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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This study explores how process drama might influence communicative competence among teachers and students in self-contained classrooms for the hearing-impaired. The theoretical framework merges three areas of academia and professional experience: Drama in Education, Speech and Hearing Science, and Education of the Hearing Impaired. To date, the primary sociolinguistic structure proposed by the conceptual framework peculiar to this study is one that has not been found to be documented in the literature.

Statement of the Problem

This investigation addresses questions that have challenged educators of students with hearing impairment and various other forms of exceptionality for several decades:

- Why do so many of our students leave schools as unsuccessful communicators?
- How can we significantly impact their future roles as adult communicators?
• How can we make communication skills training in the school setting more ecologically valid for students?

The notion of ecological validity (MacDonald, 1991) implies the existence of natural and functional acquisition of skills that facilitate effective message transmission for a variety of human social contexts.

Concerns with the acquisition of communicative skills have come to the forefront in the last 30 years with the national focus on the evaluation of the quality of education for hearing impaired students. A committee established within the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported its findings in 1965 (Babbidge Committee Report). The report indicated a need for improved educational practices with people in special education, including the hearing impaired. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued a report, *A Nation At Risk*. That described how U. S. public schools were failing at properly educating children. There was emphasis on the inadequacy of teaching methods employed with exceptional populations as well as with the "disadvantaged, the low socio-economic students," and the "at-risk" students. More recently, Congress established the Commission of Education of the Deaf (CED) through the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986. The first few lines of the later report to Congress state (Commission on Education of the Deaf, 1988):

> The present status of education for persons who are deaf in the United States is unsatisfactory. Unacceptably so. This is the primary and inescapable conclusion of the Commission on Education of the Deaf. (p. viii)
Although many areas of concentration were identified, including prevention and early identification, research, evaluation, and outreach, professional standards and training and the progress and potential of technology, more attention has been devoted to the development of functional receptive and communication skills in English than to any other instructional area (Lang, 1989; Moores, 1987). The issue of language development has pervasive effects on all aspects of academic achievement and on cognitive and psychosocial developments in deafness (Paul & Quigley, 1990).

**Communication Challenges and the Person with Hearing Impairment**

From a clinical perspective, the individual with hearing impairment is one who has a significant loss of hearing acuity resulting in an adverse effect in the one area that most distinguishes humans from all other species—the ability to communicate thoughts, feelings and information at advanced levels. A hearing impairment frequently goes undiagnosed until its effects have already had serious impact on the individual’s speech, language, knowledge base, and life situation adjustment. Individuals who have significant hearing loss, but still rely on hearing and speech for message transmission are labeled hard of hearing, whereas those who have little or no functional hearing for spoken language and the non-speech sounds around them are referred to as severely-to-profoundly hearing impaired, or deaf. Both of these groups make up the larger category—hearing impaired (see Table 1). It has been found that students who are hard of hearing face challenges that are just as serious in everyday
### Table 1.

**Clinical Categories of Hearing Impairment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Hearing Acuity Loss</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Likely Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 26 dB</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Regular education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 to 40 dB</td>
<td>Near Normal or Slight</td>
<td>Regular education program with progress monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-55 dB</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Regular-education program; may need some oral communication training; possible reading and writing challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-70 dB</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Regular-education placement; some in special education placement and speech and language therapy; hearing aid and support services (i.e. tutor and notetaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90 dB</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Part-time or full-time special education classes; speech and language training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 + dB</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Special education program; mainstreaming/inclusion possible; use of intelligible conversational speech highly unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Paul & Jackson (1993)
interpersonal situations, despite the fact that they may, objectively, hear better than others (Berg & Fletcher, 1970).

Most normally developing children know a great deal about language and communication on entrance to school and have been communicating effectively with others in their environments for a number of years (Menyuk, 1983) Although there are areas of structural knowledge which remain to be acquired by them, substantial knowledge and competence exists in all aspects of language: pragmatics, semantics, syntax, and morpho-phonology (Menyuk, 1988). This competence in communication has been achieved by normally developing children in their native language regardless of ethnic or socio-economic status (Ervin-Tripp, 1971). In contrast, most severe-to-profoundly hearing impaired children enter preschool, kindergarten or first grade with few, if any, language patterns; little, if any speech; and, all too frequently, practically no means of meaningful communication. Children with non-significant hearing for the sounds around them have usually missed out on that invaluable early interpersonal communication (Davis & Silverman, 1970; Bloom & Lahey, 1978, Ling, 1976). Although it has been documented that children labeled hard-of-hearing have significant difficulty with both structural and language-in-context skills (Elfenbein, Hardin-Jones, & Davis, 1994). Yet, generally speaking, the more severe the hearing impairment, the more severe the resulting communication difficulty.

Clinical versus Cultural Perspectives

There are bipolar philosophical perspectives that determine how individuals and issues are viewed with regard to hearing impairment.
Awareness, sensitivity and proclaimed orientation regarding these views are crucial for the researcher of deafness issues. These two metatheories are usually considered as the clinical and cultural perspectives of deafness. The preceding paragraph includes statements that describe the loss of hearing in a way that can be identified with the clinical perspective. Deafness, from a clinical perspective, is defined in terms of deviancy, deficiency and need. Terms such as "deprivation," "limitation," "disorder," "inferiority" are employed. Myklebust (1960), a major adherent of this viewpoint, suggested that in addition to the physiological loss of hearing, the psychological development and abilities of deaf individuals were qualitatively different from those of normal-hearing peers. The "DIS" in the word disability is emphasized. Clinical and educational professionals who ascribe to this metatheory, and most do so unwittingly, labor to remedy these perceived deficiencies. Their aim is to "fix" the deafness and to have individuals with hearing impairments function more like normal-hearing people. In the strictest sense, any proposition or inquiry that frames deafness in light of incompetence, inadequacy or inability—no matter how meritorious, is clinical in orientation. This clinical perspective has greatly dominated the research on deafness (see Paul & Quigley, 1990).

Commentators who adopt the cultural perspective believe that deafness should be regarded as ethnic orientation—native and natural. They believe that the skills, behaviors, and lives of deaf people should not be evaluated in the context of differences from the mainstream and from normal-hearing perspectives. Lane (1988, cited in Paul & Jackson, 1993) compared the relationship between hearing experts and deaf people with the situation that existed between Africans and their European colonizers.
He suggested that the best way to remedy the *deafness-as-deficit* clinical metatheory was to involve people from within the deaf culture in professional activities and research.

Paul and Jackson (1993) have promoted a "developmental-interactive" metatheory in regard to formal deliberations about deafness. This means understanding deafness from a number of perspectives involving both hearing and deafness norms. This "developmental-interactive" viewpoint is adopted as a metatheory for this study of communicative competence and classrooms for the hearing impaired. While it is true that I, as researcher, identified, described, and formally addressed concerns regarding communication patterns in self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired, it did not necessarily follow that these patterns resulted from participant behaviors which are qualitatively or quantitatively different from those observed in regular education classrooms.

**Educational Challenges for the Person with Hearing Impairment**

The challenges for the education system are great. Each child has individual differences in his or her needs for the development of language and communication, emotional well-being, social competency, and academic and vocational skills. Despite the energy with which people have designed and revised curricula and debated the merits of particular education methods; despite the fact that teachers and communication disorders specialists have extended themselves providing endless hours of instruction, drill, structured language programs and carry-over assignments; despite sophisticated hearing aids and most recently, expensive cochlea implant procedures—*most students with severe-to-
profound hearing impairments continue to experience significant problems with interpersonal communication. Post graduate longitudinal studies from Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf report that after years of speech therapy, auditory training, discussion groups, situational role-plays, and so on, "graduates possess good manual and technical skills, work independently, but are functionally illiterate and do not relate to others, especially in regard to communicating with normal hearing persons" (NTID, 1985). The degree of difficulty seems to be directly related to levels of inexperience in a variety of person-to-person contexts (NTID, 1985; Longhurst & Grubb, 1974; Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1980). Oliver Sacks (1989) claims:

It is impossible to acquire language by oneself: this skill comes in a unique category. While it is impossible to acquire language without some essential innate ability, this ability is only activated by another person who already possesses linguistic power and competence. It is only through transaction with another that the language is achieved.

This notion of transaction is not new. It was referred to as "negotiation" by Vygotsky (1962) and "learning the language game" by Wittgenstein (1953). Specifically, if hearing impaired children are not given opportunities to assume authority in language (Milroy & Milroy, 1985) as students and in life outside of and beyond schooling--these students will routinely miscommunicate across verbal modes: through the air (speaking or signing and listening or receiving signed communication), through reading and writing, and through nonverbal cues (Galvin & Book, 1985). Some continue to be motivated to take social risks, struggling through interpersonal and group interactions and literacy activities.
Others, through years of negative reinforcement and social penalties from others, withdraw from the challenge and propositionality of formal communication situations and are drawn to the security of culturally homogenous informal peer groups (Kelly & Subtelny, 1978). The process of learning how to negotiate communicatively is the very process by which one enters a culture (Bruner, 1986). For example, the unsuccessful communicator who is hearing impaired may be an outsider to the cafeteria culture at work, to the witness or jury culture of a courtroom, to the small-talk culture of a cocktail party. Recent surveys show that, even in formal interaction situations with those who are proficient in their language abilities, style and mode of communication, individuals with severe-to-profound hearing impairments experience varying degrees of difficulty in approaching these interactions and subsequently, negotiating meanings (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1990).

The Assessment of Communicative Competence: Metalinguistic vs. Communicative Performance

It would be an understatement to say that there has been, in the practice of special education, great disparity with the notion of communicative competence—how it is understood, how it is assessed and valued. Communicative competence is traditionally defined as the composite adequacy of message transmission in social context (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989). Most often, a communication skills assessment is conducted via the clinical orientation. The student is assessed outside of the classroom and other naturalistic environments. Speech and language skills are sampled through formal assessment measures. Popular
assessment protocols are really metalinguistic measures of how well a student responds to discrete "word" bound elicitation tasks, such as supplying morphological inflections on words, offering a word for a defining phrase, articulating a targeted sound, repeating a sentence, and the like. Some tests sample several behaviors in subtests. Damico (1990) refers to these assessment designs as modular.

Teachers in classrooms most often target language content and form parameters. They are most concerned with the characteristics of spoken language that have high correlation to reading and writing and math abilities—receptive and expressive vocabulary (which includes the understanding of English idioms), linguistic comprehension, word order, and morphological inflections of words. Implicit in the emphasis on the three Rs is the assumption that every child learns oral and printed language in the same way and at the same rate; school curricula are heavily weighted with assumptions about linguistic proficiency that severely handicap the child who is labeled "language-disordered."

The heavy reliance on purely linguistic methods for teaching literacy is reflected in the way that particular programs are frequently eliminated from school programs: art, physical education, music, drama. Such cuts reflect another implicit assumption, namely that linguistic proficiency is the only means by which children can achieve literacy. Thus, teachers and specialists make diagnostic generalizations of a student's level of "communicative competence" based solely on the results of the administration of a tool designed to focus on a few segments of decontextualized behaviors. It is paradoxical that traditionally, whether hearing or deaf, students' classroom success is directly related to the ability
to decontextualize. Decontextualization is defined as "decreasing dependence on perceptible context of setting" (Garvey, 1982, in Wallach & Miller, 1988). It is not surprising that the current thrust in language intervention, as it applies to academic success, is to help children develop organizational patterns that require compliance to the rigid behavioral expectations of most classrooms. It is a popular belief that becoming literate and learning how to learn implies that students have the ability to manage large amounts of linguistic information in effective ways, the ability to express what is known, and the ability to record information for future use as is required in the culture of the school. It appears that the primary thrust of collaborative language intervention programs is to help children and adolescents with language, learning and reading disabilities to become enculturated by learning how to play the schooling game--staying in one's seat, raising one's hand, lining up, giving brief answers, and learning mnemonic facts by rote. Little regard is given to the adequacy of communication skills which would be considered to be of high demand and high frequency outside the classroom walls. Students need to communicate effectively when walking in the corridor, explaining tardiness, visiting the principal's office, or appearing in front of a disciplinary team. They also need to be empowered to use effective interpersonal skills in a variety of out-of-school contexts in the years that follow formal education.

**Structural versus Natural Language Approaches for the Hearing Impaired**

Historically and internationally, educators of the hearing impaired have focused on structural or bottom-up approaches in the teaching of
language and communication skills (Hubbard, 1867; Peet, 1869; Bell, 1872; Fitzgerald, 1929; Nelson, 1947). Their emphases were on the development of speech intelligibility and English grammatical forms in highly structured drill contexts. Language has been taught as an academic subject area for drill, and memorization of rules and grammatical forms have dominated. Typically, students have been removed from native and community environments and placed in state residential institutions for intensive study of English grammatical forms, speech, and academic subjects. Their environments have been further restricted by submission to pull-out speech and language tutoring service delivery models. That is, most often the students, individually, are removed from the classroom by the specialist teacher and escorted away to a small, isolated therapy/resource room—often facetiously called a broom closet. The student is either seen one-on-one with a clinician or in a small intervention group (Miller, 1991). In general, the specialist implements a rigid behavior modification program aimed towards increasing the accuracy of communication skills.

Individual education plans are written, featuring a list of discrete, decontextualized and sometimes discordant goals, objectives, and facilitations. Again, skills are taught unnaturally, in segmented and sharply distinguishable precision teaching units. For example, during the first part of the session, the speech therapist may drill phrase structure grammar (i.e., noun phrase + verb to be + adjective), may then proceed to vocabulary drills, and may conclude with question formation. Even when the communication disorders specialists declare that students are in "carryover" and ready to generalize targeted skills in the classroom and other settings, they (the therapists) have usually monitored only
decontextualized behaviors and the desired socially acceptable behaviors are never evidenced in everyday situations.

There is a growing understanding that speech and language clinicians may have many skills to share in the regular classroom setting. Their training and experience have provided superior skill in language and communication focus, an appreciation and awareness for individual differences in learning, and motivational techniques (Ferguson, 1991; Wadle, 1991). However, this phenomenon of role release has not been related to the classroom as a cultural, communicative entity. Most communication skills specialists who collaborate in classrooms still isolate the individual student's strengths and weaknesses and find all problems within the child (Wadle, 1991). Only recently have a few researchers begun to develop classroom-based assessment and intervention programs which focus on contextual influences particularly salient to the language-learning challenged student, especially in regards to the teacher's communication behaviors, expectations for students and the structuring of interactions (Blank, 1986; 1988; Wallach & Miller, 1988). They realize that there are many variables within the classroom that influence language-learning decisions. Bruner (1983) suggested that communication behaviors always go together in the learning and use of language, and stressed that it is not language, but language use that must be studied.

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, methods for teaching the deaf gradually began to shift from highly structured patterns to more natural approaches for language development. European practitioners of more natural methods included Watson (1829); Tarra of Italy (1869); Hill (1850); Nelson (1947). In America, leaders like Gallaudet (1817)
concentrated on sign language, whereas Mildred Groht (1933; 1977) presented the idea of language as evolving out of natural and meaningful interactions. Her progressive ideas suggesting the acquisition of language for the hearing impaired occurred through meaningful conversations and discussions in real situations, writings of various types, and academic and skill areas of curriculum are cornerstones for the ecological approach to communicative competence held in this study. Other supporters of models of language through natural experiences followed. In 1978, Kretschmer and Kretschmer introduced a remedial language development program which included pragmatics—programming for context appropriate language. This approach has been developed more recently by McAnally, Rose and Quigley (1994).

**Whole Language Philosophy**

Most recently, programs for the hearing impaired have capitalized on the use of the whole language philosophy which presents language development as a complex of top-down processes. In the 1960's, developmental language research and theory became more integrated (Brown & Bellugi, 1964; Bruner, 1960; Vygotsky, 1962), and the movement later labeled "whole language" emerged. In the mid 1970's professionals began to develop what had come to be termed as "unified theories of language" (Bloom & Lahey, 1978; Goodman, 1984). Language was described as it operates throughout an individual's experiences whether they be social, emotional, linguistic, musical or mathematical. Assessment/intervention models based on this theory generally include the evaluation of an individual's language use within a variety of
interpersonal situations and functions of print. Following this lead, during the 1980's, many professionals argued for more social considerations to be included in the delivery of services in the education setting (Bloom, 1978; Bates, 1976; Simon, 1990). Deaf education specialists are joining the ranks of these whole language proponents. Ewoldt (1993) reports that deaf children who have the opportunity to benefit from the holistic paradigm of the whole language philosophy can draw on past knowledge to predict messages while reading with minimal attention to the print. The argument against whole language claims that this approach prohibits isolated attention to language structure and the drilling of subskills (Chaney, 1990 as cited in Shapiro, 1992). Likewise, some researchers in deaf education Dolman (1992) offered the view that some deaf children would be better served by the traditional transmission teaching models based on drills and basal readers rather than by the whole language approach. Etwoldt argues against an interactional or eclectic approach in the education of the hearing impaired in regards to whole language and transmission teaching, saying that the holistic paradigm and the reductionistic paradigm do not mix (Etwoldt, 1993). She further supports the adoption of the whole language philosophy in deaf education with the following:

The current recognition of whole language in deaf education programming has great application to the present study in that process drama may be considered to be highly compatible with this holistic philosophy. (Wagner, 1988)
Traditional Role-Play Techniques and the Education of Students with Hearing Impairment and Other Exceptionalities

Some education programs for the hearing impaired follow the NTID Interpersonal Communication Program protocol. The main focus here is the acquisition of metalinguistic skills and the facilitation of communication strategies and prosocial skills, conversation moves, repair strategies, nonverbal behaviors, and social register, through teacher-led group discussions and situational role plays (NTID, 1985). A newer program, Daily Dilemmas (McCracken & Wiig, 1991), instructs the teacher on using and developing rehearsed conversation scripts. The authors present this program as an instructional vehicle which would call for students with special needs to use several modalities to maximize their comprehension of social situations. Students interact through social drama which uses role-playing, where the players (actors) present very brief, teacher written, and rehearsed skits to an audience in order to demonstrate real life experiences. Quite often in these programs, collaborative whole language strategies are infused, blending speaking and listening (or signing) and reading and writing.

Traditional Classroom versus Communicative Discourse and Issues that Remain Unsolved

These natural, ecological, whole-language, and situational role play methods have proven to be valuable in the improvement of language skills. Although considerable success has been documented with these programs, many students continue to be unsuccessful “through the air” communicators when outside of the safe confines of the self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired students. Even in their safe
environments and even with the whole language approaches that their teachers use religiously, they struggle with communicative functions and conversation moves as well as with much of the meaning from curriculum offerings.

Douglas Barnes (1992) in his book, *From Communication to Curriculum*, described the patterns of talk in the traditional schooling "game" for regular education students. He, and many others, have observed that the scripts of most regular classroom subcultures hold some rigid expectations of who says what to whom and when (Simon, 1979; Bloom & Lahey, 1978; Menyuk, 1983; Wells, 1986; Atwell, 1987; Booth & Thornley-Hall, 1991). Wiig and Semel (1980) provided a good description of the changing demands as children advance in their schooling. These authors noted that during preschool, programming favorably emphasizes sensorimotor, language, social and emotional growth. In the primary grades, there is a shift to perceptive-cognitive strategies. During the intermediate and upper elementary grades, linguistic and symbolic skills are emphasized—at the expense of communicative system development. Recall of basic academic skills is important. In middle and high school, teachers will frequently "progress" to the presentation of course content through long lectures. Their students are usually restricted to teacher-directed and initiated question-answer-evaluation paradigm (Hymes, 1977; Saville-Troike, 1982). Student initiation, hesitation, and negotiation are often punished (Booth & Thornley, 1991). For example, in the school scenario, the consequence for "talking-out" behavior is often disciplinary action.
School is a verbal game. Social adeptness is expected; yet, it is strongly paradoxical that the integration of communicative competence skills is rarely regarded explicitly in curriculum planning and development. What is missing are significant opportunities to use flexible reasons for talking: to signal, to interpret (Paul & Jackson, 1993) to hypothesize, to talk aloud, or to use exploratory talk (Barnes, 1976). Children do not get to practice the vital roles that are characteristic of increasing independence, self-responsibility, maturity, such as authority-taking, negotiating the terms of a contract or tendering messages with sensitive content (Milroy & Milroy, 1985; Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Booth, 1987).

The latest strategies have a theoretical basis in what are termed ecologically valid paradigms (MacDonald, 1990; Damico, 1990). The students' language and communication growths are said to be realized with the adult's natural encouragements from a variety of generalized natural contexts. However, students' roles in the naturalistic and ecological programs presently in place in some classrooms, are non-variable in terms of contextual orientations. No matter how much they interact, students are continuously framed with their therapist/teacher and communication partners in the "here and now." They have no opportunity to take the perspective of another, to switch or transcend social register, age, status, cultural identifications, and the like.

There is little evidence in the literature that suggests that educators of the deaf, working directly with the hearing impaired students in the classroom or in pull-out services, formally address communicative competency—the composite adequacy of message transmission in social context (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989; Sacks, 1989). Teachers and speech
and language pathologists seldom formally and purposefully examine and teach sociolinguistic interactions in their classrooms. There are those students who implicitly know and understand the rules and can "play the game," "pull it all together" and survive academically and socially in school, and subsequently, be flexible, beyond schooling, in adult roles. Those who do not grasp these rules and do not follow the inherent scripts (rituals, routines, schema) fail in varying degrees. They do not grow out of their language-in-context problems naturally.

**Communicative Competence and Psychosocial Aspects of Deafness**

In examining the role of communicative competence in deafness, one cannot ignore the relationship between communicative competence and psychosocial aspects of deafness. Researchers have pinpointed a direct relationship between socio-emotional and personal skills and verbal and nonverbal interactions between deaf children and significant others (Paul & Jackson, 1993). Many have commented on the impact of deafness on personal, emotional and social development (Levine, 1981). Until recently, most attention was placed on psychosocial aspects in light of problem behaviors and to the quality and quantity of interactions relative to the mode of communication (sign or speech). More recently, though, there have been formal acknowledgments that it is the emotional quality of interpersonal interchange which most affects the personality and behavior of the deaf child and that emotions regulate the direction, expression, and intensity of behavior (Paul & Jackson, 1993). There is also a correlation between communication adeptness, self concept and locus of control. Years of experience in the education of children with hearing impairments have
led me to believe that there is a reciprocal masking effect between psychosocial aspects and communication behaviors. This reciprocity has also been found to be salient in considerations of normal-hearing students. The scripts of traditional classroom discourse do not allow students to initiate expressions about personal feelings, concerns, opinions and interests. Even when students are asked, "What do you think . . .?" or "How do you feel about . . .?", the actual intent of the teacher is to verify the student's recall of previously read or related information. Likewise, there is no provision for the teacher to express emotion outside of disciplining students or evaluating a response. When feelings are expressed, by chance or mishap, there is the risk of unintended disclosure and unease.

It seems that one approach which may offer an advantage for authentic and flexible language experience in the classrooms is process drama. Process drama or drama in education is a medium of communicative discourse in the classroom that is reciprocally inhibitive to the constraints of traditional discourse. It has been proven to be a most effective approach in developing language facility and flexibility.

**Drama in Education - Interacting Purposefully in Role**

Drama may be the most appropriate means for making available the types of speaking and listening situations that neither administrators, teachers, nor curriculum guides currently provide. Drama in education is a mode of learning through which pupils, alongside their teacher, actively identify with imagined roles and situations in drama. They learn to explore issues, events, and relationships (O’Neill & Lambert, 1989; O’Neill, 1995) and this exploration implies interaction, articulation and
communication. Most important to this task are the complexities of human relationships, which are distinguished by interpersonal communication behaviors. Language is at the heart of the drama process and the means through which the drama is realized (O'Neill, 1982). Several studies have shown that drama improves oral language (Smilansky, 1968; Johnson & O'Neill, 1983; Wagner, 1988; O'Neill & Lambert, 1989). It facilitates a wide variety of language uses in contexts which require full participation within an affective/cognitive frame, promoting types of talk important in encouraging deep-level thought processes, such as: expatiation, negotiation, clarification, explanation, persuasion, and prediction (Booth, 1987; O'Neill & Rogers, 1991). The child in drama is inside language. Because drama provides role situations different from those available in traditional classroom scripts, a variety of intents registers, and qualities of language can be released more effectively (Stabler, 1978). In a process drama program, children are free to use language for a variety of communicative intents rarely available in the typical classroom: planning, speculating, predicting, storytelling, sequencing, narrating, interviewing, questioning, persuading, reporting, giving details, reasoning, challenging, criticizing, evaluating and reflecting (O'Neill & Lambert, 1984; Booth, 1987).

In planning and implementing drama, the teacher pays attention to the variety of communicative occasions available to her and to her students. Interactions are structured which are designed to elicit assertive pro-social behaviors—focusing on social intents and conversation moves. The students, in response, begin to manipulate their own language at both the conscious and unconscious levels. While they are speaking, they are
monitoring what they are saying, why they are saying it, and how they are saying it. They are motivated. They rise to the occasion, not just because the teacher demands it. Only five percent of our children are motivated that way (Heathcote, in Johnson & O'Neill, 1984) but in response to the demands and rewards of drama. The students are driven by the shared commitment to the "as-if" tasks and the vital personal urgencies inside the drama.

The use of drama is not a panacea. Drama programming should be incorporated with other holistic approaches. It is not a fly-by-night venture. Planning for and guiding dramatic action is challenging work. Its implementation requires high level skills in developing worthwhile objectives, finding appropriate starting points, and negotiating meanings; thinking on the feet and providing flexible structures which will support true communicative competence and the exploration of meanings among students and teachers (O’Neill, 1988; Christie, 1990).

The Purpose of the Study

The intent of this study was to observe and analyze discourse behavior in through-the-air turn-taking communicative interactions in classrooms for the hearing impaired under two conditions or phases: (1) during typical lessons, and (2) during lessons using process drama. This study examined the effects that process drama may have on communicative competence among students in classrooms for the hearing impaired.
Research Questions

The major questions guiding the study were as follows:

1. What are the characteristics of typical classroom talk for students and teachers in each of four self-contained classrooms for students who are hearing impaired, with regard, primarily, to the following three levels of participation?
   a) The communicative nature of discourse for the overall lesson or event.
   b) Conversation moves (initiating, maintaining, turn-taking, repairing, and closing).
   c) Communication functions in conversational exchanges (across the ritualization, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining categories).
   d) Social register (level of formality dependent on contextual cues).

2. Are restrictive, inflexible talk routines which are evidenced in regular education classrooms observed in any of the typical discourse of classrooms for the hearing impaired included in this investigation?

3. Is there evidence of some pro-active or compensatory communication strategies already in place, on the part of the teacher, for optimal communicative competency in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

4. What are the characteristics of classroom talk for students and teachers in each of the self-contained classrooms for the hearing
impaired when process drama is the learning mode, in relationship to the following levels of participation?

a) The communicative nature of the overall lesson or event.
b) Conversation moves (initiating, questioning, maintaining, turn-taking, repairing, and closing).
c) Communication acts and intents in conversational exchanges (across the ritualization, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining functions).

5. Does the use of process drama have a positive influence on the manifestations of the communicative competence of students and/or teachers in any of the four classrooms studied? Is it possible to discern and analyze differences in the two conditions observed in Phase I and Phase II of the study?

6. Are the functions and behaviors of teachers significantly altered when drama is the mode of interaction?

7. If behaviors during drama are different or superior, are there particular drama strategies which appear to lend themselves well to competence in communication in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

8. Is there a competence/performance gap in the consideration of communicative competence behaviors in the classroom, or is there evidence of a psychology of deafness as it applies to language in context abilities?
Significance of the Study

This study and its results contribute significantly to the theoretical and practical knowledge in the fields of Deaf Education, Speech and Hearing Science, and Drama in Education. The analysis and interpretation of discourse patterns with and without the use of drama are consequential to all educators concerned with excellence and authenticity in the practices of teaching and learning. No other studies have been identified that address these particular concerns.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The primary metatheoretical basis underlying the initial orientation of this study of communicative competence is illustrated in Figure 2. This is a revised from and contrasted with the traditional conceptual view of the interaction of variables influencing communicative competence held by most speech communication disorders and educational specialists (Ohio Handbook for the Identification, Evaluation and Placement of Children with Language Problems, 1991) (see Figures 1 & 2).

Specific assumptions guiding this study include the following:

- Metatheoretical assumptions for the study follow Paul and Jackson's developmental-interactive model.
- This study arose from concerns encountered in the practice and advocacy of collaborative service delivery for teachers and speech-language pathologists in classrooms for the deaf and hard-of-hearing.
- My experience as a licensed and certified speech and language pathologist for 17 years and as a certified teacher of the deaf for 10 years
in educational and clinical settings qualified me to make relative judgments about the kinds of communication observed in classrooms for the deaf.

- Communicative competence is regarded as the integration of, not the intersection of, communicative content, form and use (see Figure 2).
- Communicative competence, as observed in the classroom, is a contextualized, collective and interactive concept. That is, any judgment made should be ecological, in that it reflects a complex contextual responsibility for communicative competence which implicates not only the student, but the teacher, the setting, the opportunity–classroom culture as a whole.
- Nonverbal behavior must be included with verbal behaviors in the determination of communicative competence. Nonverbal behavior contributes as much as 90% of meaning and feeling in face-to-face interactions (Gavin & Book, 1978).
- Hard-of-hearing students have educational and communication challenges which are just as great as those of the severely-to-profoundly hearing impaired student.
- Students learn best when learning is activity and experience based and they are involved in their own learning.
- Process drama is a very effective mode for the realization of language growth as well as for academic and affective objectives.
- Even teachers with very minimal training in this approach can facilitate successful drama lessons.
INTERACTION OF LANGUAGE COMPONENTS
(Traditional View)

originally conceptualized in Language Development and Language
Disorders (Bloom & Lahey, 1978, pp. 22, 291) and later referenced in
The Ohio Handbook for the Identification, Evaluation, and Placement
of Children With Language Problems (The Ohio Statewide Language
Task Force and the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Special
Education, 1991, p. 11)

Meaning of words
phrases, clauses and
sentences

Structure of language

Use and purpose of language

The shaded area indicates that language competence is the
integration of skills related to content, form, and use.

Figure 1. Traditional View of Language Competence
The layered design suggests complexity and integration as opposed to intersection of communication parameters which comprise communicative competence. Arrows indicate dynamism, contextuality, interrelatedness. The medial dot spindling the discs represents the idea of centeredness and effectiveness in communication. The netting effect represents the relationship of binding nonverbal behaviors which serve to inflect, to enlighten, to illuminate, to support or to confuse, to conceal and to override.

Figure 2. Reconceptualized View of Language/Communicative Competence
The limitations of the study included the fact that only four classrooms were studied; observations of typical classroom discourse were limited and there were small groups of students in each classroom. Perhaps the single most significant limitation of this study was that the teachers were not experts in implementing drama approaches. They had received very limited training and relied to some extent on the researcher for guidance. However, even within these limitations, this study holds to strong implications that the use of drama in hearing-impaired classrooms was both valid and worthwhile.

**Summary**

In this chapter, the problem of the inadequacy of opportunity for developing and using communicative competence skills in classrooms for the hearing impaired was addressed. Traditional approaches to teaching the hearing impaired students were discussed and drama was proposed as a viable approach for improving the basis of "through the air" communication in the classroom. Research questions, assumptions and limitations were outlined. Chapter II contains a review of literature relevant to classroom discourse, the education of the hearing impaired and drama in education. Chapter III describes the methodology of study. Chapter IV provides an analysis of the findings of the study and Chapter V contains conclusions and implications for future research in the area.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, I reflect on what has been documented in the literature in relation to the three conceptual areas of this study: process drama, classroom discourse, and the communication challenges of the hearing impaired. To date, there has been no reference found in the literature that describes an investigation of the relationship between process drama and communicative competence with the hearing impaired population. I felt it necessary to bring to discussion individual elements of the whole. The areas reviewed in this chapter are: Communicative Competence, Typical Classroom Talk, Communicative Competence and Language Learning in Classrooms for the Hearing Impaired, Dramatic Activity and Language Learning with Exceptional Children, Dramatic Activity and the Hearing Impaired Learner, Process Drama as a Mode of Learning, Process Drama and Language Learning, Process Drama and Second Language Learning and Process Drama with the Exceptional Learner.
Communicative Competence

Historically, teachers and therapist, in their endeavors to help children develop their spoken and written language abilities, have given attention to decontextualized language skills only. They targeted either word order or vocabulary skills, or articulation as if they were independently occurring characteristics.

In the last 20-25 years, language theorists have moved the emphasis of language development away from segmentals: sound, word, sentence levels. Included now is the study of language in its socio-cultural context (Searle, 1969; Bates, 1976; Ervin-Tripp, 1977; Ochs, 1983; Milroy, 1985; Wallach & Miller, 1988; Creaghead, 1989; Schiefelbusch, 1991; Simon, 1991; Damico, 1992). Other labels given to this area of linguistic inquiry include ethnography of communication (Gumperez & Hymes, 1972), sociolinguistics (Labov, 1972), and conversational analysis (Turner, 1974). Pragmatics, language in context, has also emerged from this movement (Bates, 1976; Moerk, 1977; Searle, 1991; McTear, 1992). Initially, researchers began to talk about pragmatics as an explanation for the role of context in the execution and comprehension of sentences. The initial intent of this movement was to entertain the notion of social intent in order to understand what was regarded at the time as more vital issues related to linguistic processing (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978). Sociolinguistics is not to be considered a separate discipline from phonology and grammar and meaning—linguistic processing. Variability of the structure of language has been shown to be directly related to contextual and social parameters such as gender, age, and setting (Hymes, 1970, 1974; Halliday, 1975). The
metatheoretical bases for the notion of communicative competence held in my research (illustrated in Figure 2), arise out of this interactive description of language in context.

In the 1960s, developmental language research and theory became more integrated (Brown & Bellugi, 1964; Bruner, 1960; Vygotsky, 1962), and the movement later labeled "whole language" emerged. Most recently, programs have capitalized on the use of the whole language philosophy which presents language development as a complex of top-down processes. In the mid-1970s professionals began to develop what have come to be termed unified theories of language (Bloom & Lahey, 1978; Goodman, 1984). Language was described as it operates throughout an individual's experiences whether these are social, emotional, linguistic, musical, or mathematical. Assessment/intervention models based on this theory generally included the evaluation of an individual's language use within a variety of activities aimed at improving literacy. Children are surrounded with print, integrating literacy into all areas of the curriculum, emphasizing the social functions of print. Following this lead, during the 1980s, many professionals argued for more social considerations for the delivery of services in the education setting (Bloom, 1978; Bates, 1976; Simon, 1990). Current objectors to this whole language philosophy claim that it prohibits needed attention to language structure and drilling of subskills (Chaney, 1990, cited in Shapiro, 1992).
The Speech Act View

Speech act theorists (Austin, 1962; Cohen, 1974; Searle, 1969, 1975 in Kretschmer, 1978) introduced the notion that each utterance produced by a speaker has an underlying communicative intent. The speaker's reason for talking is called the *illocutionary* force of the utterance. The listener's perception of the utterance is called the *perlocutionary* force of the utterance. The distinction made is an important one in that often what a speaker intends the listener to understand may not always be received that way. In many cases, the intent of an utterance is not expressed in the surface structure of the utterance, but it is implicit. It exists within "the deep structure" (Searle, in Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978). There have been various coding systems for the expression of speech acts, communication intents, and communication functions. According to Clark and Clark (1977), speech acts are categorized as either declarative (tell), interrogative (ask), request (order), expressive (feel), and commissive (promise). The speech act view has been widely supported in research and practices.

The Dramatic View

One view of how communication competence develops, the dramatic view, holds that all social behavior can be interpreted as a dramatic performance (Goffman, 1959). According to this view, children strive to become effective actors who can take the role of any character through imitation and can modify their actions to reflect the ways in which they
want to be perceived. Several "characters" become part of the speaker's repertory of verbal communication. This dramatic view is most relevant to the consideration of communication development in early childhood, where imitation and role-play are an essential element in the child's linguistic and social growth.

The Co-orientation Approach

This approach views communication as a co-orientation process. From this perspective, the communicators are involved in a cooperative, problem-solving effort. Each person is assumed to take the other's perspective in order to reach shared objectives for the interaction (Wiig & Bray, 1984).

The Categorical View

The categorical view proposes that the acquisition of communicative competence involves a categorization process (Hymes, 1970; Wood, 1980, in Wood & Bray, 1984). Communication mates have to perceive and categorize social situations and acquire appropriate ways of speaking in order to be successful communicators. Communicative competence would be considered to be acquired when an underlying set of appropriateness rules which are determined by culture and situation are mastered. Some categories for early language development might include: "be quiet," "be polite," "be forceful," "be careful," and "be concerned" (Wood, in Wiig & Bray, 1984). Wiig and Bray (1984) postulated that difficulties in interpersonal communication may be helped by considering the behaviors
in terms of the Hymes perspective. One method of coding communication that is based on the categorical view is the Parametric Approach.

**The Parametric Approach**

The parametric approach, proposed by Wells in 1973 (in Wigg & Bray, 1984) categorizes speech acts within each of five major functions of communication: ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining. Each speech act is further categorized with regard to the intent of the speech act.

**The Let's Talk Protocol**

Wigg and Bray (1984) developed their Let's Talk program based on the categorical view theories and Wells's parametric approach to categorization of speech acts. They said that the variety of intents could be divided into five broad categories: ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining. A brief description of these categories follows:

- Ritualizing is defined as communication which is specific to social, religious, or cultural context. It includes expressions that add little or no meaning to the utterance, but help in social transitions and appropriateness.
- Informing functions are information giving and getting, usually declaratives, questions, and answers.
- Controlling functions include intents that are aimed at getting the conversation partner to accommodate himself to the speaker's demands.
• Feeling functions include intents that are expressions of emotions or reactions to attitudes or feelings.
• Imagining is a function that has more recently been acknowledged.

When a person uses an intent in this category, ideas are expressed about that which does not presently exist in reality.

Wigg and Bray acknowledged the complexity of the considerations of communicative intent. Specifically, there could be more than one intent and/or function in an utterance or conversation turn. It is quite common for an utterance to have a secondary intent tagging after or embedded in a primary one. Respective examples of these are provided, from the data.

Teacher: OK (ritualization through summoning attention). So the boy three times cried wolf (informing through providing fact). Was there really a wolf? (informing through asking for information) . . .. The value is, if you lie, lie, lie, then people will not believe you (feeling through expressing a belief). You will start with your stories tomorrow (controlling through commanding).

Sometimes the surface structure and the intent are highly contrasting or contradictory. For example, in formal interactions, when a statement is not understood, the receiver will respond, for example:

Teacher: "I'm sorry."

This statement, considered out of context, might be labeled as a feeling function/with apology intent. In context, it should be understood differently:
Student: "I saw... (unintelligible)"

Teacher: "I'm sorry?"

"I'm sorry" here has an indirect illocutionary intent of a ritualization through polite form and a request for clarification.

Miscommunication can and does arise when the receiver does not understand the illocutionary function of an utterance for the reasons mentioned above. Without mastery of the concept of direct and indirect speech acts, communication is often seriously disrupted. The student must master the speech act aspect of communicative competence in order to achieve effective receptive and expressive message transmission.

Communication partners make certain assumptions about each other and about the communication situation. These assumptions are referred to by linguists as presuppositions or implicatures (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978). These presuppositions determine the communicative constructions that the individuals will select and use as well as the sophistication of presentation and of the information content. The phenomenon of presupposition is crucial in that it allows adjustment to be made while the conversation exchange is happening (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978). Very similar presuppositions about the interests, awareness, and understanding, and commitments that the reader brings to and takes from the text are acknowledged in theories of engagement and response in reading (Enisco, 1991; Lemley, 1993; Warner, 1995).

The most popular arguments (Bates, 1976; Grice, 1975) for categories of presupposition suggest that there are three types of presuppositions: psychological, pragmatic, and semantic propositions. Most recent
investigations have referred to the label of "schema" to presuppositions that individuals hold regarding a variety of communicative contexts (Secord, 1991).

Other issues in the pragmatics of communication include organization of information and conversational constraints. Information Organization involves the ordering of information within sentences as it relates to comprehension and fluency of communication. Conversation constraints regulate such issues as turn-taking within discourse, the opening of conversations, the techniques used to change topics within discourse, and the closing of conversations (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978).

**Typical Classroom Talk**

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study, it is impossible to consider communicative competence concerns in the classroom without focusing on what communication is like among students and teachers in the classroom. It is not surprising that most of the investigators who have studied communicative competence also have focused on classroom talk patterns. In the last 20 years, there has been an increased acknowledgment of the significance of talk in the classroom for normal hearing students (Edwards & Furlong, 1978; Barnes, 1976; Green, 1983; Wells, 1986; Edwards, 1987; Hynds & Rubin, 1990). This interest has run parallel to that in related fields such as sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication and speech and hearing science (e.g., Halliday, 1978; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Saville-Troike, 1982; Hymes, 1974; Simon, 1991; Creaghead, 1992).
Essentially, communication is what schooling is about—the sharing and clarifying of meanings.

Creaghead has suggested that successful students learn communicative scripts which are accepted as normative behavior for the classroom (1991). Scripts are cognitive schema which facilitate the child's knowing what to say, when to say it, to whom and how to say it (Secord, 1990). Since most current classroom talk is teacher-dominated and directed, students learn that they are reinforced for sitting at their desks and only talking when and if they are acknowledged for talk turns by the teacher. Then, the talk is most often in the form of a response to teacher inquiry. This paradigm is structured as: (1) teacher's question (to which she already has a predetermined right answer or correct and preferred interpretation); (2) student's very brief response; and (3) the teacher's evaluation of the student's response (Marshall, 1987, 1989; O'Neill & Rogers, 1991). The repeated pattern is like the continuous cadence of a waltz: question/response/evaluation, 1/2/3, 1/2/3. With this pattern, student learning is compromised. There is little room for students' engagement, the building of their own arguments and responses, and the exploration of their own meanings and interpretations (O'Neill & Rogers, 1991).

In the best preschool and kindergarten programs, children are reinforced for being communicative. They are encouraged to talk together, negotiate and play together. Their agenda is action-packed (Hawkins, 1986). The children spend a lot of time and energy in dramatic role-playing, rehearsing adult roles and dilemmas spontaneously. Wallach and Miller
(1977) wrote that in school, most children become strictly metalinguistic somewhere around age six or seven. Olson (1977) added that this is precisely the time when most children begin to shift from contextualized to decontextualized language. At this time, teachers impose what they have been indoctrinated to believe is the form and function of real learning and the vehicle to literacy. Much of classroom talk, especially in language arts or English classes, revolves around fostering with the students an explicitly awareness about linguistic structures and how they are to be used or understood. Students are reinforced for being able to decontextualize. Most often, the quality of learning is defined by how well a student is able to use deductive reasoning and segmentation abilities. This conscious level of metalinguistic knowledge is demonstrated by participation in standardized testing, spelling tests, writing sentences from vocabulary words, or reciting grammatical rules. Miller (1986) arranged information about the developmental process of metalinguistic behavior to correspond with Piaget's stages of cognitive development. There is no argument that students need these metalinguistic skills in order to evaluate their effectiveness in social interactions. However, the problem is that after age six or seven, approximately at the school level of first or second grade, these skills are emphasized to the exclusion of real communicative experience and real conversations in the classrooms.

With the analysis of current classroom talk contexts have come suggestions for ways in which students can be given opportunities to engage in more meaningful talk, facilitating true student-centered learning environments in classrooms (Hynds & Rubin, 1990) and in particular to its
relationship to literacy (Wells, 1986). O’Neill and Rogers (1991) advocated that talk should be regarded as real classroom work, just as are reading and writing. What they say has great significance to the proposition of this study with the hearing impaired students.

It should be realized that talk will not only be important in achieving success in classroom activities, but will have great significance in the world outside school. Students often display different degrees of abilities in initiating and maintaining conversation and taking turns. They also take on, discriminate and exhibit different competencies in being able to focus their attention on ideas and follow narrative or train of argument while listening. These skills are essential for success in the world outside school, yet are seldom practiced, developed, or refined in classrooms where quiet or mere reiteration is the goal. (Rogers & O’Neill, 1992)

**Communicative Competence and the Learner with Hearing Impairment**

Much has been written regarding language code learning with the hearing impaired population. Most of this research has involved the teaching and learning of spoken language and language form for reading and writing skill development with the severely-to-profoundly hearing impaired students. In the last thirty years, many studies have dealt with the structural aspects of American Sign Language. Comparatively few systematic inquiries have been devoted to “through-the-air” communicative competence in the classroom. The natural language principles outlined by McAnally, Rose, and Quigley (1987; 1994, pp. 85-88) have a basic assumption, that is, children with hearing impairment develop language by progressing through stages and sequences in a manner
similar to hearing children. They presented several underlying principles which provide guidelines for language development:

1. Language involves interactions among the components of content, form, and use. This first principle emphasizes the notion that teachers must take into consideration more than form of language (syntactical and morphological rules). Children talk because they have something to say; unless children attach meanings to the words and structures, they may not carryover what they have learned out of the original context of instruction.

2. Information about normal language development is the basis for determining language goals and intervention strategies.

3. Language is learned through communication. Children acquire language comfortably and early in social setting in an unconscious manner. Young children acquire language because mature language users communicate with them. Communication is critical to language development.

4. Communicative competence is the ultimate goal of language development. The final assessment of the effectiveness of a language program is how well the students can communicate in various contexts and for various purposes.

Some educators of the hearing impaired have come to realize that even if the ideal were to occur in the development of the form and content
of language, if language in context remained disordered or dysfunctional, the person would be judged to be an unsuccessful communicator (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1980; NTID Longitudinal Study, 1985).

Only a few published studies have explored the development of communicative competence and pragmatics in hearing impaired children. Kretschmer and Kretschmer (1978) addressed the importance for all children, including hearing impaired children, of learning effective pragmatic skills, across the speech act, presupposition, informational organization, and conversational constraints. They expressed concern that only a few educational professionals, working either directly with the hearing impaired students in classrooms or in pullout programs, formally addressed communicative competence, acknowledging it as the composite adequacy of message transmission in conversation contexts. When they do, there is often a debate about which educational professional is responsible for developing these communicative competency skills with the students (Westby, 1991). Should the teacher, parent or speech pathologist be the one most liable for this development?

Skarakis and Frutting (1977) categorized language behaviors of four "oral deaf" preschool aged children into thirteen semantic functions and only eight communicative (pragmatic) functions. Their data on verbal (coded language) participation showed that pragmatic functions were inferior to semantic functions in number and quality, whereas the nonverbal (body language) data demonstrated that pragmatic behaviors exceeded semantic.
Rubin (1988) studied the communicative competence of preschool children with severe to profound hearing loss. Among the findings was the discovery that the subjects were resourceful in using context effectively in conversation interactions with peers only, especially in the use of nonverbal cues.

Meath et al. (1984) advocated keeping the purpose of communication before the learner in a notional-functional curriculum framework for deaf students. Clarke and Stewart (1986) reviewed eight English language stimulation approaches in the education of the hearing impaired: language stories and drills, Fitzgerald Key, the natural approach, patterning, programmed instruction, behavior modification, linguistic programs, and developmentally based programs. They proposed an approach that focuses on functional conversation skills, facilitative activities, an systematic real-world experience.

There are those who have advocated the use of the linguistic opportunities offered by everyday school routines in the improvement of communication skills in the deaf and hard of hearing. Luetke-Stahlman (1993) drew on the research findings of others who had investigated effective environmental language development strategies with children who were not hearing impaired. She suggested formally intervening by interrupting spontaneous interaction and rehearsing language structures with children while they were in natural contexts. For example, a teacher may prompt, "Show me your arm," reviewing the body part label while helping a child dress. Luetke-Stahlman suggested that as for hearing children, routines in the environment can be altered or disrupted,
"sabotaged" in her word, in order to create a need for functional language. Stahlman recommended Constable's (1983) three areas of environmental "sabotage" as (1) violation of a routine event; (2) withholding objects and turns; and (3) violation of object function or manipulation and hiding objects. Adults become "saboteurs" rather than "doers" for children:

...The adult mischievously excludes a child (from a group, in a line to leave the room, in a game while handing out materials, etc.) so that the student will have to perform some type of conversational act. For example, the child might make a request for attention, action, or information in order to have a turn or obtain an object that is crucial to completing some larger task. . .scissors can be taped together. . .a toddler can be sent to the wrong mommy. . .these type of events occur naturally in the home but may need to be created in the clinic or school situation.

Many of the strategies recommended by Luetke-Stahlman to encourage the child to use a variety of social functions (i.e., protest, warn, request attention), such as the ones excerpted above, appear to intrusively break the flow of natural conversation with children, some seem dishonest and potentially frightening and some border on blackmail, bribery, and punishment. Some overzealous parents and teachers may use these suggested strategies excessively and to the detriment of children and their self-esteem.

There have been studies which examine the use of American Sign Language in the Classroom as a facilitator for communicative competence, but the emphasis is generally toward improving English language and literacy skills. Livingston (1986) asserted that in order for deaf children to become literate in English, they must first drop to meaning making and
meaning sharing abilities. She believed that in order for this to happen, teachers would have to use the linguistic system that best represents meaning to deaf children, and that, she believed, would be ASL.

Laughton (1989) studied the population known as "learning disabled hearing impaired" and concluded that this population required different teaching strategies in order to improve structural language and communicative competence behaviors. Kretschmer (1989) investigated three primary strands of pragmatic theory and research in interpersonal communication of the hearing-impaired individuals: communication/speech act theory, conversational organization theory, and text/discourse-building theory. He concluded that neither current research nor educational practice suggests widespread acceptance of a communication focus in the education of hearing impaired children and discussed the relationship of language, thought, affect, and context as basic processes to reading and writing; reading and writing being viewed as social as well as cognitive acts.

Using a modification of the Flander's Interactive Scale, Craig and Collins (1970) observed that in classrooms for the hearing impaired, conversations tended to be dominated by the teacher, with few student-initiated communication attempts evident. No differences in teacher dominance were noted, regardless of the communication modality used or the grade level of the educational unit examined. Questioning and information were the two most frequently observed categories of communication employed by teachers, whether the lessons were language-dependent or consisted of other special subject instructions. The degree of
communication dominance by teachers raised the possibility that deaf students may not lack the ability to acquire mature communication competence, but simply do not get the chance to practice authentic communication or to initiate interactions in the classroom.

Lawson (1978) used an adaptation of the Craig and Collins (1970) procedure to observe five classes of intermediate-age deaf students. Student directive and student compliant behaviors were observed and reported. Results showed that these behaviors were of equal frequency. The most prevalent student-directed intent was informing, which usually consisted of offering information, ideas, or comments about ongoing topics. Following directions was the most frequently observed student-compliant communicative act. It was noted that the use of another's offerings to build the student's own ideas occurred infrequently. This finding suggested that deaf children do not actively integrate information into their own thinking, a strategy that might be considered the ultimate outcome of education.

Lawson's findings were in partial contradiction to Craig and Collins (1970) because teacher dominated communication was not observed. Lawson suggests that the reason may be that Craig and Collins used, in addition to intermediate age subjects, both primary and high school classrooms, where didactic methods might be employed on a more routine basis. Kretschmer was optimistic in the evaluation of Lawson's findings, suggesting that perhaps communication involvement patterns had improved in classes for the deaf from 1970 to 1978.
Wolff (1977) used a specially constructed scale, the **Cognitive Verbal/Nonverbal Scale** to investigate communication patterns in classes for the deaf. He looked at variables which included the use of various communication modes—fingerspelling, oral method, and total communication. Wolff found that although the teachers had received prior inservice training regarding child-centered and language supported instruction, the teachers of younger children tended to dominate conversations. However in classrooms with older deaf students, who were described as probably more sophisticated linguistically, student-initiated discourse was observed more frequently. The total communication classes tended to show more open communication that did the oral classes observed. The classes using the fingerspelling mode of communication were the least open in communication. It was not made clear if the investigators had determined the diversity of behaviors to be attributable to teacher style or to methodology of instruction. However, it is highly significant to this study of the effect of process drama on communicative competence that the content of conversations between the deaf students and their teachers in the Wolff (1977) study focused on memory work and classifying—metalinguistic skills—with little attention directed toward inference building. Essentially, although the communication was judged to be more open, the teachers tended not to encourage the use of communication to enhance the key areas of cognition, fluency in linguistic processing, and in verbal thinking.

Matthew and Reich (1993) expressed concern about constraints on communication in total communication classrooms for the deaf and the
relationship to academic achievement. It was observed that despite prolonged efforts to improve classroom communication methods for deaf students, their rate of educational achievement continued to lag behind that of hearing students. They identified two issues which might negatively impact upon communicative competence in classrooms for the deaf: (1) teacher's signing rate is usually halved, and (2) students do not look directly at teachers when critical information is being given. The findings suggested that even with well-trained teachers and relatively sophisticated students, the level of possible reception of transmitted messages is disappointingly low, somewhat below 50%. They suggested a number of strategies for overcoming these constraints. Although their study was published as recently as 1993, their specific suggestions startlingly oppose the naturalistic and ecological views and seem to support the transmission mode of learning.

If the teacher plans to transmit a substantial body of knowledge, then the data from our study suggests that effort be made to minimize student-to-student communication and to resist the tendency to sign directly to a particular student. The teacher must maintain awareness of all students and direct attention to herself. The effort may be aided by arranging seating in a way that minimizes the likelihood of student to student communication, as in a shallow 'v' shape. Although the transactional circle arrangement may be optimal for discussions, it may, in fact, detract from the teacher's ability to transmit or elaborate information.

Matthews and Reich further discourage face-to-face conversational interactions in the classroom with their second strategy. They suggested having the students communicate to each other via computer network called the ENFI program. The students and teacher take turns keying in messages which are shown with a scrolling display on a computer screen. The
students look at the screen, not each other. They can answer messages also. The researchers felt this approach might work since it removes the problem of deaf students seeing no more than 50% of communication directed at them.

Other findings significant to the current research are found in Erber and Greer's (1973) investigation of observed teacher response styles in oral communication classes. Teachers were found to adopt four basic response patterns to the spoken language of their students.

a) Repetition of all or part of the utterance.

b) Application of audible or oral/facial emphasis to all or part of the students' utterances (modeling).

c) Manipulation of vocabulary or syntax to effect a structural change (emphasis).

d) The provision of supplemental information in the form of cues or prompts (expansion).

Emphasis and repetition were the most frequently observed feedback.

Scroggs (1975) trained three teachers to use expansion techniques (Brown & Bellugi, 1964). He assessed the rate of both non-oral and oral communications as they increased or decreased as a function of teacher expansions. The findings suggested that children's spoken language behaviors were greatly influenced by teacher efforts.

Kretschmer and Kretschmer (1978) questioned how quickly deaf and hard of hearing students learn to communicate without an overpowering and intrusive feedback "support" from the teacher. A profound statement
was made about the nature of communicative competence in through-the-air interactions in the classrooms:

The linguistic control of classrooms for deaf children tends to be in the mouths and hands of the teacher, regardless of communication modality or ages of the children. There are indications that teachers can be more sensitive to communication needs of deaf children. All in all, there is a reason to believe that deaf children lack communicative competence at all ages, the causes of which are not yet fully understood. (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978)

Dorothy Smith, in her *Toward More Effective Conversations with Deaf Children* (1987), emphasized that the classroom teachers’ style of conversing with deaf students is important in the students’ development of communicative competence in English. She suggested a conversation style which was low on repair and control, leading to increased student initiative and fewer misunderstandings of teacher’s comments.

**Dramatic Activity in Language Learning with the Exceptional Learner**

There have been a few studies examining the use of drama techniques with the exceptional learner. The approach known as *Creative Dramatics* has been used for many years in special education with aims of strengthening abilities, affecting emotional and intellectual growth, and building a more positive self-concept. Included in this group are the developmentally handicapped, orthopedically handicapped, the visually impaired, the emotionally disturbed, behaviorally handicapped, children for whom English is a second language, the hearing impaired, the learning disabled, and others labeled “underachievers.” The intellectually gifted are
also included in this categorization. The recent aims of programs in special education have included the progression toward social integration of these learners with children in regular education programs. Speech therapy, resource room instruction, special tutoring, remedial reading classes, language classes for ESL students, and self-contained classroom programs have operated in a "catch-up" mode. In some cases, special programs have been instituted with the goal of compensation in mind. Creative dramatics has been used to these ends as a therapeutic process. Ward (1964) a pioneer of this approach, described the use of creative dramatics with "retarded" and "disadvantaged" children as a way of "freeing them from their prisons of deprivation and helping them soar in self-expression and self-esteem."

This therapeutic process was defined by McCaslin in 1974 as not implying psychodrama or sociodrama, but rather an art form in which "children find pleasure, emotional release, mental stimulation, personal satisfaction through success, and most of all, a chance to use and stress their imaginations." She suggested that creative drama allows these children to "escape the walls of their prisons on the wings of his imagination." Susan Holden discussed the advantages of using drama in language teaching with students in regular and special education (1981). Her focus was on rehearsed skits, exercises and situational role-plays, used to improve language and social skills.

Daily Dilemmas (McCracken & Wiig, 1991) is a program which instructs the teacher in using and developing rehearsed conversation scripts. The authors presented this program as an instructional vehicle which would call for students with special needs to use several modalities
to maximize their comprehension of social situations. Students interact through social dramas, situational role plays in which the students (actors) present very brief, teacher written, and rehearsed skits to an audience of student peers in order to demonstrate and practice life experiences.

**Use of Dramatic Activity with the Hearing Impaired**

Although there always seemed to be "deaf theatre" in local deaf clubs in communities across the nation, with deaf actors doing impromptu mime shows and skits through the beauty of American Sign Language, and although there were amateur performances at residential schools for the deaf, Gallaudet University and a few scattered grass roots theatre groups, perhaps the most popular representation of dramatic activity with the deaf has been the National Theatre of the Deaf (NTD). It has used sign language as a serious and natural theatrical device in highly respected productions since 1967. The Little Theatre of the Deaf (LTD) was born out of NTD as a touring company for child audiences. The LTD sought to educate and entertain through sign language with stories, poems, songs, and other group activities as well as to encourage drama programs for deaf students (Baldwin, 1993).

McCaslin (1974) cited popular theatre companies for actors with hearing impairments such as The Little Theatre of the Deaf and the National Theatre of the Deaf, as shining examples of how the deaf could function as actors and audience through pantomime. Her suggestions about the use of theatre with the hearing impaired were focus on creative dramatics as well as theatre for the stage.
Pantomime is the obvious means of reaching the hard-of-hearing... an area of drama in which the child with hearing impairment can participate as well as enjoy as spectator. In working with the hearing impaired child... moving from dance into pantomime... There will be motivation for speech in drama, but the easiest communication will be through pantomime, in which the deaf child can achieve success.

McCaslin saw the periods when some class members were observers and some participants and also the times before, between, and after dramatic activity as times for communication opportunities (McCaslin, 1968).

Many of those who advocated in naturalistic approaches and real-life experiences in the language development of the hearing impaired suggested situational role play or socio-drama activities (Groht, 1966; Kretschmer, 1991; McAnally, Rose & Quigley, 1995). Techniques such as skits and mime have been used with the deaf as recreational activities. Davies (1984) used creative dramatics through skits, mime, and improvisation and found that such activity can lead to enhanced conceptualization skills, improved self-concept, and opportunities for self-expression. She suggested that there are specific ways to communicate the essential information to the students.

Hearing impaired children were included with orthopedically, visually, and learning disabled, behavior disordered, and developmental disabilities in Wagner's creative dramatics program presented as a case study which suggested that creative dramatics must be modified in order to foster accessibility for special students (1985). Several of her student-centered activities were recommended for use with students with hearing impairment (McAnally, Rose & Quigley, 1995). Timms (1986), using
creative drama activities, designed a language arts curriculum for eight profoundly deaf residential students in order to teach story structure. Increase in spontaneous and creative response was noted.

Mather (1993) reported how a teacher of five preschool deaf students used strategies which included role playing to help the students "adapt to the classroom situation" and be communicatively competent. The teacher's use of these visually oriented teaching strategies, according to the findings, was attributed to the fact that he or she was deaf, a native signer, and competent in American Sign Language. The study suggested that some of the strategies were special linguistic devices of American Sign Language. They included: using classifier predicates, "miniature" signs, adapting signs to the specific actions depicted in pictures, changing English words that showed sound-related concepts to signs that showed visual concepts, and, again role playing. According to Mather, the native signer naturally used role playing to transmit the information from pictures. The teacher in the study was told the story of "The Three Kittens." Rather than read the printed words, the teacher acted out the part of the mother cat. She gradually shifted her role from that of a teacher to that of a mother cat. She imitated the posture of the cat and began speaking as the cat would have spoken. While the non-native signer also acted out the cat's role, her actions were not consistent with the mathematical concepts or specific actions depicted in the pictures. The study aimed to demonstrate the need for communicatively competent teachers for deaf students--specifically teachers proficient in linguistic techniques of American Sign Language.
**Process Drama**

Process drama, the transactional approach used in this study, is a complex and collaborative mode of learning, with language at its heart. In any drama experience, language is essentially and necessarily involved (O’Neill & Lambert, 1982). In process drama, the aim is to provide an experience for participants rather than an end product for an audience. Structured dramatic worlds are created, sustained and developed through group role-play, and in particular through the social interactions of the participants. These interactions demand engagement, understanding and resourcefulness.

Research has uncovered a number of general educational benefits resulting from the use of process drama. It has been pointed out that experience in drama enables the students to understand human behavior, themselves, and the world they live in. This growth of understanding is derived from the process of engagement and reflection activated by the drama and is realized by the enhancement of the participants’ abilities of inquiry, critical and constructive thought, problem-solving, comparison, interpretation, judgment, discrimination, and most importantly, their desire to engage in further learning and research (O’Neill & Lambert, 1982).

Drama in education is compatible with the whole language philosophy as it provides real social contexts for the integration of reading, writing, talking and listening (Wagner, 1991).
Process Drama and Language Learning

The expressive skills required of the students have been among the rationales for the use of creative drama and theatre techniques in the academic classroom. Historically, drama activities have been used to improve skills such as diction, oral interpretation skills, well-defined gestures, voice projection, overcoming self-consciousness. With the advent of Brian Way (1972) the idea arose that drama could be vital to the personal development of the child, including the development of the child as communicator.

Several writers advocate the use of process drama (also termed classroom drama, drama in education, and educational drama) as vital in language development (O’Neill et al., 1976; Wagner, 1976). One of the pioneers of this way of working is the British educator, Dorothy Heathcote. In her Guarantees for Drama (Wagner, 1976), Heathcote outlines a progression of objectives in the subject. All of these guarantees are communication skill related or bound, and several which can be interpreted as having a communicative competence focus relative to this study:

• from reliance on the teacher to independent action in which the teacher is redundant.
• from random to carefully selected words, gestures, and actions to make the drama explicit.
• to show it is important to listen, and to accept, support, and then challenge the decisions the class makes.
• to press students to reflect on experience and see what they hold in common with all people.
• to develop a tolerance for a variety of personalities and ideas.
• to increase students' vocabulary and help them develop a finer control of rhetoric through interaction with others and through tapping subjective experience.
• to bring classes into situation which will improve their social health.
• to help students discover that they know more than they thought they knew.
• to lead students to see the real world more clearly in light of what is revealed by the imagined one.
• to help students capture more and more of what is implicit in any experience.

This study of process drama and communicative competence with hearing impaired students finds support in Heathcote's further explanations. She adds that drama in process demands inherent pressurized interaction which helps the participants wean themselves from the comfort of conforming to the standards or values of an adult authority. The students test their own values, sense the importance of those values, and begin to assert them candidly and maturely. Through drama they learn to discipline themselves to an awareness of their effect on others and a reflection on the quality of their interactions. Heathcote has said that through drama, students live "in advance of themselves," facing challenge and crisis in imagination before they find themselves overwhelmed by them in real life. She advocated the use of drama
methods for "coping" aspects of living being tested in the security of the life-classroom. She hoped for the development of "emergent, exploratory people" (Heathcote, c.f. Johnson & O'Neill, 1984).

They gain a feeling of mastery over events, the sense that they are equal to life. This in turn helps them relate more comfortably and openly to others. (Wagner, 1976, p. 228)

This sense of mastery also helps them to relate more competently with others.

Bolton (1979) pointed out a very important relationship between drama and the acquisition of language and communication skills. He suggested that drama is language. In discussing drama, one is inevitably discussing communication and language. "You can't conceive of one without the other." He suggested that drama can promote the use of various functions of language, such as controlling, role-defining, hypothesizing, practice in roles, awareness (self actualization), cognition and style. He also saw the value of drama for the development of interpersonal behavior as high as social development in an area often neglected by educators, the growth of social interaction.

The kind of talk that arises in drama is not as limiting as "school" talk, and neither is it merely social. It is precise, purposeful and generative, arising out of a complex dramatic situation demanding immediate attention, initiation, and response. When students engage in active role-play within the drama, they are "reading" the situation, seeking to respond appropriately to the demands of the challenges of the dramatic world, practicing communication, and developing flexibility in assuming roles and relationships in the drama. The imagined dramatic world creates a
kind of distance between the students and the situation. This allows for the promotion of reflective attitudes and motivates and empowers the participants. They use their imaginations to enter other roles and worlds, often with adult propositions, and they maintain those worlds through the strength of their verbal and nonverbal communication skills.

The intervention of adults is central in sustaining any intensive verbal interaction with children and in helping to structure turn-taking and maintaining attention. This is also true in process drama, where, unlike in creative dramatics and other more limited approaches, the teacher often takes on a role in the work. The strategy of teacher in role has a number of significant purposes. These include structuring the experience from within, supporting and reinforcing the student's linguistic and paralinguistic contributions and asking significant questions.

This research was based on the hypothesis that the motivation for creating and inhabiting dramatic roles and situations within process drama would encourage hearing-impaired students to become actively involved in collaborative meaning making. Instead of maintaining passive and subservient roles in the transmission mode of classroom learning, they would begin to take responsibility for the development of the drama work and to generate increasingly complex and autonomous language. Because drama provides a secure framework for purposeful talk embedded in context, it motivates students to become more familiar with and practice conversational moves and restraints, as well as encourages them to adopt a variety of roles and communication registers. This process would provide safe and challenging contexts for language learning. This has been found
especially true when the teacher takes a role in the action of the drama in order to support, model, challenge and enrich the language of the students.

**Process Drama and the Second Language Learner**

There have been several studies showing that the use of process drama has significant benefit for learners of a second language. Research in this area was particularly significant since there have been found to be many similarities between the educational challenges of deaf children and those of second language learners (Paul & Quigley, 1984) and minority culture hearing students.

The current trend in second language acquisition and teaching research favors the notion of communicative language teaching, which stresses the importance of learning and using the target language in meaningful context. Savignon (1983) pointed out that learning a second language should move away from the analysis and drills of isolated grammatical structures and toward the analysis and use of language in meaningful contexts. He asserted that teaching and learning only the descriptive aspects of the target language would not lead to satisfactory communication in real life. According to Savignon, the most effective language programs involve the whole learner in the experience of language as a network of relations between people, things, and events. Drama was suggested as one of the approaches helpful in shaping the communicative language curriculum.

This setting...provides an opportunity for real language use and allows learners to explore situations that would otherwise never come up in the classroom setting.
In second language teaching and learning, the advantages of using drama techniques to promote fluency and communicative competence are well established (Di Pietro, 1987; Holden, 1981; Maley & Duff, 1991). Practitioners argued that drama creates a comfortable atmosphere and meaningful contexts for language use, and promotes participation and interaction, while in many traditional second language classrooms, however, classroom discourse proceeds in a highly predictable manner and second language students may have to rely almost entirely on teacher intervention and support. Studies suggest that when drama techniques are used, learners adapt easily and without apprehension to the fictional situation (Di Pietro, 1982; Radin, 1985; Savignon, 1983; Wilburn, 1992).

Di Pietro proposed using "strategic interaction" as an instructional approach, calling upon learners to use the target language purposefully and skillfully in communication with others. The central activity in such interaction is the "scenario" of real life negotiation which requires language to reach resolution. In "strategic interaction" the students are assigned roles that oblige them to work out and implement strategies through dialogue with other role-players (Di Pietro, 1987).

Wilburn, after conducting an ethnographic study in a Spanish classroom, found that the usual initiating/responding/feedback transmission paradigm (ref. Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) existed in the second language learning classroom. This pattern, Wilburn discovered, shifted to a more dialectic communicative pattern when drama activities were employed (Wilburn, 1992). The results of these studies suggest that a drama-oriented second language learning class provides opportunities for
real growth in communicative contexts which are not realized in most classrooms.

**Process Drama with the Exceptional Learner**

Dorothy Heathcote, who has already been quoted in this study, worked extensively with special needs ("mentally handicapped") students, including the most severely brain damaged and the psychotic. Her aims for drama with the handicapped included finding out what interests them, proving that they could be responsible and useful to society, keeping the challenges simple and using concrete, non-verbal signaling, giving them reasons and motivations for talking (Wagner, 1976).

When the class comes in, there is no flow of words: in their real life experience, they are too often battered down by a stream of language they only vaguely comprehend. Here they are surprised by a nonverbal presence and silence. The fairy seems to cry out for a verbal response. Many of these children have never learned to speak, because their circumstance do not call for it. . .. Caretakers dress and feed them efficiently, all too often without words, so they are cut off from having to use language to get what they need. Heathcote's goal with these children was to use the nonverbal signals to win them to the verbal. (Heathcote, c.f. Wagner, p. 213)

**Summary**

In this chapter, I examined the literature on Communicative Competence, typical classroom talk, the education of the hearing impaired, and the use of drama activities with the exceptional learner. A review of the literature on drama in education reinforced my belief that this
approach offers significant opportunities for the development of communicative competence with the hearing impaired.

Several references were found in the literature to the use of conventional theatre and creative dramatics activities with the hearing impaired and also several references to communicative competence and the hearing impaired learner, but there were no reports of the kind of systematic inquiry which featured all three areas that compose the conceptual framework for this study: hearing impairment, communicative competence and process drama. The studies presented here support the magnitude of the problem of inadequate demonstration of communicative competence for hearing impaired students articulated by this study. They also demonstrate that drama techniques have proven to be significant in improving the communication behaviors of students in a variety of programs.

The following chapter outlines the methodology used in this study. Research sites will be described and the relationship of the researcher to the teachers and students taking part in the study will be clarified.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to observe, describe, and analyze pre-selected and emergent sociolinguistic aspects of classroom talk in four self-contained classrooms for hearing-impaired students (Table 2). This research addressed the problem of inadequacy of behaviors that reflect communicative competence among the hearing impaired students. Although the direct focus was the classroom context, the results of the study have direct implications for real-life interpersonal situations outside of the school environment. The specific design of this study needed to allow for close monitoring and evaluation of variables influencing communicative competence across two phases: during typical classroom interactions and for classroom communicative behaviors noted when lessons were shared with process drama as facilitation. Given the nature of the research problem, a qualitative case study methodology was indicated.

Figure 3 is a visual representation of progression of research activities.
Table 2.

Profile of Research Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Total Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=9)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=number of students
Figure 3. Schematic of Research Design
Research Questions

Significant research questions include the following:

1. What are the characteristics of typical classroom talk for students and teachers in each of the four self-contained classrooms for students who are hearing impaired primarily in regard to four levels of participation: the nature of discourse of the overall lesson or event, conversation moves, communication functions, and social register?

2. Are restrictive, inflexible talk routines, which are evidenced in regular education classrooms, observed in any of the typical discourse of classrooms for the hearing impaired?

3. Is there evidence of some pro-active or compensatory strategies in place on the part of the teacher for optimal communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

4. What are the characteristics of classroom talk for students and teachers in each of the self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired when process drama is the learning mode, in relationship to the same levels of participation in Question 1.

5. Does the use of process drama have a positive influence on the manifestations of communicative competence behaviors of students and/or teachers in any of the four classrooms studied?

6. Are the functions and behaviors of teachers significantly altered when drama is the mode of interaction?

7. If behaviors during drama are different, and superior, are there particular drama strategies which appear to lend themselves well
to competence in communication in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

8. Is there a competence/performance gap in the consideration of communicative competence behaviors in the classroom, or is there evidence of a psychology of deafness as it applies to language in context abilities?

Rationale for the Choice of Qualitative Methodology

The research design used to investigate these areas of inquiry follows that of a case study design. It first allows for the description of classroom communication behaviors under two distinct conditions or phases: typical classroom communication and communication when drama was the mode of operation. The observations and descriptions of classroom interaction behaviors were made in reference to four classroom groups, differentiated by school grade levels (high school or elementary) and by primary message transmission modes (total or oral communication) (see Table 2).

The methodology chosen for this study was predominantly influenced by an interpretivism research paradigm. This study was an exercise in complex systematic inquiry which lent itself well to naturalistic methods of data collection and analysis. The classroom is a complex culture, and culture is often defined by the predictable communication norms under operation. I could not simply have gone into one classroom for a time or two and record only my perceptions of pragmatic functions of language.
Qualitative inquiry is also analytical in that even subtle regularities in the data must be discovered and communicated by primary activities involving reduction, organization, display, and above all, contemplation of the data (Locke, Spirduso & Silverman, 1987). Erickson (1986) maintained that a qualitative approach is especially well-suited to research into field and classroom practices, which "is seen not as a set of generalized attributes of a teacher . . . rather . . . is seen as occurring in the particular and concrete circumstances of the practice of a specific teacher with a specific set of students this year," "this day" and "this moment" (p. 130).

I wanted to be able to ask critical questions about the sociolinguistic norms of the four environments studied and have those questions be continually generative and amenable to reconceptualization throughout the course of inquiry--from the stage of designating conceptual framework to preparation of the final manuscript. I realized many shifts in thinking and doing as I progressed in the understanding that I sought. The more relationships and puzzles that I unraveled while pouring over the literature or while working with the teachers in the classroom, or while manipulating what seemed to be endless matrixes and tables--the more connections and contradictions that presented themselves for further investigation.

The selection of this methodology allowed me to maintain the same spirit of adventure for the data analysis work that I initially experienced as I completed the coursework in educational drama and that carried me through the data collection phase. As I transcribed the videotaped classroom talk, discovered effective codings and categories, I continually pondered, "I wonder why," or "what if" or "how could" as
communication patterns and relationships emerged. I was privileged to encounter repeated surprises and unexpected perspectives as I inquired along the way. This could only have been possible with the adoption of naturalistic and ecological methods of inquiry.

The present study used techniques established for naturalistic inquiry identified as pertinent to educational research by Guba (1981), Bogdan and Biklen (1982), and Lincoln and Guba (1985). Although I broadened my scope to four classrooms as opposed to one, the particular form of the study was the case study, "a detailed examination of one setting, or one single subject, or one single depository of documents, or one particular event" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Within this controlled, systematic case study design, data were collected through interviews, teacher-completed assessments, observations of formal classroom interactions, field notes, and teacher reflection notes. Internal validity criteria for methodology, conceptualization, and assessment/analysis factors were applied in order to rule out rival interpretations and ambiguous observer effects.

Description of Site and Participants

The classrooms studied were located at satellite schools of the hearing impaired program in the public school district. These particular sites and subjects were selected on the basis of easy access, their willingness to participate, and their fitness for the study.

With the exception of the preschool and kindergarten classrooms housed in a self-contained special school for the hearing impaired, all classrooms in the hearing impaired program were located in a total of six satellite schools: two elementary schools, two middle schools, and two
high schools. At each level, one school housed children enrolled in the total communication program and the other, education with the oral approach to communication.

At the time of this involvement, the program for the hearing impaired was strongly committed to the adoption of whole language philosophy (Goodman, 1989) and its approaches to literacy and learning. There were language consultants who rotated visits to the classrooms and advised teachers on the implementation of holistic literacy activities. Language learning was at the center of their curriculum. The teachers of the deaf and hard of hearing are regarded as experts in their primary goal of teaching of language. All of the participating teachers held Master's degrees in Deaf Education, and current Ohio teaching certification in Special Education, Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing. The teachers identified in this study as Ms. Baker (T/A), Ms. Brown (T1/B), and Ms. Dobbs (T/D) had undergraduate degrees in speech pathology; teachers Ms. Wills (T/C) and Ms. Mills (T2/B) had degrees in elementary education from the Department of Special Education. At the time of the study, each had at least 10 years experience teaching with hearing impaired population.

The Speech and Hearing Services area provided speech/language pathologists and audiologists who completed speech and language and audiological evaluations, participated in treatment planning and provide intervention services. The speech and language pathologists (SLP) were involved as communication skills specialists and functioned as a members of the professional intervention team in the development of individual education plans (IEP's) for the students. Academic and speech/language goals and objectives were usually written in separate sections of the IEP.
Speech and language pathologists work predominantly with the students in individual or small group pull-out service delivery. In this manner, the students were removed from their classrooms and taken to a therapy room in order to evaluate and/or drill articulation and language skills. The State of Ohio mandated that there be a minimum of twenty contact minutes per week per child allotted for speech therapy services.

Some speech and language pathologists worked directly in the classroom collaborating and consulting with teachers regarding communication skills in the classroom setting. Lessons were prepared that sometime relate to the classroom teacher's curriculum-based activities. Although teachers and SLPs collaborate to varying degrees in planning, most often, the SLPs conducted communication lessons independent of teacher participation.

Four self-contained classrooms for the hearing-impaired were selected for this investigation (Table 2). The four classroom populations were as follows:

(A) an oral communication elementary school class of ten students.
(B) an oral communication high school class of ten students.
(C) a total communication elementary school class of four students.
(D) a total communication high school class of eight students.

Oral education programs emphasize the development of intelligible speech and optimal use of residual hearing, speechreading (lipreading), and the use of assistive listening devices such as hearing aids and auditory learning devices. In theory, the students and teachers do not use manual communication (signing).
Total communication (TC) programs support the use of any and all forms of communication in the teaching of language to the hearing impaired. These programs usually have English-based signing as the primary mode of message transmission and, in theory, include speech, speechreading, and auditory training with the signing. This combined oral-manual communication is called simultaneous communication (speaking and signing at the same time).

Identifying information regarding student participants can be found in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6. Fictitious names were used for all participants.

**Level of Researcher Participation and Involvement**

The researcher's role in the process of qualitative inquiry is situationally determined, depending on the context, the identities of others, and the researcher's own personality and values (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). My role, in this study of communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired, was that of participant observer.

A participant-observer is one who acknowledges involvement with the researched (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). This involvement may vary across a continuum from mostly observation to mostly participation. During Phase I of the data collection, I functioned as a formal observer—one who stood or sat in a corner of the room with the video camera in operation, taking field notes. At that time, I simply asked each teacher to allow me to observe during a class period and I explained that the only requirement was that the observed interaction be based on through the air communication rather than seat work or monologic discourse (lecture, extended storytelling, etc.). I was most active or immersed in the initial
Table 3.
Classroom A - Student Participants Identifying Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race &amp; Gender</th>
<th>Primary Communication Mode</th>
<th>Hearing Status</th>
<th>Parents' Hearing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Selma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Alvin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Nadine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Donna</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Burt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Mild-to-Moderate</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Nancy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 Jili</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 Danny</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 Faye</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 Debra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.
Classroom B - Student Participants Identifying Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race &amp; Gender</th>
<th>Primary Communication Mode</th>
<th>Hearing Status</th>
<th>Parental Hearing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Tia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Mike</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Vern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Kiana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Curtis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Alex</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Kiesha</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Holly</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Traci</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.

Classroom C - Student Participants Identifying Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race &amp; Gender</th>
<th>Primary Communication Mode</th>
<th>Hearing Status</th>
<th>Parental Hearing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Rayna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Billy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Rita</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Joyce</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.
Classroom D - Student Participants Identifying Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race &amp; Gender</th>
<th>Primary Communication Mode</th>
<th>Hearing Status</th>
<th>Parental Hearing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Mark</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Jay</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B/M</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Steve</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W/M</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Sarah</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Amy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Moderate-to-Severe</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Louis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B/M</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Kelly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Both Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Faye</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B/F</td>
<td>Total Communication</td>
<td>Severe-to-Profound</td>
<td>Both Deaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teacher-training segments of Phase II—the formal teacher group drama inservice and during individual consultations with the classroom teachers when lessons were planned and reflected upon. I would describe my relationship with the teachers, in Phase II, as a collaborative one. It was not unusual for me to speak from behind the camera in response to teacher inquiry as a lesson was taught through drama. If, while planning "on her feet," the teacher asked questions relative to transitions or structure, I advised. I offered social reinforcement (smiles, thumbs up, etc.). Frequent visual checks of the classroom environment, for personal security, are common for students with significant loss of hearing acuity. If a student looked my way, perhaps after the verbal generation of something he or she thought was exceptionally clever or profound, I nodded and smiled in approval.

I had worked in this school system as a speech and language pathologist since 1986, predominantly with the students in the hearing impaired program." Therefore, there was a reciprocal professional familiarity with many of program's, administrators, and staff. I served as the speech and language pathologist for sites for classrooms B and D for five years. I had not worked in either Site A or Site C, but had visited the hearing impaired classrooms in both sites several times. I had not known the team-teaching teachers in site B prior to the study. The teacher in site D and I had worked collaboratively at this school for the five years preceding this study. The site A teacher and I had worked together at site B for three years. The teacher in site C and I had been co-workers from 1978-1982 in a school for adolescents and young adults at a state psychiatric facility. I, as SLP, led classroom communication groups in her classroom. I had also
seen each of her students at the time in pull-out speech and language intervention programming.

All of the teachers, by their reports, had employed, on rare occasion, varieties of scripted skits and situational role plays, theatre games or conventions in their classrooms over the years. Although the teachers from classrooms A, C, and D had observed me working with children through drama, none had prior experience in planning or guiding a process drama lesson.

I was also familiar with many of the students included in the research. I had served as the speech therapist for none of the ten students in site A, four of the nine students in site B, none of the four participants in site C, and all of the eight students at site D. Four students out of those studied had prior exposure to process drama. I led two 45-minute drama lessons with their English class during group talk lessons a year before this study. These students were, specifically, students D3, D4, D5, and D7 (see Tables 3-6).

As a result of this familiarity with sites and participants, I had already established rapport and built credibility and trust with many of the people included in the study. In no way was I an outsider. They knew me as a person who had worked effectively in the classrooms alongside teachers in communication skills intervention. This familiarity, a priori, established a working relationship which reciprocally reflected ease, belonging, trust, and learning.

Before my introduction to process drama, I had always emphasized language-in-context skills and had instituted an effective interpersonal
communication curriculum which highlighted situational role plays, communication challenge simulations, metalinguistic-focused group talks, and the production of communication skills videos. Since 1991, I had included process drama as one approach for optimal communication skills success.

Table 7
Timetable and Organization for Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November -December 1992</th>
<th>Pilot Study: Interview and Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January - Mid-March 1993</td>
<td>Phase I: Initial Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early March 1993</td>
<td>Phase II: Drama Inservice to Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-March through May 1993</td>
<td>Phase III: Data Collection; Drama Lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1993 - January 1994</td>
<td>Phase IV: Data Transcription &amp; Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1994 - December 1994</td>
<td>Phase V: Analysis and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1995 - May 1995</td>
<td>Phase VI: Interpretation and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1995</td>
<td>Phase VII: Submission of Dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures for the Study**

**Gaining Access**

Waiver of permission to use human subjects was obtained through The Ohio State University Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee. Permission to conduct the investigation in the schools, using videotaping during formal observations, was obtained through written, person-to-person and
telephoned request to several levels of gatekeepers: the school system's office of pupil services, department of special education, speech and hearing services division, and the hearing impaired program, and through the principals at each school. I received full and timely access. The expeditiousness may have been owing to my insider status, having worked within the classrooms.

Additionally, letters requesting permission (see Appendix B) were sent to parent or guardian of each participant and returned signed, with permission granted for full participation in the study. The researcher maintained a file in a designated OSU departmental office file containing the originals of access permission forms. Copies of these completed permission forms were filed with the department office.

**Data Collection Procedures**

**The Interview**

A comprehensive initial interview was held with the education consultant for the hearing impaired program. This interview was conducted in order to obtain information which would adequately identify the local philosophies and practices in deaf education and to establish the nature of immediate and consequential concerns regarding communication skills in their classrooms for the hearing impaired. It was most important to determine if the information garnered from these interviews supported the rationale for this study. The consultant had worked with the program for the hearing impaired for more than 17 years. She had worked as classroom teacher, vocational coordinator, work-study specialist, and then educational consultant to teachers in the program. Part
of her job responsibilities was the maintenance of longitudinal data regarding success or failure of students in the workplace and other adult life situations. Elaboration's were elicited regarding her own professional background and experiences, effectiveness of in-place communication programming, school and workplace communication challenges, and reasonable expectations for communication skill programming for educators and students.

**Communication Skills Surveys**

Before classroom observations begin, each of the participating teachers was asked to complete the Communication Skills Checklist from *Let's Talk: Intermediate Level* (Wiig & Bray, 1984) for each student in her class (Appendix C). The inventory, designed for preadolescents—young adulthood, is a measure of a rater's perceptions of how appropriately a person uses communication functions. The teacher's responses to sixty-one (61) items judged the student's habitual use of communicative intents within pragmatic functions of spoken language across everyday out-of-home, non-peer contexts and across several categories of language use: (1) ritualizing, (2) informing, (3) controlling, (4) feeling, and (5) imagining. The fifth category is not included in the *Let's Talk Checklist*, but it is acknowledged and prescribed for in the intervention phase of the program. The Glossary (Appendix A) includes definitions for the five categories.

Ratings for *Let's Talk Inventories* were individually tallied and analyzed in order to obtain category and total “use” score. Scores for all were reduced in comparative matrixes for comparison across students and across classrooms (see Appendix C).
I had used the flexible Let's Talk protocol for many years in my work as speech and language pathologist with students in both regular and special education classes and found it to be a reliable tool as long as specific context for assessment considerations were specified (who is talking to whom, about what, when).

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted in order to learn about the research process and to test specific aspects of the proposed study. The context was drawn from the actual research context. The pilot study encompassed a review of the preliminary interview with the consultant from the hearing impaired program. Other components included partial progression through data collection and analysis of the Let's Talk checklist and the observation and video-tape recording of typical lessons from Classroom D.

Discoveries were made about the integrity of the study's conceptualizations, assumptions, procedures and analyses and in some cases adaptations were made based on these discoveries. Specifically, the review of the consultant's interview responses added to the assurance that the research was worthy of study and significant in the framework which it drew from the interrelatedness of drama in education, deaf education, and speech and hearing science.

In the initial planning for data collection and analysis, I intended to use the Let's Talk checklist to reflect the influences of drama in Phase II of the study. Piloting the intentions showed that the protocol would be useful in triangulating the assessment of the students' abilities in Phase I,
but revealed conceptual discrepancies in using the same, unaltered instrument to show the presence or absence of effects in Phase II.

In the data analysis component of the pilot study, I began to keep a written detail of the frequency of observed discrete behaviors (social intents) that were situationally categorized as either ritualization, information-transfer, control, feeling or imagining. I found this to be an enterprise which was interesting, but not critical in answering the questions posed by my research. As a result, I revised my plan for teacher-contributed assessment. Also, I included additional research questions and even made adjustments for improved lighting and camera positioning for clarity of video-taped sessions. In setting up for the video recording of the pilot study class session, I positioned two cameras, following my plan to incorporate two physically different images of classroom interactions. It was not long after, in my rushing from one to the other, that one of the tripods collapsed and hit me squarely and forcefully on the head, directly in the area of the mastoid process (ear/hearing). My lesson, there, was the common sense revelation that only one camera was really feasible. Since I was functioning alone as site researcher, it was all I could do physically to guard the safe movement of one video set-up.

**Initial Classroom Observations Planning**

Interaction with each of the four investigated settings followed this plan for initial observations. In order to assure the validity of the study, the teacher was not told of the specific nature of the observations. I only requested that the teacher plan and allow observation of three 30-40 minute sessions in which the primary activity was centered on face-to-face,
“through the air” communication. This request was made so that the teacher would select typical and representational lessons featuring whole-group turn-taking verbalizations and not a silent reading activity or individual paperwork at desks, so there could be logical subsequent comparison and contrast of the nature of talk prior to and then during drama moments. Although comparisons and contrasts could be made without prior instruction, for any class session, it was instrumental to this study that the teacher was given the opportunity to structure her “representative best” group talk lessons.

**Observation of Typical Classroom Interaction Sessions**

For each classroom, three consecutively observed language arts and/or history lessons were videotaped. A portable camcorder mounted on a tripod, situated at a wide enough angle so that all interactions could be evidenced, was utilized for recording. Only if absolutely necessary, for framing all participants in the viewfinder, was the original architecture and positioning of teacher and students in the classroom altered and then, as minimally as possible. Back-up audio recording, utilized in the pilot study described later, was not appropriate for the full study since much of the communicative interaction was non-vocal (signed or gestured) and because of the relative unintelligibility of some of the spoken language. Additional observation data were collected in the form of field notes recorded during the videotaping. Back-up copies of the observation tapes were made as soon as possible after each observation was completed.
Procedures for Implementing Drama Lessons

Teacher Inservice Training

At least one month prior to the initiation of the drama phase, the teachers attended a mandatory after school two hour introductory inservice on the use of process drama in the classroom. This inservice session was led by Dr. Cecily O’Neill, who is an Associate Professor at OSU and is internationally known for her work in the training of teachers in the use of process drama. The coordinator for the program for the hearing impaired gave prior approval for the workshop and opened additional participant spaces for other interested teachers in the program. During the workshop, the teachers were introduced to process drama and participated in discussion and actual improvisational role play which gave them insights into how drama might be used in the classroom for many aims, including the prospect of facilitating optimal use of flexible prosocial communicative skills (see Appendix E for full description).

Planning of Specific Drama Lessons

I provided the teachers with basic literature which presented additional relevant information about using drama in the classroom. Before the drama lessons, I met with the teachers individually for two 30-minute conferences. In the first conferencing session, I established an understanding with the teacher of a partnership approach to the implementation of drama as a mode of learning in her classroom and as a mode for experiencing real conversations in functional real-life propositions. We discussed the importance of multidimensional structuring in the planning, initiation, and maintenance of the drama
world. We considered possible adaptations which might include the following: the physical environment and student groupings, student/teacher status and relationships, multicultural themes, and involvement with the whole language paradigm. Each classroom teacher and I proceeded as a team, exploring appropriate current curricular themes for use in drama. Then we continued to work together in selecting a starting focus and planning the beginning and one or two episodes of the drama lesson. As much as possible, the "teacher-in-role" and "mantle of the expert" strategies were to be used.

The "teacher-in-role" strategy requires the teacher to work along with the students, from within the drama, assuming an individual role, attitude or stance. This would enable the teacher to maintain and build dramatic action and to facilitate curriculum and communication skills objectives from within the drama world. The teachers would use the mantle-of-the-expert strategy when, in structuring the dramatic activity, they assigned authoritative-group roles to the students. The students, by virtue of the demands of the task set before them, would most likely rise to the occasion by communicating with more mature and flexible verbal and nonverbal behaviors across language categories of content, form--and most consequential to this study--use.

Facilitation and Observation of Drama Lessons

I video recorded each teacher in drama lessons with her class. Each teacher led at least three consecutively observed drama sessions, utilizing a variety of ways in which to launch the drama. The teacher was a facilitator
rather than an instructor during the observed lessons. The lessons were videotaped and observed as outlined in the previous section, "Observation of the Traditional Interaction Session."

**Completion of Summative Teacher Journal Entries**

At the end of the three recorded lessons, each teacher was asked to complete a brief written reflection about her experience with the drama. Her response was personalized, open and unstructured. Her comments may or may not have centered on communicative competence skills, as no direct information was given about any specific targeted behaviors. Excerpts were intended to be used for the Conclusion Chapter.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

**Transcription of Observation Sessions**

After collection of the data on videotaped recordings, I transcribed the auditory visual data of the videotaped interactions. A second person, deaf and proficient in signing, reviewed the tapes and the transcriptions from the total communication classrooms in order to validate the accuracy of interpretation of the signing as an added measure of validity and reliability. The students from the total communication program used signing as their primary mode of communication. The sign system used predominantly was English-based signing or Pidgin Sign English (PSE). PSE follows the syntactical order of include standard English but few if any morphological markers (Paul & Quigley, 1994). Moreover, the total communication (TC) students' signing behavior held significant variation. They were frequently observed to code-switch, sign using ASL and ASL-
like signs, especially during drama activities. The verbal messages were
glossed (in representative standard English form, for greater ease and
consistency in transcription and review). The post-hoc manner for
transcription recording was employed, using components of van Lier's
Participation Analysis (1988), Wiig and Bray's Let's Talk Protocol (1984),
Dami... functions of language (1973). Therefore, analyses included (1)
nature of discourse, (2) conversation moves, (3) communicative functions,
and (4) social register. The complexity and sensitivity of this research
context, especially in the consideration of manual communication,
universal gestures, pantomimes, and instances of unintelligible speech,
demanded a generative approach to the recording and analysis of
transcription. A predetermined and precise method of transcription and
coding could not be selected prior to processing the data. Possibilities for
the categorization and organization of verbal and nonverbal participation
emerged as the data were examined. For example, it was reasonable to
project that the unit of measurement, suggested from pilot study
procedures, would be predetermined as based on the individual talk turn
with instances of nonverbal-only turns and complementary or
contradictory non-verbal accompaniments indicated parenthetically. Co-
occurring utterances were delineated by bracketing. No isolated judgments
were made as to the spoken or signed English language adequacy of form
(syntactical nor morphological). Comparative interpretations were made
about the differences between teacher/student, and student/student
interactions and communicative behaviors before and during the use of
process drama as a learning mode.
Analysis and interpretation of transcripted classroom talk were triangulated by incorporating relevant data gathered from checklists, and interview. Teacher reflection statements were also considered in the analysis and interpretation of the data. The use of multiple data sources and collection methods contributed to the trustworthiness of the data and methods.

Summary

In this chapter, the research sites, participants and methodology employed in this study were introduced. The following chapter will present the communication events that took place in the four classrooms during Phase I, typical classroom discourse, and when drama was used—Phase II. Key moments from these transcripts of these events will be included. These significant interactions will be analyzed in detail.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANAYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The predominant focus of this chapter is to describe, analyze, and interpret the Communicative Discourse Events that took place in Phase I and Phase II of this study. The information from the interview with the educational consultant is reviewed for significance to the rationale of the study. This chapter also presents the analysis and interpretation of data gathered from the Let's Talk Checklist.

Results from the Interview with the Hearing Impaired Program Consultant

Chapters I and II of this document include an abundance of research-based information which strongly supports the rationale for this study. Additionally, an information-getting interview with the program's educational consultant was considered to be a critical, indispensable part of the study. It was important to examine what the concerns of the program administration were in regard to classroom discourse and to students' communication challenges during and beyond the school years.
A full transcription of the interview is included in the Appendices section (see Appendix D). The consultant provided information about her many years of experience in the field of deaf education. According to her responses, she was a classroom teacher at diverse grade levels before serving as a vocational counselor/work-study coordinator for the program and then as the educational consultant for the program. She was able to speak, then, from multiple perspectives about the experiences and challenges that have been observed in the very program from which this research was conducted.

Essentially, data from the interview suggested that, historically, students in the program have experienced significant difficulty in through-the-air communication with others—both in understanding and in being understood, especially in relation to those in authoritative positions. The consultant expressed concern that many students graduated from the program as unsuccessful communicators, unable to be effective in interpersonal situations in the community and in the workplace. She mentioned several specific areas of concern which included the inability or lack of motivation to assert communication needs, strengths and weaknesses and the roles of the classroom teacher and speech-language pathologist in fostering effective discourse behaviors during formal schooling years.

**Results from the Let's Talk Checklist Protocol**

As discussed in the methodology chapter, a *Let's Talk Communication Skills Checklist* (Wiig & Bray, 1984) was completed for each child by his or her teacher. The assessment instrument is
conventionally used as a pre-/post intervention measure of observed communication skill quality. For the purposes of this study, the aim for the administration of the checklists was to determine how the teachers perceived their students in terms of communicative competence/performance related to pragmatic functions of language. The teachers were asked to relate their judgments, as much as possible, to interpersonal behaviors observed in their classrooms. \textit{Let's Talk} features four of the five communicative functions which were examined in classroom discourse analyses of this study. The four functions included in \textit{Let's Talk} are Ritualizing, Informing, Controlling and Feeling. The Imagining function, although a focus of Wiig and Bray's intervention programming, was not included in the observation categories of the \textit{Let's Talk} checklist. Although most of the pragmatic functions probed in the protocol were related to initiative taking (i.e., 'Asks others to repeat appropriately' and 'Makes complaints appropriately'), there was good representation of responsive and emerging communicative functions (i.e., 'Gives name on request' and 'Responds to complaints appropriately'). The checklist was not organized for the comparison and contrast of initiations versus responses (as was done with the classroom observation data of Phase I and Phase II). So the communicative value attributed to the comparatively passive "Responds Appropriately to Request" was the same as given to the initiative, "Asks others for Preferences or Wants" (see Appendix C).

Results of the teachers' ratings indicated that the perceptions of their students' communication performances were variable (see Appendix C). A 100% score would suggest that the behaviors were always effective. A
75% score would suggest that communication was often effective; 50%, sometimes; 25%, seldom; and 0%, never effective or appropriate (see Appendix G). Classroom B teachers gave their students the highest ratings in terms of mean percentage of effectiveness for communication (67%). Classroom A students collectively received the next highest rating (52%), then Classroom C (50%), and Classroom D (46% effective).

The checklist administration and scoring were help in that the results show that the teachers recognized that their students needed some help with prosocial communication skills in the classroom.

Phase I and Phase II - Communicative Discourse Behaviors

Phase I was the observation of typical classroom discourse patterns. In Phase II, drama was used. All the lessons in Phase I of the study were analyzed first, in terms of nature of discourse for the event, conversation moves, communicative functions and social register. Then the analyses for Phase II were presented.

PHASE I
Description and Analysis of Typical Communication Patterns

Figures 4, 5, 6, and 7 show the floor plans for Classrooms A, B, C, and D in Phase I.

General Description of Classroom A

Classroom A was the oral elementary school classroom of 10 fifth grade students. Ms. Baker (tA) could be described as an exceptionally well-organized, dedicated teacher who spent much time planning individually for each of her special education students.
Figure 4. Classroom A Layout - Phase 1
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Figure 6. Classroom C Layout - Phase I
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Figure 7. Classroom D Layout - Phase I
Ms. Baker's fifth grade classroom was a relatively spacious one. The room was plastered with large, neon whole language charts—webs, comparison/contrast charts, brainstorming charts, etc. There was an array of graded student papers on display on the walls. There was a work table with chairs around it and another table with art works in progress (see Figure 4). The teacher's paper-laden desk was to the right of the rows of chairs which faced the chalkboard in the front of the classroom.

An FM phonic ear microphone was strapped around her neck. Phonic ears are auditory assistance devices. Each student wore a receiver unit tuned in to the teacher's unit, just as one tunes in to a radio station. In this way, the teacher's voice was able to be selectively amplified over other noises in the background that might be distracting. These undesirable noises might have included the shuffling of feet, a jet passing overhead, the crumpling of papers from the neighboring desk. The phonic ears did not electronically amplify student-to-student voices.

To the side of the chalkboard was a large chart with the names of the students and labels of different academic subjects with listings of skills. Sticker stars were mounted beside the students' names and subjects in order to show comparative strengths in academic performances. There was another chart which listed the comparative grades on class assignments.

During the Phase I lessons, Ms. Baker sat in front of the rows of the desks. The students sat facing her (Figure 4). They were required to sit in their assigned seats.

The students routinely raised their hands when they wished to offer a response or ask a question. They waited until their teacher recognized and
nominated them for a talk turn. The teacher would seldom call on a student whose hand was not raised. The transcript of Phase I classroom discourse was highly demonstrative of the traditional classroom interaction patterns.

For the Phase I lessons, Ms. Baker was asked to plan lessons which were based on group interpersonal (face-to-face) communication. The topics for lessons conducted are shown in Table 14.

For all three lessons in Phase I, Ms. Baker sat in the teacher's chair, facing the children with a book on a small desk in front of her. Each of three lessons were continuation lessons, as the teacher had already introduced the subjects in previous lessons. The first lesson was a science lesson. The students were required to raise and give the short answer to satisfy the right answer to the question. Then, the students were shown a picture and asked to identify it as an insect or a bug. When that identification was made, the teacher asked the specific name of the insect or bug. The second, a language arts lesson, required the students to remember facts from a story in a reader that had been an assignment from the day before. The students were expected, again, to answer comprehension question with short answers, supplying the right answer. The third, a social studies lesson, involved answering "wh" questions with short answers, so that the teacher could verify that the students had understood the reading assignment from the previous day. Each began with what might be thought of as a review question. These questions were aimed at checking the knowledge and understanding students had achieved in previous lessons. The students' successful participation in the lessons was dependent on, at some point,
Table 8  
Topics addressed in Classroom A through typical classroom discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Insects vs. Bugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Reading Review-Trading Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Euro Settlers &amp; Native Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rote memorization abilities, and quick recall of facts. Reading comprehension and memory of rote information would determine the adequacy of the students' response. In more closely examining the nature of Ms. Baker's questions, one finds that no matter how the question starts (what, which, why, who, how, etc.), the aim is to elicit a very short answer based on information that the student has recently obtained from the teacher.

For example, the first lesson began with the teacher's elicitation, "Who can tell me what an insect is?". The students had already read about the differences between insects and bugs, had seen a filmstrip on the topic and had completed worksheets about the topic, so it was evident that the teacher was using this event as opportunity to review the concepts and to relate the scientific information to literature related to bugs.

As quickly as Ms. Baker asks the question, "Who can tell me what an insect is?", several students raise their hands. The teacher, with complete control over who says what to whom when, nominates Selma (A1).

Ms. Baker: "Uh, Selma?"

Selma: It got head and body and . . .
Ms. Baker: Yes. What's the chest part called? A thorax. A thorax. Three body parts. OK, let's see if you can tell me about what some of these bugs are in the bug book. We read about a cricket yesterday.

**Nature of the Communicative Event**

The functional style was ritualized control. The participants responded to the formal, inflexible patterns of teacher-dominated interactions.

The shared experiences of the first three lessons were based on the typical instructional discourse model. That is, the general purpose of the event was the transmission of scientific or logically based knowledge (Wallach, 1988). Successful participation was dependent on the student's ability to comprehend rote information, remember it, and then find acceptable ways to relate the information to the teacher. For all three sessions, metalinguistic skills, not interpersonal skills, were the chief measures for success. Much of the study in classrooms, especially elementary classrooms, require students to talk about language: words, sounds, sentences, word meanings, comprehension. These characteristics were true of classroom A.

**Conversation Moves**

Conversation moves include mutual focus, initiation, maintenance and closing of exchange, turntaking, repair strategies.

The students adhered to the expectations of the transmission classroom by sitting quietly, concentrating eye gaze on the teacher. Most raised their hands frequently to indicate some degree of engagement with the prescribed task.
The data show that the teacher initiated 79% of the total initiations across the five communicative functions examined. The other 21% were contributed by the students, collectively. (See Appendix G)

Only Nadine diverged significantly from the expected student behavior of giving a short answer immediately after the teacher's elicitation. In lesson Phase IA, the teacher required the students to restate the facts from the previous lessons on the differentiation of insects and bugs. After the first five minutes of the lesson, Nadine began to ask questions which were directly related to the teacher's questions and comments about bugs and insects. An example follows:

Ms. Baker: (to all) You asked me the other day why the nurse was looking in your heads - - -(no response)

Ms. Baker: She was looking for bugs like this one (showing picture of louse).

Nadine: What's it do? (no spontaneous response)

Ms. Baker: (continues to read from book) A tiny, wingless bug found on Ada's blouse was a louse. The head louse is found on human heads. It makes you itch doesn't it (laughing). The head louse is found on human heads. . . . Horses, sheep and even penguins in the North Pole may have lice.

Nadine: It's not yellow. It's a little thing like this (disputing supplied information and gesturing proportion of louse).

Ms. Baker: Yes.

Nadine: That's not yellow. (reemphasizing dispute of supplied information and asking for clarification)

Ms. Baker: That's so you can see it better. And what do you think this is? Is it an insect or is it a bug? (signals Burt [A5] to answer)
The teacher answered Nadine's first initiation, a question, "What's it do?" by reading an answer found in the ritualized form of a poem about lice. Nadine's second initiation, a disputation, with a one word and ambiguous answer, "Yes." Nadine pushed further with the repetition of her dispute. This time, the teacher answered Nadine's concern with a longer answer, "That's so you can see it better." She (the teacher) did not pause to check for Nadine's momentary understanding or satisfaction. In everyday discourse in natural contexts, there are ongoing checks for at-the-moment understanding. The tendency not to check for ongoing understanding is characteristic of typical instructional discourse (Wallach & Miller, 1988).

Nadine relented, perhaps taking a cue from the immediacy of the new question directed at another student. Thirty-four turns later, she began again:

Ms. Baker: . . . the light is on the abdomen

Nadine: (Is) that the light you hold the lady bug?


Nadine: lightning bug (correcting word choice) . . . I hold sometimes.

T: Do they bite?

All: No.

As is evident in this transcription, Nadine not only took initiative in expressing new ideas, but provided stimulus for the teacher's question, "Do they (the lightning bugs) bite?". In lessons IB and IC, T3's initiations were not remarkably greater in number than those of the other students. During Phase I-B, the student had a toothache.
Event IB was a session in which the teacher reviewed a story "Trading Places," that the class had previously read and discussed. The teacher wanted the students to demonstrate that they had read and understood the story by answering comprehension questions. The primary question was, "In the story, who traded what?". When the students could not produce the answer from their previous reading, they were required to take turns re-reading page by page, reviewing the whole story until someone found the answer to the key question, "Who traded what?". While they dealt with this central issue, the students were also required to practice the articulation of mispronounced words and reviewed meanings of words that the students did not understand as they read along.

This teacher-led discussion also followed the traditional instructional discourse model. That is, Ms. Baker asked a question, nominated a student to provide a short answer to the question, then the teacher evaluated the worth or accuracy of the answer and quickly repeated, rephrased, or asked a different question.

Ms. Baker: What do you think? (to Danny, A8)

Danny: Her grandfather gonna help out.

Ms. Baker: What?

Danny: Her grandfather gonna help out.

Ms. Baker: Her grandfather's gonna help her out. OK. He's gonna trade something with her?

Danny: No. He's just going to fly a kite.

Ms. Baker: Going to fly a kite. Why do they call it a special trade?

Danny: Oh, never mind.
Interchanges of this nature were repeated with the teacher working hard to elicit the correct answer to the question. The students tried very hard to guess the right answer, but were not successful and often, like Danny, gave up.

The teacher asked different levels of questions in order to assess reading comprehension. The questions were repeated or rephrased in order to get the right answer.

- Do you think Nellie likes Bartholemew?
- Does the girl like the man?
- Does Nellie like Bartholemew?
- Is there anything that makes you think she is happy besides the picture?

Ms. Baker: I have the story so let's find out what they are going to trade in the story. Faye, read the first page.

Danny: (reads the first page laboriously, with teacher coaching through pronunciations)

Ms. Baker: OK. Very good. So what did they do together?

Danny: (does not answer)

Ms. Baker: (signals to Alvin [A2] to answer)

Alvin: They went for a walk.

Ms. Baker: A walk?... Nancy?

The above excerpt shows that the teacher moved the conversation exchanges from student to student in the hope of finding someone who could supply the predetermined answer. She demonstrated flexibility in feedback turns that were designed to evaluate the accuracy of responses.
The previous examples show repetitions of answers with question intonations, acknowledgment markers such as "OK," "I see," "Uh huh," silence, or immediate switch to new responder. She very seldom used, "No" as feedback for inaccurate responses.

As the forty-minute class period was nearing its end, the teacher was still cueing for the answer to the central question from the story, "Who traded what?". The students were pushing hard to understand the decontextualized concepts. They re-read the entire story and looked at the picture which illustrated the answer to the question.

Ms. Baker: What do you think they're going to trade?

Donna (A4): I don't know.

Ms. Baker: OK. What do you think? (to Faye, A9)

Faye: (shrugs shoulders)

Ms. Baker: You don't know yet? What do you think. What are they going to trade?

Faye: I don't know. What??? (wanting the teacher to give the answer)

Ms. Baker: That's what I'm asking you. (many students laugh)

Faye: They changed names, whatever.

T: You think they are going to change names?

Faye: No. I asked, changed what?

T: I want you to tell me! (laughs) What do you think?

Faye: Doesn't matter (shakes head).
This sequence of turn taking showed that the teacher, asking, "What do you think?" was not eliciting an opinion, but in actuality wanted to know, "What do you think the right answer is?".

As last effort, the teacher has a student re-read the sentence, "Nellie and Bartholemew traded places".

In the beginning of the story, Bartholemew pushed baby Nellie in her baby carriage; at the end of the story, a much older Nellie was pushing Bartholemew in his wheelchair. The students continued to guess and fifty-four conversation turns later when the bell was ringing, the students were still confused.

After Class, I suggested re-enacting the two riding and pushing incidents with the students. One student portrayed Bartholemew and another Nellie. The first student sat in what they pretended was a baby buggy while "Bartholemew" pushed her. Then, they physically "traded places." After they "lived through" this, the teacher signed, using ASL-like signs "trade place." It was only then that the children fully understood the figurative phrase "trading places." In terms of conceptualization success, the two minutes of dramatic activity seemed to be a great deal more effective than the forty minutes of unsuccessful repair-laden conversation moves.

**Communicative Functions**

Figures 8 and 9, and Appendix G show each participant’s performances for the five communicative functions examined for Phase I. The summative data show that the teacher greatly dominated the initiation turns. The greatest frequencies for these initiation turns were in
Figure 8. Classroom A Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 9. Classroom A Sums of Response Functions
the informing and controlling categories. The teacher contributed 371 of the total 476 initiations for the total participants in Phase I or 78% of total initiations for the Phase. Although Nadine (A3) contributed only 9% of the initiations for the summative lessons in Phase I, her contributions for Phase IA lesson was 18%, relative to the teacher's 69%. Students' response functions for the informing function were very high, suggesting that they did have the opportunity to provide answers to teacher's questions.

Very few ritualization, feeling, and imagining functions were used by any of the participants (see Figure 8 and Appendix G).

**Social Register**

The social register characteristics for the events in Phase I lessons for classroom A adhered to that of traditional classroom discourse. The teacher was in authority, deciding on the discourse of the event and controlling conversation moves. The students were in a subordinate position, following the instructions and elicitations of the teacher.

**Table 9.**

**Key Elements: Phase I - Classroom A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Event</th>
<th>Ritualized Control. Metalinguistic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves</td>
<td>Students' attention directed towards teacher only. Only teacher has microphone unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moves all teacher initiated and directed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions:</td>
<td>Teacher dominated. Generally, students responded to teacher's verification questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Teacher as locus of control, as &quot;the one who knows.&quot; Traditional formalized style of teacher/student of interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE I
Classroom B - Typical Classroom Interaction Patterns

General Description of Classroom B
Classroom B was a self-contained classroom of eighth, ninth, and tenth grade students. The students in this class had been educated in the "oral" division of the hearing impaired program because they were able to use significant residual hearing and speech, without sign language, for receptive and expressive communication (Paul & Quigley, 1990). Their audiological profiles showed moderate to severe hearing loss when hearing aids were worn during testing and instruction. The students did not use sign language as the official mode of communication during formal instruction time; however, unofficially, before instruction time, in conversational asides, and after class, all but two of the nine students were observed to use speech only, sign with mouthing, and/or sign-assisted speech interchangeably. All students in classroom A were offspring of normal-hearing parents (Table 3).

Description and Analysis of Typical Classroom Interactions
The research was conducted in the students' English class. This class was team-taught by two teachers of the hearing impaired. The teachers seemed to have equal status and authority in the classroom during Phase I observations. However, Ms. Mills (t2B) dominated the talk sessions. Evidence of this is seen in Figures 10 and 11, which shows the frequency of conversation turns.
Figure 10. Classroom B Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 11. Classroom B Sums of Response Functions
The classroom, physically, was small. There was hardly enough room to gain wide focus for visual inclusion of the entire class in the viewfinder of the video camera. This classroom was clearly one with strong whole language influences. There were language webs, charts, and other verbal positing on the chalkboards, easels, and walls. There were two older computers for the students' word processing use. There were dictionaries, magazines, and other resource print materials conspicuously arranged on an open shelf. The chairs were free-moving, with desks (see Figure 5).

**Phase I**

The students, during Phase I, sat in a straight horizontal arrangement. The teachers explained that the students generally maintained the same voluntary seating arrangement from class to class. Both of the teachers stood during the entire session time, at the front of the class, backs to the chalkboard and facing the students. They spent considerable time, interchangeably, writing on the chalkboard, recording, organizing and categorizing student responses for whole language charts. Neither of the teachers sat at the teacher's desk which was, physically, to the right of the students' desks, facing inward (see Figure 5).

Again, the teachers were requested to implement lessons based on face-to-face group conversation. The following table shows the lesson number and the topic for each of the three observed Phase I sessions.

During the first lesson, the teachers sought to discuss the poetry unit that had recently been completed in the classroom. Lessons Two and Three were highly related in themes, as the participants reviewed readings about mysterious origins and disappearances.
Lesson topics for typical classroom discourse in Classroom B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase IA</td>
<td>Poetry Unit Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IB</td>
<td>Discussion of &quot;The Greyling&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IC</td>
<td>Discussion of &quot;The Seal Wife&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis of Communicative Events**

The teachers' primary aim for Lesson One, the poetry unit review, was to review individual experience with the reading and writing of poetry. For Lessons Two and Three, the aim was to ascertain that the students had first read, and then, understood the stories and specific meanings from the stories.

Lesson One began with the teachers complimenting the students on their work in the poetry unit. This preamble lasted about seven minutes. The rest of the period was spent with the teachers, especially Ms. Brown, leading a re-examining of previous conversations with the students and the team teacher regarding attitudes and experiences about poetry and relating her own personal experiences with writing poetry. The questions asked were, generally, questions that the teachers had already asked while studying the poems. While the structure of events for Lessons Two and Three was strictly concerned with the transmission, with the teacher
initiating (questioning), the students providing very minimal response and the teacher evaluating the acceptability of each response. The nature of Lesson One was significant in that one of its main goals seemed to be to elicit expressions about feelings and to promote self disclosure among participants regarding their reflection on the poetry unit. Since the teachers were in control of who said what to whom and because they controlled the initiations, the three lessons were also determined to be ritualized control. The inherent norms for classroom participation in the event were honored by all members of the classroom community for most of the class time. These were perceived to be, in summary, as follows:

1. The teacher would initiate all interchanges.
2. The students would not raise their hands in ritualistic bids for attention from the teacher, but would wait to be nominated (called on).
3. The student(s) would speak only in response to the cues of the teacher and not among each other.
4. The responses provided would be minimal, most often one or two words.

The Classroom B, Phase I events could also be categorized as metalinguistic in nature. Metalinguistics refers to a person's ability to think and talk about language as an object or entity for focus (Simon, 1985). When a teacher asks a student to refer explicitly to the content, form, or use of language, the teacher is asking the student to draw on metalinguistic abilities. Examples from the transcription follow:
Ms. Mills: Tell us what the boy liked to do?

Kiana: He loves to fish.

Ms. Mills: He loves to fish. Alright.

Kiana: He love to fishing.

Ms. Mills: You were right the first time. "He loves to fish." Not, "He love to fishing." (correcting to Standard English morphology)

This excerpt continues as Ms. Brown contributed to the metalinguistic nature of the event:

Ms. Brown: What's another word for love? (to Kiana, no immediate response) If you love something, you are... (again, no response) What?... (again to Kiana)

Kiana: Love.

Ms. Brown: (silence, then looks to Holly)

Holly: Devoted.

Ms. Mills: Oh, good. Devoted (and adds) dedicated. Good word.

Ms. Brown: "Devoted" is interesting. Nice word. (writes it on the board) Devoted to fishing.

And later in Phase I, session IB:

Ms. Brown: Vern, what happened to your vocabulary? Use some of your vocabulary. I need some of your vocabulary.

Vern: (no immediate response)

Ms. Brown: Let me see your paper, Curtis.
When a classroom lesson has a metalinguistic nature, the norm is that the participants are aware of and directly address communication skills. Typically, the focus is on the form of language (word order, word inflection) and content (word meaning and ideas) as is shown in the examples above; and not on the functional flexibility (communicative competence) of communication.

**Description and Analysis of Conversation Moves**

**Mutual Focus, Initiating, Maintaining, Turntaking, Repairing, and Closing Conversation Exchanges.**

The students in classroom B performed relatively well, according to the rules of a transmission classroom, in the attending level of participation. That is, they were perceived to be "looking ready" for receiving information from the teachers who stood at the front of the classroom. The specific characteristics observed in Classroom B, Phase I included:

- acceptable eye gaze towards the teacher
- body and head orientation towards the teacher
- gestures and movement confined only to those perceived as enhancing teacher-selected message transmission.

Perhaps, in this context, the term "mutual focus" is misleading, since the word "mutual" implies joint, communal, or collective interest. According to the rules of traditional classroom discourse, each student need only attend to the teacher in order to achieve successful participation.

The discourse pattern for this session was strictly in the transmission mode. According to this communication script, a teacher determines and
poses significant closed-ended questions which are aimed at eliciting pre-determined student responses, or right answers. Ideally, with no more than two or three seconds response latency, the designated student supplies the right answer to the question. The desired student responses demonstrate, in the teacher’s judgement, adequate understanding of the concepts or text. The teacher, then, immediately evaluates the adequacy or correctness of the student’s responses with verbal or nonverbal feedback. An example of this transmission mode, from the Classroom B, Phase I-B transcription, follows:

**Question** = Ms. Mills: (S) Ok, was he sad for the whole story? (2 seconds lapse)

**Answer** = Kiana. No.

**Evaluation** Ms. Mills: OK, right.

This paradigm is one mode of operation evidenced in most regular and special education classrooms. It is also the implicit norm for what was repeated continually for the rest of this session and the other two sessions in Phase I. In the following example, the teacher continued to question the same student. However, the outcome of the interchange was quite different.

Ms. Mills: When was he sad?

Kiana: (asking for clarification). Why?

Ms. Mills: NO. Not why, when.

Kiana: Why?

Ms. Mills: When.

Kiana: Why? Oh. I don’t know. (playing with her hair and hair bow)
Ms. Mills: The first part. The beginning.

Kiana: (no verbal response, but confused look)

Ms. Mills: And then when was he happy?

Kiana: (seems reluctant to answer) Why?

Ms. Mills: Not why, when.

Kiana: (seemingly with revelation and relief) Oh. In the middle.

Ms. Brown: (writes the response "middle" on the board)

Ms. Mills: In the middle! Very good.

This example shows that there were five conversation turns between the teacher's question, "When was he sad?" and the acceptable response.

The ideal transmission paradigm model was not realized here. The teacher and student were not able to follow the expected pattern of moves because there was a problem with the transmission of meaning for the question word "when." The two attempted to "repair" the exchange by asking for clarification and by restating and reformulating, but in five conversation turns, this did not work. The effect, in this case, on the student, appeared to be anxiety and confusion which led to, after several genuine attempts to understand the teacher, institution of a common conversational abandonment or relinquishment control, "I don't know."

The teacher, for whatever reason, supplied the right answer herself.

In the context of the preceding student utterance:

Kiana: Why? I don't know. (playing with hair).

Ms. Mills: The first part, the beginning.
The student, here, provided an answer, "I don't know," which, although, not the desired response, would, for the teacher, satisfy as a default answer and end the difficult exchange. Many students learn, over the years of schooling, mechanisms which meet their own needs by facilitating either their inclusions or their exclusions. This example from the classroom discourse corpus appears to be a situation in which the student's intent was to conveniently exclude herself from active discourse with the teacher.

It is critical to note, here, that in reality, the student may have known the answer to the question, cognitively, "When was the boy sad?", and just, and it's a big just, may not have understood the propositionality or intent of the teacher's question (Schlesinger, 1987), or of the word, "when." Saying "I don't know," in this instance, was judged to be a controlling mechanism for ending the "When was the boy sad?" interchange.

From observation, it was apparent that the student was reluctant to answer, when she began, she did use a controlling move by asking for clarification.

Kiana: Why? (meaning, Did you say, why?)

It appears that the "was confused about the intent of the teacher's request, "When?". Perhaps she did not understand the proposition of the word "when." Perhaps she was unable to auditorily discriminate the words "when" and "why." In any case, it is apparent, from the eventual answer, "Oh, in the middle."

It was interesting to note the temporal characteristics of turntaking, specifically that which is referred to as response latency or more
constructively, think time or processing time. Teacher Ms. Brown dominated the talk turns and asked many questions of the students. Her questions were usually closed ones which demanded a short answer—either a yes or no or a one or two word answer. There seemed to be an explicit requirement of the students to answer within two to three seconds. If the teacher asked a question and the nominated student did not answer within the time constraints, then the teacher would repeat or revise the question for the same respondent or ask the question of another student. An example from the communication participation sample follows:

Ms. Mills: (to Traci) OK. Holly said that the fisherman was considerate. What does that mean?

Traci: (no immediate response)

Ms. Mills: (snatches paper from Curtis as demonstration) Gimme that paper!

Kiana: (only one who reacted) Dag.

Ms. Brown: Was that being considerate (to Traci).

Traci: (no immediate answer)

Ms. Mills: Was that being considerate? (to Kiana)

Kiana: Yeah. (obviously not understanding concept)

Ms. Mills: It was?

Kiana: No.

Classroom B teachers appeared to follow the implicit rules of the transmission mode for moving the turntaking discourse along and maintaining the interaction. It appeared that the lapse of more than two or
three seconds between the teacher’s elicitation and the student’s response was seen as excessive and regarded as lateness of response or response latency. In this mode, little consideration is given for the processing or thinking time that many people need in order to formulate and mentally develop a representative message.

In Phase I, the Classroom B talk, the teacher held very tight rein on the conversation moves. The students, perhaps after many years of schooling in this mode, tacitly understood the basic situational scripts and schema of typical classroom interactions and although their participation may not have reflected optimal quality of participation (best opportunities to initiate, show authority, make meanings clear, etc.), they were able to proceed through the elicitation-response-evaluation paradigm with the teacher, satisfying requirements for the routine.

**Communicative Functions**

The focus of my research was the nature of communicative functions as it applies to distribution and quality. Wells’s five categories of communicative functions (1973) were used in the coding of behaviors: Ritualizing, Informing, Controlling, Feeling, and Imagining (see Figures 10, 11, and Appendix G).

The findings were consistent with what would be expected in the inflexible transmission mode of traditional classroom discourse. The teachers predominantly initiated communication for controlling and informing purposes. As the data show, within the official lesson, the teachers asked almost all of the questions, initiated all the new topics, gave
all of the instructions and directions. The teachers were the ones who initiated concerns about feelings and attitudes.

More specifically, the teachers produced 92% of the initiation functions in Lesson IA; 84% in Lesson IB; and 90% in Lesson IC. The remaining initiations, 8 to 16 percent, were distributed among the students in the class. Among this very small percentage of student initiations, more than one-half were attributable to what may have been considered to be off-task or unofficial behavior (calling another student, speaking about a blouse, purposely ignoring a question, etc.).

The ritualization function of language was evidenced 72 times by the participants in Phase I of Classroom B. The students initiated only 7 of the total ritualizations, 39 of which were counted as total initiations for ritualization. The students showed very little use of the controlling function of language. Out of the 152 controlling functions evidenced in Phase I (initiations and responses), the students carried only 45, collectively. Out of these 45 controlling functions, only 6 were initiated by the students. The other 39 were actually intentional responses to controlling functions initiated by the teacher. Although they are categorized under controlling functions, these responses do not actually demonstrate active control. Instead, they show that a person can adequately respond to a control by complying or rejecting. Only 4 feeling initiations were contributed by the students out of a total of 49 total initiations. The students contributed no initiations and only two responses in the imagining category out of a total of 8 initiations and 2 responses; showing that even the teacher used feelings as initiations only 8 times.
Social Register

Social register has been defined as the range of communicative choices and styles available to a speaker in consideration of variable contextual constraints (Wiig & Semel, 1980). It most often refers to the relative social and political status of one's communication partner.

During the lessons of Phase I, the students were framed in passive, subordinate roles to the teachers. The teacher's initiations dictated the existence of and acceptability of their responses. There was no opportunity for the students to show authority in language use; nor was there opportunity, in these particular lessons, for any of the conversation turns to be directed from student to student. When a student did talk to another student, it was unofficially, by way of an aside. These unofficial conversations between students during the class period were observed to occur only eight times during Phase I. These moments were fleeting and usually executed when the teacher was looking elsewhere. During five of the eight times, the oral students were observed to use manual communication (signing) in order to communicate without attracting the teachers' attention. It was also evident that, unofficially, the students had the competence to take the initiative in the use of communication functions. Interchanges that took place before class (Phase IC) portrayed the students using functionally flexible communication behaviors in social banter with peers.

Although the observations were focused on official class interactions, the brief interchanges among peers and sometimes, teachers, before the start of class were significant. Several students were observed to be having
very animated discussions. This spontaneous pre-session talk was excerpted from the beginning of the third observation in Phase I (I-C),

Curtis: Who 'm talking to?

Ms. Mills: (Comes over to Curtis and playfully puts something on his head)

Curtis: Hey!

Ms. Brown: Now you can't laugh when you're on the camera. (Students talk and joke, back and forth for thirty seconds or so. Turns overlap, so the talk is mostly unintelligible.)

Mike: (to S4) You running your mouf.

Kiana: Like you never ran your mouth. You don't have anything on paper, yet. You don't have anything on your paper.

Mike: Shuddup.

Kiana: You a crybaby.

Curtis: Where Andy at?

Ms. Brown: You have about three minutes before class starts.

Kiana: (dancing movements in seat, to Kiesha about her new clothes) You lucky. Pshew! . . .(announcing to peers) Time to write . . . He nasty (referring to Mike). You shuddup you.

Ms. Brown: Kiana, there will be no name calling. (timer goes off)

Ms. Brown: Time's up. Time to start class.
Although the predominant nature of the talk was anything but positive—with many 'put downs' and criticisms, there was truly spontaneous and democratic conversation occurring. It is consequential to note the assertive qualities of students' utterances and the teachers'/students' status equalizing in the moment of play. When the excerpts were coded for pragmatic function and illocutionary (speaker's perspective) speech acts, the following attributes were assigned:

Curtis: Who 'm talking to. (asserting/control)

Ms. Mills: (Comes over to Curtis and playfully puts something on his head) (teasing/feeling)

Curtis: Hey! (protesting & warning / control & feeling)

Ms. Brown: Now you can't laugh when you're on the camera. (prohibiting/control)

(Students talk and joke, back and forth for thirty seconds. Turns overlap, so it is mostly unintelligible.)

Mike: (to Kiana) You running your mouf. (criticizing/control)

Kiana: Like you nevuh ran your mouf. You don't got nothing on paper, yet. You don't got nothing on your paper. (countering/control; criticizing/control)

Mike: Shuddup. (demanding/control)

Kiana: You a crybaby. (insulting/feeling)

Curtis: Where Andy at? (questioning/informing)

Ms. Brown: You have about three minutes before class starts. (rule-ordering/control)
S5: (dancing movements in seat, to Kiesha about her new clothes) You lucky. Pshew! (complimenting/feeling) (announcing to peers) Time to write. . .rule-ordering/control) He nasty (referring to Mike) (insulting/feeling) You shut up you *#*# *#*#*#. (command/control)

Ms. Brown: (Curtis), there will be no name calling. (rule-ordering/control) (timer goes off)

Ms. Brown: Time's up. Time to start class. (rule-ordering /control)

**Culturally-Rich Behaviors**

The most remarkable characteristic of the unofficial talk in this example was the natural presence of culturally-rich verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Students S2 and S5, from the excerpt above, are both African American. Although there is strong identification with the community of individuals who are hearing impaired, observation and investigation established ethnic background to be the primary identification for these two students. S2 was sounding off. S5's demonstrations seemed most colorful in her signifyng and in her funk dance-assisted talk. There was fluency, indeed buoyancy, in the dialectal freedoms that this unofficial talk afforded. The timer signaled the cessation of all unplanned, spontaneous, and preliminary interactions and cued the beginning of the official class session.

The literature abounds in fascinating examples of cultural differences in communication. Increasingly, educational researchers have emphasized the importance of recognizing the validity of the cultures present in the classrooms and their positive impact on equalizing learning opportunities (Hooks, 1994; Banks, 1991; Bennett, 1990; Gollnick & Chinn, 1990).
Although a group of the Classroom B students showed functional adeptness in a spontaneous conversation before class, this observation was not an adequate one for the assessment of communicative competence. The assessment of functional flexibility (communicative competence) can not be made unless the person shows adeptness across a range of social register contexts which might be appropriate to the classroom, in the school office, at the work site, and for a variety of challenging communication situations.

Table 11.

Key Elements: Classroom B - Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Discourse</th>
<th>Metalinguistic focus; Ritualized control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation moves</td>
<td>Teacher dominated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions</td>
<td>Teachers asked verification, &quot;test-like&quot; questions. Student gave short answer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Typical teacher as authority stance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE I**

**Typical Classroom Interactions**

**General Description of Classroom C**

Classroom C was, physically, a spacious double-sized classroom. Like the other classrooms in the study, this classroom was carpeted and visibly whole-language oriented. The individual desks and chairs were positioned in a straight line close to and facing the chalkboard. There were two large
group-work tables on each side of the room and two personal computers. The teacher's desk was in the center rear of the classroom. The room was, visually, a language-busy room. There were teacher-made charts everywhere—language-experience charts, brainstorming charts, pre-reading charts, work process/organization charts that showed good use. On display on tables and window sills were various creative products that the children had completed. On the day of my first formal observation, the students were in the process of making relief maps of Ohio. There were many books in the classroom—in the shelves and on display.

Teacher, Ms. Wills (tC) had only four children assigned to her during the school year that this study was conducted. These four children had moved up in the same classrooms together since preschool. Perhaps this is why they seemed very comfortable with each other. The classroom was very research-friendly. The students helped me set up my equipment each time and were very cautious about not disturbing the set-up. Although they were aware of the video-taping and observation, there seemed to be little or no distraction from the official classroom tasks owing to my presence or the presence of the video equipment..

The instructional nature of each of the three individual lessons in Phase I was as follows.

**Description and Analysis of Communicative Events**

The primary instructional objective for the first lesson in Phase IA, Review of School Rules, was to have the students read and review their classroom rules with the teacher. The teacher structured a paradigm in
Table 12.

Topics addresses in typical classroom discourse in Classroom C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I-A</td>
<td>Review of school rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I-B</td>
<td>Review of safety rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I-C</td>
<td>Review of sentence pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which the students were required to take turns “playing teacher.” The teacher signed and voiced her initial instructions:

Ms. Wills: OK. I want you to take turns being the teacher. Remember how we do this? Someone will stand up here and point to the board. Then you will call on someone else to give the answer. Rayna, you go first.

The teacher explained to me later that this switching of roles was one of several standard practices for sharing information in the class and that the students knew what behaviors were required.

The students sat in a horizontal row facing and about three feet from the board. The teacher positioned herself on one end of the row. She oriented herself physically so that she was sitting at an angle, facing the students, but readily able to turn her head to see the board. The sequence of participant behaviors which follow were intended to be repeated, with little variation, throughout the class period:
1. The teacher signaled, verbally and/or nonverbally and waited for each and every student to raise his/her hand—in stylized competition to be selected to "play teacher."

2. After all hands were up, the teacher selected, either verbally or nonverbally, someone to stand in front of the class and play the teacher. The hands were lowered.

3. The student who had just won the turn to play teacher waited for a verbal or nonverbal signal from the the real teacher acknowledging permission and timeliness to stand.

4. The chosen student would stand at the board, turn around and read one of several of the enumerated written classroom rules on the board without verifying by pointing.

5. The chosen student who was standing would then turn around and wait until all of the hands were raised again. After all of the students' hands were raised—and frequently the teacher's, too, until the student who was standing explicitly allocated a turn—pointed to someone to supply the "right answer."

6. The person acknowledged would then call out the number of the sentence he/she believed to be correct; that is the one matching the one verbally identified by the play teacher.

7. All of the students were then expected to look towards the classroom teacher in order to receive verification of the correctness of the responding student.

8. If the student answered correctly, with the acceptable sentence number, the teacher would give a nod or positive verbal evaluation.
9. However, if the student answered incorrectly, the teacher would reject the response (by evaluating or ignoring) and instruct the still standing "play teacher" to designate someone else to answer. The someone else would be chosen from the pool of children again signaling with collectively raised hands.

10. The student who eventually supplied the correct number of the sentence would then be required to read the rule beside the targeted number.

11. If the student were right, as determined by the teacher, then he/she would be allowed to stand up and "play teacher." However, if the student were wrong, step 8 would be repeated.

This sequence of contingencies would be repeated from step 3. The following excerpt from the transcribed class session (Phase I-A) illustrates this observation.

Rayna (C1): (at board, looking back and forth from posted rules to eager classmates, seemingly trying to prolong her decision about which rule to pick so that she could be featured longer). She reads: "Food" (step 3).

All: (hands went up, even teacher's) (step 4).

Rayna: (pointed to Billy) (step 4)

Billy (C2): "That's three. Three!" (step 5).

Ms. Wills: (students look towards teacher for verification of answer) "Look at him." (to Rayna, who seems to be attempting to postpone end of her turn to play teacher by not visually attending to the responder) "Don't forget him!" Is Billy right or wrong? (step 6).

Rayna: (looks at board, appearing confused)
Ms. Wills: (again, to Rayna, about Billy) Look at him!

Rayna: (still looking at the board, confused; it appears obvious that she is not able to decode the posted rule in order to answer the teacher's question)

Billy: (standing at the board, but staring off into space)

Ms. Wills: "Read the rule, Billy, read the rule. (redirecting attention) (step 9).

Billy: "Keep your hands to yourself" (reading) (step 9)

Ms. Wills: (nods approval and gestures for Rachel to sit down) (step 1).

This routine was repeated until the end of the class period. The repetition of the above script is a classic example of a routine--defined as a regular, unvarying, habitual or unimaginative procedure. Regular education classrooms abound with routines like this (Secord & Wiig, 1991). The calling of roll, the cafeteria line, the spelling quiz, the question-response-evaluation paradigm, filing out during a fire drill, taking a spelling test at 1:00 p.m. every Friday are all examples of the highly predictable and repeated procedures that are characteristic of routines. I refer to them also as rituals, especially if they are highly stylized and formal, as in school graduation exercises or in the daily salutation to the flag. Although it was the teacher's intent to build the lesson on turntaking conversation, it was clear to see that successful participation, in this event, was determined not only by how well the student could engage in face-to-face interaction, but primarily by how fluently he/she could decode (read) the posted rules. If it were one's intent to assess the through-the-air communicative competence in this classroom at this time, the validity of
the of spontaneous conversation would have been highly compromised when the predominant requirement for successful participation was reading proficiency. This practice is not unlike intending to assess reading skills but requiring the child to write the responses which aim to verify that he/she has acceptably mastered the reading skill. If the child has difficulty with legibility, spatial organization, etc., the administration and evaluation would be invalid, as would reliability.

I examined the transcripts from the other two Phase I lessons for other evidences of routines and found similar patterns. In Lesson IB, the teacher reviewed dangerous situations with hand-held placards as stimuli. The teacher framed this lesson very similarly to lesson IA. Again, the students took turns "playing teacher." The teacher directed the progression of this participation "game" even more closely in terms of allocation of turns and evaluation of the correctness of student responses. There were the same ritualized regulations, such as the all-inclusive and simultaneous raising of hands before one student could be allowed to respond. Again, the students' successful participation in this interpersonal task was based not only on reading ability; but perhaps, more accurately, on visual memory of a signed dangerous situation matched to a spatial and numerical position on the chart. Quite often, the students, at a loss for these spatial memory cues, appeared to be guessing at the correct verbalizations. An example of this ritualized language game, extracted from the corpus, follows:

Ms. Wills: (to Joyce) You continue.

Joyce: (just staring at the board, with think posture-index finger on forehead, then reads) Dangerous situation . . . play or push on . . . (looks back at board) school bus. (all raise hands, including the teacher)
T: (signs only, in reference to turn designation) Doesn't matter.

Joyce: (acknowledges Billy by pointing)

Billy: Two.

Joyce: (looks back on board and at teacher, then nods as positive evaluation)

T: (nods, then does a "who's next" gesture towards those seated)

Joyce: (acknowledges Rayna for next turn by pointing)

Rayna: (stands up)

Ms. Wills: OK. One more time (turn), and then we're finished.

Rayna: (takes a long time in examining posting) Dangerous situation . . . play, push down . . . all. (hands up, even teacher's)

Rayna: (acknowledges Ms. Wills by pointing)

Ms. Wills: Number 5?

Rayna: (nods positive evaluation)

T: OK. Thank you.

The children most often selected a numbered reading item that had previously been selected and read by a peer or by the teacher. In Phase IB, the teacher introduced another ritualized language activity.

T: Now you need to pretend that you are doing the dangerous situation. Then someone has to tell you the rule. Then you will show the dangerous situation. Then maybe . . . I will do one first. (mimes drinking water with hands wet and plugging in electric curler) Which one? Which situation is that? . . . Which one? . . . Rita? (nominates Rita)

Rita: One?
T: Number one (verifying, then signaling all to read in unison)

All: (read in unison situation one)


Rayna: (stands up beside teacher, looks back at chart and starts) No. (looks back at chart again, then signs ASL-like, does not read verbatim) No. don't use again water. . . Curling hair. forget. shocked

T: Remember that rule. Don't use electrical things near the water. Very good. I need someone else to show one dangerous situation.

In this activity, the teacher modeled the miming of a dangerous situation. She expected the students to take turns miming and having someone else in the class guess which written sentence matched the mimed portrayal of a dangerous situation. This, too, was judged to be a slight variation of the preceding ritual. Although the students, in phase LA and IB, were given the opportunity to play teacher, the teacher controlled the nature of the exchanges in the activity. She controlled who said what to whom.

There was a third language game observed in Phase IB, which could be classified as a ritualized event. This particular ritual, the articulation or speech correction drill, is used by speech and language pathologists and teacher in oral programs for the hearing impaired. In the articulation drill, the aim is for the student to approximate the production of sounds in specific contexts. In this case, the teacher directed:

T: All of you did a very nice job with dangerous situations and rules. If you are at home or outside you must remember the rules. I need Rita and Joyce. . . . Rita and Joyce. . right here. OK.
(turning Rita around in order to assist her in paying attention). You must say the word. Use your speech. I must be able to understand your word and give you a point. Billy, I won't look. Billy . . . (covers eyes with hand and turns away, then points to Billy)

Billy: (accustomed to the game, goes up to the chart and points to a word and sits down again.)

T: I won't look. Billy . . . (gaining attention)

Rayna: (attempts word that Billy pointed to, but is unintelligible)

T: Billy, you have to help her a little bit . . . Where is your "s" sound?

Billy: What?

T: What is the word?

Billy: (attempts the word but is unintelligible)

T: Same word, now you forgot the "s."

Rayna: (tries again, but is still unintelligible)

T: OK. Oh, well, I think number one . . . school.

Four or five more times, the teacher proceeded down the row of students and challenged the students to say a word perfectly, especially emphasizing the sounds with frication (h,s,z,sh,ch,j,f,v). After a bathroom break, the teacher began another language game:

Ms. Wills: Ok, now for practicing your spelling words, I will tell person one word and you have to guess. OK. One minute to guess a word. (takes Rita behind partition and fingerspells a word) Go (to Rita).

Rita: (comes out from behind partition and writes the spelling word on the board)

Rayna: Wrong (to Rita)
Ms. Wills: Remember your spelling words. Remember your spelling words. Is this right?

All: (nod for affirmation)

Ms. Wills: Yes. Yes. Joyce, your turn.

In Phase IB, the teacher employs a total of seven various language learning games, ending with a vocabulary activity of having one child draw a representation of the spelling words while the other students were chosen by the teacher to guess the word.

In Phase IC, only one game was played for the entire session time of 40 minutes. The students were revisiting a picture book, entitled, "A House is a Home for Me" by Mary Ann Hoberman. Previously they had practiced this specific sentence phrase structure, "A _____ is a house for a _____" (NP + verb "to be" + NP + prepositional phrase) which varied minimally from page to page in the picture book. The teacher instructed:

Ms. Wills: Remember, we had talked about many different kinds of houses in the book. I want you to tell me what houses you remember. Remember from the book? From the charts on the board? What houses do you remember?

All students: (stare, and look around at each other)

Ms. Wills: Tell me the name of a kind of house. Sometimes it's a box or a jar, but it is called the house in the story. What do you remember? ... What's the name of it. (to Rita, whose phonic ear (assistive listening device) is emitting feedback (audible noise) because she has just turned up the attenuator) Turn it down please.

Rita: I can't hear.

Ms. Wills: (to Rayna) What's the name of it?
Rayna: A cathouse is a house of _______ (blank). A cathouse is a house of ______ (blank).

Ms. Wills: But what is the name of the house that we are going to talk about?

Rita: Wrong. Fine. Wrong. She said house for _____blank two times.

Ms. Wills: (Gets up and writes Rita's name on the board) (punishment for talking out of turn and criticizing) What is the name of the house (to Rayna, again). Can you name one thing that we talked about. Something that is a house? From here (gesturing at chart) or the book (hands Rayna the book).

Rayna: (superficially leafs through book)

Billy: LEAVE ME ALONE! (shouting to Rita who just touched him)

Ms. Wills: Please stop bothering her. (takes book from Rayna)

Rayna: Uh . . . Uh (struggling for answer)

Ms. Wills: But what's the name of it? (show Rayna correct answer in book) Remember?

Rayna: A doghouse. In car in.

Ms. Wills: What is the name of the house for a car? What house is for a car? If you don't remember, you can look on the paper (whole language chart on wall). Look in the book. . .Yes. I need to know what house is for the car. What is the name of the house? (Rayna does not answer, just looks confused). . Billy?

Billy: (signs only) Garage

T: (affirming) a garage. Can you find the word? (gives Billy the book). Find the word . . . How do you spell it?

Rita: NO! WRONG!! . . . (in reference to Billy's answer, raises hand)

Rayna: NOOoo! (thinking, also, that Billy's answer is wrong too)

Billy: g-a-r-a-g-e (spelling)
Ms. Wills: OK. (then she models the sentence) A garage is a house for a car.

All students: (copy the teacher's model) A garage is a house for a car.

The teacher and students progress in this way through several exchanges. The other target sentences included:

- A bowl is a house for a salad.
- A jar is a house for a cookie.
- A river is a house for a fish.
- A web is a house for a spider.
- A hat is a house for a head.
- A glove is a house for a hand.
- A tree is a house for a monkey.

Although the students had multiple opportunities to practice this phrase structure, it seemed as if they found it difficult to remember the sequence of the words. They needed models and additional verbal and visual cues in order to be successful with the task. An example from the transcribed session, Phase I-C, follows:

Ms. Wills: Rita, pick one house. Tell me the name of it. Pick it.

Rita: (with teacher cueing the start) A bowl is a house for . . . me.

Ms. Wills: Do you live in a bowl?

Rita: Cookie?

Ms. Wills: Look in the book or the papers up there. Which one is for bowl?
Rita: (gets up and walks to the chart, squinching her eyes) ... Oh, salad. A bowl is a house for salad.

Ms. Wills: (gestures for the next student to pick a card) 

For the most part, the students appeared to be motivated by the language game activities in Phase I, Lessons A, B, and C. They raised their hands with eagerness to respond and appeared to be motivated to please the teacher. For example:

Ms. Wills: (shows next card and waits for its naming)

All: (no response, only hesitation)

Ms. Wills: (raising eyebrows)

Rayna: (remembering) SALAD!

Ms. Wills: Good. You remembered.

Billy: SALAD, SALAD, SALAD.

Rita: (both sign over and over again, excitedly)

There seemed to be a pull toward developing more consistency in the patterns of the academic task structure and the social participation structure, suggesting that the teacher may have seen significance in teaching children how to follow rigid schooling and classroom expectations. Often teachers and students in today's formal classrooms become primarily concerned with "getting through" the lesson. They may work to complete the ritual as opposed to working for academic learning (Ripich & Spinelli, 1985)
**Description and Analysis of Conversation Moves**

**Initiating, Maintaining, turntaking, repairing, and Closing**

Conversation Exchanges- The designation of classroom C's initiations seemed to be discernable by whether or not the initiation utterance was official or unofficial (on or off task) in nature. The teacher initiated all of the official talk in Phase I. The inherent rules of the interaction events did not allow for any student initiated interaction. During the exchanges in which the students were taking the teacher-role in a language game, the teacher was the initiator and controller of the exchanges, designating turns and talk tasks in the game.

Many of the initiations observed originated with the students. However, all of these initiations were considered to be unofficial to the language game (off the subject or off-task). The teacher's responses to these initiations, usually verbal reprimands, suggested that she perceived these verbal and nonverbal initiations to be behaviorally inappropriate and counterproductive to the lesson. Two examples from Phase I follow:

Ms. Wills: Now I need everyone to read together.

Billy: (initiating) I'm tired.

Ms. Wills: I need everyone to read together. If you are tired, maybe you need to work in Room One (in school suspension room).

Billy: uh uh (no)

Ms. Wills: Yes. Ready? (to play the language game correctly)

The preceding exchange was that of the teacher having the students name the pictures from cards in the phrase structure game as she flashed
them. Another example of initiations which were perceived as inappropriate follows:


Joyce: (starts writing on the board in response to teacher's nomination.)

Rita: Ms. Wills, Ms. Wills, . . . Rayna is complaining! (initiation)

Ms. Wills: Why are you standing? Write your name. (gesturing for Rayna to record her own name on the board, a negative consequence with a back up punishment of losing the next recess)

Here, the off-task initiation, standing and complaining to Rita about something unrelated to the academic task, received a punishment of loss of recess.

Although the students demonstrated that they were basically responsive to or in concert with (Ripich & Spinelli, 1985) the interactional rules of the chosen classroom discourse patterns, the fluency of the teacher's language-learning rituals was often disturbed by the students' unofficial interruptions. These interruptions became even more intrusive to the activity as the teacher frequently needed to stop the control of prescribed activity in order to redirect behavior. Within events, no matter what they are, teachers and students hold each other accountable for contextually appropriate behavior. This was evidenced in Classroom C when a student talked- or behaved-off course, the teacher and other students admonished the errant student. Ms. Wills used verbal and nonverbal admonishments, such as skewed glances, direct stares, silence, or overt punishment.
During Phase I sessions, there was only one student (Rita) initiation which, although still contextually inappropriate to the prescribed guessing game mode, matched the official content of the lesson and was a conversational initiation. The interchange is excerpted below is from the "A ___ is a house for ___" phrase structure rehearsal paradigm.

Ms. Wills: (shows next card)
Rayna: For me (responds)
All other students: (imitate) for me... for me...
Ms. Wills: Shows another card
All students: MOUSE, MOUSE MOUSE (excitedly).
Ms. Wills: (nods in acceptance)

Rita: I saw mouse. Many, many, many at home. I have. Small mice, baby, grey, dirty, stinks.

At this point, Rayna is moving around on the floor while Billy is wiping his eyes with his sleeve and yawning, Rita is moving around from seat to floor.

Ms. Wills: (going ahead with game) Are you ready? I will pick. I am first. I am going to show you (to Rita, gesturing for her to get down on the floor with others) Are you sick?

Repair Strategies

By virtue of the nature of the events in Phase I (ritualized control), the teacher as transmitter of information and (re)director of behavior also controlled the few opportunities to repair incomplete or miscommunication when the students appeared not to understand or be able to follow through. By virtue of the routine nature of the tasks, with
their predetermined target elicitations and responses, the students, as receivers and recyclers of information, had little or no opportunities for spontaneous talk. Therefore, there was little need for the awareness of or execution of conversation repair strategies.

**Communicative Functions**

Communicative functions received the most in-depth analysis in this study in that each utterance in the interpersonal exchanges was coded, counted, and analyzed relative to five specific functions or reasons for communicating. The deliberations regarding the nature and number of behaviors observed in the communicative function categories are presented in Figures 12 and 13, and Appendix G.

It is clear to see that across the first four categories—ritualizing, informing, controlling, and feeling, the teacher strongly dominated the initiating roles. The guessing game format which restricted the student's opportunities for conversation moves and repair strategies seemed also to restrict the students' contributions to the highest representations in responses and reactions across the categories.

The teacher used seventy-two percent of the total initiations evidenced in Phase I while the students used a collective twenty-eight percent of the initiations across the five categories of pragmatic (language-in-context) behaviors. In contrast, the teacher produced only fourteen percent of the total communicative responses and the students monopoloized the responses with a collective.

It is important to note that there was no discrimination or separation made in the presentation of the official versus the unofficial behaviors of
Figure 12. Classroom C Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 13. Classroom C Sums of Response Functions
the students. Therefore, the students' unofficial initiations as evidenced in conversational asides, talking-out or acting out behavior, were included with official initiations across the categories of ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining. This particular coding decision may be regarded as an acknowledgement of my view of the unofficial initiations as an indication of ultimate communicative strength and competence, despite the fact that they were regarded as maladaptive to the current classroom discourse patterns.

In Phase I, great importance was placed on the formality of simultaneous hand-raising as ritualization for cueing the awareness of response expectations. The teacher would cue by modeling the handraising behavior, and then would not select a responder until all hands were raised with hers. In this instance, handraising was not an indicator of a student's individual intent to own a turn. Instead, it was an established and ritualized expectation for the language guessing game ritual.

The informing function showed the teacher producing ninety-seven of the total one-hundred and nine initiations to inform. That is, the students, collectively, only initiated a turn for the purpose of informing twelve times. Out of those twelve times, all but one initiation was considered to be based in unofficial or "out of-context" talk.

A similar analysis can be made of the controlling functions for Phase I, classroom C. The teacher produce one-hundred and fifty nine of the total two hundred and thirty-three initiations to control. Most of her initiations to control were bound to the requirements of the rituals of the selected language games; however, many were related to re-directing the students' behavior to prescribed task.
The feeling function realized very little expression in Phase I. There were a total of twenty-one expressions of feeling, emotion, or attitude. Of that twenty-one, eighteen were categorized as the teacher's evaluations of students' responses in the traditional elicitation-response-feedback paradigm. Specifically, when the teacher said, "Very Good" or "Alright!" or "Good speech" or "You did a very nice job with the dangerous situations," it was marked as feeling function. Also, when the teacher expressed her feeling about a student's off-task behavior (i.e., I don't like the way you are playing around), that was rated as a feeling function. During the three sessions which comprised Phase I, student Rayna intentionally expressed to another person in the classroom (whether verbally or nonverbally), one expression of feeling; Billy, also one; Rita, one; and Joyce, none.

The imagining category held only five of the eight-hundred and thirty-three total functions evidenced in Phase I. That representation is far less than one percent of the total functions for Phase I, Classroom C.

**Social Register**

Social Register has been defined as the range of communication styles available to the speaker, especially with consideration to gender, age, and social status. The first two lessons represented in Phase I were framed in such a fashion that the students took turns "playing the teacher" by standing up in front of the classroom and simulating certain teacher behaviors (pointing to a sentence on the chalkboard or chart, allocating the next turn to a particular student, etc.). This showed the awareness of the teacher regarding the importance of flexibility of social register frames of
interaction. The students clamored for the chance to play teacher. For certain, the student who was chosen "child-teacher" was perceived by himself and others, to have higher status than the three students that remained in their seats. However, this status shift did not transcend the powerful register of the teacher as the one with ultimate knowledge and authority. The previously sampled excerpts from Phase I, Classroom C show that the teacher continually controlled every transition in the interchange—strongly suggesting who would be given the next turn. The "child-teacher" consulted (verbally and nonverbally) with the actual teacher as to the worth and correctness of his/her own and peer responses. The third lesson followed the teacher-dominated pattern of teacher initiation response-evaluation paradigm.

Table 13.

Key Elements: Phase I - Classroom C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Event</th>
<th>Metalinguistic; ritualized control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves</td>
<td>Teacher controlled; even when students temporarily played teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Functions</td>
<td>Teacher as controller, evaluator students as responders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Peer to peer interactions reinforced only when students were taking turns to &quot;be teacher.&quot; Teacher as authoritative one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE I - Classroom D
Description and Analysis of Typical Communication Patterns

General Description of Classroom D

Classroom D was the self-contained total communication high school classroom. Ms. Dobbs was the teacher. The students in this class were being educated through the use of sign language as the primary mode of message transmission. Several of the students had begun their formal education in oral communication classrooms, but switched over to the total communication program at some point before middle school placement. Table 6 provides the identifying characteristics for the student participants from this classroom.

The class really has the use of only one-half of the classroom space. The space was vertically halved by moveable partitions on wheels. Ms. Dobbs's half of the classroom was that which was on the side of the door leading to the school corridor.

The students sat in a horizontal row facing the chalkboard, which was only about four or five feet away. The teacher sat between the chalkboard and the students. She usually perched either on a tall stool or on the edge of the working table next to it as she taught. Her desk was to the right of the row of students facing the door. As in the other classrooms in this study, Ms. Dobbs's classroom housed many whole language charts and diagrams. Approximately one-third of the chalkboard and all of the mounting space on the partition were used for story webs, brainstorming webs, categorization lists, etc. Because of the severe space constraints, the backs of the student's chairs were flush to the partition front.
Table 14.
Topics Addressed in Typical Classroom Discourse in Classroom D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Values and Myths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Values and Myths, cont'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Zoo Trip - World War II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description and Analysis of Communicative Events

The lessons in Phase I were essentially for information giving and verification of student's understanding of concepts from reading assignments. Much of what happened in Phase I also had a metalinguistic focus. That is, as they conversed, the students and teachers addressed specific linguistic concepts, structures and skills for the purpose of reinforcing more standardized usage.

Ms. Dobbs demonstrated that she was working with her students metalinguistically when she said the following:

"What's a value? . . . "This is an example of a myth" . . .  "Somebody tell us, what is a noun? a noun?" . . . "The plural contains more than one. " "There are grammar rules for that. A lot of times you guys have been spelling words wrong. Plural means more than one"  

Another example of Ms. Dobbs's metalinguistic focus follows:

Amy: (in answer to a question about her opinion) It is gross.  
Ms. Dobbs: "Gross," she says. We're finally getting good words.
Ms. Dobbs worked in the instructional discourse mode of lesson delivery, asking questions in order to verify students' comprehension of logical academic information. The teacher most often engaged the students by asking each person in succession along the student row the same questions. The nature of the events in Phase I followed the basic characteristics of the ritualized control native to traditional classrooms; however, Ms. Dobbs's classroom interactions appeared less rigid. Upon examination of the transcribed conversational interchanges, it was evident that Ms. Dobbs relied heavily on making personal connections from her own and her student's out of school life to the concepts being taught. For example, in Phase IA, Ms. Dobbs was clarifying the concept of beauty as a value for some people, she disclosed experiences from her own dating experiences and asks the students to share their opinions, beliefs and experiences.

Who believes in UFO's?
My mother told me that.

Marriage is not happy, happy, smiley all the time. It's argue and most of the time it's more divorce.

Quite often, the personal sharing events would take precedence over planned text-bound events.

**Conversation Moves**

Observations of Phase I interactions showed that the teacher directed the way the conversation progressed or moved forward. She appeared to engage the interest of the students and hold their attention through the use of humor and personal references. Teacher Ms. Dobbs initiated almost all
of the official exchanges and maintained the interaction by leading the discussion—whether by questioning or commenting. The students directed all of their answers and comments to the teacher and did not, according to the expectations of the traditional transmission model, officially speak to each other during their lessons. The teacher initiated and negotiated the repair strategies necessary for understanding.

Communicative Functions

Figures 14 and 15, and Appendix G show the teacher's and students' relative uses of pragmatic functions across five areas: ritualization, informing, controlling, feeling and imagining. The distribution patterns were very similar to those found for Classrooms A, B, and C. Out of the 353 total initiations across the 5 function areas, the teacher executed 278; equaling 79% of the total intents to initiate. The student with the closest highest intents to initiate was Steve who initiated seven percent of the total of initiations made by the class in Phase I. Collectively, the students performed only 21% of the total intents. The teacher used 45 ritualization initiations in Phase I, contrasted to the 13 collective ritualization initiations made by the students. The teacher's most predominant ritualizations were acknowledging turn by nominating, asking for clarification, and clarifying.

Findings for the number and percentages of informing and controlling functions of language, for students and teacher were similar to those from Classrooms A, B, and C. Most informing functions were information giving and elicitations for verification of information known to the teacher.
Figure 14. Classroom D Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 15. Classroom D Sums of Response Functions
Ms. Dobbs: Can somebody tell me what's the real reason the war started? (question for verification)

Steve: I think people started complaining and... I don't know. (beginning response, then abandoning it)

Ms. Dobbs: Come on. (controlling through persuasion) That's true. (informing to evaluate) It starts with people complaining. (giving information). But what kind of problems make people start complaining? (verification question to show memory or understanding of information already known to teacher)

Louis: Sometimes the people... someone shoots the president. (response attempting to verify information known by teacher)

Ms. Dobbs: Yeah. No. That's true (informing/evaluating). But that was Hungary. That's what started that. (giving information) But what kind of problem starts people complaining? (repeat verification question & emphasize to repair) Scott was right. (evaluation) As soon as people are unhappy, they start complaining and then what happens? (no pause) Bickering starts, right?

The teacher ends this complex and multiple-function turn by with the use of a default which has been found to be common among teachers of the hearing impaired (Griffith, Johnson & Dastoli, in Ripich & Spinelli, 1985, p 166). She answered her own question. Again:

Ms. Dobbs: ... and then what happens? (no pause) Bickering starts, right?

The teacher answered her own question without pausing to allow the student(s) the opportunity to do so. The tag question, "right?" also served as a question for verifying information already known to teacher.

Some of the questions asked by the teacher were genuine questions (questions that showed the teacher was really interested in the answer), and others were rhetorical questions. The teacher's controlling functions were
most predominantly in the form of instructions and directions. The few feeling functions used by the teacher were related to humoring. Ms. Dobbs used two imagining intents over the course of Phase I. Teacher Ms. Dobbs used several rhetorical questions which were coded as either ritualization or feeling, depending on the context bound intent.

The following example is one which shows the teacher's use of "polling questions" (firing the same question consecutively to several or all students), imagining, feeling and also the rhetorical question:

Ms. Dobbs: (speaking, humorously, without pauses) Right. Right. Exactly. What happens if there is a really intelligent girl who is really nice, but fat. Would you date her? I'm serious. Would you date her? If pretty, nice, very intelligent, nice clothes, really pretty, nice, but fat. You would date her? Why not? (students look amused)

Ms. Dobbs: (now looking at Steve) Would you date her? (proposition to speculate about intentions)

Steve: (shrugs shoulders, meaning I don't know)

Ms. Dobbs: What about you, Jay?

Jay: Maybe

Ms. Dobbs: What about you (to Louis)

Jay: If real fat, no.

Ms. Dobbs: I'm talking real fat.

Jay: No.

Steve: No way in hell. (giving a definitive answer here, since for the first opportunity, he did not appear to be visually attending when the teacher initially posed the question)
Ms. Dobbs: What about you (to Mark).

Mark: No.

**Social Register**

The teacher/students status relationship was framed very similarly to the relationships observed in the other three classrooms studied. That is, from all behaviors observed in Phase I (i.e., physical arrangements, nature of conversation moves, presence or absence and distribution of social functions), the teacher was in the position of authority and control. There was no direct peer-to-peer interaction during the official lessons. The teacher was "the one who knew." The implicit norm was that she was to transmit her knowledge to the students. This typically imposes a psychological distance between conversation mates, inhibiting the development and/or exploration of alternate interpersonal experiences; however, this typically authoritative "teacherishness" stance was modified significantly by Ms. Dobbs's use of humoring and personal connections.

Table 15 summarizes the characteristics of discourse categories examined.

**Table 15.**

**Key Elements: Phase I: Classroom D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Event</th>
<th>Metalinguistic; Ritualized control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves</td>
<td>Teacher-directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions</td>
<td>Teacher elicited; students responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Typical classroom stances. Formally decreased with personal reference and humor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE II
Implementation of Process Drama

Introduction

In Phase II, process drama was employed as a teaching and learning mode. Three lesson observations were made in each of the four classrooms in the study in order to examine the effects of drama on interpersonal communication behaviors—specifically as it relates to four highly correlated areas of communication skills: the nature of the communicative event, conversation moves, communicative functions and social register.

As was described in the methodology section, the teachers themselves implemented the drama lessons with their students. Because I was in a participant-observer role in this research, I was present in the classrooms during this phase of the study not only to gather data, but as a "sideline" coach and support for the teachers.

Phase II - Classroom A
Description and Analysis of Communication through Drama

Background to the Lesson

For their social studies work, the students in classroom A had been studying the relationship between English settlers and the indigenous peoples, the Native Americans. They were beginning to review the institution of slavery in American and the concept of involuntary immigration. The teacher expressed concern that the students might not have adequately understood this history in terms of the sensitive
relationships between groups of people. When engaged with the teacher in a review of the major events and meanings of this part of their curriculum, the students were not able to answer many of the vital questions, showing a superficial understanding, especially to the multiple historical perspectives involved.

The teacher and I decided to select a drama lesson where the themes and structure would provide the students with a greater understanding of the role of complex human behavior as it related to the two historical events covered.

**Description of the Drama Lesson**

The Jupto drama was based on a fictitious situation—Earthling astronauts had been shipwrecked on an alien planet. To summarize, the students were led through the task of developing, through extended improvisational role-play, a believable space adventure. The students' experiences in drama were artfully and skillfully scaffolded in order to build deeper dramatic action and meaning for the students. The relative teacher/student stances featured teacher in role; and, for the students, mantle of the expert. The students in classroom A were given adult roles.

The teacher, Ms. Baker (tA) introduced the lesson by explaining, out-of-role, the nature and requirements of the work to her students. As a way into the dramatic world, the sequence of episodes developed began with the students being framed (placed in social context) as most skillful and celebrated space navigation dignitaries and exploration specialists who, because of technological problems while on a very important mission, found it necessary to make an emergency landing on the fictional planet of
Jupto. The teacher, as out-of-role narrator and supporter, introduced the children to their task by suggesting what their roles and stances would be in the drama, suggesting ways by which they might collectively and individually define their characterizations and actions in the pretend world.

I am asking you to pretend—to believe with me—that you are all together on a spaceship. You are from the planet Earth. You are the most skilled and experienced astronauts. . . You were picked for this special mission because you are the very, very best in your particular fields of work. As we role-play, you might imagine that one of you is the captain of the ship, or maybe the ship’s doctor. Someone may be even a mechanical engineer for the mission . . .

Ms. Baker explained that she would adopt the role of a report clerk at the Earth control station who would be receiving a report from the spaceship while it was in space.

In the second episode, the students, as the astronauts, had crash landed on Jupto and were being interrogated for admissions by a Juptonian worker, portrayed by Ms. Baker. In a later episode, the students role-played as Juptonian dignitaries as well.

**Nature of the Event**

This study defines communication as the sharing of meanings. The events in drama were truly communicative in that the primary participant activities were centered on the democratic sharing of meanings in authentic contexts. Although the dramatic situations were fictitious, the spontaneous face-to-face conversational interaction and the complexities of
social structures were just as authentic and "here-and-now" as if they had occurred in real life situations.

In the first episode of the lesson, the teacher and students rearranged their seats in a simulation of what they accepted as a spaceship control deck. The teacher asked the students to assume non-verbal behaviors suggestive of work on a space ship. The students followed suit by physically manning their posts and carrying out believable actions of flying a spaceship. Then, Ms. Baker told the students that she would be a communications worker on earth trying to find out what was happening in the spaceship.

The social interaction premise of drama work was evident even in the first few moments of the drama. An example follows:

Alvin: Let's go faster. (initiates the conversation)

Ms. Baker: OK. Look at the computer (pointing to imaginary one). Tell the captain what's going on.

Debra: Hey, Someone's coming (referring to a another spaceship in their field.)

Burt: Here comes a planet. Watch Out!

Jill: The ship is about ready to go off (course).

Selma: Can't you see? Look, right there. (pointing to imaginary controls on pilot's (Alvin) imaginary panel.

Debra: The plane is coming in (ship landing)

Ms. Baker: (to Alvin) Start issuing orders.

Alvin: Power that spaceship. There is another spaceship out there. Burt, fire that guy in that spaceship!

Debra: The Kryptos of the earth are coming.
Ms. Baker: Tell me what's happening?

Dan: There's an airplane up there.

Alvin: What?

Burt: Hey, Watch out!

Alvin: Go up! Go up! Go up!

Ms. Baker: Very good. OK (and starts the countdown) 10, 9, 8,

All: 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. (simulating a shipwreck, the students fall off the chairs, with vocalizations of panic)

Jill: Let's go back to Earth.

Ms. Baker: Calling spaceship 49, earth control. Calling spaceship 49. Come in spaceship 49. Spaceship 49, we lost sight of you. What happened? We lost contact with you. What happened?!

Burt: We wrecked. We fell into an earth that we never saw before.

The teacher and students, in establishing their pretend world, were working to communicate meanings and to gain common understandings about their involvements. The success of their participation in their fictitious situation was not reliant on the production of right answers, but on the mutual negotiation of meanings through the authentic process of communication.

**Conversation Moves**

Observations were made regarding the nature of attentionality (mutual focus), initiation, maintenance, turn-taking, repair strategies, and closings in conversations through drama.

The students, while being active in the drama, seemed to be clinging to every word and action of others. Now, not only were the teacher's
words and actions important, but so were those of everyone involved. Even when sitting and talking in role, the students were physically on the edges of their chairs, in anticipation of the next dramatic turn in the action. They searched each other’s faces for indications of intent and motives, and feedback and reaction as they negotiated through the challenges of the dramatic world. They were observed to gain another participant’s attention by waving a hand or nudging. Because the participants had to talk amongst themselves, it was necessary, for the sake of most effective communication, to sit in a group talk circle so that each one could see all others. As involvement in drama could not be judged by outward appearance only (O’Neill et. al., 1977), more support for the level of student engagement was found as the students were motivated not only to follow, but to promote the movements of the conversational exchanges with on-topic contributions and appropriate non-verbal and verbal feedback. The students, even though this was their first experience with process drama, were observed to initiate conversational interchanges easily. As the previous excerpt shows, Alvin contributed the first verbalization in the Jupto drama, "Let's go faster!". We (the teacher and I) didn’t expect this immediate spontaneity, but it was welcomed and naturally reinforced. Alvin saw that his autonomy in language made a difference in the course of action for everyone. Through cooperation in the pretend world, the spaceship did go faster!

The students were assuming responsibility for keeping the conversations in drama going. They did not wait for the teacher to direct all participation. Having been given authoritative and expert roles, the students appeared to rise to the occasion and assumed communicative
authority. The introductory episode of the drama lesson, in the example above, demonstrates this point. The students, because of their commission in the pretend world as expert space officers, seemed to feel comfortable with shouting commands:

"Watch out!"

"Can't you see? Look right there."

"Go up, Go up, Go up!"

These authoritative biddings would not typically find a context in traditional classroom teaching and learning models.

In a later episode of the drama, the Earthling space officers discovered through a bumbling alien government gopher who has approached their wrecked ship, that they have landed on Jupto. After several turns of events, Chocktaw (the Juptonian) regretfully informed the Earthlings that because they were from Earth, they would not be allowed into the Juptopolis and may not be able to get help with the repair of their ship. The students made speech, language, and communication work for them as they struggle in the pretend world in order to save their existence in it.

After giving the Earthlings the news of their Juptonian rejection, Chocktaw (Ms. Baker) left in order to check with the Juptonian authorities, and decisively, to give the students the opportunity to talk amongst themselves in order to negotiate their next move. Chocktaw returned and erased the WELCOME sign she had originally written before (as the drama would have it) the origins of the spaceship were known. The Earthlings attacked the lower status Chocktaw:
Nancy: Why you erase the welcome?

Debra: Wait a minute!

Ms. Baker: (as Choctaw) Well, I talked to my supervisor, and well, uh, we can't let you in.

All students: Why Not??

Ms. Baker: You didn't really do anything yourself. But it's just policy that we have. I can't let you do that. You've been pretty nice to me so far, but other people don't feel the way I feel.

Dan: Will they help us fix our ship?

Ms. Baker: No. I don't think the Juptonians will help you fix your spaceship.

Jill: That means we'll be stuck here everyday. We have no way to go back home.

The teacher, out of role, discussed the next drama episode with the students:

Ms. Baker: You're going to be in Jupto's government. You're part of the Juptonian people and you will be the Juptonian Council.

Debra: What's that?

Ms. Baker: That means that we're all gonna meet together and talk about the Earthlings that crashed on our planet.

Debra: Oh, I wanna be!

Ms. Baker: We're gonna be the same people.

Debra: You know what, I wanna be the court.

Ms. Baker: OK. That's kinda what we're gonna do.

Jill: Let's have half Juptonians and half Earthlings.
Here, within moments of beginning their first drama, these students were assuming the autonomy of making suggestions about how the development of dramatic action and deeper meaning should progress.

In the next drama episode, the students were framed in role with their teacher as members of the Juptonian Executive Council. The council members had been informed of the landing of the Earthling ship. The unspoken requirement was that they reverse their perspectives from the oppressed to the oppressor and communicate as if the safety and serenity of their existences were at stake.

One of the students, Nadine, (the same one who contributed significant initiations in Phase IA) responding to cues from others in the drama, initiated a move within the Juptonian drama world that would have been highly risky for her out of role. In the midst of the much derogatory talk about the Earthlings, and speaking as one of the council members, she made a startling disclosure. The interchange is sampled below:

Ms. Baker: (to Nadine) You're kinda sympathetic (to others). I wonder why she thinks that Earthlings are OK?

Nancy: I wonder why?

Jill: She sounds like an Earthling.

Selma, Faye, Alvin: Yeah.

Ms. Baker: Do you have any Earthlings in your family?

Nadine: Of course (boldly)

Ms. Baker: (gaspng) You do?
All: (very excited, giving thumbs down and moving away from Nadine)

This spontaneous turn of the drama arose out of the knowledge that the students brought to the drama and out of their own needs and curiosities in the drama world.

**Communicative Functions**

The nature and frequency and percentage distribution of the communicative functions of language are detailed in the tables and graphs in the appendix section of this document.

It was evident that the frequency of overall initiations for each student increased dramatically when drama was employed (see Figures 16 & 17, and Appendix G). The teacher's initiations decreased significantly also. Although specific utterances in the context of conversational exchange were coded as "imagining" functions, drama is acknowledged as an imaginative process; therefore, all of what the participants contributed within the drama could count as imaginative function of communicative discourse.

Examples showing student achievement of greater autonomous and authoritative intents for language during official classroom interaction through drama follow:

Debra: (to Alvin, finger pointing) No matter what you do, you have to pay attention to the plane [spaceship] (controlling through warning)

All others: Yeah! (controlling through supporting position of preceding speaker)
Figure 16. Classroom A Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 17. Classroom A Sums of Response Functions
Jill: I must go outside to fix the ship (thrusting finger to preempt teacher's intended move). (controlling by interrupting to assert intention)

Ms. Baker: (to Alvin, as captain, while seemingly ignoring Jill) So you kind of lost control of your officers? . . (superficially, use of informing function to verify speculative information; more accurately, a controlling function with intent to insult and censure)

Alvin: Yes. (blandly answering) informing by responding to query. Either perceived as genuine request for information or not fully understood and answered yes by default; unlikely that he was accepting blame or conceding.

Jill: (again to teacher) I MUST go outside and fix the ship!! controlling through persisting

The exchange beginning with Ms. Baker's talk turn and including Alvin's response, above, illustrates complexity in regards to communicative function and the delicate relationship between intention of sender to affect the situation (illocutionary act) and the effect the utterance has for the receiver (perlocutionary act) (see Austin, 1962; Bloom & Lahey, 1978). In the immediately preceding exchanges, the students, in role as Earthling astronauts, use overt expressions in blaming their captain (Alvin) for the shipwreck.


Debra: He not pay attention to what happen what he doing. He keep ignoring what somebody say (pointing accusingly; referring to Alvin as captain) (overt accusation)

Alvin: No! (rejecting blame)

Jill: Your fault! Your fault! (pointing also to Alvin) (overt accusation)
Alvin: Well, OK. I just told the robot to fix it (hanging his head). I didn't pay any attention. I just knew the robot to fix the plane. (conceding here; also relating an imaginative intent through use of prediction)

Alvin's responses suggested that he easily understood the intended meaning of his peers as they used universally recognized gestures and stereotypic verbalizations. The teacher's quip, however, spoken without telltale paralinguistic and gestural values, did not seem to be perceived as was intended and that particular exchange was not extended further.

A teacher working through drama may or may not have chosen to target a particular student's progress with interpretation of subtle meanings in conversation. If she or he has chosen to monitor this skill, several "think-on-the-feet" options are available which include clarifying intent as quickly as possible or making a mental note for future focus.

This complexity of considerations re: functions and intents can be deliberated further. Although a teacher-in-role infers attitudinal intents appropriate to the fictional context and the building of dramatic tension, she or he simultaneously operates with undergirding intents specific to what the students are expected to experience and learn during the drama lesson. For example, Ms. Baker's comment, "So you kind of lost control of your officers? May've had a metalinguistic /regulatory intent and communicative intent served by the same utterance." The utterance would carry specific pedagogical intent as well as intent aimed at building dramatic action.

Social Register

The children were given roles as experts of highest status as the Earthling officers and as Juptonian Council members. The teacher adopted
the status of a participant in the drama who was regarded by the students as "less-knowing" and "less-powerful" than commonly perceived in traditional classroom discourse. These drama strategies used were, respectively, Mantle of the Expert (Heathcote, in Bolton, 1995) and teacher-in- (altered status) role. These adaptations in the perception of their roles and that of the teacher provided the stimulus for adult-like functional flexibility in communication.

Later, as they reflected on their participation in the drama, it became clear, at least to the teacher, that multilevels of processing had occurred. The students were using flexible communication moves in order to negotiate their ways through the challenges of the drama. They were communicating as a larger group and also in multicrooked conversations in order to meet the demands of the drama. They were also personally internalizing the feelings generated through their raised, adult status and subsequently, the threat of loss of status and exclusion (see Appendix H).

Many students vocalized greater insight into the situations of people in history who had excluded or been excluded and eventually they expressed vital personal connections.

Faye: It's like when the Africans came here.
Dan: They got nervous when they came to America.
Ms. Baker: They got nervous?
Faye: Nervous. Quiet and nervous felt nervous
Debra: It's like if your mom is black and your father is white and you have a little girl, her skin is white and her hair is curly.

Selma: At my other school, they made fun of everybody, the other kids.
Debra: Some make fun of me because hearing aid and my mom says ignore them because they are bad. But they just don’t understand.

**Summary**

Table 16 summarizes the nature of communicative behaviors observed.

**Table 16.**

**Key Elements: Phase II - Classroom A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Discourse:</th>
<th>Communicative, based in social interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves:</td>
<td>Excellent mutual focus. The unpredictable developments held attention. Students initiated many exchanges, purposefully manipulating the direction and focus of class activity. They built on each other’s verbalizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions:</td>
<td>Students quickly demonstrated flexibility with adult and authoritative ritualizations and initiated often with questions commands, and comments. Teacher’s informing functions were highly responsive and questioning genuine. All behavior was based in mutually-negotiated imagination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register:</td>
<td>Students adopted adult and authoritative roles. Language was often formal and stylized. Teacher’s roles were non-authoritative and non-expert—as absentee who sought information about happenings aboard the ship; as incompetent, bumbling—yet threatening alien, motivating the students greater insights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE II - CLASSROOM B

Background Information

This drama lesson was conducted in the high school oral education classroom and was facilitated by the team teachers, Ms. Brown (t1B) and Ms. Mills (t2B). The drama themes and summary of the communicative skill use follow.

As literature selection, the class had studied *The Greyling* by Jane Yolen and the *White Seal Maiden* by Jane Yolen. In Phase I, the teachers conducted a discussion session asking comprehension questions about their reading. The teachers decided to use the same pretexts, or initial stimulus for the drama lessons that ensued.

The teachers explained the new way of working in drama to the class:

Ms. Mills: "...We are all going to use the pretend in order to understand the readings better. We are going to make up our own situations about the mysterious people and places that we have read about. The first thing that we are going to do is pretend to know one of the people who disappeared. Ms. Brown and I will be pretending with you so it will not be hard for you to catch on."

Nature of Communicative Event

The teachers framed the initial action (Phase II-A) as town meeting with the students and teachers all portraying adults who, in the pretend world fifteen or so years ago, had known either *The Greyling* or the *Seal Maiden*. The teachers modeled their expectations:
Ms. Mills: Well, they called us here to have a meeting. Well, did you get that letter? I got a letter at home. It said that something strange had happened. Two different people had disappeared or something. Did you get one? (to Ms. Brown). What did yours say?

Ms. Brown: It wasn't real clear but it was about two different people who had disappeared. Did you guys see that letter?

**Conversation Moves**

Here, because drama is so new to the students, the teachers attempted to demonstrate how an episode may begin. It was interesting that they were predominantly using questions which were, to them the teachers, non-verifiable to them. That is, there was not one right answer as was expected in Phase I discussion. Although there may have been an evaluation on the teacher's part, of a good, on the point, or fitting answer.

The students responded with short, "yes, no" answers, since most of the questions were formulated for such:

Ms. Brown: Remember the lady, she disappeared? She's been missing for a while.

Ms. Mills: (nods) Students sit appearing a little nervous and puzzled, but attentionality is good.

Ms. Mills: Didn't we find like a shirt or something?
Ms. Brown: Yes, yeah.

Ms. Mills: No bones, no body.

Ms. Brown: The people were all standing around waiting, but no one would jump in and save him, until the young boy did, you know?

Figures 18 and 19, and Appendix G show participants' performances in relation to communicative functions. Up until now, in the drama, it
Figure 18. Classroom B Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 19. Classroom B Sums of Response Functions
appears that the teachers are carrying on a dyad conversation to the exclusion of the students. However, one of the students caught on:

Tia: (answering Ms. Brown) I bet he went to the bottom of the ocean. (imagining)

The teachers went on in this way for a while, struggling to recreate with the students details of life imagined to be twenty years previous to the here and now drama frame—the teachers asking closed-ended questions and the students answering with seemingly minimal thought or engagement.

I intervened,

"Your ideas for questions are great. Now, try to remember to ask more open-ended questions or make comments about your own (imagined) experiences."

**Communicative Functions**

The following are examples of the use of communicative functions.

Ms. Brown: Well, actually we dated for a while (with the boy from the Greyling story. (others' eyes widen, here was a subject they liked) (informing)

Tia: Assuming it was a big school... and you dated him? (expressing surprise.) (informing, feeling)

Holly: One day I saw him at the mall and he said hi to me. (initiating, informing)

The teachers and the students were beginning to build meaning together. The teachers stopped again and out-of-role, explained mutual responsibilities for effective drama work.

In Phase IIB, the students continued to talk, in townmeeting format, about the boy who had disappeared so many years ago. Complexity and
autonomy of language in conversation turns were slowly increasing. The students were enjoying the acceptance of their ideas about the greyling.

Vern: He was the same height I was, but he had different eyes. (informing)

Kiana: "No. You're describing his best friend" (controlling by contradicting)

Mike: Maybe he disappeared into outer space

The teachers gave the students the task of writing-in-role, as the Greyling. They inferred that each student (now adult in the community) saved some written years ago by the boy called the Greyling. They were told that whatever they chose to write would be considered in the pretend world to be valuable and authentic information. The students began to fulfill the task by producing (writing) these documents. One began a thank you notes, another a friendly letter, and another a daily schedule. It was at this point that the students seemed to approach the believe that it was their teachers' intention to encourage and accept as much active participation as possible from them. and that their contributions would truly be honed without censorship. When they finished, they were asked to scramble the various writings and then read aloud one created by another person. The students showed heightened anticipation as to what would be shared next.

When the oral readings were completed, some the students initiated expressions of skepticism as to how one person could have written about some many different feelings. At this point, I offered a suggestion to the teachers and they followed through with giving suggestions out-of-role to the students regarding the next episode of in-role work.
Ms. Brown: Let's move their seats back and get down on the floor with the slips of paper in the middle of the circle. Let's find out what happened a long time ago... what the boy's problem was, what kind of a person he was, how he was feeling. If you looked at them (the slips of paper) all together and talked about them and shared the notes, I'm sure you could come up with a story about them. Maybe say why he disappeared. You are people like investigators, private eye investigators, good at putting clues together. Why did the boy disappear. You've solved a lot of mysteries before, like on Unsolved Mysteries on TV. You can decode the secret message.

The students began to look again at their writings in role in a new light. They worked cooperatively shifting, shuffling, and sorting the individual messages while they talked out their strategies and positions. They had been endowed, by their teachers, with the mantle of the expert (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) and they rose immediately to the privilege.

Alex: What's going on in his head? (initiation about feeling)

Tia: He's unhappy with his mom. (response about feeling)

Kiana: What about that one. (informing) What about that one right there? (controlling)

Alex: He sounds like an alcoholic to me. (controlling)

Ms. Brown: Yeah. What's that tell you? (informing)

Holly: That he had a drinking problem. (informing)

Ms. Brown: But it's more than that. (controlling)

Traci: What does that note say? (informing)

B5: That one! I think he wanted to kill himself. He had so many problems with his body. (controlling, feeling)

Ms. Mills: Problems with his body? (ritualization)

Curtis: No. He can't help himself. Bad attitude. (informing/feeling)
Ms. Mills: Bad attitude? (ritualizing)

Holly: He must be upset about his drinking problem. (feeling)

Curtis: He can't stop it (feeling) . . .

Curtis: He wants suicide. (feeling)

Holly: Yeah, he is thinking about killing himself. (feeling)

Ms. Brown: Does he have a plan? (informing)

Mike: There's a telephone number on this one. He wanted a telephone call (handing the note to Ms. Brown). (inform)

Ms. Brown: (looking at the note Mike handed her) Oh he wanted a telephone call (looking again) Yeah. This is the opposite (another note) I mean, would you write you want to kill yourself and then write "meet me at the movies?" (ritualizing, feeling)

Ms. Mills: What do you guys know about people who want to kill themselves? (informing)

Curtis: well, uh . . .

Tia: I thought that he disappeared, and now you all are saying that he killed himself. (controlling)

Ms. Brown: Well, that's what we thought all these years (disappearance) Maybe it isn't true. (controlling)

Tia: How do we know that he's dead? (controlling)

Vern: He seemed to be a lonely person. (feeling)

Traci: He just wanted to be left alone. (feeling)

Ms. Brown: What did you say, Traci? (ritualizing)

Tia: This should go first, it tells about all the good times (handing Ms. Mills one of the notes. (controlling)

Traci: How long did you say he disappeared? (informing)
T1: Well, it's been 15 or 20 years. (informing)

Alex: He could be having problems with a girl. (feeling)

It is evident from the conversation turn-taking above, that the students, through their imaginations, were reaching beyond their usual performances as they were motivated to put the pieces to of the boy's life and disappearance together. There was initiative and autonomy in language as the verbal and nonverbal negotiations continued. The issues and concerns that they brought to the spontaneous characterization of the boy in the story were those that they may have had prior knowledge of and interest or identification with in their lives.

It is significant to note that during the on-the-floor participation time, the teachers were outside of the physical circle of students for the first time during the Phase II drama sessions. Although they were still involved in the role-play, this physical removal of the teachers from the perceived helm of control may have been the signal that these permission to exercise increased freedom to initiate and to move the conversation along.

The student who had been the most quiet during Phase I sessions and certainly during the first two lessons of Phase II spoke firmly and decisively above the others:

Traci: HE DIDN'T DISAPPEAR (pause)

Ms. Brown: Traci, you know something, have you been holding out on us. You know something. I can tell.

Traci: He told me not to tell.

Student Traci discovered, perhaps, that her own contributions to purpose and decision were expected and needed by the others and that what
she expressed could actually alter the form of the drama. As the focus of attention turned to her, the bell rang signaling the end of the class period.

**Social Register**

The students, during drama, were cast in roles with adult stances and authoritative tasks.

Table 17

**Key Elements: Phase II Classroom B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Event</th>
<th>Communicative, Based in social interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves</td>
<td>Gradual decrease in teacher control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The third episode was student structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and student centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions</td>
<td>Gradually became more autonomous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Students in expert and adult roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers in &quot;seeking information&quot; roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II - Classroom C**

**Description and Analysis of Communication through Drama**

This classroom C lesson reflection is developed most fully, relative to the treatments of Classroom A, B, and D lessons, in terms of highlighting the structuring and development of dramatic activity in a spontaneous, communicative context. The drama was facilitated over three extended class periods of 1 hour and 15-30 minutes each.
Background Information Regarding the Lesson

Ms. Wills (tC) expressed concern that the students might have great difficulty participating in role play. To her knowledge, the children had never worked in this way before. The greatest concern was that their low language levels would be incompatible to successful drama work. I had observed the children, excepting Joyce (C4), as being very animated before class and during unofficial classroom talk, commonly referred to as off-task behavior. Joyce would usually sit quietly—yet still be distracted, visually and auditorily, from the teacher-prescribed tasks by her classmates' antics. The nature of unofficial talk among the students, during Phase I, could have been characterized as argumentative and remonstrative, and seemed to have been most commonly perceived by the teacher as negative, undesirable, and counterproductive. Ms. Wills expressed that it would be advisable to gradually introduce the children to pretending by having them act-out or pantomime physical actions from written labels. I had hoped that our role play would begin from generalization, from spontaneous conversation context, but Ms. Wills had carefully prepared and rehearsed this primer drama lesson. Acknowledging that she knew her students best and noticing their enthusiastic anticipation for reviewing their activity, I agreed to observe, saying, "Let's see what happens."

Ms. Wills sat at the front of the classroom in a student-sized chair. Her back was nearly against the chalkboard. The students were seated at their desks which were arranged in a close horizontal row of four, very close to and facing their teacher. Ms. Wills began.

Remember we practiced acting these out. Who wants to be first?... You all guess what the action is.
The excerpt of the dialogue that follows is characteristic of the turn taking that ensued:

Rita (C3): Walks up, stands beside Ms. Wills, and picks a slip of paper out of the container and looks at it.

Ms. Wills: Can you read it?

Rita: (shakes head) No . . . not (discards paper aside)

Ms. Wills: (offers another slip to Rita)

Rita: (picks another slip and happily recognizes and reads out vocally and with sign the first of two words) play

Ms. Wills: Don't tell. (to others) Did you see that?

Rayna (C1): Yes.

Ms. Wills: What did it say?

Rayna: Play

Ms. Wills: Play what?

Rayna: I don't know.

Ms. Wills: Do you know what it says, Rita? Play what?

Rita: (shrugs shoulders)

Ms. Wills: (to Rita) You have to read yourself a secret, then you act. (then turns to me as I stood behind the video camera) This is what's so time consuming. They can't read the papers. (She then takes Rita behind partition and shares the sign for the concept for the label that Rita could not read. They emerge, then to researcher) I just wanted to do a few of these for you to see where they are with re-enacting things. (to Rita) Don't tell! (by showing sign prematurely)
Rita: (miming playing Nintendo, by moving two thumbs over imaginary fingerpad controls.

Rayna: (repeats the same mime/sign) Nintendo

This activity was determined to be a literacy-bound exercise. That is, a student's participation would be judged successful only if he or she could decode the written labels for targeted actions. There were a total of eight opportunities for the students to demonstrate the actions. In each of the eight instances, the teacher helped by decoding the written words on the slips of paper. Also, because of poor reading ability, the teacher almost always resorted to modeling or acting out the concepts first herself, so that the students could grasp the meanings. The other students were to watch the actions and try to guess the correct English language verb label.

Another excerpt illustrates how the teacher, in her preliminary drama activity found it still necessary to provide frequent redirection for off task behaviors.

Ms. Wills: We need different people. Can you give someone else a chance?

Rayna: Understands Ms. Wills, but belligerently reaches for another slip.

Ms. Wills: (sharply) Different people!

Rayna: (goes back and slouches down in seat)

Rita: (stands up, also out of turn, to take another turn)

Ms. Wills: (to Rita) Different people. Someone stepped on it.

Ms. Wills: Put your shoes on

Rayna: (whines)
Ms. Wills: (records Rayna’s name on board)

Rayna: Aauuggh (and more whining)

It was clear from analysis of the transcription of this warm-up exercise that student and teacher discourse patterns closely matched the patterns found in the pre-drama lessons--teacher dominated talk, non-authentic questioning, one or two word answers given by the students, high level of teacher evaluation, excessive off-task behavior. Most conspicuous was the amount of teacher time and energy exhausted in verbal redirection of distracting student behaviors.

**Nature of Communicative Event**

Ms. Wills decided that the drama lessons would focus on the sharing of an offering from multicultural literature. We reviewed several children’s picture books and chose, *Amazing Grace* by Mary Hoffman as the pretext for the drama work. *Amazing Grace* is the story of a young African American girl, Grace, who loved stories and loved to role-play as characters from the stories she read. She was encouraged by her family to pursue her desire to play Peter Pan in the school play. Her classmates thought that she did not fit the part, being African American and being female; however, she auditioned for the role and won.

In order to boost the students’ comprehension of the story, Ms. Wills thought it best to introduce it to the children the day before the drama lesson was scheduled and then read it again as a "way into" or a starting point for the drama. I observed as the children sat, quietly and attentively at first, and watched as Ms. Wills read. They were most attentive as the pages were being turned, most probable in anticipation of an exciting
picture. The teacher turned the page to a picture of Grace pretending to be a pirate. All four children pointed and began to get excited about the picture. There was no doubt that their fascination for the pirate far exceeded their interest in the rest of the story or in seeing any of the other pictures. I offered, "Let's stop right here and do some exploration with this pirate." Ms. Wills returned to the book only after the drama experience was over. The original plan was to share the entire plot of the story with the students, have the drama activities revolve initially around Grace's dilemma and then generalize to themes relative to cultural differences, overcoming odds, and aspirations. Yet, suddenly, they began to chat in multicrooked and simultaneous expressions about characteristics of piratehood. Clearly, the illustration of Grace as pirate put sparkles in the children's eyes. It was advisable to follow that light—that motivation, in order to make the forthcoming classroom drama work most meaningful for the students.

The ability to think on one's feet is most important to a teacher who works improvisationally with drama. Suddenly, we needed a pirate and a pirate's world. One of the paradoxes of educational drama is that most often, less is more. The traditional trappings of theatre (i.e., costuming, elaborate staging, lighting, cumbersome props) can be imposing and may depress individual creativity and imagination. In classroom C, having the teacher simply cover her right eye with her hand periodically and walk, with a slight limp through an unembellished performance space allowed the children the freedom to generate their own mental images; their own theatres of the imagination.
Conversation Moves

In order to establish the students' beliefs in the pretend world, the teacher began right away to spontaneously give each child a function. She skillfully did this within her role as pirate, using simultaneous communication—signing and speaking at the same time:

Ms. Wills: (in a stern voice) Go on! All of you on my ship. You! . . . You! . . . You are driving my ship (to Rita). Come on. You are the driver (Pulls Rita up out of her chair and places her in a seat imagined to be the navigator's chair in the play area. You (to Joyce) . . . You have to look out for the people who might hurt us. Look out. Over there! (modeling the use of an imaginary monocular) . . . Which one of you can cook? We need some food. (to Rayna) Go down below . . . (then to Billy (C2)) This is a very big boat. You need to help her steer the boat . . . OK Mates!!

Again, the students were involved in role-playing actions as they were in the pre-drama warm-up exercise previously described. However, in the warm-up exercises they were performing isolated, disjointed actions—playing basketball, watching TV, etc. In contrast, in the Pirate drama, the actions were sensible because they were contextualized. The students' actions and reactions—whether spontaneously conversing among themselves and with the teacher-in role as the pirate, whether steering the ship or cooking the food or and watching-out for intruders—were vital in the context of their coexistence on the Pirate's ship.

The students functioned within their shipmate roles for a few minutes, conversing among themselves about the particulars of the ship and of their duties. Their work was frequently interrupted by the disgruntled ship's captain, the pirate, who made them work like slaves and was never satisfied with their efforts.
Ms. Wills and I quickly discussed the next move. Our decision was to have the second episode of the drama framed as a secret interview with a reporter who had been summoned to hear the mates' complaints about their work conditions and unfair treatment. We wondered if the students would continue to suspend disbelief if Ms. Wills' role suddenly switched from formidable pirate to amiable and sympathetic reporter.

Ms. Wills signed for the students to grab chairs and then led them to arrange them in an area of the large classroom that was removed from the playing area for the imaginary pirate's ship. Again, the students were seated in a horizontal row up, with their teacher facing them. Yet, this time, the teacher sat very close to them, engaging them in somewhat of a huddled, secretive liaison. Out of role, she challenged.

Ms. Wills: OK. You did great pretending with me on the ship. The pirate is finished for now. He will be back later. Right now I am changing. I am pretending that I work for the newspaper. I want to write a story about your life on the pirate's ship. I am very interested in your feelings about the captain... First, I need to know, what are your jobs on the ship?

Next, Ms. Wills pretended to write enthusiastically on an imaginary notepad as the students offered details about their responsibilities on the ship. The students adapted quickly to their teacher's role switch. They were encouraged to say more when they saw her enthusiastically scribbling on her pretend pad. Here, her questions were authentic. She asked about that which she, as a reporter, genuinely wanted to know. She wanted to get to the bottom of their stories, she desperately wanted to know of their opinions and feelings. The children sensed, too, that, within the drama, their answers may have significant consequence for their fictional lives as
shipmates. This reporter might have been able to help them if they were able to supply sufficient information. The students rose to the occasion:

Ms. Wills: Tell me about your work on the ship.

Joyce: I watch for people on other boats. People come from other boats and want to eat. I have to watch and watch. Sometimes others come on our boat. They eat and leave. I'm the first one to see them out of my monocular. They are hungry. Women and men want to eat.

A little later, Rayna had her turn.

Ms. Wills: Can you explain about your cooking work?

Rayna: Hamburgers.

Ms. Wills: Say more so I can write more for my newspaper (widening her eyes to show interest, while prompting for language expansion in role)

Rayna: Fish. ...I catch the big fish. Pull them in. Scale them, filet them, put salt and pepper on them. I use a lot of seasonings and serve a lot of beer. Once I got my monocular and looked far out. I saw land. I was so excited. I saw many houses. There was a town. I want to go there to get a shave.

In this second episode, it is clear that the teacher's skillful use of open-ended questioning stimulated not only a direct answer; the student responded by volunteering highly imaginative details which served to extend the virtual world outside of the "kitchen down below" initially suggested by Ms. Wills. Rayna suggested that "lots of beer" was served on the ship. What implications could that have for the integrity of the drama: for life, work, and relationships on the ship. Rayna's creative elaboration even extended beyond the boundaries of the ship. One might wonder, "Could refuge for the shipmates be found somewhere in this town Rayna imagined?"
A teacher experienced in working through drama reinforces and immediately or subsequently builds on such valuable student contributions in the probability that their use will be significant for the development of deeper engagement and meaning-making.

The teacher's authenticity in questioning in Phase II- Drama, was highly contrastive to the closed ended questioning which predominated the Phase I pre-drama group talk sessions. These prompt or elicitation questions were extracted from Phase I:

A web is a house for a . . . what?

What is the name for a house for a car?

What is rule number seven?

The common teacher discourse stance of these elicitation questions prompt *tell me what I already know* and this question patterning is no more than perpetual test-taking. These elicitation questions are inherent in the traditional classroom recitation scripts. Morgan and Saxton (1995) emphasize that in this procedure--teacher asks question, student gives answer, teacher evaluates answer, and in the same breath, asks another question. [ref. Dillon, 1988, p. 85]. "The teacher controls the discourse; there is little time for considering the answers (your own and others) and the constant evaluation of answers is extremely inhibiting"(p. 70). Children know that they are expected to respond with "the right answer. In the face of difficulty with comprehension of concepts, younger children often try to please the teacher by struggling for the right answer when participation might be best reinforced by the teacher honoring the contribution of one of any number of good answers. Often, when students become older and
wiser, they are negatively reinforced to respond minimally, to resort to non-committals such as "I don't know" or "I quit," or not to respond at all.

There was more questioning during asides from official lessons in Phase I, such as:

Do you want me to call your mother about your behavior?
Why don't you pay attention?
Do you have a dog at home?

The questions immediately above may or may or may not be interpreted as real attempts by the originator to gain insight or knowledge. Closer analysis of "Do you want me to call your mother . . . ?" and "Why don't you pay attention?" might reveal that the teacher may not have expected or paused for a response; instead, the true illocutionary acts may have been categorized as controlling functions—to threaten and then to criticize. In the last question, "Do you have a dog at home?," it was clear that the teacher was reviewing previously verified and remembered information for the sake of rehearsing decontextualized language phrase structure or transformation.

In contrast, questioning in Phase II, the drama lesson proved to be much more authentic in content, form, and use. As is typical of everyday person-to-person interactions, the questions during process were asked in character as an appropriate and necessary activity towards discovery, clarification, and influence. Quite often, as is common of life outside of the classroom, questions reflected real curiosities (Freire & Faundez, 1989) and resulted in surprising and unexpected response; they often arose in covert or alternative form. Examples of Ms. Wills's Phase II's authentic questioning follow:
You stand there a long time watching, do you get tired?

Why do you feed other people on your boat... why can't they eat from their own boat?

Tell me about your work on the boat.
What did you think, when the pirate yelled at you?
What about me? What do you want me to do?
If you don't wash the floor, what will happen to you?
I'm afraid... I don't know what to do... What can we do?
Is the spider poisonous?
What's your favorite idea for stopping the Pirate?

Likewise, the students, in Phase II sought to satisfy their curiosities through valid questioning:

Joyce: Will you help us?
Billy: How did the pirate lose his eye? His leg, hand?
Rayna: Why did you leave your home?

Ms. Wills facilitated the maintenance of attentionality and seriousness about the work (on task behaviors) through committing the students to the responsibility and raised status implied by their drama roles.

(Rayna expressed anger because Joyce was infringing on her sitting space. She scooted over to boot Joyce back over)

Ms. Wills: (In role as newspaper reporter) I understand that all of you have very important work on the ship. It is very important for you to remember that you are all adult workers. You don't have time to play. You may have a serious problem with this captain. Let's see that adult-like behavior now.

(Rayna, along with the others, adjusts her posture and puts on her best adult face.)
As the interviewer (teacher in-role) took information for her report, the students (shipmates) began to describe the abusive conditions under which they worked. They not only related the actual encounter previously role-played with the pirate, their improvised talk included complaints about experiences on the ship that were only witnessed through their imaginations:

Rita: Sometimes it is so hot when I steer the boat. I don't get a break and I get really sunburned . . .

Rayna: The pirate made us scrub the floor. Then [he] felt the floor and said that it wasn't clean still. We had to scrub the whole thing all over again . . . He was mean. He was strict. If someone laughed, he got mad . . . (The students referred to their pirate as he, even though Ms. Wills stood in for this role) . . . I cried. I scrubbed the floor and I cried and cried. He was so mean. He stank. We couldn't use mops. We had to scrub the floor with cloths down on our knees. When he saw that the floor was still dirty, he made us scrub more and more.

Rita: (touching Rayna on the shoulder in order to acceptably get her attention and to remind her). Remember he was mean to us, too. (Rita & Billy) He yelled at us and told us not to play around and to work and clean up everything. If we looked around, the pirate would say, "You look where you're going." He was mean!

Billy had been sitting fairly quietly listening to the others. His admonishments about the pirate, so far, had been brief.

Billy: Bad. I didn't like him. He had a peg leg and walked with a limp. He made us clean the floor over and over again.

Suddenly Billy sprang from his seat and initiated a spontaneous reenactment of the previous episodes with the pirate. The teacher and I were surprised by a play within a play of sorts, with Billy standing in for the pirate and quickly enlisting the others in a vigorously pantomimed revival
of their plight. His commands and verbal offenses were much more ferocious than those of the teacher-as-pirate:

Billy: Stop laughing! Stop now! Scrub the floor. Get back over here. (yelling and screeching) Clean the floor again. I told you to get back. Do the floor again. Now! Stop laughing. I am mean. . . . (bending down to test the floor for cleanliness) Wipe more! Now! (commanding)

In the previous example, Billy was exercising intents to control the actions of others. The behaviors that he demonstrated—jumping up from his seat, imitating the teacher, and inciting others to join him—may have been punishable with at least a lunch detention or time out consequence under traditional classroom discourse conditions. But, in this particular drama structure, the role-enhancing behaviors were socially reinforced by the teacher as well as by Billy's classmates.

In order to sustain dramatic tension, the teacher proposed that the stories of the ships crew about the pirate so intimidated the interviewer (teacher-in-role) that she fled from the ship never to be seen or heard of again. Her report was never published due to fear of retaliation from the pirate and his superiors. The teacher relayed this idea to the students by simultaneously signing and speaking the following:

I've finished pretending the lady. What happened to the paper for the newspaper? The lady tore it up. She was afraid of the pirate. The lady left in a hurry. Back? No more!

Next, Billy signaled to the teacher to re-assume her role original role. (gesturing for her to re-enter the play area) PIRATE! PIRATE! come on!

He (Billy) seemed to be well on his way to becoming comfortable with the communicative freedom that drama afforded. His actions and those of
the teacher suggested that he be understood the expectation the he be cognitively interactive—thinking of self as a source of information, negotiating, planning, testing out own hypotheses and reflecting on the dramatic action. This observation was highly contrastive to what had occurred repeatedly during the Phase I pre-drama sessions when Billy frequently controlled in unofficial and, according to teacher feedback, unacceptable ways—by yelling out, bickering with his peers, laughing inappropriately, or by jumping up in the middle of another’s talk turn. The structure of Phase One interactions seemed to adhere to the teacher dominated curriculum delivery model of adult-child interactions where the teacher hands over new information and the child passively learns by recalling rote information (Webster & Wood, 1989).

I believe that I learned, from years of working in a state psychiatric hospital, that there is no discrete behavior that is indubitably appropriate or inappropriate. The acceptability of a behavior is relative to the social context in which it is exhibited and observed. Within drama work, it is possible for the teacher to structure or frame interactions differentially, so that student and teacher behaviors across a wide variety of pragmatic functions (ritualizing, feeling, controlling, as well as informing) and social registers are fitting and proper. Equally as important, another benefit of a well structured drama lessons is that the challenges of in-role tasks may motivate students to muster desirable behaviors which are typically low-frequency. For Rayna, Billy, Rita, and Joyce these low frequency behaviors may have included mutual attentionality, significant contribution to language content and progression, positive peer regard and interaction, negotiation, decision-making, reflective expression.
Drama work appeared to affect the way that language was represented in classroom C. There are several manual English systems established for the representation of the English language code through signing (Paul & Quigley, 1994). Most teacher training programs and deaf education programs formally advocate the consistent use of a selected sign system. The teachers in the total communication program accessed through this study have been encouraged by program administration to use Signed English (SE) with its English language word order and fourteen English-specific morphological markers (Bornstein, 1982) as the consistent system for developing competency in English and for delivery of instruction. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to deliberate fully about the highly controversial issues regarding selection of language system, it is important to highlight concerns as they relate to communicative competence in deaf education classrooms.

Difficulties arise in educational practice, when English is not the first or native language and a first language (i.e., ASL, for a small percentage [3%] of students with severe-to-profound hearing impairment) is not available to the students in their learning of new concepts or a second language. This difficulty is compounded when no formal first language exists—neither English nor American Sign Language (ASL) (Quigley & Paul, 1989). As emphasized in preceding chapters, most young children with severe to profound hearing loss without (culturally). Deaf parents are either not exposed to or are inconsistently exposed to the natural language of the Deaf community, (ASL) and they enter school without English language competency. Instead, over the schooling years, beginning with early intervention and preschool, these students are introduced to and
adopt the use of variable modes of English-like signing (sometimes referred to as Pidgin Sign English [PSE]), which combine features of both English and ASL. Complicating the fact that spoken and written English are often inconsistent in form and non-conceptual in representation, the children are faced with the seemingly impossible task of making sense of highly inconsistent and unpredictable teacher expectations regarding the form of signed communication that change from teacher to teacher and from year to year. It may be that it is the teacher's struggle for successful meaning exchange that causes this fluctuation from the use of a consistent sign system. Paul and Quigley (1994) explained the sources of variation:

The use of features from either language [English or ASL] depend on the language proficiency of the (student) signer. . . Another source of variation is the sign communication competency of educators and practitioners. To suit their needs some educators may 'borrow' signs from other signed systems while using English-like signing. (Paul & Quigley, 1994, pp. 32-33.)

The Phase I lesson, based on reading and patterning the sentence structure, "A (bowl) is a house for a (salad) was a classic example of the confusion that non-conceptual signing brings to the classroom."

Louie Fant (1980) concluded from his life experiences that the use of American Sign Language is a demonstration of dramatic art as well as conceptually sound communicative function. Fortunately, in this Phase II drama lesson, the teacher was observed to rise to the occasion by accepting and using conceptual signing which, in many instances, was ASL or ASL-like. For example, in her conversations as the pirate and the interviewer and later as the naive new worker, non-manual signing was common--pursed lips, blaring nostrils, bulging eyes, furrowed eyebrows, heaved or
hollowed chest—inflecting the strongest meaning. At times, while observing the participants, I appreciated an apparent metaxis, a morphing of two communicative modes, as it was difficult to determine which behaviors were attributable to the drama process and which were attributable to ASL. Ms. Wills and I shared that she, in working in this new way, was honoring and accommodating two hallmark American cultures in tandem—that of the Theatre and that of the Deaf community.

**Communicative Functions**

Figures 20 and 21, and Appendix G show that the participants' use of communicative functions across the ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining categories. Flexibility of communicative role and function through drama was further observed in the teacher-as-pirate verbalizations.

Ms. Wills: Do you want to rest? I will drive for you. Take a break now.

The teacher, in role as pirate, was displaying deceitful and underhanded motives as (she) tried to trick the crew into believing that they could relax and trust (her). Communicatively, then, the students were being challenged to recognize the incongruence between the surface
Figure 20. Classroom C Sums of Initiation Functions
Figure 21. Classroom C Sums of Response Functions
meaning of what was being said and the genuine, deeper communicative intent of the pirate. These types of communicative challenges and propositions were not evidenced in Phase I classroom talk and (excepting decontextualized discussion of multiple meaning words and idiomatic expressions) are uncommon to teacher/student interactions in conventional language-learning classrooms. Yet, for efficient language processing, the child with hearing impairment must be challenged with discriminative learning experiences which promote and reinforce skills of deciphering less conspicuous realistic to everyday interpersonal challenges of the real world beyond the classroom.

Other examples of unlikely classroom social intents, which were evidenced in Classroom C's drama, follow.

Ms. Wills: I am going to take all of you and throw you in the water to the sharks (threat)

or

Ms. Wills: What can we do? (soliciting advice)

Later, the teacher assumed the role of a new and naive crew member who was being informed by the four other crew members (the students) about the conditions on the ship.

I don't know what to do. (admitting feelings of inadequacy)
I'm afraid. (sharing feelings of fear)

Social Register

The juxtapositioning of the teacher as, paradoxically, the one who does not know or the one with uncertainties or insecurities reciprocally
raised the status of the students to those that knew. They, then, were the experts and they initiated with authority and competence:

Rita: The pirate will punish you if you do not do good work. He will make you scrub the floor. (initiating: informing & warning)

Rayna: The pirate will throw us to the sharks. He will throw us overboard at two o'clock, today. (initiating: informing, detailing, and warning)

Ms. Wills: I want to go far away from here. I have a family at home. I'm afraid. (informing / feeling)

Rayna: (to new crew person) ESCAPE! (controlling/commanding)

Joyce: I do not like the captain (feeling)

Ms. Wills: (puzzled, worried look)

Joyce: [The Pirate] said he would throw us in the water. We will fall in and the sharks will get us. (reporting/informing)

Rayna: I can help you! (controlling/offering help) I have an idea! (ritualizing/phatic expression, social oil). Swim away from here as fast as you can (controlling/demanding)

Billy: No, I refuse [to be eaten by the sharks] (controlling/refusing)

Rita: I hate the pirate (feeling/negative regard)

Rayna's third talk turn, in the transcription extraction immediately above, shows the use of phatic expression which is also referred to as "social oil." This characteristic of student and teacher conversation maintenance was relatively common to drama talk, but was rarely observed in the traditional classroom talk of Phase I. Phatic expressions, such as Rayna's "I have an idea" are ritualizations which function to show sustained interest and to maintain or further the interpersonal
relationship level. They are most commonly observed in adult-like conversations.

When Billy asked the question, "How did the pirate lose his eye and his leg?", everybody wanted to know how. Instinctively, all four students turned to the teacher for the "right" answer. The teacher asked, "Can you imagine (make-up) to show how the pirate got hurt?" The students jumped up and into the middle of an open play area. They began to move around in the space signing and voicing excitedly and physically negotiating an answer to the question. At that point, the teacher joined me as spectator to the dramatic action. The students were ready with a production piece of sorts, C2 stood in as the pirate and the students staged a slow motion non-contact bar room brawl, stopping to narrate and explain frequently.

Perhaps the most remarkable examples of competence in sharing meanings were discovered in transcription analysis of the final episode. The teacher, as the helpless neophyte, depended on the sagacity of the students to find a way to stop the pirate, lest he (the off-stage pirate) toss them all to the sharks. There was delightful antilogy in the way that the children responded to their dreadful dilemma. They worked hard and successfully in maintaining their roles as frightened, but mutinous rebels. Yet, in their eyes, one could surely discern swelling amusement and enchantment—as only the protection of the pretend could afford.

Rayna: Tomorrow, at 2 p.m., we will get thrown to the sharks (informing) We will die. Are you afraid? (feeling)

Rita, Rayna & Billy: (standing up and go over to the teacher, pulling her from her chair as they begin to actively forecast their demise.) (controlling, feeling)
Ms. Wills: You and me, we don't want that (to die). . . . (feeling) So we have to think. (controlling)

Joyce: We have to wave in order to alert somebody and get help. (controlling)

Rayna: Wave for help? (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Yes, we could do that. (feeling) What other ideas? (informing)

Billy: Let's hypnotize him. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Hypnotize him? (ritualizing)

Billy: Hypnotize him and throw him overboard. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Maybe!! (Feeling) But, I'm scared (Feeling) Do you have any other great ideas? (informing/questioning, recording)

Rayna: Let's sneak into the pirate's bedroom while he is asleep and hurry and clean it up. He will wake up and be so pleasantly surprised that he will thank us and be friendly. Then we can fix him a sandwich that's so good, he'll eat three and say a big thank you. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Oh, wow. (feeling) Oh . . . so we can do many nice things for the captain (ritualizing/repeating for clarification)

Rayna: You've got it! (feeling)

Ms. Wills: (gives Rayna a high 5) (feeling)

Billy: Ice Cream, Ice Cream, Ice Cream. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Thank you. (ritualizing) Let's see, (speaking in role as ship's recruit while recording suggestions on the chart as teacher) . . . Wave for help. . . do many nice things for captain. . . (ritualizing through summary and emphasis)

Billy: Let's put poison in his food. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: AHHH. Put poison in his food? (informing)
Rita: Put poison in his food! Maybe he will become sick and die. (controlling through suggesting)

Joyce: No. Let's just play games with the pirate; cards, toys. (controlling)

Ms. Wills: Oh? Try to earn his favor by playing games (ritualization).

The students decided to poison the pirate. In spontaneous role play, the ships crew flattered the pirate by cleaning the ship until it was spotless and by offering him most tasty food. The pirate ate the poison and fell over. Then Rayna poured a pretend bucket of water on the pirate's writhing body (in Wizard of OZ fashion) and with great satisfaction boldly and elaborately announced in ASL, "melt, . . . finish . . . success." This, when glossed in English would translate, "I melted the pirate. We're finally rid of her. We did it!!"

The participants congratulated each other, acknowledging the success of the mutually created drama with compliments, hugs and laughter. Formally, the Pirate Drama was over. The students, however, clung to their pretend world long after by relating the virtual events to others, subsequently reviving and extending the the actions in the drama, or by drawing pictures to reflect on participation.

Figures 20 and 21, respectively, display comparative sums of communicative initiations and responses among the teacher and students of Phase II, classroom C. The data generally show that drama interactions allowed for significantly greater democratic communication behavior versus the teacher-dominant initiations of Phase I. Other results are summarized in Table 18, below.
### Table 18.

**Key Elements: Phase II - Classroom C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Event -</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves -</td>
<td>Spontaneous, gradually student directed. Repair naturalistic and quickly effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions -</td>
<td>Students show more initiatives, especially for informing and controlling functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register -</td>
<td>Students with adult-like roles, experts status re: the pirate and life on the ship Teacher initially in opposing role to motivate action; later helpless in a life-threatening situation, depending on the knowledge of the experienced crew members (students)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE II - CLASSROOM D

**Description of Drama Lesson**

Classroom D was the high school total communication classroom. The three lessons in Phase II comprised one extended treatment of the universal themes related to human suffering and sacrifice and helping.

**Nature of Communicative Events**

The class had been studying World War II in social studies and were reading young adult literature based on the history. The teacher expressed a concern that the students had completed their reading assignment, but by their responses to comprehension questions, were still confused about facts from the reading. Perhaps even more critical was the concern that the
children seemed to find little identification with the underlying themes of the story. We planned to structure drama activities which would be facilitative to the exploration of "what it must have been like" along with the themes of the story.

The teacher's initial structure for the lesson was one in which she framed the students and herself as members of a very active and successful Danish Resistance group. Approximately 15-20 minutes were spent at the beginning of class for the discussion of the history as it related to the literary selection.

**Conversation Moves**

The teacher chose to begin the drama participation somewhat abruptly, with the problem:

Ms. Dobbs: Alright, we have a problem here. A big problem. I just found out some information that is making me very angry and very sad. Now all of you have agreed to be members of the Danish resistance group, but I just found out that one of you is a spy for the Nazis. Someone here in this room is telling information to the Nazis.

The teacher sets out the task and the peculiarities of the person-to-person confrontation and negotiation from within her role. It appeared from her initially controlling stance that she had also framed herself as the leader of the group. They appeared to be eager for the moment of first challenge.

Louis: Who?

Ms. Dobbs: I don't know who. But I just found out that one of you is blabbing.

Amy: Not me!
Ms. Dobbs: I don't know, but one of you is blabbing. (making sure they don't miss the premise) You know Mrs. Hurst? Mrs. Hurst is gone. Anyone know what happened to her? . . .

Kelly: I got information that the soldiers went to her shop and took her.

Ms. Dobbs: Well, if you remember our first meeting, we made plans to take Mrs. Hurst and her husband and her son and we were going to take them and hide them and send them on a boat to Sweden. But one of you told that and the Nazis arrived, took them before we could do our plan.

Louis: NO!

The students' participation was not deterred by the teacher's dominating and manipulative stance. It seemed, in retrospect, that the teacher in assessing the preparedness and experience of her students, took the risk of initially posturing herself in the drama as someone formidable and overbearing so that the students could work purposefully to dismantle her control and find their own voices. The teacher seemed to be aligning her strategy to that of Dorothy Heathcote who is often called the "Mother of Process Drama." When Heathcote works in role with students, she often adopts roles which seem formidable at first. Bolton rationalized Heathcote's use of this strategy as such:

This is because she knows that children must work for autonomy; they must find resources within themselves to earn power. Power is not something to be handed on a plate. Teachers must take power unto themselves, constantly opening up opportunities for their pupils to relieve them of it redefined the But, this did not happen right away. They struggled with the dilemma of discovering who the spy over two class sessions. The teacher during the first drama session, sat within the meeting circle, but she was clearly at head or focus of it, physically located near the center front of the classroom very near to her much taller stool that she used during Phase I. (Bolton, 1985)
A few conversation turns later, the teacher continued:

Ms. Dobbs: I can't trust any of you... How can we find out?

Amy: Stop telling things about Jewish business.

Ms. Dobbs: How? I know I'm the leader. But I can't do everything myself. That's why we formed this group, because you have been very helpful.

Amy: (nods) It was at this point that the teacher momentarily hinted, in-role, that her status as controller was vulnerable. When she was sure that the students perceived this shift in status, she quickly returned to the previous accusing stance.

Louis: Who is spying? (with sincere trepidation)

Ms. Dobbs: I don't know who. I have no idea. But one of you is a spy (angry accusation). You are a German spy (a spy for the Germans). Now how can I find out who?

Amy: Talk to people individually.

Ms. Dobbs: (expressing more exasperation) But how can I tell who's lying to me?

Mark: (sitting on the edge of his seat) Use a lie detector.

**Communicative Functions**

It was very early in the drama, yet one could see that the students were using communication effectively to negotiate and solve the dilemma before them. I had witnessed the teacher, in a phase I discussion of myths, using irony in challenging the students to take opposing viewpoints. She said,

"OK, I have proof, Look. Here's a picture of him. Look, Elvis is alive. Here is the picture. It's true! LOOK!"
The students immediately refuted her claim and they seemed to have been transferring this skill over to the drama world. This suggested a reciprocity of positive effects between the real and drama worlds.

The student's interactions in the drama continued to process as the committee members spoke of the horrors they observed about the concentration camps:

Louis: Bad smells. Crowded conditions... They have mass burials where the bodies are heaped up together

Jay: Awful!

Amy: If they talk, the Germans say shut up.

The teacher then gave the students a task of planning and "performing" in tableaux. Using this strategy, the students in three groups of three, depicted the horrors of the time and situation by freezing in place as they were representing a scene which they believed might have been from that time. The students insisted on creating, not one, but two scenes per group. Although there were none of the "trappings of the theatre" (i.e., costuming, props, lighting changes), the students artistically interpreted what life must have been like there in and around the concentration camps. One group lay on the floor of the room crowded together, representing mass burial. Another group depicted the separation of a Jewish family. Afterwards, the students reflected through discussion, showing that they had truly grasped the concepts and affective understanding that the teacher had hoped they would.

Later in the drama, Steve offered his boat to the committee members as means for escape and solace. Kelly suggested that an interrogation session be held, two members of the group, students Steve and Sarah were
framed as expert interrogators. The teacher exchanged chairs with Sarah. She was now in a non-focal position in the semicircle. The teacher, by allowing the students to "stage" an interrogation, also allowed for a most effective shift in her role. She, too, was being examined by the interrogators. No exemption was available. After several questions were asked of the others, Steve found the courage:

Steve: Wait, we haven't selected questions to ask her (the teacher)

Ms. Dobbs: Go ahead. Ask me. Ask me. What?

Steve: Where were you just before the time we were supposed to meet at the boat?

T: I was with him (implicating as the character, but as teacher, strategically involving Mark). I'll admit it...

Steve: Did you have your three kids with you.

T: No. My three kids were with my husband. I sneaked out to meet him an hour before we were supposed to have met on the boat for the secret meeting. I was with him.

Steve: (looking to Mark with raised eyebrows)

Mark: It's true (trying to conceal a smile) She was with me. Right.

The complexity of this drama was amazing. The students and teacher sat on the edges of their seats as they wove a more complex web of form and meaning as they continued to behave spontaneously in role.

Social Register

In the third session of Phase II, the teacher changed the frame from that of World War II to one in which she gave herself the attitudinal role of one who needed help. With no introduction, other than saying it was drama time, the teacher walked into the area bearing the countenance of
desolation. She sat down and said nothing. Her shoulders were slumped in and her expression was grim. Because the students were already aware that the discourse of dramatic activity often required that they deal with the unexpected through initiating language, only a few seconds had elapsed before they were asking questions in order to determine what was wrong. Through their questioning, they were able to construct the helpless person's story and then finding ways to help her solve them. The drama episode began with the students coaxing the dejected person to disclose the problem:

Kelly: What's wrong? (informing function)

Ms. Dobbs: Just awful things. (withholding information, controlling, not true information giving)

Kelly: What? (pursuing, insisting, a controlling function)

Ms. Dobbs: I don't know if I can trust you . . .

Kelly: You can tell us (convincing, a controlling function)

Faye: You can.

Mark: You can.

Steve: Be careful what you say in the group. Maybe there's someone you can't trust. (warning, a controlling function)

Kelly: If you don't tell us, we cannot help you. (delivery of ultimatum, controlling function)

Evidence of participants' use of communicative functions is shown in Figures 22 and 23, and Appendix G. The students worked with the challenge of the communicative constraint—the withholding of information and the mystery surrounding the dejected individual
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### CLASSROOM D PHASE II-SUMMATION

**RESPONSE**

- **RITUAL**
- **INFORM**
- **CONTROL**
- **FEELING**
- **IMAGINATION**

#### (a) Graphical Representation

- **T/D**
- **D1**
- **D2**
- **D3**
- **D4**
- **D5**
- **D6**
- **D7**
- **D8**

#### (b) Tabular Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RITUAL</th>
<th>INFORM</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>FEELING</th>
<th>IMAGINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T/D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 23. Classroom D Sums of Response Functions*
(teacher-in-role). They consoled and they asked searching questions (across functions) such as:

Is there a problem with your family or friends?
Are you drunk?

You seem gloomy . . . What's the reason, with your parents or something? (feeling function, perhaps own life themes surfacing)

Do you have a counselor? (contributing prior knowledge / schema)
Are you deaf? (suspension of disbelief, all know the teacher is really hearing.

Through questioning, the students created a biography of sorts for the teacher-in-role, who provided only minimal information for each response. Their reconstruction was that the character's daughter was killed in a hit-and-run accident and the perpetrator had not been apprehended. The students advised the helpless teacher-in-role, using the significantly more formal style of persons in helping professions.

Further data analysis regarding communicative functions specific to this lesson can be found in Appendix, section 4 and in Figure 22. Although the data showed that the teacher was still producing relatively numerous initiations to inform, the nature of the informing functions changed dramatically. A comparison of Figures 14 and 22 (frequency of initiations across classrooms for Phase I and Phase II) showed a marked increase in all functions for the student participants. Figures 22 (a) & (b) show clear visual representations of the students' development of increasing autonomy through drama. The pie charts in the Appendix (section 5), comparing Phase I and II performance in terms of percentage of
contributions for initiation and response functions, clearly show less teacher dominated talk initiations.

Table 19 shows a summary of the findings related to classroom discourse categories.

Table 19.

Key Elements: Phase II - Classroom D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Event</th>
<th>Communicative / Social interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Moves</td>
<td>Mutually focused. Students readily took initiative to introduce topics and use repair strategies, great effort to include everyone in the tumtaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Functions</td>
<td>Overarching imagining functions across exchanges, students question, negotiate, confront, and problem solve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Register</td>
<td>Students in role as adult experts teacher in role as one who loses trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation Of Data Regarding Communicative Responses Across The Five Function Categories**

*Initiations* across communicative function categories were emphasized as they were the focus of the study in terms of relationship to the development of and manifestation of communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired. However, almost identical methodology was applied regarding determining and analyzing frequencies and percentages of occurrences of response functions. The data showed that each teacher in the study in Phase I, conscientiously elicited responses
from the students. The responses for students were far greater than initiations for students in Phase I, seemingly because the teachers were structuring (through the IRF paradigm) for "right" answers to every question.

**Teachers' Communicative Functions: Percentages Of Use Compared In Phase I And Phase II**

Phase I and Phase II initiation and response function for the teachers only were compared for each of the five communicative functions (ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining). Visual representation data (Figures 24-33) show that in regard to relative parts of one (100%), the informing and controlling categories generally show a significant decrease for initiation from Phase I to Phase II. Ritualization performances fluctuated less from Phase I to Phase II, yet generally showed an increase. categories generally show decrease, with the exception of feeling. Other functions showed no clear trend across teachers. This method of display, based on percentages, appeared to show oversensitivity for smallest frequencies of behavior (0, 1, 2). For example, a teacher who had used imagination to respond ten times in Phase One and ten times again in Phase II, would be profiled the same as a teacher who used imagination only one time in each Phase.

**Analysis And Interpretation Of The Teachers' Initiating To Inform Functions: Compared In Phase I And Phase II**

During the generative data analyzation phase of this study, it was noted that the teachers from all classrooms, for the most part, retained the
advantage of using greater (relative to the students in the class) frequencies and percentages of the initiating to inform function of communication (see Figures 8-23) (see Tables 20-21). The data were further analyzed for nature of the teachers' initiate to inform functions. It was discovered that teachers' initiated information-giving, or initiated to ask questions in order to verify that the students knew and/or could retrieve sought right answers (similar to test questioning), and then the teachers initiated to pose question for which an answer was not previously known. This third category of questions is sometimes referred to as authentic questions (Morgan & Saxton, 1994). Ms. Dobbs (tD) used rhetorical questions, but in Phase I only.

The results of the analyzation of specific intents for the communicative function initiate to inform were highly significant to the exploration of communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired. Figures 24-33 show relative use of these informing functions within and across phases. Figure 24 is to be reviewed as representation of comparative intents within the parameters of one teacher and one phase only. Although the columns are flush and suggestive of comparison between teachers and between phases, this is impossible as data are reported in terms of relative frequency of occurrence. Figure 25 presents a comparative analysis of teachers' informing functions relative to types of initiations and inferences can be made across teachers and across classrooms (see Figures 34 and 35). In summary, in Phase I, teachers predominantly used questions in order to verify information required of the students that they already had answers to. These questions and answers were generally related to curriculum content. In Phase I, there
Table 20.

Teachers' Informing Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y/A Phase I</th>
<th>Y/A Phase II</th>
<th>T1/B Phase I</th>
<th>T1/B Phase II</th>
<th>T2/B Phase I</th>
<th>T2/B Phase II</th>
<th>T/C Phase I</th>
<th>T/C Phase II</th>
<th>T/D Phase I</th>
<th>T/D Phase II</th>
<th>Totals Phase I</th>
<th>Totals Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Questions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification Questions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave Information</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Teachers' Informing Functions
Frequency and Percentage Data for Phase I and Phase II
Table 21.

Teacher Questioning - Relative Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T/A Phase I</th>
<th>T/A Phase II</th>
<th>T1/B Phase I</th>
<th>T1/B Phase II</th>
<th>T2/B Phase I</th>
<th>T2/B Phase II</th>
<th>T/C Phase I</th>
<th>T/C Phase II</th>
<th>T/D Phase I</th>
<th>T/D Phase II</th>
<th>Totals Phase I</th>
<th>Totals Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Questions</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification Questions</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>(392)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(453) (189)
Figure 24. Teacher A - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Initiations

Figure 25. Teacher A - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Responses
Figure 26. Teacher B1 - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Initiations

Figure 27. Teacher B1 - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Responses
Figure 28. Teacher B2 - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Initiations

Figure 29. Teacher B2 - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Responses
Figure 30. Teacher C - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Initiations

Figure 31. Teacher C - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Responses
Figure 32. Teacher D - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Initiations

Figure 33. Teacher D - Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Responses
Figure 34. Comparison of Teachers’ Phase I and Phase II Initiations to Inform
Figure 35. Comparison of Teachers' Phase I and Phase II Initiations to Inform/Percent
were few authentic questions asked by the teachers. The tendencies to give information (make statements which would be regarded by the students as factual) were generally equitable across teachers and across phases. There was one exception as team-teacher Ms. Mills (t2B) in Phase II, yielded the facilitation of the lesson to Ms. Brown (t1B). She (Ms. Mills) had occasion to contribute 100% (frequency = 10) as "gave information."

**Summary**

Chapter IV described the communicative behavior in four classrooms for students with hearing impairment in two phases. Phase I explored classroom discourse and communication behaviors in typical classroom discourse. Phase II explored discourse and communication behaviors when process drama was the mode of teaching and learning. Also, description and analysis of the Let's Talk checklist and the expert interview were presented.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

This was a case study of the nature of communication behavior in four self-contained classrooms for students with hearing impairment. To date and to my knowledge, no other published study has encompassed a conceptual framework which combines process drama, education of the hearing impaired, and communicative competence. These three areas appropriately merge the areas of my educational and professional background experiences as drama in education specialist, teacher of the deaf and hard-of-hearing and speech and language pathologist. This systematic inquiry was borne out of my own concerns and the concerns of people in diverse ranks that many deaf and hard of hearing children may lack communicative competence in real life as well as school-oriented communicative contexts, especially when English language proficiency is expected. The deliberations of this study have shown that these ranks have not only included researchers in deafness and educators of the deaf (Collins & Rose, 1976; Griffith, Johnson & Dastoli, 1985; Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989; Mather, 1989; Matthews & Reich, 1993; Paul & Quigley, 1994); but vocational counselors for the deaf, employers, and even individuals with hearing impairment, themselves.
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The challenge for the educator of the hearing impaired student has increasingly been seen as that of promoting a risk-free environment in which language is learned and practiced through real and purposeful communicative contexts. In theory, the focus of teacher education programs in deaf and hard-of-hearing is language and communication stimulation. Teachers are regarded as communication skills specialists and classrooms for the deaf and hard-of-hearing are established as and believed to be language- and communication-rich environments. Yet research has shown that many educators of the deaf still respond to the challenge by drilling students in Standard English grammatical constructs and neglecting the importance of language in context behaviors (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989; Luetke-Stahlman, 1993).

This study described and analyzed communicative behaviors under two consecutively observed conditions: during typical classroom discourse and then, during the employment of process drama as a language experience mode (see Figure 36).

Process drama, which has also been called educational drama or classroom drama, is a learning medium (Wagner, 1985) in which the participants cooperatively and strategically behave in role, initiating and extended virtualities of complex human interactions through imaginary contexts. Theory and practice in drama have shown that language is at the heart of the drama process and the means through which the drama is realized (O'Neill, 1982). Researchers and specialists have found that drama may be the most successful mode of providing rich and flexible types of interpersonal communication situations (not available in regular or special education classrooms) that students need to be competent, increasingly
Communicative Competence is reframed as a socially-defined, synergistic concept with an interpersonal assessment focus, rather than intrapersonal. The bold arrows represent contextual forces which may function to dampen or enhance the effectiveness of language-in-context skills.

Figure 36. The Synergistic Nature of Communicative Competence
mature communicators. It has been said that "the child in drama is inside language, using it to make meaning, both private and public in the 'here and now dynamic'" (Booth, 1991).

Reflections on Methodology

The methodology adopted by this study was a naturalistic, contextual research model. The generative processes began with detailed observation, recording and transcription, then progressed through general description to description and analysis. Classroom observation data analysis was triangulated with the inclusion of other methods which included expert and participant interviews and observation checklists.

This research, as is true of most ecologically-based research, involved the use of intuitive judgments and decisions. This was true in all stages and areas of the process. For example, there were decisions about which classrooms would be accessed, what communicative behaviors would be targeted, how the mass of data would be organized and coded and which drama structures would be most appropriate. There are those, often causally oriented researchers, who feel that true scientific inquiry cannot rest on intuitive foundations. van Lier cited Kuhn (1962) and adds, "The role of intuition in scientific progress is pervasive and crucial." He also cited Kohl's of Bergson's has said, "from intuition one can pass to analysis, but not from analysis to intuition." The intuition employed in this study was not derived from naive conjecture; but originated from over fifteen years of educational and professional experience in evaluating communication participation in classroom--as well as in clinical contexts. The primary aim was not in finding cause-effect relationships (to get proof)
between certain actions and outcomes (experimental), but was to describe (to understand) what was happening in the classrooms (Barnes, 1988).

I was interested in the unique characteristics of face-to-face dynamics for each classroom as well as generalization among and beyond the four classrooms. I found that the greatest value in being able to "zoom in" and "zoom out," so to speak, in terms of my role as observer-participant. My familiarity with the program, teachers and students allowed me to see from within and yet I was able to distance effectively when objectification was crucial. This metaxis (simultaneous duality) of role allowed me to let the data lead the way in examining the unexpected, yet highly relevant and critical relationships of the classrooms.

Findings

Several questions drove the systematic inquiry and were considered crucial in the understanding of the nature of interpersonal communication behaviors in the classrooms researched. Conclusions are drawn about each of the following questions.

1. What are the characteristics of typical classroom talk for students and teachers in each of the self-contained classrooms for students who are hearing impaired—primarily in regard to the following four levels of participation?

   The nature of discourse for the event?

   The results shown in tables suggest that essentially, all of the typical classroom talk events or lessons in Phase I, classrooms A, B, C, and D (twelve of twelve events) were judged to be metalinguistic in nature. That is, the participants were communicating for purposes of teaching and
learning structural components of the English language, either in the
language form or the language content area. The only exception to this
rule was found in Classroom D, Phase I-C. The teacher, before the official
class event began, reminded the students about an upcoming zoo camping
trip (Discussion in Chapter IV). Those few moments of "housekeeping"
were authentically communicative, in that what was said and done was
based on the socialization of the participants; people, not solely on texts or
academic facts. The teacher used the narrative mode to storytell regarding
previous zoo experiences and the students asked questions which were
motivated by the anticipation of human interactions. When it was time,
however, for the scheduled class to begin, the teacher shifted to the
transmission mode and began asking close ended questions the answers to
which were known to her.

The nature of the event was also characterized by the predominant
pragmatic functions observed. All of the observations in the Phase I
conventional lessons for all classrooms fit the ritualized control
classification in which the teacher followed the traditional IRF (initiation,
response, feedback) paradigm. Verbal questioning was in the form of
asymmetrical dialogue, with the teacher as central control for the action.
There was frequent nomination of students to respond to the teacher's
questions by guessing the correct answer to an unstated assumption
(Carroll, 1987) and when they did, assessment, rather than genuine
feedback or reply was offered. Although numerous individual
communicative functions were coded at the level of the conversational
exchange, the underlying communicative effects for the entire lesson or
event could be and were ascertained to be teacher-controlled rituals.
Conversation moves (mutual focus, initiating, maintaining, closing turn-taking, repairing)?

Observation results show that in Phase I for all four researched classrooms, the conversation moves were teacher-centered. More specifically, in terms of mutual focus or attentionality, it was the expectation or norm that all students would look at the teacher as much as possible. Students in the total communication classroom were seated so that they could see each other and follow what the exchanges were between the teacher and the student whom she had nominated. There was little or no attentionality honored among peers (from peer to peer) in each class during official class participation time (see Chapter IV). There were unofficial instances when the students spoke to one another, before class, through asides during class which, if detected, may have been assessed negatively as off topic behavior—"talking when the teacher was talking" or "not paying attention."

The teachers in all four classrooms regulated the initiation, maintenance, repair and closing of conversation interchanges. They decided the "who, what, when, where, and how" of talk turns subsequent to their own—through signals which included nomination, eye gaze, pointing, head nods. Generally speaking, the students conformed to these constraints and appeared to accept the teacher's frame of reference regarding the way that talk should be conducted in the classroom.
Communication functions in conversational exchanges (across the ritualizing, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining functions)?

The most extensive investigation was conducted in the area of communicative functions of utterances in the context of immediate conversational exchanges. Much of the research in pragmatics (appropriateness of communication in context) has focused on intuitions about speaker motivations or objectives for talking or the listener's perceptions of the speaker's intent (Searle, 1975; Halliday, 1975). van Lier expressed reservations about coding pragmatic intents because of the likelihood of subjectivity and ambiguity in interpretation. He questioned whether a third person could validly address function in terms of the message sender's intent and receiver's perception since neither was directly observable. Yet, he acknowledge that much of what researcher do, whether they work in positivistic or naturalistic, experimental or interpretive veins, reflects dependence on informed intuition (van Lier, 1994). He further identified two layers in analysis of classroom discourse by explaining that every action occurs in context and is an illustration of both interpretation (what went on before it) and intention (what happens after it) and this takes into account planned and unplanned discourse. He emphasized that one "could not take isolated utterances, categorize them, add them up and compare them in a straightforward manner. Minimally, they must be studied in the context of their production" (van Lier, 1994).

In this study, the evaluation of function, intent and interpretation have gone far beyond the assessment of function as merely an intrapersonal concept. I observed, inferred, coded, and analyzed the interpersonal effects of what had intentionally been said and done in the
classroom. Not only did I look beyond the individual turn to the conversational exchange (at least one turn preceding and one after the targeted turn); I found it necessary to consider the effects of the observed behavior on the integrity of the group's task(s). In order to assure the validity of the assessment of function, I could not stop at the consideration of the group's present task or event. Many times it was necessary to consider the event in terms of the inter-contextuality of norms established across lessons and over time.

In summary, the analysis showed that the teachers in Phase I monopolized the initiation functions of language across the five categories. In most cases, the teachers initiated much more than the combined total initiations of students in each classroom. The teachers initiated most when questioning for information or providing information and when controlling. There was much less evidence of the feeling and imagining functions for all participants in Phase I. Rituals initiated by the teachers were predominantly nominations, repetitions of students' responses, clarifications and requests for clarification. There were very few ritualizations used in Phase I initiated by the students. Although the students in classroom C used hand-raising for mutual show of attention and although the "teacher-student" pointed for allocation of next turn, these behaviors, usually considered to be initiations, were modeled or elicited by the teacher each time. So they were counted as responses to controls. Specifically, students in classroom A used use of ritual among was the students were very few most common hand raised to signal attentionality and/or use of repetitions less tendency among groups than did informing and feeling functions.
Again, while individual intents were coded at the level of the conversation exchange, further examination of the functional nature of the event often reframed and re-categorized the intent. For example, the teacher in classroom A said, "What were they going to trade?" referring to the main characters in a storybook. The pragmatic function, at the level of the conversational exchange, was coded as a teacher's informing function with the intent to request information. However, at the level of the event, it was regarded to be a ritualized control.

**Social register (level of formality dependent on contextual cues)?**

Social register infers relative status among participants. During Phase I, the teachers held positions of authority and they controlled what was said or done in the classrooms. The students were seen, for the most part as passive receivers and responders. There were exceptions. For example, student A3 was interested in bugs and insects. Motivated to know more, she took the initiative to ask questions of the teacher. The teacher may have perceived the inquiries as interruptions from the work that needed to be covered. However, she quickly answered the questions and returned to the planned discourse.

2. **Are restrictive, inflexible talk routines, which are evidenced in regular education classrooms, observed in any of the typical discourse in classrooms for the hearing impaired?**

Data clearly showed that classrooms for the hearing impaired are not excepted from the restrictive and inflexible routines (see Summation Data, Chapter IV). In Phase I, the IRF model (teacher initiates, student responds, teacher gives feedback) was shown to be predominant in each of
the four classrooms studied. All of the lessons, across teachers and classrooms, were metalinguistic in nature. Specifically, the purpose of the lessons in Phase I was to provide the students with more knowledge about the structure of the English language or to determine if the students comprehended information gathered from reading assignments. The teachers used drills of sentence patterns, spelling games, vocabulary drills, memory games, comprehension question and answer sessions and storytelling. During Phase I, the teachers generally operated through the traditional Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) paradigm. The teachers used high percentages of the initiatives usually to elicit answers to rote recall questions (Teacher A = 78, Teachers B = 9%, Teacher C = 72%, Teacher D = 79%, Mean = 79.5%). This percentage is equal to the 80% commonly quoted for percentage of teacher talk in regular classrooms. The students supplied what was guessed to be the expected short responses to the questions. Then the teachers would either evaluate the correctness of the students' answers, and/or immediately move on until the desired and absolute response. Generally, the students were not given opportunities to initiate conversational exchanges themselves. The teacher's stance dictated the direction and course of conversation moves (openings, maintenance, turntaking, repair, closings) and also the nature of communicative functions and social register. These analyses led to the assessments of ritualized control for communicative function of Phase I events.

Although the academic foci of the lessons were varied (i.e., question-answer science review session, comprehension of school rules game, review of highlights of poetry unit, review of literary myths), the communicative characteristics were similar. The loci of control were with
the teachers. Essentially, the students showed that they were able to match the behavior which was expected of them in most of the traditional classrooms of today. They were able to sit relatively still at their individual desks, constrain their spontaneous behaviors so that they would speak only in answer to the teacher's direct question, follow instructions and follow through on the assignments given by the teacher (Wallach & Miller, 1988).

In this study, the only exception to this ability to play the schooling game and comply with the implicit rules of the classroom was observed in classroom C. The students in classroom C were not able implicitly to accommodate the old schema for what happens in more open social situations to fit the newer, and different requirements of typical classroom interaction patterns. The teacher spent instruction time explicitly teaching expected behaviors for school (classroom rules, Phase IA) and for the community (dangerous situations, Phase IB). The expectation was the same as it has traditionally been in all or most of the classrooms, whether regular or special education. Conventional classroom talk in self-contained classrooms is qualitatively and quantitatively similar to that found in regular education classrooms.

3. Is there evidence of some pro-active or compensatory strategies in place on the part of the teacher for optimal communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

Based on the analysis of three observations of the typical face-to-face classroom talk, there appeared to be little or no evidence of pro-active or compensatory strategies in place. Although the classrooms were whole-language rich, in theory and physical appearance—the talk emphasis, during official class time still appeared to be metalinguistic in nature, with
focus on reading and writing and not on social adeptness and the maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

4. What are the characteristics of classroom talk for students and teachers in each of the self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired when process drama is the learning mode, in relationship to the following levels of participation.

The nature of discourse for the overall lesson or event?

Analysis of phase II participation revealed that the underlying function of the drama-oriented events was always imagining. Everything said or done within the drama lesson focused on maintaining the pretend world. The student is cooperative with the teacher in building the dramatic events. Successful participation was directly related to engagement in face to face/interpersonal in order to talk things out. During Phase II drama sessions, the students demonstrated greater flexibility and increased autonomy in interpersonal communication (see Chapter IV).

Conversation moves (mutual focus, initiating, maintaining, closing, turn-taking, repairing?)

In drama, in order to function adequately in the pretend world, the students and teachers establish multicronered attentionality. That is, the students had to pay attention to each other as well as to the teachers and the teachers had to be aware of and continually interpret the students' actions and reactions in order to work toward greater meaning-making and satisfaction in process. The desire to meet the challenges of the drama may have also motivated them to initiate by questioning or expressing feeling. Although the students in this study worked in drama only three times, they were demonstrating increase autonomy in communicating.
There was a democratic sharing of conversation moves. Because participation in drama implies joint ownership of all that happens in the drama, the students rose to the occasion by initiating a greater number of exchanges, using effective repair strategies, and closings.

Communication functions in conversational exchanges (across the ritualization, informing, controlling, feeling, and imagining functions?)

The data showed that the students assumed significantly more authority in communication when drama was the mode of teaching and learning. The initiations across functions increased dramatically. The observation of many of the behaviors would not have been possible in conventional classroom talk. For example, the students, in drama, were free to use more challenging intents, such as criticizing, rejecting, refusing, arguing, negotiating and insisting in order to fulfill their adult-like roles in the drama.

A most significant finding was that although the pervasive communicative function of the discourse for the overall events in Phase II was imagining, still a relative few utterances, at the level of the conversational exchange, were coded as intent to imagine. Wigg and Bray (1984) included imagining with ritualizing, informing, controlling, and feeling intents in the introductory discussion of prosocial communication skills, however they omitted it as a category for observation rating, and evaluation in the Let's Talk Checklist of Communication Skills, but include it again as a primary focus for their intervention activities, saying that many of their role-play activities with cards were with pretend situation.
In this research study, students and teachers were charged by the contexts of the dramas to behave "as if" they were existing in imaginary worlds facing dramatic challenges. This imagining function was present in everything said and done when the teachers and students were engaged in the extended improvisational role-playing and other dramatic activities required by process drama.

Social register (level of formality dependent on contextual cues?)

The complementary use of teacher-in-role and mantle of the expert allowed for the exploration of flexible, adult-like roles for the students. The students in classroom A were, in ideas, distinguished space explorers while the teacher was a bumbling alien; in B, the students were in the roles of private investigators and cryptologists, while the teachers were framed as reporters in desperate need of their expertise; in C, the students were experienced crew members aboard a pirate's ship while the teacher was juxtaposed as a recruit who didn't "know the ropes"; and in D, the students were framed as experienced crisis counselors, while the teacher adopted the role of a distraught parent who needed help and support. The spontaneous use of language reflected the formality and authority of the role.

5. Does the employment of drama in process have positive influences on the manifestations of communicative competence behaviors of students and/or teachers in any of the four classrooms studied? That is, are there qualitative and/or quantitative differences in behaviors of the same students observed during typical classroom group talk vs. talk when drama is the mode of operation?
Communicative competence is defined as the ability to be flexible, effective and appropriate in a variety of interpersonal contexts. The data concluded that process drama provided opportunities for the students who participated a mode in which competencies in communication might be developed. The expectations and behavior of the teachers and students were altered dramatically from typical talk to drama talk. The focus of the teacher moved from control of students through didactic regime to the scaffolding of satisfying drama experiences for the students. The focus went from teacher centered activities to student centered activities. This reversal of the traditional classroom power structure was a critical factor in promoting student fluency and autonomy. Process drama provided motivation to the students to reach beyond themselves, demonstrating existing competences and further development in many skill areas, a primary one of which is communicative competence.

6. Are the function and behavior of the teacher significantly altered when drama is the mode of interaction?

The teacher, in drama, was seen as scaffold for the work (Vygotsky, 1982), able to support the participation of the students from within the pretend. The teachers in this study often assumed roles which were lesser in social status that those assigned to the student and therefore less dominating. The status alterations were seen as instrumental in evoking a greater levels of engagement and quality in communicative interaction.

The teachers also dramatically increased their use of genuine questioning and made thought-provoking comments which motivated continued engagement in drama.
7. If behaviors during drama are found to be different and superior, are there particular drama strategies which appear to lend themselves well to communicative competence in classrooms for the hearing impaired?

As previously demonstrated, behaviors during drama were found to be different and superior. Mantle of the expert (student behavior) and teacher-in-role (teacher behavior) were two supportive strategies that the teachers used in order to structure for increased communicative authority and autonomy.

8. (Is there a psychology of deafness as it relates to language-in-context behaviors in the classroom)... Or is there evidence of a competence/performance gap in the consideration of students' communicative competence behaviors in their self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired?

This question is concerned with whether students with hearing impairments use interpersonal communication skills optimally (to the best of their abilities) in self-contained classrooms or whether their actual performances with language-in-context behaviors lag significantly behind ability levels.

Support for the traditional notion of a psychology of deafness arises predominantly from the clinical perspective (Myklebust, in Paul & Jackson, 1994). The metatheoretical implications for this study are that irretrievable socio-communicative deficits exists which are concomitant to loss of hearing and that communicative competence for the hearing impaired child is qualitatively inferior to that of normal hearing peers (refer to Chapter I for fuller discussion of psychology of deafness).
Those ascribing to the cultural perspective would refer to the traditional concept of *psychology of deafness* as the paternalistic view of judgmental hearing persons. Therefore, in the pure sense of definition, any comparison of psychological processes between hearing and deaf people would be considered to be an interpretation of (cultural) difference as deviance (Lane, 1988). Since this study considers the language-in-context behaviors in self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired—in the light of conventional classroom discourse of regular classrooms, and since it was authored by a speech and language pathologist, it may be perceived to be one of the clinical persuasion.

However, this study, especially in the light of its results, reflects the developmental-interactive view by reframing the conceptualization of *psychology of deafness* as "provision of some understanding of the behavior of individuals with significant hearing impairment relative to certain psychological constructs such as memory, language, reading, and personal and social development" (Paul & Jackson, 1994). The development of standardized tests, which have been normed on populations of deaf individuals, may have risen out of such a developmental-interactive strategy. The motivation for such may have been the need for autonomous references of typicality in the identification, description, and assignment of patterns of behavior for children with hearing impairment. Broader parallels are found in the tendency of multicultural education programs to encourage respect and equity (equal opportunity) for people of all cultures by initially focusing on the descriptions of intra-cultural norms in light of contrast to those the mainstream culture (Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; Hale-Benson, 1986)
The results of this study show that there may very well be a significant discrepancy (competence/performance gap) as it relates to communicative appropriateness in self-contained classrooms for children who are hearing impaired. Upon superficial examination, one would view the official performances of the children in Phase I of this study and judge the behaviors associated with communicative competence to be inadequate, lacking autonomy and initiative. For most of the students, the participation would be assessed as non-communicative.

The results of this study of typical discourse and discourse during drama activity suggest that the analysis of communicative competence is an interpersonal dynamic, not an intrapersonal one. It is an assessment of the interaction of all participants in the classroom along with considerations for competence of environmental or ecological variables.

The function of the teachers appeared to be the greatest determinant of communicative competencies in the classrooms observed. The responsibility to find liberating modes lies with the teacher. Shor views liberatory teachers as change agents:

He or she changes the content of the curriculum and the learning process. In class, we are not simply teaching history or spelling . . . We are teaching people how human beings relate to each other, what kind of world exists as well as what kind of world we can make together. The choice of the teacher is what values to model in the classroom. Those values can be either authoritarian, top-down, traditional ones based in teacher-talk . . . or they can be democratic values. (Shor, 1990. p. 346)

The results of this study showed no evidence of a psychology of deafness as it relates to language-in-context abilities in the classroom.
What was observed in this study regarding conventional classroom talk and talk when drama is the mode of teaching and learning was qualitatively and quantitatively similar to what occurs in regular education classes with students who are not hearing impaired. Perhaps, in light of the results of this study, the more appropriate question would be, "Is there a psychology of classroom discourse in traditional education classrooms for students, regardless of regular/special education designation?".

Implications of the Study

The results of this study imply that although teachers of the hearing impaired and speech and language specialists are trained as language development and language stimulation experts and although varied strategies are employed (i.e., narrative presentations, metalinguistic focus, teacher-student role switching and the whole language philosophy), self-contained classrooms for students with hearing impairments are still not truly communicative environments.

The discussion does not, however, close here. It would be highly remiss of educators to assume that what is seemingly acceptable for regular education students also meets the goodness-of-fit criteria for the effective education of students with hearing impairment. Normal hearing students generally have opportunities to balance the low-communicative nature of the traditional classroom with rich communicative experiences outside of school while many hearing impaired students do not. Although it is well excepted that even a slight hearing loss can negatively affect academic achievement and language abilities (Paul & Quigley, 1987), this exception is especially true of the severely-to-profoundly hearing impaired students.
The review of literature and triangulation of data from this study have shown that most students with severe-to-profound hearing losses (deaf) do not usually have the advantage of models in the home and other out-of-school contexts who provide a shared language and communication system. It is the very small percentage who are deaf children of deaf parents who do that usually fare better in terms of earliest proactive communication interaction. Most of the deaf children of hearing parents (approximately ninety-seven percent) enter school with little or no functional language while most hearing students enter with through-the-air language established and ready for refinement. What is even more unfortunate is that many deaf and hard of hearing students leave school as unsuccessful communicators in the face of challenging communication situations in the real world.

Educators of individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing are charged with the redeeming task of providing ecological contexts and purposes for talk, creating situations which encourage talk within the confines of the classroom.

The results of this study suggest that the assessment of communicative competence is an interactive notion. The implication is that one should, in evaluating, prescribing, and implementing class activities, consider other forces of influence which are in operation in the classroom. These communicative forces may include participants' culture, participants' home communities, peer relations, the architecture of the physical classroom or time constraints and the demands of the curriculum. Moreover, this study suggests that the most powerful force for enhancing or dampening the perception of student's competence in face-to-face
situations is the teacher. Teachers, no matter what the activity or procedure, are regarded by her students as the locus of control in the classroom. What happens in the classroom, the way things are done—will either reflect the teacher moves to control for passive, restrictive and shallow interactions or to control for authentic opportunities the use more flexible and mature language in context skills. The teacher's success in controlling for freedom invariably transfers to the students as freedom to control some of what happens in the enterprise of teaching and learning. The results of the study imply that educators need to formally address communicative foci that reflect real life challenges when devising curriculum and planning lessons.

The results of the study have shown that process drama is a medium for authentic classroom interactions through which participants (students and teachers) have motivating opportunities within pretend situations to bridge the competence/performance gaps in communicative behaviors. Although the drama world may be bound in fantasy, the meanings shared, the feelings evoked, and above all, the communication challenges discovered are just as authentic as those experienced in real life. Effectively planned dramas allow participants to encounter a variety of language experiences in which they can effectively express feelings, negotiate, persuade and reflect on and refine meanings (Booth & Thornley-Hall, 1991). Drama has been found to have a positive effect on self-esteem and positive regard for others (O'Neill & Manley, in process). When participants behave in role, they bring recollections from personal experiences and authentic curiosities about human relationships and life. The teacher who works effectively in drama realizes this and works to
engage the children in meaningful and challenging communication situations with the aim of extracting new meanings, new ways of seeing for all. This engagement for meaning-making may greatly reflect the mission of today's most effective education programs.

The findings suggest that process drama may fit well under the umbrella of the whole language philosophy. Meaning generation is central to drama work and is the focus of literacy use in the world. The employment of drama may be one answer to ways in which gaps between some whole language theory and practice can be bridged (Kucer, 1991). Teachers in this study demonstrated a variety of approaches through which drama could be connected to whole language practices already in-place. Table 22 is an illustration of how process drama may be conceptually linked to whole language. The right-most column, entitled "Beliefs About Drama" was added to an adaptation in order to show relationship.

In the study, the teachers who scaffolded shared experiences through drama were new to this way of working. Yet, hey were able to be successful in facilitating with just one formal in-service, very few follow-up conference, and my "behind the scenes" support. The implication is that formal acting ability has little or nothing to do with success in implementing or participating in successful drama strategies. What counts most is the willingness to take certain calculated risks: altering the classroom organization and culture so that more democratic through the air communication is a primary mode of operation, inviting the students to share in the suspension of disbelief, trusting that students come into the classroom with valuable prior knowledge and frames of reference, and also, recognizing that teaching is also learning.
Table 22.

Comparison of Traditional, Whole Language, and Drama Modes of Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL AND WHOLE LANGUAGE BELIEFS</th>
<th>BELIEFS ABOUT DRAMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>variable</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRADITIONAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Environment</td>
<td>teacher-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Role</td>
<td>authority, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Emphasis</td>
<td>decoding, graphophonic cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Skills</td>
<td>isolated, fragmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Reading</td>
<td>skills, product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts Instruction</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
<td>limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>worksheets, workbooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table, adapted from Weaver 1991: 36, compares traditional and whole language beliefs with those of process drama.
The implications of the study go far beyond self-contained classrooms for the hearing impaired. The results of the investigation suggest that educators more closely evaluate the typical practices of assigning often unearned and perpetually penalizing labels (such as "at risk" and "language-learning disabled") to and prescribing exceptional treatment outside of the classroom for those students who find challenge in following the unnatural communicative-restrictive regime of traditional schooling. Use of process drama as a learning and language experience tool.

Limitations of the Study

There are factors which might be perceived as limitations to this study. The number of classrooms included (four) was modest. The generalizability of the findings may have been greater if data had been gathered and analyzed from more than four sites. The same is true of number of class sessions sampled per classroom (six).

It would have been ideal to have been able to have equal number of students present, across classrooms, during each class session. It may also be logical to assume that the smaller the group, the more frequent and equitable the individual talk turns would be. The durations of the sessions were variable, making the frequencies of conversation turns across classrooms variable, also. There were expected influences for late starts, such as the teacher needing to complete matters of "housekeeping" and
unforeseen schedule changes. A few times, class periods were when the students opted to relinquish recess or break time in favor of continuing a drama lesson. Although the primary interest of this study was relative performances within classrooms and not between, more information may have been gleaned if the time allocations were consistent across classrooms.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Based on the generative exploration and the results of this study, the following have been identified as focuses for further investigation:

1. The effects of longer term teacher training and teacher/student experiences in the study of the value of drama for communicative competence in the classroom.

2. Studies of through the air proficiency drama use in classes where hearing impaired students, and if necessary, interpreters, are included with hearing students in regular education programs.

3. Drama as a mode for authentic and motivating meaning-making for the secondary form of English expression—(reading and writing).

4. Study of the degree of reciprocal facility regarding ASL-like signing and drama.
5. The relative frequency of participant conversation turns in typical discourse and while drama is the mode of learning.

6. Process drama as collaborative focus for the teacher and the speech and language pathologist.

7. Process drama as authentic communicative mode for other categories of students labeled "at risk" for significantly decreased school performance (language-learning disabled, developmentally challenged, the physically challenged, students who use dialects of standard English or apply English as second language).

8. Deeper exploration of drama conceptualized as a whole language strategy.

Summary

The results and findings of this study suggest that although classrooms for the hearing impaired are considered to be progressive and language-rich, the communicative characteristics are very much traditional in nature. Student participation was judged as lacking initiative and autonomy while teacher in response to the ritualized control of the learning contexts. Process drama, an experience mode in which participants manipulate communication behaviors within fictional situations arising from curriculum content, proved to be a significant approach by motivating students to use increasingly autonomous and flexible patterns of communication. The results suggest that it was the
teacher's competence in setting up liberating contexts for purposeful talk that was most significant in bridging the competence-performance gap and unlocking communication in classrooms for students with hearing impairment.

There is propensity in drama to deepen meaning and build dramatic action by closely associating or linking perspectives which would not commonly find mutuality in reality. This strategy is now used to blend a voice of distance and past with voices from the here and now as final expression of the precepts that drove this study of communicative authenticity in classrooms for the hearing impaired.

... I have a very bright, but very immature group of hearing impaired fifth graders. Most of the students have trouble communicating their feelings, working cooperatively, and solving their own problems. My use of drama gave the students a chance to explore their feelings and learn how to express them appropriately... the opportunity to question... the opportunity to solve problems through discussion and compromise. (Teacher A)

... the guidance given by the teacher to the exercise of the pupils' intelligence (competence) is an aid to freedom, not a restriction upon it. (John Dewey, 1938, p 71.)

I did not know it was possible! ... (drama) opened up a 'whole new world' to my 4th grade hearing impaired class and me... The children zeroed in on one page with the picture of the pirate, excitedly, in a 'stop-action' sort of way. I let them lead the way. In an almost magical way, my students and I found ourselves right in the middle of a pirate scene. (Teacher C)
the intellectual anticipation . . . must blend with personal impulse and desire to acquire moving force. (Dewey, 1938, p. 69)

I was the one who said how we should put the pieces of paper together. I wanted it to look like (the character) was worried about someone who was drinking. . . . I was glad when everyone did my idea. (Student B, written reflection)

. . . there is no point in the philosophy of progressive education sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the (communicative) purposes which direct his activities in the learning process . . . cooperative enterprise, not dictation. (John Dewey, 1938, p. 67)

The heart of language . . . is communication: The establishment of cooperation in an activity in which there are partners, and in which the activity of each is modified and regulated by partnership, to understand is to anticipate together. It is to make a cross reference, which, when acted upon, brings about a partaking in a common inclusive 'undertaking'. (Dewey [1925], 1981, p. 141)

This study has described the hearing impaired partaking in the common inclusive undertaking of drama where fictional worlds are generated in order to make sense of the real world; an undertaking that happens through language and communication. Susanne Langer reminds us:

Language does more than make communication possible: it's first and most astounding function is to shape the human world. (Langer, 1964)
APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY
Glossary

American Sign Language - (ASL) - native language of the Deaf culture in the visual - gestural mode of delivery. There is no standardized written form of ASL.

Audiological Categories - There are five categories which pertain to the degree of hearing loss. They are:
- slight - 27 to 40 decibel (dB)
- mild - 41 to 55 dB
- moderate - 56 to 70 dB
- severe - 71-90 dB
- profound - 91 dB or greater

Clinical Perspective of Deafness - consideration of deafness as a disability of hearing that also causes deficits in psychological processes.

Communication - is sharing of meanings. It includes both nonverbal and verbal behaviors.

Communicative Competence - traditionally thought of as the ability of the speaker to effectively transmit an intended message so as to alter the listener's attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors. As reconceptualized in this study, communicative competence is an interactive, synergistic notion, suggesting successful meaning-making in a variety of authentic human contexts. A valid evaluation of communicative competence in the classroom does not stop with the individual, but includes assessments of contextual influences, the most significant of which may be teacher behavior and nature of discourse.

Communicative Functions - (Parametric View, Wells, 1973)
- Controlling - communication function in which the participants' dominant function is to control behavior (commanding, offering, suggesting, permitting, threatening, warning, persuading, bargaining, etc.)
- Feeling - communication functions that express and respond to attitudes and feelings (exclaiming, blaming, teasing, asking about feelings, etc.)
Imagining - communication function that cast participants in imaginary situations, and include creative behaviors (role playing, fantasizing, speculating, dramatizing, storytelling, etc.)

Informing - communication function in which the participants' function is to offer or seek information (stating information, questioning, answering, justifying, naming, pointing out an object, explaining, etc.)

Ritualizing - communication function that serves to maintain social relationships and to facilitate social interactions (greetings, taking leave, participating in verbal games such as pat-a-cake, reciting, etc.)

Cultural Perspective of Deafness - a view of deafness as a natural condition, not as disadvantage or disability, seeks to depathologize deafness and celebrate the Deaf community.

Deaf - with an upper case "D" refers to one who is a member of the deaf culture and who likely has American Sign Language as primary language.

deaf - the word, with a lower case "d" refers to a clinical label for one who does not rely on residual hearing for communication, but depend on vision as the primary channel for communication.

Discourse - means by which verbal exchange is organized. Although discourse study can be applied to the reading of texts, this study focuses on the discourse of face-to-face communication.

Ecologically valid - directly reflective of one's natural interactions and experiences. Clinical and educational activities may be considered ecologically valid if they involve authentic human contexts outside those of the directive, structured approaches which traditionally predominate.

Event - an occurrence in a certain place at a particular time, as part of script or routine.

Hard of Hearing - usually characterizes those with slight to moderate hearing loss.

Illocutionary Acts - utterances which have meaning in the sender's intention and in subsequent effect on the receiver.

Language - the rule-base, generative code shared by individuals of the same cultural community.
Mantle-of-the-expert - refers to a drama method popularized by Dorothy Heathcote which requires the participants to behave as if they have the knowledge, skill, and responsibility of an expert.

Meta- (linguistics, communicative, cognitive) analyzing and talking about knowledge and performance with these skill areas. It often involves confronting students about nature of relative strengths and weaknesses.

Metatheory - a framework that determines how one directs bias. Metatheory directs the makeup of theories and decisions about research methodologies.

Metaxis - a greek term interpreted by Boal (1982) as a way of identifying two worlds, the real and the imaginary, which are necessarily held in the mind simultaneously by the drama participant.

Non-verbal communication - is behavior which is complementary to language code. It includes facial expression, bodily moves, body orientation, eye contact and gaze, space, dress, and environmental influences to shared meanings. Non-verbal communication has been said to comprise as much as 90% of the true feeling of communication.

Oral communication - refers to the primary use of speech, speechreading, and the development of optimal auditory functioning.

Participants - the teachers and students in the classroom.

Perlocutionary Acts - The effects of specific behaviors or acts on the receiver/perceiver.

Pidgin Sign English - (PSE) - sometimes called English based signing, used by most total communication (TC) students.

Pragmatics - communication behaviors considered in light of social context-often called language-in-context skills.

Process Drama - dramatic and learning and experience mode which is far removed from putting on a play or doing skits in which structured dramatic worlds are created, sustained and developed through group role-play; although most theatre conventions are accessed, extended spontaneous improvisation is a key dramatic strategy.

Ritual - a highly stylized routine.
Role play - assuming characterization usually within simulated or pretend contexts

Routine - a regular, unvarying, habitual or unimaginative procedure.

Schema - a mental plan or model by which an event or concept can be understood.

Script - an event sequence that underlies a referenced situation

Self-contained classroom - relates to a special education class within public schools reserved for students grouped homogeneously in regard to a disability label. Students usually spend most of the school day in this classroom with a teacher who is trained and experienced in the education of children who are assigned to the group.

Severely-to-profoundly hearing impaired - suggests that the student's residual hearing is not functional for speech discrimination.

Social Interactionist theory of language development - Language competences emerge from real person-to-person contexts.

Social register - situational variation in communication behaviors. A function of what the speaker is doing in terms of social activity, which determines how the speaker will speak in a particular situation. Halliday (1968). Five styles posited by Joos (1968) may be

1. Intimate - people who know each other very well and who interact on a regular basis
2. Casual - shares features of intimate style; but less emphasis on private language
3. Consultative - everyday conversation between speakers who are strangers or do not know each other well. Emphasis on making speech as clear and unambiguous as possible.
4. Formal - most important function of speech at this level is to impart information and that the talk does not have a great deal of social importance (interactive importance
5. Frozen - Language that is formulaic, language - used in religious services and in the courtroom.

Talk - (for the purposes of this study), used in reference to any through-the-air communication whether signed and seen or spoken and heard.
Teacher-in-role - the teacher assumes a role with the students within the dramatic episode in order to scaffold experience and meaning-making from within the imaginary world.

Through-the-air communication - face-to-face interactions, usually referring to receptive and expressive use of signing and/or speech and audition. It is usually spoken of in contrast to written communication.

Total Communication - the commitment to make available any and all facilities for communication mode that a student with hearing impairment may require for most successful communication. This approach usually features manual communication which may be combined with auditory training, speechreading, signed assisted speech, . The particular combination of behaviors may vary, intrapersonally, over social contexts.

Verbal - is a term synonymous to “uses language”

Whole language - a philosophy of language development and literacy learning with focus on student centered, top-down processes; experiential bases.
APPENDIX B

PARENTAL PERMISSION FORMS
Dear Parent:

The Ohio State University Department of Education Studies and are working together on an innovative project. Anita Manley, speech pathologist with / Public Schools for six years, is leading a study re: communication interactions in classrooms for the hearing impaired. The / Speech and Hearing / Special Education administration has already approved the study.

The students, with your permission, will be videotaped with their teacher for three 30 minute regular English class sessions. Then, there will be 4 or 5 additional class periods before the school year's end when the teacher and Ms. Manley will engage the students in a special way of learning called process drama. Special role-play activities will be explored as a way of experiencing communication challenges while learning curriculum content and sharing meanings.

These sessions will be videotaped. Only Ms. Manley and the teacher will have access to the recorded videotapes. Group communication performances will be analyzed.

Please sign below to give your son/daughter permission to participate in this study and to be videotaped with the class and teachers.

Thank you,

Anita O. Manley
Speech Pathologist
Public Schools
5230

_________________________________ has my permission to participate
in Ms. Manley's study at High School.

Date ___________________________ Signature, Parent or Guardian
November 18, 1992

Dear Parent:

As pilot study for OSU research, Anita Manley, speech pathologist, is studying communication interactions in classrooms for the hearing impaired. The / Speech and Hearing / Special Education administration has already approved the study.

The students, with your permission, will be videotaped with their teacher, Mrs. for two 30 minute regular English class sessions. Then, there will be 3 or 4 additional class periods before the school year’s end when Ms. Manley and Mrs. will engage the students in a special way of learning called process drama. Special role-play activities will be explored as a way of experiencing communication challenges while learning curriculum content and sharing meanings.

These sessions will be videotaped. Only Ms. Manley and M will have access to the recorded videotapes. Group communication skills will be analyzed

Please sign below to give your son/daughter permission to participate in this study and to be videotaped with the class and teachers.

Thank you,

Anita O. Manley
Speech Pathologist
Public Schools
5230

________________________________________ has my permission to participate in Ms. Manley’s study with Mrs. class at Elementary School.

________________________________________ Date
________________________________________ Signature, Parent or Guardian
APPENDIX C

LET'S TALK CHECKLIST PROTOCOL AND RATING SUMMARIES
## Communication Skills Checklist

**Name** ____________________  **Birth Date** ____________________  **Sex** ____________________

**Address** ____________________

**Classroom** ____________________  **Teacher** ____________________  **Date** ____________________

**Other Information** ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION ACTS</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ritualizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Greets others appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduces him/herself appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduces people to each other appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greets others appropriately when telephoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Introduces him/herself appropriately when telephoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Asks for persons appropriately when telephoning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Says farewell appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks others to repeat appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gives name (first and last) on request</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gives address (number, street, town, etc.) on request</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gives telephone number on request</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quality of speech acts may be noted as (1) informal, (2) formal, (3) direct, or (4) indirect.*

*Permission is granted to purchasers of Let's Talk to reproduce this checklist for educational use.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION ACTS</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Asks others appropriately for name</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asks others appropriately for address</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asks others appropriately for telephone number</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asks others appropriately for the location of belongings and necessities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Asks others appropriately for the location of events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Responds appropriately to requests for the location of events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks others appropriately for the time of events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Responds appropriately to requests for the time of events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks others appropriately for preferences or wants</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Responds appropriately to requests for preferences or wants</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tells others realistically about abilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tells realistically about the levels of various abilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Asks appropriately for information by telephone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Asks appropriately for permission to leave messages</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tells appropriately who a message is for</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION ACTS</td>
<td>RATINGS</td>
<td>QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Leaves appropriately expressed messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Suggests places for meetings appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suggests times for meetings appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asks appropriately for permission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asks appropriately for reasons</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tells reasons appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Asks appropriately for favors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Responds appropriately to requests for favors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Accepts and carries out</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Evades or delays</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Rejects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Offers assistance appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Makes complaints appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Responds to complaints appropriately:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Accepts blame and suggests action</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Evades or refers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Rejects blame</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Asks for intentions appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responds appropriately to requests for intentions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Asks to discontinue actions appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION ACTS</td>
<td>RATINGS</td>
<td>QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Asks appropriately for terms of contract:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Pay</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Vacations, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Asks appropriately for changes in contractual terms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Pay</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Vacations, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feelings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Expresses appreciation appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apologizes appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expresses agreement appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expresses disagreement appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expresses support appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compliments appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expresses affection appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expresses positive feeling and attitudes appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expresses negative feelings and attitudes appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23.

Teacher's Ratings of Communicative Functions - Classroom A

**LET'S TALK: COMMUNICATION SKILLS CHECKLIST**  Intermediate Level - Wig & Bray (1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ritualizing</th>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum=55</td>
<td>Maximum=80</td>
<td>Maximum=125</td>
<td>Maximum=45</td>
<td>Maximum=305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 - Selma</td>
<td>44 80%</td>
<td>58 73%</td>
<td>59 47%</td>
<td>37 82%</td>
<td>198 65%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 - Alvin</td>
<td>40 73%</td>
<td>49 61%</td>
<td>49 39%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>126 41%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 - Nadine</td>
<td>33 60%</td>
<td>37 46%</td>
<td>51 41%</td>
<td>15 33%</td>
<td>136 45%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 - Donna</td>
<td>36 65%</td>
<td>42 53%</td>
<td>46 37%</td>
<td>17 38%</td>
<td>141 46%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 - Burt</td>
<td>29 53%</td>
<td>43 54%</td>
<td>51 41%</td>
<td>21 47%</td>
<td>144 47%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 - Nancy</td>
<td>46 84%</td>
<td>63 79%</td>
<td>58 46%</td>
<td>36 80%</td>
<td>203 67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 - Jill</td>
<td>45 82%</td>
<td>61 76%</td>
<td>61 49%</td>
<td>30 67%</td>
<td>197 65%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 - Danny</td>
<td>27 49%</td>
<td>39 49%</td>
<td>51 41%</td>
<td>17 38%</td>
<td>134 44%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 - Faye</td>
<td>34 62%</td>
<td>30 37%</td>
<td>48 38%</td>
<td>16 36%</td>
<td>128 42%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 - Debra</td>
<td>41 74%</td>
<td>51 64%</td>
<td>57 46%</td>
<td>27 60%</td>
<td>176 58%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35 63%</td>
<td>47 59%</td>
<td>53 42%</td>
<td>23 51%</td>
<td>158 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24.

Teacher’s Ratings of Communicative Functions - Classroom B

**LET'S TALK: COMMUNICATION SKILLS CHECKLIST**  
Intermediate Level  Wing & Bray (1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ritualizing</th>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum=55</td>
<td>Maximum=80</td>
<td>Maximum=125</td>
<td>Maximum=45</td>
<td>Maximum=305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 - Tia</td>
<td>51 93%</td>
<td>72 90%</td>
<td>78 62%</td>
<td>37 82%</td>
<td>238 78%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 - Mike</td>
<td>45 82%</td>
<td>48 60%</td>
<td>74 59%</td>
<td>40 89%</td>
<td>207 68%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 - Vern</td>
<td>38 69%</td>
<td>52 65%</td>
<td>70 56%</td>
<td>27 60%</td>
<td>187 61%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 - Kiana</td>
<td>41 75%</td>
<td>50 63%</td>
<td>68 54%</td>
<td>30 67%</td>
<td>189 62%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 - Curtis</td>
<td>35 64%</td>
<td>48 60%</td>
<td>67 53%</td>
<td>27 60%</td>
<td>177 58%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 - Alex</td>
<td>36 65%</td>
<td>51 64%</td>
<td>72 58%</td>
<td>36 80%</td>
<td>195 64%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 - Kiesha</td>
<td>55 100%</td>
<td>67 84%</td>
<td>95 76%</td>
<td>45 100%</td>
<td>262 86%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 - Holly</td>
<td>55 100%</td>
<td>64 80%</td>
<td>81 65%</td>
<td>38 84%</td>
<td>238 78%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 - Traci</td>
<td>29 53%</td>
<td>41 51%</td>
<td>51 41%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>139 46%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43 78%</td>
<td>55 68%</td>
<td>73 58%</td>
<td>33 74%</td>
<td>204 67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25.

Teacher’s Ratings of Communicative Functions - Classroom C

LET'S TALK: COMMUNICATION SKILLS CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ritualizing</th>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum=55</td>
<td>Maximum=80</td>
<td>Maximum=125</td>
<td>Maximum=45</td>
<td>Maximum=305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Rayna</td>
<td>29 53%</td>
<td>42 53%</td>
<td>52 42%</td>
<td>26 58%</td>
<td>149 49%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Billy</td>
<td>27 49%</td>
<td>38 48%</td>
<td>55 44%</td>
<td>26 58%</td>
<td>146 47%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Rita</td>
<td>28 51%</td>
<td>40 50%</td>
<td>52 42%</td>
<td>27 60%</td>
<td>147 48%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Joyce</td>
<td>32 58%</td>
<td>45 56%</td>
<td>53 43%</td>
<td>36 80%</td>
<td>166 54%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29 53%</td>
<td>41 52%</td>
<td>53 42%</td>
<td>29 64%</td>
<td>152 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26.

Teacher's Ratings of Communicative Functions - Classroom D

LET'S TALK: COMMUNICATION SKILLS CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Ritualizing</th>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum=55</td>
<td>Maximum=80</td>
<td>Maximum=125</td>
<td>Maximum=45</td>
<td>Maximum=305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 - Mark</td>
<td>25 45%</td>
<td>32 40%</td>
<td>50 42%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>125 41%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 - Jay</td>
<td>24 44%</td>
<td>40 50%</td>
<td>62 50%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>144 47%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 - Steve</td>
<td>42 76%</td>
<td>47 59%</td>
<td>77 64%</td>
<td>25 55%</td>
<td>191 63%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 - Sarah</td>
<td>28 51%</td>
<td>38 47%</td>
<td>54 45%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>138 45%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 - Amy</td>
<td>40 73%</td>
<td>40 50%</td>
<td>33 27%</td>
<td>19 42%</td>
<td>132 43%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 - Louis</td>
<td>24 44%</td>
<td>33 41%</td>
<td>48 38%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>123 40%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 - Kelly</td>
<td>32 58%</td>
<td>32 40%</td>
<td>53 42%</td>
<td>19 42%</td>
<td>136 45%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 - Faye</td>
<td>27 49%</td>
<td>32 40%</td>
<td>53 42%</td>
<td>18 40%</td>
<td>130 43%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30 55%</td>
<td>37 46%</td>
<td>54 43%</td>
<td>19 42%</td>
<td>140 46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW WITH THE PROGRAM CONSULTANT WITH HEARING IMPAIRED PROGRAM
Transcription of Interview with the Program Consultant with Hearing Impaired Program

(Bold-face print highlights Mrs. 's utterances. Interviewer's verbalizations are in plain text and italicized.)

First, tell me about yourself and your work.

(Laughter) Well, I'm currently the Educational Consultant with the Hearing Impaired Program. Prior to that, for eight years, I was the work-study coordinator for the Hearing Impaired Program. Prior to that I was a teacher in the high school in the Career Center and in the middle school. Prior to that, I was a substitute teacher for 11 years in all different exceptionalities.

Uh huh. When you were a teacher, you said you were teaching the hearing impaired?

Yes.

How many years?

I did that for one year, full-time, in middle school, four years full-time in high school. Two of those years, I also worked as a liaison with the Career Center. There were half days at each place.

Career Center?

Career Center.

Can you describe your teaching experience over those years when you were a full time teacher with the hearing impaired?

Initially, my first year, when I was in middle school, it was an oral program. Prior to that, I had been substituting in that program on long term assignments numerous times. And then when I went into the high school, I was placed in a total communication program, a new program with multihandicapped students the first year, then I was moved to , which again was an oral program and at Northeast, I had both oral and total communication students. I did tutoring when necessary, interpreting, and mostly dealt with the instructors, trying to help them deal with our students.

At the high school level?

At the high school level. Eleventh and twelfth grades.

In that first year, when you taught the multihandicapped, were they hearing impaired?
They were hearing impaired and all having secondary handicaps. At least as serious, if not more serious, than the hearing handicap.

And where were they placed?

High School.

About how many children were you responsible for?

We had in the classroom, we had 27 students. There were three teachers. We taught in one room.

Uh. Talk a little bit about your students. . .when you were in the classroom and your perceptions of them as students, how they communicated, what their needs were, strengths, if you can make any generalities.

OK, the middle school students that I had at Middle School for several years and then one year as a full-time teacher there were predominantly hard of hearing students. They were caught between the hearing impaired and the hearing world, sometimes I thought that was more difficult for them than if they had been more profoundly hearing impaired. We had different levels of academic achievement. We had students who would go on and complete a four year college. We had students who would go into the MRDD program after they had completed the hearing impaired program and had gotten a diploma from high school. In the high school level, they were predominantly oral students who had a wide variation. That group of youngsters that I had over at were both TC and at they were oral, were part of the rubella generation. And those youngsters not only had a hearing handicap, but a secondary, rather severe handicap. Also, I had a number of youngsters who were deafened as a result of meningitis. Most of them had a hearing handicap as a result of the meningitis. Uh, we had to deal with all of those.

What kinds of secondary . . .

A lot of them had some mental retardation, uh, some of them had rather severe learning disabilities. There were a number of children in the MH program who were autistic or who had autistic tendencies and also some who had behavior handicap tendencies. Prior to the time that I taught hearing impaired students, I taught autistic students, autistic elementary students. And when I started substituting, I substituted in the least desirable classrooms, because they couldn’t get anyone who would do it, except at that time, they were not labeled anything and there was no certification required to teach them. So I had experience working with autistic and those who had autistic tendencies before I went to That was real beneficial to me.

And where were they placed?

They were placed in Elementary School. And I had youngsters mostly from the ages of nine to thirteen and they had all of the oh, tendencies that autistic children have — head banging, spinning, perseveration. It was a very interesting experience. It was not one that I wanted. I got it by accident, because the teaching
quit after I had subbed for her for a couple of days. She just quit. And they asked me if I would stay and teach in that program. And I did. Good experience. I don't want to repeat it. (Laughter)

Very interesting. I thought I knew about some of your experiences, but I didn't have much of a clue. That's great.

(Laughter) It's pretty wide, it turned out that way because I was willing to substitute anywhere and in that capacity, I could work any day I wanted to. I had small children at home when they weren't ill and they didn't need me for something else, then I would substitute. And usually it was in special need classes. And I subbed in a lot of what were called DH classes then. I substituted also in a couple of SBH classes. I felt less comfortable. I taught with the visually impaired and of course a lot of times with the hearing impaired. And I developed an interest and decided to go back and do my master's work in hearing impaired.

UnHuh. Why that decision?

I don't know. I thought about that a lot, why I ever got involved. When I was originally in college back in 1956. I started in 1956 and I was in a special program and at that time we had to do a lot of field work; a lot more field work. I guess more than they have to do now, that they haven't done for the 20 or 25 years in between. And one of my field experiences that I requested was at the School for the Deaf. And uh at that time, I became very interested. It may be result of the fact that my father was deaf in one ear or it may just be that the whole idea fascinated me. There was not as much of an emphasis on manual communication as there is now at . However, there was a lot and there were a number of hearing impaired teachers who taught there. And I had the privilege of working with them. And I was fascinated with the excellent speechreading and speech that these people had. And I think that is probably what encouraged me into the field, because I thought, my goodness, if they can do that, then I think a lot of other students can and I think that is how I got interested in the whole idea of oralism and of course the program, the Hearing Impaired Program at that time was all oral. There was nothing else available. They wouldn't permit me to teach at the School for the Deaf when I left college because I was on a special scholarship and I had to teach in a public school in Ohio. And School for the Deaf is not a public school. So for many years, I kinda put that back in the back of my mind. And when I went on to substitute, pretty extensively in about 1974, I started doing a lot of subbing, and then that's when I got the opportunity to come back into the . I have since done that a lot as my work there as a work-study coordinator. But I didn't go back and teach there. I didn't substitute there at all.

I didn't know that they had any other emphasis besides manual communication.

Uh huh. It was a considerable emphasis on speech. And a few there who were profoundly deaf instructors, had excellent speech and if you didn't know or if you weren't standing behind them, you wouldn't have known they were deaf. And they fascinated me. I couldn't figure out how they did that; how they did that so successfully. And I think that is probably the reason that I wanted to live here.
And I haven't regretted it. I have always enjoyed it. And I still enjoy it.

Uh Huh. I know. (Laughter)

(Laughter)

Let's get back to talking about the hearing impaired children and your perceptions of them.

One of the things that I think is very important and I have been real fascinated with the speech program. I am allowed to talk about that, aren't I?

Yes, you are.

The speech program, that has been used particularly with our high school students. I can remember vividly early on when I was first teaching hearing impaired students, high school students. And the reluctance that those students had to go to speech. When it was time to go to speech, often times you would find yourself literally dragging them down there. And their argument against going to speech was, "I have been going for my whole life and it hasn't done me any good and I am not going to go anymore. I am tired of it." So when the idea that interpersonal communication came in, I was one of its strongest advocates. Because I thought this was really where it was needed so desperately, especially with our older students. And I have seen it be very, very successful. And I certainly hope that it will be able to be continued and used a lot, because so many of our students have excellent skills. They can be taught to do many many jobs. But their social skills are so poor that they often times cause themselves problems on the job, not because they can't do the work, but because they don't know how to interact with each other, with the hearing people on the workplace, and particularly with their employers. They oftentimes appear to be much less capable than they are, based on the fact that they don't have the kind of social skills that are so natural to hearing people.

Uh Huh. Can you elaborate about some of those skills?

Right. A lot of times, there is a lot of down time on any job. There are periods of time whether it be an organized break or whether it be that you are at work before the time you are scheduled or you are staying after the time you are scheduled, you need to be able to interact with other people in the workplace. Otherwise, these people tend to get the impression that you think you are better than they are or that you are standoffish or that you simply are not able to communicate. So a lot of times, our students do not have any kind of coping skills on how all the different strategies that they could use to communicate with people and this is particularly. This is as true with our oral students as it is with our total communication students. Neither one of them seem to have a good idea about how to have small talk. The kind of talk that is very important to teenagers, early adolescents, early adult. It is very important to be able to communicate things that are going on in your world. Interesting things. And if you can't communicate those, even if it is not done perfectly; if you're reluctant to try or if you don’t have the skills that are required to just start a conversation, they don’t initiate conversations well. Now a
lot of times, when I would go out with students on a job, and I would then, initiate a conversation between a student and an employer or another employee. Then they would get it and we could maybe do some modeling. I would try to model some of the ways that they could communicate with the other people. If it is writing on a piece of paper, fine. If it is trying to give them some kind of information, orally, even if you feel your speech skills aren't very good. It is better than to just remove yourself from the group. Because usually the student didn’t like the job and the job didn’t like the student. And so, that’s why I felt that the Interpersonal Communication Program was so valuable to our students. And we had done initially, a lot of role playing. A lot of things that involved the kids. You gave them ideas about how to go about stimulating conversation.

_Uh huh._

Because, so often. They didn’t know. No one had ever asked them to do that before. Usually they were asked to produce sounds or they were asked to produce answers. But they weren’t asked to ever produce the initiating comments to get other people to start a conversation with them. And I realize that particularly when I went into the total communication program. Because a lot of those students had been discouraged from ever trying to speak in the first place. Because they had poor voice quality or they had poor articulation. All kinds of things. People had discouraged them from trying to talk. [Discouraged by whom?] A lot of times, parents and, unfortunately, the teachers. But predominantly the community. Family members, grandma and grandpa didn’t want the child to make strange noises when they were out in the public, so consequently the big things was—"be quiet, don’t talk, you can sign if you need to; but don’t say anything to anyone, because, it is embarrassing to us. But, we don’t want to call attention to your handicapping condition." So a lot of these children picked up on it. By the time they became 13, on up, they had learned the lesson so well, they didn’t want to communicate with anyone. And so when they got in the workplace where people do not normally sign, they had no good idea of how to start something. And when they were doing interpersonal communication, they were practicing these kinds of things and this was the emphasis of the program. I thought it was real valuable. Still think it is.

_Uh Huh._

And have fought very hard to keep it in our high school.

_Yes, you have._

_(Laughter)_

_So, when you said that the students followed or answered questions or just repeated sounds, were they aware of what their needs were or what they were missing. What was missing in conversations or in socializations? Did the students care? Were they responsible?_

It is kind of interesting, because if I watched the students in their own environment, they possess the skills to do it, but they are reluctant to try it with those who are not a part of their group. And normally, when they get away from the school setting, they are with people who are not a part of their group who do
not have the same needs and desires and interests that they do. A lot of them don’t have any skills to communicate with our, particularly with our profoundly deaf students. And I have always been interested in the fact that they can do it in the one setting and would do it and do it quite well. They were comfortable with it, but weren’t comfortable when they got away from the setting. And unfortunately, that is where life is, away from the school setting. But some of the youngsters seem to have so much better handle and it doesn’t have anything, that I can see, to do with the degree of loss they suffer. That doesn’t seem to be the factor. I think a lot of it depends upon the home environment. I do, honestly, believe that our deaf students of deaf parents do much better, than our deaf children of hearing parents, especially if our hearing parents have never accepted the deaf child and I think they discouraged a lot of the things that the child could have done and would have done, at an early age. So that by the time that they get into the awful period of their lives where everything is awful for them, in the early teens. It is destroyed. And then, I don’t know if we can pick it up again, unless it is specifically taught to them. And I know that we as teachers often times accept conversation from students which is not appropriate. We accept bits and pieces of language. We fill in a lot of things ourselves. And I was guilty as anyone of doing that. They will sign two or three signs and we pick up and fill that in and make it into a full conversation. And that isn’t true when they are with other people. That’s only true of us. So that we are teaching something that we shouldn’t be teaching. So I try, today, if I go out into the buildings, to think, “I am not going to do that.” And the next thing I know, I am doing it because I am so interested in what they are trying to tell me that I forget that I should be asking to communicate it to me the same way they would to someone who didn’t know sign language or doesn’t understand some of the ways that some of our oral students speak.

But in a way, you are wearing multiple hats...

Yeah.

You have to be a counselor and a person who has to get things done in an efficient amount of time, but then you have that teacher hat, too.

Unhuh.

I want to go back to what you said about deaf students of deaf parents and deaf students of hearing parents. I want you to contrast that a little bit and help me understand about what kinds of behaviors those deaf parents have that the hearing parents don’t have. What are they doing? And what makes that difference?

Well, I think first of all and most importantly, the deaf parent accepts the deaf child immediately at birth. In fact...

What kinds of observable behaviors.

I would imagine just in the way... Now I’ve never seen deaf parents interact with a deaf, tiny infant, so I don’t know what they do. But I have observed that some of the deaf parents and they happened to have been former students of mine who now have small children in this program where we are right now. That would be three/four year olds. And they are very accepting of all the things they do. And
they elicit conversation from these little children. They expect them to communicate. If they don’t, then they force the communication.

How is that?

Sometimes physically. They take a hold of the child and sign or speak or whatever it is you want and wait until that child responds.

Uh huh.

While a lot of time I see hearing parents who have a deaf child who seem a little bit overwhelmed by the whole thing; they don't force that interaction. If the child is being good and if the child is doing what they are supposed to do. That is sufficient. Unlimited conversation is unnecessary, it would appear. So I think that it is probably an acceptance thing and there is nothing that we can do to remediate that. That's just the way that it is in life. Unfortunately, we have far more hearing impaired or hearing parents than we do of hearing impaired children with hearing impaired parents. So it is a problem, so I guess that is why I feel we need to remediate some of those things. It would be nice if it were done considerably earlier and I know the teachers here in the preschool program encourage the children to make comments, to comments on things. And they do it in all kinds of fanciful and great ways, that I would imagine when we get into the elementary and middle school, the teachers are a little reluctant to do these things. They kinda consider them to be slightly babyish or inappropriate to the age level of the child.

Uh Huh.

But to get the children to make spontaneous comments about anything. And our little ones will do it. They can be encouraged.

How little?

Very small. Our youngest ones here are...we have children who come in here on Wednesdays that are usually, oh well...somewhere between a year old and three years old.

Uh huh.

And the people who work with these children do through play all sorts of things, get the children to comment to make just these spontaneous remarks that are very important later. I mean, they would be more sophisticated in high school. But still the kind of spontaneous conversation that hearing people have all the time and have with total strangers. On buses, in the movie theaters, standing in line in the grocery store. Our hearing impaired students do not have those kinds of things happen. And they don’t realize that that is OK. It’s good to be able to make some kind of a comment to elicit something from another person.

Uh huh. In the program here, I guess in the preschool program through high school programs, have you seen much emphasis being put on the nonverbals? Or the things that go around what is actually said?
A lot of times, we accuse our children of giving mixed messages and that maybe because they don’t realize that their nonverbals are saying so much. It seems to be that our younger children do a better job than the older ones.

Hmm.

The young child usually shows by their facial expression exactly how they feel and it is appropriate to what they are saying to you. If they are saying, “I don’t like it at school today,” their face or body says, “I don’t like it at school today. I’m not happy here today. I don’t feel well.” Well, sometimes our older children will tend to give some kind of mixed messages in that they don’t always...and I think our total communication students do much better than our oral students...because the total communication students are dependent upon it. Because a lot of the people are getting a lot of the information from their body language and their nonverbals than they do because they don’t know sign. They don’t have any idea. And I know that a lot of times a child, a student coming up to me, they will give me some kind of a nonverbal clue or cue, then I can better use the sign language. Because I have a lot of trouble, a lot of trouble with receptive sign language. A lot of trouble with it. And I need those kind of...And if they don’t give me any kind of a clue, if their body language and their facial expression don’t say anything to me, I have a lot of trouble finding out what it is we and a lot of times they start a conversation in the middle of the thought instead of giving me some kind of an idea at the beginning. They just walk up to me...I had yesterday a young woman, a high school senior, walk up to me from a total communication program and say, “a letter $5 mother.”

Oh my.

And I had absolutely no idea at all and she just stood and looked at me and signed that to me. And I thought maybe I misread it and I asked one of the teachers who was there and she read the same thing. Finally, after a whole lot of discomfort on everybody’s part, I finally found out what it was she was saying to me was that I needed to send a check for $12, not $5, to pay for an order that I had placed with the student.

So that was the intended message that you finally got?

The intended message that we finally got it after going around and around and by filling in a lot of gaps ourselves. The student didn’t help us a lot. We had to fill in a lot of those gaps by thinking, now what in the world would she be saying. Why would she be talking to me about money. I know the family. I know the mother. I know the situation, which helped me tremendously. If I hadn’t known all of that, I don’t think I would have ever gotten the message she was giving me. And this was a senior.

And you were a person who was a helper and a motivator. What would have happened if somebody really didn’t care or didn’t take the time?

They would turn around and would walk away and would never try to get anything out of that message, because the message would have meant absolutely nothing to about 95% of the world.
Wouldn't have meant anything. I wouldn't have been able to have made any connection. As I say, she gave me the wrong dollar figure and so, even if you would have had a clue, based on that, you wouldn't have had because she gave me the wrong figure.

Um huh.

Eventually, we got to the message. I hadn't gotten the letter yet, so we didn't know anything about it. Now had I known ahead of time that I would have been able to piece in that information when she gave it to me. But I got the letter when I got back to the school. By that time we'd already had the conversation, and finally figured it out. Now surprisingly this is a deaf child of deaf parents. So...

Hmm. Interesting. You said something that was very interesting to me also about oral children, children in oral programs, oral communicators—that they have just as much problems or can have just as many difficulties as those in total communication programs.

Oh, I do believe so. I've always felt that sometimes hard-of-hearing children were the ones who had the most difficulty later in life. They aren't part of either world. Now we have youngsters in this program who are borderline; who are in the program because they had a sufficient enough loss to qualify, but just.

Um huh.

Then we have a group of youngsters who are in this program who are perhaps oral because families were more comfortable with the oral program. The children were more comfortable with it.

Um huh.

Staff was more comfortable and it was they're in the oral program but perhaps they don't belong there. Then we have that group of youngsters who are in the oral program; they belong in the oral program. They have a lot of deficits in speech and a lot of hearing people don't have time to deal with those deficits when in a conversation or when a comment is made or when a question is brought up.

Speech intelligibility or...?

Sometimes speech intelligibility and sometimes misuse of vocabulary; a lack of understanding of a lot of vocabulary words because they didn't pick them up as small children as hearing children do. I guess there are a lot of different reasons. But those children seem to be, an interesting thing is, I have kept a very careful record of the children who graduated from this program in 1984, simply because they were a large and a very interesting group and they were a group that I had taught many different times. A lot of those youngsters, the great number of those youngsters, were of course in the oral program because that was the predominant program. Some had switched over to TC. The only students who were not oral were those who had moved into Columbus much later in their education. So these
had all been oral to start with and there was all kinds of degrees of hearing loss among those students. There was 74 of them to start with. Seventy-four did not graduate. There were just a little over 50 who actually graduated in '84. But in that class, through the years, there had been over 70 children. And the children who had been oral, who had not been very successful, or who had been very successful, it doesn’t seem to have made any particular difference. Most of those students now, when they come back to see me are now Total Communication. Most of those students have gone to the manual form of communication. They have been more comfortable in the deaf world than they have been in the hearing.

Even though they had quite a bit of residual hearing?

A lot of residual hearing, intelligible speakers and were very much opposed to sign language—to the degree that some of those children, they are not children anymore. Some of those individuals were with me at Career Center. And I was supposed to be the person who would keep them in the career center program so we give them the resources they needed to be successful. So a lot of times, that would involve interpreting and they wouldn’t let me come in and sign in the classroom. I’d have to wait. I’d have to come in and listen to the lecture and then I’d have to tell it to them, sign it to them, later. They were so reluctant to have any sign language used in front of anybody else. Of course, these were basically one or two or three students in a class of all the rest hearing students. But now, these same students would come back to see me. First thing that we talk about is that now they sign all the time. Now obviously that is not true of all of the students in that group. They were a number of students who were very oral and whom I am assuming are still very oral. But many, many of them. And the ones who were the most adamant—and I tease them about it when I see them and this happens, I will say to them, “My gosh, you wouldn’t ever let me sign to you and now you are signing to me and you are expecting a signed response. What happened.” Well, some of them went away to school. Some of them went to the Program for the Deaf, which has a good mix of students from all over the state who have all different kinds of sign skills and speech skills and everything else. And in order to be able to communicate with other people, they had to learn sign. And it was so nice, they just continued to use it. They still, a lot of them, use their speech skills. A lot of them do use Total Communication. They speak and sign, simultaneously. But, that has been the most fascinating thing. And I haven’t watched that as much with the other groups because that group, I knew, all of them started out oral. And that gave me a basis to make. Also, it has been fascinating for their job. I have been keeping track of what kind of job skills they have developed and how many jobs they’ve kept; how many jobs they’ve lost. And I have no way of knowing how much they use sign language or oral communication on the jobs.

Oh, what can you say generally about the types of jobs the class of '84 have held and what they come back saying in terms of successes and failures and especially anything related to communication skills.

OK. A lot of the students have had a certain level of success. And it has been very surprising that not only for the class of '84 but almost every other class that I’ve worked with. The students that we would call lower academically functioning students and a lot of times nonverbal students who really don’t talk well, they
don’t sign well. They are the ones who are most likely to keep jobs. And they are the most likely to make improvements in their pay scales, if not improvements in their job descriptions. But they do usually stay and are usually successful. And that has been something that I have written up a couple of times in the parent newsletter because it seems to give some encouragement to those parents whose children are not capable of going to Ohio State University. Because it sorta says that these students seem to be able to get into the job. And maybe it is because a lot of them can accept boredom. Maybe it is because a lot of them are somewhat social isolators and therefore they don’t create problems on the job. They just do their work and go home.

Wow.

So that has been, like a real fascinating thing and I have no answer for why that is and I have watched that over and over and it is not just with one class. It has just permeated with all students that we’ve had for the last 10 or 12 years.

Do you think people on the job and in their lives allow them to function with a lot of dependency in terms of not really being assertive communicators and just letting them do the rote, day to day things?

Yeah. Most of the jobs are very repetitive, very repetitive jobs. They don’t require much communication. A lot of them are in—the two areas where we have had a lot of students and it is unfortunate because it is not what I would have like to have seen happen. A lot of them fall into two classifications: janitorial and clerical. And then all the ramifications of both of them. And then all of the ramifications of both of those. From someone who writes programs for the computers down to the person who scrubs floors in the restrooms at some hotel. So it is a wide range within. But those two areas have been probably the greatest. And it may be partly because some of the students have seen other hearing impaired students be successful and then they pick those careers. There are obviously limits to what can happen with the students. I mean, a lot of them place their own limits upon themselves. A lot of families place limits on the students, not believing that they really are capable of much or way overestimating the academic abilities of a student and having expectations that are way out of line and probably causing a lot of frustrations. A lot of them, I think, gravitate towards jobs where they are successful, where they make an adequate wage. They are able to maintain themselves. Far too many of the hearing impaired individuals, not just from our program, but in general, across the country, have maintained a dependency status. They still live with parents at an age when many many hearing and nonhandicapped individuals are on their own. And a lot of them have not really attempted to get many jobs. They exist on supplemental security incomes and other kinds of programs of that type.

Uh huh. That is very interesting. It is very helpful to get this top-down perspective, because my own way of looking at things has been from within the education system so I don’t have good ideas and what the perceptions are in the real world, once they graduate and get out of school.

Right. Yeah. Well this is a good time to be deaf. It really is. Of all times. This is a good time to be deaf. The Deaf Awareness situation, the ADA, all of the things,
the IDEA law, all of these kinds of things have been very beneficial. To not just
defaf individuals but all handicapped individuals. And many employers are being
told they must seek handicapped individuals. And hearing impaired individuals
are easier to assimilate into the corporations than a lot of other handicapped
individuals.

*Because.*

Because a lot of times their skills, their intellectual ability is the same as it is for a
hearing person. They can do a lot of different kinds of jobs. This program has
been usually very thorough in making sure that everybody graduates with some
type of a skill which is real helpful to them. But we still have the ones who never
really want to leave the nest. They want to stay at home and no matter how hard we
try, they won’t go out and do anything.

Would you say that bosses and coworkers perceive the hearing impaired people on the job to
look normal?

They look normal, sure. Except for hearing aids, usually, you wouldn’t know. I
mean there is nothing physical about a hearing impairment. There is, you know,
you have a hearing aid perhaps, and other than that, there is nothing else to really
say until they open their mouths to speak.

Any idiosyncrasies that get in the way, in terms of nonverbals?

Except not being able to initiate, not really being able to start a conversation or not
having those skills that are necessary to make them compatible with the people
around them.

*Uhh huh.*

No. I think a lot of times, it may be that they are more comfortable left alone and if
you don’t start conversation, you are. You are left alone. No one tries to force you.
They let you be what you are.

What is this “IDEA” law?

Ah, yes. The Individuals with Disability Education Act. It replaced 94-142, Public
Law 94-142 and it is responsible for the, probably one of the biggest thing that it
involves in school, is transition planning. It is necessary to start when students are
16 or younger to plan for their lives when they leave school; to plan for their lives
in the future—sometimes way in the future. And this is done with school staff,
parent involvement, sometimes BVR counselors. . .

Is this across handicaps?

This is across handicaps. Yes, this is across handicaps. And our program has been
involved with it a long time, even before it was required by law.

Yes, “you” were.
Yeah, yeah. We've always been. I have always been real interested in that and have always believed that parent involvement was the most important thing and that it is good to get them involved that way.

So, the education plans and what goes on in the classroom and other placements have to reflect and have to address longer or for the life of the individual?

Yeah. Now our program hasn't always done as well on that as some have. Because we haven't always had as much emphasis on daily living skills or those kind of social skills and things of that type. We haven't always had that much emphasis. It has been a program that has been predominantly academic. However, our Life Centered Education Program (LCE) here at , in which all students are exposed to at some point in their life, does provide help with those kinds of things with daily living skills and just those skills that are required to go out into the world and—be.

Uh huh. A particular concern of mine is trying to decide if what we are doing or what we intend to do with our interpersonal communication classes and doing role-plays are realistic or if we are taxing the children behaviors in school that even regular children don't show. For example, in traditional classrooms, research has shown that the scripts are usually teacher centered where the teacher does all the talking and the kids answer, like you said that the hearing impaired kids are expected to just answer. Or they write answers and not much talk is expected. So why should the expectations be different for our children, the hearing impaired children.

Well, probably they shouldn't be, but they are. Simply because those hearing children who act like that in a classroom do not act like that outside of a classroom. That is true in a typical teacher-student situation. What is it? The figure is 80% teacher participation, 20% student participation. Something like that. Maybe it is even worse than that. And in our classes, that is probably true. About the same. And we unfortunately don't have the outside of the class experiences that the hearing students have.

Whose fault is that? Whose responsibility?

That's not probably the school's responsibility, but we have to assume it. It is just like when we have to assume responsibility for parenting skills, for teaching sex education, for doing all the other things that are required to make these individuals productive, valuable, independent, all these other things we expect of them later, we want for them. We have become very involved with our students. We have a much fewer number than most other teacher and teachers in nonhandicapped classes. We've had them for a much longer period of time. And sometimes we forget that eventually they are going to leave that nice safe environment and that they are going to have to go out there and be able to communicate. They are going to have to be able to be relaxed when they do it. It can't be a forced kind of a situation. It just kind of needs to be natural. It seems like, maybe with captioning it is better, but for television, for example, which hearing children have been raised with, and they see this happening on television all the time. People have conversations. They talk about things. It doesn't have
anything to do with social studies or math. They talk about weather. They talk about the presidential election and they talk about lots of things. Our kids don't do that. They don't seem to have that feeling that that is important. And maybe it is partly because they don't see, they don't hear the television. A lot of them don't know what's going on unless mom or dad or brother or sister tells them what's going on. And I doubt that the family says to the child, "Now, they are having a conversation that doesn't have anything to do with school experiences. But instead this has to do with just life. And people talk about things and you can have any kind of a conversation that you want. I doubt that the families do that. I'm not sure that we do that either, to tell you the truth. So, that's way, in interpersonal communication, it is there. It is part of the curriculum. It is encouraged. And it is the only time it is. And so, if that isn't there, then where are they ever going to get this?

Uh huh. And so in interpersonal communication classes, there is role-playing and there is actually talked about learning about talking, learning about listening, learning about interacting. Say something about carryover, generalization of those kinds of role-play kinds of activities to real people in the real world.

I don't really know. I don't know whether there is much carryover. I hope there is a lot of carryover. Students interact so differently with staff people than they do with each other. And unless you go in and you sit in, and I have done that. I have gone into the lunch rooms in the buildings and I have sat at a table and I have kind of observed what is going on. And I do see them doing some of this sort of thing, where they usually are talking about the things that are specific to school, like the football game is coming up or some dance is going to happen or something that is going on in the Deaf Club or at one of the churches that have a lot of emphasis for the deaf. Those seem to be the kind of things. I don't think I have seen a group of students have a conversation about politics. Uh, I don't think I have seen much of a conversation about weather. Maybe that is my perception. I think they may do those. I mean, obviously, if it is raining they may comment about the fact that they got wet. But as far as having a conversation about, "Well do you remember last year when it was much warmer than it is this year." Those kinds of things, I don't think so. But I think that they do realize that by having that interpersonal communication class, talking like that is OK. It doesn't have to be centered on school. It is OK to talk about nonessential things and they are encouraged to do that. And I know that a lot of times the combination of the interpersonal communication class and the whole language approach has caused many of the students; at least a couple of them specifically, to write me some very interesting notes which have some very interesting greetings to them, and varied ones. So this is coming from somewhere. This isn't just coming from out of the air.

Give an example of something you have gotten.

OK. I should pull some of these letters out, because I have a lot of these letters. I keep them all. But, I had one the other day from a student that said, "How are you doing?" and how are you doing is not something that I have heard routinely from hearing impaired students. So they had to have picked that up somewhere—either in the English class when they were doing whole language or in interpersonal—or somewhere. That would not be. . .and these are profoundly deaf students I am talking about. I am not talking about students who hear these kinds of things.
These are students who don't hear much of anything. "How are you doing" or they'll start out with something that is very appropriate to be an initial thought in a communication.

And not so egocentric?

Right. And not starting right out with what it is that they want. They start out, they try to make the reader comfortable.

Wow!

And you know, "And how are you feeling?" and "I'm fine" and something that we have in common, if we've been to a job situation, they'll maybe mention something about that, which I think is really good. And I am very pleased to get these things, especially from some of our students who have lower communication skills. Some of them you've worked with, in fact.

That's interesting. Do you think it is a reasonable expectation to expect some of our students, especially those in high school, to ever practice adult roles in the classroom, in interpersonal communication activities? I have found, through research, that the children talk and think in "first person" only and they never see any other status or role other than the "I" person that they are. When they graduate, they must assume other roles other than students in a classroom. They are babysitters or coworkers.

Parents.

What about them getting rehearsal time in the classrooms?

Right. And that is a very important thing and I don't think they do. I don't think they do rehearse. A lot of the things, then, that you get are the same that they were in school. They still are very egocentric—"I need," "I want." Those kinds of things come in all the time. And these are from some of our former students who now have children in our program. They are still very egocentric. Of course, most of the children that we have that are in our program that are lower functioning, several of them are from the multihandicapped class that I had back at all those years ago.

They have the little ones here, right?

They have little ones here, right.

So I heard you say earlier that while the students talk about things that center on their needs and wants, they don't habitually use ritualizations like apologies and greetings. What about expressions of feelings, other than needs or wants?

They are being forced to do that now. That is one of the big emphases of the whole language program: to be able to describe your feelings, to describe how you feel. They develop all kinds of lists of feelings so that they can be comfortable talking about feelings; their own or those they perceive of others. Now most of them are just at a writing level where it's their own, "I feel sad today." Most of them haven't moved yet to the level of, "You look sad today."
“Maybe you don’t feel well.” They haven’t gone quite that far. But they are dealing a lot with those kinds of things that are very abstract. Very difficult for them. Feelings are descriptive things, trying to give the reader a much greater feeling for what they are talking about than just using a bunch of nouns that don’t have any true significance.

Uh huh. And do they have the same problems with “through-the-air” communication?

Yeah, I think they do. But you know, it is so interesting. A lot of the students who have quite excellent through the air communication don’t have it in written form. And you know, we’ve seen that for years and years with every group of youngsters. And a lot of times through the air they have very flagrant mistakes. If you have them sign something to you and you “read” exactly what they said, exactly and you have them read it, they will deny, deny and deny that that’s what they said, because that was not the way that they perceived what they said to you. “Why did you leave that out? Why did you put that in? Why did you write that?” And all you did was write exactly what they had said. So I think, yeah, through the air and then the written communication—there is a big variation.

What about controlling functions? What do you see in terms of the needs and strengths? Asking for terms of a contract, negotiating meanings, asking for clarification, those kinds of things?

Those, unfortunately are not there and that is real obvious, usually when you go into job interview situations or things of that type. The one thing we usually warn them about before they do is, “Please don’t ask how much money you are going to make the first day.” A lot of times, they don’t ask anything. And they don’t even ask that and you come out, they don’t even know when it is they are supposed to work. They don’t ask any questions. They just sit there and let the information be given to them. And you have to, if you’re interpreting, you have to sometimes force the issue—which you are not supposed to do. You step out of that interpreting role and you step into the work-study role and then you say, “Don’t you have some questions you want to ask? Don’t you want to know if you have to work on Saturdays?” and they say, “Oh, yeah!” They don’t think of it themselves, a lot of times. They are just there. They are just a body that may or may not be hired.

I want to ask you about the role of the teacher or the person who is working in the classroom. A lot of times, it is easy for us to look at the kids and say what their skills are and what their needs are. What do you see as a teacher’s role in eliciting or facilitating, or contributing to these skills?

Well one thing that we have to be very careful about is our body language. And mixed messages that we often give to these students. So I guess we are teaching them what we don’t want them to learn when we do those kinds of things. And I think that a lot of times we who work with the hearing impaired are so excited. If we can get them to say or sign anything; that we accept things that are not appropriate and that we don’t require those kinds of things that are needed. We
take our little tiny children and we encourage them to vocalize all the time. Do anything. Sign. Make noise. Do something. Don’t just sit there. And then we put them in a school situation where that is not appropriate anymore. In high school, that’s not appropriate to sit there and sign all the time. It is not appropriate to make noises all the time. It is not appropriate to talk in class, and yet we have encouraged to do it dramatically when they were three, four, five, and six year old. And now we are saying to them now, you know, “Now don’t do that anymore.” So I guess we give them a real mixed messages all the way through if we have them from the time that they were small. I suppose the biggest thing that you hear usually is, “I’m an English teacher.” “I’m a math teacher.” “I’m a social studies teacher.” “I’m not supposed to worry about that.” “That’s not my role and function. That’s somebody else’s job.”

And what does the speech teacher say?

The speech teacher would say, “That’s not my job, either. I need you to do this in the classroom. I need you to do these kinds of things to encourage these kinds of things because I’m not there all the time.” And when they are in a normal setting, just a real comfortable setting is when you need to encourage those things. Yeah. It goes both ways and I have been as guilty as anyone of doing both, of say, “That’s your job. You’re the speech teacher. You work on getting them to do those kinds of things. I am going to ask them a question about math and I want them to have an answer. I don’t care how they start it.” They can start by saying, “Gee, you look beautiful today, and I think the answer is 25.” That is not what I’m looking for. So we tend to pass the buck, “It’s not my job.”

In your observations and experiences, what can you say about yourself as a teacher who has been successful with communication competence—or any other teacher. What have you seen them doing? What kinds of things do they do that make the children control more and use more ritualizations, be more flexible in their interactions, progress through conversations successfully? What do those teachers do to facilitate those kinds of skills?

Well, a lot of them don’t accept bits and pieces of conversations. A lot of them require that the things that are being said are appropriate. They won’t accept inappropriate things. Some of the really good teachers encourage the students to use all of the skills that they have and that becomes very obvious when you see those students later. The ones who truly use total communication. The teachers of the oral students require that the students speak to them in sentences, use appropriate kinds of language in the school setting, will not accept profanity or many of the things that the other students in the building are doing and are not supposed to be doing, either.

Are there other things, in particular, that these teachers do to give the students other experiences besides what is usually seen as communication in classrooms? Other kinds of learning opportunities or activities?

Usually not, so much, in the classrooms. The work-study coordinator does this by going in and doing these kinds of things in the classroom setting. These are done a lot in the Life Centered Education (LCE) programs which all ninth graders are exposed to here.
They focus on communication skills?

They use a lot of kinds of things like that. Right now they are getting ready to do some work with TTYs, appropriate kinds of conversations with TTYs; how to initiate, how to end, and also how to use the Ohio Relay System...

What's that?

That's the new system that will be started in January in Ohio and TTY users can use a 1-800 number. For a while they will be getting a place in Michigan who will then turn that conversation back around and bring it into any home in Columbus, Ohio free of charge. They are going to relay the conversation. So if I have TTY and you don't and I want to tell you something, I can use 1-800. I can type my message. They will then speak the message to you as it would then come from me. And reverse. Do it the opposite way. Many of our students will be able to communicate with each other outside the school setting, without having to have TTYs, because a lot of families can't afford them.

Uh huh. This gives more independence also. That's right and they can use that for anything. They can use it for ordering a pizza, calling in to complain about something. There's a lot of different avenues that will be open. Once they really start working on it and that's really the kind of thing that we are going to have to work on in the classrooms.

Uh huh.

To encourage the use of it, otherwise, it won't be used enough. Ohio Bell has that.

Who eventually is financially responsible, the State?

Yeah, well Ohio Bell got the contract, so yes, through the state funding. Some kind of government funding. I don't know whether it was national or not. It's not a national service. Only a few states have it. It just so happens Michigan has it now, but Ohio is implementing it but doesn't have it yet. So we are going to be using Michigan's system until Ohio gets going which will probably sometimes be late spring. And then it will just be, it will be Cleveland, Ohio. The calls will go that way.

I find it very interesting that you said that you felt that the children are competent, but that the children are competent for effective conversation moves and being effective interpersonal communicators, but that they restrict these positive skills to their peers who have similar communication styles.

Right. I think that is true. That has always been a complaint. Particularly, for example at High School. Of course, there is a very large hearing-impaired population there and there are a lot of those hearing students who are very interested in communicating with our hearing impaired students. That is one of the things that oftentimes you get caught up in if you happen to be in a hallway at the wrong time, you know. The hearing student will want to tell the hearing impaired person something and they will often look around and try to find somebody who has sign skills—a teacher, somebody, who could intercede in the
conversation, rather than just trying to go ahead. And that is true when our hearing impaired students are called in to be reprimanded and to be disciplined. What they'll do is, they'll want to get one of the teachers or the interpreters to go in and interpret. The administration wants that. They want that. So it takes so much more effort to try to do it on your own and most people aren't willing to put that much effort into it.

Is it an intelligence bound thing?

No. No. I don't think that it is at all, because some of the students that are the least academically capable are some of the best communicators.

So, are you suggesting that sometimes, if the students would put forth their personal best in situations and show it in versatile situations...

They'd do a lot better. I know I was aghast yesterday. I got a telephone call from a family who was telling me that they were interested in having the young woman have more speech. And I said, "What kinds of things do you have in mind?" And the gentleman said, "I guess I don't really mean speech." And, I thought, "It's going to be really hard to get a speech therapist to do something that has nothing to do with speech." He said, "No, here's what is. She talks at home all the time in Russian. She hears in Russian. She communicates beautifully all the time. We don't use any kind of Russian signs. We don't know any signs. But when she gets to school, she doesn't know how to do that in English. And we'd like the speech therapist to work with her in getting her to produce English sounds. So I asked the speech therapist who is assigned to that building if she could do that. Now I don't know. That's going to be a new kind of an assignment. that was very surprising, because I never heard this girl say much of anything. She doesn't talk at all here. Yeah. She doesn't say anything.

But, evidently, she's fluent in Russian?

Yes, but she's fluent, verbally, you know, orally at home. And I just couldn't believe it when this man told me that.

Let me ask you again about the smaller children, say the preschool age and the parental involvement and what it has to do with parent/child dyads, communication interactions and how parents might foster greater communicative competence in their children. I really hadn't considered that too much with this study. What can be done with the parents? What is being done?

I don't know much is. I know when I was working on my master's degree, this was one of the things we had to do for one of my classes, we had to read quite a bit of research that had to do with the interaction between mother and infant. Hearing mother of a hearing infant, hearing-impaired mother of a hearing infant, hearing mother of a hearing impaired infant and whatever, whatever's left. Anyway all those different kinds of things and they found that the communication between a hearing mother and a hearing impaired child was almost nonexistent. There was almost no communication. Those little things that you say to little babies when you are a hearing person when you figure that it is a hearing baby, those little goo-goo-ga-ga things were not being done. As soon as the mother knew that the child
was hearing impaired, then she didn't see that as valuable. Reading them stories... they just didn't do it. A lot of times children would come to school here at three years of age, be exposed to library downstairs where there is a story time going on. They go in there and the librarian, who is hearing impaired, signs and reads a story to them. For some of these children, I think that this is a brand new experience. Nobody has ever read them a story because they couldn't hear. So why would you want to waste your time talking or reading to a child when they can't hear? Well, that really puts a handicap on that child when they come to school because they haven't had those kinds of things that the other children have had. While I am assuming that hearing impaired parents of hearing impaired children have much better signed communication or whatever it is. They are much more comfortable with each other. This isn't a strange, unknown kind of a child.

That's very interesting. Self-concept... and communicative competence or opportunities.

(Laughter) I guess the idea of self-concept among our population is just exactly as it is among the population at large. Some have a very good self-concept. Some have a very poor self-concept. I suspect very strongly that a lot of profoundly deaf individuals who have been told many times as small children that their communication skills were very poor, nobody wanted to hear those noises. That would have to have a real dramatic effect on self-concept. I can't see how it wouldn't have. And those who have not been encouraged would certainly have developed a different self-concept from those who had been encouraged and everyone understood them and really made the effort. Especially within a family group. We have some family groups that are real supportive. And if grandma can communicate with the child, that's gotta be a real booster. That'd be a real interesting thing to look at to see what kinds of acceptance levels... We have some families that that would be easy enough to do it with, because there are grandparents who are very close to the children. They are hearing grandparents who are very accepting of these children. But that has to have, because conversation is so important in our society and that has to have a negative effect on self-concept if they feel themselves to not be able, even if they are able, if they think they're not. That's why I've always accepted any utterance children made. I've never, ever, ever told a child, don't make sound. I don't discourage them. No matter how bothersome it sometimes is and how much it throws me off track, I still don't do that. It's probably been the one thing I've been very consistent in all these years. I'll accept them. I try to get them to do some correction, you know, some self-correction, but that's not the thing, I just want them to keep on going.

What are your feelings about how educators of the deaf concentrate or do not concentrate on structures and looking at how successful students do or do not communicate.

We all do things different. There are those of us who say, I don't want them to make any sound or verbalization with sign language. I have had them say that to me. We discourage that. Because that kinda takes away from total communication. Sometimes it is easier. And I will admit that all of us have been guilty of simply just signing and not saying anything. It is a secret.

Yeah. It's harder for me to sign and talk at the same time.
Well, I'm not good at all at ASL. If I were, I surely wouldn't be able to do it at work and be oral, because you can't do it. I couldn't speak English and sign ASL at the same time. I can barely do the same thing at the same time. I don't feel to myself that I'm, an ambitious signer. My self-concept in that area is real low. So, I feel that probably a lot of the kids have the same feeling about speech. They feel real inadequate. Better not to try than to screw up.

Gosh!

Yeah!

Well, we know we have other strategies so we can get our meanings across, so hopefully they (students) can develop the same perceptions. Finally, what do you think about the willingness of people who work with the students in and out of the classrooms in education settings to really focus in on communicative intents, reasons for talking; successes in real world situations and in making kids real flexible in terms of what they do with conversations with different types of people in different roles, especially adult roles. How willing are teachers to approach this in what they do in the classroom?

I can imagine if they were encouraged and that the reasons for it were clearly explained to them, we would have a much greater level than we do now. I don't think that that's necessarily very important. I suspect that that probably would not be a priority item at all with most of the teachers, because I don't think they have ever been told why. "If you give information to me, that's all that is really important." The fact that that isn't necessarily the way that adults communicate with each other probably has never been stressed that you almost have to teach that. You have to encourage that and teach that. As far as willingness to try? I don't know. Our supervisor here made a wonderful statement in a meeting that I attended with him not too long ago and he said, "Adult behaviors are almost impossible to change." I truly believe he was right. I believe that those of us who have certain ways of doing things find any kind of change extremely difficult and oftentimes are resistant just because it is different. Sometimes, if you can explain why that is important, some people are more willing to make the effort. Some are always going to believe that conversation and speech is the speech teacher's responsibility and no one else's. We have no reason to have to do that, because that's why we hire speech therapists for. And sometimes the speech pathologist think that it is the teacher's responsibility.

Yeah, so the question is who wears the hat in terms of responsibility for oral communication responsibility?

Yeah.

Very interesting. OK! Thank you very much! If there are other questions or puzzles, may I call you and ask over the phone. I'm sure I'll think of something.

Of course. Anytime. You know how to reach me.
APPENDIX E

TEACHERS' FORMAL INSERVICE SESSION
The Teachers' Formal Inservice Session

Before the formal and informal drama orientation sessions, the teachers expressed various perceptions of what classroom drama would be. The two teachers who were team teachers in the high school oral classroom's Language Arts class had never experienced process drama and expected to be doing more socio-drama. The teacher in the oral elementary classroom had observed several of my drama lessons. I facilitated communication sessions in her classroom when she taught at site one, in the oral communication high school classroom two years before the data collection period. At times, she would join in with an attitudinal role with the group, but she never led a drama lesson. The teacher in the total communication high school program had not participated with me in the classroom, but was familiar with drama because she had completed a drama workshop with Dr. O'Neill at the university just before the data collection period. This teacher had never attempted to lead a drama lesson in her classroom. The teacher from the total communication elementary school classroom had previously invited me to facilitate a drama experience with her church group; so she had observed drama and knew how it might work with children.

As planned, all five classroom teachers participated with the researcher and Dr. O'Neill in a three-hour in-service training session. During that session, the teachers were introduced to extended improvisational role play. It was presented, for the purposes of this research, primarily as a mode of learning and as facility for improved communication skills in the classroom. Although most emphasis was given to pragmatics - language appropriateness in context - additional educational values of process drama were presented.
The participants explored, through actual drama experiences and discussion, what drama can do. During the session, the teachers reflected and agreed that drama could also help to fulfill academic subject matter objectives and objectives from the affective domain. They recognized that it could help to foster a democratic atmosphere in the classroom, and to provide an effective way to hold honor cultural and individual interests, characteristics, and values.

In order to sample how drama might be used effectively in the classroom with students, a version of the African folktale, Mu faro's Beautiful Daughters, written and illustrated by John Steptoe, was used as a pre-text for the teachers' role play. A pre-text might be described as an effective catalyst or springboard for the beginnings of a drama lesson. Steptoe's story is a traditional African version of the Cinderella story.

After having read the first half of the story and having shown the illustrations, Dr. O'Neill led the teachers in several episodes of active exploration of the stories' themes through drama. In order to establish the dramatic elsewhere, we took some time in the recreation of a marketplace scene. Participants collaborated in defining the physical characteristics and simulating the activity of a marketplace. The teachers were encouraged to move through the space and communicate as townspeople might. They were given the opportunity to physically "stand-in" for what was perceived to be the conceptually perfect queen candidate for the African King character story in the book. The teachers experienced the duality of actor/spectator roles as they manifested, observed and interpreted poses which were suggestive of personality qualities that ranged from grace, humility, and modesty to greed, vanity, and deception.
Dr. O'Neill then demonstrated how the teacher-in-role strategy (Wagner, 1976) can be used to optimize the quality of students' communication behaviors. She assumed the role of a mere assistant's assistant of the king, given the task to meet with and garner advice from an exalted council of advisors (the teachers) who were most widely respected in all kingdoms as foremost authorities on the selection of individuals suitable for royal matrimony. In employing the drama convention, "mantle of the expert", it was demonstrated how students might, through a status shift in role, function as experts. That is, if they were royal advisors, they would be expected to adjust their behaviors in order to meet the tasks of their pretend world. They would walk as royal advisors, they would gesture as royal advisors, they would speak with the formality and assertiveness, and genius of royal advisors - judiciously advising, reasoning, collaborating with fellow experts; yet, they would be compelled, in order to make their situation in the drama "come out right", to carefully modify their expressions so as not to offend his majesty.

Both trainers, in role as assistants to the king, interviewed, in pairs, the teachers in role as the noble one's prospective brides in their final elimination conferences. Each teacher, now in role as a candidate, had the task of convincingly representing herself as most suitable to be the king's betrothed. It was necessary to employ communication skills selectively and strategically in order to meet the challenges of the fictional, yet realistic, roles and situations. The hopeful candidates were driven, through the demands of the role, to use controlling communicative intents which included reasoning, persuading, and appealing in convincing the

The teachers acknowledged that their students would most likely find similar motivations in this kind of role play. Their students could respond to
interpersonal situations which would pressurize them and cause them to work through the problem (Heathcote, in Johnson & O'Neill, 1984). The compelling experiences of "living through" challenges and changes in the dramatic world can and should inherently demand heightened flexibility, sophistication, effectiveness and facility in interpersonal behaviors - or, more concisely, significantly improved communicative competence.

And, equally important, in their debriefing after the Mufaro drama, the teachers expressed their understanding that the proposition of improved communication is not one-sided. One of the characteristics of successful drama implementation in the classroom is the liberation of the teacher to adopt critically differential interpersonal stances or social registers which demand departure from the traditional role of teacher as the omnipotent source of information and as the sole authority in the classroom. In a complementary way, the students are liberated to assume critical roles that allow personal contributions, which, although unusual in regular classroom methodology, welcome the students' increased expressions of authority, control, feeling, and imagination.

We discussed how process drama might be included in their existing curriculum based on the whole language philosophy. The teachers were then given comparison sheets which briefly detailed how drama might follow the expectations of the whole language philosophy (Table 22). These aligned characteristics include emphasis on cooperative learning strategies and opportunities for reading and writing in and out of role.

The teachers were encouraged to view this initial session on process drama as just the beginning of a long-term learning experience. They were assured that I would continue to work closely with them as they worked as
"instigators in committing their students to work" (Heathcote in Johnson & O'Neill, 1989).

**Subsequent Training Sessions**

As scheduled, I met with the teachers individually at their school sites for two follow-up drama discussion and planning sessions. The two teachers who team-taught at the oral high school participated together.

During the three 30 minute sessions, we first reviewed our participation in the formal session, reviewed the nature of process drama, the "rules" and rationales for its use in the context of the confines of the typical classroom situation. We then discussed possibilities for their own classroom drama structures and facilitations. The teachers were told that I would be videotaping communication behaviors during the drama sessions. They were not told the specific behaviors which would most likely be targeted for analysis. The teachers were not burdened, in this very early stage of teaching through drama, with the cause and effect propositions about the good of drama for enhancing specific language and communication performance. Instead, a good deal of discussion focused on the merits of teacher-in-role and mantle of the expert as primary structures for the dramas that they would be facilitating. My assumption was that if these conventions were implemented successfully, there would be a positive effect on communication behaviors by reducing the overbearing status and practice of the teacher as "dictator" and "the one who knows".
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APPENDIX G

PIE CHARTS WITH PERCENTAGES OF COMMUNICATION ACROSS CLASSES
Table 27.

Pie Chart: Classroom A, Phase I Initiation

CLASSROOM A PHASE I-SUMMATION

INITIATION

- T/A
- A1
- A2
- A3
- A4
- A5
- A6
- A7
- A8
- A9
- A10
Table 28.

Pie Chart: Classroom A, Phase I Response

CLASSROOM A PHASE I-SUMMATION

RESPONSE

T/A A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 A7 A8 A9 A10
Table 29.

Pie Chart: Classroom B, Phase I Initiation

CLASSROOM B PHASE I-SUMMATION
INITIATION

■ T1/B ■ T2/B ■ B1 ■ B2 ■ B3 ■ B4 ■ B5 ■ B6 ■ B7 ■ B8 ■ B9
Table 30.

Pie Chart: Classroom B, Phase I Response

CLASSROOM B PHASE I-SUMMATION
RESPONSE

- Ritual
- Inform
- Control
- Feeling
- Imagination

T1/B T2/B B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 B6 B7 B8 B9
Table 31.

Pie Chart: Classroom C, Phase I Initiation

CLASSROOM C PHASE I-SUMMATION

INITIATION

- RITUAL
- CONTROL
- FOUNDATION

T/C  C1  C2  C3  C4
Table 32.

Pie Chart: Classroom C, Phase I Response

CLASSROOM C PHASE I-SUMMATION
RESPONSE

T/C C1 C2 C3 C4
Table 33.

Pie Chart: Classroom D, Phase I Initiation
Table 34.

Pie Chart: Classroom D, Phase I Response

CLASSROOM D PHASE 1-SUMMATION

RESPONSE

- RITUAL
- INFORM
- CONTROL
- FEELING

T/D D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 D6 D7 D8
Table 35.

Pie Chart: Classroom A, Phase II Initiation
Table 36.

Pie Chart: Classroom A, Phase II Response

CLASSROOM A PHASE II - SUMMATION

RESPONSE

- T/A
- A1
- A2
- A3
- A4
- A5
- A6
- A7
- A8
- A9
- A10
Table 37.

Pie Chart: Classroom B, Phase II Initiation

CLASSROOM B PHASE II-SUMMATION

INITIATION

RITUAL

DISORDER

CONTROL

FEELING

IMAGINATION

T1/B  T2/B  B1  B2  B3  B4  B5  B6  B7  B8  B9
Table 38.

Pie Chart: Classroom B, Phase II Response
Table 39.

Pie Chart: Classroom C, Phase II Initiation

CLASSROOM C PHASE II-SUMMATION
INITIATION

- Ritual
- Control
- Feeling
- Imagination

T/C C1 C2 C3 C4
Table 40.

Pie Chart: Classroom C, Phase II Response

CLASSROOM C PHASE II-SUMMATION
RESPONSE

- RITUAL
- CONTROL
- IMAGINATION
- INFOEM
- PARTING

T/C C1 C2 C3 C4
Table 41.

Pie Chart: Classroom D, Phase II Initiation

CLASSROOM D PHASE II-SUMMATION
INITIATION
Table 42.

Pie Chart: Classroom D, Phase II Response

CLASSROOM D PHASE II-SUMMATION
RESPONSE

[Diagram of pie chart with sections labeled T/D, D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8]
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