (e.g., “honey”, “stupid cow”) are other research topics, which can function as both downgraders and upgraders.

Finally, it is also a worthy goal to investigate teachers’ directive usage in other settings and particularly that of instructors who teach English or the subject matter in English in Korean universities. In this context, they teach Korean undergraduates, meaning that they are not inferior to their students in terms of pragmatic power. It would be interesting to examine whether their directive behaviors are similar to or different
from those of the KTAs investigated in this dissertation. There are other possibilities with regard to the participant recruitment (e.g., Korean teachers' directives in elementary classrooms; native speaker teachers' directives in elementary/university classrooms in Korea).

In conclusion, this dissertation informs how KTAs, non-native teachers, perform directive speech acts in a U.S. university setting. Comparing KTAs' in-class directives to the native baseline provides suggestions for ITA training in higher education in the U.S. and for English language education in Korea. Triangulating interviews, which focus on those directive behaviors of KTAs which differed from those of NSTAs, revealed that the deviant patterns stemmed from lack of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. This finding draws our attention to the importance of pragmatic instruction, which is believed to help speakers avoid infelicitous cross-cultural interaction.

This dissertation does not take undergraduate students’ perspectives or offer any suggestions for them. Rather, its focus is only on the KTAs' directive language behaviors, meaning that it takes a one-way approach. In this regard, it falls within the realm of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), rather than cross-cultural pragmatics (CCP). I hope this dissertation can serve as a trigger for a number of insightful studies on non-native teacher discourse which promise to enrich the fields of ILP, CCP, ITA education, and English language education in general. And finally, I hope these continued research efforts in the field of applied linguistics effect a change in peoples’ views on cross-cultural communication. That is, as more and more people, native and non-native alike, feel responsible for the felicitous nature of their interactions, they are increasingly likely
to work together for more satisfactory cross-cultural interaction regardless of linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors.
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### APPENDIX B

**TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Backchannel cues; unsuccessful interruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xx)</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(   )</td>
<td>Uncertain transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;   &gt;</td>
<td>Contextual or paralinguistic information in italics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Short pause (approximately 2-3 seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;pause&gt;</td>
<td>Longer pause (longer than 3 seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;laugh&gt;</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>False start; cut-off words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT FORM (FOR RETROSPECTIVE INTERVIEWS)

Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Protocol Title: Retrospective Interview about Korean Teaching Assistants’ Language Use in Academic Setting

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to investigate Korean teaching assistants’ reasoning behind their use of directives in class or lab.

What you will be asked to do in the study: You will be asked to talk about teaching-related topics given by PI. In addition, you will be asked to watch a few segments of your teaching videos played by PI and to answer questions related to particular expressions you used. However, you do not have to answer any question that you do not wish to answer. The interview will be audio-recorded.

Time required: About 1 hour

Risks and Benefits: There are no anticipated risks or other direct benefits to you in participating in this study.

Compensation: You will be paid $20 compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number and your name will not be used in any report. Only PI will have access to the audio recording.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Eunha Hwang, PhD Student (fuga95@ufl.edu, 352-672-5314), Dr. Diana Boxer (dboxer@ufl.edu) Department of Linguistics, University of Florida, 4131 Turlington Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

Agreement:

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Principal Investigator: ____________________________

Approved by
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02
Protocol # 2012-4-U-0453
For Use Through 04-16-2013
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