UC San Diego

UC San Diego Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

A Study of Talk-in-Interaction between a Deaf and Hearing Student in an Inclusion Classroom in Iquitos, Peru

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2p56j8vz

Author

Goico, Sara Alida

Publication Date

2011

Supplemental Material

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2p56j8vz#supplemental

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

A Study of Talk-in-Interaction between a Deaf and Hearing Student in an Inclusion Classroom in Iquitos, Peru

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts

in

Anthropology

by

Sara Alida Goico

Committee in charge:

Professor John Haviland, Chair
Professor Kathryn Woolard
Professor David Pedersen

2011

The Thesis of Sara Alida Goico is approved and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm and electronically:

_____

_____

_____

Chair

University of California, San Diego

2011

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my Abuelo, José Miguel Goico Sr., who has always embodied the ideals that I attempt to live up to. As I continue with my graduate career, your singular example helps illuminate the path before me.

For you, Abuelo, with constant love and admiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Signature Page..... iii

Dedication……..... iv

Table of Contents..... v

List of Tables and Figures..... vi

List of Videos..... vii

Acknowledgements..... viii

Abstract..... ix

Chapter 1: Background..... 1

Chapter 2: Estefany and Luis' Interaction 29

Chapter 3: Conclusion..... 62

Bibliography..... 67

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 1: Images of the interaction between Estefany and Luis……. 16

Table 1: Examples of Summons-Answer Sequences……...…….. 30

Table 2: The Structure of Estefany and Luis' Summons-Answer Sequence.. 32

LIST OF VIDEOS

Video Clip 1…… 2

Video Clip 2…… 15

Video Clip 3…… 15

Video Clip 4…… 16

Video Clip 5…… 34

Video Clip 6…… 43

Video Clip 7…… 45

Video Clip 8…… 46

Video Clip 9…… 46

Video Clip 10……. 46

Video Clip 11……. 48

See Supplemental Files for videos.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my parents Anne and José, my brother Jeremy, and my sister Madeleine for all their encouragement through the writing of my thesis. They were always there for me, whether to hold long discussions, revise sections, give advice, or just for moral support.

Thank you to the Fulbright Program for providing the funding to conduct fieldwork in Peru. And thanks to my advisor, John Haviland, for his assistance in guiding me through the writing process.

Most importantly, I want to extend my gratitude to all the students, teachers, administrators, and parents in Iquitos who made my work possible.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

A Study of Talk-in-Interaction between a Deaf and Hearing Student in an Inclusion Classroom in Iquitos, Peru

by

Sara Alida Goico

Master of Arts in Anthropology

University of California, San Diego, 2011

Professor John Haviland, Chair

In 2010 I conducted nine months of fieldwork in Iquitos, Peru, which consisted of observation, filming, and semi-structured interviews in an inclusion classroom with one deaf student, Estefany. This paper is the first half of a two-part study that addresses the question: How comparable are the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing classmates? This question stems from Vygotsky's theoretical framework that learning occurs through interaction. From this perspective, an investigation of the interactions between Estefany and her classmates speaks to the broader question of the effectiveness of inclusion education for deaf children in Peru.

Using the approach of Conversation Analysis, I analyze one interaction between Estefany and her classmate Luis. Through this microanalysis I demonstrate that Estefany successfully capitalizes on the structural organization of interactions in order to communicate with her classmate. This is most evident in Estefany and Luis' opening sequence. Additionally, I describe some of the elements that characterize Estefany's communication system, focusing largely on the most prevalent of these – indications. Finally, I discuss the closing of Estefany's conversation with Luis. In my conclusion I hypothesize that once the study has been completed, this portion of Estefany's interactions will contrast most sharply with the interactions among her hearing peers. I suggest that Estefany maintains control over the direction of the interchange by closing down her conversations. This results in interactions that consist of a small number of turn exchanges. I propose that Estefany uses this technique so that she is not uncomfortable or confused in the classroom.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

The second grade classroom at 25th of June, San Juan is sparsely furnished. The teacher's desk is in its permanent location next to the door and a 10-liter water cooler, the only one in the school for student use, sits in the corner. Against a blue washed concrete wall hangs a blackboard with the day's lesson printed across it. Above the board is a religious scene of Jesus and two saints. On the opposite wall are colorful paintings of Winnie the Pooh and cartoon jungle scenes. Other than these few consistencies, the tables and the 31 students sitting at them are arranged haphazardly across the room according to who is fighting or getting along with whom on that particular day. The mid-day heat of the jungle beats down, causing all to be covered in a thin film of sweat. The class is filled with the ceaseless din of voices bouncing off concrete walls. Noises from the street and adjoining classrooms spill through the ventilation gaps that run along the tops of all four walls to mingle with the cacophony. The teacher and students continue their daily routine oblivious to the noise.

Profesora: Cuando fuimos a la calle… [When we went out on the street…]

Alumno: No

Profesora: No debemos estar discutiendo… [We should not be discussing]

Alumno: Nada [Nothing]

Profesora: ni [xxx] ni conversando con [xxx] personas descono...? [nor (xxx) nor conversing with (xxx) stran…?]

Alumnos: CIDAS [GERS]

Profesora: Desconocidas [Strangers] (PR008, Video clip 1).

The teacher walks languidly through the room, book in hand. A few students yell out answers to the litany of prompts; giving enough of a response for the teacher to continue without paying attention to the majority of the class that is uninvolved in her lesson. Most continue to copy from the board or from their neighbor's notebook. In one corner of the classroom a group of boys is sitting around their table laughing and talking.

In many respects this is a typical second grade classroom in Iquitos, Peru. What sets it apart is the lone deaf girl in the classroom, nine-year-old Estefany.[1] She is part of the new program of inclusion education that the Ministerio de Educación Peruana [Peruvian Ministry of Education] passed into law in 2005. The two main goals of the inclusion system are "La equidad, que garantiza a todos iguales oportunidades de acceso, permanencia y trato" [The equity, that guarantees to all equal opportunities of access, permanence and treatment] and "La calidad, que asegura condiciones adecuadas para una educación integral, pertinente, abierta, flexible y permanente" [The quality, that assures suitable conditions for a comprehensive, pertinent, open, flexible and permanent education] (Ministerio de Educación 2005:10). Prior to 2005, disabled students in Peru were educated in separate schools called Centers of Basic Special Education (CEBEs). However, this was viewed as an exclusionary practice because it segregated disabled students from the rest of the student body. With the passing of the inclusion law, students with only one disability now have the opportunity to become full-time members in regular education classrooms.

---

[1] In this paper pseudonyms are used for all students, teachers, and schools in order to protect the identity of the participants.

During the 2010 school year I conducted nine months of observation and filming in Estefany's inclusion classroom. The research provided me with an up-close perspective on this education system in practice. This paper uses the analysis of video data from my fieldwork to address the issue of Estefany's conversational skills. This topic is relevant to a broader understanding of the ability of Peru's inclusion education system to provide an education of fairness and quality for Estefany and other deaf students. There are a number of ways one can evaluate the success of Peru's inclusion system. The most obvious would be to compare the academic work of Estefany to that of her hearing classmates. In this way, one can chart her individual academic progress in comparison with her peers in the inclusion setting. However, in Estefany's case, such an approach would not provide an accurate picture of her abilities since the majority of her work is copied from other students. Therefore it is necessary to find another method to measure the success of the inclusion program. A number of theorists, most notably L.S. Vygotsky, have argued that a critical way in which children learn educational material is through interaction with their peers. Therefore, focusing on learning through peer interaction is one strategy to evaluate how disabled, and in the case of this paper specifically deaf, students are faring in inclusion classrooms.

This paper is the first half of a two-part study that will answer the question: How comparable are the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing classmates? The analysis presented in this paper focuses on the structure of Estefany's interactions with her hearing peers. At the end of each section, I propose hypotheses for possible areas of similarity and difference between the communication systems of Estefany and the other students in her class. The second part of the study will appear in a forthcoming paper

where I will analyze interactions between Estefany's hearing classmates and attempt to address the hypotheses that I present in the discussion below. I begin with an introduction of two topics that are essential to framing the analysis of Estefany's communication system, those of inclusion education and Vygotsky's work on learning through interaction. Using this framework I move to the local context in which this interaction takes place, focusing on inclusion in both Peru and Iquitos. In this section I also provide background on the social and linguistic context in which Estefany is educated and end with a first glance at the interaction between Estefany and Luis. Next I delve into the methods I use to analyze Estefany and Luis' interaction. Although I am unable to provide a full presentation of the work of Conversation Analysis in the limited space provided, I touch on the issues most relevant to the interaction at hand. Chapter 2 presents the analysis of Estefany and Luis' interaction and finally in Chapter 3 I bring the discussion to a close.

Inclusion Education

The shift to inclusion education in Peru comes out of an international call to better address the educational needs of disabled students. For most of the history of special education, students were placed in parallel, separate institutions instead of regular education schools. Today, however, inclusion has become the dominant philosophy of educating disabled students (Lindsay 2003:3). The Salamanca Statement of 1994, titled as "[a]rguably the most significant international document that has ever appeared in the field of special education," was the prime motivator behind this new policy (Ainscow & César 2006:231). Representatives from 92 governments and 25 international organizations passed the statement at the World Conference of Special Needs Education.

Inclusion was presented as the most effective method to educate disabled and regular education students equally, along with helping to fight discrimination and celebrate diversity. Two paragraphs from the statement summarize the arguments in support of inclusion:

> - those with special educational needs must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them within a child-centred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs,
> - regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all; more over, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system (UNESCO 1994:viii-ix).

Since 1994 a number of countries around the world have adopted inclusion policies. Mel Ainscow notes that these programs have developed in such varied nations as "Australia, Ghana, Hungary and China" (1997:3). However, the concept of inclusion has come to possess a variety of meanings across the globe. These definitions include a method of educating disabled individuals, students with behavioral problems, or more broadly, any students who are disadvantaged (Ainscow & César 2006:233-4). Due to this variation in understanding, the goals and implementation of inclusion often vary from country to county.

Regardless of how a country chooses to define inclusion, one of the main points underscored in the Salamanca Statement is the need to provide support for disabled students so that they may receive an education equal to that of any non-disabled student. The Framework of Action of the Salamanca Statement reads, "Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students" and "children with special educational needs should receive whatever extra support they may require to ensure their

effective education" (UNESCO 1994:11-12). For deaf students specifically, these resources may include interpreters, note-takers, real-time captioning, teachers of the deaf, or microphone equipment. Many of the studies on inclusion with regard to deaf students focus on the effectiveness of these resources, especially interpreters, at assisting in the educational process (Antia and Kreimeyer 2001; Cerney 2007; Jones et al. 1997; Winston 1994). Research on inclusion education of the deaf, however, is often limited to countries with advanced economies, such as the UK, the US, and Australia (Vasishta 2011:352).[2] A current gap in the literature is how nations with emerging or developing economies are implementing inclusion programs. Thus an investigation of the inclusion system in Peru helps address this lacuna in the literature.

Learning Through Interaction

L.S. Vygotsky was interested in understanding how learning and developmental maturation are related in children. In *Mind in Society* (1978) Vygotsky reviews three theories that have attempted to understand how these two processes interact. The first is that development precedes learning. In this hypothesis children must arrive at a certain level of developmental maturation in order to learn. Subsequently, this learning utilizes these developments, but never influences them. The second theory is that learning and development are one and the same. Thus learning and development occur simultaneously in order to replace innate behavior. The last theory holds that learning and development are distinct but always in interaction. In this view "the process of maturation prepares and makes possible a specific process of learning. The learning process then stimulates

[2] The classification of advanced versus emerging and developing economies comes from the International Monetary Fund's World Economic Outlook, April 2011 (International Monetary Fund 2011).

and pushes forward the maturation process" (Vygotsky 1978:81).

Vygotsky on the other hand, provides a fourth perspective in understanding the relationship between learning and development. Vygotsky defines development as advancing through the cognitive gap between innate human abilities and higher psychological functions. This process is only possible through learning, and is essentially social in nature (Moll 1990). His theory relies on the concept of the zone of proximal development, defined as "*the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers*" (Vygotsky 1978:86). Vygotsky claims that the zone of proximal development is a result of the fact that learning precedes development. If a child is able to accomplish a task independently then that process has developed to maturation. Therefore, exams that test one's independent knowledge are testing their 'actual developmental level' (Vygotsky 1978:87). However, learning that children are able to accomplish through collaboration with others provides a window onto the skills that they are in the process of developing. This collaboration may take the form of imitation, leading questions, or group problem solving. An important caveat however is "that a person can imitate only that which is within her developmental level" Vygotsky 1978:88). The example Vygotsky provides is a child who is attempting to do a math problem. If a teacher performs an operation that is within the child's grasp, such as an addition problem for a second grader, the child quickly grasps how the answer was attained. However, if the teacher is explaining a calculus problem to this same student,

no matter how many times the child imitates the solution he will not understand how it was solved.

The implications of this theory are significant. It implies that learning is essential to a child reaching his full developmental potential, and that this learning requires interaction with others. Vygotsky writes, "learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers" (Vygotsky 1978:90). Therefore, in the case of Estefany, it is important to know whether the inclusion classroom is providing her with an environment that supports not only her learning of the classroom material, but also her development as well. For an educational environment to begin to achieve these two objectives, it would have to facilitate her ability to learn through interaction with her peers. For this reason, my analysis focuses on Estefany's interactions with her classmates.

The Local Context in Peru

Inclusion Education in Peru

In 2005 Peru adopted a special education policy of full inclusion. This shift in policy came out of a project by the Ministerio de Educación to restructure the entire education system. This overhaul included a new General Law of Education and National Curriculum Design of Basic Regular Education. The General Law of Education N° 28044 addresses all areas of public education in Peru, which include Basic Regular, Alternative, and Special Education, along with Technical and Community Education. The new bill lists inclusion as one of the eight guiding principles for all five of these

areas and defines it as: “La inclusión, que incorpora a las personas con discapacidad, grupos sociales excluidos, marginados y vulnerables, especialmente en el ámbito rural, sin distinción de etnia, religión, sexo u otra causa de discriminación, contribuyendo así a la eliminación de la pobreza, la exclusión y las desigualdades” [The inclusion, that incorporates people with disabilities, excluded, marginalized and vulnerable social groups, especially in rural areas, without distinction by ethnicity, religion, sex, or other cause of discrimination, contributing in this way to the elimination of poverty, exclusion and inequalities] (Ministerio de Educación 2005:10). It is evident from this statement that the guiding principle of inclusion refers not only to disabled students, but also to all marginalized populations. However, inclusion is also the general policy behind the Special Education reform and thus affects disabled students more directly than other marginalized groups.

In Peru students with Necesidades Especiales Educativas (NEE) [special education needs] are those with sensory, intellectual, or motor disabilities (Ministerio de Educación 2005:50). Sensory disabilities include deafness, blindness, or other inabilities to use one of the five senses. Intellectual disabilities result in a lower level of intellectual functioning, such as the case of Down syndrome. Finally, motor disabilities affect the motor system and can be caused by an accident, complications at birth, or a genetic disorder. Examples of these disabilities include spinal cord injuries and cerebral palsy. The Supreme Decree N° 002-2005-ED, the bill that addresses basic special education, highlights three of the eight guiding principles from the General Law of Education: “la inclusión, la equidad y la calidad” [inclusion, equity and quality] (Ministerio de Educación 2005:99). In order to achieve these goals, the decree calls for the separation

of disabled students into two categories, gifted students with disabilities and those who are severe or multi-disabled (having more than one disability). The bill states that "Los estudiantes que presentan necesidades educativas, asociadas a discapacidades sensoriales, intelectuales, motrices y quienes presentan talento y superdotación son incluidos, de acuerdo a metas anuales, en las Instituciones Educativas" [The students that present educational needs, associated with sensory, intellectual, and motor disabilities and who are gifted and talented are included, according to the annual goals, in the Educational Institutions] (Ministerio de Educación 2005:50). In this regard, students who only have one sensory disability, such as deafness, are prime candidates for placement in inclusion classrooms. Students in the category of severely or multi-disabled are not transferred into regular education classrooms; they continue to be educated in separate CEBEs. This separation achieves the goals of inclusion, equity, and quality by allowing gifted disabled students the opportunity to be educated with their regular education peers and to have access to the public education curriculum (Ministerio de Educación 2005:102).

As the Salamanca Statement makes plain, many disabled students may require resources and support to transition into and succeed in an inclusion setting. A number of sections in the Supreme Decree N° 002-2005-ED address this very issue. In regards to materials the bill states, "Los materiales educativos para la atención de los estudiantes con NEE son de diversa naturaleza y deben responder a sus necesidades y características específicas de acuerdo a la discapacidad y a las intenciones curriculares, teniendo en cuenta el contexto sociocultural y económico productivo" [The educational materials for the instruction of students with special needs are of a diverse nature and should respond to their needs and specific characteristics according to the in agreement with the

disability and the curricular intentions, keeping in mind the sociocultural and productive economic context] (Ministerio de Educación 2005:103). As the decree mentions, the resources needed by disabled students varies on a case-by-case basis, depending on the specific abilities of the child. In addition to material support services for the children, the government calls for support in other ways. These include making adaptations to the classrooms, giving workshops on the best way to organize inclusive classes, providing teachers of inclusion with a smaller workload, and using the CEBEs as another line of support for the included children (Ministerio de Educación 2005:102-105).

The Implementation of Inclusion Education in Iquitos, Peru

In Iquitos there are a total of four CEBEs that students can attend based on the district in which they live. Three of these four contain a mix of deaf students and students with a range of other physical and mental disabilities. The fourth school only accepts children who are blind or have Down syndrome. Due to the new General Law of Education, in 2006 the CEBEs began transferring students into regular education classrooms. During the 2010 school year the largest CEBE in Iquitos, 25th of June, was monitoring 63 students in regular education classrooms, seven of whom were deaf. At the start of the 2011 school year, five of the seven remaining deaf students in the second grade classroom at 25th of June, CEBE were moved into inclusion classrooms (personal communication, Maria Helmi Vargas Martinez).

While the Supreme Decree N° 002-2005-ED calls for educational materials that respond to the specific needs of the students' disabilities, the reality for poor cities such as Iquitos is that they do not have the economic means to provide them. Therefore, students such as Estefany receive no support services of any kind during the school day.

Of the many different ways listed in the bill to address inequities between disabled and non-disabled students, the only one that is currently in effect is the continued support of the local CEBE. A teacher from 25th of June, CEBE observes each included student once a week for 45 minutes. However, this observer is unable to address the various needs of all these children in the 45 minutes that they see each one (personal communication, Maria Helmi Vargas Martinez). Additionally, at the beginning of the school year 25th of June, CEBE organizes a workshop for all the teachers who will receive disabled students into their classroom. This non-mandatory, five-day workshop addresses and provides information on a variety of disabilities and not solely the one that teachers will encounter in their class. Since the workshop is non-mandatory, only about 50% of the teachers complete the entire five days (personal communication, Maria Helmi Vargas Martinez).

An Inclusion Classroom at 25th of June, San Juan

In my fieldwork in Iquitos I observed Teresa's 2nd grade inclusion class at 25th of June, San Juan. The class consists of 30 hearing students and one deaf student, Estefany. As mentioned in the previous section, Estefany, like other children in inclusion, does not have access to support services in the classroom. Even if support services could somehow make Estefany's learning environment equal to that of her hearing peers, it is only one of the many asymmetries that Estefany experiences in this environment. A second one is the age gap between Estefany and her classmates. As a nine-year-old in a 2nd grade classroom, she is two years older than most of the other students, and consequently, taller than most of them as well. Estefany is also the only student in the class who is deaf. The inability to hear in an environment with all hearing individuals disadvantages Estefany in a number of ways. She is constantly a step behind her

classmates in knowing what the teacher is saying or whose name is being called. She must rely on visual cues in order to orient herself to who is talking and what is being discussed. Additionally, she misses a great deal of the information that is shared around her. This includes the teacher's announcements or class lectures and the everyday conversations of her peers.

Another asymmetry between Estefany and her peers is that she is not fluent in the language shared by the rest of the class, namely oral Spanish. Although Estefany can pronounce and lipread a small set of Spanish words, she is unable to produce or understand full sentences. Furthermore, Estefany knows very little written Spanish. Once again her knowledge in this modality is very limited and consists almost entirely of lexical items. However, she is adept at the alphabet, allowing her to copy written Spanish quite easily. Nevertheless, she is unable to produce her own sentences without copying from some other source, such as the book, the blackboard, or another student. Finally, Estefany does not share a sign language with anyone in her community. Estefany has never had the opportunity to learn Iquitos Sign Language (ISL) in school or through interaction with other deaf individuals. In my interviews at 25th of June, CEBE I was told that while attending the school Estefany had been educated in a separate classroom from the other deaf students because she demonstrated a higher level of residual hearing (personal communication, Maria Helmi Vargas Martinez). Thus even the creation of a new manual communication system with her peers is unlikely. With this said, there are a few examples of signs in Estefany's communication system. This is most likely a result of her previous schooling at the CEBE. In my observations at that school I found that teachers who were not fluent in ISL but taught deaf students, would learn a few signs

from a dictionary or individuals who signed and try and incorporate these signs into their classes.

Although Estefany borrows a few lexical items from the both the oral and sign languages around her, the communication system that she uses is primarily a manual, idiosyncratic system referred to as a homesign. Research on the communication systems of a few individuals who use homesign has found that while it does not possess the complexity of a language, it does have language-like properties at the lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels.[3] For example, at the lexical level, homesigners display pointing and iconic gestures that are non-situation specific, can be combined, imitate the range of entities referred to by young hearing children, can refer to objects not presently visible, and form a stable lexicon (Goldin-Meadow in press). In spite of the asymmetries present and the clear language barriers between Estefany and her classmates and teachers, Estefany does not seem confused or uncomfortable in her classroom. On the contrary she seems extremely aware of what is going on around her and her role in the school. In fact, her teacher pointedly remarks on how well she does within the classroom and how hard she works.

The Videotaped Interaction between Estefany and Luis

The videotaped interaction that I present in this paper takes places in the social context described above. On the particular day in which this interaction takes place the class has just returned from break and is re-organizing the tables and chairs. Estefany is setting herself up at a table by herself. Upon seeing this, one classmate, Luis, who has already sat down at another table, moves himself over to sit by her. His friend, Juan,

[3] See the work of Susan Goldin-Meadow (2003) for a structural analysis of homesign.

follows after him and also sits at their table. Once everyone is settled Teresa hands out an exam. It consists of six questions about families and what to do in case of natural disasters. After tracing over each of the printed questions with her pencil, Estefany begins copying the answers from Luis, who is sitting on the other side of the corner from her. He notices her copying and makes it easier for her to read by moving the exam toward her, lifting his arm away from the paper when he is not writing, and at times even holding the exam up for her and pointing to parts she should copy (PR109, Video clip 2).

After the exam is distributed one student in particular, Carlos, repeatedly approaches Estefany and Luis' table in order to look at their exams. On one of these occasions Teresa is walking by as Carlos is standing at Estefany's table. She taps him on the butt to send him back to his seat (PR109, Video clip 3). A few minutes later Luis has turned away from his exam and Estefany to face Juan; the two are flipping through their book looking for answers. Estefany continues to copy off of Luis' exam (A, see Figure 1 below), but looks up to find Carlos, who had been sitting behind her at another table, looking down at Luis' paper (B). She quickly glances at the exam and slaps her hand over it (C), looks back at Carlos, and then looks pointedly behind her toward his empty seat. At this junction Carlos points to something in Luis' book and then walks back to his seat. Luis glances up for a moment, but quickly goes back to searching through the book with Juan. In an attempt to inform Luis about what has just occurred with Carlos, Estefany taps Luis' arm three times to get his attention (D). When Luis does not respond, Estefany pulls his arm (E) and gestures "Look at me" (F). When he still continues looking at the book, she taps his chin (G) and gestures "Look at me" twice. Finally, Luis turns his gaze toward her and she begins her utterance. She indicates Luis' exam with

two quick taps on the table (H) and then turns and points twice toward Carlos (I). When she turns back around Luis is looking away from her and toward the teacher, who has just called out Juan's name to return his notebook (J). Estefany follows Luis' gaze to the front of the room, while turning Luis' paper face down (K). A few moments later, Luis and then Estefany turn to face forward again (L). Luis looks over in Estefany's direction, but she turns her head down toward her paper and continues to work (M) (PR109, Video clip 4).

A. B.

C. D.

E. F.

Figure 1: Images of the interaction between Estefany and Luis.

G. H.

I. J.

K. L.

M.

Figure 1: Continued

Methods

Conversation Analysis (CA)

In order to analyze the videotaped interaction between Estefany and Luis I use the

approach of Conversation Analysis (CA). This section provides an overview of the concepts of CA that are most salient to this interaction. At the end of this section I provide a brief outline of how the work of CA will be used to structure the analysis of Estefany and Luis' interaction. CA developed in the 1960's through the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. Their work takes talk-in-interaction as its central topic of study, using actual recorded interactions to analyze the structure of conversation. At the time that CA was developed this method of studying language was unique to the social sciences.

The early work of CA focused on casual or mundane talk-in-interaction. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson make a point of distinguishing casual talk from other 'speech-exchange systems,' considering mundane talk to be the most basic of all these systems (1974:730). They make this claim because the interlocutors locally manage the allocation of turns. This refers to one of the main properties of casual conversation; in real time the interlocutors, and not an outside force, manage the coordination issues of next speaker, turn length, conversation length, and what is said. On the opposite end of the turn-taking spectrum are debates, where turns are pre-allocated or determined in advance. Herbert H. Clark (1996) also makes a claim for the basic nature of face-to-face casual conversation. He refers to face-to-face interaction as the most basic form of conversation because it is universal, does not require specialized knowledge, and is the first type of conversation children acquire (Clark 1996:8-9). All other forms of conversation are then derived from this basic form. However, one main difference between the notions of basic conversation as defined by conversation analysts and Clark is that CA has developed a number of its findings from the analysis of telephone

conversations. Clark (1996) would argue that this deviates from the most basic form of face-to-face conversation because it removes visibility and co-presence and thus affects how language is used. Nevertheless, the other elements of Clark's notion of basic conversation – audibility, instantaneity, evanescence, recordlessness, simultaneity, extemporaneity, self-determination, and self-expression – are all elements of mundane conversation as defined by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson. (Clark 1996:9-10).

In using language in interaction people are not simply producing speech; they are also producing actions. These activities that interlocutors participate in through the use of language vary from interaction to interaction, but some examples include getting to know someone or making a request or an offer (Clark 1996, Schegloff 2007). However, conversations, like other activities where a group must work in coordination such as a soccer game or a tango, are not individual or autonomous, but joint activities. As mentioned in the paragraph above, next speaker, turn length, conversation length, and what is said are just some of the issues that participants must manage in real time with each other. Conversation requires the continuous coordination of content and timing (Clark 1996). Further examples of the way this coordination is achieved will be discussed below.

The initial findings of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) demonstrated that one essential way in which the issue of the coordination of talk-in-interaction is handled is through a turn-taking system. This conclusion was based on the discovery that in conversations individuals take turns speaking with little to no overlap or gaps in the talking. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) define a turn as consisting of at least one unit, termed a 'turn-constructional unit' (TCU). TCUs in English can be sentences,

clauses, phrases, or lexical items. At the end of any such unit is a 'transition relevance place,' or the location at which a switch to the next speaker can take place. One of the most critical and fundamental elements of the turn-taking system is the need to transition between speakers. While this point may seem self-evident it is noteworthy that interlocutors with no prior knowledge of what will be said in a conversation are generally able to pull these transitions off smoothly. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) describe the three rules of turn-allocation that allow the transition between speakers to occur efficiently. When the speaker reaches a 'transition relevance place' the first possibility is that the current speaker chooses the next to speak. For example, this can occur in the form of a question directed at a specific recipient. If the current speaker does not choose the next to speak, recipients may self-select. In this situation the first to speak becomes the next speaker. Finally, if neither of these options occurs then the current speaker may continue speaking until the next 'transition relevance place' is reached and the process can begin again (Sacks, et al. 1974:704).

Although the turn-taking system is an example of the overarching sequential organization of mundane conversation, lower levels of sequenced interactions also occur in talk. Sacks (1992) found that one of the most prevalent turn-taking sequences in conversation is the adjacency pair, which consists of two adjacently placed turns by different speakers that are 'relatively ordered' (i.e. "there is a first pair part" (FPP) and a "second pair part" (SPP)) and fall into a variety of different types, such as question-answer and greeting-greeting (see also Schegloff 2007). An example of an adjacency pair occurred as I was sitting writing this paper. My friend Clarence presented me with a FPP when he called out, "Sara?" My response, the SPP was, "Give me a sec." In this

example, the adjacency pair is a summons-answer (SA) sequence, where Clarence's FPP is an attempt to get my attention and my SPP is a response about whether I am available for the interaction. However, the naturally occurring question in regard to adjacency pairs is how to determine whether two adjacent utterances actually form a pair or whether they should be analyzed as separate units that just happen to occur next to each other. In order to answer this question it is necessary to determine whether two utterances are conditionally relevant. Schegloff writes, "By conditional relevance of one item on another we mean: given the first, the second is expectable; upon its occurrence it can be seen to be a second item to the first; upon its nonoccurrence it can be seen to be officially absent – all this provided by the occurrence of the first item" (1968:1083). When Schegloff writes expectable he refers to the fact that a FPP makes relevant only a limited amount of SPPs from which one can anticipate certain alternative answer forms (2007). For example, in my interaction with Clarence, he can expect that my response will have one of two basic forms, even if he is unable to predict the exact words I will use. These two forms can be categorized as a go-ahead response that demonstrates availability to talk or a blocking response, which suggests that the recipient is unavailable to talk (Schegloff 2007:59). My answer, since it implied that I was not available, falls under the broader form of a blocking response.

In conjunction with these alternative responses, Schegloff and Sacks found that the alternatives to a FPP are not always symmetrical; one form of the SPP can be preferred and another dispreferred (Sacks & Schegloff 1973; Schegloff 2007). Preferred responses facilitate accomplishing the action put forth by the FPP, while dispreferred responses inhibit the action (Schegloff 2007). Going back to my conversation with

Clarence, I mentioned that there were two alternative answer forms to his question: a go-ahead and a blocking response. For an SA sequence a go-ahead response is the preferred answer because it accomplishes the action of establishing the recipient's availability to talk. On the other hand, a blocking response falls under the category of a dispreferred response. Therefore, by saying, "Give me a sec" I gave a dispreferred response that blocked the continuation of a conversation. It is important to note that the status of a response as preferred or dispreferred is not dependent on the answer that an individual speaker desires to receive. For instance, one can call someone and hope that they do not pick up the phone. Nevertheless, the preferred response is still that the recipient answers with a go-ahead response (Schegloff 2007).

In the definition of an adjacency pair discussed thus far, the only possible sequence of interaction is a FPP followed immediately by its SPP. However, it is easy enough to think of examples when this does not occur. For instance, if I had not heard what Clarence said to me the first time, I would have had to ask for a repetition of the FPP and thus would not have been able to immediately give a response about my availability to talk. In order to address such occurrences Sacks (1992) and Schegloff (2007) discuss the existence of pre-, insert, and post-expansions to a base adjacency pair. The base pair is the adjacency pair that underlies the main reason for a particular sequence of talk. For example, in my conversation with Clarence, the main point of Clarence's calling my name was not simply to get my attention for no reason. As I found out later, when I had finished writing my sentence, the reason was to ask me if I was going to break dancing in the morning. Thus the initial summons-answer sequence was a pre-expansion on the question-answer pair that would have asked his question.

Before completing this section on CA, it is important to clarify an important aspect of CA that may not be evident from the discussion above. The structures that CA has described do not present themselves the same way in every conversation, but have the property of recipient design. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson write, "By 'recipient design' we refer to a multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants" (1974:727). In other words, this concept refers to the fact that in casual conversation turn-size and turn-order are not established before the conversation begins, but handled by interlocutors in the moment of interaction. Furthermore, the authors find that some of the key features of mundane conversation fall under the domain of recipient design. The first is that talk is 'locally managed,' or that turn transitions and lengths are handled at the moment that each particular turn occurs (Sacks, et al. 1974:725). Additionally, it is characterized by the 'party-administered' nature of these turns (Sacks, et al. 1974:726). In other words it is the participants in the interaction, who are making the decisions about turn transitions and turn length. Finally, conversations are 'interactionally managed' (Sacks, et al. 1974:726-27). Turn exchange is not the work of any one individual; alternatively, it relies on the combined participation and coordination of the parties involved in the conversation. Thus, recipient design allows for a great deal of flexibility and variation in how conversations unfold.

An Outline of Estefany's Interaction with Luis

As discussed above, the work of CA has focused on casual conversation. However, there are many other types of speech genres that occur in our lives, including interviews, debates, and lectures, to name a few (Bakhtin 1986). Each of these examples

deviates to a different extent from the locally managed allocation of turns in mundane conversation. At times a particular genre is related to the location in which it takes place. For example, one might expect to see a particular speech genre in a doctor's office and an entirely different one in a courtroom or on a soccer field. The interaction between Estefany and Luis takes place in a school classroom while the teacher is not lecturing and thus the participants locally manage the turn-taking structure. Nevertheless the teacher still has authority over talk in the classroom and can interrupt or stop the conversations of her students. Since this has an effect on the management of the turn-taking structure, theorists have categorized talk in classrooms as institutional talk. In institutions such as schools and professional offices individuals are in close proximity for long periods of time for the purpose of accomplishing some task. Drew and Heritage (1992) refer to such settings as non-formal types of institutions (see Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998 for further information).[4] "Although the talk in these settings is clearly institutional in that official task-based or role-based activities occur at least some of the time, turn-taking procedures may approximate conversational or at least 'quasi-conversational modes" (Drew and Heritage 1992:28). This is an apt definition of the environment in which Estefany and Luis' interaction takes place. At the moment of the video recording the teacher is not lecturing, and thus not actively guiding the talk of the students, leaving greater flexibility in whom they talk with, what they talk about, and when they start talking (Arminen 2005). Nevertheless, the goal of completing the exam is still the main task at hand and must be accomplished in the allotted time. Additionally, the teacher maintains the right

[4] This contrasts with formal settings such as courtrooms, where the institution controls the turns at talk (Drew and Heritage 1992).

to recall the students' attention.

The phrases 'continuing state of incipient talk' (Sacks & Schegloff 1973:325) and 'open state of talk' (Goffman 1981:134) have been used to describe the interactions that take place in settings such as schools or offices. "[P]articipants have...the right but not the obligation to initiate a little flurry of talk, then relapse back into silence" but this conversation only occurs on the periphery of the other activities being undertaken (Goffman 1981:134-35). Additionally these conversations do not require greetings or farewells that would signify that the state of talk was or is closed. Since students are together for an extended period of time in order to engage in learning activities, when the teacher relaxes control over the flow of interaction, conversations can begin, exchange back and forth between individuals, end for a little bit, and restart about the same or different topics.[5]

The interaction between Estefany and Luis unfolds in this state of incipient talk. The base pair, which is the ultimate reason that Estefany begins the interaction, falls into the category of an announcement-reaction sequence. Estefany is trying to share a piece of news with Luis that she believes he does not have, namely the fact that Carlos was looking at his exam. Thus the FPP of the base pair is initiated when Estefany starts to share this information, which she achieves with a tap on Luis' exam and then a point to Carlos. However, this is not Estefany's first turn at talk. Prior to this TCU, Estefany makes a variety of attempts to get Luis' attention. This SA sequence is a pre-expansion to the announcement-reaction base pair.

[5] For information on the structure of interactions between teachers and students during a lesson see Mehan (1979).

My discussion of Estefany's interaction with Luis begins with a discussion of this pre-expansion and how Estefany uses it to open the conversation (Ch. 2). It is evident from the development of this opening sequence that Estefany must use a number of devices to secure Luis' attention. It is only after the third summons that Luis finally shifts his eye gaze toward Estefany. This pre-expansion is a good example of the concept of recipient design. Due to Luis' initial lack of response to the summons, the sequence does not unfold as a FPP followed immediately by a SPP. However, Estefany continues summoning Luis until she gets a preferred response.

After Estefany has Luis' attention she initiates the base pair. In Chapter 2 I also present an analysis of Estefany's FPP, the announcement to Luis that Carlos was looking at Luis' exam. This section not only focuses on the structure of the interaction between Estefany and Luis, but also expands past this particular interaction to discuss generally some of the elements that populate Estefany's communication system and their implications on her interactions with her classmates. The last section of the chapter picks up after the completion of Estefany's FPP. We find that Luis does not follow Estefany's FPP with a SPP. Instead the teacher distracts Luis from his conversation with Estefany. This section focuses primarily on eye gaze direction to try and understand why the interaction is left in its unfinished state. The discussion in Chapter 2 will expand on these basic comments about Estefany and Luis' interaction.

Summary

In this first chapter I presented my central question: How comparable are the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing classmates? In answering this question I hope to shed light on the broader issue of the effectiveness of the new inclusion

education program for deaf students in Peru. The communication skills of Estefany and her classmates is fundamental to taking up this inquiry because of the important role that peer interaction plays in both learning and development. Vygotsky's notion of the zone of proximal development specifically addresses the developmental maturation that can only occur through interaction.

After establishing this central question I presented background on inclusion education at both the national policy level and the local level in Iquitos. The General Law of Education passed by the Ministerio de Educación Peruano in 2005 establishes inclusion as the new system of education for gifted students with disabilities. Although the law calls for support services to assist disabled students in regular education classrooms, poor cities such as Iquitos are unable to provide these resources. Therefore, Estefany and other deaf students must individually manage an all-hearing classroom and school. In this environment, the degree of communication between Estefany and her hearing peers is called into question. In order to analyze Estefany's interactions with her hearing classmates I use CA. This approach allows me to examine Estefany's conversations from both a structural and a micro level.

In the subsequent chapter I use CA to discuss one interaction between Estefany and her classmate Luis. I begin with Estefany's attempt to secure Luis' attention. Next I move to her statement that informs Luis about Carlos coming over to their table and looking at his exam. Finally, I discuss how this interaction is brought to a close. Although my investigation consists of a two-part study, this paper is only able to address the first part, Estefany's communication skills. Therefore, I conclude each of the sections

in Chapter 2 with some hypotheses on how the interactions among the hearing students in Teresa's class may appear similar or different to Estefany's interactions in the classroom.

CH. 2 ESTEFANY AND LUIS' INTERACTION

Conversational Openings

The Summons-Answer (SA) Sequence

The opening portion of Estefany's interaction is a SA sequence that attempts to secure Luis' attention for the forthcoming base pair. This section will provide background information on the SA sequence and analyze the example of the SA sequence in Estefany and Luis' interaction. An SA sequence is an example of an adjacency pair and also an important pre-expansion when one wants to ensure that his recipient(s) attend(s) to his full turn. Therefore, the SA sequence is necessary in order to gain the attention of one's interlocutors, establish their availability, and to coordinate their entry into the conversation (Goodwin 1980; Schegloff 1968). Summonses, also referred to as attention-getting devices, are the myriad of ways that one can use to get another's attention. Some examples include verbal methods such as saying 'hey' or calling a person's name, mechanical devices such as a phone ring or a doorbell, and manual techniques such as waving or tapping someone's shoulder. The answer portion of the sequence is the interlocutor's response to indicate whether he is or is not available for the conversation. This can also take a number of forms including a verbal 'hello' or 'yes', manual reactions such as turning one's eyes or body toward the summoner, or even a mechanical response such as the answering machine (Liddicoat 2007). Some common examples of SA sequences are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Examples of Summons-Answer Sequences

Summons: Ring, Ring, Ring (phone) Answer: Hello?
Summons: Mom? Answer: Yes?
Summons: Bob taps Jane on the shoulder Answer: Jane turns her head to look at Bob

It is important to note some of the characteristics of the SA sequence. First, if the summons is not answered, it can be (and often is) repeated. For example, we allow the phone to ring multiple times, call back again if the phone call does not go to an answering machine, and repeat someone's name if they do not respond the first time. The very fact that we repeat the summons suggests that some form of answer is expected. Along with repeating a summons, individuals may use different types of summonses in order to get another's attention (Schegloff 1968). For example, my eighth grade history teacher decided to call on a student who was clearly sleeping in class. After calling Johnny's name, which had no effect, he slammed a book down on sleeping Johnny's desk; he definitely had his attention then. The corollary to the potential for repeating a summons is that once the summons is answered it is not acceptable to perform another one. "If, as occurs on occasion, a summoner does not hear the answer of the other, and repeats the summons, should the answerer hear both summonses he will treat the second one as over-insistent" such as when "[c]ontinued knocking on the door is…met with the complaint as the answerer is on his way, 'I'm coming, I'm coming' (Schegloff 1968:1082). Thus a summons is only a means to an end and once an answer is received, the summoner moves on to the next portion of the conversation.

This point brings me to the next important characteristic of the SA sequence: it is never the terminal exchange, or in other words, the end of a conversation (Schegloff 1968). Although the enactment of an SA sequence does not actually necessitate that the original reason for the conversation is ever brought up, as a pre-expansion it is initially utilized in order to facilitate the initiation of some other action. Therefore, once a summons is answered with an indication of availability, presumably the summoner will speak again, demonstrating the reason for the original summons. Similarly, if a recipient gives an indication of his availability, it is expected that he will participate in the conversation, at least for one more turn (Schegloff 1968, Sidnell 2010).

Estefany's Conversational Opening

Prior to Estefany initiating the SA sequence, Luis is involved in looking through a textbook with Juan and thus not engaged with Estefany. Therefore, she must obtain his attention before she is able to tell him about Carlos' actions. The opening of Estefany's interaction is a prime example of an SA sequence at work. Estefany produces three different attention getters in this clip. She begins with three quick taps on Luis' arm (D, see Figure 1 above). When he does not look at her, she pulls on his arm once (E), followed by the utterance, which I have glossed as "Look at me" (F). When this still does not work, she touches his chin (G) and says, "Look at me" twice. At this point, Luis adjusts his eye gaze toward Estefany. Luis' lack of response to Estefany's summonses were taken as blocking responses, but after he shifts his eye gaze toward her, she takes this action as a go-ahead response and launches into her main topic of conversation (see Table 2).

Table 2: The Structure of Estefany and Luis' Summons-Answer Sequence.

Summons: Taps on Luis' arm (3x)
Answer: [Luis does not turn his eye gaze toward Estefany]
Summons: Pulls on Luis' arm (1x), Look at me
Answer: [Luis does not turn his eye gaze toward Estefany]
Summons: Touches Luis' chin (1x), Look at me (2x)
Answer: Luis turns eye gaze toward Estefany
Estefany: Brings up first topic of conversation

The concepts CA puts forth help us explicate the structure of Estefany's conversational opening. First, Estefany is using an SA sequence in order to attract Luis' attention and to coordinate starting her first topic of conversation with securing his eye gaze. Second, Estefany repeats her summons until she is able to secure Luis' attention. When Luis does not respond to her first summons, the three taps on his arm, she produces two more, the arm pull and then the chin touch. When he finally responds, however, signaling that the SA sequence is complete, she no longer performs a summons but moves directly into her explanation that Carlos was looking at his paper. This action demonstrates that she is not using the SA sequence as a terminal exchange; on the contrary she was ready to provide the first topic of conversation once the SA sequence was completed.

From this small section of the interaction one can learn a great deal about what Estefany's communication system looks like. Not only does Estefany's conversational opening show a high degree of structural organization, but also a wide variation in the

summonses that she uses. In a matter of seconds we see three distinct attention getting techniques. Moreover, these three do not encompass her total range of summonses; she also taps surfaces, waves, places herself in someone's line of vision, and uses her voice to get attention. At first this may seem unremarkable because, as mentioned above, each of us has a variety of techniques in our repertoire. However, in Estefany's case her classmates and teachers do not use the same set of attention getters that she demonstrates. Although I have not conducted a systematic analysis of the hearing students' attention getting techniques, in witnessing a number of their interactions with Estefany the biggest difference seems to be related to the modality of their language. Many of the hearing students use vocal summonses, even when trying to get Estefany's attention, whereas manual summonses are featured much more prominently in Estefany's repertoire. Additionally, although at times the hearing students use manual summonses, I never saw them touch or move another individual's face, as Estefany does in this interaction with Luis.

The last comment on Estefany's attention getters is not obvious from this one interaction with Luis alone, but is evident from my corpus of video data at large. Not only does Estefany have a different set of attention getters from her classmates, but she has also categorized them. In this interaction, we witness Estefany's use of attention getters with a fellow student with whom she interacts on a regular basis in the classroom. In this example she pulls on Luis' arm and touches his face. These particular attention getting techniques were limited to students with whom she is close. Estefany did not use these summonses with teachers, students that she did not communicate with regularly, or with me. Waving, tapping, and putting herself in someone's line of vision were the three

techniques that were used most regularly with a wide variety of individuals, including adults and other students. Teresa had her own particular attention getter; Estefany would use her voice to call out "Profesora" (PR109, Video clip 5). In the school, this is the only person with whom Estefany would use her voice. In trying to get the attention of her classmates, she neither called their names, nor used other types of sounds. Estefany was extremely successful in getting Teresa's attention with this summons. Upon hearing Estefany's voice, Teresa would often leave other students to attend to her. These findings demonstrate that Estefany has organized her various summonses based on their acceptableness for her interlocutors.

Apart from demonstrating a range of summonses, the analysis of this interaction brings to light three other devices worthy of note. First, there seems to be a clear progression to the three different summonses Estefany uses. A tap on the arm is easy enough to ignore, a pull on the arm a little harder, and finally having one's chin touched is impossible to ignore. Thus Estefany's attention getters over the course of the clip progress through three stages, each more invasive into Luis' personal space than the last. She is not merely repeating the same summons; each successive one demonstrates an increase in intensity. This is what Schegloff (2000, 2007) refers to as an upgrade. Second, Estefany uses tempo as an important element in structuring her opening exchange. In most interactions Estefany's summonses are produced at a casual speed. She will execute one, and if not answered, wait for a moment before repeating the summons. In contrast, in this clip Estefany jumps to each successive summons extremely quickly; there is hardly any delay between each new attention getting technique. What little delay exists is filled with the gesture "Look at me."

This brings me to the third device she uses in this clip, inserting the utterance "Look at me" multiple times between her summonses. The handshape configuration of this gesture is a balled fist with the index and middle fingers extended in a 2 or V handshape. The movement starts with the hand placed in neutral space in front of Estefany's face, palm facing up, and the tips of the fingers either facing directly towards Luis or up toward the ceiling. Next the tips of the fingers are brought toward Estefany until they point at her eyes. I gloss this gesture to mean, "Look at me" because that same sign with this meaning is used in both American Sign Language and ISL. As mentioned above, Estefany did learn a few signs from the teachers at her previous school. In my observations at 25th of June, CEBE I saw the teachers use this sign frequently in trying to get the attention of deaf students. For this reason I chose to continue to use the gloss from both these standard sign languages. Along with the upgrading in her summonses, Estefany also demonstrates an upgrade in this device as well. After the first summons, she does not say anything, only fixes her hair. After the second summons, she inserts the utterance once; and finally after the third she repeats, "Look at me" two times. The utterance "Look at me" can be categorized as having a directive function in speech. Searle (1976) writes, "The illocutionary point of these consists in the fact that they are attempts…by the speaker to get the hearer to do something" (11). Such attempts can take a variety of forms, including demands, orders, requests, or supplications. In this case, the utterance "Look at me" falls into the category of directives because Estefany is trying to make Luis shift his eye gaze toward her.

In this videotaped interaction Estefany demonstrates upgrading, a fast tempo, and the insertion of directives between her summonses. One question that has been left

unanswered thus far is why Estefany would choose to use these three devices in this particular interaction? When Estefany sees Carlos copying from Luis' exam, she slaps her hand over the paper. Then in the subsequent conversational opening, Estefany uses three devices that are not normally present in her attention getters. Their combined presence seems to display a sense of urgency; that is to say, there is something especially significant about the piece of information that she has to share.

Conclusions

From the analysis above it is evident that Estefany has a great deal of structure and organization to her opening sequence. First, she taps Luis on the arm; when no answer is achieved, she tries pulling on his arm. When she receives no answer a second time; she touches Luis' chin. Only after he turns his eye gaze toward her does she stop her summonses in order to explain the first topic of conversation. It is clear from this example that Estefany follows many of the rules of the SA sequence that Schegloff (1968) developed. Additionally, I explored the variety of summonses in Estefany's repertoire and the way in which her use of them differs by her interlocutor. We also gathered evidence about some of the additional devices Estefany uses to get another's attention. In this short sample she demonstrates three such devices: 1) upgrading her summonses by entering further and further into one's personal space; 2) increasing the tempo with which she performs each successive summons; and 3) inserting directives between her summonses. This set of devices adds a sense of urgency to Estefany's opening sequence. Finally, I ended this section with a discussion of my hypotheses for the possible areas of similarity and difference in the conversational openings of Estefany and her hearing classmates.

In this last paragraph on Estefany's conversational opening I return to the question addressed at the start of this paper: How comparable are the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing classmates? Since only the first half of this analysis is complete the attempts to answer this questions are hypotheses based on my initial viewings of the hearing students' interactions with Estefany. First, I hypothesize that the overall structure of Estefany's conversational opening in her interaction with Luis is very similar to those that the hearing students in her class will demonstrate. As discussed previously, interactions are recipient designed and therefore I will not find an exact replica of Estefany's interaction with Luis. However I believe that the hearing students will demonstrate an equal understanding of turn-taking norms and SA sequences. I believe they will also demonstrate a set of devices, although not necessarily the same ones, to convey particularly important and urgent information. I imagine that the portion of Estefany's conversational opening that will differ the most from her classmates is the actual set of summonses that she uses. For example, I never witnessed her classmates using the face touch with either her or other peers. It will be interesting to see the ways in which the hearing students categorize their own repertoire of summonses based on whom they are talking to. Are there any similarities in these categories between the different hearing students, between the students and Estefany, or between the students and their teacher? The next section on Estefany and Luis' interaction focuses on Estefany's FPP of the base adjacency pair.

The Base Pair of Estefany and Luis' Interaction

Turn-taking Structure and Adam Kendon's Formal Gesture Coding

The portion of the interaction between Estefany and Luis that will be analyzed in this section is Estefany's announcement to Luis about Carlos' copying. This segment of the conversation is the FPP of the base adjacency pair and includes Estefany's tap on Luis' exam (H) and her point toward Carlos (I). Before analyzing this TCU, I will look first at the transitions in and out of the base pair. Along with demonstrating an understanding of the structure of SA sequences, Estefany's transitions also demonstrate an understanding of the general turn-taking structure. These turn exchanges will be explored through the use of Adam Kendon's formal gesture coding. Kendon (2004) defines a gesture phrase as a preparation, a stroke, and any post-stroke hold. The preparation is the movement of the hand from its resting position to the stroke of the gesture. The stroke is the peak or climax of the movement, while a post-stroke hold is any pause at that location. Kendon (2004) defines a gesture unit as one or more gesture phrases followed by a retraction of the hand. When the hand finally falls back to rest, this is known as the retraction. From analyzing Estefany's interaction in this way, it is evident that her entire utterance, which includes her attention getters, occurs within one gesture unit because the first time her hand comes to rest is after she points to Carlos.

The portion of the gesture unit that constitutes the FPP of Estefany's base pair consists of only two gesture phrases. However, I will begin my coding with the last portion of Estefany's summonses. After touching Luis' face Estefany says, "Look at me" two times. The first of these gesture phrases starts with a preparation, in which Estefany's left hand and entire arm move away from Luis' chin and toward her face. As her hand crosses the space between them, her hand shifts from an open palm to the V or 2

handshape. The stroke occurs when Estefany flips her palm face down and aims her fingertips toward her face. The second of these gesture phrases is very similar, but the preparation is much shorter this time. Estefany's hand is already in front of her face, so her preparation consists of flipping her wrist back so that her fingertips point away from her face again. Then Estefany reaches the stroke of the phrase as her wrist flips back down and her fingertips come to point toward her face again. As Estefany transitions into the base pair she begins with a preparation, moving her left hand from in front of her eyes, and shifting her index finger to right above Luis' paper, which is on the table between the two of them. The stroke of the gesture is the moment when her finger touches the paper. She subsequently follows this first stroke with a re-stroke, and taps the paper one more time, completing this gesture phrase. Next she enacts a new preparation as she moves her arm, torso, and eye gaze to face behind her and performs the stroke, which is the index finger point at Carlos. Once again she re-strokes by using another quick point at Carlos. At the completion of this gesture phrase she begins the retraction by bringing her body back to the front and her arm to rest at her side.

Breaking down Estefany's gestures through Kendon's formal analysis can help articulate the precise coordination in timing of the speaker transitions. As noted previously Estefany's initiation of the SA sequence is a pre-expansion to the reason for her conversation, which is executed in the base pair. The base pair that Estefany sets up is an announcement-reaction sequence because she has a piece of news that she believes Luis does not know. We will look at the transition between the pre-expansion and the base pair. CA found that one of the pervasive characteristics of the turn-taking system is that transitions to next speaker occur with little to no gaps or overlap in talking. Estefany

seems to accomplish this quite well, especially in terms of making sure that no gaps appear. At the first transition relevance place, the end of Estefany's last summons, we see that Estefany has filled what would be a $3/10^{th}$ of a second gap between the summons and Luis' response with the utterance, "Look at me". At the completion of this gesture phrase Luis has still not responded to Estefany and so she begins the preparation for the second utterance of "Look at me". About $1/10^{th}$ of a second into this gesture phrase, right after Estefany has completed the preparation and her hand is poised to flip back toward her face, Luis finally begins to move his head toward Estefany. Here we see a slight overlap in their utterances. As Estefany is finishing her last gesture phrase of "Look at me," Luis is also enacting his response by shifting his eye gaze toward Estefany. The result of this overlap is that since Estefany now has Luis' go-ahead response she does not retract her hand or end this gesture unit; instead she moves immediately into her preparation for the first gesture of her FPP.

After the transition into the FPP of the base pair, Estefany includes in her TCU a tap on Luis' exam (H) and then a point toward Carlos (I). The discussion of the characteristics of Estefany's TCU will be discussed below. For the moment I continue on to the next transition relevance place. Kendon's gesture coding provides a clear indication of where the next transition relevance place occurs. At the end of the second gesture phrase of the FPP, Estefany brings her eye gaze and torso back to the front and brings her arm to rest by her side. As I mentioned earlier there is only one gesture unit from the time Estefany initiates the conversation to the end of her point toward Carlos. Therefore, it can be inferred that the retraction of Estefany's hand at this juncture is indicative of the end of her FPP. This would suggest that when Estefany rotates to look

toward Luis again, she is attempting to select him as the next speaker. However, Estefany finds Luis turning to look at the teacher (J). The SPP is left unexecuted and the adjacency pair incomplete. Aside from the structural organization of this interaction, a number of important attributes of Estefany's communication system can be gleaned from looking more closely at the TCU of Estefany's base pair. I will investigate some of these characteristics in the sections below.

Estefany's Turn Constructional Unit (TCU): A Focus on Indications

The brief explanation that Estefany provides is an excellent example of her typical TCU. First, the utterance is only two gesture phrases in length. Estefany tends to have very short turns at talk, consisting of between one to four gesture phrases. Next, we move on to the elements that comprise her turn at talk. In this videotaped interaction with Luis, Estefany's entire turn at talk consists of indications. This is by far the most frequent component of Estefany's communication system. Additionally, aside from the attention getters described in the previous section, the five most common elements that populate Estefany's utterances are head nods and shakes, various facial expressions, and a small number of oral Spanish words and conventionalized signs. However, since indicating occurs so frequently, I will look at it in greater detail below.

Sotaro Kita (2003) writes that pointing "is ubiquitous in our day-to-day interaction with others" (1). This may be the reason why the common perception of pointing is that it is a simple communicational element; that is to say, *mere* pointing. However, as Kita's edited volume (2003) demonstrates, pointing is much more complex than this common perception gives it credit for. Clark (2003) problematizes the concept of pointing by first placing it within a general framework of indicating. He defines an

index as anything that directs our attention, and notes that among others there are two basic kinds of indications, directing-to and placing-for. The fundamental difference between the two is determined by what they manipulate; the former moves a person's attention toward an object and the latter moves an object into someone's attention. Within this framework, pointing is just one of a variety of techniques for directing-to. Estefany relies heavily on directing-to in her communication system and therefore I will only focus on this element below.

Within the directing-to category there are a number of ways in which Estefany uses pointing. First and foremost, in Estefany's interaction with Carlos she uses her index finger to do both tapping and pointing. Estefany's decision to tap versus point to an object is an important indicator of the distance and state of the particular thing being pointed to. As a general rule, she will tap objects that are within an arm's length of her, and point to those that are farther away. The tendency to tap objects is most likely part of her communication system because taps are more explicit for her interlocutors than pointing at a distance. Although taps are more explicit than points in space, they are also ambiguous to the recipient. For example, a tap on a book can indicate the book itself, the author, or a character (see below for an extended discussion of this characteristic of indications). Nevertheless, it still provides some level of clarity over a point in space, because in the latter the recipient must first determine if it is the book, the table it is sitting on, or the pencil next to the book, before determining if the book, the author, or a character is the referent. Even though Estefany uses tapping to indicate objects within an arm's length of her, she usually does not tap people whom she is indicating. For example, later in this same class Estefany is commenting to me about Luis' ability to

draw the mural on the wall. When she points to him, she does not touch him although her hand is right next to his arm (PR109, Video clip 6). One possible reason Estefany taps objects and not people is because the person who is tapped might interpret her action as a summons. If within a conversation Estefany is talking to Juan, but trying to indicate María, it could be disruptive to tap Maria and then have to explain to her that she was not trying to get her attention. In the interaction between Estefany and Luis, we see that Estefany taps on the exam, making it clear to Luis that her utterance is somehow connected to the paper and then she points to Carlos. Since Estefany does not tap Carlos, in order to increase the chance that Luis recognizes her point is toward Carlos, she uses other parts of her body to indicate him as well.

Estefany uses a variety of forms of indication, which use different parts of her body. Although, the index finger is a very common one, she also uses other fingers, her whole hand, torso, eyes, and even her chin. In addition to the use of these different forms in isolation, she often combines them. In the second gesture phrase of her utterance, the index finger is not the only part of Estefany's body indicating Carlos; she also shifts her entire torso and eye gaze toward him as well. Kita (2003) found that the co-articulation of the index finger point, torso direction, and eye gaze is a very common technique used in language, even when the particular object being indicated is not in sight. Kita demonstrates that people shift their eye gaze prior to pointing toward an object that is out of sight in order to "fine-tune the computation of gesture direction" (2003:325). Estefany accomplishes this same feat when she turns her eye gaze, and thus her torso toward Carlos as she is pointing at him. Since there are a number of students seated behind Estefany, she uses her eye gaze in order to ensure that she provides Luis with accurate

information about who was looking at his exam. Thus it is clear from this example, that Estefany integrates a number of different forms of indicating in order to assist her localization on Carlos as the referent of her index finger point. In turn, this facilitates Luis' ability to determine whom she is indicating, even if she cannot tap Carlos.

The final piece of information taken from this clip addresses the rhythm of Estefany's indications. I noted in the formal gesture analysis of her utterance that both phrases include a re-stroke. In the first gesture phrase of the turn at talk Estefany's stroke is the tap of her index finger on Luis' exam; she follows it with a re-stroke. In the second gesture phrase Estefany turns her torso and eye gaze toward Carlos and uses her index finger to point toward Carlos. She also follows this stroke with a re-stroke, or a second point at Carlos. This is not a common property of Estefany's communicative acts. In most instances of indications she executes one point and either holds it, moves to another gesture, or retracts her hand. I predict that the re-stroke adds an emphatic quality to her utterance. This coincides with Estefany's opening because it maintains the sense of urgency developed in her summonses. Once again, this addresses that fact that the information Estefany wishes to share with Luis is especially important.

Forms of Directing-to outside the Scope of Estefany's Interaction with Luis

Estefany's variations in forms of pointing are essential to her communication system in another way. Drawing a parallel from the work of Kendon (2003) on alternative structures in the indications of Neapolitan speakers, I analyze the different meanings contained within Estefany's various forms of pointing. Kendon found that the variety of forms in pointing gestures is "systematically related to the way the object being referred to is presented in the speaker's discourse" (2003:109). For example, he

discovered that Neapolitan speakers utilize the index finger palm down for object individuation, or when the object is the main focus of discussion. In contrast, the thumb point is used when not identifying the exact position or identity of a particular object (Kendon 2003). Due to the difficulty in pinpointing the exact translation of many of Estefany's indications because she generally does not provide descriptions for her indications, such a complete analysis is not possible. However, Estefany's different forms of pointing do seem to tell something important about what is being indicated.

First, Estefany seems to use the index finger to achieve individuation among referents. This can be seen most clearly in her use of the index finger for underlining and enacting multiple taps. In order to provide a demonstration of how Estefany achieves individuation with these forms I present a few examples from the same day that the interaction between Estefany and Luis took place. The first example is taken from before the exam was handed out. Estefany is copying the text from the board into her notebook. Luis shakes his head at what she is doing and says something to her in Spanish. In order to justify her actions she uses her chin to point toward something off screen, most likely the teacher, and then uses her index finger to underline a portion of text in her notebook before going back to copying off the board (PR109, Video clip 7). This example shows Estefany is separating out a specific portion of the text; individuating this line from the rest of the words on the page. The second example occurs after the class has already received their exams and Estefany is copying the first answer from Luis. When she finishes copying what he has on his paper she taps him twice in order to get his attention and then points out each of the remaining questions on the page that they must respond to. He replies by pointing emphatically to the second question, which asks the students to

draw two family members (PR109, Video clip 8). Once again, Estefany is singling out certain items. This time she uses multiple index finger points in order to individuate each question.

In contrast, the full hand placement or sweep seems to indicate a general area, and does not individuate a specific item. The first example is of the open palm, hand placement. In this instance, the class has not received the exam and Estefany is at her table talking with Luis and Juan. She is searching through Luis' book to find a particular page she wishes to show them. When she finds it she slaps her open palm down on it. She looks quickly through a few more pages and then goes back to the one she originally chose and taps her open palm on the page a few times (PR109, Video clip 9). The next example is the hand sweep. In this videotaped interaction Estefany is commenting to me about Luis' drawing of the mural above the blackboard. After getting my attention she points to Luis' drawing with her left hand and then uses her open palm to sweep across the length of the mural (see Video clip 6 above). In both examples, Estefany uses the open palm to indicate an entire entity. There is no attempt to separate out a specific part of the page or the mural, but she indicates the item in general.

Finally, the chin point appears when Estefany's hands are occupied doing something else, such as already pointing to something or taking her notebook out of her bag. An example of the chin point comes from the very beginning of class when the students are getting settled in their seats. Luis approaches Estefany's table to ask if he can sit with her. She is in the process of moving her chair up to the table and responds with a chin point toward the open seat (PR109, Video clip 10). This demonstrates that

when Estefany does not have her hands available to point, she uses other parts of her body.

Issues of Uptake with Indications

It is now important to address the role of the interlocutor, Luis, in the interpretation of Estefany's directing-to gestures. The ability of any recipient to disambiguate what someone is indicating is one of the most complex aspects of pointing. The first difficulty for the recipient is to understand the correct way to read each particular directing-to device (Clark 2003). For example, in her first gesture phrase Estefany taps on the exam, but in the second she points to Carlos who is a short distance away. In order to interpret Estefany's gestures, Luis must recognize that in the first phrase he is attending to the entirety of the exam that she is touching, but in the second, he must trace the vector of her finger to determine whom she is indexing. Moreover, as discussed previously, directing-to does not only occur with the index finger (Clark 2003; Sherzer 1973). Therefore Luis must read the vector of her index finger, torso, and eyes in order to determine the referent of her index in the second gesture phrase.

As can be seen from the description above, the recipient must do a great deal of work to understand directing-to gestures. For this reason, "Directing-to ordinarily gets its description from outside, usually from the accompanying talk" (Clark 2003:250). In other words, the explanation for what a point indicates is explicated within the speech of a conversation (Clark 2003; Goodwin 2003). For example, a person pointing toward a particular book could simultaneously say, "That book is mine". Or someone could ask, "Which book is yours?" and be answered with a tap on a particular one. Due to this property of directing-to, Estefany's use of this technique without any description can

make it difficult to interpret her utterances. For instance, in one class, a boy approaches Estefany and asks for a pencil sharpener with a gesture commonly used among the students in the classroom, twisting the index finger of one hand in the fist of the other hand. The 20-second long interaction that proceeds from this moment consists of Estefany pointing to a particular girl at another table and the boy failing to recognize whom she is indicating. Even though Estefany attempts to mouth what seems to be the name of the girl she is indicating, at the end of the exchange the boy asks the wrong girl whether she has a pencil sharpener and the problem is left unresolved (PR109, Video clip 11).

An additional problem for the recipient trying to understand an index is that a point can be part of a 'chain of indication' (Clark 2003). For example, as mentioned above, when pointing to a book one could be referencing the book itself, the author, or a character. The spoken description (or signed in the case of a sign language) provides the relevant information. This is significant because as speakers and gesturers we have a specific description in mind, which we wish to convey to the other person. As Clark writes, "When Kay asked, 'Which car is yours?' and I pointed at a nearby car, I was indicating the thing I was pointing at *as* 'a car,' and not *as* 'a piece of junk' or *as* 'a good example of modern technology.'" (2003:246). It would be presumptuous to assume that because Estefany does not have a full language, her points are also not intended to signify a chain of meanings. Charles Goodwin (2003) provides an example of the difficulty of interpreting chaining without the use of descriptions with an aphasic man, who can only speak three words, Yes, No, and And. Goodwin writes, "Note that in attempting to figure out where Chil [the aphasic man] is pointing, Chuck [his son] is not simply trying to

locate the target of the point, that is, successfully accomplish reference, but is simultaneously attempting to locate the action Chil is performing – that is, does he want something to eat, or the table to be cleared, or movies to be checked" (2003:226). When Chuck finally determines that Chil is pointing to the newspaper, he understands the point as not only an indication of the paper itself, but as a desire for him to check the movie times. The difficulty with which Chuck establishes this reference, even when Chil is able to hear Chuck's wrong choices and correct him, places in stark relief Estefany's struggle in the classroom. Consequently, one of the most problematic aspects of interpreting Estefany's utterances can be to determine exactly what or whom she is indicating with her directing-to gestures. Conversely, it may be one area of expression with which Estefany also struggles. As demonstrated above in the interaction between Estefany and another student about the location of a pencil sharpener, Estefany may have information to share, but find it difficult to be understood.

This last point on chaining leads to the subsequent question: If pointing can be difficult to interpret without accompanying descriptions and it is the main element of Estefany's communication system, how do others understand her? The answer to this question is summarized in Clark's concept of common ground (1996) and Goodwin's situated activity and sequence frameworks (2003). Clark defines common ground as when "The participants in a conversation work together against a background of shared information" (1992:4). In order to be able to work against such a background individuals must have a self-awareness of what they know and be aware that they know it. Additionally, they must also have a belief about what others know. Beliefs about others stem from the two broad categories of communal and personal common ground (Clark

1996). The former refers to knowledge that we share with others because we are all members of communities. These groups can be cultural, linguistic, religious, occupational, etc. Such community memberships do not require that one personally know all the other members, nevertheless, being a part of the group creates a level of inside information about that particular community. Personal common ground refers to knowledge that two individuals believe they have in common based on shared experiences (Clark). Any conversation is based on the interlocutors' concepts of their common ground with each other. Such beliefs about shared common ground influence what is discussed and what type of language is used.

Estefany shares a great deal of common ground with her classmates. Some of this is communal shared knowledge. All the students have a shared background as Peruvians who live in Iquitos. This provides them with knowledge such as when the rainy and dry seasons are, the most common modes of transportation, and the types of meals eaten at the different times of the day. Even more significant however is the level of personal common ground that Estefany has with her classmates because of their experiences in school together. During the day the students work on the same assignments, following explicit instructions from the teacher. These tasks require the use of the same set of materials, such as pens, rulers, or scissors, and have a right and wrong answer. Additionally, the students share the same routine; every Tuesday and Thursday is math class. Estefany also participates in interactions with particular students, which builds her common ground with these individuals. In Estefany's case the large amount of common ground in the classroom environment works to her advantage because it may counter the fact that in general there are no descriptions to accompany her indications. Since both

Luis and Estefany have witnessed Carlos approach their table numerous times throughout the class period to look at Luis' paper and also saw the teacher send Carlos back to his seat for one of these instances, Luis may have a good idea of what Estefany is talking about when she points to the exam and then toward Carlos.

Goodwin's concept of activity frameworks (2003) is another form of common ground. Activity frameworks refer to the items in one's environment and the different activities that can be done with them. Chil, the aphasic man mentioned above, is able to capitalize on his own and others' knowledge that there is a section in the newspaper where they can look up movie times. Goodwin writes about how this benefits Chil when he states, "The way in which the objects that inhabit his lifeworld are already sedimented with visible, public meaning and tied to typical courses of action provides Chil with crucial semiotic resources for saying something meaningful to others despite his lack of speech" (2003:227-28). When Estefany points to a book in the classroom, she could want to borrow it, read it, or copy from it, all activities that are done with books on a regular basis. However, particular activities in the classroom narrow down the possible activity frameworks around many of the items she uses during the school day. Therefore, if all the students are cutting out numbers from a sheet of paper, it can be assumed that Estefany's search for a pair of scissors is in order to complete this activity and not to cut her fingernails.

Not only does Estefany have knowledge of the things populating her environment, but also of the 'sequential framework' of the interactions in which she is involved (Goodwin 2003, Schegloff 1968, Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974). Sequential organization is defined by Schegloff (2007) as "any kind of organization which concerns

the relative positioning of utterances or actions" (2). An example of this can be seen once again with the aphasic man Chil and his interaction with his family. In Goodwin and Goodwin 2000 one family member is showing off the pages of a calendar he has just received as a present. The rest of the family is responding with different forms of enthusiasm to the various pictures. At the start of the interaction Chil (in this article referred to as Rob) is looking at his food and does not see the first picture. However, in response to hearing the word "Wow" from another family member, he turns to look at the picture and then responds with his own show of enthusiasm. When the picture is switched he quickly changes from his first response "dih-dih-dih-dih" to "YEAH". It is evident that Chil is relying on his knowledge of the sequential organization of the triggering event and response cry in order to participate in the activity even with a limited vocabulary. He understands that the response cry follows the perception of the triggering event and thus holds his initial response until after his gaze has reached the image (Goodwin and Goodwin 2000). Estefany also demonstrates an understanding of sequential organization in her interaction with Luis. Both her opening and turn at talk show an overall awareness of the rules of turn taking in conversation. In the opening sequences, Estefany relies on the visual cue of gaze direction, to assess when Luis has completed his turn and thus she can move to her next turn. Additionally, Estefany's interactions must occur when her interlocutor(s) are attending to her and therefore she waits to achieve Luis' eye gaze before she begins her utterance (Clark 1996, Haviland 2003, Goodwin 2003). Knowledge of the objects in her environment, how they are used, and the structure of interactions are all elements of common ground between Estefany

and Luis that she relies on to facilitate conversation even in the context of sharing a very small common vocabulary.

Conclusions

In this section I analyzed the FPP of Estefany's base pair. I began with Kendon's formal gesture analysis in order to look at the turn transitions into and out of this FPP. Once again, Estefany shows a strong understanding of the sequential structure of talk-in-interaction. Next I focused on the TCU that comprises Estefany's FPP. She executes two forms of indications, first a tap on the exam and then a point in space toward Carlos. Indications are the most prevalent element in both this interaction with Luis, and Estefany's communication system in general. In this section I addressed the two examples of pointing evident within Estefany's interaction with Luis and some other forms of pointing that are evident from my video corpus. Finally, I addressed the role of the recipient in interpreting Estefany's directing-to gestures. This task is complicated by the fact that indications are generally accompanied by a spoken or signed description. However Estefany rarely includes such a description, making it difficult to interpret the referent of her indications. Nevertheless, Estefany is able to capitalize on the wealth of shared information, or common ground, between the teacher and students in the classroom, particularly in regards to the activity and sequential framework of interactions.

Similar to my hypothesis in the section on conversational openings, I believe that Estefany's knowledge of turn-taking structure is shared with her hearing classmates. I believe that in analyzing the conversations of the hearing students I will also find turn transitions that are precisely timed to occur with few gaps or overlap in talk. I predict

that it is in the exact design details of the TCU where I will find the most contrast between Estefany and her hearing classmates. I hypothesize that Estefany's peers will show greater variation between interactions in the both the number of elements that make up their TCUs and how many TCUs they string together within one turn. Additionally, I believe that there will be fewer problems of mutual understanding (i.e. the interaction between Estefany and the classmate looking for a pencil sharpener) among the hearing students because they share a language. In the final section I turn to the closing of Estefany and Luis' interaction.

Conversational Closings

Eye Gaze and Restarts in Talk-in-interaction

After Estefany finishes her explanation to Luis, we arrive at the last portion of the interaction, Luis' response to Estefany (or lack thereof) and how the conversation is brought to a close. At the end of Estefany's explanation the teacher distracts Luis by calling Juan's name. Upon completing her point at Carlos, Estefany turns around to find Luis in the process of shifting his eye gaze toward the front of the classroom (J). She follows his gaze while flipping over his exam, and sees Juan receive his notebook from the teacher (K). Luis looks back toward his work, and Estefany soon after turns her head to look forward again (L). At this point, Luis looks in her direction briefly, but she turns her head down toward her work (M). As will become evident in the subsequent discussion, Estefany does not use the opportunity when Luis looks back at her to restart the conversation, but lets it come to a close. The following analysis utilizes the eye gaze

of the participants as an integral factor in determining their engagement in the conversation.

The nature of adjacency pairs is that they contain at least two parts by two different speakers. For example, in the SA sequence, Estefany conducted the FPP and Luis the SPP to complete the pair. In the previous section I provided an analysis of the FPP of the base adjacency pair, Estefany's announcement or telling of the piece of news to Luis. However, as briefly addressed in the previous paragraph, we find that when Estefany turns back to Luis, instead of providing a SPP or a reaction to the news she has presented, Luis has adjusted his eye gaze toward the teacher. The lack of a SPP from Luis leaves the conversation feeling unfinished. My resulting question is – if Estefany's opening and turn at talk seem to demonstrate a sense of urgency then why does she not actively try to remedy the unfinished nature of the conversation? One possible answer is that once Estefany has lost Luis' attention to the teacher, there are no resources for bringing the conversation back into line.

However, Goodwin's (1980; 1981) work on eye gaze in interaction demonstrates a common technique that speakers use when they lose the attention of their recipients. Goodwin (1980; 1981) noticed that restarts, pauses, and hesitations in spoken language, while possibly indicating an internal 'disorder of natural speech', are more often tools the speaker uses in order to assure that all parts of his talk are attended to. Goodwin (1980; 1981) finds that all three of these "mistakes" are systematically tied to eye gaze. Prior to Goodwin's work, Kendon (1967) found that although there is a great deal of variability in the extent to which interlocutors gaze at each other, listeners consistently spend more time looking at the speaker than the speaker spends looking at the listener. The reason

for this property is that the listener's eye gaze is one way they demonstrate 'hearership' or engagement in the conversation (Goodwin 1981). In an interaction held in the manual modality the eye gaze of the receiver is even more significant because it is required in order for the recipient to understand what is said. Additionally, forms of demonstrating engagement other than eye gaze, such as nodding one's head with eye gaze averted, do not apply for the manual modality. The oral modality does not have such a strict requirement on eye gaze, allowing for conversations where two people are in different rooms or talking over the phone. The newest technology for deaf people that simulates the telephone is the videophone, which allows for visual contact between either two signers or between the signer and an interpreter. Nevertheless Goodwin's work on the interaction of gaze in conversations holds for both hearing and deaf interactants using either a manual or an oral modality (Coates and Sutton-Spence 2001).

Goodwin (1980; 1981) presented two rules in regards to the gaze of participants during interaction. "Rule 1: A speaker should obtain the gaze of his recipient during the course of a turn at talk" (Goodwin 1980:275). Although it is not absolutely necessary for a speaker to gaze at his recipient, there are a number of reasons why a speaker might want to do this. Kendon (1967) found that speakers glance toward their interlocutor(s) for monitoring, regulatory, and expressive functions. Expressive functions are shifts in the eye gaze that result from emotional sentiments, such as embarrassment. The monitoring function, explained aptly by its name, is when the speaker glances toward the hearers in order to monitor them, such as checking that they are still gazing at him and engaging in the conversation. Most relevant to this analysis is the regulatory function of the gaze. Speakers regulate the conversation by looking at their recipients at relevant

times in their turns at talk, such as when they are ending a turn and would like a response. In Estefany's case, she looks away from Luis while still engaged in a turn, but upon finishing her utterance shifts her gaze back toward him in search of a response. This analysis of Estefany's gaze is supported by the fact that the end of her gesture unit occurs at the same time as she glances toward Luis. Both of these elements combined suggest that she has completed her turn and is looking to Luis for a response.

Rule 2 states that "A recipient should be gazing at the speaker when the speaker is gazing at the hearer" (Goodwin 1980:287). This rule demonstrates that there is an unequal responsibility in eye gaze direction during a conversation; the hearer is required to be looking when the speaker gazes at him, but the reverse is not mandatory. Instances when Rule 2 are broken are significant to the speaker because when they occur during or at the end of a turn, the speaker is left with the question of "whether the talk that preceded it has been understood, attended to, and dealt with in a relevant fashion by its recipient" (Goodwin 1981:103). Goodwin (1980; 1981) found that such locations in an interaction are often repaired with a restart of the utterance. He notes that since eye gaze is an indicator of hearership, restarts that occur because of a drop in gaze are one way in which speakers can guarantee that their entire utterance is fully attended to (Goodwin 1980; 1981).

Thus Goodwin (1980; 1981) demonstrates that there are tools that speakers use in order to handle situations in which they lose the eye gaze, and potentially the attention of their recipient, namely the restart. When applied to the interaction between Estefany and Luis, we see that Estefany turns around to find that Luis is not looking at her. The reason that Luis' gaze is averted is due to an interruption from the teacher. Such a disturbance is

common and allowable in classrooms because the teacher has control over the flow of talk. Nevertheless, when Luis and Estefany both face forward again, Estefany has the option to enact a restart and finish her conversation with Luis. Estefany, however, chooses not to use this technique. On the contrary, when Luis glances in her general direction, Estefany shifts her gaze down to her paper and begins working.

Control over Conversational Closings

Once again I am returned to the question: If Estefany's opening and turn at talk seem to demonstrate a sense of urgency then why does she not actively try to remedy the unfinished nature of the conversation? At the current stage of my research I am unable to answer this question definitively. However, I hypothesize that Estefany closes the conversation as opposed to restarting it because she is maintaining control over the direction of the talk. Aside from this interaction between Estefany and Luis, there are three other lines of evidence that lead me to this hypothesis. The first piece of evidence is the fact that Estefany does not seem confused or uncomfortable in the classroom. Since Estefany does not share a language with her classmates or teacher one might expect the opposite to be true. One reason Estefany does not appear confused could be related to her control over the direction of the talk. If she manages when conversations end then she can remove herself from an interaction before it reaches the point where she is unable to understand what is said to her and thus would be confused.

A second piece of evidence is the overall length of her interactions. Estefany's conversations do not exceed exchanges of more than a few turn exchanges. In the entire one-hour video from which the interaction between Estefany and Luis is extracted, the maximum number of turn exchanges is ten. This occurs in the interaction in which one

of Estefany's classmates asks her for a pencil sharpener (see Video clip 11 above). The conversation contains five adjacency pairs, the SA sequence and then four question-answer sequences as the boy tries to narrow down which girl Estefany is pointing to. However, there is only one example of an interaction of this length; on average the number of turn exchanges in Estefany's conversations hovers between four and five. Upon an initial reflection of Estefany's talk-in-interaction, I had noticed that she had very short conversations with the other students. However, I believed that at times the two of us had managed significantly longer periods of exchange. In spite of this, when I analyzed the video I realized that we had a number of interactions about the same subject, but they were short, separate interactions. For example, in the class that contains the interaction between Estefany and Luis, we had seven different conversations about Luis' drawing ability, but each was only a maximum of four turn exchanges. In recalling our interactions, I had connected these separate conversations and imagined we spoke for a much longer set of turn exchanges because all the instances of talk focused on the same topic. Thus I found that my own interactions with Estefany mirrored the short interactions she had with her classmates.

Finally, the last piece of supporting evidence is that Estefany seems to regularly close down her conversations with others. As mentioned previously Estefany and Luis' interaction can be categorized as institutional talk. In this type of talk it is unnecessary to officially close a conversation because both parties are still sitting next to each other and are available for further conversation. When I say officially close down the conversation, I mean that it in unnecessary to exchange farewells or a terminal exchange. As discussed above, one tool Estefany uses to interact with her classmates and teachers is sequence

frameworks (Goodwin 2003, Schegloff 1968, Sacks, et al. 1974). And just as Estefany demonstrates an understanding of how conversations are opened, she also demonstrates a similar knowledge of how conversations are closed in an open state of talk. As most interactants in an open state of talk, she looks away from her interlocutors at the end of an exchange in order to return to her work, only to start a new conversation at a later time. However, what struck me about Estefany's closings in general is that she regularly turns her eye gaze away first. This statement does not mean to imply that Estefany should not be the first to close a conversation; all of us at times take on this role as a result of the particular turn-taking structure of an interaction. Nevertheless, in the half hour of video leading up to the interaction between Estefany and Luis, Estefany is the first to drop her eye gaze in 70% of the interactions that she starts and in 62% of the interactions that others start.

I hypothesize that Estefany's conversational closings portray a marked difference from those performed by the hearing students in the class. Since Estefany's peers share a language with each other they do not have to maintain strict control over the length or direction of the conversation. As mentioned previously I believe the hearing students will demonstrate much longer stretches of turn exchanges. Additionally, I hypothesize that they will be display significantly more instances of conversational repairs and much more variation in which student closes a conversation. Having watched a number of interactions between Estefany and her peers, I predict that the times when hearing students end conversations abruptly will be in their interactions with Estefany because they are unable to understand her communication system.

Conclusions

In this section I analyzed the closing of the interaction between Estefany and Luis. I noted that at the end of Estefany's turn at talk, she turns toward Luis to find that he is looking toward the teacher. Since Luis is distracted he does not complete the SPP of the adjacency pair, although there is evidence in his subsequent behavior that he is aware that the conversation was left incomplete. This finding led me to a central question about the closing of the conversation: If Estefany's opening and turn at talk seem to demonstrate a sense of urgency then why does she not actively try to remedy the unfinished nature of the conversation? I discussed Goodwin's analysis of restarts to demonstrate one technique speakers use to handle situations in which the speaker finds the recipient with his eye gaze averted. However, Estefany does not use this technique and allows the conversation to terminate. I hypothesized that Estefany chooses to allow the conversation to end as a way to maintain control over the conversation. I discussed three other lines of evidence that bring me to this prediction. These include the fact that Estefany does not seem confused or uncomfortable in the classroom, the short length of Estefany's interactions, and her general tendency to end conversations by dropping her eye gaze. I predict that the closing of Estefany's conversations will demonstrate a marked contrast with the closings of her hearing classmates.

Chapter 3: Conclusion

Around the world countries are setting up inclusion programs in response to the Salamanca Statement's call for a more equal education of disabled students. Although this change is taking place, very little research has been conducted on what these educational systems look like in countries with developing economies. My research in Iquitos, Peru speaks to this gap in the literature. Additionally, deaf students are a special case when it comes to the philosophy of inclusion because they are at a clear disadvantage due to their inability to access the language used in the classroom. Even the Salamanca Statement, the official document in support of inclusion education, states in regard to deaf students,

> Educational policies should take full account of individual differences and situations. The importance of sign language as the medium of communication among the deaf, for example, should be recognized and provision made to ensure that all deaf persons have access to education in their national sign language. Owing to the particular communication needs of deaf and deaf/blind persons, their education may be more suitably provided in special schools or special classes and units in mainstream schools (UNESCO 1994:18).

Nevertheless deaf students are often included in policies of inclusion education.

One important question when evaluating the inclusion system is how well deaf students are faring in comparison with their hearing classmates. However, my initial fieldwork in Iquitos quickly showed that a comparison between the academic work of Estefany and her classmates would not be an effective means of evaluating the inclusion system because Estefany copies the majority of her work from her peers. Therefore, I decided to investigate another important area of learning in the classroom, learning through peer interaction. With this topic in mind, I wrote this paper to address the

question: How comparable are the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing classmates? This discussion is the first part of a two part-study to answer this question. In my paper I looked at Estefany's communication system through a microanalysis of one interaction between her and a classmate Luis. I relied primarily on the approach of CA in order to conduct this analysis. From this perspective I broke the analysis into three sections, Estefany's opening, base pair, and closing. Overall, I found that Estefany demonstrates a great deal of structure in her conversations. She follows the rules of turn taking that allow for conversations to flow without gaps or overlap. This structure is especially evident in the opening of Estefany's interaction with Luis. Additionally, I delved into the elements that make up her communication system. I spent the most time discussing indications, which comprise the majority of the elements in her talk.

Furthermore, in each of the three sections I provided hypotheses for the similarities and differences between the structure of Estefany's communication system and that of her hearing classmates. In regard to conversational structure I believe that Estefany demonstrates considerable knowledge of the structural framework of talk-in-interaction and that her hearing classmates will demonstrate similar organizational patterns in their interactions. I hypothesize that the most marked difference between Estefany and her hearing classmates' conversational structure is the closing of their talk-in-interaction. Due to Estefany's tendency to maintain control over the direction of the conversation, I predict that her interactions consist of a smaller number of turn exchanges than her peers and that her classmates will demonstrate weaker tendencies to close conversations first. Additionally, I believe that the hearing students will demonstrate much more flexibility in when and how their conversations end because they do not have

to worry about arriving at a place in the conversation where they no longer understand what is said to them.

Another important area of difference in the communication skills of Estefany and her hearing peers lies in the elements that compose their talk. This difference may seem self-evident because Estefany is using a manual modality and her classmates an oral modality. However, the majority of the elements in Estefany's communication system can be found in the talk of her classmates when one takes into account their co-speech gestures. Therefore the elements themselves are not what is in question. What I am referring to is the level of ambiguity in the elements of Estefany's communication system. As discussed in the section on Estefany's base pair there is a constant dialogic at play between the lack of description to accompany the referent of her indications and the level of common ground between her and her recipients. This can make it difficult for others to understand Estefany and for Estefany to explicitly communicate her thoughts.

I will end by bringing this discussion back to the larger picture of the effectiveness of the inclusion system in educating deaf students. For Estefany's hearing classmates it is clear that the inclusion system is a beneficial alteration to their education. Estefany's presence allows her peers to meet a deaf person for probably the first time outside of the deaf beggars on the streets of Iquitos. Additionally, these students are educated on what deafness is and how to interact with a deaf individual. It is evident even with the small number of interactions presented in this paper that Estefany's peers often approach her to begin interactions. These interactions are integral to changing negative majority attitudes about deafness. While there is little question of whether the

hearing students in Teresa's class benefit from inclusion, the more significant question is how successful inclusion education is for Estefany and other deaf students.

In the inclusion setting it is clear that Estefany is able to take control over her social world to an extent that allows her to appear comfortable and unconfused the majority of the time. Estefany may not always be in environments that allow her this same level of control. Additionally, in the inclusion system Estefany has more interlocutors who are at her same cognitive and social level than she did at 25th of June, CEBE. The experience of interacting with peers who are of equal or greater intelligence opens up Estefany's social world in ways that she was unable to achieve at her previous school. However, these positives must be balanced with the level of responsibility and burden that are placed on Estefany always to control the flow of conversation, and to attempt to understand and be understood by individuals with whom she does not share a common language. All-in-all Estefany requires an educational environment where she has access to a shared sign language. Currently in Iquitos, the government does not provide a public schooling option that can supply Estefany with such a learning context. Additionally, she has never had the opportunity to be educated with other deaf students where an environment with a shared language could evolve naturally, such as the case in Nicaragua. Therefore in the choice between a separate, general special education school and an inclusion classroom, the latter may be the more beneficial for her communicative skills and social worlds, allowing for a higher amount of learning through peer interaction.

This line of inquiry, however, is far from complete. Further research is necessary in order to see if Estefany is the exception or the rule in the inclusion setting. Are other

deaf students in this environment as comfortable and unconfused as Estefany? Additionally, these students' skills in the inclusion classroom must be placed in a broader context. What do they gain from their initial education at a CEBE, and then how are their social worlds changed as they move into the inclusion setting? An understanding of their home environments is also important to contextualize their communicative skills in the classroom. What are the similarities and differences between the deaf children's abilities to communicate with their families versus their classmates and teachers? The significantly longer amount of time spent with their families suggests that there should be noticeable differences in these two contexts. It is evident that along with the completion of this two-part study there are a number of other important issues to investigate in order to understand the effectiveness of the inclusion program for deaf children in Peru. This area of research is only just beginning and requires significantly more exploration.

Bibliography

Ainscow, Mel
1997 Towards Inclusive Schooling. British Journal of Special Education 24(1): 3-6.

Ainscow, Mel and Margarida César
2006 Inclusive Education Ten Years after Salamanca: Setting the Agenda. European Journal of Psychology of Education XXI (3): 231-238.

Antia, Shirin D. and Kathryn H. Kreimeyer
2001 The Role of Interpreters in Inclusive Classrooms. American Annals of the Deaf 146(4):355-65.

Arminen, Ilkka
2005 Institutional Interaction: Studies of Talk at Work. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M.
1986 The Problem of Speech Genres. *In* Speech Genres & Other Late Essays. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, eds. Vern W. McGee, trans. Pp. 60-102. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cerney, Janet
2007 Deaf Education in America: Voices of Children From Inclusion Settings. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Clark, Herbert H.
1992 Arena of Language Use. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1996 Using Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2003 Pointing and Placing. *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Sotaro Kita, ed. Pp. 243-268. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coates, Jennifer and Rachel Sutton-Spence
2001 Turn-taking patterns in Deaf conversation. Journal of Sociolinguistics 5(4):507-529.

Drew, Paul, and John Heritage
1992 Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. *In* Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings. Paul Drew and John Heritage, eds. Pp. 3-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving, ed.

1981 Footing. *In* Forms of Talk. Pp. 124-159. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goldin-Meadow, Susan
In press Homesign: Gesture to Language. *In* Handbook on Sign Language Linguistics. R. Pfau, M. Steinbach and B. Woll, eds. Pp.145-160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

2003 The Resilience of Language. New York: Psychology Press.

Goodwin, Charles
1980 Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievement of a State of Mutual Gaze at Turn-Beginning. Sociological Inquiry 50(3-4):272-302.

1981 Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers. New York: Academic Press.

2003 Pointing as Situated Practice. *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Sotaro Kita, ed. Pp. 217-241. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, Marjorie H., and Charles Goodwin
2000 Emotion within Situated Activity. *In* Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader. A. Duranti, ed. Pp. 239-257. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Haviland, John B.
2003 How to Point in Zinacantán. *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Sotaro Kita, ed. Pp. 139-169. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt
1998 Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices, and Applications. Malden: Polity Press.

International Monetary Fund.
2011 World Economic Outlook: Tensions from the Two-Speed Recovery Unemployment, Commodities, and Capital Flows. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

Jones, B. E., G. Clark, and D. Soltz
1997 Characteristics and practices of sign language interpreters in inclusive education programs. Exceptional Children 63(2), 257–268.

Kendon, Adam
1967 Some Functions of Gaze-Direction in Social Interaction. Acta Psychologica 26:22-63.

2004 Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kendon, Adam, and Laura Versante
2003 Pointing by Hand in "Neapolitan." *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Sotaro Kita, ed. Pp. 109-137. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kita, Sotaro, ed.
2003. Pointing: A Foundational Building Block of Human Communication. *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Pp. 1-8. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

2003 Interplay of Gaze, Hand, Torso Orientation and Language in Pointing. *In* Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet. Pp. 307-28. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Liddicoat, Anthony J.
2007 An Introduction to Conversation Analysis. New York: Continuum.

Lindsay, Geoff
2003 Inclusive Education: A Critical Perspective. British Journal of Special Education 30(1):3-12.

Mehan, Hugh
1979 Learning Lessons. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Ministerio de Educación
2005 Educación: Calidad y Equidad, Reglamentación de la Ley General de Educación N° 28044. [Education: Quality and Equity, Regulation of the General Law of Education N° 28044]. Lima: República del Perú.

Moll, Luis C., ed.
1990 Introduction. *In* Vygotsky and Education: Instructional Implications and Applications of Socio-Historical Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, Harvey
1992 Lectures on Conversation, vol. 2. Gail Jefferson, ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Sacks, Harvey, and Emanuel A. Schegloff
1973 Opening up Closings. Semiotica VIII(4):289-327.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gale Jefferson

1974 A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. Language 50(4):696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A.
1968 Sequencing in Conversational Openings. American Anthropologist 70(6):1075-1095.

2000 Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language in Society 29(1):1-63.

2007 Sequence Organization in Interaction, vol 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R.
1976 A Classification of Illicutionary Acts. Language in Society 5(1):1-23.

Sherzer, Joel
1973 Verbal and nonverbal deixis: the pointed lip gesture among the San Blas Cuna. Language in Society 2:117-131.

Sidnell, Jack
2010 Conversation Analysis [electronic resource]: An Introduction. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

UNESCO
1994 The Salamanca Statement and Framework For Action On Special Needs Education. Salamanca: World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality.

Vasishta, Madan
2011 Response: Social Situations and the Education of Deaf Children in India. In Deaf Around the World: The Impact of Language. Gaurav Mathur and Donna Jo Napoli, eds. Pp. 352-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S.
1978 Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, Ellen Souberman, eds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Winston, E. A.
1994 An interpreted education: Inclusion or exclusion? In Implications and Complications for Deaf Students of the Full Inclusion Movement RC. Johnson and OP. Cohen, eds. Pp. 55–62. Gallaudet Research Institute Occasional Paper 94–2. Washington DC: Gallaudet University.